University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2016

Understanding Women Leaders in a Male-Dominated Profession: A Study of the United States Marine Corps' Women Generals

Marianne S. Waldrop
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Military History Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Waldrop, Marianne S., "Understanding Women Leaders in a Male-Dominated Profession: A Study of the United States Marine Corps' Women Generals" (2016). *Dissertations*. 60.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/60>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@san Diego.edu.

**UNDERSTANDING WOMEN LEADERS
IN A MALE-DOMINATED PROFESSION:
A STUDY OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS' WOMEN GENERALS**

by

Marianne S. Waldrop

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2016

Dissertation Committee

Lea Hubbard, Ph.D.
Cheryl Getz, Ed.D.
Robert Donmoyer, Ph.D.

University of San Diego

© Copyright by Marianne S. Waldrop
All Rights Reserved 2016

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES

CANDIDATE'S NAME: Marianne S. Waldrop

TITLE OF
DISSERTATION: UNDERSTANDING WOMEN LEADERS IN A MALE-
DOMINATED PROFESSION: A STUDY OF THE UNITED
STATES MARINE CORPS' WOMEN GENERALS

APPROVAL:

<u>Lea Hubbard, PhD</u>	Chair
<u>Cheryl Getz, PhD</u>	Member
<u>Robert Donmoyer, PhD</u>	Member

DATE: April 26, 2016

ABSTRACT

Contemporary organizations are increasingly realizing that future success requires a significant shift in leadership due to globalization, flattened organizational command and control structures, rapid technology growth, and the shift from manufacturing to service industries. Specifically, current leaders and scholars have begun to recognize the importance of employee diversity within organizations, and in particular the critical need to tap into the underutilized half of the population—women. Yet, the efforts to recruit, develop or retain women has been minimal, leading to metaphors such as *glass ceiling* and *labyrinth*, which characterize the institutional, social and personal barriers women encounter when seeking high-level leadership positions.

While many women have pushed past these barriers, the current body of literature tends to focus more on the challenges that serve to hold women back. As a result, there are few studies of highly successful women in high-level leadership positions, and even fewer of those that have examined successful women in male-dominated career fields such as the United States Marine Corps. Although the organization is noted for rigid institutional barriers and pervasive gender bias, women have been able to achieve the highest positions of responsibility within the the Corps' general-level ranks.

This exploratory case study/cross-case analysis examined the career trajectories of eight of the ten women Marines who achieved the rank of general, revealing the complexity of navigating success in the male-dominated context of the Marine Corps. An exploration of personal, organizational, and cultural influences revealed three themes consistent across the women generals: a willingness to settle for short-term career goals, the privileging of their Marine identity, and a strong affinity with the core values of the

Corps' culture. Beyond this, the women generals attributed their success to an array of differing strategies, motivations, and decisions. As Brigadier General Reals concluded, "There is no magical path or yellow brick road" leading to success of women in the Marine Corps. This inquiry not only offers a rare glimpse into the careers of successful military women, but also provides greater understanding of some of the factors that support and challenge leadership achievement for women more generally.

DEDICATION

My study of successful women in the Marine Corps is in tribute to my parents, Colonel Floyd “Cy” H. Waldrop, USMC (Ret.) and Mary Ann Waldrop who always supported me. My father, who passed in 2003, was my greatest inspiration and was the role model for my life: basketball player, golfer, and Marine. Although I may be a bit biased, my dad continues to be the best Marine officer that I have ever known. He once questioned my decision to go into the Marine Corps while in Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps in college, suggesting that the U.S. Navy would have more opportunities for women; I boldly retorted, "Dad, you didn't settle for less, so why should I???" That was the end of the debate. As for my mother who passed away 21 months after my father, she was an ardent Marine Corps supporter, wife, and cheerleader for all the other Marines in her life (and there were many)! She was the daughter, wife, mother, grandmother, and mother-in-law of Marines. I owe my success to their example, their commitment and passion for our country and the U.S. Marine Corps, and my inborn love for the same.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people I would like to thank who made this landmark study a reality. This examination and research would not be possible without the willingness and enthusiasm of the eight women Marine Corps generals who participated in this study. It was an honor and privilege to be the first to study the collective group of the 10 most successful women in the Marine Corps. Major General Tracy Garrett was essential to my success in completing this research. Her willingness to act as a liaison for me was crucial to my access to these women generals. Furthermore, I would like to thank the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation for generously bestowing me with their support through the General Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Memorial Dissertation Fellowship in illuminating the stories of the Corps' women generals and filling a significant gap in Marine Corps literature.

My accomplishment in completing this study was aided by many wonderful people. First, I would like to thank my committee of Drs. Lea Hubbard, Bob Donmoyer, and Cheryl Getz. Lea Hubbard was my committee chair who served as my academic coach, maintaining faith in my writing and analytic ability even when I had lost it. Bob Donmoyer was my continual cheerleader and also my trusted methodologist. Cheryl Getz, along with Dr. Terry Monroe, encouraged me to think big, suggesting to me early in the program that women Marine Corps generals were “mine” to study. Second, if it were not for my trusted friend and admired colleague, Dr. Tricia Rhodes, this study would yet to be finished. I credit her unfailing loyalty, compassion, enthusiasm for me and my work, and most importantly, her editorial skill for my ability to finish on time. Third, Heather Gibb is credited for reminding me of my sense of humor and the

program's deadlines. Finally, I thank Sergio Rodriguez for his willingness to help me produce the historically valuable appendices to this dissertation.

It is imperative that I express my gratitude for the friendship and comradery that my fellow students shared with me during this journey: Juan Roche, Jessica Williams, Rubina Bhatti, Mara Vicente-Robinson, Jenny Jones, Andria Shook, Elizabeth Castillo, Elaine Lewis, and Rafael Tovar. Each of them knows our unique connection and bond. I also want to express my gratitude to Kathryn Bingham for being my carpool partner for the three years we attended classes on campus.

On a personal note, I wish to thank family and friends. My hope is that they already know my appreciation of their role in my accomplishments and the gift that they were to me. I am grateful for my sister, Dr. Judy Waldrop-Williams, and her enthusiastic interest in my study and enduring emotional support as well as her guidance and encouragement. And finally, I wish to thank my golfing friends, Debbie Rossi and Melinda Balkom, and those from Rancho Bernardo Inn Women's Golf Club for their patience and understanding regarding my absence on the links since starting my dissertation. I will be out there again, soon!

PREFACE

I am the third of four generations to have served in the U.S. Marine Corps, and of these, am the only woman. At the age of 10, I proclaimed to my retiring U.S. Marine Corps colonel father that I wanted to grow up to be a U.S. Marine Corps officer just like him. Twelve years later in 1987, after participating in the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, I was commissioned a Marine Corps second lieutenant.

I feel tremendous pride in my service of over 24 years in the Marines. My career spanned some critical milestones and advancements for women Marines, including being allowed to deploy with their units to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia in support of Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, serve aboard U.S. Navy combatant ships, and qualify as Marine Corps pilots. Although the prohibitions against serving aboard ships and flying in the Marine Corps were not lifted early enough to expand my own service options, opportunities have significantly increased for the young women who were commissioned after me. These policy changes, along with changes in social and cultural attitudes regarding women's capabilities, have improved women Marine's opportunities and enabled them to serve in a more egalitarian manner alongside their male counterparts. Despite the prohibitions under which I served, I became an intelligence officer, deploying to combat zones in Africa, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq, and ultimately achieving the rank of colonel, a senior level rank rarely reached by any Marine, much less a female one.

My interest in this study was born out of both frustration and curiosity. First and foremost, I was continually frustrated in reading the literature on women leaders. Whether it came from academia or was a product of the popular press, the storyline was

the same: Women have made little progress in ascending to the top of organizations over the last half century. Almost inevitably, women were portrayed as victims of oppression who were marginalized by the barriers they faced in a wide array of organizations and institutions, and in society as a whole. This tale of victimization of women did not reflect my own career experience, nor my understanding of how far women have come more generally.

Frustration has also, at times, given way to curiosity: I wondered how I—and so many other women I know—achieved success in a male-dominated organization like the U.S. Marine Corps. In order to satisfy my curiosity, I identified some formative factors that I believe supported my effort to successfully navigate through and thrive as a Marine. However, I remained curious about how other women Marines had succeeded, particularly those who achieved some of the highest ranks in the Corps. What factors influenced, and what experiences occurred in their lives that led to *their* success? How were their stories similar and how did they differ from each other? What might other women—both those in the Marine Corps and those from a wide range of other organizations—learn from the experiences of successful women Marines as they seek to attain top leadership positions? These are some of the personal questions that have led me to embark on a study of the most successful women in the Corps.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
PREFACE.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study/Research Questions	19
Significance of the Study	20
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	22
Successful Women.....	22
Identity and Advancement of Women Marines	34
Success Strategies	43
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	63
Research Design	64
Participant and Site Selection	65
Data Collection	67
Data Analysis	70
Confidentiality	75
Positionality	75
CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDIES	77
Brigadier General Gail M. Reals, USMC, Ret.....	77
Lieutenant General Carol A. (Wiescamp) Mutter, USMC, Ret.....	89
Major General MaryAnn Krussa-Dossin, USMC, Ret.	101
Major General Angela (Angie) Salinas, USMC, Ret.....	113
Major General Tracy (Mork) Garrett, USMCR, Ret.	125
Brigadier General Marcela J. (Velasco) Monahan, USMCR, Ret.	137
Brigadier General Loretta (Lori) E. Reynolds, USMC	149
Brigadier General Helen G. Pratt, USMCR.....	160
Conclusion	171
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	172
Cross-Case Comparison.....	173
Limitations of the Study.....	203

Recommendations for Future Research	205
Significance of the Study	205
Final Words.....	206
REFERENCES	208
APPENDICES	217
APPENDIX A. Study Announcement and Solicitation Correspondence	218
APPENDIX B. Primary Research Participant Interview Protocol.....	221
APPENDIX C. Supporting Research Participant Interview Protocol.....	224
APPENDIX D. Career Timeline for BGen Margaret Brewer, USMC (Ret.)	226
APPENDIX E. Career Timeline for BGen Gail M. Reals, USMC (Ret.).....	229
APPENDIX F. Career Timeline for LtGen Carol A. (Wiescamp) Mutter, USMC (Ret.)	232
APPENDIX G. Career Timeline for LtGen Frances (Fran) Wilson, USMC (Ret.).....	235
APPENDIX H. Career Timeline for MajGen MaryAnn Krusa-Dossin, USMC (Ret.)	238
APPENDIX I. Career Timeline for MajGen Angela (Angie) Salinas, USMC (Ret.).....	241
APPENDIX J. Career Timeline for MajGen Tracy (Mork) Garrett, USMCR (Ret.)	244
APPENDIX K. Career Timeline for BGen Marcela J. (Velasco) Monahan, USMCR (Ret.)..	247
APPENDIX L. Career Timeline for BGen Loretta (Lori) E. Reynolds, USMC.....	250
APPENDIX M. Career Timeline for BGen Helen G. Pratt, USMCR	253
APPENDIX N. U.S. Marine Corps Women Generals at a Glance	256
APPENDIX O. Timeline of Milestones for Women Marine Corps Generals	258
APPENDIX P. Coding Cycles and Codes	261

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Over the last 40 years, a growing body of literature has suggested that women represent a significant source of untapped leadership potential for organizations (Barsh & Yee, 2012; Binkin & Bach, 1977; Friedan, 1974; Helgesen, 1990; Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986; Rhode, 2003; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007; The White House Project, 2009). Specifically, women remain dramatically underrepresented in the upper echelons of American business, education leadership, politics and the military (Binkin & Bach, 1977; Blount, 1998; Eagly & Carli, 2004; Iskra, 2007; Rhode, 2003; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). For example, only 14.6% of executive officer positions in Fortune 500 companies are filled by women, and that number dwindles to 4.8% when the focus is narrowed to chief executive officers (Catalyst, 2014). Likewise, government statistics from 2011 indicated that only 26% of college presidents and from 2014 that 16.2% of military officers were women, while in 2013, only 18.5% of the U. S. Congress were women (Cook & Kim, 2012; Women's Research and Education Institute [WREI], 2014; National Women's Political Caucus, 2010). These statistics provide updated evidence of a historical trend, one that has given rise to a monumental effort to explain the factors that prohibit women from rising to the heights of leadership.

Barriers to Women's Leadership Success

An abundance of literature, both in academia and in the popular press, has explored the institutional, social, and personal barriers that deter, prevent, or legally prohibit women from ascending the power ranks (Barreto, Ryan, & Schmitt, 2009; Barsh & Yee, 2012; Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Josefowitz, 1980; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007; WREI,

2014). Specifically, some of the significant variables that have been identified include issues of social norms, gender identity, role congruity, bias and stereotyping (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). However, another explanation potentially resides with the women themselves. Eagly and Carli (2004), for example, argue that “a more subtle human capital argument is the ‘female choice’ proposition that employed women do not seek leadership positions because they believe that the demands of such positions would compromise their family responsibilities” (p. 283).

Since 1986, barriers to women in leadership are often discussed through metaphoric lenses. In the popular press, Hymowitz and Schellhardt (1986), for example, coined the metaphor of the “glass ceiling,” one that many continue to use when explaining women’s inability to climb the corporate ladder (and ladders to the top of the organizational hierarchy in other types of organizations as well). This metaphor depicts “those artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing upward in their organization into management-level positions” (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991, p. 1; Barreto et al., 2009; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987). In 1991, the Federal government established the “Glass Ceiling Commission” to study and make recommendations for legislation that would protect women from institutionally condoned discrimination (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995).

Although the government’s legislative efforts improved women’s access to leadership roles in a large spectrum of professions, social and personal barriers and biases continued to stymie women’s ability to “break through the glass ceiling.” A significant

body of literature explained that organizations and industries in the past favored male leaders because they embodied masculine or “agentic” leadership traits. Agentic leaders are task driven and assertive (Eagly & Carli, 2007a), qualities that played well in “command and control” contexts, which in the past, at least, were characteristic of organizations in a wide variety of fields. In contrast to the “agentic” traits characterizing the ideal typical conception of men’s leadership, the traits and qualities of women are characterized as “communal.” Eagly and Carli (2007a) explain that “communal associations convey a concern with the compassionate treatment of others....being especially affectionate, helpful, friendly, kind, and sympathetic as well as interpersonally sensitive, gentle, and soft spoken” (p. 86). These feminine traits, it is argued, have contributed significantly to the obstacles for women’s advancement to the highest levels.

Historically, the agentic prescriptions for male gender roles and those held for leaders were considered synonymous. The stark differences between traits that were socially expected in leaders and the communal prescriptions for women created a dilemma for women (Eagly & Carli, 2007a). There has been an often unconscious, yet very real and pervasive belief that the natural temperament of women does not mesh with what is required of high-level leaders (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2004; Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Josefowitz, 1980; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). This has subjected them to a “double bind,” a term that refers to the perception of incongruity and ineffectiveness of women in positions of leadership, resulting in women not being considered for upper-level positions. Assuming that women are incapable of being agentic, conventional wisdom promotes a stereotype of women as less hierarchical

and more collaborative, as well as being more oriented to enhancing others' self-worth (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990).

Changing Contexts Demand a Different Leadership Style

Today, there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that contemporary organizations are different from organizations in the past (Eagly & Carli, 2004). This is due to a number of factors including globalization, flattened organizational command and control structures, rapid technology growth prompting the creation of virtual organizations, and the shift from manufacturing to service industries. Because of these changes, scholars argue that organizations face a need for leaders that operate differently than the prototypical male leaders of the past (Barreto et al., 2009; Barsh & Yee, 2012; Blackmore, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Carli, 2004; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Helgesen, 1990; Larson, 2000; Rhode, 2003; Riggio, 2008; Rosener, 1990). In fact, today's organizations appear to require approaches to leadership that are associated more with what society has thought of as communal rather than agentic traits (Eagly & Carli, 2004; Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Eagly & Carli, 2007b; Hoyt, 2013).

This shift appears to open the door for women to be considered for top-level leadership positions. Of course, males are certainly capable of expanding their repertoire of leadership approaches to include those that traditionally were associated with a female ideal type of leadership. Still, it seems that this shift in attitudes toward leadership has proved advantageous for women. We find therefore that the stereotypical characterization of women, a group of individuals not previously having the sorts of skills

and attitudes necessary for effective leadership, may now be what is needed, accounting for some of their recent career advancement.

Changing the Metaphor

Given the changing nature of organizations, it is hardly surprising that a new metaphor has been proposed to replace the glass ceiling imagery of the past. Eagly and Carli (2007b), for example, contend that the Hymowitz and Schellhardt's (1986) "glass ceiling" metaphor has become outdated, suggesting that:

a better metaphor for what confronts women in their professional endeavors is the labyrinth....As a contemporary symbol, it conveys the idea of a complex journey toward a goal worth striving for....For women who aspire to top leadership, routes exist but are full of twists and turns, both unexpected and expected. Because all labyrinths have a viable route to the center, it is understood that goals are attainable. The metaphor acknowledges obstacles but is not ultimately discouraging. (p. 64)

Eagly and Carli (2007b) add that even if women today have to negotiate a labyrinth rather than crash through a glass ceiling to get to the top of most organizations' leadership pyramid, the road they must travel is not an easy one. Women still encounter a variety of obstacles, including difficult family and personal choices, clandestine forms of gender bias and often, unacknowledged stereotypes (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Eagly & Carli, 2007b; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Regardless, Eagly and Carli (2007b) conclude that some women have proven to "negotiate these labyrinthine paths to positions of power, authority, and prestige, regardless of the discriminatory impediments that they encounter along the way. Some women find roundabout or discontinuous or nontraditional routes to authority" (p. 8).

Surprisingly, however, little focus has been given to successful women, i.e., to the few who might be considered "outliers." These women have achieved leadership

positions despite the obstacles and barriers that have kept many of their female peers from advancing to top-level positions in organizations. Their achievements are important to understand and acknowledge because their lives and leadership trajectories may be instructive for women who follow them (Eagly & Carli, 2007a, p. 199). This is particularly true when considering successful women in male-dominated fields where the challenges are even greater.

Statement of the Problem

The kinds of obstacles and barriers that women face are particularly problematic in male-dominated organizations such as the United States (U.S.) military and more specifically, the U.S. Marine Corps (USMC). Holm wrote in 1992:

The smallest and most combat intensive of the services, the Corps, continues to project itself as the last bastion of the classic fighting man....In this environment, more than in any other military service, women have been something of an anomaly. (p. 414)

What was true when Holm wrote these words continues to be true today (United States Marine Corps [USMC], 2014; WREI, 2014). USMC (2015) reports that the total percentage of women serving on active duty in March 2015 was 7.6%, or 14,223 out of a total of 188,000 Marines. More specifically, only 0.8% or 1,432 of the entire Marine Corps were female officers, i.e., members of the formally educated leadership of the military, as opposed to approximately 10.4% of the entire Marine Corps being male officers. The statistics have changed negligibly in recent history, demonstrating that the U.S. Marine Corps continues to be a male-dominated institution, with few women serving in its leadership “suite.”

In spite of the odds against becoming a leader in the Corps, some women Marines have not only succeeded but also managed to rise to some of the very top positions.

Specifically, ten women Marines have attained the ranks of general officer, a level that in a military context signifies a significant achievement, rarely achieved, regardless of gender (See Appendices D-O). In 1978, the Marine Corps' first woman Marine brigadier general was appointed by President Carter; the tenth woman was promoted to that rank in September 2014. Among these ten, five achieved the rank of brigadier general (BGen) or O-7 (one-star), three advanced to major general (MajGen) or O-8 (two-stars) and two achieved the rank of lieutenant general (LtGen) or O-9 (three-stars). No women Marines have attained the rank of full general (Gen) or O-10 (four-stars). Of the ten women generals, seven served on full-time active duty and three served in the part-time or reserve component of the Marine Corps (See Appendix N). These women's career accomplishments are hugely impressive, and yet, to date, there have been no thorough studies of their success.

This study is designed to examine the factors that supported the advancement of these women who were able to progress to some of the highest ranks in this male-dominated institution. The women generals in this study served from the early 1950's to the present. The temporal dimension of their career offers opportunity to investigate the ways that the historical and social context in which they served may have supported and/or challenged their advancement. This study also sheds new light on the specific actions that these women took, and the personal backgrounds that motivated and supported their ability to achieve these high-level leadership positions.

U.S. Marine Corps Context

To understand the success of these women Marine generals, it is imperative to understand the context in which they led. This includes the organizational culture of the

Marine Corps, as well as its structure, with the laws and institutional regulations that existed at the time of the women generals' service.

Culture. Edgar Schein, an expert in organizational culture, offers a helpful explanation of the relevance of culture in accounting for the actions of both individuals and groups. His theoretical frame helps us to understand how Marine culture may have supported or challenged the success of the women Marine leaders in this study. Schein (2010) explains,

Culture is to a group what personality or character is to an individual....Yet, just as our personality and character guide and constrain our behavior, so does culture guide and constrain the behavior of members of a group through the shared norms that are held in that group. (p.14)

Schein adds later that “culture is the deepest, often unconscious part of a group and is therefore less tangible and less visible” (Schein, 2010, p. 16). In the case of the Marine Corps, culture is at the heart of everything the organization does. It is likely that a successful Marine would be one who has been completely enculturated into the Corps.

A vivid example of the influential depth of culture is evident in the U.S. Marine Corps' 240 years of warfighting history and their experience of creating, developing, molding, and motivating Marine leaders to courageously respond in a moment's notice to fight the nation's wars. Specifically, the Marines have the reputation as the premier fighting force throughout the world. They possess an indomitable spirit, a highly respected heritage, and a tradition with widely acclaimed esprit de corps. Those who choose a career in the Marines relate it more to a *calling* than a profession (USMC, 2014). A former Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC), Gen James Amos, speaking to the Senate Armed Services Committee in February 2013, explained Marine culture by pointing to their insistence on “readiness”:

By the will of the 82nd Congress [January 1951-January 1953], the Marine Corps is mandated to be the nation's expeditionary force in readiness. Having been dubbed 'America's 911 Force,' we are our nation's hedge against uncertainty...a national insurance policy of sorts. (Amos, 2013, p. 3)

Schein (2010) suggests that to understand an organization's culture and its influence on behavior, an examination of three levels of organizational culture is necessary: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. Artifacts, which Schein describes as "all the phenomena that you would see, hear and feel when you encounter a new group with an unfamiliar culture," are at the surface level of culture (p. 23). The Marine Corps has many representative and generally known artifacts. It possesses its own emblem, the *Eagle, Globe and Anchor*, which symbolizes the global, expeditionary mission of the U.S. Marine Corps. Its colors are scarlet and gold and its motto is *Semper Fidelis*, which is Latin for "Always Faithful."

Another significant example of a cultural artifact of the Corps is their recently updated, 128-page book called *Leading Marines, Marine Corps Warfighting Publication (MCWP) 6-11* (USMC, 2014). This book reminds Marines at all ranks of the Corps about the leadership traits and principles that are privileged, and offers historical accounts to serve as a "touchstone," a guide for all Marines throughout their service, whether they are in combat or garrison. These artifacts are uniquely representative of the Marine Corps institution and have become recognized as revered icons of pride and courage throughout the world.

The next deeper level of culture, according to Schein (2010), is the espoused beliefs and values of the organization. These are consciously and explicitly articulated, and guide behavior and responses to critical events. USMC (2014) explains that, "as Marines, we share the core values of honor, courage, and commitment. As much as

anything else, our core values set us apart. They give us strength, influence our attitudes, and regulate our behavior” (p. 1-6). Marines view themselves as different from other service members because they strive to embody these values, resulting in the Corps’ elite wafighting tradition, with the mettle and preparation to go anywhere and always be ready to be “first to fight” (USMC, 2014).

In the USMC (2014) document, an entire chapter entitled *Our Ethos*, is devoted to showcasing who Marines are, how they are made, what they do for the nation, what is valued, and the esteemed traditions that lie in the heart of every Marine. Ethos is defined as “the distinguishing character, sentiment, or moral nature, or guiding beliefs of a person, group or institution” (Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary, n.d.). In the Marine Corps, the credo or ethos is that *every Marine is a rifleman* (USMC, 2014). It is an espoused belief that the service vigorously endeavors to inculcate, in order to realize the all-important function of the Marine Corps as “America’s 911 force” in readiness (Amos, 2013; USMC, 2014).

The third level of culture according to Schein (2010) is the existence of basic underlying assumptions. Basic assumptions are those ideas that have become taken for granted, and for which little variation exists among the organizational community. He says that assumptions “tend to be nonconfrontable and nondebtable, and hence are extremely difficult to change” (p. 28). The most basic assumption among all Marines is that they must possess the quality of selflessness—“a spirit that subordinates self-interest to that of the Country, Corps and fellow Marines” (USMC, 2014, p. 1-14). This characteristic, which is the cornerstone of the Marine Corps’ leadership philosophy, is

essential because military life, the “profession of arms,” demands that each Marine incur a higher moral obligation than that expected of members of society at large.

Education has been key to enculturating those entering the Marine Corps. As an institution, the Corps ascribes to an on-going education process that addresses the heart and mind. This socialization has strong historical foundations, beginning with each member’s crucible moment as they graduate from either Marine Corps boot camp or officer training. This “rite of passage” is where Marines are initially ingrained with a sense of service, honor and discipline that exists nowhere else in our society (USMC, 2014). According to USMC (2014), “...leading Marines is the most important responsibility in our Corps, and thus we must educate the heart and mind to prevail on the battlefield and in the barracks, in war and in peace” (Amos, 2014).

It is within this culture that the successful women generals in this study have had to work to advance their career. Informed by Schein’s three levels of culture, we gain a better understanding of the motivations and commitment made by these Marines. Throughout American history, men and women have accepted the challenge that the Marine Corps offers, and successfully earned the title “Marine.” The requisite commitment to the Marine culture seems to place considerable demands on those who do so.

Structure. An examination of the Corps’ institutional structure, legal prohibitions, and gendered integration efforts help to further explain the opportunities available to women in the military. In reviewing the history of the federal laws and service regulations, as well as the Marine Corps’ institutional structures, we gain a greater understanding of the experience of these Marine generals (See Appendix O).

Laws and regulations. By the end of 1942, the two-front World War had generated overwhelming manpower demands. In order to address this need, all the military services initiated reserve service programs to replace current servicemen with women in all possible state-side positions, in order to “free a man to fight” overseas. To that end, on 13 February 1943, the Marine Corps established the Marine Corps Women Reserves (MCWR). Initially, the MCWR offered women reservists opportunities in 34 job assignments, rapidly expanding to over 225 specialties by the end of World War II. Undeniably, women Marines proved their value in wartime support and came to be indispensable to the functioning of the Corps (Stremlow & United States Marine Corps [USMC], 1986; Women in Military Service to America [WIMSA], 2015). Because of this, support was palpable for women becoming members of the regular military with opportunities for permanent service, rather than being relegated to reserve duty.

However, it took three years from the end of World War II to legalize the regular military service status of women. Finally, in June 1948, Congress passed, and President Truman signed into law the Women's Armed Services Integration Act, Public Law 625 (P.L. 625), with specific provisions regarding regular status, as well as other opportunities, and the administration of women within the military (Stremlow & USMC, 1986; WREI, 2014). Across all of the Defense Department, P.L. 625 realigned promotion regulations for women to more closely parallel those of males and expressly entitled women to the same pay, leave, allowances, and benefits as men, with a few exceptions based on individual family circumstances.

In implementing the legislation of P.L. 625, significant accommodations for women's opportunities in the Marine Corps were made available. Most importantly, it

authorized the enlistment and appointment of women in both the Regular Marine Corps and the Marine Corps Reserve, rendering the MCWR obsolete, proving an important step toward gender integration. As a result of this significant step, the position of Director of Women Marines, a female colonel (O-6) position, was established to serve in the office of the Commandant (Stremlow & USMC, 1986). Her function would be to “initiate action on matters affecting women Marines or make recommendations on policies and procedures concerning them but prepared by other agencies” (Stremlow & USMC, 1986, p. 24). At its inception in October 1948, the position of Director of Women Marines, served as a positive formal acknowledgement of the value of the contributions of women and the necessity of having them in its ranks.

P.L. 625, despite the advancements it institutionalized, also set forth provisions that introduced legal barriers to women’s ability to serve and compete equally for promotion. The law specified a two percent hiring ceiling on the number of women “Regulars” across the nation’s four military branches and also mandated lieutenant colonel as the highest permanent rank to which women could promote. The rank of colonel would be reserved for special positions, like Director of Women Marines, requiring women holding these positions to revert to lieutenant colonel when the tour of duty was complete. Additionally, explicit prohibitions against women serving in combat-related occupations and positions were established, some of which are still in place today under the Department of Defense’s (DOD) ground combat exclusion policy for service women (Stremlow & USMC, 1986). Regardless, P.L. 625 is credited for some incrementally positive changes toward gender equality within the military, as well as arguably influencing social attitudes on gender roles, as is later evident.

After the advances made in 1948, there were still legal barriers to overcome that contributed to the absence of women at the highest levels in the Marine Corps. In November 1967, President Johnson signed into law Public Law 90-130 (P.L. 90-130), significantly modifying the previously discussed P.L. 625 of 1948. Important highlights of P.L. 90-130 were the repeal of the legal limitation of two percent of women in the armed forces, removal of some of the existing restrictions on promotions and assignments, allowance for permanent promotion of women to colonel (O-6) and permission for women to hold temporary appointments to flag/general officer when serving in designated billets (Stremlow & USMC, 1986; WREI, 2014).

Five years later, in August 1972, Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), Admiral Zumwalt, issued a directive legendarily known as Z-Gram #116 (Z-116), Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women in the Navy, which opened additional occupational fields and the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) to women (Naval History and Heritage Command [NHHC], 2015; WREI, 2014). In spite of these efforts by the Department of the Navy, the Marine Corps made little progress toward gender equity until 1980 when Congress passed the Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act (DOPMA). DOPMA was instrumental in reforming promotion practices in the services and was significant to the women of this study for two primary reasons: 1) it abolished the requirement for separate appointment, promotion, accounting and separation procedures between the servicemen and women of all Armed Services and 2) it mandated the competitive selection process for women's promotions to flag/general officer rank, rather than by appointment by the President of the United States, requiring their records to be considered in competitive selection boards alongside those of their

male contemporaries (WREI, 2014). Because of reforms like these, DOPMA proved revolutionary for the advancement of women Marines and their long term career aspirations.

Since the passing of DOPMA, progress has been gradual in expanding opportunities for servicewomen. In 1988 and 1994, DOD regulations and memorandums reversed some of the prevailing statutory restrictions, opening up significant numbers of jobs that were previously closed to women; however, some still argue that until *all* military specialties are available to women, women will continue to leave the service, while women who stay will not be competitive for general officer rank (Military Leadership Diversity Commission [MLDC], 2011). To address this, the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC), comprised of 34 professionals, both military and civilians and established by the National Defense Authorization Act of 2009, was convened to evaluate and assess the policies and practices that influenced diversity among military leaders.

The Commission was critical of the existing statutory restrictions on women's opportunities in the U.S. Marine Corps and other branches of the military. MLDC (2011) recommended,

DOD and the services eliminate the combat exclusion policies that have barred women from direct ground combat fields and assignments since the early 1990s. ...these policies constitute a structural barrier that prevents women from entering the tactical/operational career fields associated with promotion to flag/general officer grades from serving in career-enhancing assignments. (MLDC, 2011, p. 71)

According to MLDC (2011), the U.S. Marine Corps' lack of women in high-level leadership positions seemed to point to the DOD's inclination to promote those serving in combat arms professions to general officer. As of January 2013, one of the final barriers

to equal opportunity was removed with the lifting of the Combat Exclusion Policy, allowing women access starting in January 2016 to all positions, including combat and special forces jobs. In spite of the legal implementation, social sentiment about women in combat jobs remains divided.

Institutional structure. As noted earlier, at the conclusion of World War II, the undeniable value of servicewomen and their unique contributions led to the services instituting programs to allow permanent military service for women, rather than utilizing them only in the capacity of wartime reserves. With these changes, the Marine Corps was faced with implementing organizational structural changes and adapting internal processes to accommodate this new arrangement.

Two changes were made, as noted earlier—the disbanding of the MCWR as a separate branch of the Marine Corps and the establishment of the office of Director for Women Marines. Although the dissolution of MCWR served as a positive step toward greater integration and opportunities, the establishment of Director of Women Marines perpetuated a sense of separateness and division between women and the rest of the Marine Corps; which in the long term, proved problematic for real equality. The inception of women Marine regulars in 1948 introduced a separate leadership structure for women, known in the military as a “chain of command.” Within this new established chain of command, the Director of Women Marines had what many perceived to be ultimate authority over decisions made regarding women in the Corps.

By the mid-1970s, the Director’s position had become representative of a seemingly “shadow” Marine Corps, which may well have impeded meaningful gender integration in the Marine Corps (Frank & United States Marine Corps [USMC], 1983).

In practice, women Marines were administratively managed, accounted for, and tracked by other women Marines in a local Woman Marine Company, while reporting for duty in operational units with their male counterparts. Male Marines, however, were not subject to this same duality of leadership. Stremlow and USMC (1986) explain it this way,

Leave and liberty, for example, were granted by the commanding officer [of a Woman Marine Company], based upon a written release by the work supervisor [her male operational supervisor]...On matters of discipline, if a work supervisor [typically male] put a woman on report, it was handled not within his chain of command, but through her company, and, when necessary, battalion. (p. 137)

This arrangement of dual chains of command proved to be both beneficial and detrimental for the women. For some women, during early integration efforts, being subject to an all-women chain of command provided them protection, a line of defense against potentially unfettered, unfair, or biased treatment by men. Alternatively, the male Marine leadership seemingly preferred this dual line of authority as it absolved them of discomfort and awkwardness in having to lead in a mixed-gender environment. However, as time passed and women became more integrated, the separate or dual chains of command were perceived as promoting professional separation, and consequently, inequity between servicemen and servicewomen.

The administration and management of women Marines from 1948 to 1977 provides insight into early institutional attitudes about gender equality and acceptance of women. Historically, there is evidence that the Marine Corps administration identified and differentiated women Marines through the use of naming conventions and titles. In 1948, as a result of the policy instituting women as “Regulars” in the Marine Corps, a Marine Corps memorandum was published that “directed that women entering the Regular Marine Corps be referred to as ‘Woman Marines,’ [WM] with ‘USMC-W’ as the

short title or reporting form” (Stremlow & USMC, 1986, p. 27), and the women reserves, likewise, designated as USMCR-W. These gender-based identifiers explicitly differentiated the women Marines from their male counterparts, indicating an institutional preference for separate accountability. However, in March 1950, after open opposition to this policy by women Marines, a new directive was published designating instead that a “W” be placed before the women Marines’ serial number, reversing the official reference to women as “WM” (Stremlow & USMC, 1986). This accommodation, however, lacked substantive institutional reform, serving only as an overt or symbolic gesture to appease the women.

In 1975, although “WR” and “WM” had been generally accepted as abbreviations, official use of them ended when they were deleted from the Marine Corps’ Individual Records Accounting Manual (IRAM) (Frank & USMC, 1983). Personal attitudes and behaviors, however, were slower to change. In practice, until the mid-1980’s, the institutional reforms associated with gender integration continued to gain traction, gradually leading to the diminished habitual use of monikers and labels like “Woman Marine” and “WM” in favor of the title, “Marine.”

