

Arlene R. Saitzyk, Sally Harvey, Ann Landes,
Carla Long, and Rebecca Porter

"I am Amber," she told the frightened group, looking at the women directly as the interpreter translated. "I'm an American soldier and we are here to help keep you and your children safe. We will make sure none of the soldiers come near here." As she tried to let her "combat braids" spill past her scarf to "prove she was a female," Amber donned her gloves, and searched the women and children. She gave the children some candy, and when at last the group realized she was not going to harm them, they started telling her about nearby Taliban activities. As Amber gathered information, one of the Rangers radioed her, wanting to know the "count" (the number of local individuals reported presently on site). The Ranger called back a few more times, as Amber's number did not match his. Amber's more accurate count (provided by the Afghani women to her) allowed the Ranger to search for and locate the "missing"

insurgent, though the evolution erupted in gunfire, and unfortunately, one was wounded. When at last the medevac helicopter arrived, it was high time for Amber and the Rangers to make a five mile sprint back to their base before daylight, and while still under fire. As they reached base, one of the Rangers remarked, "Oh yeah, hey, CST, good job out there ... you corroborated the fact that we were missing somebody." In that moment, Amber truly felt part of the team. And she thought, "I love this job." (*From the book Ashley's War* (Lemmon, 2015)).

The female soldier described above served in a combat support role, though the narrative suggests a fine line between combat and combat support. This soldier effectively engaged with the local women, obtained the needed intelligence, and kept up with the Ranger team without anyone needing to slow down or take care of her, and her input was an integral part of the mission's success. Amber (likely not her real name) was one of several women embedded with special operations forces in Cultural Support Teams (CSTs) that helped units work with local Afghani females operating in the villages. As Lieutenant General Mulholland, prior commander of the US Army Special Operations Command, said, CSTs serving alongside Army Rangers and Special Forces "provided enormous operational success to us on the battlefield by virtue of their being able to contact half of the population we normally do not interact with" (Lemmon, 2015).

This chapter will discuss women's increasingly expanded and integrated roles in the military, examine women's experience as leaders in the

A.R. Saitzyk (✉)

Behavioral Sciences Department, Marine Corps
Embassy Security Group,
27277 Browning Road, Quantico, VA, USA
e-mail: arlene.saitzyk@usmc.mil

S. Harvey

U.S. Army Integrated Disability Evaluation System
(IDES) Clinic, Building 36036, Fort Hood,
TX 76544, USA

A. Landes

North Florida/South Georgia VAMC,
6900 Southpoint Drive North, Jacksonville, FL
32216, USA

C. Long

Arlington, VA, USA

R. Porter

U.S. Army Medical Command, San Antonio, TX,
USA

military, and highlight the challenges for women in garrison, in deployed settings, in combat, and as they transition out of the military. We conclude by providing guidance for individuals and commanders on the conditions necessary for women (and men) to succeed in integrated units and beyond.

Historical Background

Women comprise about 20% of new military recruits and 15% of service members (Henderson, 2015). The history of women in combat and combat support roles is well documented, and dates back to the Revolutionary War (Naclerio, 2015). Women join the military for many of the same reasons voiced by men – an opportunity to serve, or give back to their nation, a chance to challenge themselves professionally and personally, and the potential to gain educational benefits and achieve economic parity. On average, in the civilian sector, the average working woman earns 78 cents for every dollar that a man makes. In the military, a woman makes the same base salary as her male peer. It is also of note that women in the military represent an increasingly diverse racial group – for example, while 16% of the men in uniform are African American, African American women constitute 31% of military women (Bensahel, Barno, Kidder, & Sayler, 2015).

Recently, women's roles have received heightened attention, as the military began to use women to support counterinsurgency (COIN) operations focused on destabilizing and defeating insurgents and creating secure environments supporting government rule (Harding, 2012). Women's involvement in this arena was born of necessity, as male soldiers were simply unable to gain intelligence from women and children due to the strict cultural rules surrounding gender in Muslim countries.

More specifically, starting in 2003, commanders used female service members to search Iraqi women at checkpoints for weapons and to defuse tensions with Iraqi women and children as part of an Army program called Team Lioness (Harding, 2012). The Marines also developed two programs in Iraq to interact with the female population, the Lioness Program and the Iraqi Women's Engagement Program (IWE). While

the Lioness Program was largely comprised of searches at entry control points and while on patrol with soldiers, IWE was aimed at identifying sources of instability such as insurgents, through the Iraqi women. The IWE worked to connect the women together who could influence the social networks that insurgents use to disrupt civil and government operations, as well as support each other and coordinate with local government, civil affairs personnel, nongovernment organizations, and provincial reconstruction teams to facilitate reduction of instabilities.

In 2009, the Lioness Program expanded, as female military units increasingly engaged directly with women in occupied communities, including humanitarian engagement and provision of medical care. The new teams were called Female Engagement Teams (FETs), and the work resulted in more positive relationships with the community (Moore, Finley, Hammer, & Glass, 2012). As well, Provincial Reconstruction Teams, though not designed to provide dedicated FETs, also used women to perform similar duties when they were available and permitted (Holliday, 2012). Such duties included opening women's centers and vocational training schools – efforts designed to build goodwill in Iraq. Interestingly, an Army requirement released in 2011 mandated FETs for all brigades deploying to Afghanistan – this was the direct result of successes the teams experienced (Nicolas, 2015).

Building on the achievements of the FET program, the Army Special Operations Command created a more in-depth training program to support their missions, the CST program, as mentioned above. The CST program consisted of a demanding and competitive two-week assessment and selection period, followed by six weeks of training and qualification. Upon graduation from the course, students were awarded a project development skill identifier (PDSI) and the title "cultural support specialist." CSTs generally served up to eight months overseas, attached (not assigned) to an Army special operations unit in support of contingency operations. While Army Special Operations had been deploying women to hostile areas in many types of roles before CST, including intelligence and psychological operations, CSTs were distinct because they were specifically assessed, selected, trained,

and educated to support particular Special Operations missions (Harding, 2012).

