DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH

How Do Active Duty Women Perceive the Army's Equal Opportunity Climate?

by

Brenda L. Moore, Ph.D.
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY

Summer Faculty Research Fellow

Summer 1997

DEOMI Research Series Pamphlet 97-14

How Do Active-Duty Women Perceive the Army's Equal Opportunity Climate?

ABSTRACT

Equal opportunity is recognized by the Department of Defense (DoD) as being crucial to maintaining a high state of military readiness. In the last two and a half decades, a number of equal opportunity initiatives have been employed by the DoD and each of the military Services in an effort to promote fair treatment of minorities and women. Social science literature suggests that the integration of racial minorities, particularly black males, is a military success story (Moskos, 1990). Some social scientists argue convincingly that the military has far surpassed civilian organizations in integrating African Americans (Moskos & Butler, 1996; Moskos, 1993).

While the U.S. military has had a long history of addressing racial issues, problems concerning gender have only recently been addressed on a large scale. Some scholars assert that the military is the last male bastion in the United States, and it lags behind the civilian sector in integrating women (Burke, 1996; Becraft, 1992).

This study examines the perceptions of active duty men and women in the U.S. Army to determine whether or not minority men are more satisfied with the equal opportunity climate than women and whether or not minority women are less satisfied with the equal opportunity climate than non-minority (white) women. Although the focus of this study is on active-duty women in the Army, active-duty men have been entered into the statisical analysis for comparison. Degree of satisfaction is measured by responses to items on the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (MEOCS). The data were stratified by rank level (officer and enlisted), and a General Linear Model was estimated with race, gender, and the intersection of race and gender as independent variables. Results indicate race is a more powerful predictor of the attitudes of active-duty men and women toward the equal opportunity climate in the military than gender. While gender and the interaction of gender and race are significant in most of the statistical models in this study, they explain less than one percent of the variance. Although African-American men are more satisfied with the equal opportunity climate than African-American women, they are less satisfied than both white women and, in some cases, Hispanic women.

INTRODUCTION

Military Service is often viewed as being an avenue of upward mobility for minority men (Lopreato & Poston, 1977; Moskos, 1990; Moskos & Butler, 1996). Browning, Lopreato, and Poston (1973) found that the military provides a "bridging environment" for racial minorities, providing them with the training skills necessary to advance socially and economically in the civilian context. Some scholars go so far as to argue that the U.S. Army is pardigmatic in the way it has integrated African-American men (Moskos, 1990; 1993; Moskos & Butler, 1996). The scenario, however, is ostensibly less optimistic for women, whose participation in the Armed Services is relatively recent, and who are still excluded from military occupations involving direct combat.[1] Although the military has expanded opportunities for women over the last two decades, it is often viewed as the last bastion of male resistance when it comes to integrating women (Stiehm, 1989; Burke, 1996). Surely, military service is typically viewed as being a male domain even in the United States where women are liberated from many of the restrictions associated with traditional norms.

A central question is how active-duty military women perceive the military's equal opportunity environment. The purpose of this study is to examine perceptions of active-duty men and women to determine whether active-duty Army women are as disgruntled about the military environment as some of the literature would suggest. By the same token, are minority males as satisfied with the equal opportunity climate in today's Army as much of the literature implies? Are active-duty military women more satisfied in some types of units than in others? Are women officers more satisfied than enlisted women? Are active-duty military women, on average, less satisfied than active-duty men? Are active duty women of color, by virtue of their race/ethnicity, more or less satisfied than white women in the military? These are some of the questions explored below. Although the focus of this study is on active-duty Army women, active-duty men are analyzed for comparison.

BACKGROUND

Studies on Race, Gender, and Military Service

Some scholars argue, quite cogently, that the U.S. Army is "unmatched in its broad record of black achievement," and that the Army is the "only place in American life where whites are routinely bossed around by blacks" (Moskos & Butler, 1996, 2). African Americans are overrepresented in the Armed Services, comprising 12 percent of the overall population while making up 19.4 percent of the total active forces (all active Services combined) and 26.8 percent of the Army as of March 1997. African Americans, however, are underrepresented in the officer corps, comprising 7.7 percent of the total active force, and 11.5 percent of Army officers. However, since officers must have a college degree, this level

of officer representation compares favorably with the national proportion of African-American college graduates (6.9 percent in 1993) (Smith & Horton, 1997). While the total percentage of African Americans in the Army has been decreasing slightly over the last ten years, the percentage of African-American officers has increased slightly.

In an article published in 1993, Charles Moskos claimed that the racial climate in the military is more positive than on most college campuses, reflecting the military's success with racial integration. According to Moskos, this is attributable to three factors. First, the military provides a level playing field, dramatized by basic training where economically disadvantaged Blacks may outperform middle-class Whites. Second, he claims that there is a sincere commitment on the part of military leadership to nondiscrimination. Finally, Moskos asserts that the Armed Forces' equal opportunity training program conducted at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute helps to reduce racial prejudices among Service members. Indeed, the American Armed Services have come a long way in ameliorating racial tension since President Truman signed Executive Order 9981 mandating racial desegregation in the military. The favorable conditions for racial minorities referred to in Moskos' article may be categorized as "military pull factors," (i.e., incentives for men and women to join the military). An additional "military pull factor" is the standardized pay scale; regardless of race/ethnicity/gender, servicemembers of the same rank receive the same military pay. This is in contrast to the civilian sector where, for example, men and women in the same jobs, at the same level, sometimes receive different salaries, often lower for women.

"Military pull factors" alone, however, do not completely explain the overrepresentation of African Americans in today's military. There is at least one major "civilian push factor." I would argue that the overrepresentation of African Americans, particularly African-American women in the Armed Services, is less a factor of choice and more a factor of need (Fernandez, 1982; Moore, 1991; 1996). Elsewhere the author asserted that for many African-American women, military Service represents job security (Moore, 1996b, 127). African Americans are twice as likely to experience unemployment as are white Americans; the unemployment rate for African Americans is two to three times higher than it is for European Americans (Moore, 1996b, 128). This strongly suggests that there is an economic push factor in the civilian sector which helps to explain why African Americans are overrepresented in the Armed Services.

Hispanics, by comparison, are underrepresented in the U.S. military. Compared with their percentage of the overall population (11 percent), only 6.0 percent of the active-duty force is Hispanic. Hispanics make up 6.5 percent of the Army's enlisted ranks and 3.5 percent of the officers. Are Hispanic men and women less satisfied with military Service than men and women of different racial and ethnic backgrounds? Hispanic women make-up 5.5 percent of all Army enlisted women and 3.7 percent of Army women officers. This raises a question about how Hispanics on active-duty perceive the military's equal opportunity climate.

Representation of white men and women in the Army has been decreasing slightly over the last ten years from 64.1 percent in 1988 to 60.7 percent in March 1997. A previous study showed that from 1971 to 1989 both the numbers and percentages of white women decreased (Stoddard, 1993, 33). This implies that over time, white women are comparably less inclined to join the active Services. Could it be that white women serving in the military are dissatisfied with the equal opportunity climate in their units?

While women are more active in the military today than they have been in previous years, they are still largely underrepresented in the active Services. Women constitute 50 percent of the American population but only 14 percent of our active-duty military forces. Sexual harassment scandals, such as the Navy's 1991 Tailhook incident, and the 1997 rape charges against male noncommissioned officers and a commissioned officer at Maryland's Aberdeen Proving Grounds indicated to many that the military Services have major problems associated with integrating women. As stated in a *U.S. News and World Report* article, "The . . . accusations of rape, sexual harassment and fraternization at Army training posts show the problem is serious" (Noah, Newman, Auster, Hetter, and Fischer, 1996, 40). Media assessments, however, generally reflect the views and interpretations of outsiders looking in. An interesting question is: how do active-duty Army women view the military equal opportunity climate?