Conclusion

The Marine Corps’ historical and social context provides valuable insight into the factors that support, but also challenge women Marines. The Marine culture and their laws and regulations are powerful determinants, and changes related to these may help to account for women’s success in this male-dominated profession. Ten female Marines have managed to rise to the rank of general officer. To date, however, scholars have given little attention to the process that enabled these successful women to advance in

their careers. Thus the U.S. Marine Corps offers an ideal organizational context in which to explore the social construction of career success for women.

Purpose of the Study/Research Questions

To better understand what it looks like for women to successfully navigate the career labyrinth, this study focused on the careers of the ten women leaders who achieved the heights of positional leadership in a male-dominated organization. The overarching purpose of this study is to shift the focus within studies of women and leadership from the barriers that inhibit women from achieving high-level leadership positions—a topic that has already been studied extensively (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Blackmore, 2002; Lyman, Ashby & Tripses, 2005)—to the career paths of women who succeeded in spite of some very real barriers. More specifically, this study looked at eight of the ten women general officers that have made it to the top of a highly elite and traditionally male-dominated organization—the U.S. Marine Corps. This study examines the structural, cultural and individual factors that prompted these women’s desire and ability to lead in the Marine Corps, from their perspective. This inquiry was particularly attentive to uncovering any strategies or tactics they employed, as well as any situational and organizational factors, motivations, personal characteristics, behaviors, and beliefs that appear to have contributed to their attaining the rank of general in the U.S. Marine Corps.

The following research questions were used to structure this study:

Research question 1: How do these women leaders describe their career trajectories in the U.S. Marine Corps, a male-dominated organization?

Sub-question 1a: What factors supported their journey to the rank of general?

Sub-question 1b: What barriers had to be overcome on their journey, and how were they overcome?

Research question 2: Of the following factors, which do women Marine leaders explicitly identify or which can be inferred as helping them to attain the rank of general: personal strategies and tactics, beliefs, motives, effective behaviors, relationships, personal characteristics and/or factors related to the organization or situation?

Significance of the Study

There are four significant implications of this study, related to two distinct bodies of literature—women’s leadership and women in the military. The first point of significance is that it attempts to re-orient the discussion about women in leadership from one of victimization and defeat to optimism and inspiration for future women leaders. The study attempts to acquaint those individuals who have uncritically accepted the literature and made commonsense assumptions about barriers and limited leadership opportunities for women, with these unique success stories.

The second point of significance is that future women leaders will benefit by knowing how women in the past “navigated the labyrinth” to success in order to eventually achieve a place in the high-status, powerful positions of today’s evolving, contemporary organizations. Specifically, the findings will inform the behavior and thinking of these women leaders. Thirdly, the study provides insight for leaders of organizations and leadership development professionals regarding the influences that lead to leadership achievement for women, particularly in male-dominated organizations.

Finally, the findings and hypotheses developed out of this study may provide a foundation for future research on women leaders, regardless of the context. Although

they were small in number, the achievements of these U.S. Marine Corps women generals in a male-dominated profession deserve to be acknowledged and explored. This study appears to be the first attempt to collectively document their stories. There is much to be learned from their journeys to success.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to better understand how some women have succeeded beyond expectation in male-dominated organizations, it is helpful to be familiar with the existing body of literature on successful women leaders. Additionally, while conducting this study, it became apparent that the identity development of leaders, particularly as women in a male-dominated industry, is a significant factor in examining success. For this study, I review literature that examines highly successful women, some of the strategies they use, and the significance of their identity development relative to success. I do so by exploring some of the literature that showcases high achieving U.S. women in male-dominated industries, i.e., business, educational leadership, and the military. I then explore the body of knowledge that examines eight of the important strategies that are attributable to women's success: five that promote the cultivation of human capital through deliberate behaviors and three that promote establishing social capital through relationship building. Finally, I discuss the three levels of identity and the role identity development plays in success.

Successful Women

A significant body of literature exposes the barriers and obstacles that challenge women from achieving high level leadership positions in this country. However, according to Madsen (2008), a scholar who studied women university leaders, there is a dearth of scholarly research reports or application-centered writings that provide information about the development of high-level women leaders. The literature that does exist consists of some career management and "how-to" books that provide guidelines to help women ascend to the highest power positions within organizations. Some tell a

“good news story,” of how some highly successful women have “broken through the glass ceiling” or successfully “navigated the labyrinth” of achievement. In, general, however, the body of research on successful women offers little hope for the next generation of women leaders who aspire to top leadership positions. Most warn of derailed careers and unsuccessful struggles to gain promotion.

The literature to date has also focused its stories of women’s career trajectories primarily on the business sector. Some early literature describes successful pioneering women. More recently however, stories of success have included tales of women making extraordinary achievements in other male-dominated careers such as media, medicine and education leadership. I begin with a review of some of the literature that focuses primarily on women in two non-military, male-dominated fields—business and educational leadership—in order to examine the challenges women face in advancing their careers. I then discuss the career challenges of women in the military.

Women in Business

There are a few foundational and often cited works about women in business that are worthy of examination, in that they focus on the challenges women have had to face in their attempt to gain leadership positions. One such work is research initiated by two female Harvard scholars in 1973, Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim, graduates of the Harvard Business School and the founding Deans of the Simmons Schools of Management at Harvard. Hennig and Jardim (1977) published their findings of 25 women who were classic pioneers in the book *The Managerial Woman*. All of the women they studied held line positions as presidents or divisional vice-presidents of nationally recognized firms that were considered male-dominated organizations at the

time. These trailblazing women leaders, born in the United States between 1910 and 1915, assumed their first entry-level position during the Great Depression, in positions that their fathers helped them get, or jobs that were created as a favor to a father or friend. This Depression era study concluded that while these women were successful, their path was not easy:

Millions of women will spend an entire career life living and working in a culture whose traditions, rules and implicit codes are derived from the male experience. The extent to which as women we can understand this culture, and manage our existence within it, will determine how far we can go and what costs we will pay. (p. 183)

The researchers point out that a woman's ability to attain high-power positions within their organizations will largely be dependent upon their ability to understand, adapt and accommodate to cultures that have been instituted by men, for men. The stories of these women give life to the pioneering spirit of courageous women who dared to pursue non-traditional paths, and underscores how aspiring women leaders must develop ways to operate strategically within a male-dominated culture.

A smaller selection from recent literature reveals that women who followed the advice offered in the previous work and attempted to navigate these male-dominated cultures, did so by paying a significant emotional price. Walsh (1995), in her book, *Divided Lives*, attempts to reveal a more honest portrayal of the journeys of successful women. According to Walsh, "The battle beneath the surface of a woman's life, the beliefs and the fears that she brought to her decisions, [have] gone curiously unrecorded" (p. 16). Attempting to shed light on the emotional toll that successful women suffer along the way, Walsh captures the stories of three highly successful and visible women in their respective male-dominated professions: television journalist Meredith Vieira,

conductor and first lady of West Virginia, Rachael Worby, and the breast surgeon, Dr. Alison Estabrook.

Through the exemplar stories of these three highly successful women, Walsh (1995) sheds light on the inevitable personal challenges that are unique to women and draws out deep emotional themes from their stories. Personifying Eagly and Carli's (2007a) metaphor of "navigating a labyrinth," a significant source of the angst in the lives of these successful women during their professional journey involved their choice to bear children while being unable to delegate domestic and child responsibilities to their spouses. In this work, Walsh gives voice to successful women's private struggles and domestic dilemmas that can challenge their desire to continue to the top, in spite of the allure of greater responsibility and power. She concludes that "despite all the gains, they lived divided lives, unable to integrate the parts [of their lives] and overwhelmed with frustration and guilt" (p. 25). Their stories clearly identify some of the complexity that women leaders face that men typically do not.

In another landmark study, Gallagher and Golant (2000) examined 200 women executives who held posts within one or two steps of their FORTUNE 1000 company's Chief Executive Officer post, of which 17%, remarkably, represented women executives of color. All of these women were the first to reach a senior position in these major, most powerful corporations in the world. This work synthesizes the experiences of these women into four critical success factors and 15 proven strategies for career advancement, as well as provides advice and a road map to the executive suite for the next generation of women leaders in business.

Women in Education Leadership

Another major sector where women have attempted to make career advancement is education. Although women have and continue to be widely represented in the teaching profession, they have been far less successful in achieving positions in educational leadership or higher education. Some exceptions, however, have been noted. The work by Griffiths and Kennedy (1996) attempts to raise awareness of a small group of successful women education leaders. In their work, *Beyond the Glass Ceiling*, they showcase accomplishments of 40 highly successful women from international educational organizations, spotlighting how women, covering the spectrum of race and ethnicity, have embarked on uncharted territory in higher education worldwide. One purpose of this work is to inspire future generations of women educators into positions of influence in academia, through compelling stories from stellar examples such as Condoleezza Rice, bell hooks, and Carol Gilligan.

In recent research on a small group of women who have become university presidents, Madsen (2008) argues that “all aspects of women’s lives must be explored to understand how they have prepared themselves to become effective high-profile leaders” (p. 209). Identifying a significant void in the body of literature on women university presidents, she notes that “...current publications share little about the leadership motivations, styles, and philosophies of actual university presidents, particularly women” (Madsen, 2008, p. 241). She addressed this gap through extensive, highly personal and candid interviews with ten high-achieving academic women, revealing how significant events and formative experiences from their childhood and throughout their lives affected their approach to their careers.

Similar to Walsh's (1995) findings from her study, *Divided Lives*, Madsen (2008) reveals that the female university presidents in this study identified both personal decisions and domestic struggles as significantly influencing how they navigated their careers. A surprising similarity amongst this sample of women with diverse backgrounds was their relentless self-reflection regarding both good and bad experiences. Their stories demonstrated the value of continuous personal learning and change based on new insight. The women divulged their personal stories, describing what influenced their leadership development, decisions and perspectives along their professional journey. They discussed not only how they got to their positions but also the source of their motivations to lead, and what inspired how they executed leadership in their capacity as university presidents.

Both Madsen (2008) and Walsh (1995) point out that knowing about the lives and experiences of successful educators serves to benefit other aspiring educational leaders. According to Madsen (2008), "to help prepare future leaders it is important that a variety of constituencies have a deeper understanding of the types of things that are most helpful in the development of past women leaders throughout various stages of their lives (p. xxi). As in higher education, the military and its constituencies could benefit from knowing more about its past women leaders and especially the women that made general officer in the U.S. Marine Corps. The limited body of literature on this exceptionally small group of women in the military will now be examined.

Women in the Military

The military is acknowledged as one of the most male-dominated organizations in the U.S., with women occupying less than 15% of the entire population and only 16% of

the officer population (WREI, 2014). In an industry that is arguably one of the most legally restrictive and socially biased when it comes to women, it is perhaps somewhat remarkable that some women have succeeded, and ultimately, some have even attained the rank of general officer in all five of the military branches. The literature reviewed here includes the earliest identified study of pioneering women veterans who have successfully advanced in the military, three of four published biographical stories of women generals, and finally three academic dissertations that examine the experiences of some women general officers, of which only one woman general served in the U.S. Marine Corps.

In spite of the barriers, women continue to proudly and courageously volunteer their service in defense of their country. But, what is known about these courageous women? Willenz (1983) was one of the first to begin to fill the void in the literature on women veterans. As Executive Director for the American Veterans Committee she discovered that the literature on veterans was silent on the country's contingent of women veterans and their contributions. She was moved by their extraordinary accomplishments and their unfortunate lack of recognition by either the public or the U.S. government. In Willenz's study (1983), she briefly profiled over 25 female trailblazers that served between World War II and the early 1980s. Although some of these pioneers agreed to be identified, many desired to remain unnamed, and none of them were identified as high ranking. At the time her work was seen as establishing the beginning of a new age in women veteran's history because she publicized their contributions. Since that time, some popular press books have been published showcasing a variety of individual female military veterans' accomplishments in a variety of services and fields. However, in spite

of the extraordinary accomplishments of the 350 women military generals in U.S. history, only four have been the subject of any biographical work (Adams-Ender, 2001; Dunwoody & Collins, 2015; Kennedy & McConnell, 2001; Williams, 2004). Next, I examine these four: three autobiographies and one biography.

Although all four works recount the normative experiences related to challenges and obstacles, two retired, high ranking U.S. Army women generals, Lieutenant General (LTGEN) Claudia Kennedy and General (GEN) Ann Dunwoody, also wrote of how they broke through barriers, offering leadership advice and strategies that they hope will inspire future women leaders, military or otherwise. (Dunwoody & Collins, 2015; Kennedy & McConnell, 2001). Kennedy, the first woman to achieve lieutenant general, or 3-star rank in the Army, explains the impact that progressive gender policies had on her career, covering 31 years of service, from commissioning in the Women's Army Corps in 1969 to commanding the Army Intelligence Corps when she retired in 2000 (Kennedy & McConnell, 2001). Similarly, Dunwoody, the first woman to be promoted to four-star general in the U.S. armed forces, draws on 37 years of experience as a logistics officer from 1975-2012, offering 11 leadership strategies that she believes account for her success (Dunwoody & Collins, 2015). These two works are the only ones that detail modern day stories of women generals containing relevant, practical advice for women who aspire to succeed in today's U.S. military.

The two other works chronicle the stories of two one-star general/flag rank officers in the 1980s who "break the glass ceiling," proving inspirational because of their professional value in the fields of computer science and nursing. Williams's (2004) biography brought to life the extraordinary journey and pioneering contributions of Grace

Hopper, renowned as both a computer science professor and ultimately a Rear Admiral (RADM) (one-star) in the U.S. Navy. Volunteering in 1943 to support World War II, RADM Hopper's unprecedented expertise and indispensable knowledge of computers and programming led to an unconventional career, lasting over 43 years, having retired in 1986 just before her 80th birthday. Highly valued for her computer science breakthroughs, the story of RADM Hopper and her contributions represent possibilities for women, even against all odds and societal norms of the day. Her biography, however, provides little practical advice for, or insight on, how women today can lead in a male-dominated institution.

Similarly, Adams-Ender (2001) recounts her trailblazing career attaining the rank of brigadier general, as an African American, a daughter of a North Carolina sharecropper in the 1940s and 50s, and as a woman. She served in the U.S. Army Nurse Corps from 1961-1993. As a woman officer in the Army Nurse Corps, she was the first to earn an Expert Medical Field Badge, as well as being the first female to earn her Masters in Military Art and Science from U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. She later became the first African American Nurse Corps officer to graduate from the U.S. Army War College. Her rise to brigadier general (BG) (U.S. Army abbreviation for one-star general) is an inspiring story for any woman, but particularly for those who are African American and who do not come from great means.

Adams-Ender's autobiography demonstrates her remarkable optimism, offering her view of obstacles as opportunities for one to decide how to conquer them to achieve one's goals. Despite the discrimination of the time, BG Adams-Ender takes the "cup half-full" approach in describing her journey to success. Her story helps to address the

gap in literature of women, particularly that of minority women in the armed forces and will serve as timeless inspiration for minority women who aspire to lead in the military and elsewhere. Aside from these three women's published stories, the available literature remains nearly silent on the lived experiences of the remainder of the 350 women who have achieved general-level rank in the U.S. military.

Most relevant to a future study of success strategies of women Marine generals are three dissertations on women generals from all of the U.S. military services, published by women veteran scholars (Doll, 2007; Dougherty, 2014; Iskra, 2007). These researchers utilized predominately qualitative research methods, with semi-structured interview protocols in exploratory, multiple-case studies.

The first study was conducted by a retired naval officer, Darlene Iskra, a pioneer herself in the diving community of the U.S. Navy. Iskra's (2007) study incorporated a preliminary data gathering phase that collected biographical surveys of over nearly 207 women generals across all U.S. military service branches, with a response rate of 74%. From these respondents, 21 women generals were selected for interviews. The interview sample varied by branch of service, year group (generation), military status (active duty or reserve), family status, and geographical proximation to Washington, D.C. Iskra (2007) identified important patterns in the interpersonal relationships and behaviors the women military generals engaged in to help them succeed. She refers to these in her findings as "strategies for success." Some of the relevant findings of her research will be included below in the success strategies section of this review of the literature.

The second of two dissertations written in 2007, studied women military generals and was published by a retired Army officer, Yvonne Doll. Doll (2007) conducted a

phenomenological study of 23 retired and active duty U.S. Army women generals to explore their perceptions and lived experiences. The ultimate goal of her study was to identify factors and competencies that assisted these women in attaining the rank of general. Seven overarching themes were found to be consistently mentioned in the interviews. These themes will also be discussed below in the section on strategies.

Finally, a 2014 dissertation by another U.S. Army reserve officer, Judy Dougherty, describes a qualitative study examining the motivation and success strategies of 16 retired women U.S. Army generals. Dougherty, however, enlisted a slightly different perspective of women generals' success. Following closely with the research questions of a previously completed study on African American male U.S. Army generals, she attempted to understand the perceptions of U.S. Army women generals regarding the factors that led to their selection for promotion by a board of senior Army officers. In this study, success strategies seemed to be related to conforming to institutional expectations for selection to the general rank within the military, rather than identifying the women generals' particular behaviors, characteristics or relationships that enabled them to ascend to the highest ranks of their service. For this reason, I will include only a couple of the success strategy findings from Dougherty's study in this review of the literature that focuses on strategies.

There are two significant critiques of these three studies that are important to discuss. The first is the obligation of confidentiality for study participants. Aside from the long-standing research protocol that defaults to maintaining confidentiality, some scholars say that retaining confidentiality of those being researched allows for greater freedom and honesty in the telling of personal or sensitive stories that contribute to

richness and realism of their life story. On the other hand, the unnamed participants and their stories can more readily be reduced to generalizations, characteristics or strategies identified in the findings of studies, diminishing the humanness of the experience. Absent details that would better contextualize their lived experiences, the women's accounts of their success may lack some of the critical information that could contribute to a much richer understanding of the challenges and struggles that these women overcame.

Qualitative research may be undergoing a change of heart when it comes to confidentiality and informed consent (Patton, 2002). Patton suggests that "the presumption has been that the privacy of research subjects should always be protected. This remains the dominant presumption, as well it should. It is being challenged, however, by participants in research who insist on 'owning their own stories'" (p. 411). Some participants may feel that deeper understanding could be gained by their being open and courageous, yet vulnerable when recounting their personal experience and accomplishments. Regardless of the researcher's preference, applicable laws, such as Internal Review Board policies, organizational practices or participant choice will prevail when it comes to making decisions regarding confidentiality.

The second critique of these studies is that of the three dissertations, only one researcher attempted to include a woman Marine general in their study sample (Iskra, 2007). In Iskra's (2007) study, confidentiality and inclusion of all military services significantly diminished any prospect of identifying qualities or experiences potentially unique to the Marines by making the participant's voice indistinguishable within the study (pp. 146, 161, 196). Because of the different missions and cultures amongst the

services, it is speculated that women generals' professional experiences and strategies may, in fact, reveal differences due to their service affiliation. This body of knowledge on the advancement of women in the military could benefit from including women from all branches of the service, as well as identifying their branch, so that comparisons or conclusions can be examined.

This review of successful women's literature provides support for the importance of telling personal stories of women who have achieved leadership success. Most evident is the obvious gap in the literature of published studies or books showcasing military women generals in all branches of service, but particularly, the Marine Corps. To inspire more women and to gain greater understanding of their complex journeys, stories of highly successful women need to be shared through more personal and intimate discourse, as shown by some of the literature focusing on the business and educational leadership sectors.

Identity and Advancement of Women Marines

As discussed at length in the Statement of the Problem, the U.S. Marine Corps' culture and structure have historically challenged women's acceptance, integration and advancement in the Marine Corps. They continue to face some degree of institutional, cultural, and personal bias and suffer from inequality. Women represent less than 8% of the Marine Corps. Some scholars say that minorities, especially those visibly identified by their race or gender, are especially prone to negative outcomes since they often elicit stereotypes and prejudice (Brickson, 2000; Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010; Tajfel, 1982). Brickson (2000) discusses the effects of minority status through the lens of "identity," describing minorities as individuals

“belonging to identity groups traditionally possessing low power or opportunity ...” (p. 86). The suggestion here is that some of the challenges women face in the Marine Corps may be related to their struggle with their identity as a minority.

The fact that some women Marines have overcome these challenges and disadvantages in male-dominated institutions may have something to do with what research has pointed out—their ability to develop a sense of belonging and commitment to their organization (Archer, 1989; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Thus, how minorities choose to identify professionally and personally may provide valuable insight into their successful career trajectory.

Literature on identity theory offers a credible lens for understanding a potentially significant factor that impacts women’s sense of belonging in and commitment to a male-dominated institution in which they are a visible minority. Nkomo and Cox (1996) suggest that identification processes can impact dynamics within diverse organizations; where diversity is defined as “a mixture of people with different group identities within the same social system” (p. 339). Specifically, the identity that women privilege as a minority amongst men can produce both positive and negative organizational outcomes, manifesting their own membership either in the in-group [group membership in favor] or the out-group [group membership out of favor] (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Day & Harrison, 2007; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Hogg, Terry & White, 1995; Tajfel, 1982; McLeod, 2008; Van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Identity development theories help inform how the women Marine generals developed a sense of belonging in a male-dominated institution, in spite of being a minority.

The body of knowledge on identity formation is positioned within the studies of psychological and sociological human development. The body of early seminal studies of identity development are commonly attributed to scholars like Erik Erikson (1959), Stryker (1968), Tajfel and Turner (1979), and Burke (1980) and has evolved with valuable research from the likes of Marcia, Loevinger, Kegan, and Torbert and Associates (Archer, 1989; Day & Harrison, 2007; Hogg et al., 1995; McLeod, 2008; Nkomo & Cox, 1996). Day and Harrison (2007) offer that identity theorists agree that, “identity develops as a function of challenging environments and the integration of experiences with the self, resulting in a self-conceptualization that can range from relatively simple and unsophisticated to complex and integrated” (p. 365). Furthermore, many theorists seem to also agree that identity is socially constructed or co-created. The literature offers a variety of ideas, however, about how and on what bases identity or self-concept is formed (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Hogg et al., 1995; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tajfel, 1982).

Two similar and overlapping identity theories have emerged from the body of knowledge about it: identity theory and social identity theory. Two particularly insightful studies outline the similarities between these two perspectives, but carefully point out the nuanced differences between them (Hogg et al., 1995; Stets & Burke, 2000). Simply put, the differences in the theories relates to the basis and malleability of identity. In identity theory, one’s identity is based on identification with the named and classified world, using socially recognized position designations, referred to as roles, which remain static. According to Hogg et al. (1995), identity theory is “principally a microsociological theory that sets out to explain individual’s role-related behaviors” (p. 255).

Alternatively, social identity theory (SIT) “is a social psychological theory that sets out to explain group processes and intergroup relations” (Hogg et al., 1995, p. 255). SIT posits identity as a dynamic construct in which the basis of identity originates through self-categorization where the individual is deeply affiliated with a social category or group (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Hogg et al., 1995; Stets & Burke, 2000). Identity theory along with enculturation process of the Marine Corps, as previously discussed, may help explain how the women generals developed their identity. This literature review will briefly examine the two predominate theories and a study that attempts to merge them in an attempt to develop a general theory of the self.

Identity Theory

Turner (1978) and Burke (1980) are recognized for their more recent work on what has formally become known as identity theory (Hogg et al., 1995). From these scholars’ work, Hogg et al. (1995) claim that identity theory is “a perspective on the relationship between the roles people play in society and the identities that such roles confer. The focus is on individual behavior as it is mediated by role identities” (p. 266). Scholars of identity theory attribute complexity of identity to the “multiple components of self” (Hogg et al., 1995, p. 256), its multidimensional, multifaceted construct, and contextual dynamics (Markus & Wurf, 1987).

According to Day and Harrison (2007), “we [people] are a composite of multiple sub-identities rather than a univocal self” (p. 365). Much of the research says that identity is influenced on multiple levels so that people can switch easily between bases of identities, depending on their current context or experience (Brickson, 2000; Day & Harrison, 2007; Hogg et al., 1995). This body of knowledge portrays identity or self-

concept in three dimensions that are referred to by slightly different names; however, they are most commonly referred to as: individual/personal, relational/interpersonal, and collective/group (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Brickson, 2000; Day & Harrison, 2007; Johnson & Yang, 2010).

The first level or dimension of identity is the personal or individual self-concept. Johnson & Yang (2010) describe ‘individual’ as a self-concept based on personal uniqueness where behaviors are motivated by personal goals and welfare and personal success dictates one’s self-worth. Similarly, other scholars describe this level in terms of ‘personal self,’ which is differentiated and individuated (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

The second dimension of identity is relational/interpersonal self-concept. Brickson (2000) offers that “a relational identity orientation is apt to emerge when the organizational context promotes interpersonal cooperation and when distinct groups of individuals are not the overriding emphasis” (p. 92). Furthermore, in the literature of diverse organizations and minorities, it is offered that relational identity orientation may frequently “promote benefits and inhibit disadvantages associated with diversity” (Brickson, 2000, p. 82).

The third level of identity found in this theory is that of collective/group identity. Brewer and Gardner (1996) suggest that the level of inclusiveness is the difference between interpersonal and collective identities in this theory. Explained this way, “many social roles and professions can be experienced in terms of specific role relationships (e.g., parent-child, doctor-patient) or in terms of membership in a general social category (e.g., parents, medical professionals)” (Brewer & Gardner, 1996, p. 83). Brickson (2000) describes collective identity as: “Static and salient group membership [that] elicits a

collective identity orientation because it increases the extent to which people identify as group members” (p. 90). Furthermore, collective identity motivates people to provide for the welfare of their group, particularly relative to other groups (Brickson, 2000). In their experimental work, Brewer and Gardner (1996) found that in “priming of the interpersonal and collective, ‘we’ can alter spontaneous judgments of similarity and self-descriptions” (p. 83). This finding from their research may prove helpful in understanding the success of women in male-dominated institutions because it shows that identification with a group (in this case as a Marine) rather than as an individual, may cause one to be judged on shared group similarities, as opposed to individual differences prompted by unfavorable stereotypes.

Despite the multi-faceted nature of identity as explained from identity theory perspective, only one identity is said to be activated at any given time (Day & Harrison, 2007; Johnson & Yang, 2010; Markus & Wurf, 1987). Johnson and Yang (2010) explain that self-concept is commonly described as similar to a storage bin that can contain multiple identity levels. From the orientations described above, a person’s self-identity accessed most frequently may be referred to as “a person’s chronic identity” (Johnson & Yang, 2010, p. 230). According to Brickson (2000), “forces at various levels of analysis (e.g., personality traits, relationship qualities, group composition, organizational structure, societal norms) can influence the cognitive accessibility of a given self-definition” (p. 84).

Finally, the literature on identity theory says that each level of self-concept is distinctly determined by two predominant factors, sources of self-worth and motivation, each with a different origin (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Brewer and Gardner (1996) and

Brickson (2000) agree that each identity orientation serves as a frame of reference from which one determines their self-worth and “each is associated with a particular primary motivation among individuals: the desire to enhance their own, their relationship partner’s, or their group’s well-being” (Brickson, 2000, p. 84). Ultimately, what differentiates identity theory from social identity theory is primarily the static nature of identity, along with its basis being in one’s individual role or position designation (Stets & Burke, 2000).

Social Identity Theory (SIT)

Nkomo and Cox (1996) describe social identity theory (SIT) as “one of the most prominent intergroup theories informing us about group identity effects on human behavior” (p. 339). Unlike identity theory’s basis in role, SIT is based on category or group (Stets & Burke, 2000). This differentiates SIT from identity theory with its collective dimension of self-concept. Ashforth and Mael (1989) affirm that, “According to social identity theory, the individual defines him- or herself partly in terms of salient group memberships. Identification is the perception of oneness with or belongingness to a group, involving direct or vicarious experience of its successes and failures” (p. 34).

SIT literature offers four factors directly relevant to promoting identification with groups: 1) distinctiveness of the group’s values and practices, 2) group prestige, 3) salience of and competition with outgroups, and 4) traditional causes of group formation (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Ethier & Deaux, 1994). Additionally, social identification may also involve “internalization of, and adherence to, group values and norms and homogeneity in attitudes and behavior” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 26). If fully embodied, one can adopt these stereotypical perceptions of oneself, depersonalizing

oneself in favor of being seen as exemplifying the group (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003).

The benefits of SIT are being realized in the field of leadership. Relatively recently, many researchers have been making the link between leadership and social identity theory principles and are working to address the ineffective, traditional leadership theories currently in use (Day & Harrison, 2007; Haslam, Reicher, & Platow, 2011; Hogg, 2001; Hogg, Van Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012; Ibarra, Snook, & Guillen Ramo, 2010; Van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). As discussed in the Background to the Study, leadership of the past was understood as hierarchical, typically undertaken by an individual, usually a man, in a role with positional power. However, a variety of factors, including global markets and technological advancements, call for a more decentralized, cross-boundary, collaborative form of leadership, moving from “person as leader” to the collective action of leadership (Haslam et al., 2011; Hogg, 2001). This need for shared leadership rather than positional leadership, signals a shift in leader development to leadership development—from an individual leader identity based on roles, such as manager or general manager, to a group-based process (Day & Harrison, 2007; DeRue, Ashford, & Cotton, 2009; Hogg, 2001; Ibarra et al., 2010). SIT may play a significant factor in women Marine generals in this study being able to find belonging and acceptance in the Marine Corps.

A General Theory of Self

Hogg et al. (1995) undertook an extensive study to compare the two predominate theories of identity; identity theory and SIT. They determined that while there were significant similarities, each theory offered its respective strengths: “Identity theory may

be more effective in dealing with chronic identities and with interpersonal social interaction, while social identity theory may be more useful in exploring intergroup dimensions and in specifying the sociocognitive generative details of identity dynamics” (p. 255).

Nearly five years later, Stets and Burke (2000) reexamined these two theories based on the depth of similarities that were found by Hogg et al. (1995). Their intent was to identify the linkages in order to develop a “general theory of self, which can attend to both macro and micro processes, and which avoids the redundancies of separate theories on different aspects of the self” (p. 224). Stets and Burke wanted to offer social psychologists a more fully integrated view of self than currently existed. However, for reasons that were unclear, the research team determined that the creation of such a general theory was premature. However, in the spirit of moving the effort forward, they outlined the identifiable differences, focusing on how they might reinforce and complement one another, should a general theory be possible in the future. In the end, Stets and Burke argued that “although differences exist between the two theories, they are more differences in emphasis than in kind...” (p. 224).

In conclusion, the review of the body of literature on identity, how it develops, how it is accessed and how it influences one’s relationship with his or her environment suggests that identity may play an important role in a woman’s relationship to her career, particularly in male-dominated organizations such as the Marines. Ayman and Korabik (2010) say,

Both gender and culture matter because they can affect a leader’s style behavior, emergence, and effectiveness in many complex ways. For example, gender and culture matter because leaders’ gender-role identities and cultural values can affect the choices they make about the manner in which they will lead. (p. 166)

To this end, Sanchez-Hucles and Davis (2010) offer that “the interaction among multiple sources of identity may exert a powerful influence on the way that women experience the workplace” (p. 174). These findings suggest that there is likely a significant and incredibly important relationship between identity and women’s career success.

In the next section, I examine some important research that exposes the ways in which successful women in male-dominated fields adopt purposeful strategies to support and advance their careers.

Success Strategies

A few women leaders have managed to navigate paths, thrive and attain powerful ranks in male-dominated cultures (Adams-Ender, 2001; Doll, 2007; Dougherty, 2014; Gallagher & Golant, 2000; Griffiths & Kennedy, 1996; Helgesen, 1990; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Iskra, 2007; Kennedy & McConnell, 2001; Lyman, Ashby & Tripses, 2005; Madsen, 2008; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987; Rimm, Rimm-Kauffman & Rimm, 2001; Walsh, 1995; Willenz, 1983; Williams, 2004). Their success has been difficult however, given the context of an organization that does not promote gender diversity and does not endorse the development of female workers. Women have had to construct their own path through conscious and deliberate adoption of behaviors and the cultivation of relationships, in order to advance.

But what are these strategies or actions and where do women learn them? Interestingly, some research points to the idea that strategy development starts early in life. Gladwell (2008) credits child development in which individuals are conditioned in their family of origin; a developmental concept that occurs regardless of gender. Other research suggests that strategies are learned throughout a person’s career in response to

adversity and challenge, indicating that the family background of women may construct attributes and/or dispositions that influence their life path (Madsen, 2008).

A significant amount of literature discusses the importance of strategies that cultivate both *human* and *social capital*, which are both seen as essential for career advancement (Brass & Krackhardt, 1999; Eagly & Carli, 2007a). Leadership literature is dominated by discussions of strategies that are used to develop human capital aspects such as leadership traits, characteristics and style and how they influence women's leadership success (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Helgesen, 1990; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). However, this review will focus on yet another aspect of human capital, the effective learned *behaviors* that have proven helpful in overcoming the challenges and obstacles confronted in male-dominated cultures (Brass & Krackhardt, 1999; Eagly & Carli, 2007a).

While creating human capital is attributable to women's success in male-dominated environments, it is only part of the formula. Successful women have also needed to cultivate social capital by identifying and affiliating with people and groups who can support, promote and advocate for them (Brass & Krackhardt, 1999; Gallagher & Golant, 2000). Social capital can be developed in a variety of forms, including personal and professional relationships and through networks. Furthermore, these relationships can be informal alliances with family or work colleagues, or more officially constructed in formal mentor partnerships or professionally sanctioned social groups. The combined effect of women employing both human and social capital is a strategy that contributes significantly to whether they are positioned for continued success or are

derailed in the face of the gender challenges and organizational obstacles that may become too daunting.

For the purpose of this study, I examine five human capital and three social capital success strategies that the literature attributes to women who have achieved extraordinary leadership success. The human capital factors refer to behavior strategies that are employed to effectively manage gender bias, stereotypes, and workplace obstacles, which can typically impede career progression for women in male-dominated organizations and oppressive cultures (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Blackmore, 2002; Lyman, Ashby & Tripses, 2005). Likewise, the social capital strategies are those employed to effectively create advocacy and support relationships in these environments (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Gallagher & Golant, 2000; Hill, 2003; Josefowitz, 1980; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). These are strategies that both men and women can cultivate, but have proven to be more challenging for women, yet are deemed essential if they are to advance in male-dominated career fields (Gallagher & Golant, 2000; Josefowitz, 1980).

Strategies for Cultivating Human Capital

Today, behavior is considered one of several important aspects of “human capital.” The benefit of adopting effective behaviors for the work place is not a new topic in leadership discussions. Since at least 1977, women’s leadership literature has discussed the importance of women learning a particular “behavioral style,” a set of behaviors that will enhance their opportunities to be successful. According to Hennig and Jardim (1977),

Since the crucial issue for a woman may lie in getting others to accept any woman, however superior, in what they consider to be an exclusively male role, behavior style is a factor even more critically important to women executives than it is to men. (p. 72)

What are some of these behavior strategies that the literature purports to be effective for women to develop as they journey on a path through an organizations' highest levels?

The vast collection of women's management and leadership handbooks, government studies and scholarly articles identify many strategies, but I have chosen to explore examples of those that have been shown to be influential for women attaining power positions in male-dominated careers. These five strategies include: 1) develop a leader identity, 2) become visible, 3) develop yourself, 4) challenge yourself, and, 5) communicate effectively. I begin with an examination of the ways in which research has pointed out that women can develop a leader identity.

Identify as a leader. One of the key success strategies for women is to adopt and privilege a leader identity in the workplace. However, much of the literature explains that sex-role identity makes this one of the most contentious and challenging issues for women in male-dominated organizations (Brooks & Brooks, 1997; Hennig & Jardim, 1977). According to Ayman and Korabik (2010), "Gender is an affective structure of identity and cohesion.....gender can be good or bad depending [on] if you are [a gender] minority or majority" (p. 158). Women leaders have to manage the duality of powerful positions and cultural subjection in their professional lives. Believing in themselves as competent leaders, whether or not men perceive them as such, is precisely at the heart of one of the most significant challenges for women who are trying to "navigate the labyrinth."