In January 2013, the Department of Defense (DoD) rescinded the Direct Ground Combat and Assignment Rule, which removed barriers for assigning women to combat units and occupations, and mandated implementation of gender integration by January 1, 2016. Though not yet fully integrated, the military services are in the process of reviewing and validating performance standards (Kamarck, 2015). The Government Accountability Office (GAO) provided an update on positions open to women since the January 2013 directive, and noted marked differences among the services (Government Accountability Office [GAO], 2015). While almost all positions in the Air Force have been open to women since before 2013, there was a notable increase in openings to women in the Army and Navy since 2013. However, at the time of the 2015 GAO report, the Marine Corps still had 25% of jobs closed to women, and the US Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) had 41% of positions closed. That being said, in 2016, the first three women graduated from Ranger School, the Army's most elite combat training course, previously closed to women. Ideally, the other services' operational commands will follow suit in the near future. USSOCOM reported they want to stand behind decisions of the Secretary of Defense, and "fully support opening all special operations specialties and units to women service members" (Votel, 2015). Table 24.1 provides a summary of key events regarding the integration of women in the military over the past century.

Current Challenges for Women in Garrison, on Deployment, and in Leadership Roles

Without question, the confluence of societal changes in expectations, policies, and protections, combined with the realities of the wars waged in Iraq and Afghanistan, have led to significant changes in the military. Over the past several years, women have graduated from Ranger School; Air Force General Lori Robinson became the first woman to lead a combatant

command, and female Sailors began to serve on submarines. This is clearly not the military of 1966 – then, federal laws restricted the number of women who could serve at any one time, and career progression was halted at the rank of O-5 (lieutenant colonel in the Army, commander in the Navy), and O-6 (colonel) in the Marine Corps (Women's Armed Services Integration Act, 1948). In contrast, gender-based barriers to occupational specialties were removed in 2016, and several women have been promoted to four-star ranks.

Many popular books (Gray, 1992; Tannen, 1991) and research studies (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974) report differences between men and women, and likely an equal number criticize these assertions (Archer, 2004; Carothers & Reis, 2013; Hyde, 2005). While it is not our intent to argue that an absence of differences is essential to equality, it must be noted that expectations regarding prescribed stereotypical behaviors for men and women in the workplace impact women in garrison, in deployed settings, and in leadership roles. For example, women who violate the stereotypes associated with nurturance and assertion may be penalized in hiring and evaluations, more so than male leaders with the same traits (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004). Awareness of stereotypes and associated biases is essential as leaders strive to integrate new service members, both men and women. Initial impressions and leaders' immediate reactions are key. A female service member, especially in an organization in which her male counterparts outnumber her, tends to draw more attention from the moment she arrives to a new duty assignment. One female command sergeant major (CSM) said it this way when she and four male CSMs signed in at the same time:

It is difficult to show up at the same time as a guy - sometimes there's a biased opinion. I felt like I was automatically judged. Quite often they think I'm not good enough or I'm too assertive. It's a fine balance between two negatives. And without letting that affect your performance. It gets tiring.

Because of the negative perceptions and gender stereotypes of female service members' abilities and performance, some women view success as an uphill battle, and place additional pressure

Table 24.1 Key events for integration of women in the armed services

1901	Army Nurse Corps established
1908	Navy Nurse Corps established
1948	Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 passed, making women permanent part of the military, albeit prohibited from assignment to combatant aircraft and naval vessels, and limiting women in the military to 2% of enlisted and 10% of officers
1967	Limits on percent of women in the military repealed
1975	Women allowed admission to military service academies
1978	Women permitted permanent assignment on noncombatant Navy ships and temporary duty up to 6 months on other ships
1988	DoD implements the "risk rule," excluding women from noncombat units or missions if the risk of exposure to direct combat, hostile fire, or capture were equal to or greater than the risks in the combat units they support
1991	Presidential Commission on Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces established. Congress repeals prohibition of women flying combat aircraft
1993	Congress establishes requirements for gender-neutral occupational standards and repeals prohibition of women serving on combatant vessels
1994	"Risk rule" rescinded, and DoD issues the Direct Ground Combat and Assignment Rule, limiting women from being assigned to units below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in indirect combat on the ground
2000	Based on recommendations by the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), efforts were made by the Pentagon to open up assignments for women on submarines. Any concerns in this arena were more centered on issues of privacy and habitability, rather than on the dangers of combat. Congress mandates a 30-day (in-session) notice of any change that would open assignment of women to Navy submarines
2005	Sergeant Leigh Ann Hester, an Army soldier, became the first female soldier awarded the Silver Star since World War II and the first to be cited for close combat action
2006	Congress mandates 30-day in-session notification for changes to 1994 Direct Ground Combat and Assignment Rule or opening or closing of military career fields to women
2008	The Military Leadership Diversity Commission is established to review promotion and command opportunities in the armed services by ethnicity and gender
2009	Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act established the Military Leadership Diversity Commission, and was tasked with studying the "establishment and maintenance of fair promotion and command opportunities for ethnic- and gender-specific members of the Armed Forces." Focused on officers at the O-5 or higher level. The Commission recommended DoD take deliberate steps to open additional career fields and units involved in direct ground combat to women
2010	DoD notifies Congress of intent to allow women to serve on submarines.
2011	Congress mandates review of the Direct Ground Combat and Assignment Rule
2012	DoD eliminates co-location restriction from Direct Ground Combat and Assignment Rule
2013	DoD rescinds Direct Ground Combat and Assignment Rule, removing barriers to assigning women to combat units and occupations, and directs implementation by January 1, 2016. Exception to policy requires approval by the chairman and the joint chiefs of staff and then the secretary of defense
2015	Congress issues validation criteria to develop gender-neutral occupational standards

Adapted from Kamarck (2015)

on themselves to succeed. Mediocre performance may be attributed to gender rather than individual weaknesses. Further complicating the picture, women who succeed in nontraditional environments, and as such do not fit stereotypes of incompetence or physical weakness, may actually encounter social rejection (Heilman et al., 2004).