Previous Studies Using the MEOCS

Research conducted by Dansby (1994, 1995) revealed that of all servicemembers responding to the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (MEOCS) from June 1990 to July 1995 (approximately 385,000 respondents), minority women officers viewed the military's overall equal opportunity climate least favorably. Among his other findings: white military members perceived the equal opportunity climate to be more favorable than minority (non-white) members, men perceived the climate to be more favorable than women, and officers generally perceived equal opportunity to be better than enlisted members. What was unusual about minority women officers is that they were more pessimistic than minority enlisted women.[2]

In a subsequent study, Dansby and Landis explained minority women's responses in terms of what Rosebeth Kanter (1977a, 208-209) referred to as "tokens" in "skewed" groups. Members of token groups, as illustrated by Kanter (1977a, 1987b), are powerless due to their low-level representation in the organization and referencing earlier studies (Kanter 1977b; Spangler, Gordon, & Pipkin, 1978), Dansby and Landis tested the assumption that a low ratio of minority to majority members of an organization affects the quality of group interaction in the military. They found that as the representation of minority (non-white) women officers, minority male officers, and white male officers increased, group members' perception of the equal opportunity climate improved (Dansby & Landis, 1995, 7).[3] This finding did not hold true for either enlisted men or for white women. The perceptions of enlisted men, by contrast,

were less favorable as their representation increased. Dansby and Landis suggested that this may reflect the type of unit men are assigned to, arguing that larger units are more likely to be assigned to combat missions.

The present investigation differs from previous studies using the MEOCS data in several ways. First, the category of "minority women" is decomposed: Hispanic women and African-American women are examined separately. Due to small sample sizes, Asian and Native American women are not examined in this study. Unlike previous studies, this study combines MEOCS scales to form two dependent variables: one measuring perceptions about the equal opportunity climate in the unit, the other measuring the respondent's perceptions about equal opportunity climate in the Service. Finally, this study examines race, gender, and the interaction of these variables in all of the statistical models in an effort to determine (i) which variable is more significant in explaining perceptions of active-duty men and women and (ii) if there is a significant interaction effect between the two variables.

A primary objective of this study is to determine the interaction effects of race and gender on the perceptions of military women. While it appears that the U.S. military is making progress toward integrating women in its Services, there are a number of facts which suggest that the degree of women's integration varies with regard to race and ethnicity. For example, the U.S. military, particularly the Army, has been the leading employer of African Americans. Relative to their proportion in the civilian population (12 percent of all civilian women), African-American women are overrepresented in the U.S. military (30.8 percent of all military women), constituting 47.1 percent of Army enlisted women and 20.4 percent of Army women officers. Previous studies revealed that African-American women in the military serve longer terms and do not separate from service before their terms have expired as often as members of other racial/ethnic groups on active duty (Binkin, 1982, 52-53). Additionally, African-American women reenlist more often than other members, and comprise the greater proportion of single heads of households (Moore, 1991). In contrast, other minority women (i.e., Hispanic women) are underrepresented in the military.

These facts raise interesting questions: Are African-American women more committed to serving in the military than other members of society? Why, as in previous studies, have African-American women rated the military's equal opportunity climate less favorably yet reenlist at a higher rate than do other women? Still, African-American women face the same gender issues as white and other women. It is not unreasonable to surmise that since the military has made great gains in addressing racial issues, the primary concerns of African-American women are gender issues.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Gender is a stronger predictor than race in predicting the attitudes of active-duty Army women toward the equal opportunity climate. Hypothesis 2: African-

American and Hispanic women are less satisfied with the equal opportunity climate in the Army than white women due to an interaction effect between race and gender.

Data

The MEOCS data were used for the present analysis. The survey was developed by the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI), under the auspices of the Defense Equal Opportunity Council (DEOC). The survey, which is used to assess equal opportunity as it pertains to race and gender in military organizations, is a 124-item pencil and paper inventory. These items may be classified into four general categories, the first of which is demographic. The other three categories measure the respondent's perceptions of (i) equal opportunity within his/her unit, (ii) his/her organization's effectiveness, and (iii) equal opportunity in the Service as a whole.

METHODOLOGY

Based on prior factor analyses, survey items that measure the same perceptual domain were combined into 12 five-point factor scales; these scales have been shown to be reliable with an average Cronbach's alpha of .84, and a range from .75 to .91 (Dansby & Landis, 1995, 5). (For a more detailed explanation of scale reliability see Appendix A). Scales 1 to 5 and 12 measure perceptions on equal opportunity behaviors within the respondent's unit; scales 6 to 8 measure perceptions of organizational effectiveness; and scales 9 to 11 measure the respondent's perception of equal opportunity in the overall military society. Scale 12 is a global evaluation of the unit's equal opportunity climate (Dansby & Landis, 1992; Landis, Dansby, & Faley, 1993). (Items for each of the scales are displayed in Appendix B.) Dansby (1996) noted that the MEOCS's average alpha value is higher than most organizational climate surveys.

The MEOCS has been widely used by units comprised of both civilian and military personnel. The scores on each scale range from 1 to 5; the higher the score, the more favorable the perceived equal opportunity environment. In the analysis of the preliminary statistics, a disparity index (DI) was used to measure differences between subgroups. The DI, which was developed by Mickey Dansby of DEOMI, is a summary statistic consisting of the average absolute difference between compared subgroups across all scales.[4] It is used to help estimate the potential for organizational conflict "based on equal opportunity and organizational perceptions that differ between subgroups in the unit" (DEOMI, 1994a). The value of this index typically ranges from 0 to 1 (Conceivably, if the compared groups always rate all factors at diametrically opposite extremes, the DI could be 4. However, in actuality, the DI is rarely as large as 1); the higher the DI, the greater the difference in perceptions between compared subgroups.[5]

Sample Description

Between June 1990 and April 1997, 627,000 military personnel were surveyed from approximately 4,000 military units. As of April 1997, 283,204 active-duty men and women in the United States Army had been surveyed from approximately 1,450 Army units located in the United States, Europe, Asia, and Panama. A data file was created including only active-duty Army personnel and was further reduced to include only Hispanic, African American, and white men and women on active duty. This left a total sample of approximately 203,000 respondents (See Table 1).

TABLE 1

Rank Level, Unit Type, Educational Level and Race/Ethnicity by Gender

	Women	**Men**
	N	**N**
Rank Level		
Officers	6017	28661
Enlisted	26685	138780
Total	32702	167441
Unit Type		
Combat	6277	57633
Combat Support	6973	26407
Service Support	24667	80555
Total	37917	164595
Educational Level		
< High School	702	3056
High School/GED	7751	43763
Some College	15050	63525
College	8948	33855
Advance College	5469	21084
Total	37920	165283
Race/Ethnicity		
African American	11975	35468
White	18049	116606
Hispanic	2678	15367
Total	32702	167441

Method

Because the lifestyles of enlisted and officer personnel are often quite different, the data were stratified by rank level (officers and enlisted) and cross-tabulated for each of the twelve scales by gender, while controlling for race. These findings are discussed below in the results section, under the subsection on preliminary statistics. The subsection on preliminary statistics is further separated to show variation in women's perceptions by rank level, unit type, and level of education. Although the discussion in this section includes findings before a test of significance was done, these statistical trends are noteworthy.

To determine whether or not the differences detected in the preliminary statistics were significant, two multivariate analyses were performed (one for officers and one for enlisted personnel) with race, gender, and the intersection of race and gender as independent variables, and the 12 scales as dependent variables. The F-test was used to determine significance. The results of the multivariate analyses showed each of the scales measuring the EO climate in the respondent's unit (scales 1 to 5 and 12) to be significant. The scales measuring perceptions about the overall EO climate in the Service (scales 9 and 10) were also significant. On the other hand, none of the scales measuring organizational effectiveness (scales 6 to 8) were significant. All of the scales measuring perceptions on the equal opportunity climate in the respondents' units were combined into one variable labeled "COMBUNIT;" and all of the scales measuring the overall equal opportunity climate in the Service (global environment) into one scale labeled "COMGLOB."