Women leaders face a fundamental dilemma in the perception that there is incongruity between being a woman and being a leader. On one hand, women are expected to be communal (relational), while leaders are expected to be agentic (task-

driven), creating a *double bind*, where women are perceived as ineffective in leadership positions (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Josefowitz, 1980; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). Similarly, role congruity theory describes the effects of such a dilemma on the individual woman leader and how she is perceived (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Phenomena like the double bind and role congruity theory serve as the impetus for women to develop strategies relative to gender behavior.

Eagly and Carli (2007a) have written extensively on the double bind for women in leadership, describing it as an experience where expectations of gender and leader roles collide, creating doubt about and resistance to women leaders in ways that impose an extraordinary burden on women. In response, women often employ a hybrid leader identity (Lyman, Ashby & Tripses, 2005), one that embodies effective traits and styles that may not be naturally characteristic. According to Eagly and Carli (2007a), this means that women are made to more deliberately establish a personal leadership style that blends masculine and feminine leadership qualities that are uniquely appropriate for each woman. This strategy is viewed as effective for overcoming the challenge of the double bind and easing women's navigation through the labyrinth of male-dominated organizations.

Likewise, according to Hennig and Jardim (1977), some successful business women believe another important strategy is to downplay sexual differences in order to achieve successful working relationships with men. The literature on sex-role identity contends that a successful female strategy is to employ an "androgynous" identity (Brooks & Brooks, 1997; Ayman & Korabik, 2010), one that is a fusion of individual characteristics that is neither indicative of a man or a woman, but an adoption of both

male and female leadership traits. Similar to Eagly and Carli (2007a), Ayman and Korabik recommend, that women “blend agency with communion” (p. 163). Ayman and Korabik explain,

Androgyny may offer women a way out of the double bind they are put in when they are expected to have the instrumental qualities that are associated with leadership ability but also the expressive qualities associated with their prescribed gender role. Thus, adopting an androgynous leadership style may help women to negotiate their way through the labyrinth. (p. 162)

Accordingly, some literature says that androgynous leaders are perceived as more effective due to their orientation toward both task and person (Ayman & Korabik, 2010), enabling the leader to adeptly switch between gender-based roles and personal traits in order to adapt to emerging leadership needs (Eagly & Carli, 2004).

However, Eagly and Carli (2007a) offer a caveat. They argue that “some environments may allow few deviations from traditionally masculine leadership because there have been few, if any, leaders who have acted in other ways” (p. 167). In other words, women in the military and those in other male-dominated fields may not be able to effectively employ “androgyny” as a strategy. Many women in these career sectors attempt to assimilate to the existing organization by adopting a masculine style in order to make men more comfortable (Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Meyerson & Ely, 2003).

Sex-role identity can complicate adopting a leader identity, particularly for women in positions of power and authority. While a gender-related behavior strategy may help women to overcome the double bind, this sort of strategizing clearly undermines authenticity. As Barnes (2003) says, “Women should not be imposters. Too often women fail because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the charade” (p. 182). And, importantly, such a “charade” sustains male privilege.

Become visible. The research seems to suggest that enhancing one's visibility is essential for leadership advancement. Thus, women must learn ways to be personally recognized and be able to accept acknowledgment for their professional accomplishments. However, while there are exceptions, studies suggest that women lead by instilling a group identity and encouraging involvement of others in nearly every aspect of the work. The literature on gender stereotypes says that women are naturally inclusive, or "communal" leaders (Eagly & Carli, 2007a). Generally, women opt to deflect any personal credit for an achievement to that of the larger group (Barreto, Ryan & Schmitt, 2009; Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Rosener, 1990). However, to succeed in male-dominated organizations, leaders must stand out and be seen as personally valuable to the organization.

Josefowitz (1980) suggests that women should gain visibility early in their career because it has the potential to change the trajectory of their career path. They can do this by becoming an expert in a specified field that will provide a platform for which to be seen and heard (Hennig & Jardim, 1977). Josefowitz also believes women should be in control of resources, specifically that of information, so that people will depend on them and potentially consider them indispensable. In other words, as Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) advocate, women should "be seen as able" (p. 170). To do this, they suggest that women take control of their own public relations campaign so that their accomplishments are noticed and rewarded.

Once women become established in their profession and have earned some credibility, they can take on agentic behaviors such as letting others know of their competence on a regular basis, something Eagly and Carli (2007a) say is difficult in that

“many women feel uncomfortable blowing their own horn” (p. 168). In their Director’s Advisory Group Report on Women in Leadership, the Central Intelligence Agency (2013) concludes that as women’s careers progress, they should muster the courage and seize opportunities to accept highly visible jobs when opportunities arise. Strategically important jobs are usually of high interest to decision makers; those that succeed in those positions often gain scarce organizational rewards and highly beneficial attention from people who wield power (Hill, 2003).

There are other ways for women to gain professional visibility. Brooks and Brooks (1997) suggest that women should request to “be part of a highly visible team, preferably one endorsed and initiated by senior management” (p. 58). Gallagher and Golant (2000) offer a slightly different perspective, suggesting that, “It’s also important for you to stay with the mainstream, highly visible business unit so that you are perceived as a key player....And, whatever you do, make sure others are aware of your contributions.....Take opportunities to be noticed” (p. 282).

In regards to military women, Doll (2007) and Dougherty (2014) report that others knowing about you and what you have accomplished is important for advancement. Doll (2007) found nearly half of the 23 women U.S. Army generals believed that being known for their good reputation was vital to their success. From yet another perspective, Dougherty (2014) says, “Promotion to general requires some political savvy in making known one’s capabilities to senior leaders who vote for officers they know as a proven human resource or based on the recommendations of that officer’s proponents” (p. 113).

Regardless of the industry in which a woman works or the stage of her career,

there is an appropriate way to “be visible” that can promote women toward the next level of leadership. However, due to gender socialization, self-promotion is difficult for women and typically does not occur naturally. It must be consciously enacted.

Develop yourself. Research suggests that successful women attribute their success to a life-long pursuit of both personal and professional development. Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) maintain that education needs to be life-long in order to maintain one’s competence in their profession and organization and to attain positions with increasing responsibility. Specifically, the authors advocate that honing critical skills like speaking, writing, and understanding organizational politics and culture should be continuously refined—women need to be ready for unexpected opportunities. In addition, women must make a concerted effort to understand the politics and cultures of their organizations, dramatically improving their ability to navigate the career labyrinth and create opportunities for professional success (Brooks & Brooks, 1997; Lyman, Asby & Tripses, 2005).

Doll (2007) notes that one fourth of the women generals in her study expressly agreed that professional competence is vital and that specific competencies must be cultivated through self-study, professional reading and a dedication to lifelong learning. Kennedy and McConnell’s (2001) autobiography indicates that professional development for LTGEN Kennedy involved a continuous effort to maintain “fitness,” that being mentally, physically and spiritually fit factored significantly in her success in the military.

Developing oneself professionally, as indicated by the literature, includes developing both technical expertise and breadth of knowledge of other departmental functions within an organization. This benefits both the individual as well as the

organization, enabling women to create possibilities for non-conventional career paths and organizational flexibility (Josefowitz, 1980). Developing expanded knowledge of, and interest and proficiency in other aspects of the business can provide women with professional alternatives, without which they might have no other option but to leave their job, or worse, their career.

Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) offer a different perspective on personal development. They encourage flexibility and openness to opportunities such as lateral moves, suggesting that women shouldn't limit their career too narrowly since "Opportunities, after all, are unscheduled and sometimes disguised" (p. 172). Similarly, the CIA (2013) suggests that successful women take the long view by considering lateral, career broadening opportunities, to learn new skills that will better prepare them for positions of increased responsibility. Validating this, Hill (2003) says, "Individuals who are able to grow beyond their initial strengths and develop a broad repertoire of talents are more likely to progress in their careers because they have the requisite abilities to meet the ever-changing demands of their jobs" (p. 150).

Challenge yourself. An abundance of literature on success strategies for women advocates encouraging women to take assignments out of their "comfort zone." When they do, it becomes a catalyst for greater opportunities to take place sooner than if they had maintained a more traditional career path. Much of the literature says that highly successful women leaders take what are called the "stretch" assignments, positions which she does not feel presently qualified for, but which are associated with greater positional power within the organization (Central Intelligence Agency [CIA], 2013; Hill, 2003).

In accepting this kind of challenge, there is inherent risk involved; however, the CIA (2013) study asserts that challenging or “stretch” assignments are occasions that likely offer great development opportunity. Hill (2003) points out that “These assignments are riskier, since the manager [leader] is more likely to make mistakes that might set back her career progress or have a negative impact on organizational performance” (p. 149). Regardless of the risk, Hill explains that these same positions offer opportunities to gain new knowledge, skills, perspective and judgment that will ultimately promote career advancement. Similarly, Brooks and Brooks (1997) believe that taking “smart” career risks will ultimately benefit women leaders. They acknowledge, however, that fear is a significant barrier to women and it often prevents them from accepting challenging positions. Only by getting used to the feeling of discomfort are women able to move to the next level of accomplishment.

Not surprisingly, all three of the dissertations on women military generals had findings that supported the benefits of taking challenging positions. According to Iskra’s (2007) study, rarely saying “no” to a challenge was a strategy of study participants that promoted their success in their male-dominated profession. Likewise, Doll (2007) reported that the U.S. Army women generals in her study believed that taking and doing well in the tough jobs was crucial. Finally, this idea was found as a success strategy in Dougherty’s (2014) study of women generals. Her respondents typically reported that they “embraced the philosophy of taking the hard, aggressive leadership positions to be competitive with their male counterparts...Success on promotion boards resulted from participants taking high-risk positions of command or operational staff positions” (pp. 116-117). Successful women appear to make deliberate choices to accept calculated risks

and operate outside of their “comfort zone”; doing this ultimately promotes professional growth, visibility and professional value to the organization.

Communicate effectively. Women may have unique effectiveness as communicators. Eagly and Carli (2007a) note that “Women elicit communal associations of being especially affectionate, helpful, friendly, kind and sympathetic as well as interpersonally sensitive, gentle, and soft-spoken” (p. 86). Although such statements suggest a generalization, the reality is that all women need to have the capacity to communicate effectively. For those women for which it does not come naturally, additional techniques and behaviors need to be developed if they are to become effective leaders.

According to Gallagher and Golant (2000), women who successfully master a wide spectrum of skills related to communicating, including; reading the audience, listening carefully, communicating clearly and concisely, and choosing when and where to speak up, will succeed. Over half of the women generals in Doll’s (2007) study said that their interpersonal and communication skills played a significant role in their career development and advancement. Brooks and Brooks (1997) offer that developing one’s “voice” is critical to women’s success in male-dominated organizations. The gender stereotype and power literature indicates “voice,” or what some call being “assertive” is generally difficult for women to develop and employ, especially in interaction with men. Yet, according to the CIA’s (2013) study, successful women must be able to pursue honest, sometimes difficult, career conversations with management. They also must solicit constructive performance feedback regularly from their supervisors and ensure that they are proactively communicating their professional needs and situation before crisis or

burnout occur. Josefowitz (1980) offers, “I believe that the ability to express our feelings and thoughts and to ask for what is right and to refuse what is not makes us people whom others can trust, to whom others can give responsibility and respect” (p. 88).

More specifically, Josefowitz (1980) and Eagly and Carli (2007a) suggest that women who develop effective techniques for asserting themselves have access to, and wield greater power within their organizations and relationships, ultimately aiding them in gaining professional visibility and credibility. According to Josefowitz, “Assertion at the place of work takes the form of *expressing*, *requesting*, or *refusing* around the three categories of *role*, *task* and *resources*” (p. 85). Women who stand out or speak out in effective ways will inevitably be noticed, talked about and probably praised. Developing assertive communication techniques is foundational for long term success in any career of a man or a woman, but has been found to be more challenging for women and thus more important for them to develop (Brooks & Brooks, 1997).

In summary then, research has routinely credited the five behavior strategies discussed above as ways that women can build human capital, advance their careers and become successful leaders in male-dominated organizations. Several of these strategies were found to be more challenging for women to develop and less instinctive or natural than for men (Eagly & Carli, 2007a, p. 188). Some of the challenge in developing these can be attributed to gender stereotyping and socialization that occurs during childhood and throughout a woman’s life. The perception that there is a conflict in roles between being a woman and a leader, *the double bind*, continues to constrain women’s opportunities, but it must serve instead to motivate women to consciously develop some of these behavior strategies (Eagly & Carli, 2007a).

This research has made clear that building human capital is key to success. Research on women in leadership goes further however, to point out the importance of building another kind of capital—social capital. But, what is this, how it is developed and why is it important to women's success? In the next section I examine research that details the strategies that successful women have adopted to cultivate social capital.

Strategies for Cultivating Social Capital

The literature on highly successful women leaders indicates that both professional and personal relationships are essential to their success. According to Eagly and Carli (2007a), “women confront a labyrinth that poses many challenges to their leadership. Clearly, women can't tear down the labyrinth on their own” (p. 180). Many of the obstacles encountered in the labyrinth are products of employment discrimination, organizational policies that favor men, and inequities in domestic responsibilities. In order to overcome organizational and cultural barriers, a variety of alliances, relationships and networks need to be cultivated to “build knowledge, trust, cooperation and shared understanding” (Eagly & Carli, 2007a, p. 144; Daly & Finnigan, 2010). These kinds of relationships can ultimately empower women, even in male-dominated fields, and are often referred to as social capital (Lin, 1999).

Because of gender differences, women may have to work harder at cultivating social capital (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Proudford, 2007). Women are typically at a deficit in this area, because, as Eagly & Carli point out, men have more experience socially in building professional relationships that matter. However, Proudford highlights that men and women approach relationship building in different ways, and that a woman's style in this may hinder her prospects for advancement. Furthermore, for women, building these

relationships is not only difficult, but also delicate work. Rhode (2003) notes that issues related to sexual harassment or the appearance of impropriety can create awkwardness and discomfort, making building relationships challenging for women leaders in male-dominated professions. Despite the challenges, Rhode's study points out that women must work to successfully cultivate professional relationships.

Relationship building spans a wide spectrum and represent different kinds of social capital (Lin, 1999). They can be formal or informal, they may encompass networks, coalitions or one-on-one interactions, and they occur at both the professional and personal level. Although professional networks seem of obvious importance (Daly & Finnigan, 2010), relationships with spouses, friends and family can prove vital to creating balance between professional goals and domestic obligations (Eagly & Carli, 2007a). The three social capital strategies identified from the body of literature that will be reviewed here are: 1) seeking mentors, 2) cultivating sponsors, and 3) developing supportive networks.

Seeking mentors. The literature supports the idea that people do not achieve success alone or in isolation, but through relationships with others (Brass & Krackhardt, 1999; Josefowitz, 1980; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987). One of the foundational relationships that can be forged to support leaders in their career are mentors (Eagly & Carli, 2007a). Although, the literature suggests that women need to proceed carefully when developing relationships, particularly with men, women have demonstrated that mentor relationships can be successfully forged with both men and women (Josefowitz, 1980). In practice, these are more often with men, possibly because of the number of

men occupying high level positions. As gender advances are made, this trend should begin to level off.

One particularly important benefit of mentors is that they can provide support by teaching the protégé (person being mentored) specific skills or by offering the knowledge needed for a specific task. According to Josefowitz (1980), “A mentor is more of a teacher and helps someone get started, learn the job, know the company norms” (p. 94). Specifically, according to Eagly and Carli (2007a), “mentors can teach their protégés about their organizations or professions and help them to obtain good assignments. Mentors can also offer encouragement, acceptance, and friendship” (p. 174).

Learning the culture and norms of a male-dominated institution is particularly important for military women attempting to smoothly integrate. The literature on women generals substantiates the importance of mentors in their success. Doll (2007) and Kennedy and McConnell (2001) found that seeking out mentors was an important strategy for promoting the ascent of women through the ranks in the military. Specifically, Iskra’s (2007) study found that mentoring was one of the most important factors for success, potentially being the second most important aspect. Mentorship enabled the generals to navigate the system, provided them with career guidance, opened opportunities for them, supported them, and was a means of getting advice when they needed it.

Mentors provide encouragement, acceptance and friendship, but do not necessarily wield any power or influence within the organization (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Josefowitz, 1980). These mentor-protégé relationships are particularly important early in one’s career, but can provide great support throughout its trajectory. Gallagher and Golant (2000) offer that most of the senior executive women that they researched did not have one “golden

bullet” mentor in their careers, but that they encountered many people who helped them throughout their journey. Brooks and Brooks (1997) summarize that mentors, advocates and cheerleaders sustain women on their journey to the upper echelon of organizations.

Cultivating sponsors. Generally, the literature indicates that highly successful women leaders are able to identify significant advocates or allies that have positively influenced their careers. Specifically, it can be particularly advantageous for women to develop relationships with more-powerful allies who have greater access to the decision-making process or are decision makers themselves (Eagly & Carli, 2007a; Barnes, 2003). However, the literature is not always consistent with the terminology that describes this type of relationship. Some literature says that executive women identified the importance of having sought out “influencers,” “advisors,” or “advocates” (Gallagher & Golant, 2000; Brooks & Brooks, 1997) who cared about their career and played an instrumental role in its development and in their ultimate success. These sponsor type relationships are more pragmatic in nature. Josefowitz (1980) adds that sponsors “have very little to teach you about your job, but can help your career by recommending you for special projects....[and] can be any people with influence inside the organization, or even those outside the organization who have clout” (p. 93).

The sponsor relationship can be a game changer for aspiring women leaders. Sponsors can help women by recommending them for positions, speaking on women’s behalf and including them in high-visibility assignments (Barnes, 2003). Women who desire to attain leadership positions at the highest levels of male-dominated organizations reap the greatest benefit from a male sponsor, because it is typically men who hold the

more influential positions (Josefowitz, 1980). In general, whether they serve as sponsors or not, Barnes (2003) recommends that women should cultivate male allies. He says,

...if a woman is up for partner, executive, or potential party representative, in that room of male decision makers, she needs a male ally. If there is no man, and particularly no man of influence, to advocate on her behalf, she will not advance. She needs a champion who will fight for her success. (Barnes, 2003, p. 182)

Research on the women military generals who were trailblazers confirm the benefit of sponsors for these women; however, since there was no mention of the gender, it is assumed that for anyone fortunate enough to have had one, the sponsor was male. Iskra (2007) found that mentors were important in providing counsel, but that sponsors had greater value in that “these are more senior officers who recommend an officer to others and may directly provide career-enhancing assignments” (p.44). An examination of the gender of sponsors for women generals would be a valuable aspect of future research.

Developing supportive networks. The literature discusses the advantages of networks in professional environments (Daly & Finnigan, 2010) as well as in personal settings, amongst family and friends (Barnes, 2003). Relationship building, whether informal and formal, has proven to be an effective mechanism for gaining greater social capital for women leaders. According to the CIA (2013), civilian women leaders within the CIA enhance their opportunities for advancement by taking ownership of their careers through participating in both formal and informal networking. Similarly, Brooks and Brooks (1997) suggest that cultivating supportive networks, both at work and home, are effective in attaining positions of power and authority. From a perspective of establishing personal power, Josefowitz (1980) suggests that by developing or joining

coalitions or support groups, women are able to confront those with power, using the pressure of numbers, which can be effective and influential for their career.

However, Eagly and Carli (2007a) caution women professionals about the pitfalls that can occur, depending on the gender dynamics of networks. First they warn that networks made up exclusively of women are not as valuable as those that include a “generally more powerful group of men” (p. 145). However, they also caution that women who are in the minority in these groups may have less credibility and power. Eagly and Carli (2007a) and Brass and Krackhardt (1999) concede that in contexts like these, supportive and strong mentoring relationships with a man who carries clout can overcome the absence of membership in networks, which may turn out to be counterproductive.

Eagly and Carli (2007a) advocate for developing social capital more naturally by informally interacting with co-workers at every level and creating relationships with them. These relationships with colleagues often are the source of valuable inside information that is available to women only through positive, trusting relationships. Moreover, Brass and Krackhardt (1999) attribute the value of social networks to gathering information, creating change, acquiring resources, coordinating activities or missions, and providing help in personal career advancement (Daly & Finnigan, 2010; Lin, 1999). By establishing effective relationships at all levels, social capital can provide support for achieving greater success (Lin, 1999).

Likewise, Eagly and Carli (2007a) advocate cultivating support from within the family system, most importantly from the spouse in sharing the household requirements, arguing that “successful women leaders often acknowledge their spouses as helping them

advance” (p. 178). To this point, Iskra’s (2007) research on women military generals indicated that

Social support and interpersonal relationships formed with bosses, peers, subordinates, and supportive families was key to the ability to navigate the military culture and overcome many of the structural and cultural obstacles of being a woman in a man’s world. (p. 203)

Rimm et al. (2001) recommend that women assess and renegotiate within the partnerships that exist in their personal life so that they can continue to achieve balance under dynamic situations. It is critical that women engage in open communication with their support infrastructure, especially in decision making, when emotional balance and life choices are at stake. Generally, social networks, whether personal or professional, can support women through engagement that encourages perseverance, resilience and provides sage advice that would not otherwise be available or accessed in isolation (Rimm et al., 2001). The literature further indicates that participating in networks, whether formally or informally, has proven beneficial to the development and ascension of women into executive ranks.

In conclusion, there is substantial evidence to suggest that it is helpful for women to employ these eight human and social capital strategies, independently or synergistically, regardless of the existence of formal institutional development programs. Much of the body of literature on highly successful women discusses a vast array of human and social capital strategies; however, these eight were examined to better inform this study that is designed to unpack the reasons why women Marines were successful in becoming generals.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Much has been written about the institutional, social and personal barriers women encounter when seeking high-level leadership positions. In spite of rigid institutional barriers and pervasive gender bias in many industries, some women have been able to penetrate the glass ceiling or navigate the labyrinth to achieve positions of power. The purpose of this study was to understand how a small, elite group of women were able to achieve general-level rank in the U.S. Marine Corps, which is unquestionably one of the most male-dominated organizations in the world. The following research questions were used to guide this study:

Research question 1: How do these women leaders describe their career trajectories in the U.S. Marine Corps, a male-dominated organization?

Sub-question 1a: What factors supported their journey to the rank of general?

Sub-question 1b: What barriers had to be overcome on their journey, and how were they overcome?

Research question 2: Of the following factors, which do women Marine leaders explicitly identify or which can be inferred as helping them to attain the rank of general: personal strategies and tactics, beliefs, motives, effective behaviors, relationships, personal characteristics and/or factors related to the organization or situation?

This chapter discusses the research methodology that was used to understand the leadership journey of women Marine generals. Specifically, the case study/cross-case analysis design is described, including the qualitative research methods that were employed. Next, an explanation is offered about how the primary research participants for this study were recruited. Following that, I discuss how confidentiality was handled

for participants in this study, as well as my positionality relative to this research. Finally, an overview of the data collection and my two-stage analysis process will be presented.

Research Design

This study employed an exploratory multiple-case study/cross-case analysis design. Stake (2005) explains that the “case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied” (p. 443). Furthermore, Yin (2009) indicates that by utilizing the individual case study design, scholars contribute to knowledge of whatever unit of analysis is selected, while allowing investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of the subject of study. In this study, the individual women generals who were the *primary research participants* were the unit of analysis; they were, in short, the cases that were studied. Eight of the ten women generals’ stories were examined, first, individually, and, then, through a cross-case analysis process. Two women generals did not participate; one was deceased and one declined through email correspondence. For these two generals, document review proved sufficient in developing their career timelines (See Appendices D & G). I have included these in this study in an attempt to provide a more comprehensive understanding of this special group.

The case study method allowed each of the eight women Marine generals interviewed for this study to freely share their personal journeys, and also facilitated reporting each idiosyncratic story in great detail. The cross-case analysis process focused on similarities and differences across the cases of the factors influencing success. This analysis also served to develop hypotheses for further study relative to the factors that influence female success in the Marine Corps, as well as potentially shed light on the success of women who are in other male-dominated organizations.

The study not only employed a case study/cross-case analysis design; it also employed qualitative research methods. According to Patton (2002), exploration and discovery are the particular merits of qualitative inquiry. The exploratory nature of this study is due to my desire “to develop pertinent hypotheses and propositions for further inquiry” (Yin, 2009, p. 9). To achieve maximum explorative benefit from qualitative case studies, Khan and VanWynsberghe (2008) “propose cross-case analysis as a mechanism for mining existing case studies so that knowledge from cases can be put into service for broader purposes” (p. 2). They also maintain that previously dormant case study knowledge is “mobilized” through cross-case analysis as a research method.

Participant and Site Selection

A purposeful sampling strategy was implemented to select research subjects from the elite group of women who achieved the rank of general in the U.S. Marine Corps. Patton (2002) identifies this type of sampling strategy as extreme or deviant case sampling, which “involves selecting cases that are information rich because they are unusual or special in some way, such as outstanding successes or notable failures” (pp. 230-231). Since only ten women have reached the rank of general in the history of the U.S. Marine Corps, the intent was to examine the entire population of this outlier group. However, as noted, one of the nine living women generals did not consent to be interviewed for the study and the first woman Marine general is deceased.

I was awarded a research grant from the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation (MCHF) that permitted travel across the country to whatever location each participant wished to be interviewed. One of the woman Marine generals, MajGen Tracy Garrett, offered to solicit the support of the others, primarily due to her knowledge of and access

to the women generals, as well as her sincere desire to support this study. Initially, the MCHF sent official letters to the nine living women generals announcing their support and advocacy for this study and asking them to consider participating. Following up, MajGen Tracy Garrett sent each one an email which included my personal request for their participation (See Appendix A). Seven of the nine living generals contacted me as a result of one or both of the above mentioned invitations, indicating their willingness to participate in this study. One woman general provided her consent after she received U.S. Postal Service correspondence from me personally requesting her participation. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved consent forms were signed by all participants.

Interviews with the eight women general participants took place between December 2014 and June 2015. Seven of the eight participants were interviewed in person in one of three locations: Washington, District of Columbia (D.C.), San Antonio, Texas, and Phoenix, Arizona. The eighth participant, MajGen Tracy Garrett, had been a part of a pilot study I conducted in the Spring of 2013; data from that Skype interview was subsequently used for this study, along with a new interview via Skype. The interviews with the women generals ranged in length from a minimum of two hours to over six hours. Several of the women were recontacted for short follow up interviews, either through Skype or by telephone.

Interviews were also conducted with colleagues or associates of the generals, who served as supporting research participants. These were conducted virtually, either by telephone, video Skype, or email, with the exception of one colleague who participated in two in-person interviews in Carlsbad, California. Interviews with the supporting research participants varied in duration from 30 minutes to two hours.

Data Collection

Glesne (2006) writes, “In qualitative case studies, data tend to be gathered through the ethnographic tools of participant observation and in-depth interviewing” (p. 13). Patton (2002) simply states that the purpose of a case study is to collect “comprehensive, systematic, and in-depth information about each case of interest” (p. 447). In order to begin to understand the labyrinthine journeys of the women generals of the U.S. Marine Corps, the primary source of data on the participating women generals is drawn from personal interviews with them.

However, Stake (2005) says, “What details of life the researchers are unable to see for themselves is [sic] obtained by interviewing people who did see them or by finding documents recording them” (p. 453). As noted, additional interviews were conducted with military colleagues that had first-hand knowledge of the women generals’ careers. These interviewees served as *supporting research participants* for this study. Finally, examining a wide variety of documentation on these women provided valuable insight and information in constructing the women’s case studies and career timelines.

Interviews

Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) state that “interviews are well suited for studying people’s understanding of the meanings in their lived world, describing their experiences and self-understanding, and clarifying and elaborating their own perspective on their lived world” (pp. 116). Depending on the purpose of the study, there are different ways to design interviews; one style of interview is referred to as the *exploratory* interview. Kvale and Brinkmann indicate that “an exploratory interview is usually open, with little preplanned structure” (p. 106) in order “to discover new dimensions of the research

topic” (p. 112). Through exploratory interviewing, I was able to probe deeply into these women generals’ experiences so as to hear how they articulate and discuss their personal assumptions and general ideologies (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

These interviews were conducted using a general interview guide (See Appendix B) to generate the study’s primary source of data for constructing the case studies.

According to Patton (2002), a general interview guide serves as a way

to ensure that the same basic lines of inquiry are pursued with each person interviewed...and provides topics of subject areas within which the interviewer is free to explore, probe, and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate that particular subject. (p. 343)

Through a broad, open ended prompt (*Please tell me about your journey to becoming a general in the Marine Corps.*), I learned about the unique journey that each woman Marine traveled to achieve the rank of general. New and unexpected factors associated with their achievements emerged in the stories they told, and a couple of these new factors revealed unanticipated facets of the study topic (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

However, when any topics such as beliefs, behaviors, personal characteristics, identity, and institutional structure and culture of interest were not addressed in response to the open ended initial question, I inquired about those specifically. To clarify and augment data from the face-to-face or Skype interviews, follow-up telephone or Skype calls were made, as well as some email solicitation. All primary research participants’ interviews were audio recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim (Patton, 2002, p. 441).

The women generals recommended 13 associates and colleagues who could provide valuable sources of insight about them and these were interviewed. These *supporting research participant* interviews were also governed by IRB guidelines and research protocols as described above for the primary research participants. A general

interview guide was provided in advance (See Appendix C), serving as the basis for the conduct of these interviews. Supporting research participant interviews offered additional insight about and perspective on these women and their achievements and often corroborated data previously collected from the women generals, themselves.

Document Review

In conjunction with the interviews of both the women Marine generals and the supporting research participants, I conducted an extensive document review of different types of information related to the women generals in order to garner more insight into, as well as different perspectives on their lives and careers. Data included public media sources, military and historical archives, and some the generals' private document holdings. Specifically, the documentation consisted of oral and written military biographical sketches, transcripts and audio recordings of previous interviews, newspaper and magazine articles, and artifacts that the primary research participant provided, including articles no longer available through on-line searches.

Information from all of these sources served to better inform interview questions, to develop more comprehensive and detailed cases, and to develop accurate career timelines. However, despite a thorough review of printed biographical data and archived military audio and transcribed oral histories, there was insufficient information available to develop a case study for the deceased general, BGen Margaret Brewer. The documents reviewed revealed little of her personal journey and experiences becoming a Marine or of the agency she wielded in the course of navigating her career. However, document review and official releasable information made it possible to develop career timelines for both BGen Brewer and LtGen Wilson (the general who declined to

participate), accounting for their service accomplishments and providing a timeline of significant milestones achieved in their careers (See Appendices D, G).

Data Analysis

Stake (2005) and Patton (2002) say that the case study is considered both a process and product of inquiry, and may include a variety of sources of data relative to the case of interest. The case studies that resulted for the eight generals was the outcome of fusing, distilling and triangulating all the information collected from and about them. This included historical information that offered relevant context about the institution and society at the time each woman served in the U.S. Marine Corps. Furthermore, analysis across the cases produced findings about how these particular women succeeded that may also inform strategies and behaviors for women navigating their future organizations and professions.

Triangulation

Triangulation proved a valuable process because, according to Patton (2002), “it is in data analysis that the strategy of triangulation really pays off, not only in providing diverse ways of looking at the same phenomenon but in adding to credibility by strengthening confidence in whatever conclusions are drawn” (p. 556). Denzin (1978) identified four types of triangulation: data, investigator, theory, and methodological, which in some combination can be utilized in the analysis of the data. For this study, I employed two of these to increase accuracy and credibility of findings—data and methodological (Patton, 2002). Data triangulation occurred through personal interviews with the generals, along with document review and supporting participant interviews.

Analysis consisted of two consecutive stages of case study analysis, which Polkinghorne (1995) refers to as *narrative analysis* and *analysis of narrative*. The first stage utilized *narrative analysis* to construct individual case studies for each of the women generals. The second stage explored and compared the cases through *analysis of narrative* which explored and identified similarities and differences along categories across the cases. Finally, hypotheses emerged from the case study data that may guide subsequent studies. Throughout this qualitative analysis process, I participated in personal reflection of my research via analytic memos (discussed in more detail later), which further contributed to the accuracy and credibility of findings in this study.

First Stage Analysis

The narrative analysis strategy was selected because it allows for the most vivid depiction of the life journeys of these very exceptional leaders. Polkinghorne (1995) says that in *narrative analysis* the researcher configures the data into a story where “the analytic task requires the researcher to develop or discover a plot that displays the linkage among the data elements as part of an unfolding temporal development culminating in the denouement” (p. 15). In this case, the anticipated denouement was promotion to the rank of general.

The analysis process for each case study began with questions like: 1) How did this happen? 2) Why did this come about (Polkinghorne, 1995)? According to Sykes (1998), there are seven procedural steps that should be employed in developing the emplotted narrative from the data: 1) specify the intended outcome or denouement of the narrative, 2) arrange the data chronologically, 3) identify which data elements contribute to the denouement, 4) develop an outline for the plot, 5) expand the outline using detail

from the collected data, 6) adapt outline to fit the data, and finally 7) collect any additional data to fill in deficient areas of the story (p. 77). These steps guided the construction of the emplotted cases.

A way to more deeply understand and organize the data is through the process of coding. Although manual coding of data is possible, ATLAS.ti, a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) program (Creswell, 2013; Friese, 2011; Patton, 2002) was chosen to facilitate the coding process, which included interview transcripts, analytic memos, audio interviews, word processing documents, Adobe Portable Document File (PDF) formatted articles, high resolution photos of one-of-a-kind documents and articles, and email correspondence (Saldaña, 2009). Next, I will briefly explain the first cycle of coding for the first stage of analysis.

According to Saldaña (2009), there are seven simple and direct first cycle coding methods available to analyze the data initially. Of those first cycle coding methods, I utilized *structural* and *simultaneous coding* in multiple iterations. Saldaña says that “structural coding is designed to start organizing data around specific research questions” (p. 51). Structural coding proved particularly effective in this exploratory study which involved multiple participants and utilized a relatively standardized semi-structured data-gathering protocol. Furthermore, the data proved to be appropriate for engaging in simultaneous coding, which allowed for multiple code assignments simultaneously to a piece of qualitative data (Saldaña, 2009). Simultaneous coding is important because “the richness or complexity of an event or participant’s story makes it difficult for a researcher to assign only one major code to the datum” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 64).

While the first stage of analysis culminated in the development of case studies, this was accomplished by conducting multiple iterations of first cycle coding, initially based on the research questions, and then later on the actual data collected (See Appendix P). Ultimately, the case studies were developed through the identification and application of a total of 18 codes. Through multiple iterations of first cycle coding, over 2700 quotations were annotated within ATLAS.ti across ten families of primary documents.

As the cases were completed, each woman general was asked to review her case study, an analytic process called *member checking*, in an attempt to maintain the highest level of validity possible during data analysis (Glesne, 2006). Throughout the writing of the cases and continuing through member checking, similarities and differences began to emerge across the case studies relative to supports and challenges posed by institutional structure and culture, and individual agency.

Second Stage Analysis

The second stage included cross-case analysis. Patton (2002) says, “Cross-case analysis means grouping together answers from different people to common questions, or analyzing different perspectives on central issues” (p. 440). Polkinghorne (1995) describes this as the, *paradigmatic analysis of narrative*¹. Paradigmatic analysis of narrative “seeks to locate common themes or conceptual manifestations among the stories collected as data” (p.13). The purpose here is to identify information from different sources to facilitate grouping data into patterns, themes or concepts that will ultimately provide answers to the research questions (Patton, 2002; Saldaña, 2009).