Notably, it can be a fine line for female service members in terms of physical ability. In some environments, a woman may be socially rejected if she is more fit than her male peers, or perceived as incompetent and ostracized if she isn't fit enough. Despite the conundrum associated with fitness, physical ability can serve as one method

for a woman to establish herself within a nontraditional military environment. However, there are unique historical issues associated with this performance arena for women. For example, in the past, women service members had to contend with poorly fitting gear, which weighed them down, and female soldiers were 20% more likely than their male counterparts to report musculoskeletal disorders (Hefling, 2011). As well, a 1998 Institute of Medicine subcommittee report noted factors such as increased stride length as shorter women worked to maintain the same stride length as taller men while marching and mixed-gender training to meet fitness standards as contributing factors to increased injuries for women service members (Subcommittee on Body Composition, Nutrition, and Health of Military Women, 1998). Combat uniforms and equipment have recently been sized for the female anatomy and proportions, though some women asserted they did not want equipment changes, because it would separate them from their male peers (Hefling, 2011).

Despite being technically excluded from combat positions in the Army until very recently, since 2001, 9123 women have received the Combat Action Badge, which is awarded for actively engaging or being engaged by the enemy. Of the service members who deployed since September 11, 2001, 11.8% were women, and 100 paid the ultimate price. The deployed environment is obviously associated with unique stressors, and service members – both men and women – often turn to their teammates as a source of support. A strong team can increase performance in the deployed environment and reduce combat-related stress (Cawkill, Rogers, Knight, & Spear, 2009). As such, depreciated unit cohesion is one of the chief concerns raised by those who oppose the expansion of women into direct combat roles. Many question if women can successfully integrate into a traditionally male population. That being said, research has demonstrated unit cohesion and performance are not dependent on common traits like race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or gender (Haring, 2013), and that diversity increases creative problem solving, improved professional-

ism, and results in better performance. For example, mixed-gender Army basic combat training (BCT) companies performed as well as, if not better than, single-gender basic training companies (Chapman, 2008). Further, having women on a team can mitigate groupthink and excessive social cohesion. That is, high social cohesion – especially when it is based largely on elite group membership, social aspects, and attractiveness, rather than on competence or task completion – can actually undermine the effectiveness of group decision-making processes, promoting a state of groupthink (RAND Corporation, 2010).

Another potential concern or challenge regarding the expansion of women into combat roles is boundaries, or rather boundary violations. Some fear that men will be distracted from the mission due to the presence of women in nontraditional assignments, rendering men less effective on the battlefield. As well, behaviors in male units that were previously viewed as normative and formative for team building (such as teasing, storytelling, and sometimes sexual references) may not be appropriate in mixed-gender environments (National Research Council, 2014). As female service members seek to integrate on a team and gain support, they may become de facto arbiters of boundaries. It can certainly be a challenge to maintain appropriate boundaries while also garnering necessary support from peers during deployment. As women work to maintain boundaries, they may begin to feel isolated from their male teammates (Doan & Portillo, 2016) and less likely to feel they have support (Haslam & Ryan, 2008). Separate sleeping quarters on training exercises and on deployment can isolate leaders from their teammates and subordinates, and potentially hamper team integration. That said, shared experiences will enhance team cohesion despite separate billeting.

As noted above, women have proven they are value-added in the combat environment. They can sometimes reach out to local nationals and noncombatants to obtain information that male service members cannot. Female service members are eager to contribute and to maintain high

standards. Many have proven they are the right service member for the job, regardless of gender.

Despite the increasing presence of women in the military – in garrison and in deployed settings – significant challenges remain in terms of leadership, including both structural obstacles and those of an institutional mindset, not unlike those facing women in corporate America (Bensahel et al., 2015). The military is not an exception when one compares the number of women in senior leadership positions versus those in the rest of the workforce – women constitute only 7% of the military’s general or flag officers across the services (Zenger & Folkman, 2012). This discordance is the result of multiple factors, as outlined below.

Firstly, and understandably so, the military is steeped in a “warrior culture.” While the successful completion of being in command is identified as key to credibility and potential, the types of commands held serve as a discriminator. The value placed upon leadership within combat units is clear when one considers the background of senior leaders. Of all the senior officers across the services, 65% who hold the rank of O-7 (i.e., one-star generals or admirals) have held leadership positions in combatant commands – that percentage increases to 80% for those attaining the rank of O-10 (four-star generals or admirals) (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010). While the Air Force and Navy opened many of their tactical fields to women in 1993, the Army and Marines excluded women from assignments to such units below the brigade level, if the primary mission was to engage in ground combat, or if the units were in close proximity to direct combat. As a result, the vast majority of the “career-enhancing” assignments – those within tactical or operational units – were, until 2016, closed to women. While women are now eligible to enter those fields, it will take years, if not decades, for them to gain the experience and expertise needed to be considered for the senior ranks. On average, an officer promoted to O-7 has completed approximately 23 years of service (Schacherer, 2005). Women who do serve in the top ranks of the military continue to be promoted less frequently than their

peers. When compared to male peers, approximately half as many female O-6 s (colonels) are selected for promotion to O-7 (brigadier general) in the Army, and only 37% of female O-7 s, compared to 41% of their male peers, are promoted to O-8 (major general) (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010).

Secondly, while the elimination of the combat exclusion ban may remove one structural barrier for women’s promotion opportunities, other confounding factors remain. In the past, graduating from one of the service academies, or being identified as a “ring-knocker,” was seen as providing considerable advantage for officers. While research has suggested that the source of commissioning has become less of a factor over time, graduates of the service academies do enjoy several advantages early in their careers – that of graduating with a sizable cohort of peers with whom relationships have been forged over four years of academic, physical, and leadership challenges. The first women graduated from the military’s service academies in 1980, and included just 213 women (Army: 62, Navy: 54, Air Force: 97). In addition to providing a built-in network for problem-solving, advice, and key assignments, graduates have the benefit of an appreciation of some of the rigors of military life. While the number of women graduating from the service academies has grown, it remains a fact that only between 17% and 22% (depending on the service academy) of the recent graduates have been women.

In addition to assignments, relationships play a key role in one’s career, whether based in mentorship or rating chains. As an example, the networks developed when serving as an aide-de-camp¹ for a senior leader can often lead to other career-enhancing opportunities. Women, however, face two obstacles in obtaining these positions: the first based upon a lack of experience in combat-related fields – having an aide-

¹An aide-de-camp serves as a general’s or admiral’s executive assistant, typically managing correspondence and taking notes at meetings, planning travel, itineraries, and social events, coordinating protocol, and assisting in personal matters, depending upon the individual’s preferences.

de-camp who is “Ranger-qualified,” for example, is a desired qualification for many senior Army leaders. The second is based upon perception. Senior leaders in the military, more so than in the civilian sector, live in a “glass bubble,” where their actions and behaviors are subject to considerable scrutiny. The near-inevitable speculation that arises when a senior male has a younger woman as his aide-de-camp can be intolerable for a flag officer and his spouse (Priest, 1997), particularly given well-publicized issues of sexual misconduct within the ranks.