To test the hypotheses specified above a General Linear Model (GLM) was developed. The L-matrix was used to determine interaction effects of gender within racial categories (See GLM models in Appendix C). Because large sample sizes often show significance where there are small actual effects, the Eta Squared statistic was used to determine the proportion of variance explained by the independent variables. The findings of these tests are reported in the GLM section under the subsection on the "total stratified sample." To control for paygrade, unit type, and level of education, the data were stratified and the models were run on each part separately. To examine the effects of unit type, for example, the entire sample was stratified (both officers and enlisted personnel together) by unit type: combat, combat support, and combat service support. The GLM was tested on each stratified part separately. Finally, F-tests, level of significance, and Eta Squared statistics were compared for variation across control groups. These findings are discussed below in the subsection on control variables.

RESULTS

Preliminary Findings on Women Controlling For Race

For the exploratory data analysis, the data were cross tabulated by rank level (officers

vs. enlisted), unit type, and level of education with each of the 12 scales. Race and ethnicity were controlled. Some of the more interesting findings are reported below.

Variation in Army Women's Perception by Rank Level

Results of the cross-tabulations revealed that white women officers perceived that there was less sexual harassment and discrimination in their units than did white enlisted women, and women of different racial/ethnic groups (Scale 1). (See Appendices A and B for a description of the scales.) Hispanic women officers perceived a higher rate of sexual harassment and discrimination than did Hispanic enlisted women. Hispanic enlisted women perceived that there is less sexual harassment and discrimination in their units than white enlisted women. African-American officers and enlisted women scored similarly on the sexual harassment and discrimination scale ($X = 3.7$), but lower than white and Hispanic women. The DI between African-American and white women officers was .2, which is moderately low. The highest ranking African-American and Hispanic women officers (O-6 or above) perceived that there was more sexual harassment in their Army units than perceived by lower ranking officers of the same racial/ethnic background. The higher-ranking white women officers, by contrast, perceived there was less overt sexual harassment and discrimination in their units than did lower ranking white women officers.

Army enlisted women perceived greater command differential treatment toward minorities (scale 2) than did officers. The gap was greater between white women officers and enlisted women (DI = .2, which is moderately low) than it was between African-American or Hispanic women officers and enlisted women (a DI of .08, which is low). In general, women officers perceived the overall equal opportunity climate (Scale 12) to be more favorable than did enlisted women, but African-American women officers scored lowest on this scale, a finding also reported by Dansby and Landis (1998).

African-American women in the enlisted ranks had the strongest, while white women officers had the least, desire for racial and gender separation (Scale 11) of all the women in the study (DI = .4, which is medium). Hispanic women officers had slightly more of a desire for racial and gender separation than Hispanic enlisted women.

Variation in Army Women's Perceptions by Unit Type

When controlling for unit type, the cross-tabulation results showed that active-duty women assigned to combat units had the least favorable perception of the overall military equal opportunity climate (Scale 12), as well as on other scales, as compared with women assigned to other units. For example, they perceived that there were more instances of overt sexual harassment and discrimination in their units (Scale 1) than women in either combat support or service support units. Similarly, they perceived that there was more discrepancy in command behavior toward minorities and fewer instances of minority and majority members getting

along well in their units (Scales 2 and 3) than women in either combat support or service support units. Given these findings, it was not surprising that active-duty women in combat units also believed that minorities and women are discriminated against more in the larger society than women in the other units (Scale 9), and that racial/gender groups should have less interaction with each other (Scale 11).

Within combat units the same racial trend persisted: Hispanic women generally rated the scales lower than white women, and African-American women rated them lower than Hispanic women. However, there were a few notable exceptions. African-American women rated the scale measuring perceptions of reverse discrimination in their units (Scale 5) highest, exhibiting a more positive attitude, as compared with women in the other race/ethnic groups. All of the women, regardless of race/ethnic background, were equally positive that reverse discrimination was not a problem in the general society (Scale 10), and were equally satisfied about their jobs (Scale 8).

Variation in Army Women's Perceptions by Level of Education

The preliminary summary of the data also showed that better educated white women perceived that there was less sexual harassment and discrimination in their units than was perceived by less well educated white women. Similarly, African-American and Hispanic women with a high school education or less perceived that there was more sexual harassment in their units than women in the comparison groups with college degrees (Scale 1). However, African-American and Hispanic women with at least a college degree perceived that there was more sexual harassment than their African-American and Hispanic women counterparts with some college, or less.

For the most part, the more educated the women, the less they perceived overt sexist and racist behavior when compared with less educated women (Scale 4). When controlling for race within educational category, white women rated the overall EO climate in their units higher than Hispanic women, who rated it slightly higher than African-American women (scale 12). The summary data also suggested that the most educated African-American women perceived more discrimination against minorities and women (Scale 9). In contrast, white women with a high school degree or less perceived that there was greater discrimination against minorities and women than better educated white women; but they perceived that there was less discrimination than did African-American or Hispanic women at the same educational level. Hispanic women of all educational levels perceived less discrimination against minorities and women than was perceived by African-American women.

In general, the more educated active-duty women were, the less they desired racial or gender separation in the military. Still, while these data showed variation in race and ethnicity within gender, they had not been tested for significance at this point.

Multivariate Analysis

The multivariate analysis was done as a first step in modeling the data. All of the scales were entered into the multivariate model as dependent variables in an effort to determine what was and was not significant before refining the model. As mentioned above, in the multivariate analysis, it was found that race, gender, and the intersection of race and gender for all of the scales measuring the unit's equal opportunity climate, and those measuring perceptions on the global equal opportunity climate (EO climate in the Services in general) were significant for both officers and enlisted personnel. However, race and gender were not significant variables in predicting organizational effectiveness. The F-statistic for race, gender, and the intersection of race and gender did not vary significantly when job satisfaction (Scale 8) or organizational commitment (Scale 6) were placed in the models. Therefore, no test for organizational effectiveness was conducted and Scales 6 to 8 were not included in the final General Linear Model.

General Linear Model

Total Stratified Sample

Because the independent variables were categorical, the race variable had three levels: white, African American, and Hispanic, and this study was concerned with the interaction effects of race and gender, the General Linear Model (GLM) was used in the final analysis.[6] To test the hypotheses that gender was a stronger predictor than race in predicting the attitudes of women in the Army toward equal opportunity and that African-American women were less satisfied with the equal opportunity climate in the Army than white or Hispanic women, four GLMs were developed. Results of Model 1, shown in Table 2, contain Army officers only; the measure of perception at the unit level, COMBUNIT, is the dependent variable. The design is as follows: COMBUNIT is a function of Intercept + Gender + Race + (Race*Gender) (See Appendix A).

Model 2, shown in Table 2, has the same design and the same dependent variable (COMBUNIT) as Model 1 except it examines Army enlisted personnel rather than Army officers. Model 3, shown in Table 2, is the same design as Model 1, includes Army officers only. However, the dependent variable in this model is COMGLOB, which measures the respondent’s perceptions of equal opportunity in the overall military society (See Appendix A). Model 4, shown in Table 2, is the same as Model 3 but includes enlisted personnel only.