---

¹ Polkinghorne’s *paradigmatic analysis of narrative* can be used as a method of analysis for both within case and cross-case studies.

The cross-case analysis process relied on first cycle codes in order “to develop a sense of categorical, thematic, conceptual, and/or theoretical organization” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 149). As Saldaña notes, this requires more rigorous analytic skills and thus proved to be a bit more challenging. In second cycle coding, two methods utilized were *pattern* and *focused coding*. Pattern coding identifies similar first cycle codes and assembles them together, reducing the potentially significant number of initial codes. Three categories emerged through this process (institutional structure, organizational culture, and personal), and I then used focused coding to identify the similarities and differences across cases in these categories.

Analytic Memos

Researchers can directly contribute to their own analysis by being reflective and thoughtful during the conduct of the study. Research scholars say that documenting these thoughts and insights through journals, notes, or memos can promote critical thinking about the data being collected, as well as challenge the researcher’s assumptions and understanding of what is under study. Specifically, Glesne (2006) says that “analytic noting is a type of data analysis conducted throughout the research process; its contributions range from problem identification, to question development, to understanding the patterns and themes in your work” (p. 59).

To that end, I drafted analytic memos throughout the study in order to identify gaps in the research data, as well as similarities and differences between the cases relative to the three categories and emergent themes. According to Saldaña (2009), these memos are an additional source of research data that can be coded, categorized and linked for consideration in the narrative inquiries. Through this process, I was able to identify the

common theme of belonging, and ultimately, how the women Marine leaders all privileged their Marine identity.

Confidentiality

All eight of the women Marine Corps generals who agreed to participate in the study consented to releasing their identity for purposes of this research and the development of their case studies. Because of the small number of women and their distinctive career milestones, these women would likely be uniquely identifiable, even if confidentiality had been requested. For the supporting research participants, confidentiality was granted unless they expressly requested otherwise.

Positionality

Researchers should be attentive to and systematically seek out their own subjectivity throughout the entire research process. Peshkin (1988) explains that “the purpose of doing so is to enable researchers to be aware of how their subjectivity may be shaping their inquiry and its outcomes” (p. 17). However, he also argues that a researcher’s subjectivity, if consciously monitored and managed, does not have to be a liability. Indeed, he argues that “by monitoring myself, I can create an illuminating, empowering personal statement that attunes me to where self and subject are intertwined” (p. 20).

As noted in the preface of this dissertation, I am a career woman Marine myself, and thus have significant institutional insight, along with an ardent interest in understanding how women have succeeded in the U.S. Marine Corps. Because of my insider status, I was vigilant and attentive to acknowledging where and how my subjectivity arose. I journaled periodically throughout the research process to assist in

identifying tendencies and occasions where biased thinking may have influenced my research. While interviewing these women generals, I sought to consciously manage my subjectivity in order to avoid influencing and guiding the interviews and construction of their case study stories toward premeditated answers or conclusions.

The case study/cross-case analysis design supported by qualitative research methods used in this study contributes to understanding the leadership journey of women Marine generals. In the next chapter, I offer eight case studies of these women developed as a result of this methodology. Each begins with a brief narrative analysis of their lives, followed by a short discussion of the significant challenges and supports they believe contributed to their success in the Marine Corps, and concluding with a short epilogue.

CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDIES

Brigadier General Gail M. Reals, USMC, Ret.

Brigadier General (BGen) Gail M. Reals served on active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1954-1990, the second woman in the Marine Corps to attain the rank of brigadier general (one-star) (See Appendix E). She was the first of two women Marine generals who initially enlisted in the Marine Corps, serving for seven years and attaining the rank of sergeant before being selected for a meritorious commission in 1961 and promoted to second lieutenant. Reals is the only woman Marine general to attain the rank of brigadier general without having obtained a bachelor's degree.

Over the time period in which Reals served, women were granted expanded opportunities and greater equality in the military, which proved both helpful and challenging. Reals attributes her greatest career accomplishment to the passing of Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) in 1980, previously discussed in Chapter One, which allowed women to be eligible for promotion to general. In 1985 Reals became the *first* woman selected under a revised promotion system directed by DOPMA, which authorized the permanent promotion of women to brigadier general based on competitive selection from a field of her peers.² Reals' achievement is particularly impressive in light of the progressive changes in policy, which significantly impacted the institutional culture, as well as her personal choices. Now at the age of 80, Reals is the oldest of the nine living women generals.

---

² Margaret Brewer (See Appendix D) was the *first* woman Marine to be appointed to brigadier general in 1978, under PL-90-130 of 1967 (See Appendix O). Brewer was selected by the Commandant of the Marine Corps and was granted a *temporary appointment* (not competitively selected) to brigadier general by President Carter.

Her Story

My first personal exposure to BGen Reals occurred before I ever imagined doing this study. I was as a Marine officer in training at Quantico in 1988, where she served as the commanding general of the base there. She retired two years later, and nearly 24 years had passed when I asked and she agreed to meet with me to share her story in what would become a series of in-person meetings and phone calls. In 2014, I traveled to meet with her in Springfield, VA, outside of Washington DC, where she lives in a retirement community that is popular with retired government officials. As a “warm up” for the interview, Reals invited my sister and me, along with some of her local women Marine friends to join her for lunch at her community center bistro. Upon entering the lobby, I introduced myself to Reals, a woman no taller than five feet, with short, curly white hair, and dressed in pants and a cardigan sweater.

After a leisurely lunch, Reals and I found an available room adjacent to the dining room that offered the privacy we needed for the interview. She was thoroughly prepared for the interview questions I had sent her prior to the interview with hand-written notes she had put together to ensure the accuracy of her story. An interview I’d anticipated lasting two-and-a-half hours eventually ended after five, prompted by mutual fatigue. Once we “called it quits,” Reals provided me with stacks of documents, articles, pictures, and personal papers to take home and examine in greater detail, suggesting that I keep whatever I wanted. She also asked that I contact her in a month to see if she had any new recollections and noted that we might meet again if the opportunity were to arise.

Months later I did return, and she shared more stories, as well as more artifacts and documentation that she had recently discovered of her career.

Reals began by sharing that she was born in 1935 during the Depression to a relatively poor family in Fayetteville, NY, a small town outside of Syracuse. Her mother was a homemaker and her father worked as a welder and maintenance man. Work was often hard to find and he struggled to earn just a few dollars a week. Despite periods of time when her father was either underemployed or unemployed, Reals acquired a strong work ethic from this man who she described as always hardworking. In 1950, at 14 years of age, Reals' life changed forever due to her father's untimely death, which left the family with little money and no apparent breadwinner.

Faced with raising four children on her own, Reals' mother hired on as a domestic worker. At the time, Reals' oldest brother had one year left in high school, while her two younger brothers were attending middle school. Feeling that she had to do something, Reals immediately began looking for work in order to help support her family. The job she found required her to leave her mother and three brothers and move to a small town near her rural home to work as a live-in babysitter for a large family. Living and working for this family not only provided Reals the stability that she needed to be able to graduate from high school, but also relieved some of the financial burden for her mother.

Graduating from Manlius High School in 1953, Reals was motivated to develop professional skills so as not to get caught in the same position her mother had years earlier. She took advantage of a partial scholarship to attend the one-year secretarial program at Powelson Business Institute. While attending school, she also worked part time as a payment receiving clerk for an insurance company in order to subsidize her

living expenses and unmet tuition costs. The self-reliance she had developed during her high school years continued to press her forward.

After completing the program at Powelson Business Institute, Reals began to look for opportunities “to do something no one else [she] knew had ever done.” She recalled, “I knew if I didn't do something different, I probably would have ended up working in an insurance office or as a cashier at a five and dime.” In a demonstration of her self-sufficiency and personal drive, Reals, with no prompting, influence or assistance from anyone, contacted the Marine Corps recruiting office about enlisting, believing this could satisfy her desire “to do something different.” Receiving immediate encouragement from the recruiter to begin the screening process, she took the entrance exam and posted an impressive score. She remembered hearing one of the recruiters shout to another in the rear of the office, ““we’ve got a live one!”” Reals added, “I guess that meant that I was a good candidate for continuing the process.”

Hearing of her acceptance, Reals knew what she wanted to do, but being a woman and only 19 years old, she would need parental consent to enlist. Because her mother trusted and had faith in her, she signed off, making it possible for Reals to be the first woman in Fayetteville, NY to join the Marines. Determined to make something of herself, Reals finished Powelson and within a month left home and her family, boarding a train to South Carolina where she reported in for boot camp at Parris Island, SC, the only installation in the country to train women Marine recruits. Upon graduating from boot camp, she was assigned the military occupational specialty (MOS) of administrative clerk, and reported for duty at Quantico, VA.

Reals’ early assignments offered her some extraordinary opportunities to continue

to develop her self-reliance and passion for service in the Marine Corps. During that time, she became a standout Marine, resulting in two meritorious promotions to corporal (E-3) and sergeant (E-4) within months of each other in 1956. After three years of service, she recognized that she wanted to do and see more in the Marine Corps. As a 22-year-old sergeant, she extended on active duty for two more years and wisely took the suggestion of a trusted male leader, Sergeant Major Bestwick, to accept orders to U.S. European Command in Paris, France. She found the Paris assignment life-changing, both professionally and personally.

Professionally, she was afforded the opportunity to work as a stenographer for several high ranking male generals. Personally, until taking the assignment in France, Reals had never been on an airplane or even outside of the United States. Paris proved much more than a duty station to Reals for it whetted what would become a lifelong appetite for travel and history. While in Europe, she traveled extensively, took in the museums, and developed a fascination with La Louvre; one that holds to this day. In retrospect, Reals credits her decision to go to Paris and her experiences there as formative in her desire to pursue the Marine Corps long term and the success therein—a decision she has never regretted.

Over the next few years, Reals received encouragement from many high ranking officers to apply for an officer commission, in spite of not having a bachelor's degree. With determination, she did so and was accepted for a commission. At the age of 26, Reals attended Women Officer Training Course in Quantico, VA; and in September 1961, with her mother present, was commissioned as an officer in the Marine Corps and promoted to second lieutenant.

Over the next 24 years, Reals established herself as a trailblazer for women in the Marines. On multiple occasions when offered choices of duty stations, Reals pursued assignments where women Marines had never been assigned and indeed, places that she never would have imagined visiting before becoming a Marine herself. This included assignments ranging from administrative/staff positions to command positions in all-women units and later in larger, co-ed organizations at duty stations in Quantico, VA; Washington, D.C.; Paris, France; Twentynine Palms, CA; Beirut, Lebanon; Parris Island, SC; and Okinawa, Japan. Her tenacity and determination in these jobs not only garnered her professional acclaim but also paved the way for even greater opportunities for women that followed.

Reals also accepted highly sought after assignments to three esteemed educational opportunities in U.S. Army, Marine Corps and Navy schools; as typical of the time, she was the only woman selected to attend the Navy and Marine Corps courses. Likewise, in many of her jobs or duty stations, she was predictably “one of the first” or “the only” woman to have served in that capacity. Her resolve and astute career decisions Reals made in the first 31 years of her career ultimately paid off in her selection to brigadier general in 1985.

Discussion

The complexity of Reals’ achievement in the Marine Corps is best understood through examining challenges that she faced in achieving work-life balance and managing the ramifications of a changing culture. She managed to overcome these challenges initially through pragmatism and perseverance; but those traits also fueled two important supports that played a dominant role in her career. First, she enacted a

personal strategy of avoidance or “leading with a side-step,” and second, she demonstrated a strong personal and organizational identity, which enabled her to adapt to the massive changes that took place around her.

Challenges. Achieving work-life balance proved to be a challenge for Reals during her 36-year career as a Marine. She admitted that she never did *achieve* it; she just grew comfortable with the “imbalance.” She believes there were two reasons for this—institutional policy and her work ethic. As discussed in Chapter One, when Reals joined the Corps, policies either deterred or legally prevented her from marrying, adopting, or getting pregnant, presumably obviating the need to be concerned with “work-life balance.” These early laws and policies were generally accepted by women in the Marine Corps, including Reals, who saw them as the terms and conditions of employment for women who wanted to serve their country.

One such policy that was in place until the early 70s was that women Marines who became pregnant were involuntary discharged from the service (See Appendix O). In the beginning, this did not bother Reals, who recalled, “I wasn't too crazy about having a family. So at that time I wanted to stay in the Marine Corps, so I pushed that [thinking about having a family] aside.” By the time the restrictive policies regarding women’s personal choice were largely repealed, Reals was nearly 40 years of age and firmly entrenched in her career, thus not feeling inclined to exercise any of these “new-found” personal freedoms. She concluded that with nearly 20 years in the Marine Corps and having never consciously considered the matter of having a family, she had indirectly made her decision to remain single and childless. While Reals indicated that she had

little regret about how these Marine Corps policies ultimately shaped her life, she was grateful that servicewomen no longer faced the ultimatums of the past.

The second factor that Reals suggested contributed to her unorthodox approach to work-life balance was her work ethic. Given the relational restrictions early on, she threw herself into her Marine Corps career to the detriment of her personal life, creating a significant work-life imbalance. Her devotion to her Marine Corps career grew over time and little distracted her from it. She recalled, “I worked awfully damn hard, made a lot of sacrifices, setting aside my personal life. A large part of my life was the Marine Corps. That is the price you pay, always putting the Marine Corps first.” She also came to believe that the demands and expectations of the institution required all of her focus and energy, noting: “Maybe I am a perfectionist in that whatever I try, I want to do it extremely well. [In order to do that] you must renounce something.” Reals’ self-reliance and focus on work may also account for not maintaining a closer relationship with her mother and brothers as she grew older and her career progressed. Ultimately, by remaining in the Marine Corps, she privileged career over starting a family or cultivating a fuller personal life.

Beyond the personal work-life balance challenge, Reals was forced to deal with a major culture shift fueled by the policies promoting gender equality in the Marine Corps during her tenure. At the outset of Reals’ career, she was valued for her skills as a stenographer, a highly recruited specialty for servicewomen serving in stateside positions while “freeing men to fight” in combat overseas. As gender integration policies were implemented, women were encouraged to compete for positions and advance in careers that were previously male-only. The ramifications of this were that women Marines,

including Reals, at times became the target of resentment and animosity by some male Marines.

Reals realized early on that she was unprepared for this cultural transition. Before progressive gender equality efforts, occasions for female and male Marines to serve together in operational environments were rare, primarily involving administrative roles or as co-workers in office jobs. Reals recalled that it took her 19 years and the rank of major before being assigned with male Marines who were professionals in combat operations. It was in her interactions with these male Marines, her fellow students at Marine Corps Command and Staff College, that she began to understand how professionally marginalized she had been as a woman Marine. She saw how she lacked, among other things, the basic level of knowledge regarding combat operations that her male counterparts possessed, leading her to believe that women had essentially been serving in a “shadow” Marine Corps, one vastly different from “the *real* Marine Corps.”

Not only did Reals feel marginalized by the institution itself, but she readily recalled occasions when male Marines did not welcome her because she was a woman, even as a major with almost 20 years in the Corps. Yet, in spite of these challenges, Reals’ desire to do something extraordinary with her life by serving as a Marine never waned. Even as things changed around her, Reals’ Marine Corps career continued to satisfy her yearning and she remained convinced that she had made the right choice. As the next section shows, her professional identity as a Marine, along with another personal strategy also played key supporting roles in helping her navigate the challenges of the transformed Marine culture.

Supports. A key strategy that Reals used in negotiating challenging situations

was one of “avoidance.” She claimed that avoidance, or as she calls it, “leading with a side step,” helped her evade serious, career ending conflict while in the Marine Corps and particularly when treated with disregard by male Marines. For example, in professional encounters that were potentially controversial, she remained calm, composed and non-confrontational, refusing to be provoked. She said, “I have amazed myself at how controlled I can be...sometimes you lead with a side step.” By maneuvering around potentially volatile encounters, she was able to not only maintain her career motivation, but also achieve success in doing so, particularly amidst the discomfort that came from the gender inequality she faced as the culture changed.

Reals also attributes her strong sense of identity to both helping her overcome cultural challenges in the Marine Corps and enabling her to achieve long-term success. She explained that her identity, both personal and professional, played a pivotal role in her success during this particularly tumultuous period of gender integration. First, she believes that having a strong sense of self [individual identity] was essential for her survival in an environment like the Marine Corps in which women were beginning to be perceived as unwelcomed and powerless. She recalls giving advice to other women by saying, “Know yourself, and don’t let others define you. And you will grow and change, et cetera, yes, but you’re responsible for who you are. Don’t let other people tear you down.” She believed that developing a sense of confidence and inner strength contributed to her own personal identity, while deterring those who wanted to make her feel that she did not belong.

Beyond the personal identity, Reals developed a strong professional identity. Although Reals was recruited in part by the Marines *because* she was a woman and a

trained stenographer, she began to sense an insidious movement for women to relinquish their identity as “woman” for that of “Marine,” as her career advanced and progressive gender equality policies took hold. Indeed, her identity as a woman Marine was viewed by some as a liability and counterproductive to the equality effort. Reals believed however, that dual identities as “Marine” and “woman” did not have to be in conflict and that women should not have to surrender their femininity or act like men to perform their jobs and serve honorably. She said, “Women should not be deterred from utilizing their talents and what they are good at. You do not have to take away everything that [is] ‘feminine’ for someone to be a Marine.”

Reals’ experience in the Marine Corps convinced her that the Marine Corps could benefit from more women branching out into other jobs, but this did not mean they would have to give up their gender identity. Indeed, Reals resisted any institutional pressure for her to deny her gender in favor of fitting in and being a “Marine,” explaining:

It's a constant day-to-day battle. I revel in it. Others may find it a problem...The true test of the discipline, the stamina, and the *guts* of a woman Marine is for her to recognize all of that, maintain her sense of identity as a woman, and then prove to everybody that it's an advantage to the Corps to have her in its ranks.

In the end, however, Reals eventually did embrace her Marine identity above all others, as evidenced in the advice she offers to other female Marines: “Put the Marine Corps first. We tend to get too involved with worrying about ourselves. The first thing we should be worried about is not whether it's good for you, but, rather, whether it's good for the Corps.” While Reals feels she embraced her Marine identity wholeheartedly, she always sensed a reluctance on the part of the institution to fully accept her as a Marine. Indeed, she noted that if she were to ever write a book about her career, it would be

called: *An Outsider's View from Inside: A Woman Marine's Story*, an appropriate title, given the time and context in which she served.

Epilogue

In 1985, Reals and 14 male counterparts were competitively selected from a pool of 312 eligible colonels to achieve the rank of brigadier general. She was the first woman to be competitively selected, but the second to have worn the rank of brigadier general, and this at a time when women represented not quite five percent of the Marine Corps. Despite the progressive gender policies and the resulting cultural transformation within the Marine Corps that created such enormous challenges, she was able to attain one of the top ranks in the institution. Reals said, “The key is putting that kind of time [at the detriment of a personal life] into tough jobs and staying around.” Regardless, after years of reflecting on her career, she firmly believes that there is “no magical path or yellow brick road” leading to success, noting:

I just kept at it and at it and at it and realized I wasn't spending a heck of a lot of time doing other things that were external to the Marine Corps. Now I can look back and say I guess that was good, but you pay a price for that. Nothing is free.

An admiring colleague said this about Reals: “She’s one of the most committed leaders I know, sacrificing family and marriage for the Corps.” The Marine Corps and the country really did “get a live one!” when they recruited Reals.

Lieutenant General Carol A. (Wiescamp) Mutter, USMC, Ret.

Lieutenant General (LtGen) Carol A. (Schneider) (Wiescamp) Mutter served on active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps for over 31 years, from 1967-1999 (See Appendix F). She was a trailblazer, achieving significant milestones both in the Marine Corps and in the armed services at large. As a colonel and under very unique circumstances, she became the first woman military officer to qualify as Space Director for U.S. Space Command in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Three years later, in 1991, she was the third woman Marine to be promoted to general and the first Marine to ever be selected from the comptroller field.

As a brigadier general (one-star), Mutter commanded 3rd Force Service Support Group (now 3rd Marine Logistics Group), earning the distinction of being the first woman of general/flag rank to command a major deployable tactical command in any service. In 1994, she became the first woman in the Marine Corps to be selected for major general (two-star), and for a period, was the senior woman on active duty across all of the services. In 1996, she was selected as the first woman in any military service for appointment to lieutenant general (three-star), the first woman to be promoted to that rank in the Marine Corps and the second woman three-star in the armed services. In terms of her personal life, Mutter was the first woman general officer to be married, and the first of three women generals to be married to a Marine. Mutter's career offers valuable insights from both institutional and personal perspectives that help explain the complexity of her journey to success in the Marine Corps.

Her Story

Mutter has unquestionably been one of my greatest advocates for this study. Upon receiving an initial request for participation, she immediately contacted me expressing her willingness to be involved. Known nationally for her advocacy of women veterans, her enthusiasm for my research came as no surprise. Acknowledging the time and expense of travel from my home in San Diego to hers in Indianapolis, Indiana, she offered for me to meet her in Phoenix, Arizona, where she was scheduled to attend a meeting. To further simplify the visit, she suggested that I meet her at the airport and accompany her in her rental car to the hotel where we were both staying; moreover, she graciously offered to drive *me* back to the airport for my departure the next day.

Although I had not seen LtGen Mutter in person since 1996 when I first met her at a luncheon at Camp Pendleton, I recognized her right away when I saw her in the airport after I landed during my trip to interview her for this study. Amazingly, her appearance had changed little: as in the past, her short, light brown hair was now streaked with blond and grey; she wore glasses, and she still had a disarming smile. At the baggage carousel, I greeted her with a handshake, introduced myself, and we set off. With her meeting not taking place until the next day, she graciously invited me to join her for lunch with personal friends, for the reception at the hotel that evening, and for a Women Marines Association chapter breakfast in Mesa the next morning, for which she was the guest of honor. While I was able to learn much about her during our casual conversations throughout the day, she also agreed to meet the next morning in my room for a nearly two-hour formal interview before I departed for the airport.

As we began the interview, Mutter offered relevant details of her childhood and family life that she believed had contributed to her success in the Marine Corps. Born in Greeley, Colorado to a mother who was a high school graduate and a father who achieved only an eighth grade education, Mutter was raised on a working farm with her only sibling, a younger brother, in a lower-middle class family. Appreciating the experiences that she had and values she acquired there; Mutter noted: “I always said if I had children I wanted to raise them on a farm because I think you learn responsibility much easier.” Other activities that she felt laid the foundation for her personal character development were her participation in Brownies, Girl Scouts, religious activities, and 4-H, explaining, “I think that it [her extracurricular activities] just kind of reinforced a lot of my value system growing up.” All of these things proved formative for the course her life would take.

In the early-mid 1960s, Mutter found herself in a cultural quandary. She had developed a sense of confidence, particularly in male-dominated environments, in large part due to the competency she developed handling livestock and farming. However, society did not encourage women to do “men’s work”; most women of the time were strongly encouraged to pursue traditional female careers as secretaries, teachers, or nurses, if not intent on being a wife and mother. Upon graduation from high school, she managed to find a way to attend Colorado State College (currently named University of Northern Colorado) with the intent of becoming a teacher; however, she gravitated to male-dominated fields of study such as mathematics and science. Mutter explained,

I’d been in essentially a male environment my whole life. You know growing up on a farm I was a tomboy. I took the cattle to the fair in a mostly male environment, which was a lot of fun because boys were a big deal. A math major, science minor; mostly men in my classes and in fact many of them were former

military who were there on the GI Bill and were very, very serious about school, and tough competition in school.

Mutter's interest in male-dominated pursuits did not stop there. During her junior year of college, she spoke with a woman Marine officer recruiter on campus who told her about an opportunity for a paid ten-week "summer job" attending Women Officer Candidate Course (WOCC) in Quantico, VA. Mutter felt that attending Marine Corps WOCC between her junior and senior year of college would not only help her earn much needed college tuition money, but would also challenge her. Since a long-term commitment was not required, her mother eventually gave her consent for Mutter to go. While she was there, she met a gentleman from Colorado and a serious relationship began to develop when they both returned to Colorado to finish their senior year of college.

After graduating from WOCC in August 1966, Mutter returned to college for her senior year in order to satisfy the student teaching requirement. However, instead of going into teaching upon graduation in 1967, she accepted a three-year reserve officer commission in the Marine Corps. She first married her fellow Marine, and then they each embarked on their respective careers in the Corps. The marriage ended in 1975, with Mutter citing frequent separations and incompatibility for its demise.

As a second lieutenant completing her officer training at The Basic School, Mutter received her first choice of occupational specialty as a data processing officer; a specialty that she had requested due to her interest and its relevance to her earned degrees in math education augmented with computer courses. However, she had not anticipated that her role as a data processing officer would also require her to lead others. Mutter recalled,

In fact when I went into the Marine Corps and I asked for computers, that's all I wanted to do was just [be] me and [with] my computer, so I really didn't want to work with people. I just felt more comfortable with machines than I did with people and of course nobody told me as an officer you can't avoid that...

Mutter explained that later she did learn to lead and motivate teams and grew to really value the satisfaction it brought.

Having capitalized on early opportunities to prove herself technically and as a leader, Mutter's career in the Marine Corps was looking promising; after three years, she was selected for "augmentation," an esteemed opportunity for officers to continue serving indefinitely as a regular commissioned officer. Following this significant achievement, she was chosen as a captain to command a platoon at Woman Officer School (WOS) in Quantico, VA, which was at that time one of the rare and highly prized opportunities for command for women. She believes that this command assignment may have significantly impacted the trajectory of her career, explaining:

That was my opportunity to show what I could do in a leadership role. And I think later on it had a lot to do with my ability to continue to be able to be promoted because I was one of the few women who had that opportunity to show what I could do [command Marines].

Ten years into her career in 1997, Mutter married Major Jim Mutter, who would become her life-long partner. Early in their marriage, the couple decided that they would forgo having children. While this alleviated some significant challenges, there were others to face. As a dual-military couple, they were aware that career management would be critical if they wanted competitive assignments in close proximity to each other, especially as they advanced in rank. They were masterful at achieving this, in large part due to a strategy of mutual support through advanced planning and negotiation. As a result, they were able to meet both personal and professional needs, rarely serving apart,

and if so, only for short durations (this strategy is discussed in greater detail later in this case). They served on active duty together from 1977-1993 in places like Virginia, Colorado, and Missouri and on three occasions in Okinawa, Japan.

Mutter's career demonstrates the greatest breadth of skill amongst the women Marine generals. Over the span of her 31-year career in the Marine Corps, she served in seven different professional fields, including data processing, financial management, air command and control, space operations, logistics, acquisition, and personnel. Being a challenge-seeker, Mutter admitted that she enjoyed continuously learning different facets of the Marine Corps along with attaining new skills, which moving from one specialty to another afforded her. She recalled,

I thrived on challenges and doing something new and different....At Command and Staff [College] it [the challenge] was more the people. I went from there to the Wing [1st Marine Aircraft Wing], new Comptroller job. And going into a Colonel's billet as a Lieutenant Colonel-select, at that point, was a challenge.

Discussion

Mutter's journey as a Marine is best understood through the institutional and personal factors that influenced how she navigated her professional and personal life. A significant challenge that Mutter experienced over the course of her career was negotiating the "uneven playing field" that women faced in the advent of policies that expanded women's roles and expectations in the Marine Corps. Furthermore, as a result of these policies, Mutter sometimes encountered resistance, animosity, and the legacy of a "good ole' boys" culture. She navigated these challenges strategically by working harder and confronting her foes honestly and courageously. Mutter was resourceful as a Marine and wisely utilized supportive strategies that were essential for the success of two

married military officers. In addition, she noted that achieving a sense of “belonging” in the Marine Corps was essential for her career longevity and her satisfaction in the Corps.

Challenges. Women like Mutter who joined the Marine Corps in the late 1960s and early 70s, were trained and educated differently than their male counterparts, due to the regulations and policies that restricted the roles of women. This would have reverberating effects on women Marines, even after the opportunities began expanding. For example, when Mutter joined the Marine Corps in 1967, women Marines received significantly less operational skills training in their initial officer instruction at Women Officer Basic Course than their male counterparts at The Basic School because women were not legally permitted to perform jobs that required them. As progressive gender equality policies were enacted and more opportunities were opened to women, women like Mutter found themselves inadequately prepared to assume these new roles which made it difficult to contribute equitably in organizations alongside their male counterparts.

Mutter successfully overcame gaps in knowledge and training deficiencies through her commitment to additional professional preparation and homework. As an example, she recalled anticipating her assignment to the Amphibious Warfare School (AWS) in 1973:

Having to get into subject areas that I had no background for was a little daunting and people had recommended, ‘You need to take a map-reading course before you go because the men all got that in Basic School, we didn’t,’ and so I had to know how to read coordinates and figure out where things were on a map and how to draw the grid and the Green forces and the friendly forces and all that. So I took a couple of MCI [Marine Corps Institute] courses to give me the right background in order to be able to survive in the course and in fact as it turned out I did much better in the course than some of the men...

Mutter's experience at AWS serves as an example of how women Marines of that time had to work harder than their male counterparts to succeed. She admits that although it required extra work, it was necessary, and inevitably paid off in her career and with her male counterparts, garnering her much deserved respect and credibility. Mutter concluded; "Some women did have difficulty with men accepting their authority. My advice: do your homework and do your job; act like you belong there." Fitting in with her male Marine counterparts sometimes required Mutter to attempt to "level the knowledge playing field" even if that meant doing so on her own initiative and without the support of the institution.

Additionally, Mutter faced a male-dominated culture that was slow to change as she began breaking barriers and pursuing opportunities never before available. Her career spanned the period in American history when the women's liberation movement was permeating all segments of society, even the Marine Corps. She noted:

I was commissioned in '67. We were in kinda' that leading edge of women's lib [liberation], and women in the military expanding their roles. Every Friday you'd open up the base paper and see something new about a woman—first woman in crash/fire rescue, or whatever. So it was just one of those evolutionary things that just happened all through my career. And things were happening in the civilian world, as well, at that time, where women were, more and more, getting into careers, and not just being secretaries or executive assistants, even, or nurses, and that type of thing.

Regardless of the progressive push for institutional gender equality, the corresponding cultural shift in the Marine Corps appeared to be slow in coming, in spite of, or possibly because of all the woman Marine "firsts" being achieved.

Mutter encountered *some* male Marines that appeared unwilling to accept women Marines in their new roles and expanded opportunities, particularly in the early stages of gender integration. Mutter recounted a wide spectrum of disrespectful behavior, which

she hopes are not tolerated today, from working for a salty, war-hardened Korean War veteran that often made inappropriate remarks in front of her (though not believed to be directed at her), to a description of Mutter in an early fitness report [performance evaluation] as “an engaging and attractive lady Marine.” Evidence of the male-dominated, “good ole’ boys” culture continued even into 1984 when the Naval War College leaders would routinely command military audiences to “Take your seats, *gentlemen*,” evidence of a culture that continued to attempt to *ignore* the presence of a small female population by referring to all military members as “gentlemen.”

In some situations, Mutter faced resentment and personal bias head on. Her reaction was dictated by her philosophy that: “If you don't think I belong, that's your problem. That's not my problem. The Marine Corps says I belong, I'm here, and I'm going to do my job. And that's what I'm here for.” In spite of these cultural challenges, Mutter's philosophy about it at the time is summed up as follows:

I'm willing to accept the Corps' conservative approach in order to be a part of the proudest and finest military organization in the world. But let me truly be part of it, not just a garrison-bound surrogate [someone who performs an office job in the U.S.]. I have a lot to contribute gentlemen, and so do the other women who want to be one of the best—a U.S. Marine!

Supports. As a married couple, Mutter and her husband, Jim, developed a strategy of mutual support utilizing advanced planning and negotiation that enabled them to overcome the challenges that Marine Corps policies and regulations presented. The Marine Corps' policies neither *guaranteed* dual-military couples rights for co-location nor allowed the partners to work in the same chain of command. Mutter remarked, “Makes a lot of sense, but it's hard to do sometimes when you're in a small place that only has one command [organization].” As Marine officers each having careers of ten years

or more, opportunities became more limited for each of them and so did their room for negotiating options, unless they compromised.

Mutter explained that her husband was committed to equitable management of both their careers and identifying opportunities for compromise when benefit could be gained. She recalled, “Managing dual careers required lots of future planning and compromise. We always looked at the art of the possible. We worked with our monitors [Marines responsible for assignments] at least 2 years out from our next transfer.” In spite of the limiting policies governing both women and dual-military couples, Mutter offered two instances when their strategy for mutual support paid off. The first occasion occurred early in their marriage when Mutter determined that she needed greater professional flexibility to assure future assignments with her husband. She explained how she did it:

I requested to change my MOS [military occupational specialty] because it was obvious there were not many billets in the Marine Corps for lieutenant colonels and colonels in data processing, which was my original MOS. And there's much more flexibility for me to go different places in the financial management MOS.

Transitioning to financial management in mid-career was a risky career move for Mutter in light of a promotion system that rewards occupational credibility; however, it did offer better co-location opportunities than were likely had she remained a data processing officer.

The second occasion occurred in the face of devastating family news that prompted Mutter to reconsider her future in the Marine Corps. In light of the news, the Mutters decided to request an unscheduled transfer, knowing that the new location might not be able to accommodate two senior Marines. Mutter recalled,

While we were there [stationed in Kansas City], we found out that Jim's adult son had leukemia. And we wanted to get [permanently assigned] as close as possible to him [in Albuquerque, NM] as we could. And Jim's monitor [person who issues transfer orders] found him a job in Colorado Springs, five hours up the road from Albuquerque. But [initially] there was no job there for me. So I was writing a resume and figuring out what kind of a job I was going to try for on the outside.

At the same time, however, Mutter continued to pursue all possibilities that would allow her to continue her Marine Corps career. She soon discovered that identifying a viable assignment for her in Colorado Springs required unconventional and aggressive negotiations between military branches at the highest levels. Mutter's active and multi-service professional network, along with the couples' professional reputation, made it possible for her to attain permission for orders to U.S. Space Command, accompanying her husband to Colorado Springs. Completely unexpected, her orders would afford her a "glass-ceiling-breaking" opportunity to hold a highly-revered position never before held by a woman officer, while saving her from an undesired retirement.

Mutter offered that the longevity and success of her career in the Marine Corps was significantly based on effectively developing a sense of "belonging" in the Marine Corps and her Marine identity. Her Marine identity accompanied two other significant identities, that of a woman and a wife; ultimately, she was able to reconcile her institutional identity as a Marine with that of also being a woman as well as a wife, (it may have helped that her spouse was also a Marine). Although for her WOCC was initially intended only as summer job, once back in college for her senior year, she recalled making her decision to join the Marine Corps. Mutter said, "of course, by the time you leave [WOCC] you're imbued with the esprit de corps, and there's no other decision to make...Not to mention the fact that we believe we're the best and I could be proud of my service." Effectively indoctrinated into the Marine Corps culture during

WOCC, Mutter immediately recognized her need to fit in or “belong” in the Marine Corps, in other words, identify as Marine. She recalled that, “I always felt that if I acted like I belonged there, I would be treated like I belonged. That turned out to be true.”

Mutter’s identity as “Marine” had a solid foundation; but for her this did not mean giving up her identity as a woman. Indeed, from her perspective, it was little different from growing up as a rare girl on her family’s farm or being one of the only female mathematics majors in college. She noted:

I always said being a female and -- being a woman Marine -- the phrase "woman Marine" is not an oxymoron. You can be a woman and be a Marine. And that doesn't mean you're all frilly and giggly and that kind of -- but a professional woman doing a professional job, approaching it professionally, from a professional perspective. You don't have to “out-male” the men to be a Marine.”