The third challenge for women obtaining leadership roles is associated with mentorship. Mentorship, a key for growth in one’s profession, is intrinsically tied to leadership – it is a rare occasion when someone rises to senior leadership without that experience, and it is an expectation that senior leaders will share their wisdom and guidance. However, it should be noted there are really two types of mentorship – mentorship and sponsorship, with sponsorship, or the use of influence to advocate for the mentee, being the “higher” level. Studies suggest women’s mentors have “less organizational clout” (Ibarra, Carter, & Silvas, 2010). Given the known relationship between assignments in tactical commands and senior positions, this finding has implications for women in the military as well. Although the Ibarra et al. (2010) study suggested that both genders report receiving valuable career advice from their mentors, it was the men who described being “sponsored,” or having a mentor plan career moves and endorse their capabilities publicly. Women, on the other hand, spoke about how mentors “helped them understand themselves, their preferred styles of operation and way they might need to change as they move up the leadership pipeline.” The authors concluded that high-potential women may actually be over-mentored and under-sponsored when compared to their male peers.

The fourth challenge for women involves the difficulties inherent in maintaining and blending work demands with family (Konrad, 2003). Women leave the military between their fifth and eighth year of service at double the rate of their male counterparts, reducing the number of

women with the requisite skills and potential to fill leadership positions. Demanding assignments, operational deployments, and geographic separations are factors absent from the equation used by most civilians, as are the very real issues of risk in training and combat. While there are men who are single parents and stay-at-home fathers, military women, like their civilian colleagues, bear a disproportional degree of family responsibilities. As an example, Zellman, Gates, Cho, & Shaw (2008) noted that over 50% of military mothers were late to work at least once during the previous month due to childcare issues, compared to 7% of fathers. Demands common to the military, to include unpredictable schedules, training exercises, and extended deployments, can be exacerbated by the availability and affordability of childcare, especially for single and dual-military parents. Twenty percent of families with children cited the above issues as primary considerations in determining whether the military would become a career, and said that time away from families due to deployments was the primary reason soldiers leave the Army (Zellman, Gates, Moini, & Sutturp, 2009).

It should also be noted that for married service-women, nearly half are married to another service member, whereas only 7% of active duty males fall into that category (Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, 2014). Dual-military families experience a unique set of challenges (see also Najera et al., Chap. 11, this volume). Service members typically rotate through jobs every two to three years, a change that often results in a geographic move, and a request for a joint domicile, even if granted, can limit job opportunities which, in itself, can have an adverse impact upon career progression. While deployments are challenging for all families, dual-military families are affected to an even greater extent, as it is not uncommon for one spouse to redeploy (i.e., return from deployment) only to see their spouse deploy. As a military woman is seven times more likely to be married to a service member than a man, these factors have a disproportional impact upon women. Women in dual-military marriages are almost 50% more likely to leave the military than their male coun-

terparts. As a female service member works to establish herself within her organization, she also has to contend with differing expectations. She must balance her role as a spouse and parent with that of a service member.

A female CSM stated:

You always get criticized for working on Army instead of working on marriage or kids. I've always chosen to deploy. Family can resent you for it. Success is within yourself. It has been a huge personal sacrifice. When the dust settles and you retire, you have to be OK with your personal sacrifice. You have to be OK with the cost of what you've done.

This is not just a “woman’s problem,” as noted by Vice Admiral (Ret) Ann Rondeau (2015), but “a challenge to the stability and health of the entire all-volunteer workforce.” There is a growing body of research that speaks to the career preferences of the “millennial generation,” a cohort that appears to equally value work and lifestyle above financial compensation in making career decisions (Pew Research Center, 2013). It certainly can be argued that addressing the challenges women face will likely benefit both genders. As Zenger & Folkman’s study (2012) comparing 16,000 male and female leaders highlights, women rated better than men on 12 of the 16 competences, to include traditional measures for effective leadership, taking initiative and “driving for results” – as well as more human competencies – development of self and others as well as collaboration and relationship building. That being said, the authors postulated women were less frequently represented in senior leadership roles because while men have historically felt compelled to sacrifice their families to advance their careers, many women believe the cost to their families too great to pay. This has much relevance to the military.

In addition to the aforementioned obstacles, there are also barriers centered on perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs. For example, there is the perception, still held by some, that women have no role in the military or that their roles should be constricted to more “traditional” settings. There continue to be incidents where women are chided for “taking a man’s job when he needs to support a family,” and told their military career is “shortchanging” their

children. While a discussion of the prevalence and impact of sexual assault, harassment, and discrimination is beyond the scope of this discussion, the subtleties of gender-based bias continue (see also Thomsen et al., Chap. 21, this volume). “Until women are fully accepted in the military’s warrior culture, this minority status will put them at greater risk” for abuse and discrimination (Laughlin & Haring, 2013).

A final potential barrier for women to attain senior leadership is an internal one – a sense of competence and willingness to “take a seat at the table.” The book *Lean In* (Sandberg & Scovell, 2013) makes the argument that women often unwittingly undermine themselves; while men often overvalue their strengths, women too frequently undervalue theirs, resulting in a confidence gap.

It can be argued that the military provides women with a skill set to “lean in,” if women are empowered by the command culture to do so. The military demands that individuals work as a team. The ability to look past gender, just as for race, religion, and sexual orientation, to identify strengths and minimize weaknesses while mentoring and guiding individuals is essential. Strength – physical, psychological, and emotional – is enhanced by challenges, in moving beyond one’s comfort zone, in order to achieve growth and develop competence. Whether in a war zone, during a physical fitness test, when faced with inappropriate behavior, or given the opportunity to break down another stereotype, military service offers women multiple opportunities to exercise their strength – to address issues, lead and make decisions, stand up, and use one’s command voice if they are willing to take a “seat at the table” (Sandberg & Scovell, 2013).