The first hypothesis was not supported by the data. While gender was significant in all of the models in Table 2, it accounted for less than one percent of the variance in the Eta-squared statistic (See results of all Models in Table 2). Similarly, where there was significant

Table 2

MODEL 1

ARMY OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
Intercept	1	326988.2*	.000	.913	1.000
Gender	1	71.159*	.000	.002	1.000
Race	2	1146.245*	.000	.068	1.000
Race*Gend	2	3.140*	.043	.000	.605

MODEL 2

ARMY ENLISTED PERSONNEL (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
Intercept	1	1800064*	.000	.923	1.000
Gender	1	.020	.887	.000	.052
Race	2	2196.232*	.000	.028	1.000
Race*Gend	2	5.204*	.006	.000	.831

MODEL 3

ARMY OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
Intercept	1	247706.8*	.000	.887	1.000
Gender	1	21.044*	.000	.001	.996
Race	2	575.247*	.000	.035	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1.302	.272	.000	.284

MODEL 4

ARMY ENLISTED PERSONNEL (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
Intercept	1	1361190*	.000	.900	1.000
Gender	1	75.353*	.000	.000	1.000
Race	2	573.610*	.000	.008	1.000
Race*Gend	2	11.285*	.000	.000	.993

**Significant at the .05 level*

interaction effect between race and gender in Models 1, 2, and 4, the interaction effect accounted for less than one percent of the variance in these models. Race, on the other hand, was significant in all of the models and accounted for seven percent of the variance in Model 1, three percent of the variance in explaining differences among enlisted personnel (Model 2, Table 2), three and a half percent of the difference in the perceptions of officers about the EO in the United States (Model 3, Table 2), and almost one percent of the variance in the perceptions of enlisted personnel on the EO climate in the broader military environment (Model 4, Table 2).

The second hypothesis, however, was partly supported by the data. Comparing mean scores of men and women by racial and ethnic categories in all of the models, it was clear that African-American women were less satisfied with the equal opportunity climate in their units and in the global military society than were white or Hispanic women. Hispanic women were less satisfied than white women. The means reported in Tables 3 and 4 indicated the direction of the significance reported in Table 2. All of the models in Tables 3 and 4 revealed that the average scores for white men and women were higher than those of Hispanic men and women, which was higher than the average score for African-American men and women. In other words, Hispanic men and women were less optimistic about the overall EO climate than whites, but more optimistic than African Americans. As expected, the greatest mean difference across gender existed between African-American women and white male officers on issues of equal opportunities in their units ($\Delta = .5858$) (see Table 3). The Eta-Squared statistics reported in Table 2 indicated that this difference is attributable more to race than gender, and that the interaction effect between the two variables was small (approximately zero).

The fact that African-American and Hispanic men were more pessimistic about the military equal opportunity climate than were white women was noteworthy. The greatest mean difference between these groups was between the perceptions of white women officers and African American male officers about equal opportunity in their units (see Table 3). This finding also helped to explain why the gender effect, and the interaction effect between race and gender, explained less than one percent of the variance in the models in which they were significant. It was concluded that race was a more powerful variable than gender in explaining the differences found in the MEOCS data.

Total Sample with Control Variables

The hypotheses were tested controlling for pay grade, unit type, and level of education. After stratifying the total sample by the categories of the variable controlled for, the same GLM models were estimated as shown in Appendix C. The results follow.

Table 3

MODEL 1

ARMY OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

SEX	RACE-ETHNIC	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
WOMEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.6655	.6612	1247
	Hispanic	3.7899	.7003	281
	Wht (Not Hisp)	4.1101	.5529	3843
	Total	3.9901	.6186	5371
MEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.7565	.6521	3374
	Hispanic	3.9040	.6939	1310
	Wht (Not Hisp)	4.2513	.4988	21171
	Total	4.1691	.5611	25855
TOTAL	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.7319	.6557	4621
	Hispanic	3.8839	.6961	1591
	Wht (Not Hisp)	4.2296	.5100	25014
	Total	4.1383	.5754	31226

MODEL 2

ARMY ENLISTED (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

SEX	RACE-ETHNIC	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
WOMEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.5932	.6064	9787
	Hispanic	3.7208	.6195	2113
	Wht (Not Hisp)	3.8832	.5987	12606
	Total	3.7534	.6191	24506
MEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.6022	6039	28637
	Hispanic	3.6934	.6213	12445
	Wht (Not Hisp)	3.9040	.5891	84723
	Total	3.8145	.6099	125805
TOTAL	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.5999	.6045	38424
	Hispanic	3.6974	.6211	14558
	Wht (Not Hisp)	3.9013	.5904	97329
	Total	3.8045	.6118	150311

Table 4

MODEL 3

ARMY OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

SEX	RACE-ETHNIC	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
WOMEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.6872	.6469	1247
	Hispanic	3.7750	.6968	283
	Wht (Not Hisp)	4.0472	.5758	3863
	Total	3.9497	.6196	5393
MEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.7344	.7003	3370
	Hispanic	3.8575	.7384	1325
	Wht (Not Hisp)	4.1316	.6013	21365
	Total	4.0663	.6383	26060
TOTAL	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.7216	.6866	4617
	Hispanic	3.8430	.7317	1608
	Wht (Not Hisp)	4.1187	.5982	25228
	Total	4.0463	.6367	31453

MODEL 4

ARMY ENLISTED (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

SEX	RACE-ETHNIC	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
WOMEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.6996	.6110	9779
	Hispanic	3.7925	.6571	2107
	Wht (Not Hisp)	3.9006	.6454	12660
	Total	3.8112	.6401	24546
MEN	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.6711	.6610	28715
	Hispanic	3.7308	.7081	12507
	Wht (Not Hisp)	3.8225	.7175	85494
	Total	3.7792	.7071	126716
TOTAL	Blk (Not Hisp)	3.6784	.6488	38494
	Hispanic	3.7397	.7012	14614
	Wht (Not Hisp)	3.8326	.7091	98154
	Total	3.7844	.6967	151262

Pay Grade

The results of the cross-tabulations reported in the subsection on preliminary data showed differences in women's perceptions based on rank level (officers vs. enlisted). Using the GLM model, paygrade was controlled within rank levels to determine if race, gender, and the intersection between race and gender were more or less significant in predicting active-duty personnel's perceptions about the equal opportunity climate in the military and in the broader military society. While race and gender were both significant in predicting how officers at each paygrade level perceived the equal opportunity climate in their units, there was no significant interaction between the two variables (See Models in Table 5).

Women officers were less optimistic about the equal opportunity climate in their units than male officers at each paygrade level. In general, white officers perceived the equal opportunity climates of their units more favorably than Hispanics and African Americans. However, the perceptions of African-American and Hispanic officers varied according to officer paygrade. On average, African-American officers in paygrades O1-O2, O3, and O4, scored the equal opportunity climates in their units lower than Hispanics. In paygrade O5, African-American women perceived the equal opportunity climate in their units to be better than Hispanic women; African-American and Hispanic men rated the equal opportunity climate in their units the same at this paygrade. In paygrades O6 and above, African Americans rated equal opportunity in their units higher than did Hispanics.

In the enlisted ranks, race was significant in all paygrades when measuring respondents' perceptions about the equal opportunity climate in their units. Gender was significant in all paygrades except E6; and the interaction of race and gender was not significant in any of the paygrades except E6 (See Table 6). What was even more interesting was that women in paygrades E1-E3, and E4-E5, were more optimistic about the equal opportunity climate in their units than their male counterparts. Women in the paygrades E6, E7, and E8 or above, scored the equal opportunity climate in their units lower than their male counterparts. In each of the paygrades, white men and women perceived the equal opportunity climate in their units to be better than did Hispanics, who perceived it to be better than did African Americans.