Epilogue

Upon her retirement, Mutter reflected on her career as a Marine:

It was a great life. I’m very proud of the Marine Corps for all the things they do and I’m most proud of the title ‘Marine.’ General is not important at all. The fact that I was a Marine, that’s important. After all, there’s nothing like being a Marine as you know. Anyone who’s not a Marine doesn’t understand it.

Major General MaryAnn Krussa-Dossin, USMC, Ret.

Major General (MajGen) MaryAnn Krusa-Dossin served on active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1975-2010 (See Appendix H), becoming the fifth woman to achieve the rank of brigadier general and the third to reach major general (2-star). Commissioned during a period of expanded opportunities for women, Krusa-Dossin was one of the first regular commissioned women officers to serve as a military police (MP) officer in the Marine Corps. She was a first lieutenant when the first woman was promoted to brigadier general and twenty-five years later, in 2003, she would be fortunate to receive the same promotion, herself. Four years later she pinned on her second star, achieving the rank of major general. Personally remarkable, Krusa-Dossin was the first, and remains, still, the *only* active duty mother to become a Marine general. The story of how she did so is marked by challenges related to the introduction of aggressive gender integration policies, which she managed to overcome with confidence, courageous action, and supportive relationships throughout her career.

Her Story

As Krusa-Dossin would later tell me, she was initially ambivalent about participating in the study and thus did not respond to multiple attempts to contact her. When she finally did respond, she agreed to participate and suggested we meet either in Washington D.C., where she would be for a few days, or in Fernandina Beach, FL, where she resides. Since I was already heading to D.C., I reserved a room at her hotel for us to meet for a two-hour interview. When she arrived, she appeared energetic and fit, standing five feet nine; she was dressed comfortably. Carrying a large purse that held her drinking water and some documentation, which she would later offer me, Krusa-Dossin

greeted me with a businesslike manner, firmly shaking my hand. Settling quickly across the table, she initiated the conversation by asking, “So, who else are you going to talk to [about me]? Because I have some names and one lives close to you.” This surprised me since she had seemed hesitant in the first place, and because no one else in the study had made such an offer.

Krusa-Dossin soon turned to the influence of her family and upbringing on her personal development and life decisions. She explained that, though her family was not wealthy in terms of money, they were rich in other ways. She was raised in Gary, Indiana, the third daughter of nine children; she remembers her parents teaching and modeling great moral values in their home, while encouraging each of the children to fulfill their dreams. Specifically, her parents promoted and encouraged their children to work hard, be courageous, be patriotic, and be service-oriented.

Krusa-Dossin began working at a young age, having learned the necessity and importance of hard work, no matter what the pursuit. Initially, she took baby-sitting jobs, but her work evolved to community opportunities like lifeguarding and even managing the city pool. When she first determined to become a lifeguard, she found out that females were prohibited from applying. Feeling this to be unreasonable, she decided to confront the perceived injustice head on, and applied anyway, tenaciously fulfilling all the application requirements and ultimately earning a well-deserved position as one of the first two women guards on Lake Michigan during the late 1960s. This job not only required hard work, but also tremendous courage and commitment, while under enormous scrutiny. Krusa-Dossin believes that this experience taught her two important lessons that she carried into her Marine Corps career. The first is to courageously address

issues of injustice or inequity. The second is to be committed to your cause, or as she put it: “push forward, even when people are pushing back,” or “don’t be denied.”

Krusa-Dossin credits her father for nurturing and encouraging her extraordinary courage and confidence at a young age. A World War II veteran who served as a Marine Raider in 1942 during the Battle of Guadalcanal, Edward Thomas Krusa knew a lot about courage, although he did not talk much about it, and as a result, Krusa-Dossin knew little else about his service.

Nonetheless, Krusa-Dossin’s sense of patriotism was seeded early and fostered in her childhood, particularly by her mother, who was a member of the American Legion Auxiliary. As a result, Krusa-Dossin marched in parades, learned American history and visited veterans’ homes, instilling in her an awareness and respect for military service and the people who served their country. She met many great people, and one inspirational leader in particular, Alice Galka, became her friend and mentor who continues to make a difference in her life. Krusa-Dossin believes that her experiences with the Auxiliary may well have contributed to her pursuit of a military career and her life of service. That passion for service was also deepened through her membership in Girl Scouts and community volunteer opportunities with St. Jude’s Children’s Hospital.

After high school, Krusa-Dossin moved to Texas where she attended Texas Christian University, earning a bachelor’s degree in 1974 in psychology and sociology, areas that truly inspired her. After working with her sister in retail for a year in Chicago, IL, she began looking for more challenging endeavors and became interested in pursuing the Marine Corps as a career. In a very short time, she applied and was accepted into Officer Candidate School in Quantico, VA. Upon completion, she was commissioned as

a second lieutenant and reported to The Basic School where she would begin her career as a Marine officer.

For many reasons, Krusa-Dossin was enthusiastic about becoming a Military Police (MP) officer in the Marine Corps. She wanted to do something challenging and serve in a valuable role that would utilize her field of study, all of which being an MP fulfilled. Furthermore, her timing was particularly advantageous because at the conclusion of the Vietnam War, the MPs offered Marines opportunities to demonstrate professional proficiency under real world circumstances that were not otherwise found outside of combat zones or in other military specialties in peacetime. Thus, serving as an MP in this post-war era would provide Krusa-Dossin with greater possibilities for advancement when competing against male peers who had served in highly-valued combat arms professions with Vietnam combat experience.

At the same time however, joining the MP community as a woman Marine was not an easy path, presenting Krusa-Dossin with serious cultural challenges. Until her assignment in the MP specialty, women had never held commissioned officer leadership positions in the field. Yet even in the face of cold, often unpleasant reception she received as a woman, Krusa-Dossin continued to feel the passion and satisfaction of serving in the Marine Corps as a MP Officer. Furthermore, she pointed out that the MP community offered greater opportunities to command Marines than most other military specialties, saying, "Becoming a Provost Marshal (PMO) (and that's really kind of what you strove to do) was actually equivalent, if not higher than, being a company commander." During her career, Krusa-Dossin was fortunate to assume command of a

variety of units that made her particularly competitive for promotion, both in and out of the MP community.

In addition to her command opportunities and professional performance, Krusa-Dossin capitalized on esteemed educational opportunities, which made her a highly prized leader. With a commitment to life-long learning, she participated in law enforcement-related courses and post-graduate studies, earning two master's degrees, which expanded her professional knowledge of human relations and military resource strategy. These opportunities satisfied her intellectual curiosities as well as the pragmatic needs of the Marine Corps, contributing to her proficiency and professional advancement.

Krusa-Dossin also managed to create a satisfying personal life while serving in the Marine Corps, which included a wonderful husband and a beautiful son. Three years into her career, she married Paul Dossin, also a Marine, who she contends has always been her biggest supporter, best friend, and confidante. In 1980, within two years of marrying, and while serving in Iwakuni, Japan, they became proud parents to their only son, Michael. As a Marine family, they took assignments across the country from North Carolina to Arizona and again overseas, on Okinawa. How they, being dual-military, achieved work-life balance in the Marine Corps during the course of their careers is more deeply explored later in this case.

In large part, Krusa-Dossin credits her supportive husband and the opportunities their partnership afforded her for her promotion to brigadier general in 2003. Three years later, having continued to demonstrate outstanding leadership, including command of Marine Corps Base, Camp Butler, Okinawa, she earned a second star. Krusa-Dossin and

Paul are still happily married and enjoying retirement from the Marine Corps together in Florida while Michael, their son, pursues his business career in Washington D.C..

Discussion

As Krusa-Dossin tells it, because she was driven to make a difference, she perceived the challenges she encountered in the Marine Corps as opportunities and not barriers. Some of her greatest “opportunities” arose from the poor execution of new policies governing servicewomen, and the need for the Corps to make cultural changes related to active duty pregnancy and previously male-only occupations being opened to women. By successfully overcoming the challenges, she managed to constructively shape gender-related policies and influence the male-dominated culture within an institution that had yet to make meaningful progress. She did this not only for her own survival, but also in hopes of eliminating similar barriers for the many women Marines that would come after her. Aside from the challenges, Krusa-Dossin acknowledged that there were two significant factors that promoted her ascent to general officer ranks. She credits her long and successful career in the Marine Corps with having been able to achieve work-life balance while on active duty, as well as having privileged her Marine identity over all others.

Challenges. Initially, the nature of many of Krusa-Dossin’s challenges in the Marine Corps were related to changing gender policies and regulations that were poorly articulated and implemented, as well as untested. In the 1970s and early 80s, the Marine Corps seemed sluggish, if not unconcerned about preparing or educating Marine leaders on the details of implementing new gender equality policies and what the policy

implications would be for women Marines and their leadership. Krusa-Dossin offered two examples relative to her pregnancy that illustrate this.

In 1980, when Krusa-Dossin became pregnant she was told, “When your uniforms no longer fit, you are authorized to wear civilian clothes.” Incredulous and unwilling to do this, she seized the opportunity to assist the Marine Corps in identifying an appropriate and professional maternity uniform. Over the course of her pregnancy, she voluntarily developed and wore possible alternatives; ultimately presenting the Corps with a feasible and practical solution that was eventually approved and became the basis for the current maternity uniform. When asked how she felt about “taking this issue on” she said, “Somebody's got to do it. You know, when you join the Marine Corps for a challenge... those are some of the challenges.”

Krusa-Dossin also had to contend with her male captain supervisor who believed that being pregnant would undermine her authority and professional credibility, and as a result, initiated her reassignment to a more administrative position before she became visibly pregnant. Krusa-Dossin felt the move was senseless and disadvantageous to her career, so she raised her concerns up the chain of command. When higher ranking officers considered her issue, the captain was encouraged to reverse his decision and she was allowed to stay in her position. Not only did she never miss a day of work during her pregnancy, but the Marines she led highly anticipated the birth. She recalls thinking, “Are you kidding, if I would have allowed them to name the baby, they would have. And oh, they were having fun betting on the baby’s weight and time of birth; again very supportive.”

Krusa-Dossin experienced no loss of respect or confidence from the Marines that

worked for her as a result of the pregnancy, something her captain would soon acknowledge. By courageously challenging leaders' judgements and decisions, she not only influenced the refinement of the policy but also demanded that women be held equally accountable to established standards and expectations of the Marine Corps. Unquestionably, this serves as an example of how she helped pave a more affable path for women to integrate more effectively into the Corps.

Another of Krusa-Dossin's greatest challenges was in becoming one of the first commissioned women officers in the MP community. MPs, as an occupational specialty, had just been opened to women commissioned officers and was steeped in a "good ole boys" culture, having never been subject to women leaders. Institutionally, the Marine Corps highly regarded the MP profession; it was viewed as one demanding proficiency in advanced combatant skills for domestic environments, as well as those required in warfighting. A historically male-dominated specialty, this was more challenging than some other specialties to integrate. Krusa-Dossin was confronted at the outset of her first assignment with hostility, resentment, and personal bias from some experienced male MPs.

The animosity of her fellow male MP Marines would not deter Krusa-Dossin; she approached this cultural challenge on two fronts. First, she was driven to demonstrate that women *could* do the job and that having women in the MP ranks was beneficial to the mission. Attempting to integrate rapidly and to prove that she could compete, particularly in the daily routine and training, she wanted the Marines to understand that not only did she possess the necessary proficiency, but brought added value to the

mission as a woman. Ultimately, her efforts to influence the culture and gain acceptance began to pay off as she proved herself as a leader and capable police officer.

The second thing Krusa-Dossin credits for her ability to cope with and even erode the initial bias and hostility in the MP community was the existence of supportive networks. She says she learned “to get over it” with the help of a few critical alliances and professional relationships that she developed in her department. Most gratifying was the bond she forged with a true warrior of his day, Staff Sergeant (SSgt) Rick Pittman, a Medal of Honor recipient. Thus, her camaraderie with a small group of officers and senior enlisted men such as SSgt Pittman enabled her to persevere and ultimately build bridges with many of the men with whom she served.

Supports. Krusa-Dossin demonstrated as an officer, mother, and a wife that work-life balance was achievable even while serving on active duty in the Marine Corps. As noted earlier, this hinged on her partnership with her husband, Paul, himself a career Marine. She described her marriage as both a personal and professional equitable partnership, which served to be mutually supporting rather than perpetuating traditionally expected roles and responsibilities that accompany that of “husband” and “wife” within a marriage. Not only were the roles shared, but so were the career decisions that each made during almost 20 years on active duty together. This meant there would inevitably be compromise when determining the next best career move for either of them. Ultimately, her husband was proud to retire in order to support his wife’s blossoming career.

Krusa-Dossin and her husband’s partnership made it possible to raise their son Michael while managing successful careers in the Marine Corps. She attributes their

teamwork as a dual-military couple to alleviating the prohibitive parenting burden that normally falls on the mother. She commented somewhat smugly, “When our son was born (which of course was a great joy), I guarantee that Paul [her husband] changed more diapers than I ever did!” As time went on, Krusa-Dossin and Paul succeeded in equally sharing the more significant parenting tasks, so that neither experienced an inordinate impact on their professional career.

Paul even supported Krusa-Dossin in her desire to pursue a master’s degree through a program that took up significant off-duty hours and prohibited time with her son, telling her: “You know, this may be one of the only times where you’ve got decent working hours. I think it’s time for you to go ahead and work on the master’s degree.” The implication of this offer was that he voluntarily committed to take on a greater share of the parental duties for her to achieve her educational goals, in spite of his own career demands.

In cases that involve dual-military households with children as the Dossin’s did, creative alternatives to less than ideal situations seem possible when mutually-supportive partners and a wide supportive network are involved. Krusa-Dossin explained:

There’s always an abundance of great folks to step in and help. If I had to go to a school for six months, there were always good folks in our group [military colleagues] that would step in and help Paul and me.

Support networks enabled them to effectively raise their son, Michael, now a highly successful young man. When asked about her son’s feelings regarding his upbringing, she said, “let me just tell you he would describe himself as being a mama’s boy. And by the way, he doesn’t care who knows it.” Despite time apart due to professional commitments, her connection with her son seemed undisturbed. As a young woman

officer who worked for Krusa-Dossin said, “I think of the general [Krusa-Dossin] as the one that helped pave the way for women to ‘keep on keeping on’ and allowing people to stay in as mothers. She gave me the courage to do it.”

Another factor that Krusa-Dossin believes may have contributed to her success in the Marine Corps is that she privileged her identity as “Marine” over other important identities to which she could have laid claim. She had many “hats” or identities while serving in the Marine Corps, ranging from personal and relational identities as a woman, wife, and mother, to the collective or group identity of Marine. When asked about her identity as a woman Marine, she responded, “I never thought of it [my identity] that way. I just never did. ....Just as a Marine. Just as a Marine, and being myself.” That said, the Marines that worked with her seemed to detect a distinct blend of identities: one as woman and the other as Marine. Some described her as feminine yet “very in charge” and formidable. Another Marine officer said, “You never doubted that it was a lady that you were in the presence of who was also your commander; but, she seemed absolutely natural, confident, comfortable; it was clear that she belonged there [as the Commanding Officer].” Regardless of how others saw her, she said she always saw herself as a Marine.

In telling the story of her career, Krusa-Dossin exuded great delight in speaking of her personal identities as “wife” and “mother.” However, important as they were, she never described them as being in conflict with her demanding career as a Marine Corps officer. By many accounts, the institution rewards Marines who privilege the Marine identity over all the others. Krusa-Dossin fits this criteria. She held fast to her identity as

a Marine in spite of the professional and personal obstacles she faced; and perhaps *because* of them.

Epilogue

Krusa-Dossin credits her mother's early inspiration and motivation for planting the seed of high expectations. She fondly recalls, "I think my mother always said 'Don't let anything stop you. Reach for the stars.'" Smiling, Krusa-Dossin added, "She had no idea that someday that would come to fruition." Though being a woman Marine was undeniably difficult, she did what some perceive is impossible—enjoyed having a family, too. Because of her experience, she still advises young women that "you can have both" career and motherhood, though, with a significant caveat—you have to have the right partner:

We [she and her husband Paul] were very blessed. I mean, we truly were -- I can't even think of a better word. Again, with all the opportunities that we had, and the doors that were opened. And the doors that we banged open, in some cases. But, blessed. That's all I can say. I mean, it's been fantastic.

Major General Angela (Angie) Salinas, USMC, Ret.

Major General (MajGen) Angela Salinas served in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1974-2013 (See Appendix I). In 2006 she became the sixth woman and the first Hispanic female Marine to be selected for brigadier general. Her 39-year career included both reserve and active duty. She initially enlisted in the Reserves while in college, but three years later, after earning her bachelor's degree, was selected for the Enlisted Commissioning Program (ECP). She was the second enlisted woman Marine that eventually achieved the rank of general. Salinas holds other significant milestones for women Marine officers, including being the first woman Marine to command a recruiting station, to be assigned as a combat service support ground monitor, and to serve as a recruiting district commanding officer. While a brigadier general, she became the first woman to command a highly-prized base—Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD), one of two in the world. Four years later, she would be the fourth woman in the Marine Corps selected for major general (two stars).

Her Story

The first time I met MajGen Salinas, she was standing in the lobby of my hotel with a gift bag for me filled with edibles and souvenirs, precursors of the warm, hospitable approach she would bring to our conversation. She exuded confidence and charisma but with a commanding presence, which probably surprises some, given her diminutive stature of little more than five feet. She appeared slender and stylishly dressed, sporting her “signature” short sandy blond hair, which, by her own admission, has been the same most of her adult life. After the formalities of the initial meeting, she

left no doubt about her enthusiasm for explaining the nuances of the Marine Corps promotion system and sharing her Marine story.

That story begins when Salinas, the youngest of five children was born in Alice, Texas. Soon moving to Vallejo, California, her mother was a domestic worker with a 4th grade education, while her father had a 6th grade education and worked as an auto mechanic. She remembers her parents having modest expectations for her and her siblings, realistically hoping they would graduate from high school. Salinas believes, however, that they may secretly have had higher hopes for her, as their youngest child. Upon graduating from high school, her parents gave her advice that she has never forgotten, “Make a difference with what you have that maybe someone else does not.” She attributes getting through some challenging times during her Marine Corps career to her parents’ call to action and attitude of optimism.

With the support of her Catholic high school education, Salinas would be the first in the family to attend college. She recalled choosing to attend nearby Dominican College in San Rafael, CA, with the intention of becoming a Catholic nun. Making the most of her college experience, she served as president of her sophomore class and captain of the basketball team, which she founded; but due to academic and financial hardship, she seriously considered dropping out of school.

Through a chance encounter with a Marine recruiter at a post office, Salinas saw a way to pay for the remainder of her college education, have summer employment, and the opportunity to develop job skills, so she made the decision to join in record time. The news of Salinas’ enlistment came as an unpleasant surprise to her parents when they were finally notified five days prior to her boot camp graduation. Wanting more for their

daughter, they believed that she had abandoned her ambition for a college degree. However, after boot camp, Salinas did indeed return to Dominican College, graduating with honors and receiving a Bachelor of Arts in History. Far exceeding her parents dream, she had become her family's first college graduate.

Although Salinas' decision to enlist in the Marine Corps was for practical reasons, she explained that her boot camp experience ignited a spark in her and set her on a course to find her true calling; one that would shape the rest of her life. Compelled to return to a life of service in the Marine Corps, she knew this was where she should be. After graduating from college in 1976, she joined a Reserve unit in San Antonio, Texas and was quickly selected for the Enlisted Commissioning Program (ECP) to become an officer. She was proud to be a Marine, discovering belonging, satisfaction, and the call to serve something greater than herself.

In 1977, as a woman officer candidate, Salinas found herself on the crest of gender integration legislation in the Marine Corps. As a result, she was a member of the first gender integrated classes in both Officer Candidate School (OCS) and The Basic School (TBS) in 1978. The women in these courses were afforded unprecedented opportunities to train in the combat skills that had been traditionally demanded only of their male counterparts. However, since the actual implementation of these skills was largely prohibited to women under current laws governing combat, this served essentially as "familiarity" training. In Salinas' case, combat skills were unnecessary in the daily execution of her duties as a legal officer (MOS 4430) and subsequently as an adjutant (MOS 0180). She believes however, that the training she received was invaluable as a

“rite of passage,” bolstering her courage and confidence as a Marine and her commitment to the institution.

Not only was Salinas devoted to the Marine Corps, but her commitment to her family played a significant role in how she navigated her career. Early on after her father died and while she was stationed at Parris Island, SC, her mother, Florita, came to visit, intending to stay only a few months. Although she had no prior experience with Marines or the Marine Corps, Florita immediately developed an affinity for the people and the institution, electing to remain with Salinas for the next 33 years of her career. Sixteen years later in 1996, her sister Janie, whose husband had died, came to live with Salinas and her mother.

In light of her Hispanic heritage and culture, it is not surprising that Salinas was grateful for her family’s company and thoroughly enjoyed sharing her Marine Corps experience with them. While she never married or had children of her own, this was not because of her close relationship with her mother and sister. On the contrary, particularly during her early career, she kept her options open for relationships and marriage; suggesting that if she had gotten seriously involved with someone, she might have even considered getting out. Salinas explained,

I never found the right guy. I had been engaged twice by that point [10-year mark, 1984] in my career and because of tough choices and expectations of these potential mates, I found no options and so I decided to stay in.

Although a non-traditional one, Salinas certainly had a family that required all the care and consideration of a traditional family. In the later years of her career, she would receive much needed support from her sister in providing an increasing degree of attention to and care for their aging mother.

Professionally, Salinas characterizes her career with great pride and satisfaction. While she held professional officer designations as both a legal officer and adjutant, she enjoyed much more esteemed positions that provided opportunities to “command,” or lead Marines. She explained that opportunities for command were frequently offered to adjutants due to a common perception of them being “generalists” or “jacks of all trades.” Because of this, officers in her profession were frequently viewed as resources that offered the institution manpower flexibility, being ideal candidates to fill gaps, and thus were often selected to command units of all sizes. However, after Salinas’ first command as a young first lieutenant, she began to establish a favorable reputation that would open up many more opportunities throughout her career.

In fact, Salinas held command at every rank, many of which were involved in recruiting or basic training of Marines. Although some would question whether Salinas had enough MOS (professional) credibility required for successful promotion, her performance as a commanding officer and success within recruiting and recruit training alleviated all doubt. One of her premier career highlights occurred in 1988 when she was selected as the first woman Marine officer to command a recruiting station (RS), in Charleston, West Virginia. At the time she assumed command of RS Charleston, it ranked 48th in the country; however, after successfully completing her station command, its ranking had risen to fifth. With such a successful, highly visible commanding officer tour, she gained much acclaim and continued to make her mark in the highly revered community of Marine Corps recruiting and training. She ultimately established herself as eminently qualified in her role as general in command of Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego and the Western Recruiting District, a position never before held by a woman.

The Marine Corps also demonstrated its confidence and support in Salinas through the enviable professional education opportunities for which she was selected during the course of her career. She remembered, “It was after MCRD [Marine Corps Recruit Depot tour in the early 1980’s] when I realized that my selection to attend resident AWS [Amphibious Warfare School in Quantico, VA] meant that I was considered valuable to the institution.” She was fortunate to attend professional schools at all three career tiers of the Marine Corps, being a graduate of the Amphibious Warfare School (AWS) in Quantico, VA; the Naval Command and Staff College in Newport, RI, where she earned her Master’s in National Defense Strategy; and the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle, PA.

Salinas’ extensive command and professional education opportunities demonstrate the commitment that the institution had to advancing and preparing her for greater rank within the Marine Corps. While the timing of opportunities and her coveted talents and skills in recruiting and recruit training precluded her from serving in combat deployments, the institution proved that it valued a wide variety of skill-sets as vital contributions to the accomplishment of the Marine Corps’ mission.

Discussion

In many ways, Salinas’ story seems idyllic and her success is certainly inspirational. However, she faced unique cultural and structural challenges presented by the Marine Corps that could have potentially short-circuited her career goals. Her values, personal traits, and judgment helped her to overcome and to actually benefit from the experiences. At the same time, she established some personal values early on that she

suggests were central to her success. Without an understanding of these things, her story is incomplete.

Challenges. Salinas identified two significant challenges that she faced during her 39-year career in the Marines—an institution that arguably could be considered the most male-dominated organization in the world, along with the ways in which she overcame them. The first challenge took place when she was a very junior officer, working in a hostile environment where some in her chain of command were the perpetrators. Believing their behavior inconsistent with that expected of Marine leaders, she began contemplating leaving the Marine Corps. What bothered her most was that the hostility she faced was not from the male Marines, as might have been expected, but from other *women* officers.

A culture of hostility eventually grew so egregious that those responsible for the harassment attempted to withhold her promotion to Captain. Ignoring the personal and professional risks, Salinas took courageous and decisive action in her own self-defense by raising the issue with those in higher authority. As a result, she was eventually promoted, but perhaps more importantly, she received invaluable counsel from a much senior woman officer to which she suggests she owes her career.

When Salinas spoke of her disenchantment based on her treatment by other officers, her battalion commander, a female lieutenant colonel advised her, “Just wait six months, things will change.” Salinas took her advice seriously and over the years found that the operational style of the Marine Corps meant that either your assignment or the people involved would most assuredly change within any-given six-month period. Not only did she not resign from the Marine Corps at that point, but subsequently received

orders to attend AWS in Quantico, VA, a clear indication of the institution's confidence in her potential for greater responsibility in the Corps. Her career continued to periodically offer challenges where this strategy served and sustained her through her career all the way to major general. To this day, she continues to value this sage advice shared back in 1983.

The second significant challenge for Salinas was the unwritten policy of never appearing weak or showing physical pain. The male-dominated, warrior culture of the Marine Corps demands that Marines be strong and capable, and any weakness suggests inadequacy. In a culture that touts "No pain, no gain," health issues for women in particular, no matter how severe, invite other Marines to more quickly question their fitness and intestinal fortitude as Marines. Salinas recognized this and was committed to avoiding such scrutiny at all costs; she never wanted to be labeled as "weak" or to use health challenges as excuses for her performance. During the course of Salinas' career, she would go to great lengths to ensure that her pain or physical injuries never interfered with or inhibited the execution of her duties, or impaired her ability to lead effectively.

She did experience two significant physical challenges, which, for most of her career, she was able to manage so as not to interfere with her duties or raise suspicion. When she entered the Marine Corps, she had already undergone one knee surgery for a torn anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) from playing college basketball. Then in later years, as is not uncommon for career Marines, she began to experience back problems that became debilitating and would eventually threaten her career. Early in her career while attending OCS, Salinas' tenacity inspired her peers; although there were sightings of Salinas icing her knees after arduous and physically demanding events at OCS, she

always managed to successfully accomplish whatever task the course would demand of officer candidates. A fellow officer candidate recalled that in spite of her pain, she always seemed to be smiling and never complained. While she learned to cope with her chronic knee pain as her career progressed; in 1995 her ability to manage and conceal her deteriorating back condition was no longer feasible.

In what would prove to be one of the highest points of her career, Salinas was forced to come forth with her struggles. As a highly successful leader in the Marine Corps training community, she had been identified as the most qualified Marine officer to command the only women's recruit battalion in the Marine Corps, 4th Recruit Training Battalion at Parris Island, SC. The Marine Commandant (CMC) was making some fundamental changes to recruit training and he strongly endorsed her selection due to the confidence he had in her leadership and recruiting experience to accomplish his new objectives. However, when told of this, Salinas agonizingly declined the offer and immediately prepared to submit her request to retire. She knew that she could not meet the physical demands necessary, nor would she be able to set the example that was expected in that leadership position. When summoned to personally meet with and discuss her decision with the CMC, she explained her previously undisclosed physical limitations as the impetus for her decision to decline command.

But this was not the end of her career, as Salinas had assumed it would be. Instead, the CMC intended to exhaust all options; interceding on her behalf to receive assessments by medical and surgical experts, it was determined that surgery could resolve her back pain. This resulted in her taking command of the only women's recruit training battalion in the world wearing a concealed back brace only weeks into recovery from

major back surgery. Without the interest of the CMC and her proven track record in training and recruiting, Salinas may never have become the sixth woman Marine Corps general. Her dedication to Marine Corps values and culture paid off in the end, but not without “a stiff upper lip” all along the way.

Supports. Salinas offered two very significant factors that she believes facilitated her success in the Marine Corps; her Marine identity and family relationships. First and foremost, Salinas attributes her attainments to her affinity for the Marine culture and particularly, her ability to identify as a “Marine.” This was rooted in a foundational experience that helped her understand the Marine culture and recognize her desire to identify as a Marine over that of her gender or cultural affiliation. This began during boot camp when Salinas observed a female Hispanic gunnery sergeant whom she could identify with culturally and as someone whom she would like to model herself after. When she approached the woman for mentorship, Salinas was told, “first and foremost, you are a Marine, and nothing else—just a Marine.”

Although these were startling words for Salinas, it was a critical moment that profoundly shaped her career in the Marine Corps. In reflection, she said, “I always wanted to identify as a ‘good’ Marine regardless of any other factors.” She went on to explain that she was driven to make a difference in some way, each day of her career; however, she did so with much consideration and care, acknowledging that “the institution does not like to be embarrassed.” She added, “I loved being a Marine, and never wanted to bring embarrassment to the institution.”

Another profoundly supportive factor for Salinas’ career longevity was the support of her family. Salinas valued family and the foundational influence that her

parents' values had on how she led and navigated her career. She explained, "I truly believe that the qualities, the values that my family instilled in me were instrumental in long-term success because they were just really the very basic foundation to be a good person." Salinas believes that the character traits consistently promoted in her household were those culturally embodied in those core values of, "honor, courage, and commitment," that the Marine Corps espouses, and these inevitably bonded her with the institution.

Furthermore, Salinas reiterated that the direct support and advocacy of her mother and sister were important to her advancement in the Marine Corps. In many ways, her non-traditional family was her way of achieving a satisfactory work-life balance, and it promoted great personal satisfaction and peace of mind. Her mother and sister became "force multipliers," both to her career, as well as the Marine Corps, as an institution. They provided her with career encouragement, hosted official parties, and served in official capacities within the family support community. Salinas, along with her mother and sister, grew to truly feel and act as if the Marine Corps was their extended family.

Epilogue

As Salinas reflected on her career, she concluded with some powerful insights. First, she proclaimed her thankfulness for the foundation her mother established for her life,

She instilled in me that you have to work really hard, and you need to appreciate where you come from, and you need to just strive to return to society -- to do something good; [just because] you've earned the right to be alive, you don't have the right to be given anything. And you have to earn all that. So, I think that that foundation....allowed me the opportunity to see what I could become. So that's kind of where it started.

Second, she offered some counsel for those starting their Marine Corps careers; "Take

every day as it comes; take and look at the good in everything. It [The Marine Corps] is demanding by design, challenging; so keep faith in [your] self. Keep a sense of humor.”

In conclusion, Salinas shared that although she is proud of her accomplishments, she would not want her career to be measured by the ranks she achieved, but by the impact she made. “If I affected the life of one person, or made one person say that I am where I am today because of Angie Salinas.....that would be a great legacy. I would be happy for making one person’s life better.”

Major General Tracy (Mork) Garrett, USMCR, Ret.

Major General (MajGen) Tracy (Mork) Garrett retired in 2014 as a major general (2-star), the highest rank attained by a woman in the Marine Corps Reserve. She spent the first three years on active duty and the remainder in the Reserve in a career that spanned 36 years, from 1978-2014 (See Appendix J). Garrett remains the only woman Marine Corps general commissioned through the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) program. As a colonel, she was mobilized to Taqaddum, Iraq in 2004 in support of operation Iraqi Freedom, the only combat deployment of her career. Three years later, she became the first woman Marine Reservist to be promoted to brigadier general, and in 2010 to major general. Regarding her personal life, she is the second of three women general officers who had children while on active duty. Garrett offers some unique insights about what she believes contributed to her success in the Marine Corps, particularly in the Reserve.

Her Story

I first met Garrett in her capacity as the Inspector General of the Marine Corps when I was deployed to Al Asad, Iraq, in 2008. In a brief stop aboard our base, she reached out to women Marines, inviting us to the chow hall for a roundtable discussion. Since that time, we have maintained contact and in 2011 we met again briefly at Camp Pendleton, CA where we discussed my own plans for retirement. Of all the things we talked about, the most fascinating topic centered on factors that contributed to women becoming Marines. At the conclusion of our time together, Garrett suggested that a study of the women general officers of the Marine Corps might be valuable. Not only the impetus for my study, she has continued to support and encourage me in pursuing this

research—particularly having assisted me with unprecedented access to the rest of the women Marine Corps generals.

Garrett began by explaining that her accomplishments can be attributed to the influence of, and modeling by, her parents who were successful, college educated, and committed to family, marriage, and country. She was the oldest of four children, her father being a combat veteran of the Korean and Vietnam Wars with 20 years in the Marine Corps as a combat engineer officer. He retired from the Corps when Garrett was 16 years of age, and subsequently settled the family in Kent, Washington, a suburb of Seattle. Moving around the country frequently in her young life, Garrett developed a keen ability to adapt to new environments, cultures, and people. Nevertheless, Garrett credits her mother for ensuring some semblance of normalcy and stability for the family amidst the years of continual change so prevalent in the military.

In spite of the transience that characterized her youth, or possibly because of it, Garrett developed into a committed, driven, and confident young woman. Attending many schools across the country, she was a high achiever in high school and loved learning, noting that “class work was of utmost importance to me and I wanted to be a top student.” In addition to her academic talents, Garrett also discovered her propensity to lead at a young age, both in academic and extracurricular settings, specifically developing her sense of independence and self-sufficiency along the way.

One important way this manifested itself was through the Girl Scouts. Garrett said, “I was active in scouting from the second grade on—even through high school. It was a wonderful ‘constant’ through all of the moving and reassignments that my family went through over the years.” In hindsight, she credits her involvement in the scouting

program for encouraging her independence, self-sufficiency and practical aptitude in the functional skills they promoted. Specifically, she said, “I liked camping. I liked the kind of things where you have to get organized.” Her continued involvement in the Girls Scouts has become a significant part of her commitments since her retirement from the Marine Corps. She now recognizes that the leadership development and skills she learned through scouting helped prepare her for success in the Marine Corps. Beyond scouting, Garrett also took advantage of other opportunities to develop as a leader. Her father encouraged her to join her high school’s Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC), in part because he was the Instructor and that it would offer different leadership challenges; she joined.

Garrett’s affinity for learning and leadership found her yearning for something after high school. She recalled,

So I was a high school kid and I thought it would be great fun to go to college as a goal, at 16. And I didn’t have any money and my parents thought it would be a great idea for me to live at home and go to community college. And I was ready to leapfrog that and I wanted to go off to school. So my dad was a Marine, and I was aware that there was such a thing as ROTC [Reserve Officer Training Corps] scholarships and it was appealing to me.

There were some very appealing aspects of the “Marine-option” NROTC scholarship for Garrett; she liked the flexibility in choosing the university and her academic major, as well as the promise of being debt-free after college. Garrett applied for and was awarded a Marine-option, four-year NROTC scholarship in 1974 to attend the University of Washington, a location that was only 30 miles from her family’s home, which offered her some flexible living alternatives.