Women Leaders’ Experience in the Military: Predicting Success

A review of the historical background and leadership challenges for women in the military quite understandably leads the reader to consider the characteristics of women who succeed in this environment. While a randomized controlled trial on the topic is beyond the scope of this chapter, previ-

ously conducted research in the field of Grit offers a convenient rubric for hypothesizing some of the underlying processes and attributes (Duckworth, 2016). Grit is not the only characteristic that has been explored as a possible explanation for success. Related to Grit, but different from it is Hardiness. Grit can be considered to be one's ability to sustain interest and effort for a passion over time, rather than succumbing to disappointment or boredom (Duckworth, 2016). Hardiness, on the other hand, is a person's response to stress as being a challenge for growth, rather than cause for becoming discouraged or quitting (Maddi, Mathews, Kelly, Vilarreal, & White, 2012). Both contribute to success, though likely in different ways. For example, Kelly, Matthews, & Bartone (2014) found significant differences in Grit and Hardiness scores among US Military Academy cadets who attrited from initial training versus those who persisted through graduation. Notably, the Grit "interest factor" of the scale is what differed significantly between the two groups; those with higher Grit interest at entry were more likely to graduate. With respect to Hardiness scores, differences among cadets emerged during the more novel and demanding aspects of their initial training, but not during extended and more academically focused periods.

For the purposes of this chapter, we consider that success over the course of a military career might require a sustained effort that is characteristic of Grit. In developing and studying the topic of Grit, psychologist Angela Duckworth (2016) asked herself and others such questions as: Who is successful and why? Is there a characteristic that is predictive of success? After interviewing countless exceptionally successful individuals, such as world-class swimmers, premier chefs, renowned cartoonists, graduates of the US Military Academy at West Point, and winners of the National Spelling Bee, Duckworth identified "perseverance" and "passion" as the common themes in their journeys to eminence, and called the combination of these two traits endemic to achieving very long-term goals "Grit." Regarding the first trait, perseverance, or hard work, Duckworth suggested that simply discussing talent is a distraction, whereas effort can be thought

of as contributing twice to eventual success; effort can improve one's basic talent to develop skill, and putting additional effort into the skill one has developed leads to even greater achievement. Passion, the second component of Grit, is related to one's unwillingness to let setbacks or distractions prevent them from achieving particular goals. The Grit scale (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007) provides a valid measure of grittiness, shown to be predictive of success among diverse groups, such as new cadets at West Point, National Spelling Bee competitors, and teachers.

The authors of this chapter wondered whether successful military women are similarly "gritty." Rather than administer the Grit scale to them, we developed a few open-ended questions to elicit narratives that might illustrate how they succeeded. These questions included the following: (1) How do you respond to setbacks? (2) How would you describe your focus/attention on projects and goals? (3) To what do you attribute your success? Can you provide examples of these?

Several successful military women answered the questions. We heard from noncommissioned officers who had served at the top of their military specialty, such as a CSM for several thousand people, officers who had successful careers as flag/general officers, and other senior officers who had excelled in their fields. Time and again, these women commented on how both the perseverance and passion aspects of Grit allowed them to achieve their goals.

One retired senior officer expressed it this way:

When I was much older I heard my father contemplating how he raised us kids and he said, "I knew if they got into the best college, they'd find it challenging and would survive it." I found it interesting he said survive, not thrive in it. So, with that, you learn to have high expectations of yourself. You drive yourself to succeed. That explains me – regarding raw horsepower of my brain – I have an average brain but I work a lot harder than the average person. For example, at West Point and later at business school – I was scared silly and worked my ass off. It was one of the most affirming events in my life. I was successful because I worked my butt off – be it work, physical training, whatever – determination is what is important.

Arguably one the most influential aspects of Grit behaviors is that of practice. Most have heard that leaders in their field are shown to have spent over 10,000 h practicing in order to achieve mastery (Gladwell, 2008). But putting in the hours is not enough; practice must be goal directed and, for greatest effect, aimed at responding to feedback or identified shortcomings.

The military trains its members from early on to examine how outcome or performance can be improved. An Army officer wrote:

Being the good Army officer that I am, I conduct an After Action Report. I look at what went well and what went not so well. For the things that did not go so well, I dissect into what I can control and what factors I could not have controlled. For the ones I could have controlled, I brainstorm how I might have done those activities better. For the ones I could not have controlled, I look hard at them – are they really out of my control, or could I have shaped them with other entities to serve me better in the long run?

A senior officer said:

Finding trusted advisors who will be frank is critical. The higher I've gone in rank, the more difficult it has become to find people who will tell me when they think I'm about to make a mistake or an uninformed decision. Without critical and honest feedback, how will I improve? In every situation and in every job, I am trying to learn more and do better. I'm always watching how others lead – and I try to take every opportunity to make my thought processes explicit to my subordinates. I think it's important to model and cultivate an environment of continuous development.

The women we interviewed also seemed to have struck a balance between pursuing their passion and knowing when to adjust their short-term goals. A senior noncommissioned officer noted:

A good example is when I was working on a new program, it was a tough road to work through the numerous stovepipe signatures that needed to sign off on the program. I had to justify every dollar, hour, material, and asset being put into the program. I was blocked at a certain junction and sent back to the drawing board. Did I stop? No, I engaged with my team and asked, "What will it take to get this program approved?" I wouldn't take no for an answer and after a couple years, the program finally got through all the appropriate authorities and is working even today!

Just as important, however, is the ability to adjust one's short-term goals and put one's energy and efforts toward something that will pay off. A master sergeant in the Marine Corps recalled:

I remember there was once a program I really wanted to do – it was a joint special program. I was qualified, and the joint unit wanted me, but the Marine Corps wouldn't let me go. I fought really hard for a while, and then I quit fighting, it just must not have been meant to be. I was disappointed, but I moved on. That's what I do, I move on, I don't dwell. Interestingly, last week someone brought up another disappointment and asked me if I remembered that. I didn't! So, when I have setbacks, I don't dwell on it – I move on.

If the immediate goal, however, could be seen as an important step toward achieving one's long-term passion, these women were willing to work hard and take risks to achieve it:

I was hesitant to interview for a new position working with a joint service (the boss was in another service). So I took the chance and won the job! I had to learn about the differences between the services and the administrative portion which was a lot of work. I feel this set me up for the ultimate top job that I interviewed for a couple years later and won! I showed that I was teachable, flexible, and customer service oriented. I truly feel that because of the way I treated people and cared for their well-being and satisfaction, this was and will always be my key to success!