Race was significant in each of the officer paygrades when measuring perceptions of the broader military society (See Table 7). Gender was significant in all of the paygrades but O6 and above. There was also a race/gender interaction effect among O3s and O5s. In each of the paygrade levels, women officers were more pessimistic about the equal opportunity climate in the overall military society than men officers. As expected, white men and women scored the global equal opportunity climate higher than Hispanics and African Americans. In paygrade level O1-O2, Hispanic men and women were more optimistic about the global EO climate than African-American men and women, respectively. In paygrades O3 and O5, African-American women rated the global EO climate more favorably than Hispanic women,

but African-American men rated it lower than Hispanic men. Among O4s, African-American

Table 5

MODEL 1

OFFICER PAY GRADE (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
O1-O2					
Gender	1	12.966*	.000	.002	.950
Race	2	194.354*	.000	.051	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1.727	.178	.000	.364
O3					
Gender	1	44.339*	.000	.005	1.000
Race	2	318.199*	.000	.069	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1383	.251	.000	.299
O4					
Gender	1	27.701*	.000	.005	1.000
Race	2	200.807*	.000	.067	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.544	.581	.000	.141
O5					
Gender	1	29.722*	.000	.007	1.000
Race	2	138.579*	.000	.064	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1.796	.166	.001	.377
O6 and Above					
Gender	1	13.765*	.000	.009	1.000
Race	2	105.997*	.000	.121	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.182	.834	.000	.078

Table 6

MODEL 2

ENLISTED PAY GRADE (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
E1-E3					
Gender	1	43.469*	.000	.002	1.000
Race	2	375.637*	.000	.027	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.988	.373	.000	.223
E4-E5					
Gender	1	31.725*	.000	.000	1.000
Race	2	1414.372*	.000	.033	1.000
Race*Gend	2	2.921	.054	.000	.572
E6					
Gender	1	2.136	.144	.000	.309
Race	2	527.876*	.000	.037	1.000
Race*Gend	2	4.860*	.008	.000	.804
E7					
Gender	1	29.195*	.000	.002	1.000
Race	2	262.061*	.000	.029	1.000
Race*Gend	2	2.486	.084	.000	.501
E8-E9					
Gender	1	19.992*	.000	.003	1.000
Race	2	90.565*	.000	.025	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.816	.442	.000	.191

**Significant at the .05 level*

Table 7

MODEL 3

OFFICER PAY GRADE (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
O1-O2					
Gender	1	4.972*	.026	.001	.606
Race	2	103.843*	.000	.028	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.108	.898	.000	.067
O3					
Gender	1	47.967*	.000	.006	1.000
Race	2	173.241*	.000	.039	1.000
Race*Gend	2	10.090*	.000	.002	.986
O4					
Gender	1	12.735*	.000	.002	.946
Race	2	73.972*	.000	.026	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1.612	.200	.001	.343
O5					
Gender	1	28.273*	.000	.007	1.000
Race	2	90.878*	.000	.043	1.000
Race*Gend	2	4.777*	.009	.002	.796
O6 and Above					
Gender	1	3.577	.059	.002	.472
Race	2	64.722*	.000	.077	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.351	.704	.000	.106

**Significant at the .05 level*

women rated the global EO climate less favorably than Hispanic women, but African-American men rated it more favorably than did Hispanic men. In paygrades O6 or above, both African-American men and women rated the global EO climate more favorably than Hispanic men and women, respectively.

Race was significant at all of the enlisted paygrade levels when measuring respondents perception of the global equal opportunity climate (See Table 8). Gender was significant in this model at the E1-E3, E4-E5, and E8-E9 paygrade levels. The only significant interaction effect was at the E4-E5 paygrade level (See Table 8). As reported above (with the dependent variable COMBUNIT), women in the E1-E3, and E4-E5 paygrade levels were more optimistic about the global equal opportunity climate than men in those categories. The mean score for men and women E6s on the global equal opportunity scale (COMBGLOB) was the same (3.8), which was moderately high on a scale of 1 to 5. Women in the E7 and E8-E9 paygrade levels scored lower on this scale than men in these paygrades. Hence, women in the higher enlisted ranks were less satisfied about the equal opportunity climate in the military, and in the overall military society, than men in comparable ranks.

Unit Type

As with other models in the analysis, race was significant in all of the models testing the effects of unit types (See Models 5 and 6, Table 9). When testing for perceptions of the equal opportunity climate in the respondent's unit, gender was significant in combat and service units, but not in support units (See Model 5, Table 9). Women in each of these models scored EO in their units lower than their male counterparts. White men and women scored the COMBUNIT scale higher than Hispanics, and African Americans scored the EO climate of their units least favorably.

When examining perceptions on the global equal opportunity climate, race was significant in each of the unit types, but gender was only significant in support units (see Model 6, Table 9). There was also a significant race/gender effect in support and service units (See Model 6, Table 9). The direction of the race effect was the same in the models with COMBGLOB as it was in the models with COMBUNIT as the dependent variable -- white men and women rated the scale higher than did Hispanics, who rated it higher than did African Americans. The direction of the gender effect varied; men and women in combat and service units had the same average scores (3.6 and 3.8, respectively). Another unexpected result was that women in support units were more optimistic about the global EO climate than were men.

Level of Education

As with the other models specified above, race was significant for respondents at all educational levels (See Models 5 and 6, Table 10). The race effect was in the same direction

Table 8

MODEL 4

ENLISTED PAY GRADE (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
E1-E3					
Gender	1	101.924*	.000	.004	1.000
Race	2	155.197*	.000	.011	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.822	.440	.000	.192
E4-E5					
Gender	1	134.470*	.000	.002	1.000
Race	2	371.637*	.000	.009	1.000
Race*Gend	2	7.441*	.001	.000	.942
E6					
Gender	1	.551	.458	.000	.115
Race	2	146.748*	.000	.011	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.460	.632	.000	.126
E7					
Gender	1	3.664	.056	.000	.482
Race	2	59.226*	.000	.007	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.252	.777	.000	.090
E8-E9					
Gender	1	10.271*	.001	.001	.893
Race	2	17.289*	.000	.005	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1.391	.249	.000	.300

**Significant at the .05 level*

Table 9

MODEL 5

UNIT TYPE

ARMY ENLISTED AND OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
Cbt.					
Gender	1	50.037*	.000	.001	1.000
Race	2	737.113*	.000	.023	1.000
Race*Gend	2	2.183	.113	.000	.448
Cbt. Support					
Gender	1	3.012	.083	.000	.411
Race	2	801.715*	.000	.046	1.000
Race*Gend	2	.857	.425	.000	.198
Cbt. Service					
Gender	1	58.879*	.000	.001	1.000
Race	2	2930.150*	.000	.053	1.000
Race*Gend	2	8.618*	.000	.000	.969

MODEL 6

ARMY ENLISTED AND OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
Cbt.					
Gender	1	.284	.594	.000	.083
Race	2	243.657*	.000	.008	1.000
Race*Gend	2	2.977	.051	.000	.580
Cbt. Support					
Gender	1	5.901*	.015	.000	.580
Race	2	241.630*	.000	.014	1.000
Race*Gend	2	3.704*	.025	.000	.682
Cbt. Service					
Gender	1	3.473	.062	.000	.462
Race	2	705.779*	.000	.013	.920
Race*Gender	2	6.788*	.001	.000	.920

** Significance at the .05 level*

Table 10

MODEL 5

ARMY ENLISTED AND OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBUNIT)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
High School Diploma or less					
Gender	1	.401	.527	.000	.097
Race	2	1051.291*	.000	.037	1.000
Race*Gend	2	4.905*	.007	.000	.808
Some Coll. no deg.					
Gender	1	2.286	.131	.000	.327
Race	2	1869.311*	.000	.038	1.000
Race*Gend	2	3.126*	.044	.000	.603
Coll. Deg. or more					
Gender	1	74.627*	.000	.001	1.000
Race	2	2243.451*	.000	.062	1.000
Race*Gend	2	17.063*	.000	.001	1.000

MODEL 6

ARMY ENLISTED AND OFFICERS (Dependent Variable COMBGLOB)

Source	df	F	Sig	Eta Squared	Obser Powr
High School Diploma or less					
Gender	1	7.124*	.008	.000	.761
Race	2	329.267*	.000	.012	1.000
Race*Gend	2	4.587*	.010	.000	.779
Some Coll. no deg.					
Gender	1	16.109*	.000	.000	.980
Race	2	365.823*	.000	.008	1.000
Race*Gend	2	1.545	.214	.000	.330
Coll. Deg. or more					
Gender	1	19.096*	.000	.000	.992
Race	2	679.372*	.000	.019	1.000
Race*Gend	2	4.490*	.011	.000	.770

in each of the models controlling for education: white men and women rated equal opportunity in the unit and the overall society most favorably, and African Americans rated it least favorably. Variation occurs with the effects of gender. Men and women with a high school diploma or less, or with some college but no degree, rated the EO climate of their units the same (3.6 and 3.7, respectively). Women with at least a college degree or more were less optimistic about the EO climate of their units than men with comparable education.