While in college, Garrett pursued a variety of leadership opportunities that she describes as “influencing the rest of her life as a woman and a leader.” In NROTC, she

voluntarily joined the unit's Rifle Team and held a variety of midshipmen leadership positions throughout her four years. In addition to her affiliation with the NROTC Unit, she also joined and held leadership positions in the Kappa Delta sorority, capitalizing on additional opportunities to lead an organization. The most beneficial achievement of college was demonstrating that she was able to successfully manage multiple time-intensive commitments simultaneously, including gainful employment. Garrett reflected,

My success was integrating various aspects of my life that were disparate. So certainly, a west coast college in the 70's is a liberal environment, not much inclined to value ROTC students and their presence on campus, but that didn't slow me down. I worked on campus to try to support myself in that way. Probably what happened in college was [that I practiced] integration ... trying to be successful in each of those undertakings, all of them challenging.

In 1978, her hard work culminated in her graduating and earning a degree in English Literature. Subsequently, she was commissioned and promoted to second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps, marrying her college boyfriend, who knew little about the military. Garrett, though satisfied to have the opportunity to become a Marine Corps officer, never intended to make it a career, much less envisioned becoming a general. She approached her Marine Corps service as a good beginning position that would prepare her for increased options on the outside after completing her four-year service contract obligation.

Garrett began her career, as all Marine Corps officers do, at The Basic School (TBS), in Quantico, VA. Her TBS cohort was the first to be offered the military occupational specialty (MOS) of logistics, available to both men and women. She explained,

Around 1978, the assignment spectrum was opened up to women and there was a move to create the logistics occupational specialty. One of the instructors at The Basic School said that I should be a logistician, offering, 'You seem to be suited

to it.' I hadn't thought of it, and of course, nobody was one; so there was no way to know what that really meant. I was game. I wasn't going to have to do it forever.

She believes that becoming a logistics officer in the Marine Corps afforded her significant opportunities and advantages for advancement in the Marine Corps, including promises of assignment flexibility as well as abundant command opportunities.

After completing the logistics officer course in Albany, Georgia, Garrett was joined by her husband at her first duty station at Camp Pendleton, CA where she would serve almost two years with Headquarters Battalion, 1st Marine Division. Here, she encountered challenges when unexpectedly she became pregnant, while her husband was also pursuing his career. The couple had originally anticipated starting a family after Garrett had satisfied her military obligation; however, becoming a mother as a Marine compelled her to revisit her decision to serve in the Marine Corps. After discovering opportunities in the Reserve, she resigned from active duty, transitioned to the Reserve, and moved back home to Seattle, WA where she could raise their child.

During Garrett's transition from active duty to Reserve service in 1981, she discovered that 4th Landing Support Battalion (4th LSB) in Seattle was an ideal logistics organization that offered highly respected command and coveted staff opportunities. Within months of transitioning to the Reserve, she began serving in significant, high profile officer billets within 4th LSB, eventually commanding at all the intermediate levels, and in 1999 as lieutenant colonel, she attained the coveted position of battalion commander.

Garrett reflected on her battalion commander assignment,

As you know, it's [being in command] a fairly uncommon assignment for women in the Marine Corps and I was thankful. But I worked hard. There was a little bit

of waiting in line for that too; but I didn't hold that against the Marine Corps. It didn't slow me down. I didn't say 'oh, jeez this is taking me too long; I guess I will wander away.' No, I am gonna do that. Plenty of people told me that I couldn't, which was crap. I loved being a battalion commander.

Moreover, while she was in command, the battalion was recognized as the best within 4th Force Service Support Group and was awarded for their impeccable safety record.

Achieving many of the significant career milestones for Marine Corps officers like that of commanding a battalion, Garrett was able to progress, making rank and gaining MOS credibility by serving in organizations across the Marine Corps in both the Reserve and active components. More remarkably, she was able to accomplish all of this while also creating a loving and nurturing environment for her two sons, Ola and Peder.

Garrett placed importance on being a well-rounded officer, and as a result, sought a wide spectrum of experiences in important jobs that would help her expand her knowledge and talents beyond the logistics units. Garrett explained, "So one of the nice things about the Reserve program is that you have a lot of flexibility in the work that you take on." This further distinguished her from her peers and proved beneficial for her advancement over the long term.

Garrett's breadth of knowledge of the institution, specifically regarding manpower, funding and budgeting, and the reserve establishment, along with her proficiency as a logistician made her an indispensable asset of the Marine Corps. She explained, "I've just been a student of logistics and of leadership my whole career and I think that has satisfied the institution [and] prepared [me] for future assignments. And that is really what the Marine Corps wants." After positions of command and a combat deployment, Garrett was promoted to brigadier general in 2007, where she was assigned

as the first woman Inspector General of the Marine Corps. Three years later, she was promoted to major general.

Discussion

Garrett's success in the Marine Corps is due in large part to her response to the obstacles that faced active duty mothers pertaining to insufficient accommodations for child care in the early 1980s. Although these challenges derailed many women's careers, Garrett looked for a way to continue her service while also raising a family. She discovered that the Marine Corps Reserve would serve as her "lifeline," helping to overcome the dilemma of having to choose between career and family by offering flexibility in the "how" and "when" of her service. Furthermore, Garrett explained the importance that achieving work-life balance and identifying as a Marine played in being able to serve as a Marine for 36 years.

Challenges. As a mother in the early 1980s, Garrett faced significant challenges to being an active duty Marine that proved both frustrating and seemingly irreconcilable. First, as discussed in Chapter One, in spite of the change in policy in the mid-1970s that no longer automatically discharged pregnant women Marines from the service, Garrett, like other pregnant Marines, was required to submit a written request to stay on active duty. She said, "I found it [submitting a request] to be offensive; I mean, why should I have to apply? What's wrong with me...Nothing!" Although she complied, she felt this unfair, in that the institution was seemingly treating pregnancy as a liability to military service.

Second, Garrett found that even though the laws and regulations permitted active duty mothers to continue to serve, critical base support services such as child care

centers, did not accommodate her family's needs. At the time of the birth of her son in 1981, Garrett's husband was expecting to return to full time work as a merchant seaman, requiring him to be absent from the household, working aboard ship for months at a time. In order for Garrett to meet her professional obligations, she would have to rely on childcare for extended hours. However, the Marine Corps day care center hours were untenable, as they proved insufficient for extended and non-routine work and physical fitness schedules. Garrett explained,

So as a working Mom, I was at a loss to figure out what I was going to do with our baby. The day care center didn't open until 10 and it closed at 6 and was closed on Mondays, this kind of goofy stuff, when I was working 6 1/2 days a week 10 to 12 hours a day. So I was kind of confronted with becoming a mother and trying to integrate being a mom and being a Marine... I couldn't find a way for that.

Given that off-base childcare alternatives for junior officers was financially prohibitive, Garrett found herself in an impossible situation. While she loved the Marine Corps, being the only parent at home created insurmountable obstacles to her staying on active duty.

Faced with an agonizing decision, Garrett fortunately discovered a way to be both a mother and a Marine—the Reserve, which offered choice and flexibility in determining how and when she served. By accepting a commission in the Reserve upon leaving active duty, Garrett continued to serve her country as a Marine and was also able to attend to mothering her new child, something she believed to be a very satisfying solution to an otherwise formidable set of problems.

Supports. There were two important factors that supported Garrett's success in the Marine Corps—achieving work-life balance and her fidelity to her Marine identity. As a Marine mother, Garrett encountered critical institutional obstacles while on active

duty, and was forced to develop a strategy in order to balance her work and personal life. To do so, she chose to transfer to the Reserves, recognizing that this would change and perhaps limit her career trajectory. Even serving in the Reserves, however, required her to find ways to care for her child since her husband also worked and this led to her second strategy of looking outside of the Marines for support. Thus, in 1981, after their first son was born, Garrett and her husband relocated to Seattle, WA in order to be close to family, as well as potentially local Reserve opportunities. She explained,

I came home to Seattle, which is where my family lived, and there was a reserve unit in the area, which was a perfect match for me. The unit that was closest to me was a Landing Support unit, which was *logisticians' heaven*. It was an odd circumstance, because if it had been an infantry battalion or a flying squadron, maybe that would not have been an opportunity [for logistics] and [my] story would have been different.

Garrett said, “In the end, it [the Marine Corps Reserve] was kind of a lifeline for me because I did like being a Marine.” With the Reserve as “her lifeline,” positive career opportunities became available to Garrett. These, plus her family’s support promoted her success as a Marine mother, while still enabling her to actively seek frequent reserve opportunities and hold significant billets within her unit, 4th Landing Support Battalion (4th LSB). Garrett affirms, “The work-life balance that being a reservist afforded me while building a meaningful career was really important.” Relocating to Seattle led to Garrett commanding at every level within 4th LSB, culminating in command of the battalion. Her legacy of proven outstanding performance at 4th LSB led to many other career broadening and educational opportunities which contributed to her professional advancement and provided options for her to best fulfill her priorities as a mother.

Second, Garrett attributes identifying as a “Marine” as a significant factor for her success in the Marine Corps. However, identifying as a “Marine” may have been more

challenging than Garrett indicates due to significant personal and relational identities to which she was entitled: as a woman, wife, mother, logistics officer, and reservist. It is helpful to examine the factors in Garrett's life that allowed the "Marine" identity to prevail over all other identities to which she lay claim.

The depth that Garrett's Marine identity is ingrained is evident by what she referred to as her "Marine-ness." The manifestation of her identity started when she was young. As explained previously, she was born and raised in a career Marine family, exposed to the culture through living in a variety of Marine Corps and other service communities, across the country, including Hawaii, until she was 16 years old. She managed to develop resilience and an ability to adapt quickly as a result of her military upbringing.

Between her firsthand experiences as a child in a Marine Corps family, participation in JROTC in high school, and her NROTC preparation in college for Marine Corps service, her identity relative to being associated with or becoming a Marine was certainly ingrained for over 21 years. If this was not compelling enough to privilege the Marine identity, the Marine Corps also performed its own enculturation of its officers in Officer Candidate School (OCS) and The Basic School (TBS) where she received more cultural indoctrination, known for significantly compelling the Marine identity.

Although Garrett's professional identity as a Marine was unwavering, there were other identities that could have been privileged from having become a wife and a mother early in her career. Garrett had not been married long before becoming a mother; as a matter of fact, she spoke almost nothing about her marriage or her experience of being a wife. According to her, it was becoming pregnant when she experienced her first real

identity crisis, staring “motherhood” in the face. For some, identity as “mother” may have gone unrivalled, but as the case has been made, Garrett was first and foremost a Marine to the core. She would figure out a way to do both. She remembered,

the fact of becoming a Mom pushed me out of the Marine Corps or out of active duty; but I loved being a Marine, so oddly, and I think I was kind of pathetic about it, but geez, I loved being a Marine.

She was motivated to somehow reconcile her identity as a Marine and as a mother. Based on the strength of her Marine identity and commitment to being a good mother, Garrett discovered a path that allowed her to continue being a Marine and raise her son.

As for her identity as a woman, she seemed to attempt to downplay or avoid drawing attention to her gender. Although some male Marines did take issue with her gender, she did not let their attitude deter her from continuing to serve in the Marine Corps. Two factors may account for Garrett’s ability to stay the course, persevere, and make great accomplishments as a woman in a sometimes toxic environment, when other women could not. First, her life-long exposure to, comfort and familiarity with the Marine Corps and its culture may have shaped her behaviors and attitude, downplaying her gender and emphasizing teamwork.

Second, serving as a logistics officer, a gender integrated field, inherently little controversy arose regarding her gender. As a one of the founding officers in the logistics community, Garrett was fortunate to be in a position to shape a more gender-neutral culture of the community. She was able to be a “Marine” in this specialty, rather than having to *defend against* being a woman, as was often the case in the Marine Corps, at large. In reflecting upon her professional selection as a logistics officer, she said, “So, I didn’t get it that there was anything like a “boy track” or a “girl track,” there was a

Marine track.” Regardless of her competing personal identities, it was ultimately the depth of her Marine identity that compelled her to continue her Marine Corps career in the Reserve. Garrett, very comfortable in the Marine Corps environment, acknowledged that transitioning to the reserve component early in her career made it possible for her to embody her identities as a woman, mother, and wife.

Epilogue

A humble and self-less Marine, Garrett reflected on her career:

I didn't have any aspiration to be a general. I just wanted to be a good Marine, and I was just really lucky that there were opportunities available to me where I could work hard and do well. You know I worked with good people, I had good assignments, and I had a supportive family. I was healthy. There are a lot of things that eat away at your ability to do a good job that are not always apparent. So I feel really lucky, really lucky.

Brigadier General Marcela J. (Velasco) Monahan, USMCR, Ret.

Brigadier General (BGen) Marcela J. (Velasco) Monahan was the eighth woman Marine promoted to brigadier general and the second from the Marine Corps Reserve. She served for 30 years, from 1984-2014, with her first six years on active duty and the remainder in the reserve component (See Appendix K). Monahan and her active duty husband, John, have eight children, one boy and seven girls, born between 1990 and 2004, the year her husband retired. As the third Marine Corps general to both marry a Marine and have children, she offered valuable insight into the success she achieved as an active and reserve Marine officer in logistics and as a Marine Corps Air/Ground Task Force MAGTF) officer, all the while excelling as a wife and dedicated mother to eight children.

Her Story

Today Marcela Monahan is a highly successful businesswoman in Arlington, Virginia, serving as the Regional director for Latin America for AM General, LLC, an international company that designs and manufactures commercial and military vehicles. At our first meeting she emerged from her office and greeted me with a steady gaze and a firm handshake. As she offered me a beverage and invited me in to have a seat, I realized that this woman was the antithesis of *retired*, appearing youthful, slender, and fit. She exuded confidence, with a “get-down-to-business” attitude while also seeming excited to share insights from her career and family. Although I had only asked for two hours of her time, we took few breaks and skipped lunch, as she revealed much thought and consideration through the detailed stories and experiences that she believed contributed to

her success. Her enthusiasm was contagious and I was stunned that six hours had passed when we finished.

Monahan began by explaining the significance of her Hispanic heritage. The second of three sisters, she is a first-generation American, born in Salt Lake City, Utah to Chilean parents. Friends of the family and employment in the Phillip 66 copper mines drew her parents and older sister to Utah, but this quickly lost its allure when their close friends moved away. At about the time Marcela was born, her father found new, more interesting employment as a service director with General Motors' (GM) overseas division. Three months after her birth, the family moved to New York for his first assignment with GM. Throughout her childhood she traveled the hemispheres as her father took positions in Colombia, El Salvador, Panama, Spain, England, and the Philippines. Eventually her parents would return for a short time to Chile. Having Chilean parents and frequently living in Spanish speaking countries, she was raised as a native Spanish speaker and remains fluent today. Needless to say, her childhood provided amazing multi-cultural experiences, providing a valuable foundation for her future success.

After attending two years at Schiller College in Spain, Monahan returned to the United States permanently, transferring to California State University at Chico (Chico State), where she joined her older sister who was preparing to graduate. During her junior year at Chico State, she seized on a chance opportunity to talk with two Marine recruiters on campus with whom she inquired about needs of the Marine Corps and how she could serve. She reminisced:

I was riding my bicycle through campus, and lo and behold, there was the Marine gunny [gunnery sergeant] and the captain. And so I stopped to talk to them. And

the captain was talking to somebody else at the time, and I stopped to talk to the gunny. And remember, I didn't even know the left from right, or gunny or captain. Not a clue.

Monahan had long been intrigued by the mystique of Marines from her time overseas, but knew almost nothing about the organization. After her conversation with these recruiters, Monahan headed immediately to the campus recruiting office to pick up an application for Marine officer training.

That evening Monahan tenaciously gathered the required information to complete her application for the summer platoon leaders course (PLC), which necessitated contacting her parents in Chile. The next morning as she made her way to the Marine recruiting office to submit her application, she decided to drop in on the Navy recruiters to satisfy her curiosity about *their* opportunities. She was unimpressed, however, and left there to go directly to the Marines where they gladly took her application, delighted at the prospects of signing “a two-fer,” both a woman and a Hispanic! Fascinated with the Marines, Monahan was determined to take advantage of the summer training.

A few months later, Monahan received a call from the recruiting office. She remembered the recruiter saying,

The good news is we definitely want you in the program. The bad news is there's only one slot left [for women] for this year for PLC. And there's already two females that have long since applied, been accepted, and done their PFT [physical fitness test].

Unwilling to accept any seemingly needless delay, “I just simply said ‘No. I'm going *this* year.’ Waiting for their response, she said again, ‘No, no. I'm serious. I'm *going* this year.’”

Days later, making an impromptu visit to the campus recruiting office, she happened to arrive during a rare visit by the colonel in charge of Officer Selection

Officers. Because she was such an enticing officer candidate for the Marines, the colonel asked her, "Why do you want to be a U.S. Marine?" She quickly responded,

Even though I haven't been in the States very much, I see what being an American is, and I think I need to pay back. It's as simple as that. And it's just -- the Marines are the best. I mean, overseas you see what the Marine Corps is. The ethos, I mean; you see how they're revered. There's something there; and that's what I want to do.

The following day the Marines called and notified her that she had been allocated a spot in summer PLC. She was enormously satisfied by the news, but had no firm plans as to where it might lead. She remembered,

I was not thinking about a career, but I just wanted to go to OCS [officer candidate school or platoon leader's course] to see how high I could jump and how far I could run; and I thought this was a great summer thing to do... and they paid me on top of it. Not that I didn't have an intention to go through with it or anything. It was so much discovery learning, I don't think that I truly understood what was going on.

After completing ten weeks at PLC, Monahan was determined, now more than ever, to become a Marine Corps officer as soon as she graduated from college.

After her sister graduated from Chico State that spring, Monahan enrolled as a senior at San Francisco State in order to be near her parents who had returned to the U.S., and to save money by living with them. Despite changing schools three times and being only 20 years of age, she graduated within four years in 1984, with a bachelor's degree in business administration and international finance. Simultaneously, she was commissioned in the Marine Corps, promoted to second lieutenant, and reported to Quantico, VA for initial officer instruction at The Basic School (TBS).

Because of her lived cultural experiences and near-perfect proficiency in Spanish and French, her course instructors encouraged Monahan to pursue the intelligence field for her military occupational specialty (MOS). Unfortunately, due to legal restrictions

regarding foreign born parents, she was determined ineligible. Ultimately, she was assigned her second choice, as a logistics officer, an assignment that satisfied her. In January of 1986, after graduating from the logistics course, Monahan arrived at 1st Landing Support Battalion (1st LSB) at Camp Pendleton, CA, becoming the first woman officer in the Marine Corps to be assigned to any of the three Marine Corps Landing Support Battalions.

In communicating with her superiors prior to her arrival, she sensed confusion and consternation about her orders, as women officers had never before been assigned there. She began assuming organizational roles and assignments that initially appeared to make the battalion leadership uncomfortable. Monahan, quickly and without debate, executed the functions and duties normally expected of a young Marine officer, some of which had previously been perceived as barriers to effectively integrating women. Examples included everything from determining where she would sleep during field exercises to how she would inspect male birthing areas.

Monahan managed the unit leaders' uncertainty and sometimes resistance relative to integrating women into the unit through demonstrating her professional competence and taking decisive action. By so doing, she established relationships of trust and a reputation for reliability and decisiveness that helped to win over the unit's most apprehensive male officers and convinced others of her value to the organization. Due to her superlative performance at 1st LSB, she was selected for, and accepted augmentation into the regular component and received orders to serve as a commander of women Marine recruits in 4th Recruit Training Battalion at Parris Island, SC.

While serving at Parris Island, then 1st Lieutenant Velasco, met Captain John Monahan, a fellow company commander, and they began dating. Eight months later, Velasco would also be promoted to captain and the two married in June. Things would move quickly for the two Captains Monahan. Fourteen months after they married, Monahan resigned from the Marine Corps in her last month of pregnancy with her first child and was sworn into the individual ready reserve (IRR) to satisfy the remainder of her service commitment. The following month, after relocating to Quantico, VA where her husband was assigned to a year-long school, she gave birth to their first daughter.

Monahan's opportunity to enjoy her new roles as a mother and spouse was short-lived. By the time their child, Bridget, was just three months old, she was involuntarily recalled from the IRR to Camp Pendleton, CA to serve on active duty in support of Desert Shield/Desert Storm. Fortunately for Monahan, as she explained, "I happened to have my parents who lived right outside of Pendleton [Oceanside]. So, to me, it was an immediate decision. I didn't have to think about it." Despite never having had her Reserve obligation explained to her, she was ready to respond to the nation's call. Monahan and her infant daughter packed up, leaving her husband to attend to his studies, and reported for duty in January 1991. A month into her assignment, she gladly extended her orders to support unit redeployments and to garner real-world logistics experience while being of service to her country in its time of need. Completing four months of duty, she and her baby then redeployed back to Quantico, VA.

However, within two months, Monahan returned with her family to Camp Pendleton, this time accompanying her husband to his next assignment. Monahan's recent affiliation with the reserve establishment at Camp Pendleton prompted her to join

the Selective Marine Corps Reserve (SMCR), serving as a logistics officer with 1st Medical Battalion, Camp Pendleton, CA. It was there, she said, that she discovered more about the role of the Reserve and how it functioned, and began considering the feasibility of continuing to serve. She noted, “It wasn't a set of decisions or concerted effort to plan ahead. No strategy. It was just whatever the Marine Corps needed.” Likewise, she also admitted having had no strategy for determining the size of their family, elaborating:

So [we were] Latin American Catholic and Irish Catholic deciding before we got married we'd probably have five – eight, it's in the realm, you know? I don't know what's going to happen. I know that I don't want to have them in daycare all the time.

Simply, she said that between her family and serving in the Reserve, she did whatever was required to keep things moving forward.

Professionally, Monahan's Reserve Qualification Summary (RQS) [resume] substantiates exceptional breadth of knowledge within the Marine Corps, a goal of those who intend to pursue a career in the Marine Corps. Explaining her geographical flexibility, she said; “it [RQS] looks like I was willing to travel. Well, no. I've always found the nearest place [reserve billet] where my husband was stationed. So I had that variety [locations varied due to husband's career path].”

Not only did Monahan serve in a variety of locations, but also in a variety of professional capacities that included logistics, instructing, project management, transportation, and inspector-instructor (I&I) duty. As a colonel in 2009, she seized the opportunity to deploy for a year as the Engineering officer (G-7) on the II Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward) (II MEF (Fwd)) staff, in Al Asad, Iraq. Upon selection for the position, she was quick to ensure her personal and professional readiness. In her absence, her husband took the helm of the household and the seven children who were

still at home. She describes this assignment, her only combat deployment, as the most satisfying of her career.

Discussion

Becoming a woman Marine general is certainly an extraordinary achievement, but even more so in light of the choices Monahan made regarding marriage and family. Her 30-year Marine Corps career seems implausible in light of having mothered eight children while married to an active duty Marine infantry officer who served until retiring at 20 years. Balancing work and family was certainly challenging, but Monahan seemed energized by what she prefers to call a perpetual “work-life imbalance.” This outlook provides valuable insight about her broader success in the Marine Corps.

Additionally, in recounting her career, she revealed two particularly supportive factors that, in part, contributed to her success in the Marine Corps. First was her ability to reconcile her identity as a Marine with the many other roles and identities to which she affiliated and second was her straightforward approach to both personal and professional tasks. She believes that getting the fundamentals right is the foundation for successful outcomes and insists that clarity in thought and action is the result of keeping things simple. Her mantra is “brilliance in the basics.”

Challenges. Monahan’s decisions to marry a Marine and to have children introduced what many would consider insurmountable challenges to achieving an acceptable level of work-life balance in the Marine Corps. Giving birth to eight children in 14 years would likely have derailed most women Marines’ careers. So, how was Monahan able to achieve work-life balance?

Monahan actually dismissed the idea by suggesting that the notion of *balance* was a myth and not even possible. Instead, she *was* driven by a desire to be of service and make a difference, both at home and at work, either creating opportunities to do so or dealing with those that arose. This enabled her to feel *comfortable with the imbalance*, and in spite of it, she managed to attain extraordinary outcomes in both her family and career.

Monahan noted that she was never a planner per se, but someone who “seizes the moment,” which included ignoring barriers when necessary. She compared her approach to the Marine Corps’ Rapid Response Planning Process, commonly known to Marines as “R2P2.” This decision style of recognizing a need, requirement, or opportunity, making a quick decision based on the information available, and taking swift action, fit her well, creating a sense of empowerment and confidence. She attributes this method with her ability to move ahead in an often challenging and unpredictable profession like the military, particularly the Reserves, while also parenting a large family.

An early example of this was when Monahan faced unexpected military orders in support of the first Gulf War just after becoming a mother. Due to her reserve obligation, she was subject to a massive involuntary recall of the military, particularly as an officer who had just resigned with obligated service. While many servicewomen under these circumstances may have requested exemption, Monahan remembers,

To me, it wasn't even a thought. It was ‘Nope. This is what we need to do. We'll figure it out, and it's because this is what the Marine Corps needs. And, yes, my family needs, too, but we're okay.’ John was at school, and other than missing each other, we were fine. I was available and in good shape.

Another example occurred in anticipating their move to Okinawa with six children and being pregnant, Monahan knew that on-base housing for families their size

was very limited, but that it would be much easier for the family if they lived aboard base. To that end, Monahan urged her husband to fly to Okinawa to check in and get the family's name on the waiting list before the others. Through quick assessment of the need and making a speedy decision, the Monahan's were able to alleviate undue financial and logistical hardship by not having to live outside the base and on the local economy. The effort of this couple led to a more conducive environment for the family at large, while working in Okinawa.

Although Monahan had not originally planned for a career in the Reserves after she resigned, she became adept at creating exceptionally beneficial opportunities within it. She explained that, "as a reservist we don't get *assigned*. We *look* for jobs." As long as she was serving the needs of the Corps and could help move the task forward, she was content to continue to serve; allowing that she did not always have to be in command or in charge as long as she felt she was making a difference.

Monahan established a broad Reserve network that facilitated access to information and ideas about potential opportunities. She regularly approached organizations to determine their needs and see what she could do to help, making recommendations as she saw fit. She reflected, "Now that I look back I think I did form opportunities; but at the time I just thought it was pure luck or something." According to Monahan, her approach to decision making, was certainly a short-term strategy and purely a matter of navigating life, not intended to overcome problems or achieve balance. Simply put, Monahan prioritized being of service and influencing outcomes, both of which might seem counterintuitive to the traditional notions of work-life balance, at least in the normative discourse related to women and their careers.

Supports. Monahan’s decision to end her active duty career was born of dedication to her family; her decision to return to reserve duty was born of dedication to the Marine Corps. Monahan shared her pride in being of service to her country, especially as a Marine, attributing her success to privileging her identity as “Marine.” Her life choices offered her still more personal and meaningful identities as a woman, mother, wife, Hispanic, logistics officer, and reservist. However, from the outset of the interview she made it clear; “I do not specifically advocate nor serve as an expert on *women* in the Marine Corps. I can only speak for being a Marine.” As further evidence of the power of her “Marine” identity, she explained that even striving to be a “good reservist” was not her goal nor was it enough for her. She wanted to make a difference and contribute while serving the Marine Corps, in spite of her “part time” status as a reservist.

Offering further insight into her Marine identity, Monahan explained that despite being a mother of eight children ranging from 5 to 19 years old, in 2009, her one-year deployment to Iraq was *the most* satisfying time of her career. Serving during time of war and the loyalty and comradery she cultivated with her fellow Marines during that tour brought her the greatest satisfaction of all. With the help of a very supportive, loving, and capable husband, the satisfaction she experienced indicated how she was able to ultimately privilege her Marine identity over all others.

In addition to privileging her “Marine” identity, she credited a supportive strategy she called “brilliance in the basics” for successfully navigating the unpredictability and discontinuity typical of Reserve careers. She expounded,

Don’t get fancy, get the basics right; don’t complicate things before you have the basic foundation for what you are doing. “I am very particular about doing things

right. I don't even want to talk about higher levels of anything if you haven't done something right in the first place. You have to have a good basis.

She explained this strategy was significant because professional reputations in the Reserves are based primarily on effectiveness rather than technical credibility.

Monahan accomplished this through simple communication and basic thinking and questioning, bridging communication gaps that she routinely identified between and within organizations. She explained, "I think I knew how to listen to what was important: what are the basic things to be done and what is the most effective way in the current environment to do it." Furthermore, she strove to clearly communicate across levels of military hierarchy by using few, carefully chosen words in order to ensure understanding, or as she put it, "You have to be direct." She attributes this "brilliance in the basics" strategy to making her a more effective leader and ultimately to her success in the Marine Corps.

Epilogue

Although the Marine staff at Chico State University claim Monahan as *their* recruiting success, Monahan admits she was already sold on the Marines when she met them. She recalled her first *true* experience of the Marine Corps when she was in high school while living in England, sharing;

I remember going to the Royal Albert Hall [performance center in London] and the Marines were doing a concert, The President's Own [world-renowned Marine Corps band]. [Voice trembling and seeming to feel emotional] And I remember distinctly going up to that Gunny [gunnery sergeant, band master] and saying [clearing her throat so she can speak] 'This is what I'm going to do.' And he says 'Why?' And as you know, it's the pride, and everything. I just knew it. But I didn't even really know what Marines were. I just remember that. I remember the uniform, I remember the pride. And that stuck with me.

Brigadier General Loretta (Lori) E. Reynolds, USMC

Brigadier General (BGen) Lori Reynolds is the only active duty woman general currently serving in the Marine Corps. She rose to that rank in 2011, becoming the ninth woman Marine to do so. She has achieved some significant milestones for women in the Marine Corps over her 30 years of service. She was the first female Marine commissioned out of the U.S. Naval Academy (USNA) to achieve the rank of general, having graduated from there in 1986. She was the first woman Marine to command battle space in a combat zone with I Marine Expeditionary Force-Forward Headquarters Group (I MHG-Fwd) in Helmand Province, Afghanistan in 2010. Subsequently she also became the first woman to assume command of Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD), Parris Island, SC. Finally, in 2015, she assumed command of U.S. Marine Forces Cyberspace Command (MARFORCYBER) where she now serves. Reynolds, both humbled by her success and incredulous at what she has achieved, offered insights on factors she believes contributed to her becoming a general in the Marine Corps.

Her Story

Reynolds enthusiastically accepted my request for an interview, inviting me to meet at her office in the Pentagon. This however, was not my first exposure to Reynolds. Although we had never worked directly together, our careers were concurrent, we had some mutual colleagues and served simultaneously aboard some of the same bases. Though it had been a while, I recognized her immediately as she came out of her office. Standing about six feet tall, with an athletic build and short hair, Reynolds exuded a “no-nonsense” demeanor. After getting reacquainted, she suggested conducting the interview in the cafeteria down the corridor. It wasn’t long before we realized that the Pentagon

was not going to suit our needs so, she graciously invited me to come to her house at a later date. A few days later, she picked me up from my hotel on her way home from work, we stopped for take-out Chinese food and headed to her residence. Although she conducted herself with the directness and confidence one would expect of a Marine commander, it was clear throughout the two-hour interview that she had thoughtfully considered the questions I had sent ahead. She recounted her journey in the Marine Corps with deep personal insight, interspersed with a subtle, and admittedly, dry sense of humor.

She began by describing her family and childhood. Born and raised in Baltimore, Maryland, Reynolds is the youngest of five girls, the granddaughter of a retired Vietnam Marine and daughter of a steelworker who passed away when she was in college. Although Reynolds' grandfather was a Marine, she says that his service was not the most significant impetus for her career.

For all 12 years of her primary education Reynolds was required to wear uniforms while attending Catholic schools. She laughed as she recalled that she has *never* not worn a uniform. In fact, in her middle and high school years, she was in *two* uniforms, one for school and one for sports, as she played soccer, softball and basketball. While in high school, she became intrigued by the idea of attending the USNA. Living close to USNA, she attracted the attention of the women's basketball coaches there, who sought to recruit her for their program, eventually offering an appointment, which she accepted.

In 1982, Reynolds became a member of the seventh integrated class at the Naval Academy which had begun admitting women in 1976 due to the passage of P.L. 94-106 (See Appendix O), the law that opened USNA to women. The women of the early

integrated classes faced significant cultural challenges as the Academy struggled to incorporate them into the institution. In spite of the blatant intimidation and bias toward women at that time, Reynolds managed not only to survive, but to handle the stress with composure and calm. The courage and mental stamina Reynolds developed as a result of overcoming the challenging early days for women at the Academy gave her confidence to seriously consider joining the Marine Corps upon graduation from the USNA, an opportunity only offered to 25% of each Academy class.

She admitted that when she entered the USNA, she had no understanding of the differences between the Marine Corps and the Navy. However, during her plebe year she immediately noticed the contrast between the Navy and the Marine officers at the USNA. She recalled how the Marines appeared crisp, professional, and held themselves to higher standards, as well as valuing fitness. Ultimately, she saw the Marine Corps as a perfect fit for her and was commissioned as a Marine Corps second lieutenant in 1986.

Reynolds was the first of the woman Marine generals I interviewed to explicitly identify the impact and importance of women Marines being physically fit. This may be attributed to progressive gender equality efforts that took place within the military during her tenure. For example, Reynolds was recruited to play competitive women's basketball at the Naval Academy; a situation made possible because of the implementation of Title IX [Education Amendments of 1972] only ten years earlier. Aside from her personal passion for competitive sports, Reynolds' focus on fitness may have stemmed from the emphasis that the services, particularly the Marine Corps, had begun to place on increased physical requirements and expectations for women due to the expansion of unprecedented opportunities for them.

Reynolds recalls feeling challenged by the physical rigors she faced as she began her Marine Corps journey at The Basic School (TBS) in Quantico, VA, her first taste of the Marine Corps after leaving USNA. She shared, “You have to be able to compete physically early on. I can hike, and I can keep up on unit runs. That matters a great deal early on [in a career].” Reynolds concluded that, “The emphasis on fitness keeps you honest [gains you credibility].” She offered that for her, being physically fit and often exceeding established standards, gained her tremendous credibility and a foundation of trust with other Marines that paid dividends that continued through her career.

Beyond the physical requirements and challenges that were important to her professional success, Reynolds confessed to having very modest and simple professional expectations. While at TBS, she developed an interest in serving as a communications officer and ultimately, she was selected to serve in that capacity. She said,

Originally, I just wanted a job that would not find me behind a desk my whole career. I wanted to be a platoon commander in a job that allowed me to be able to go [travel with] and do [the job] with my Marines. I had no professional aspirations beyond that. No one ever left me with an impression that I had a chance to command a battalion [be a commanding officer] when I was a lieutenant.

However, in considering what she believed had made her so successful in the Marine Corps, Reynolds pointed to her good fortune in being selected to lead Marines as their commander for a variety of Marine Corps units. She went on to explain,

The opportunity to command Marines at every rank absolutely matters in the Corps. Communications is a great community if you want the opportunity to show both a technical skill and leadership. And it [communications field] gave me an opportunity to command a platoon, a company, a battalion, and a group. That matters [gained her visibility and name recognition].

Regarding other significant aspects of her professional career, Reynolds credits LtGen Mutter, an active duty woman Marine general at the time, for advocating for her

selection in June 1997, as the third woman to command a recruiting station (RS).

Although not recognized as a sponsor at the time, Reynolds says Mutter was “looking out” for her as a young major and got her a job she did not realize she needed. In retrospect, she recognizes that being in command of a RS was particularly formative in her leadership development. Interestingly, one of the two previous RS women commanding officers, then-Maj Angie Salinas, was also eventually promoted to general officer. Then-LtCol Salinas offered Reynolds what today would be termed “mentorship” during her recruiting assignment and subsequently maintained contact with her.