Another officer who also switched services attributed her success to her initial training, and said:

From your first job in the military, you are saddled with leadership responsibilities that continue to train you – the Marine Corps teaches you not to quit. If you allow yourself to be uncomfortable, you will achieve. I took a risk and completely changed careers, I may not have gotten to retire from the military, but I felt I could do more for the military in my new role.

These accounts suggest characteristics that contribute to success in military women are not necessarily different from characteristics we might uncover in elite athletes or world-renown scholars. The women we interviewed demonstrated numerous aspects of Grit – a willingness to work very hard with lots of practice, and use critical feed-

back, input, and passion to achieve long-term goals. What may be different for these women, however, is the context in which they need to be gritty. The challenges and resistance they experience (e.g., working in oftentimes male-dominated, hazardous/combat environments, with frequent moves) may require additional Grit, or may require they solicit feedback for growth in a different way. Additional exploration of Grit in military women is needed to help understand how many grow to be so extraordinarily successful. The next section delves into the lives of women service members as they transition to civilian life. True to form, when faced with unique challenges women service members are able to employ many of the aforementioned skills in order to successfully achieve their personal and career goals.

Women Transitioning Out of the Military: Challenges for Female Veterans

As of 2014, two million of the 21.9 million veterans were women, representing 9% of the entire veteran population (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2016). It is anticipated that women veterans, specifically those of minority status, will continue to be the fastest growing veteran population (Miller, 2015). Because representation of women in the military continues to grow, it is predicted that by year 2035, women will comprise 15% of all living veterans (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2011).

A profile of the post-9/11 military force indicates some differences in the experiences of female and male veterans (Patten & Parker, 2011). In terms of positive effects, a significant portion of women veterans report feelings of pride for having served their country (Patten & Parker, 2011). They recognize benefits of having served, communicating they gained both personally and professionally through their military affiliation. For example, being a service member assisted them in preparing for a career, achieving a sense of self-improvement and self-confidence, and excelling in life. Impressively, the majority of female veterans reported that they would

strongly encourage and guide a young individual they cared about to join the military.

Concerns, however, include the following: Though female veterans are less likely to have served in combat, been deployed away from their permanent duty station, or served with someone who was killed in the line of duty, they are equally as likely to have experienced an emotionally traumatic event during service. A comparable percentage of women and men report struggling with posttraumatic stress disorder (42% and 35%, respectively), strained family relations (50% and 48%), and low motivation (27% and 33%) post-discharge. Both female and male veterans described this transition as very or somewhat challenging (43% and 45%) (Patten & Parker, 2011).

Regarding the last statistic, transitioning out of military duty can result in increased stress for some due to the many questions that arise in three critical areas: personal identity, loss of a cohesive and supportive military community, and employment. First, in case of personal identity as a military member, when one chooses to join the military, they make a commitment to a significant life change. Starting in boot camp – the established training ground for all military personnel – recruits are indoctrinated into military culture, and trained on the shared values and goals of the organization. They learn how to accomplish a common mission, maintain a collective, versus an individualistic, worldview, and kill another individual, if need be, in keeping with allegiance to their nation (Demers, 2013). Military indoctrination is essentially a process of stripping away the old identity and introducing the new. The values accentuated include duty, integrity, allegiance, and dedication to one's comrades, unit, and country. Successful induction into the military is a complex calling on both a personal and a professional realm. This personal transformation becomes apparent when an individual discharges from military service and returns to civilian life. They may experience what has been described as a "civil-military cultural gap" – the difference between persons who have served and those who have not. In actuality there can be several gaps, representative of divergences in values, norms, attitudes, and culture. Transitioning to a civilian life may be complicated for women ser-

vice members in particular; not only will they encounter the normal challenges of reintegrating back into civilian society, they may also contend with barriers related to negotiating a world that commonly holds women in traditional feminine roles and images. Hence, female veterans have expressed consternation about being caught between two worlds: being a warrior, devoid of feminine traits, and returning to a society where there are fairly rigid and distinct gender norms. Other issues noted in the literature concerning reintegration into civilian life and involving loss of identity are associated with recently acquired or newly diagnosed physical and/mental health disorders upon discharge. Women service members who had to separate from the service due to medical problems report grief over the loss of their earning potential, their roles as providers and caregivers, and concerns about short-term and long-term fiscal security. Consequently, they may struggle with feeling weak, dependent, lacking purpose, and ashamed – all quite the opposite of the masculine warrior ethos.

Loss of identity may also be experienced within the context of community. Female veterans describe a sense of isolation and ineptness regarding communication and social engagement with civilians. Feelings of emotional insecurity are commonplace during the transition/reintegration period as service members learn how to (re)engage with others outside the service.

Another well-documented concern among veterans is the issue of homelessness, and women veterans are four times more likely to be homeless than their nonveteran counterparts (Hamilton, Poza, & Washington, 2011). Explanations for this disproportionate representation by female veterans include traumatic military experiences, substance abuse, pre- and/or post-military adversity (e.g., interpersonal violence, unstable housing, loss of income due to illness, mental illness), and unemployment. The combination of these factors increases the likelihood of homelessness, and the path to homelessness generally begins after discharge and lasts an average of ten years before the women actually become homeless (Belcher, Greene, McAlpine, & Ball, 2001). Notably, women often join the service to make a

better life for themselves by leaving behind violence and abuse. Their inherent will for survival and independence is likely what helped them escape these bad situations. However, strong will and independence, two characteristics generally enhanced in the military, may readily prevent female veterans from requesting or securing assistance when needed, especially with regard to maintaining or seeking adequate shelter. Another relevant risk factor for homelessness is the lack of transferrable skills that female veterans acquire during their military service. Though the skills are valuable within the military, they may be ineffectual in the civilian workforce. Alternatively, it may be that the skills are more appropriate for a predominately male field. This inability to translate skills and experience gained from one's military occupational specialty may hinder the female veteran's ability to gain employment, directly impacting the post-separation adjustment.