When responding to questions pertaining to the EO climate of the overall society, women with a high school diploma or less, and those with some college but no degree, scored higher than men. Women with a college degree or more rated the global EO climate less favorably than men.

DISCUSSION

Greater Opportunities for Women in Today's Army

The result of this study raises a question about the high level of satisfaction displayed by white women as compared to minority men. This relatively high degree of satisfaction may be explained by the fact that white women are recipients of recent structural changes enhancing their military careers. In recent years there has been a growing tolerance in the broader society, as well as in the military, toward women serving on active duty. There has also been interest on the part of the military Services to recruit more women. This is reflected in recent structural changes in military laws and policies that allow not only for greater participation of women, but also for women to fill a wider array of military occupations. Even in the face of the recent military downsizing, the proportion of women on active duty has continued to increase from 9 percent in 1982 to 10.4 in 1988, 11.7 in 1993, and 12.6 in 1995.

Today, women constitute 13.3 percent of the active armed forces. Responding to a Secretary of Defense Directive in 1993, the Services have increased the number of women in combat support and combat service support units.[7] Women are now authorized to serve in 83 percent of the Army's enlisted occupations, 97 percent of the warrant officer specialties, and 95 percent of the officer occupations.[8] While the issue of women serving in combat has yet to be resolved, military women have had a recent opportunity to demonstrate competency in this area. From 1990 to 1991, approximately 40,000 American women experienced war in the Persian Gulf, deployed to Saudi Arabia mostly by the Army (Enloe 1994, 81). According to a Government Accounting Office (GAO) report on women deployed in the Persian Gulf War, women served in a variety of occupational roles and performed a wide range of tasks before, during, and after hostilities (U.S. GAO, 1993, 11, 16). The report also revealed that women and men endured similar encampment facilities and conditions and displayed little difference in their abilities to cope with wartime stress. Where there were mixed gender units, according to

the report, unit cohesion was good (U.S. GAO, 1993). GAO concluded, as did several military officials, that women were an integral part of military service operations, and that they performed well.

The Gulf War experience helped to refute the myth of women's frailty and added support to a movement to allow women to serve in combat roles. One scholar observed that women who served in the Persian Gulf were portrayed in the media as "professionalized women militarized patriots" (Enloe, 1994, 102). Enloe further states:

> . . . [W]omen being taken prisoners and "women coming home in body bags" did not have the negative effects that were expected. And it wasn't for the lack of coverage. Two American women became prisoners of war and both survived. . . Eleven women died in the war, five in combat (Enloe 1994, 101).[9]

Women's participation in the war certainly helped to expand opportunities for women on active duty. Shortly after the war, in 1991, Congress lifted the ban on women's flying combat aircraft and serving on combat ships. In 1993, President Clinton signed a bill ending combat exclusion for women on combatant ships, and the following year 60 women were assigned to the USS Eisenhower, a combat aircraft carrier. In 1994, Defense Secretary Aspin approved a policy to allow women to serve with some ground combat units. As of September 1997, 26 Army women officers were assigned in Air Defense Artillery; there were no women assigned to these military occupations in 1994. Similarly, Army enlisted women are now assigned as Army drivers and in special duty assignments; in 1994, there were no women in those military occupations. More Army women today, than in 1994, are filling occupational slots in aviation, maintenance support, operation research, and small arms artillery repair.

Current Race Issues in the Army

While the military has made more progress toward racial integration than comparable institutions in the civilian sector, it is far from complete. These data suggested that psychology at least, racial integration in the military is incomplete. These data measure perceptions of the equal opportunity climate in the military that serve as a good indicator of reality. Referencing the late sociologist, W.I. Thomas, situations which are defined as real become real in their consequences (Thomas, 1966). Contrary to assertions that military women are more socially disadvantaged than are racial minority men, these data show just the opposite. Racial disparity in attitudes regarding the Army's equal opportunity climate, particularly those between African-American women and mainstream white women, is still prevalent.

African Americans are still socially, economically, and politically deprived in the civilian sector. Indeed, racial minorities in the United States are more economically

disadvantaged than majority women. This continued racial inequality in America in large part may be attributable to tenacious, racial stereotypes. As mentioned above, attitudes toward race and gender in the military reflect those that exist in the society at large.

Indeed, the military is the vanguard of racial integration at the structural level. More than any other institution, the military has reduced overt discrimination and has placed minority and women into positions of leadership. It has been able to accomplish structural integration primarily because of its coercive compliance structure. Where the military has not been as successful is in changing the attitudes of military personnel. The MEOCS revealed the perceptions of men and women in the military, not their overt behavior. It could very well be that the racial climate in the military is not as harmonious as reported in the studies cited above. The data also revealed that in some instances African-American women on active-duty in the military experience double jeopardy due to their race and gender.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Based on the current findings, it would be useful for DoD to monitor attitudes of active-duty men and women over time to see if the racial/ethnic gap closes or widens. Possibly, gender may emerge as a more significant variable than race as the issues of women become more politicized and as the number of women in leadership positions in the military increases significantly. It would be useful to look at race/ethnicity, gender, and the interaction of these variables in different Services. Finally, it is advisable for DoD to closely monitor gender issues given the fact that more women are likely to be entering the military well into the next millennium; and these women are likely to be “women of color.”

Appendix A

MEOCS Scale Reliabilities

Scale		Alpha
1	Sexual Harassment & (Sex) Discrimination	.89
2	Differential Command Behavior toward Minorities	.90
3	Positive EO Behaviors	.86
4	Racist/Sexist Behaviors	.85
5	"Reverse" Discrimination (I)	.79
6	Commitment to the Organization	.83
7	Perceived Work Group Effectiveness	.87
8	Job Satisfaction	.81
9	Discrimination against Minorities & Women	.91
10	"Reverse" Discrimination (II)	.75
11	Attitudes Toward Racial Separatism	.82
12	Overall EO Climate	.89

Source: Mickey R. Dansby, "Reliability and Validity of the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (MEOCS)," DEOMI, PAFB, FL

Appendix B

Scales with Corresponding Survey Items

Scale No.	Survey Item
1	Sexual Harassment & (Sex) Discrimination
	32. A male supervisor touched a female peer in a friendly manner, but never touched male peers. 36. When a female subordinate was promoted, a male peer made the comment, "I wonder who she slept with to get promoted so fast." 39. When a woman complained of sexual harassment to her superior, he told her, "You're being too sensitive." 41. The only woman in a work group was expected to provide housekeeping supplies, such as needle and thread, aspirin, etc., in her desk. 43. Racial/ethnic jokes were frequently heard. 45. A better qualified man was not picked for a good additional duty assignment because the Commander/CO said it would look better for equal opportunity to have a woman take this duty. 46. A supervisor referred to female subordinates by their first names in public, while using titles for the male subordinates. 47. The Commander/CO assigned an attractive woman to escort visiting male officials around because, "We need someone nice looking to show them around." 48. A woman who complained of sexual harassment was not recommended for promotion. 49. A man stated, "Our unit worked together better before we had women in the organization."
2	Differential Command Behavior toward Minorities
	10. A majority supervisor frequently reprimanded a minority subordinate but rarely reprimanded a majority subordinate. 16. A supervisor discouraged cross-racial dating among personnel who would otherwise be free to date within the organization. 18. A majority supervisor did not select a qualified minority subordinate for promotion. 23. A minority member was assigned less desirable office space than a majority member. 25. The Commander/CO changed the duty assignments when it was discovered that two persons of the same minority were assigned to the same sensitive area on the same shift. 28. A Commander/CO giving a lecture took more time to answer questions from majority members than from minority members. 30. When reprimanding a minority man the majority supervisor used terms such as "boy." 34. A motivational speech to a minority subordinate focused on the lack of opportunity elsewhere; to a majority subordinate, it focuses on promotion. 38. A qualified minority first-level supervisor was denied the opportunity for professional education by his/her supervisor. A majority first-level supervisor with the same

qualifications was given the opportunity.
44. A supervisor gave a minority subordinate a severe punishment for a minor infraction. A majority member who committed the same offense was given a less severe penalty.