Reynolds admitted that commanding a recruiting station was the most challenging assignment of her career to date. She explained,

Recruiting duty was a rite of passage [unofficially for Marine officers] and a humbling learning experience. In the late 80s/early 90s, the jobs that distinguished you were the MEU [Marine Expeditionary Unit, forward deployed aboard ships] jobs. When I came in though, women were not allowed on ships. No way to overcome that. My ‘rite of passage’ was [serving as] RS CO [commanding officer of a recruiting station].

Reynolds recognized that successful RS command likely offered her similar gravitas and professional recognition that, at that time, was nearly commensurate with the heralded, MEU jobs sought by her male colleagues. Only in hind-sight did she recognize the significance her recruiting station command assignment played in her advancement, particularly considering the competitive disadvantages that women faced at the time.

Reynolds acknowledged that in her 30 years as a Marine, the institution had changed significantly. From being resistant to deploying women, as evidenced in 1991 during Desert Shield/Desert Storm, to being uncomfortable with women firing live ammunition, the Corps had matured by 2010 to an organization that, without any forethought, assigned battle space to a woman like herself in Afghanistan. She expressed

satisfaction that her service may have influenced cultural change for women in the Corps. Between 1991 and 2010, some of Reynolds' accomplishments most assuredly raised the standard and expectations for women. She successfully commanded 9th Communications Battalion during wartime, deploying first in 2003 to Kuwait and again in 2004 to Fallujah, Iraq. She recalled, "You have to perform when given those early opportunities. I was fortunate enough to have a great team that performed well." With experiences like these behind her, she gradually emerged as a standout Marine leader who would be given even greater responsibility.

From 2005-2009, Reynolds undertook a variety of career enhancing assignments and attended professional schools that would prepare and qualify her to be considered for general level promotion. Subsequently, she would assume colonel-level command for I MHG. In this capacity, as noted earlier, she became the first woman Marine to have command of and responsibility for force protection and defensive security for battle space in Afghanistan. At the conclusion of this combat deployment, she was selected and promoted to brigadier general, assuming command of MCRD, Parris Island, South Carolina, the only recruit depot that trains both men and women. Reynolds would serve briefly as a region policy director within the Pentagon before assuming her current position as Commanding General, MARFORCYBER in Fort Meade, Maryland.

Discussion

Reynolds' career has covered a period marked by significant structural and cultural change due to progressive gender equality efforts in the armed forces. While the implementation of Title IX and passing of P.L. 94-106 offered unprecedented athletic and educational opportunities for women like Reynolds, the cultural attitudes and biases

toward them were slow to change and proved challenging, particularly as one of the first women to navigate these new opportunities and expectations. However, seeking to account for her success in the Marine Corps, Reynolds explains that in part, amongst a whole host of supports, she managed to capitalize on her professional identity and one of her foundational leadership strategies.

Challenges. Some factors that contributed to Reynolds' success as a Marine lie in how she navigated significant cultural challenges, triggered by both personal and institutional circumstances. Upon entering the USNA, she felt a palpable discomfort in her new environment. She recognized that the challenges she faced were twofold: first, her ability to adjust to an all-male environment, and second, the men's ability to accept women. Personally, Reynolds found herself in an unfamiliar landscape, realizing for the first time that she had little experience dealing with men, something she could no longer avoid. Reynolds explained,

That was certainly an interesting [experience], you know, I don't think I knew what I was in for when I did that [joined the USNA]. I've got four sisters. I went to a coed grade school, but my high school was an all-girl Catholic school. So from the time I am 13 years old -- I don't know men. I'm not dealing with them.

Although personally alarming for Reynolds, recognizing her inexperience in dealing with men was subsumed by a more perplexing institutional cultural challenge, that of operating in a male-dominated institution where women were seemingly unwelcomed. For many women, this may have terminated their USNA experience.

In 1982, the USNA was only seven years into integrating women, and despite the legal implementation, the culture and personal attitudes relative to women were slow to change. Reynolds offered that she had been warned before her plebe year [freshman year at the USNA] that some male midshipmen would do their utmost to make her cry, to

prove that women were weak. Expecting this, she anticipated being able to cultivate a support system of other women, but to no avail. She explained,

There were no upper class females that would have looked out for you, because it was one of those 'I went through it, and you're going to have to, too.' That's the way it was. They [women upperclassman] weren't mean to you; but they just weren't going to help you.

Reynolds recalls having almost no emotional support system apart from female roommates or teammates. She identified rare instances when a sympathetic male midshipman reached out and offered assistance. But these unusual acts of support from the men belied the typical institutional intimidation that unkindly targeted female midshipmen. Through her entire time at the USNA, Reynolds said that when she was subject to such treatment, she managed to avoid showing weakness or letting anyone see her break down. Though they tried, the upperclassmen that hassled her could not break her. Determined to persevere, Reynolds' mantra became, "I am not going to break," and as a competitive athlete, she found it helpful to consider the culture of harassment and hazing as "a game" that she would win.

Reynolds' stalwart reaction to aggressive treatment by the upperclassmen had a lasting impact on her psyche and made an impression on her perpetrators. Not only did she develop unwavering courage and bearing through those early days, those that witnessed her in these episodes began to declare that she was "Marine material," a compliment to those who aspire to be Marines. Becoming conditioned to hearing that she was "Marine material," she seemed to unconsciously internalize it. Reynolds claimed that she did not "make the decision" to go "Marine-option," but that it was "spoken into existence" by the upperclassmen who failed to "get to her." More seriously, she admitted developing her affinity for the Marine Corps culture in her plebe year. The confidence

and courage she developed overcoming these cultural challenges at the USNA became her source of power and strength as a leader of Marines.

Supports. Reynolds offered two significant factors that she believes contributed to her success in the Marine Corps: her Marine identity and a strategy of mastering the basics. First, to account for her identity as “Marine,” she credits her upbringing, her experiences at the USNA, and her ability to lead. She claims that her participation in competitive team sports and Catholic education laid the foundation for her Marine identity. Both were highly regulated environments which contributed to her developing what she calls, “willing obedience,” something she said may have attracted her to institutions like the USNA and the Marine Corps.

As previously noted, Reynolds’ resilience demonstrated at the USNA further motivated her to consider becoming a Marine. She explained, “Given that I was successful at not letting them break me. . . I wanted to just keep pushing myself. I wanted to be able to say I was a Marine.” In reality, for Reynolds, being a Marine goes much deeper than just pushing and proving herself. She said,

The Marine Corps is just a good fit for me, I think. It's a culture of fitness and obedience, and that's the way I was raised. I've been wearing a uniform since I was four years old. So, it's easy. The Marine Corps will tell you exactly where your boundaries are. You know what the rules are. There's a certain security in knowing where the boundaries are, and being able to thrive within the boundaries. You know what's expected of you.

As the only active duty woman general serving in the Corps today, Reynolds is often asked about how she succeeded within such a male-dominated institution. She explained that for her, the most important aspect of being a Marine is identifying as one, above all else. She elaborated, “When you wear the Marine uniform, you're expected to act in a certain way. It's not about being a female Marine; it's about how you wear the

uniform, how you represent the Corps.” She added that to her, “representing the Corps” included being an effective leader and taking pride in the organization, above all else.

Leadership effectiveness contributed to Reynold’s identity as a Marine. She stated that regardless of gender, if a person in the Marines cannot lead, they will never develop a “Marine” identity. Furthermore, she believes that seeking opportunities to command Marines is essential to proving yourself as a leader and identifying as “Marine.” Reynolds recalled seeing firsthand how seemingly irrelevant the gender of the leader was when she was deployed to Iraq while in command of a communications battalion. She said, “I learned through the deployment that Marines will follow anyone if they feel well-led. They [her deployed Marines] were busy, focused, and motivated. They were doing what they came in to do. They didn’t care that I was a woman.”

Reynolds’ commitment to the Marine Corps and her identity as a Marine is most evident when examining how she has approached the issue of work-life balance. She shared her thoughts, “I’m single; I don’t have to convince a spouse and a bunch of kids to move every two years - But again, I don’t know how you can be a mom and a wife and give 100% to this job.” Reynolds continues to dedicate her life and energy to the Marine Corps and being the best Marine she can, without distraction.

Reynolds also employs a leadership strategy that she believes has been foundational in the success she has achieved while commanding all levels of units and organizations. She explained that her strategy was always to focus on the basics and ensure that attention is paid to the little things, because they do matter. Illustrating her point, she offered, “One day, early in the deployment, I watched a couple of lance corporals walk by trash that was blowing all over the camp. [I was thinking] ...Pick up

the trash.” She reiterated that it is in opportunities like that one that an organization can hone its skills in focusing on the basics and doing the small things right. Reynolds said that the payoff for this strategy of focusing on the small, sometimes seemingly inconsequential things is that the more complicated, professional tasks, such as daily care of the communications network, convoy preparation, and warrior skills, will become easier to manage. Philosophically, Reynolds concluded, “I owed it to them and to their parents to make them ready....To do things the right way...to pick up the trash.”

Epilogue

Although Reynolds privileged her “Marine” identity over all others, she recognized that being a *woman* Marine required a nuanced approach to success relative to her male counterparts. She offered a perspective that she acquired early in her career,

It’s a story of trying hard to fit in while knowing somehow that you have to stand out. For a woman there is a balance between fitting-in and standing-out. [For women,] it is not hard to stand out. Early on in a career, women work extra hard to simply fit in: to be worthy, to be a part of the team, to make yourself indispensable. And you hope that someone will notice. Along the way, though, I think, just being professional, working hard, and taking care of Marines, you stand out. ‘Fitting in’ to our Corps makes you stand out.

However, she has come to realize that the need to fit in is not determined along gender lines; men strive to find belonging in the Marine Corps too. Reynolds noted, “It’s reserved for all who absolutely treasure the legacy, the love and the respect we have earned as United States Marines.” Likewise, Reynolds’ feels that her motivation to be a Marine is no different from any other highly successful Marine. She explained, “I love my country. I have always enjoyed being able to say that my profession is one of service. Not sure that accounts for my achievement, but it certainly continues to motivate my service and my career.

Brigadier General Helen G. Pratt, USMCR

Brigadier General (BGen) Helen Pratt is the only woman Marine Reserve general in the Marine Corps today. In 2014, she became the latest of ten women Marines to attain the rank of general, being the third from the Reserve component to achieve this distinction. Commissioned in 1988, she spent the first four years of her career on active duty and the remainder in the Reserves (See Appendix M). Even given her reserve status, Pratt has a rich history of both command and combat experience. Remarkably, she has more deployments in support of combat operations than any of the other women Marine generals, with tours in Saudi Arabia for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm (DS/DS), Kuwait and Ramadi, Iraq twice supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, and most recently Helmand Province, Afghanistan in support of Operations Enduring Freedom. Upon promotion to brigadier general, Pratt was the first woman and only reserve general ever selected to be president of Marine Corps University (MCU), the Corps' institute of higher education, where she still serves. Pratt offered details about how she became a Marine, important personal insights about the challenges she overcame, and key factors that supported her career achievements in the Marine Corps.

Her Story

This was my first opportunity to meet Pratt, though I had heard of her from mutual friends over the course of my career. In coordinating emails for my visit, Pratt recommended that we meet in her office at MCU, in Quantico, VA. Arriving for our interview, I noticed an enthusiastic buzz of activity amongst those that worked in her command suite. She came out of her office to welcome me with a friendly handshake, asking if I would like a beverage and some pastries. As expected, she was in uniform,

but to my surprise she was not as tall as I imagined, standing only about five and a half feet, with her sandy brown hair pulled back into a tightly bound bun. As her time was limited, we sat at a conference table in her office and began our interview immediately. She did suggest we might need a future skype session to wrap up any incomplete questions, and we did.

Pratt began by talking about her upbringing, including the influence she believed having brothers and being a daughter of a Marine had on her life choices. She was the youngest of five children, two boys and three girls, all of which her mother gave birth to by the age of 23. For Pratt, military lifestyle and culture was more than anecdotal stories; she experienced it firsthand as a young girl. Her father was a career Marine Corps infantry officer who graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy (USNA) and retired as a lieutenant colonel. Additionally, her grandfather on her mother's side was a career U.S. Army officer who served in World War II and the Korean War.

Growing up in a Marine family, Pratt was immersed in the Marine Corps culture and way of life, which made her what was often referred to as a "Marine brat." She was accustomed to frequent moves, relocating to bases like Camp Lejeune, NC; Quantico, VA; and Fort Benning, GA. Only once did they move "west of the Mississippi River" when her father received orders to Albuquerque, New Mexico as the Inspector-Instructor for 4th Reconnaissance Battalion. Pratt recalled that when her father went to Vietnam, her Mom took the family to Florida to be close to extended family, which was a common decision made by military wives of those serving overseas. Her Marine family story changed abruptly at 13 years of age when her parents divorced. She and her four siblings lived with their mother who was trying to raise five teenage children alone. Beyond the

emotional and financial difficulties, the Pratt children only got to see their father during the summers. As the youngest child in a struggling, single parent household, Pratt believes she developed self-reliance, resourcefulness, and determination, which led to many good things in her life, including being able to afford to send herself to college.

Upon her graduation from University of Central Florida in 1986, with a degree in Physical Education and Science, Pratt decided to pursue a career in education. Due to a scarcity of teaching positions in her locale at that time, she worked in the university health center until a teaching opportunity became available. Within a year, she managed to secure a teaching position in Apopka, Florida; however, while working at the university health center, someone with whom she worked and who happened to serve in the Marine Corps Reserves suggested that she consider joining the Marine Corps. Enjoying the irony, she shared that she was a daughter of a Marine and that this was something she had not considered. Regardless, her co-worker arranged for a call from a Marine recruiter to discuss opportunities. After their talk, she began seriously considering the Marine Corps, but it would be a year before a spot became available for her to attend Officer Candidate School. That worked out well, as she had already accepted a teaching job for the coming year.

Pratt maintained that in no way did her father and grandfather encourage her to serve. In fact, in 1987 when she told her father that she was considering joining the Marine Corps, she recalls him telling her, “You really need to look at the other services. Don’t join the Marine Corps because I did.” Pratt understood that her father was trying to protect her, knowing how difficult it was for women in the Marine Corps. However, having a propensity to seek challenges, she decided to leave her teaching position in

Apopka, Florida after a year, to join the Marine Corps. In June of 1988 she attended Officer Candidate School; upon graduation in August, she was commissioned, promoted to second lieutenant, and executed orders to report the following Monday to The Basic School (TBS) in Quantico, VA for six months of Marine officer training.

Marine officers knew that TBS would be both physically rigorous and mentally challenging. Pratt had confidence that she could excel in both the physical and basic military skills required in the Marine Corps, and in fact, she exceeded her own expectations and those of others. She explained that her affinity for all things physical was born from playing with her two brothers outside when they were young. “Building tree forts in the woods, slogging through the creeks and the rivers, catching fish and making bridges to cross certain places, made me very confident in my ability to do physical things and physical labor.”

The TBS staff took notice of Pratt’s remarkable ability to adeptly perform the most demanding military skills, tasks, and physical training in the course. She explained,

I aced anything that had to do with physical fitness, with field training tactics. My strength and confidence was in my navigation skills and in being in the field. I felt like that was one of my strengths, I am a *field* Marine. I am a ‘doer.’ I like to be out fixing things, solving problems.

Academically, though, it soon became apparent that she suffered from “test anxiety,” which proved problematic when taking exams. Pratt was driven to improve her test performance; she asked her friend and roommate to help her prepare for the exams. Her efforts proved fruitful and her class standing improved, making graduation from TBS possible.

Toward the end of TBS, the students were asked to submit their top three choices for military occupational specialty (MOS) assignment. Initially, Pratt wanted to serve in

aviation maintenance, as it would afford her lucrative and desirable opportunities after she left the Marine Corps. However, her Staff Platoon Commander suggested that Pratt reconsider her options, relaying that the motor transportation MOS offered greater opportunities for leading and commanding, and would better utilize Pratt's proven leadership talent. Ultimately, Pratt took her advice, recalling,

I think I would have been happy in aviation maintenance, and I could have managed the supply field, but I love working with the Marines on trucks, and fixing things and making things work; the convoys that we were able to go on -- that type of thing. So I think it was the exact right MOS for me.

As a Motor Transport officer, Pratt spent her first and only tour on active duty with 7th Motor Transport Battalion, at Camp Pendleton, CA. She held many assignments there, both in the U.S. and deployed, with her most prized ones including platoon and company command, and battalion adjutant. Although these were satisfying, she faced significant personal and professional challenges during this tour, causing her to end her active duty career after nearly four years.

Professionally, Pratt had become disillusioned with the Marine Corps after confronting perceived legal barriers to women's service, which will be discussed in detail later in this case. On a personal level, Pratt had endured emotional devastation from the heartbreaking loss of her brother to AIDS and the dissolution of a serious romantic relationship. The convergence of these life changing events and her professional disappointment culminated in her decision to end her active duty career so she could better attend to important family matters and reassess her professional future. So in 1992, Pratt returned to Orlando, Florida.

Once there, Pratt sought to reestablish herself as an educational professional. However, anticipating delays in employment with the school system, she prudently

decided to attain a Master's Degree in Exercise Physiology and Wellness, while pursuing a variety of short term jobs and opportunities in the Marine Reserve, which would offer some much needed income. After a year of civilian employment with Walt Disney World, Pratt took a position as a high school teacher at an at risk school and then transitioned to become a school counselor in a middle school in the Orlando area. To date, when not serving on active duty in the Marine Corps Reserve, she works as a counselor for 1200 middle school students in Orlando. Pratt's career in the Marine Corps Reserves has flourished, something she attributes to the synergy that comes from being able to work during the school year and engage in reserve active duty training during the educational summer breaks.

Pratt's Reserve career features valuable experience in leadership, motor transport, logistics, civil affairs, and supporting combat operations. She has held a full range of command positions as well as important staff positions that required motor transport, civil affairs and logistics expertise. Some of these organizations include: 6th Motor Transport Battalion from which she provided five years of support to combined arms exercises at Twenty-Nine Palms, CA; 4th Maintenance Battalion; 4th Force Service Support Group (4th FSSG); Marine Forces, Europe; and 4th Marine Logistics Group, formerly 4th FSSG. Most recently, Pratt's leadership and extensive knowledge about and experience in the Reserve component led to her selection to command Force Headquarters Group, a part of the command element for Marine Forces Reserve. In this capacity, she also continues her role as President of MCU.

Pratt also proved herself as a tested leader by serving in three combat deployments. In 2003, at the rank of major, she was mobilized to deploy to Kuwait in

anticipation of transportation requirements supporting combat operations in Iraq. As a lieutenant colonel she deployed to Ramadi, Iraq as the executive officer for 6th Civil Affairs Group (CAG) at which time she was granted a secondary MOS of civil affairs officer. After her promotion to colonel, she deployed as the Commanding Officer, 4th CAG in Helmand Province, Afghanistan, while serving concurrently as the Assistant Chief of Staff for Civil Affairs for 2nd Marine Division-Forward. Pratt noted that commanding the Marines of 4th CAG in Afghanistan was one of the best experiences of her career.

Discussion

Pratt's journey to the rank of general is one marked by hurdles that she managed to outmaneuver, as well as factors that she found advantageous for navigating a career in the Marine Corps. Serving during significant periods of combat operations, Pratt experienced firsthand the negative consequences of vague laws, regulations and policies governing women's service. While these could have derailed her career, Pratt was not only tenacious and exhibited remarkable perseverance, but she also consistently enforced and defended personal boundaries and convictions and privileged her identity as "Marine," which account in part for her success in the Marine Corps.

Challenges. Pratt faced significant structural challenges as a result of the laws, regulations and policies that governed women's military service. With the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein in 1990, Pratt was hopeful that she would get a meaningful opportunity to prove herself by deploying with her unit to Saudi Arabia. However, due to seemingly ambiguous military policies regulating women in combat, commanders across the Marine Corps debated whether servicewomen such as Pratt could legally deploy, and

if so, which jobs they could be assigned. Pratt recalls growing frustrated and feeling marginalized while awaiting permission to deploy with her unit. After many decision reversals and much confusion, women Marines were finally authorized to deploy with their units in support of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm (DS/DS).

However, Pratt continued to encounter barriers even after they deployed. She recalled that as a female Motor Transport officer serving in Saudi Arabia, she was not permitted to conduct convoys. Though she did not know why, she speculated two scenarios, both attributable to ambiguous and “interpretable” policy. First, the commander may have determined that the area external to the established military base was potentially too dangerous, posing unnecessary risk to women if participating in convoy operations. Alternatively, she also recognized that leadership had a sensitivity to the local Muslim culture and that prohibiting exposure of servicewomen to the local Muslim populace would be respectful. Ultimately, the controversy and confusion that being a servicewoman created during operation DS/DS contributed to Pratt’s disenchantment, which in part led to her departure from active duty.

Fourteen years later while in the Reserves, Pratt would again confront similar gender challenges as a lieutenant colonel, the executive officer of 6th CAG in Ramadi and Fallujah, Iraq. This time, the military commanders of different services appeared to be inconsistent in how they interpreted policies governing service women operating in a combat zone. Pratt was ordered by her Marine commanding general to not leave the confines of the secure base, or to not go “outside the wire.” His justification for this directive was that the area outside of the camp posed great risk and constituted “front lines,” which if women were serving there, would, in his interpretation, be a violation of

policy. However, these constraints did not appear to apply to all women, particularly from other services. This policy of restricting women Marines' movement may have been the unilateral prerogative of her Marine commanding general. Complying with the general's order, she was unable to accomplish her mission, which required her to engage with local leaders as well as execute leadership functions in service of her Marines that were operating outside of the base.

In spite of these professional difficulties during this deployment, Pratt subsequently continued to advance and was given even greater responsibility. A testament to her tenacity and perseverance, a male colleague of hers offered,

She has an unflagging spirit of marching on in her career regardless of what she is faced with. Regardless of what comes her way, she has found ways and means to continue to appropriately move forward. She just keeps on plugging [along], 'move, shoot, communicate.'

Supports. Pratt developed a strategy early in her Marine Corps career to address matters head-on and to defend her personal boundaries and convictions. She particularly found this strategy helpful as a woman in a male dominated profession. She recalled an episode early in her career while deployed in support of operation DS/DS in which a group of junior Marines hiding in a tent nearby whistled at her as she ran by. She immediately stopped and returned to find the Marines in order to address the issue. She added,

I walked into the tent and saw about fifteen Marines and I said 'Marines, do you know who I am?' And they're, like 'Uh, Lieutenant Pratt?' And I said 'That's right. And you are Corporal Smith, and Sergeant Jones.' I said 'I want to see your supervisor in my office in an hour, to talk about your inappropriate behavior. And if I ever run on this base again and I hear one of you whistle at me or say anything to me again, it won't be your [the two Marines in question] supervisor that I'll be speaking to. It will be all of them [supervisors for every Marine in the tent]. And it needs to stop.'

By addressing the insult directly and confronting the disrespect quickly and professionally, Pratt hoped to discourage any future incidents. She recognized that ignoring it would undermine good order and discipline, as well as demonstrate a lack of courage for maintaining her boundaries. She added that as a result of her response, the “word” got out and she developed a “don’t mess with her” reputation.

Not only was Pratt committed to this strategy with her juniors, but also with her superior officers, as one colleague of hers attested. When Pratt was a colonel, the colleague recalled that she courageously confronted a general level officer about an issue that was proving detrimental to the unit. It was hard, but she was right, and she told him what he needed to know. Pratt’s colleague added, “She took it head on and did what was best for the institution. She doesn’t take *shit* from anyone, regardless of gender, especially if they are inappropriate or acting against the good order and discipline of the Corps.” This scenario also serves to underscore Pratt’s moral courage in being able to have uncomfortable conversations regardless of the potential ramifications.

According to Pratt, one of the more powerfully compelling factors supporting her successful journey in the Marine Corps was that she embodied a “Marine” identity. She offered two complementary explanations for how she adopted her identity as Marine over that of “woman Marine” or “Reservist,” both of which she felt were inadequate at best and at worst could be considered liabilities in the Marine Corps. Instead, Pratt privileged her “Marine” identity largely because of the power of the Marine Corps’ institutional culture. She explained,

'Cause I don't think I ever saw myself as separate from the other Marines -- the male Marines. I saw myself as a Marine. I joined the Marine Corps because I wanted to be a part of something greater than myself and I thought that the Marine Corps: the values and the morals, and the tenets that we hold dear; those

things that are important: honor, courage, and commitment. I wanted to be one of ‘those’ guys—the Few, the Proud. You know, ‘Looking for a Few Good Men.’ I just wanted to be a part of that [culture of the Marine Corps], and associate myself with that institution.”

Pratt’s second explanation is found in her perspective on leadership that corresponds closely to the culture of the Marine Corps. She said,

I really think that [serving others] is my leadership philosophy. Because any time I focus on me and not the institution [it doesn’t feel right]-- and when I say the institution, I mean the Marines and the values and the traditions that we have in place. It has to be about the institution. And so I think, for me that is definitely helpful for me to remind myself on a regular basis: it's not about me; it's about the institution, it is about having a higher purpose.

A colleague also offered his perspective on Pratt’s Marine identity by saying, “She believed that she was a Marine first, not female first. It served her well. She is a proud Marine that identifies first and foremost as a Marine.”

Epilogue

Some say that an already difficult and arduous career in the Marine Corps can be further complicated by serving in the Reserves. However, as noted earlier, Pratt managed to find a mutually beneficial balance between her civilian and military careers. She also determined that leadership techniques and strategies for motivating and inspiring were the same, whether working with at-risk students or Marines. Pratt capitalized on the valuable lessons drawn from both of these environments in order to continuously improve as a leader.

Although Pratt spent more time serving on active duty in the Marine Corps as she became more senior, the affinity amongst herself, the students, and her faculty colleagues remains strong. This can be seen in the fact that she chose to conduct both her colonel and brigadier general promotions not aboard a Marine base, but in the gymnasium at her

middle school in Orlando, FL. A male Marine officer colleague who attended both of her promotions sensed that the middle school staff and students had enormous respect for Pratt, despite her frequent and prolonged absences as a result of her military duty; no lingering jealousy or resentment was apparent. Pratt anticipates leaving active duty in August 2016, signaling the end of her tenure as President of MCU. She plans to resume her counseling duties at her middle school in Orlando, Florida until the Marine Corps calls on her again. The middle school community is looking forward to her return.

Conclusion

These are the stories that comprise the fascinating trajectories of the eight women generals in this study. While each of them has lived a unique and varied life, a comparison of their experiences and perspectives yields some interesting insights into their successes and the barriers they overcame. This will be the focus of the cross-case comparison in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Women seeking high-level leadership positions often face rigid institutional barriers and pervasive gender bias in many industries, and yet some have been able to penetrate the glass ceiling or navigate the labyrinth to achieve positions of power. The purpose of this study was to understand how a small, elite group of women were able to achieve general-level rank in the U.S. Marine Corps, which is unquestionably one of the most male-dominated organizations in the world. More specifically, this study's exploratory multiple-case study/cross-case analysis design, supported by qualitative research methods, examined the leadership journey of eight of the ten women Marine Corps general officers.

More specifically, this study explored the structural, cultural and individual factors that prompted these women's desire and enhanced their ability to lead in the Marine Corps, from their perspective. This inquiry was particularly attentive to organizational and situational factors, as well as strategies or tactics they employed, motivations, personal characteristics, behaviors, and beliefs that appear to have contributed to their attaining the rank of general in the U.S. Marine Corps. The research questions that guided this study were:

(1) How do these women leaders describe their career trajectories in the U.S.

Marine Corps, a male-dominated organization?

(1a) What factors supported their journey to the rank of general?

(1b) What barriers had to be overcome on their journey, and how were they overcome?

(2) Of the following factors, which do women Marine leaders explicitly identify or which can be inferred as helping them to attain the rank of general: personal strategies and tactics, beliefs, motives, effective behaviors, relationships, personal characteristics and/or factors related to the organization or situation?

The careers and the lives of these eight women Marine Corps generals were first examined through individual case studies, as reported in chapter four. Next, a cross-case analysis was conducted for all eight cases. In this chapter I offer a discussion of the findings and themes derived from the cross-case comparison, focusing specifically on the factors that supported and challenged the generals' career success. After sharing these, as well as discussing an important insight from the study, I will highlight the significance of the study, implications for policy and practice, describe limitations, and explore future research needs.

Cross-Case Comparison

The journeys of these eight women Marine generals were complex, due in large part to three interrelated elements: their personal attributes, strategies and identities; the culture of the Corps as a male-dominated institution; and the policies and regulations to which military women were subject. This cross-case comparison takes these things into account, exploring the personal, cultural, and organizational factors that played a role in supporting and challenging research participants' success. It should be noted that it was often impossible to separate supports from challenges because a factor that challenged one woman might have been viewed as a support to another. In addition, supports and challenges often proved to be two sides of a single coin; they were, in short, often interrelated. In other words, issues that might have deterred other women from pressing

forward in their careers often served instead to strengthen these generals' resolve and tenacity, as this chapter will demonstrate.

Personal Factors

Joining the Marine Corps can prove particularly challenging for women, given the historical and, to some degree current, social perspectives regarding women's roles and life choices. As a result, these women generals relied on an array of personal factors in navigating their successful careers. These include, but are not limited to career catalysts, personality traits, navigation of work-life balance, and leadership strategies.

Career catalysts. The reality that women have never comprised more than eight percent of the Marine Corps population raises the question, *why do women join the Marine Corps?* In the case of these women generals, although the reasons varied significantly, there seemed to be three kinds of catalysts: family/finances, education, and a desire for something more after college.

Family of origin-related circumstances served as a catalyst for three of the women generals turning to the Marine Corps. For Reals, the premature death of her father shaped her independence and self-sufficiency, which played out as she enlisted so as to not burden her mother. Two others were driven to realize their parents' dreams of them becoming first generation college graduates, and the Marine Corps was a way of obtaining the financial means to do so. Mutter, who ended up attending Officer Candidate School (OCS), explained, "I could go to OCS the summer between my junior and senior year of college, get paid for it -- which was important, I needed to earn money for college. I had to have a summer job." As a side note about family as a catalyst, although four of the study's eight participants had some connection with male relatives in

the Marine Corps, that did not appear to be a driving force for any of them to pursue a career there.

The desire for a debt-free education that would lay a foundation for their professional lives served as a catalyst for both Garrett and Reynolds who sought and obtained a Navy Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarship and an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy, respectively. However, Krusa-Dossin, Monahan, and Pratt, who had already graduated from college, were looking for something more—a greater challenge, doing something meaningful, or being of greater service, all of which the Marine Corps seemed to offer. Monahan, who'd had limited but impactful exposure to Marines overseas explained, "Though I haven't been in the States very much, I see what being an American is, and I think I need to pay back. And the Marines are the best. I mean, overseas you see what the Marine Corps is."

Personality traits. A second factor related to these women generals' success was the personal traits that they embodied and brought to their careers in the Marine Corps. Overall, the women that achieved the highest ranks of the Marine Corps brought a wide range of qualities, temperaments, and personalities that uniquely supported them in their career journeys. However, they identified three qualities consistently, which were an esteem for learning, the ability to adapt and stay flexible and the capacity for effective communication.

Many of these women placed a high value on learning, a characteristic that served them well in the Marine Corps. For example, Reals bridged the scholastic gap in her formal education by educating herself in unconventional ways such as reading, travel, studying history, experiencing different cultures, as well as attending technical courses,

like Powelson Business Institute. This continued in the Corps where she noted, “I was a voracious reader. I even read what I typed [work-related],” adding that this enabled her to increase her vocabulary and become more informed about the institution and its issues. Her zeal for learning enabled her to overcome an acknowledged barrier to advancement, not having a college degree.

Alternatively, Garrett’s formal academic resume demonstrates her scholastic proficiency; she not only enjoyed learning in high school, but it continued through college and her military career. She said, “The academic environment is one that I’m really good at. So [I enjoyed] going to Command and Staff College and later, to the Naval War College.” Along with the personal enjoyment that she got from learning, the Marine Corps also valued her for it. Garrett offered, “So I’ve just been a student of logistics and of leadership, my whole career, and I think that has satisfied the institution that I was prepared for future assignments.”

Still other generals touted the benefits of being adaptable and flexible. As a partner in a dual-military relationship, Mutter found it particularly advantageous to be professionally agile, recalling, “You know, I went from job to job in the Marines Corps doing something very different every time, everywhere I went. I loved the new challenge, it was new and different, I was never bored.” Salinas believed that being a successful Marine Corps leader was contingent on the ability to adapt to different situations, explaining that she was able to align with a variety of people and groups of people, enlisted, officer, women or men. In reality, the careers of each of these women Marine generals reveal that some degree of adaptability and flexibility was necessary.

Four of the women generals relied on their ability to communicate effectively, whether that meant boldly speaking up or listening carefully. Both Pratt and Krusa-Dossin courageously spoke out when necessary in order to resolve problems, generally achieving desired results. Krusa-Dossin had learned early in life the value of addressing issues in order to bring acknowledgment and resolution to inequitable policies. She consistently demonstrated a philosophy that shows up in her slogan-like phrases such as “push forward, even when people are pushing back,” or “don’t be denied.” Similarly, Pratt was often outspoken regarding the “right” treatment of others, noting “I am really [adamant] about things being fair. If somebody is being treated unfairly, it really bothers me. So if people are being treated unfairly, I’ll speak up. Easier to address on the spot rather than let fester.”

On the flip side of that coin, Monahan and Reynolds suggested that their ability and willingness to listen was critical in their careers. Monahan explained: “It was about listening, figuring out what the real problem is, and finding out who has the answer. I think I knew how to listen to what was important.” Similarly, Reynolds believed listening well supported professional credibility.

I learned early that you learn more by listening than by talking. That really helped me in my career. I think in the Corps, you have to be careful early on to earn your credibility, especially as a woman. But as an introvert, for me I’m taking it all in. And I’m going to be very, very conscious that when I say something I know what I’m saying. I’ve thought it through, it’s very deliberate and I think that helped me.

Work-life balance. Each woman general had to grapple in some way with reconciling her career in the Marine Corps and her personal life. As noted in chapter one, the Marine Corps is the smallest service, with the primary function of fighting the nation’s wars, demanding agility and rapid response. Meeting these demands creates

challenges for Marines in balancing commitments relative to family, personal, and service; but for women, the demands were and are even greater, given the traditional societal expectations that exist to this day. This meant that for these women to advance and succeed, they would have to make significant personal choices that would present obstacles and/or require sacrifices throughout their career. The stories of how the generals navigated this are very different.

Three of the women Marine generals remained single and without children or dependent family members, eventually finding themselves deeply and fully entrenched in their careers instead. In the early days, a woman Marine was relieved of duty in the military once she became a mother, a policy that severely restricted Reals' personal choices. She explained,

At that time I wanted to stay in the Marine Corps, so I pushed that [thinking about having a family] aside...I worked awfully damn hard. I made a lot of sacrifices. I set aside a great deal of my personal life. A large part of my life is the Marine Corps. That is the price you pay. I always put the Marine Corps first.

After years of policy revisions, Pratt and Reynolds *could and did* make personal choices to stay single. Reynolds offered her point of view, "I'm single; I don't have to convince a spouse and a bunch of kids to move every two years - But again, I don't know how you can be a mom and a wife and give 100% to this job." These three single generals, through various external interests and personal networks, did manage to achieve a type of work-life balance that they were comfortable with, although others might challenge the notion that the balance was a chosen one.