The picture for female veterans is not all negative. Looking at educational attainment, for instance, a greater percentage of female veterans are enrolled in or have attained higher education compared to women nonveterans (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2016). In 2009 it was estimated that Montgomery GI Bill benefits were used by 284,000 women veterans, representing 19% of the total population of women veterans (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2011). Over 80% of female veterans applied these benefits toward education in undergraduate or junior college and 12% used these benefits for graduate-level education. In the same year, female veterans comprised 20% of veterans who participated in the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (VRE) program. Through the GI Bill and VRE program, female veterans are obtaining the education and skills training necessary for the transition to civilian life. Perhaps consequently, female veterans tend to possess a higher median household income than female nonveterans (\$54,993 versus \$44,999, respectively). Furthermore, employed female veterans are more likely to hold positions in management and professional occupations, and to be employed by the government than female nonveterans

(National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2011).

Because there are differences between military and civilian/private sector work environments, it is imperative that female veterans are adequately prepared to transition into civilian jobs. Women veterans do not lack confidence, but potential barriers to their successful transition into the private sector relate more to issues regarding civilian salary and promotion negotiations, which is distinct from the military personnel system (Bensahel et al., 2015). Additionally, women veterans may need assistance in the actual process of creating a resume, applying for jobs, and preparing for job interviews. Within the civilian work environment, learning about rules of behavior, work ethic, and workplace climate may prove essential as well.

The following list outlines some of the available Department of Defense, Veteran's Affairs (VA), and community-based services to help female veterans in addressing the barriers that may exist. Female veterans may apply for a variety of supports, including health care, insurance, disability compensation, pension, education and training, VRE, home loans, and burial (for more information on this topic, see <http://www.benefits.va.gov/persona/veteran-women.asp>).

1. Women Veteran Coordinators (WVCs) are located in every regional office and function as a primary contact for women veterans. WVCs are trained to provide specific information and comprehensive assistance to women veterans, their dependents, and beneficiaries concerning VA benefits and related non-VA benefits. Additionally, WVCs may assist in the claims intake, development, and processing of military sexual and personal trauma claims.
2. VA Health Care for Women Veterans: At each VA medical center nationwide, a Women Veterans Program Manager (WVPM) is designated to advise and advocate for women veterans. The WVPM can help coordinate all the services female veterans may need, such as primary care, specialized care for chronic conditions, and reproductive health.

3. VA Benefits for Survivors of Military Sexual Trauma (MST): There are special services available through the VA to help women who experienced MST. Services include free and confidential counseling and treatment for mental and physical health conditions related to the military sexual trauma. To receive this benefit there is no need for a service-connected disability/injury, to have reported the incidents when they happened, or to have other documentation to prove that they occurred. Individuals may be able to receive this benefit even if they are not eligible for other VA care. Every VA facility has a designated MST coordinator who serves as a contact person for MST-related issues. They are available to assist veterans in locating and accessing VA services and programs, state and federal benefits, and community resources.

Where Do We Go from Here? Recommendations for Leaders

This chapter highlighted the expansion of roles for women in the military, along with numerous associated challenges experienced in garrison, in combat, as leaders, and in transition out of the service. Such challenges include structural or policy/procedural obstacles, along with outdated stereotypes and perceptions that have implications for all service members and their leaders. As “gritty” service members, women’s presence “at the table” will continue, and as we have emphasized here, to the benefit of all we serve. The following are offered as recommendations for service members and their leaders as women’s integration proceeds:

1. Emphasize the duties and responsibilities of service members based on military occupational specialty and ensure it is not based on gender. Make certain all service members have opportunities to excel, and that women service members are not limited to office positions or jobs outside of their specialty.
2. Ensure objective performance criteria help organizations reduce and eliminate gender and

racial discrimination. Leaders need to know what “right” looks like. By clearly defining and communicating performance evaluation criteria, everyone knows what is expected, and when those expectations are met. This leaves no room for subjectivity in performance evaluations.

3. Make sure your service members are physically and mentally prepared as they pursue nonstandard training. Before a woman service member attends nonstandard training events, offer pre-training. Ensure that an appropriate fitness standard is achieved. As Kamarck (2015) highlighted:

Whenever the Secretary of Defense establishes or revises a physical requirement for a military career designator, a member serving in that military career designator when the new requirement becomes effective, who is otherwise considered to be a satisfactory performer, shall be provided a reasonable period, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to meet the standard established by the new requirement. During that period, the new physical requirement may not be used to disqualify the member from continued service in that military career designator.

4. Be aware of personal and collective stereotypes and biases within the organization. Are women service members being penalized for being “harsh” or “not a team player”? Would a male service member be viewed similarly?
5. Maintain professionalism. Discuss the issue of maintaining boundaries with service members. Jokes and levity help some build relationships, as does disclosing personal information, but both can also violate boundaries and diminish professionalism, or be misconstrued. Teammates need to know when to say when, regardless of gender.
6. Find good mentors. Seek women mentors to guide women service members through their leadership development. Educate managers and employees about gender stereotyping, and showcase the success of women leaders in the workplace. Have guest speakers who

cover a spectrum of demographics. Find out if they are available for consultation or mentorship.

References

- Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8, 291–322.
- Belcher, J. R., Greene, J. A., McAlpine, C., & Ball, K. (2001). Considering pathways into homelessness: Mothers, addictions, and trauma. *Journal of Addictions Nursing*, 13, 199–208.
- Bensahel, N., Barno, D., Kidder, K., & Saylor, K. (2015). *Battlefields and boardrooms: Women’s leadership in the military and private sector*. Retrieved from http://www.cnas.org/sites/default/files/publicationspdf/CNAS_BattlefieldsVsBoardrooms_BensahelBarnoKidderSaylor.pdf
- Carothers, B. J., & Reis, H. T. (2013). Men and women are from earth: Examining the latent structure of gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104, 385–407.
- Cawkill, P., Rogers, A., Knight, S., & Spear, L. (2009). *Women in ground close combat roles: The experiences of other nations and a review of the academic literature*. Fareham, Hants: Defence Science and Technology Laboratory.
- Chapman, A. W. (2008). *Mixed-gender basic training: The U.S. Army experience*. Fort Monroe, VA: Army Training and Doctrine Command, 1973–2004.
- Demers, A. L. (2013). From death to life – Female veterans, identity negotiation, and reintegration into society. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 53, 489–515.
- Doan, A. E., & Portillo, S. (2016). Not a woman, but a soldier: Exploring identity through translocational positionality. In *Sex Roles* (pp. 1–14). New York, NY: Springer.
- Duckworth, A. (2016). *Grit: The power of passion and perseverance*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 1087–1101.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, & Company.
- Government Accountability Office [GAO]. (2015). *Military personnel: DoD is expanding combat service opportunities for women but should monitor long-term integration process*. GAO-15-589.
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus: A practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in your relationships*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