Scale No.	Survey Item
3	Positive EO Behaviors
	1. Organization parties, picnics, award ceremonies and other special events were attended by both majority and minority personnel.
	2. The spouses of majority and minority personnel mixed and mingled during special events.
	5. Majority and minority supervisors were seen having lunch together.
	7. Majority and minority personnel were seen having lunch together.
	14. A new minority person joined the organization and quickly developed close majority friends from within the organization.
	19. When the Commander/CO held staff meetings, women and minorities, as well as majority men, were asked to contribute suggestions to solve problems.
	29. Majority and minority members were seen socializing together.
	31. Second level female supervisors had both men and women as subordinates.
	35. Majority personnel joined minority friends at the same table in the cafeteria or designated eating area.
	37. A supervisor gave the same punishment to minority and majority subordinates for the same offense.
4	Overt Racist/Sexist Behaviors
	3. A majority person told several jokes about minorities.
	6. A majority first-level supervisor made demeaning comments about minority subordinates.
	9. A majority member in your organization directed a racial slur at a member of another organization.
	12. A group of majority and minority personnel made reference to an ethnic group other than their own using insulting ethnic names.
	13. Graffiti written on the organization's rest room or latrine walls "put down" minorities or women.
	15. A minority man made off-color remarks about a minority woman.
	20. A majority member complained that there was too much interracial dating among other people in the organization.
	24. The term "dyke" (meaning lesbian), referring to a particular woman, was overheard in a conversation between unit personnel.
	40. Offensive racial/ethnic names were frequently heard.
	42. Racial/ethnic jokes were frequently heard.

Scale No.	Survey Item
5	"Reverse" Discrimination in the unit (I) 4. The Commander/CO did not appoint a qualified majority in a key position, but instead appointed a less qualified minority. 11. The supervisor had lunch with a new minority member (to make him/her feel welcome), but did not have lunch with a majority member who had joined the organization a few weeks earlier. 17. A minority man was selected for a prestigious assignment over a majority man who was equally, if not slightly better, qualified. 21. A supervisor always gave the less desirable additional duties to men. 22. A minority woman was selected to receive an award for an outstanding act even though she was not perceived by her peers as being as qualified as her nearest competitor, a majority man.
12	Overall EO Climate 110. Most people would rate the equal opportunity climate in this organization 1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = about average 4 = good 5 = very good 111. I personally would rate the equal opportunity climate in this organization 1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = about average 4 = good 5 = very good
9	Discrimination against Minorities & Women 75. More severe punishments are given out to minority as compared to majority offenders for the same types of offenses. 76. Majority supervisors in charge of minority supervisors doubt the minorities' abilities. 77. Minorities get more extra work details than majority members. 81. Majority males act as though stereotypes about minorities and women are true (for example, "Blacks are lazy"). 84. Majority males have a better chance than minorities or women to get the best training opportunities. 86. Majority males do not show proper respect for minorities or women with higher rank.

89. Majority males are not willing to accept criticism from minorities or women.
90. Majority members get away with breaking rules that result in punishment for minorities.

Scale No.	Survey Item
10	"Reverse" Discrimination in the United States broader society (II)
	91. Some minorities get promoted just because they are minorities. 93. Minorities and women frequently cry "prejudice" rather than accept responsibility for personal faults. 96. Minorities and women get away with breaking rules that majority males are punished for. 100. Many minorities act as if they are superior to majority members.
11	Attitudes Toward Racial Separatism
	80. After duty hours, people should stick together in groups made up of their race only (e.g., minorities only with minorities and majority members only with majority members). 82. Trying to bring about integration of women and minorities is more trouble than it's worth. 87. Minorities and majority members would be better off if they lived and worked only with people of their own races. 88. I dislike the idea of having a supervisor of a race different from mine. 92. Power in the hands of minorities is a dangerous thing.

Appendix C

Models 1 and 2:

```
GLM COMUNIT BY GENDER RACE
/LMATRIX 'COMPARING BLACK AND HISPANIC WOMEN'
RACE 1 -1 0 GENDER*RACE 1 -1 0 0 0 0;
RACE 1 0 -1 GENDER*RACE 1 0 -1 0 0 0
/METHOD = SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT = INCLUDE
/CRITERIA = ALPHA(.05)
/EMMEANS = TABLES (GENDER*RACE)
/PRINT = DESCRIPTIVE ETASQ HOMOGENEITY
/PLOT = SPREADLEVEL PROFILE (GENDER RACE GENDER*RACE)
 /DESIGN = GENDER RACE GENDER*RACE.
```

Models 3 and 4:

```
GLM COMGLOB BY GENDER RACE
/LMATRIX 'COMPARING BLACK AND HISPANIC WOMEN'
RACE 1 -1 0 GENDER*RACE 1 -1 0 0 0 0;
RACE 1 0 -1 GENDER*RACE 1 0 -1 0 0 0
/METHOD = SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT = INCLUDE
/CRITERIA = ALPHA(.05)
/EMMEANS = TABLES (GENDER*RACE)
/PRINT = DESCRIPTIVE ETASQ HOMOGENEITY
/PLOT = SPREADLEVEL PROFILE (GENDER RACE GENDER*RACE)
 /DESIGN = GENDER RACE GENDER*RACE.
```

References

Arbona, Pedro L. (1996). “Soldiers, Technology and the 21st Century," *Army, 46(1*), pp. 9-11.

Becraft, Carolyn H. (1992). "Women and the Military: Bureaucratic Policies and Politics." In E. A. Blacksmith (Ed.) *The Reference Shelf: Women in the Military*. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., pp. 8-17.

Binkin, Martin. (1994). "Military Technology and Army Manpower: Do Smart Weapons Require Smart Soldiers?” In Mark Eitelberg and Stephen Mehay (Eds.) *Marching Toward the 21st Century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 169-187.

_____, Mark Eitelberg, Alvin Schexnider, & Marvin Smith (1982). *Blacks and the Military*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.

Browning, Harley, Sally Lopreato, & Dudley Poston. (1973). "Income and Veterans Status: Variations among Mexican Americans, Blacks, and Anglos." *American Sociological Review, 38*, 74-85.

Burke, Carol. (1996). "Pernicious Cohesion." In Judith H. Stiehm (Ed.) *It's Our Military Too!: Women and the U.S. Military*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 205-219.

Butler, John S. (1995). "The Changing Requirements of the Military Organizations: The Military 2010.” Paper presentation at the Army 2010 Conference: Future Soldiers and the Quality Imperative." Catigny, IL, 31 May-2 June.

_____. (1988). "Race Relations in the Military." In Charles Moskos & Frank Woods (Eds.) *The Military More Than Just a Job?* New York: Pergamon-Brassey, pp. 115-127.

Dansby, Mickey R. (1994, December). *The Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (MEOCS)*. Paper presented at the WorldWide Equal Opportunity Conference, Cocoa Beach, FL.

_____ (1995). "The Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey: Overview Briefing to DACOWITS,” 13 October, Phoenix, AZ.

_____ (1998). "Cultural Diversity and Gender Issues." In Chris Cronin (Ed.) *Military Psychology: An Introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

_____ & Dan Landis (1998). "Race, Gender, and Representation Index as Predictors of Equal Opportunity Climate in Military Organizations." *Military Psychology, 10(2*), 87-105.

_____ & Dan Landis (1991). "Measuring Equal Opportunity in the Military Environment," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 389-504.

Davis, James, Jennifer Lauby, & Paul Sheatsley. (1983). *Americans View the Military: Public Opinion in 1982*, Report No. 131. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, April.

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (1994). *Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey: Commanders' Guide*. DEOMI, Directorate of Research, Patrick AFB, FL.

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (1994). *A Report of the Army Database from the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (MEOCS)*. DEOMI, Directorate of Research, Patrick AFB, FL.

Dorn, Edwin. (Ed.) (1989). *Who Defends America? Race, Sex, and Class in the Armed Forces*. Washington DC: Joint Center for Political Studies.

Enloe, Cynthia. (1994). "The Politics of Constructing the American Woman Soldier." In Elisabetta Addis, Valeria Russo, and Lorenza Sebesta (Eds.). *Women Soldiers: Images and Realities*. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 81-110.

_____. (1985). "Invisible Soldiers of the `80's." *Minerva*, Winter, 106-116.

_____ & Wendy Chapkis (1981). "Introduction." In Wendy Chapkis (Ed.) *Loaded Questions*. Washington, DC: Transnational Institute.

Janowitz, Morris. (1975). *Military Conflict*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

_____ & Charles Moskos (1979). "Five Years of the All-Volunteer Force." *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 5, 171-218.

Kanter, Rosebeth M. (1977a). *Men and Women in Corporations*. New York: Basic Books.

_____ (1977b). "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology, 82(5*), 965-994.

Landis, Dan & Mickey Dansby. (1996). "The Relationship of Equal Opportunity Climate to Military Career Commitment: An Analysis of the Impact of Race and Gender Using Latent Variables." Paper presented at the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Seminar, Washington, DC, May.

Landis, Dan, Mickey Dansby, & Robert Faley. (1995). "The Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey: An Example of Surveying in Organizations." In Paul Rosenfeld, Jack Edwards, and Marie Thomas (Eds.) *Improving Organizational Surveys*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 210-239.

Landis, Dan, G. Fisher, & Mickey Dansby. (1988). "Construction and Preliminary Validation of an Equal Opportunity Climate Assessment Instrument." In F.E. McIntire (Ed.). *Proceedings of Psychology in the DoD Symposium* (Technical Report 88-1), pp. 487-491. Colorado Springs, CO: U.S. Air Force Academy.

Lopreato, Sally, & Dudley Poston. (1977). "Differences in Earnings and Earnings Ability between Black Veterans and Nonveterans in the United States." *Social Science Quarterly*, 57 (March), 750-66.

Moore, Brenda L. (1991). "African-American Women in the U.S. Military." *Armed Forces and Society*, *17(3*), 363-384.

_____. (1996a). *To Serve My Country, To Serve My Race: The Story of the Only African American WACs Stationed Overseas During World War II*. New York: New York University Press.

_____. (1996b). From Underrepresentation to Overrepresentation: African American Women." In Judith Stiehm (Ed.). *It's Our Military, Too: Women and The U.S. Military*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 115-135.

Moskos, Charles C., & John Sibley Butler. (1996). *All That We Can Be: Black Leadership and Racial Integration the Army Way*. New York: Basic Books.

_____. (1993). "From Citizens' Army to Social Laboratory," *The Wilson Quarterly*, *27*(1), 83-94.

_____. (1990). "Army Women," *The Atlantic Monthly*, 266(2), 71-77.

Smith, Jesse & Carrell Horton (Eds.). (1997). *Statistical Record of Black America*. Detroit: Gale Research.

Spangler, E. M., A. Gordon, & R. M. Pipkin (1978). Token Women: An Empirical Test of

Kanter's Hypothesis." *American Journal of Sociology*, *84*(1), 160-170.

SPSS, Inc. (1997). *SPSS Advance Statistics 7.5*. Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

Stoddard, Ellwyn R. (1993). "Female Participation in the U.S. Military: Gender Trends By Branch, Rank, and Racial Categories." *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military*, *11(1)*, 23-40.

Thomas, W.I. (1966). "The Relation of Research to the Social Process." In Morris Janowitz, (Ed.). *W.I. Thomas on Social Organization and Social Personality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 289-305; orig. 1931.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1993). *Women in the Military: Deployment in the Persian Gulf War*. Washington, DC: GAO, July.

_____. (1988). *Women In The Military: More Military Jobs Can Be Opened Under Current Statutes*. Washington, DC: GAO.

Endnotes

1. The fact that women do not serve in military occupations involving direct combat has negative consequences for their career advancement.

2. Mickey Dansby combined all non-white military women (African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and Native-American) in the category he labeled "minority women."

3. Dansby and Landis (1995) combined all non-white military personnel (Hispanic, African American, Native American, and Asian) into a group they labeled minority.

4. The Disparity Index (DI) between men and women would be the sum of the absolute difference in the average scores of men and women on each of the 12 scales divided by 12.

5. Values of the DI are as follows: Below .1 = Low, .1 to .25 = Moderately Low, .26 to .4 = Medium, .41 to .6 = Moderately High, .61 to .75 = High, .76 to .9 = Very High, and .91 and above = Extreme.

6. I used the contrast coefficients matrix to study the between-subject effects. This procedure is explained in *SPSS Advanced Statistics 7.5*, pp. 348-364.

7. This increase in women's representation has been accompanied by expanding military roles for women. Under Public-Law 94-106, women were admitted to the three major Service academies in 1976. Two years later, Congress passed legislation abolishing the Women's Army Corps as a separate unit. In more recent years active duty Army women have been deployed in increasing numbers to combat zones. In 1983, 179 women were deployed to Grenada during Operation Urgent Fury. Seven years later over 26,000 women soldiers were deployed to the Gulf region during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. In April 1993, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin directed the military Services to open more specialties and assignments to women. The Army responded by opening attack and scout helicopter units. In January 1994, the Secretary of Defense announced a new assignment rule and ground definition. As a result of this announcement, the Army opened an additional 32,000 occupational specialties to women.

8. In 1988 Senators William Proxmire, William Cohen, and Dennis Deconcini requested that the General Accounting Office (GAO) investigate how the exclusion of women from combat jobs influenced the number of women entering the military and limited the job opportunities

for women already in the military (U.S. GAO, 1988). The report indicated that in 1988, the combat exclusion statutes, and Service policies implementing them, prohibited women from serving in 675,000 combat jobs. In addition, the active-duty Services also restricted women from 375,000 noncombat jobs to meet program needs created by the existence of the combat restriction. For the Army, these needs include considerations for providing rotation for men in overseas combat assignments and to insure that enough casualty replacements are available in the early part of a conflict. Other considerations include ample promotion opportunities for men in combat.

GAO found that the Army's accession goals limited opportunities for women even beyond the combat exclusion policy and after accounting for program needs (U.S. GAO, 1988, 23). GAO recommended that the Army reprogram its enlisted job system to reflect "male only" and "unrestricted" positions, creating a gender-neutral accession system for unrestricted positions. This would result in more job opportunities being available to women (U.S. GAO, 1988,26). DoD did not agree with GAO's recommendations.

9. What is interesting about Enloe's observation is that the women who died in the Gulf War were martyrs; they proved women can die for their country. Such a sacrifice, Enloe further asserts, has been and still is "a norm for American first class citizenship." (Enloe 1994, 102).