- Hamilton, A. B., Poza, I., & Washington, D. L. (2011). Homelessness and trauma go hand-in-hand: Pathways to homelessness among women veterans. *Women's Health Issues, 21*, S203–S209.
- Harding, T. A. (2012). Women in combat roles: Case study of female engagement teams. *U.S. Army War College, Strategy Research Project*. Retrieved from dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a561195.pdf
- Haring, E. L. (2013). What women bring to the fight. *Parameters, 43*, 27–32. Retrieved from http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/issues/summer_2013/3_haring_article.pdf
- Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2008). The road to the glass cliff: Differences in the perceived suitability of men and women for leadership positions in succeeding and failing organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 530–546.
- Hefling, K. (2011, April 22). They're not guys: New gear to fit for female soldiers. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com>
- Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 416–427.
- Henderson, E. C. (2015). Women home from war. In E. C. Ritchie & A. L. Naclerio (Eds.), *Women at war* (pp. 157–177). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, J. R. (2012). Female engagement teams: The need to standardize training and employment. *Military Review, 92*, 90–94.
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*, 581–592.
- Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., & Silva, C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review, 88*, 80–85.
- Kamarck, K. N. (2015). Women in combat: Issues for congress. *Congressional Research Service, 7–5700* (R42075).
- Kelly, D. R., Matthews, M. D., & Bartone, P. T. (2014). Grit and hardiness as predictors of performance among West Point cadets. *Military Psychology, 26*, 327–342.
- Konrad, A. M. (2003). Family demands and job attribute preferences: A 4-year longitudinal study of women and men. *Sex Roles, 49*, 35–46.
- Laughlin, A. M., & Haring, E. L. (2013). In the army, discrimination begins at West Point. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Lemmon, G. T. (2015). *Ashley's war*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *Psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Maddi, S., Matthews, M., Kelly, R., Villarreal, B., & White, M. (2012). The role of hardiness and grit in predicting performance and retention of USMA cadets. *Military Psychology, 24*, 19–28.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010). *Military occupational implications for racial/ethnic and gender diversity: Officers*. Arlington, VA: MLDS Issue Paper 23.
- Miller, C. (2015). *The battlefield at home: The meaning of homelessness from the female veteran's perspective* (Doctoral dissertation), Kansas State University.
- Moore, T. W., Finley, P. D., Hammer, R. J., & Glass, R. J. (2012). Opinion dynamics in gendered social networks: An examination of female engagement teams in Afghanistan. In S. J. Yang, A. M. Greenberg, & M. Endsley (Eds.), *Social computing, behavioral – Cultural modeling and prediction, Lecture notes in computer science* (Vol. 7227, pp. 69–77). Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany: Springer. SBP 2012.
- Naclerio, A. L. (2015). Medical issues for women warrior on deployment. In E. C. Ritchie & A. L. Naclerio (Eds.), *Women at war* (pp. 49–77). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics. (2011). *America's women veterans military service history and VA benefit service utilization*. Washington, DC: Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Policy and Planning. Retrieved from https://www.pritzker-military.org/files/1313/8755/8465/Final_Womens_Report_3_2_12_v_7.pdf
- National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics. (2016). *Profile of women veterans: 2014*. Washington, DC: Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Policy and Planning. Retrieved from http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/Women_Veterans_2016.pdf
- National Research Council. (2014). *The context of military environments: An agenda for basic research on social and organizational factors relevant to small units*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/18825/the-context-of-military-environments-an-agenda-for-basic-research>
- Nicolas, A. (2015). What the Female Engagement Team experience can teach us about the future of women in combat. *Military Review, 95*(2), 56–61.
- Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense. (2014). *Demographics: Profile of the military community*. Retrieved from <http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2014-Demographics-Report.pdf>
- Patten, E., & Parker, K. (2011). *Women in the US military: Growing share, distinctive profile*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Pew Research Center. (2013). *On pay gap, millennial women near parity for now: Despite gains, many see roadblocks ahead*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/12/11/on-pay-gap-millennial-women-near-parity-for-now/>
- Priest, D. (1997, December 29). Few women get generals' top jobs. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/longterm/armywomen/stories/army29.htm>
- RAND Corporation. (2010). *Sexual orientation and U.S. military personnel policy: An update of RAND's 1993 study*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND National Defense Research Institute.

- Rondeau, A. (2015). Tackling troubling trend of women leaving military, San Diego Union-Tribune on 10 June 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/2015/jun/10/military-women-retention-leadership/>
- Sandberg, S., & Scovell, N. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Schacherer, R. (2005). The conditions affecting military enlistments, *The Public Purposes III*. Retrieved from <http://www.american.edu/spa/publicpurpose/upload/The-Conditions-Affecting-Military-Enlistments.pdf>
- Subcommittee on Body Composition, Nutrition, and Health of Military Women, Committee on Military Nutrition Research, Institute of Medicine. (1998). *Reducing stress fracture in physically active military women*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/6295.html>
- Tannen, D. (1991). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Votel, J. (2015). Statement from USSOCOM on SECDEF's women in service review decision. *Small Wars Journal*. Retrieved from <http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/statement-from-ussocom-on-secdef%E2%80%99s-women-in-service-review-decision>
- Women's Armed Services Integration Act. (1948). Public Law 625. Retrieved from <http://documents.mx/documents/public-law-625-the-womens-armed-services-integration-act-of-1948.html>
- Zellman, G. L., Gates, S. M., Cho, M., & Shaw, R. (2008). *Options for Improving the Military Child Care System*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2008/RAND_OP217.pdf
- Zellman, G. L., Gates, S. M., Moini, J. S., & Sutturp, M. (2009). Meeting family and military needs through military child care. *Armed Forces and Society*, 35, 437–459.
- Zenger, J., & Folkman, J. (2012). Are women better leaders than men? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2012/03/a-study-in-leadership-women-do>