Salinas, the fourth in this group of single generals, embraced a more non-traditional approach to balancing personal and work life when her mother and sister came to live with her after their spouses died. For some, this would have presented a career-

ending distraction; but in this case, the general's relationship with her mother and sister developed into a mutually beneficial partnership. Salinas explained, "Janie [her sister] was a key volunteer and helped with entertaining, whether it was a dinner party or decorating the house for Christmas house tours. It was proof that things could still get accomplished outside the traditional norm." As Salinas progressed up the ranks, her family's support enabled her to take on greater social and military family advocacy obligations, which arguably offered her greater rapport and connection with those she led and their families.

Finding balance for the women generals with spouses and/or children was a bit more complicated. Half of the women in this study were married, three who had Marine spouses, and three who had children. They achieved a level of balance in a combination of ways: through effective spousal partnerships that included planning and negotiation strategies, through personal support networks or nannies, or by opting to transition to service in the Reserve component of the Corps.

Women in dual-military relationships like Mutter, Krusa-Dossin, and Monahan, essentially had to manage two careers, which required foresight, adept maneuvering and creative optimism. Mutter described this: "Managing dual careers required lots of future planning and compromise. We always looked at the art of the possible. We worked with our monitors [Marine responsible for assignments] at least 2 years out from our next transfer." Having a military spouse also proved advantageous in that the men understood the demands on their wives and were thus uniquely able to support them. Krusa-Dossin, the only one of the three Marine mothers that remained on full-time active duty, shared:

“When our son was born (which of course was a great joy), I guarantee that Paul [her husband] changed more diapers than I ever did!”

Two of the women opted for the flexibility the reserves offered in order to try to find balance between work and family. As Garrett explained:

So as a working Mom, I was at a loss to figure out what I was going to do with our baby. The day care center didn't open until 10 and it closed at 6 and was closed on Mondays, this kind of goofy stuff, when I was working 6 1/2 days a week 10 to 12 hours a day. So I was kind of confronted with becoming a mother and trying to integrate being a mom and being a Marine... I couldn't find a way for that... The work-life balance that being a reservist afforded me while building a meaningful career was really important.”

No matter the women's decision to stay active or transition to the reserves, they were able to manage family expectations in a way that supported advancement in their military careers.

In reality, every women Marine general was constrained and had to accept some degree of sacrifice in order to achieve the level of success that they did; marriage and motherhood for the single women, and missing children's milestones or compromising on professional opportunities for the married ones. Yet in the end, each of these women generals felt that the choices they made throughout their career, either as a single woman or with a spouse or family members, did enable them to achieve a unique and satisfying degree of work-life balance and as Salinas concluded: “I don't think I gave up anything.”

Leadership strategies. The fourth and final personal factor considered in the cross-case comparison that contributed to the success of the eight women generals was their approach to leadership. Given their position and length of service, each of these women had a “toolbox” full of preferred leadership principles and strategies, some of which they identified in the context of this study. From these, three significant things

emerged relative to how they led. These included knowing and caring for your Marines, promoting teamwork, and developing subordinates.

Monahan took pride in knowing and caring for her Marines, believing this offered invaluable organizational benefits. She explained, “I felt that I understood people and could identify their strengths and weaknesses, instead of firing or discharging, I could identify a better place or purpose for them in the organization.” Similarly, Pratt suggested that leaders taking care of the Marines fosters within them a sense of importance, which in turn promotes their success and that of the organization. Garrett offered her own leadership strategy in this regard:

My favorite framework for leadership is something called ‘servant leadership;’ the business of taking care of your Marines meant that you were leading, meant that you were providing resources for them to be successful and meant that you were trying to clear the way for their efforts, that you were concerned about their context, their family, their community, the place they came from.

Although expressed in different ways, the women generals believed that by knowing their Marines, they could better ensure that each one received a fair chance to contribute, which one general described as making sure that everyone was “in the right seat on the bus.”

Paramount in Marine Corps culture is the idea of success through teamwork, rooted in the belief that no one Marine can accomplish the mission without the help and expertise of others. Given this, some of the women generals did not explicitly identify “promoting teamwork” as a revered principle of leadership; however, they all in some fashion provided examples of accomplishments while crediting others, peers and subordinates alike, with their support or role in achieving it. Reynolds did explicitly

identify teamwork as the foundation of her leadership philosophy, comparing it to her experience as an athlete:

Without a doubt team sports has a correlation to the Marine Corps...the things I learned on the basketball court absolutely helped me as a young Marine officer, in terms of being part of a team, leading the team, never letting the team down. The Marine Corps is all about team work; everyone doing their part for the team mission.

Furthermore, as explained in chapter one, women are inherently collaborative and as leaders have a tendency to be more inclusive, and therefore, team oriented. These women are no different—perhaps even more so because they are Marines.

Last of the leadership strategies that emerged in the stories of these women is the importance of developing subordinates. From Reals' experience, she remembers, "It sure makes it easier to delegate if you have taken the time and effort on a daily basis to upgrade the skills of your subordinates. I get satisfaction out of watching people grow and develop..." This responsibility is one of those that made being in command of Marines such a privilege for these women Marine generals. As Krusa-Dossin said, "Influencing the lives of others is huge. The joy is in teaching, and in shaping, and in watching them [Marines] grow. That's the joy."

Cultural Factors

The culture of the Marine Corps is rich from over 240 years of fighting our country's wars, as was discussed at length in chapter one. Women, however, have only been officially recognized as members of the service for the last 73 years, and it was 35 years before the first woman Marine, Margaret Brewer, was appointed to brigadier general (See Appendices D and O). Though the opportunities for women have been increasing and gender equality has improved since then, the challenge for women lies in

dealing with the sluggishness of cultural change in a male-dominated organization like the Marine Corps.

Many of the women who came in or served in the Marine Corps in the 60s and 70s did so at a time when both civilian society and institutions like the military were attempting to level the professional “playing field” for women. In fact, some would argue that the military services may have been leading the social movement in this arena.

Lieutenant General Mutter recalls,

.... in '67, we were in kinda' that leading edge of women's lib [liberation], and women in the military expanding their roles. Every Friday you'd open up the base paper and see something new about a woman—first woman in crash/fire rescue, or whatever. So it was just one of those evolutionary things that just happened all through my career. And things were happening in the civilian world, as well, at that time, where women were, more and more, getting into careers, and not just being secretaries or executive assistants, even, or nurses, and that type of thing.

As a case in point, during a time when the lines between “men’s work” and “women’s work” was still strongly drawn in society, Mutter joined the Marine Corps so that she could more readily pursue opportunities to use her technical skills in the data processing field, a role that had been largely seen as belonging to men. She perceived that given the current cultural mores, society would not be as welcoming. She may have been right.

However, what may have not been so obvious to Mutter or other women was that while the services had led the way in implementing gender equality policies, the military culture itself was not as quick to adapt to these. As a result, women in the services consistently encountered resistance and resentment as they navigated their career paths amongst men. In addition, the Marine Corps has historically established *different* physical requirements for women, yet in reality, these were not very demanding and in a culture that prizes physical fitness, this fueled that resentment. Furthermore,

enculturation for the generals created pressure to act tough and hide pain or weakness, perhaps even more than their male counterparts. For many women in military service, the unwelcoming culture became a career terminator; for those in this study, however, they managed to not only persevere, but thrive in the face of the male-dominated culture.

Strategies for confronting gender bias. Undoubtedly, women in the Marine Corps, in various environments, situations, and to different degrees, have faced some form of personal bias or discrimination due to the male-dominated culture. It is interesting to note that, with the exception of Pratt (see chapter four), the generals who spoke least about having to address gender bias during their careers were the two that transitioned into the Reserve component early on and were married with children. This finding may suggest that the diverse nature of the Reserve component—occupationally, temporally and geographically—creates less antagonism for women in a male-dominated culture. Without more data, it is impossible to speculate on whether or not being married with children may have played a role here.

As more gender equality policies were enacted and the male-dominated culture appeared to be in “greater danger,” the frequency of the encounters involving gender bias grew. The rest of the active duty women generals (those not mentioned above) specifically addressed the ways that they managed to handle resistance, bias, and unfair treatment by the Marines with whom they worked. Many of these women generals adopted a more stoic, indirect approach, “developing thick skin,” and “putting their money where their mouth is,” by proving themselves worthy of being a Marine every day. From days of early gender integration, Reals recalls how she approached the bias:

It's a constant day-to-day battle. I revel in it. Others may find it a problem...The true test of the discipline, the stamina, and the *guts* of a woman Marine is for her

to recognize all of that, maintain her sense of identity as a woman, and then prove to everybody that it's an advantage to the Corps to have her in its ranks....I have recognized that the first years were hard. You need a thick skin in order to survive. You cannot be too sensitive or permit them to depress you with negative comments, because they will make you crazy.

Mutter offered a different perspective to the cultural dilemma for women:

Working mostly with men was not a problem [for me] since I had been a tomboy and was a college math major with mostly men in my classes. I was used to that environment. [But, I found that if you] do the right things for the right reasons and do them well, everything else will take care of itself. [I] didn't let other people's hang ups concern me. If they had a problem with a female Marine, that was their problem, not mine...

Reynolds offers a more recent perspective on handling herself in the more competitive, male dominated culture she faced:

I think in a male dominated organization, having a serious, professional, no drama exterior, an unexpected sense of humor and being willing to perform and be a part of the team begins to earn you the reputation that you are looking for....Don't talk about what you can do. Just perform.

Still others grew accustomed to verbally confronting the behavior or holding men accountable by raising the issue to higher authority or up the chain of command. Pratt shared that in 1991 while on active duty and deployed in support of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, she discovered the value of this. She recounted the situation in which a group of young Marines had been disrespectful as she ran by them:

I said, 'I want to see your supervisor in my office in an hour, to talk about your inappropriate behavior.' I think that they learned not to mess with me. But, [later] they also saw me on the camp, working, and doing the things that I was asking them to do....So I think they developed a respect for me because I was concerned for their well-being, but I held them to a standard.

Krusa-Dossin stood out as the one woman general who not only confronted, but also influenced policy by taking an active and pragmatic position on issues, both personal and institutional. She admitted very matter-of-factly that she had a propensity to be

vocal, explaining, “Probably early on in the Marine Corps, if I saw *anything* that I thought was unfair, I opened my mouth about it. If I thought I saw something that was *stupid*, I was also vocal about it.” This proved true particularly in issues that she encountered relative to becoming an active duty Marine mother. As a result, she made significant inroads in clarifying policy or establishing standards for the Marine Corps. Using direct and indirect means, these women generals made it clear that inaction could not be tolerated.

Strategies for dealing with the culture of physical fitness. The Marine Corps has historically placed a high value on physical fitness in order to prepare the body and spirit for the rigors of combat, which is the Marine Corps’ core competency, as seen in its institutional policies and mandates. As a result, a culture of esteeming fitness has taken hold in the Marine Corps and has become an aspect of what society believes makes a “Marine,” someone epitomized by strength and brawn. This is illustrated by the informally held, underlying assumptions regarding fitness that are manifested in mottos like: “no pain, no gain” and “pain is weakness leaving the body.” As in the past, these ideas are certainly viable and alive in the Marine Corps today. At the same time, women Marines historically and even now, are held to much lower physical standards than that expected of men, perhaps because, until recently, women were not expected to be prepared for the rigors of fighting our nation’s wars.

To put this into context, Mutter explained, “In OCC in 1966 we [women] wore pantaloons. We ran a total of 600 yards, they gradually moved it up to 1.5 miles and they moved it up to 3 miles in 1999, when I was retiring.” Not surprisingly, the near absence of any mention of physical fitness and training required by the women in this study who

served prior to 1977 speaks to the lack of rigor demanded during those years. Reals merely mentioned that being “active in basketball, softball, volleyball teams” served to help build comradery with her Marines and peers. Alternatively, Mutter admitted that she was not intrinsically motivated for physical fitness, as was expected of a Marine officer. She remembered,

One of the other women in Command and Staff [school in 1978] ...said ‘Come on, we’re going to go running.’ We had to do a mile and a half in those days. And we would run closer to two or three miles, so the mile and a half ended up being a piece of cake. So I just needed that -- I wasn’t really motivated to get out there and do that. She kind of got me going, and I was able to keep up with it, to some extent.

Nevertheless, in an integrated Marine Corps where women have long been prohibited from qualifying for and holding combat jobs, the culture of fitness and its underlying assumptions have been increasingly applied to both genders.

This has proven to be a greater challenge for the more recent women Marines due to the expansion of opportunities, the more intense effort toward gender equality, and resulting higher fitness standards for women in order to sufficiently perform and serve in more demanding jobs and environments. Beginning with MajGen Salinas, who served as an officer from 1977-2013 and was a member of one of the first gender-integrated officer candidate and basic school courses (See Appendix I), the women generals spoke of the increasing demands regarding the fitness standards and physical expectations, as well the culture of fitness and the pressures it imposed. Salinas said, “The institution has come a long way, opened up restrictions gradually. Battling the legacy and traditions from 1775, it is hard. You gotta’ be good and have stamina to stay in the organization, especially with the physical requirements.”

Likewise, as time passed, women like Reynolds and Pratt began experiencing

even greater pressure to demonstrate physical competence. According to Reynolds, “You have to be able to compete physically early on. I can hike, and I can keep up on unit runs. That matters a great deal early on [in a career].” Similarly, Pratt felt fortunate to be prepared for and enthusiastic about the physical demands placed on women Marines:

I aced anything that had to do with physical fitness, with field training tactics. [In my youth] building tree forts in the woods, slogging through the creeks and the rivers, catching fish and making bridges to cross certain places, made me very confident in my ability to do physical things and physical labor.

However, the flip side of the culture of fitness was that the consequences of demonstrating weakness or becoming injured, particularly in the face of lower institutional standards, proved so demoralizing that women would deny their own reality. For example, as detailed in chapter four, Salinas felt that she had to cover up physical pain and even serious injury to avoid appearing weak and unfit as a Marine in order to advance in her career. In summary, while the fitness demands levied on each of the women generals in this study varied, their success was incumbent on their ability to meet the established standards and to successfully navigate the underlying assumptions of the culture of fitness.

Organizational Factors

As American society was beginning to openly advocate for greater gender equality, military and department of defense officials were enacting progressive laws that expanded professional opportunities for women and promoted a higher level of gender equality throughout the armed services (See Appendix O). Chapter four demonstrated how laws and policies both supported and at times challenged the women Marine generals’ ability to achieve levels of success commensurate with that of highly successful male Marines. As discussed in detail in chapter one, two laws (PL- 90-130 of 1967), the

modification of Women's Armed Services Integration Act (PL-625 of 1948), and the Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act (DOPMA of 1980) enabled these women to attain the rank of brigadier general and beyond.

While most of the legislation was beneficial for women, there were other policies and laws that created both personal and professional challenges for the women generals. For example, some policies early on severely restricted servicewomen's personal freedoms such as marriage or motherhood, whether by birth or adoption, as well as denying or limiting marital benefits. Mutter, one of the women generals married to a Marine, remembers, "Initially we could not both draw BAQ [housing allowance]—only my husband could because the definition in the law was with or without "dependents" and I couldn't be a "dependent" as long as I was on active duty."

Additionally, even given the expanded opportunities for women, the generals continued to face professional constraints in navigating their careers, as do women, to some degree, even today. For example, Reynolds noted: "In the late 80s/early 90s, the jobs that distinguished you were the MEU [Marine Expeditionary Unit, forward deployed aboard ships] jobs. When I came in though, women were not allowed on ships. No way to overcome that." In reality, this was not entirely true and Reynolds did find a way.

How did these generals overcome these challenges? Largely by taking advantage of a combination of a variety of organizational opportunities. For example, not only did the Marine Corps allow for some professional flexibility; but placed high value on support functions that afforded women opportunities to expand their experience beyond their occupational specialty. The women generals utilized the flexibility and career broadening opportunities to enhance their careers whenever possible. Additionally, some

of them found institutional support and advocacy through mentors or sponsors, which were success strategies described in the literature review in chapter two.

Professional opportunities. While some of the generals initially felt certain assignments could be undesirable or potentially a waste of their talent, in retrospect they were grateful for the professional opportunities and assignments they were afforded during their career, which they attributed in part to “timing” and “luck.” Mutter epitomizes this sentiment by saying, “Perhaps I was lucky, but I always did the best I could at whatever job I was assigned, even if I didn’t perceive it to be the ‘right’ job for my career progression.”

The reality is that the Marine Corps as an organization values breadth of knowledge, training, and expertise in its leaders, regardless of gender. Assignments and duties outside of one’s occupational specialty are not only esteemed but *required* for those seeking promotion. The success of these eight women generals is certainly evidence of this organizational premise. For example, each of these women generals was assigned to occupational specialties that afforded them highly desirable opportunities to command Marines (See Appendices D-N), both in and out of their specialty. For example, Krusa-Dossin served in the military police field, explaining with some pride; “Becoming a Provost Marshal (PMO) (and that's really kind of what you strove to do) was actually equivalent, if not higher than, being a company commander [in any other specialty].” Similarly, as an Adjutant, Salinas spent time in both her specialty and command positions:

From there [Okinawa, 1984] I went to Pendleton and I spent a year as the Adjutant. But then I got a company, and so I spent a year and a half as a company commander. And then I fleeted upstairs [was offered a more senior position] to

the G-1 shop [administration department], as a Deputy G-1. And I was only there about nine months, and then I went off to command the recruiting station.”

As was the case with Salinas, outside of those highly sought out command opportunities, these women held assignments in other valued sectors of the Marine Corps that they believed proved beneficial to their careers, including: Marine Corps family services, recruiting, and basic training (both officer candidate school and boot camp). Reynolds described her experiences as a commanding officer of a recruiting station as her “rite of passage,” that she felt was “a humbling learning experience.” As she would find out later, those that performed successfully in recruiting jobs reaped significant accolades and rewards through promotion to the next rank, similar to her peers in the combat arms jobs.

Of particular note, both Mutter and Pratt proved to be uniquely valuable resources to the Marine Corps by being adaptable, flexible, and professionally resilient. Mutter held a wide variety of occupational specialties, triggered by organizational and personal needs. Mutter explains the benefits of her professional flexibility:

Having changed my MOS [occupation] as a Capt and served in lots of different jobs, to include leading female OCs [officer candidates] and lieutenants in training, showed I could do a lot of different things. [That is] important for a general – especially in the Marine Corps where we’re so small – general officers have to be generalists.

Similarly, Pratt proved to be valuable to the institution in part due to her ability to adapt, adjust, and excel in a variety of positions, both on active duty and in the Reserve. She explained,

One of the things that happened to me as a Lieutenant is I had seven different billets by the time I left active duty. So within three and a half years I had seven different billets... I'm always filling gaps. I'm filling a gap here [Marine Corps University as a brigadier general], I was filling a gap as a lieutenant.

While she lamented that it seemed as if the military didn't know what to do with her so they just kept moving her around, in reality, Pratt was developing a proven track record and prized reputation within the institution for adeptly filling operationally significant gaps with very short notice and with little preparation or training. Ultimately, she has been able to reconcile her valued role as a "gap filler," not only as a lieutenant but as a lieutenant colonel and presently as a brigadier general, backfilling the unexpected departure of the former president of the Marine Corps University.

Finally, many of these women *found* themselves in the "right" place, working for the "right" person, and/or serving at the "right" time. For example, Reals capitalized on a rare opportunity that most likely changed the course of her career. She explained,

It was during that extension [two year additional commitment] that the Paris thing came up. And the sergeant major, said "Two or three people have turned this down. And they came to me and wanted to know whether or not you would consider filling the billet at USEUCOM in Paris." I said "Oh, sir, I'm a little -- you know, that's scary." And I thought: well, I better --; He said "Tell me tomorrow morning." So I went, and I thought: I can't turn *Paris* down.

Still others in the Reserve component often had to *find* their own job, having the "right" timing, people, and location all come together in order to land a viable assignment.

Monahan described her experience:

So I think it's a mixture of thinking of different ways of doing things and just asking and doing it. Recognizing the opportunity -- or making the opportunity. A lot of times I think -- now that I look back I think I did form an opportunity. But at the time I just thought it was pure luck or something.

For four of the women Marine generals, their timing *was* right and they were able to take advantage of highly valued opportunities to deploy in support of combat operations, which enhances prospects for promotion.

Educational opportunities. The Marine Corps encourages life-long learning and professional development by its leaders, not only promoting off-duty education, but frequently sending promising Marine leaders to a variety of one and two-year professional schools and institutes for their full time duty assignment. It is not a coincidence that these promising women were chosen to attend at least one formal professional military school, and some were even afforded advanced training in their occupational specialty, both government and civilian sponsored. Most of them were awarded master's degrees at the conclusion of certain professional military schools.

These opportunities provided benefits beyond the education itself, as Mutter noted:

Going to professional schools was definitely a plus (check in the box plus got to know others and they got to know me). I went to AWS, C&SC and Naval War College. At every school the most important thing wasn't what I learned but who I met; they got to know me and know that they could work with me.

Similarly, Garrett was clear about how each of the courses she attended helped to groom her for advancement in the Marine Corps:

I've been in a lot of schools for the Marine Corps. But you know, once again I think early on most school experience is about 'dipping you in Marine-ness' and over time your education experience is an enhancement of your professional experience; whereas when I went through Amphibious Warfare School was really about learning the basics of amphibious operations and the Marine Corps' key role in that, and then Command and Staff College—how to be the planner that helps the Marine Corps negotiate the joint objective, to top-level school where we are trained to put the conflict in the context of political choice of our nation and our nation's leaders.

While all of the generals benefitted from the professional and educational opportunities discussed above, the reality is that there are very few similarities in how these eight women did so.

Professional relationships. A significant aspect of leadership in the Marine Corps is wielded through the use of the chain of command, which ideally provides guidance, advice, teaching, and training, as well as setting an example to emulate. This was the primary means by which the women generals were “mentored,” and, given the ratio of men to women, most of the time it was by men. According to Mutter,

The Marine Corps doesn’t want to have a formal mentorship program because they believe it’s inherent in leadership and I do too. I think it is inherent in leadership...We probably need some kind of formalized program, at least minimally formalized in order to make sure it happens on an equal opportunity basis....Mentorship is good leadership.

It stands to reason that the early generals in particular, did not refer to helpful colleagues and role models as “mentors” but rather as leaders or as those who offered help. For example, when Reals was asked about mentorship in her career, she requested clarification of the term, and then responded: “I have [had] by virtue of much good luck, the help of some fine professionals to help me climb the ladder from private to general in the Marine Corps.” Likewise, Reynolds recalled a particularly memorable period when she received support from another:

When I was on recruiting duty, she [LtCol Salinas, former commander] called. “Hey, Lori, how are you doing?” She reached out. Someone reached out, which -- that was probably the first time. I bet that was my first time. ...I was talking to her on the phone and I was thinking: this is the first time that anyone has called me to help me. And I was a major.

In reflecting back on her career, Mutter offered an example of a mentor relationship: “My husband [Jim, also a Marine] was my greatest mentor. We worked together initially [before their relationship] and he told me how others would interpret my quiet approach (for example) as uncertainty and lack of confidence.” Krusa-Dossin told of more than

one commanding officer who “pushed me, taught me, pushed me, taught me... got me out of my comfort zone.”

Perception of mentorship in the Marine Corps is changing and some of the generals who served more recently spoke of having “mentors” and the inspiration they provided throughout their career. Although Garrett made no mention of having a mentor, she offered her opinion about the importance of mentoring in the Marine Corps: “I’m a big fan of mentoring ...helping people who are in the next generation see their way, their path to continue contributing but also to building the Marine Corps, so that it stays strong.” There was no discussion, however, about whether women needed mentors any more than men, nor did they indicate that they felt there was any advantage to having a female mentor over one that is male.

Many of the woman generals did acknowledge having received professional advocacy for valuable opportunities from senior ranking Marines with institutional influence and power, but which they did not solicit. As discussed in chapter two, this relationship is referred to as a “sponsor.” By way of example, Krusa-Dossin, in hindsight, was incredulous as to how fortunate she was to have been the recipient of two high-ranking officers’ advocacy, both resulting in opportunities to command. While she felt she didn’t really understand the importance at the time, she was able to look back and see the steps these sponsors had taken that shaped and influenced her career. Likewise, Reynolds credits Lieutenant General Mutter, an active duty woman Marine three-star general at the time, for advocating for her selection in June 1997, as the third woman to command a recruiting station. Although not recognized as a sponsor at the time, Reynolds says Mutter was “looking out” for her as a young major and got her a job for

which she had not understood the value. Neither of these women had first-hand knowledge of the people providing them support, but heard about it after the fact. While their experiences certainly differed, all of the women generals valued the role other Marines played in helping them navigate their professional journeys.

Consistent Themes

An overview of the cross-case analysis provided above reveals how complex and diverse these women Marine generals' experiences have been. However, a closer look reveals that there are three significant themes that characterize all eight of them in relationship to their professional paths. These are the willingness to settle for short term career goals, privileging their Marine identity, and exhibiting a strong attraction to many of the core values in the Marine culture.

Short term career goals. Literature on successful women frequently suggests that success requires that they develop a long-term career strategy. However, the experiences of these women Marines defies that logic. The consensus of these women Marine generals was that they not only did not have a long-term strategy for success in the Marine Corps, but in many cases “had no strategy,” as Reynolds explained, “I did none of ‘this’ deliberately. I went where the Corps told me to go.”

However, a closer examination of their careers suggests that in reality what they had developed was more of a short-term outlook. These women functioned simply by anticipating the *next* tour, planning ahead only to the degree that a decision was needed, as Mutter explained:

I was always a ‘keep-your-options-open’ kind of person. And so at that point [two years after commissioning] I liked what I was doing, I felt like it was worthwhile, and I augmented [accepted regular commission]. And then I just

stayed. And every time it came up that -- a decision of some sort -- ‘do I go to the next duty station? Do I take the next set of orders?’

Pratt concurred, suggesting; “So my philosophy in the reserves was pretty much ‘one drill at a time,’ that's how I managed it. As long as I continued to be motivated, I continued to stay, and I found renewed motivation after drill weekend.”

There are several reasons why these women generals may not have been motivated by long-term strategies. First, to some degree, they joined the Marine Corps because of their desire to serve, believing that their most effective role would be wherever the Corps needed them. For example, Reynolds explained, “Well, you know, you go job by job. You think, ‘well, these are pretty good orders. I think I'll take these’... You have to live a life of service, you have to go where the Corps tells you...” Similarly, Mutter recalled,

[Initially,] I was going to serve my 3 years and get out and be a school teacher following my husband around the Corps (my 1st husband was also a Marine). I didn't really plan to stay as long as I did. I kept enjoying what I was doing and felt it was worthwhile, so I stayed as long as I could.

Garrett offers yet another perspective toward service: “My professional goal was never to become a general officer. My professional goals were much more aligned to successive leadership challenges, or helping to shape the future of the Marine Corps in a different way.”

Another reason the women generals may have relied on short-term career strategies was the expectation that they would receive orders for a new assignment every two-three years, usually without regard for their personal desires, an organizational premise in every branch of the military. As Reynolds explained, “You have to move every two years. You have to give into that. And then, by the time you look at it, you go,

‘this [thinking about leaving the service] is stupid, now I've got 10-12 years in this organization’.”

Yet another reason related to the five generals who had family and/or husbands, is that they experienced such rapidly changing circumstances that a long-term strategy was untenable. As the only active duty Marine general mother, Krusa-Dossin offered, “For some women who actually plan, or think that they can plan, I would caution [them]. Because sometimes you can plan too much and it can have that boomerang effect [be counterproductive].”

Finally, as has been thoroughly discussed, throughout women’s history in the Marine Corps, the laws and policies have continuously changed, creating emerging opportunities that they could have never anticipated or planned for. This atmosphere lent itself to short-term strategies based on what was available at the time. As Reals noted early in her career: “You know, I wanted to be promoted, but that's different from saying I wanted to be a general. Because most of my career I couldn't have been, anyway. That was not something that I could attain.”

Identify as a Marine. The importance of identity for women’s success is discussed in depth in chapter two of this dissertation; specifically, that chapter focuses on literature describing how identity development impacts women’s sense of belonging in and commitment to a male-dominated institution in which they are a visible minority (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Day & Harrison, 2007; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Hogg, Terry & White, 1995; Tajfel, 1982; McLeod, 2008; Van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). The Marine Corps seems to understand the importance of organizational identity development. As explained in chapter one, the enculturation process of basic training,

both for officers and enlisted, is legendary for establishing a strong foundation in Marine identity, encouraging each recruit or candidate to assume the organizational or collective identity as “Marine” above all others. Reals’ advice to the next generation of Marines serves as an example of this: “[Marines should] put the Marine Corps first. We tend to get too involved with worrying about ourselves. The first thing we should be worried about is not whether it's good for you, but, rather, whether it's good for the Corps.”

Reals was not unique in this regard. Every women Marine general in this study believed that much of their success or their drive to persevere in the Marine Corps, was attributable to having developed and privileged a “Marine” identity over other identities, particularly that of “woman,” for the good of the institution. Salinas explained, “I always wanted to identify as a ‘good’ Marine regardless of any other factors [gender or nationality]. ... I loved being a Marine, and never wanted to bring embarrassment to the institution.” Similarly, Reynolds said, “It's not about being a female Marine; it's about how you wear the uniform, how you represent the Corps. I love being able to call myself a Marine. And I could never imagine doing anything else.”

For the four generals who identified as wives and/or mothers, privileging their Marine identity could not have been easy, and yet it seemed almost a non-issue to some of them. As Krusa-Dossin noted, “I never thought of it [my identity] that way [woman, wife, or mother]. I just never did. ....Just as a Marine. Just as a Marine, and being myself.” Even more profound is Monahan, mother of eight, who made it clear from the outset of her interview: “I do not specifically advocate nor serve as an expert on women in the Marine Corps. I can only speak for being a Marine.” Garrett reveals the emotional connection to her Marine identity in her decision to join the Reserves: “...becoming a

Mom pushed me out of active duty; but I loved being a Marine ... and I think I was kind of pathetic about it...”

Compelling organizational culture. As detailed in chapter one, the Marine Corps offers a vivid example of the influential force of culture, evidenced by the Corps’ 240 years of warfighting history and the ways in which they have created, developed, molded and motivated Marine leaders to courageously respond in a moment’s notice to fight the nation’s wars. Although some of these women were quite familiar with the Marine Corps before they joined as a result of family ties, others had no understanding of the organization they were signing up to serve. Whether the Corps’ values such as selfless service or pride in the organization were familiar to the generals or they learned them upon joining, each one embraced the principles on which the Marine Corps was founded and by which it continues to be guided.

For many of the generals, the values of the Marine Corps resonated with those with which they were raised. Mutter clearly remembers her initial impression:

After WOCC [woman officer candidate course], there was no other decision than *to* join. It was the ethos of the Corps that convinced me that I could do this. The values in the Corps matched those I was brought up with, the honor, courage and commitment ethos was something I believed in. There was also the allure that we believe we’re the best and that I could be proud of my service.

Those principles and the values were enticing to Salinas, who felt they matched ones instilled by her family:

I think the Marine Corps built on the foundation developed by my family. I tried to embody the principles that the Marines espouse as their core principles, honor, courage, & commitment; I think these values really were something that reinforced family values.

Still others remember how they felt when they first encountered the Marine Corps. Monahan recalls watching the Marine Corps band, *The President’s Own*, perform

in England when she lived overseas and how impressed she was in that instant. She added, “It’s just -- the Marines are the best. I mean, overseas you see what the Marine Corps is. The ethos -- I mean, you see how they’re revered. There’s something there; and that’s what I want to do.” For Salinas, it was also the feeling of connection and the “brotherhood”: “I think the Marine Corps’ ‘extended family’—you know, that sense that anybody that’s a Marine is part of the family.”

Reynolds recalls the impression that the Corps made on her when she was a Plebe at the Naval Academy in 1982:

...it was clear to me even then that the culture and the standards and the ethos of the Corps were something that I wanted more of. Once in, you fall in love with the culture and the people. I believe in the goodness of the Marine Corps. I understand the transformation in Marines and the force for good that the Corps can be.

Often these memories or the connection to their commonly held life values compelled these women, not only to join the Marines, but to continue their journey to some of the highest levels. Pratt sums it up nicely for her and the rest of the women in this elite group:

I joined the Marine Corps because I wanted to be a part of something greater than myself and I thought that the Marine Corps: the values and the morals, and the tenets that we hold dear; those things that are important: honor, courage, and commitment. I wanted to be one of ‘those’ guys—the Few, the Proud. You know, ‘Looking for a Few Good Men.’ I just wanted to be a part of that [the Marine Corps], and associate myself with that institution.”

Cross-Case Analysis Conclusion

The careers of eight of the highest ranking women officers in the Marine Corps offer valuable insight into the complexity of success, particularly considering the personal factors of a leader in interaction with and subject to the context in which he or she operates. Each of the women in this study brought with them a variety of personal

dynamics and decisions, served under different laws and policies, and were pretty much left to themselves to navigate the male-dominated culture. What this study has shown regarding the careers of these women Marine generals is that there is no predictable, repeatable path for women to make general in the Marine Corps. In the words of Brigadier General Reals, “There is no magical path or yellow brick road [leading to success in the Marine Corps].”

Implications

Perhaps the lesson here is that successful women emerge from a variety of backgrounds and with a variety of dispositions. However, all of the women that this dissertation research studied were drawn to the Marine Corps because of its compelling culture, finding themselves devoted to the institution and its concomitant ethos for most of their adult lives, while identifying as “Marine” even amidst other demanding life roles.

It is also important to note that these women’s paths to success reveal the challenges all women Marines face as they navigate their careers, the vast majority of whom never achieve general-level rank. Indeed there is a cost to the ever-changing policies related to gender, the limiting organizational structure and the often hidden gender bias that exists, as has been shown in the scarcity of women achieving upper-level ranks across the board.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the appeal of an organization’s culture and the congruence one feels for it, along with unique and at times idiosyncratic personal traits, actions, and decisions are what has driven success for women in this male-dominated organization, in spite of, or perhaps even because of the barriers they faced.

Limitations of the Study

Although this study makes a significant contribution to the body of literature on highly successful military women, it does come with some recognizable limitations. Four will be briefly discussed. The first limitation arises from having such a small population from which to sample. While this exploratory case/cross-case study was intended to examine all nine of the living woman Marine Corps generals in the smallest military service in the U.S, one of these chose not to participate. With one being deceased, this meant only eight of the ten total women Marine generals were a part of the study. While this percentage is excellent by social research standards, the small size of the population could serve to limit the strength of the results if the goal was to develop insights that transcend the Marine Corps context and apply to women in other male-dominated organizations.

Another limitation in this study lies with my positionality within it. As noted in both the preface and in the methodology section of this dissertation, my experience in the U.S Marine Corps, along with my passion and high regard for the institution, had the potential to introduce bias and subjective judgments, if not properly monitored and managed throughout the study. As noted in my methodology section, I sought to ameliorate any potential contamination of the data through various means. However, because research is never completely bias-free, under the best circumstances, my positionality does suggest a limitation of some sort.

The third obvious limitation of this study arises from the fact that each of the woman generals who participated in this study waived their right to confidentiality and as a result, I tell their stories using their names rather than pseudonyms. As previously

addressed in the review of the literature in this dissertation, there are acknowledged trade-offs relative to retaining confidentiality in terms of transparency and authenticity.

However, even given these potential drawbacks, one of the most compelling benefits of this study is the preservation of important historical data on women Marines, contributing significantly to what is currently, a very small body of knowledge. Furthermore, with such a small *n*, the study would have had a difficult time truly masking participants' identities even if pseudonyms had been employed.

The final limitation is related to the issue of generalizability. This study's findings are not generalizable in the traditional scientific sense for two reasons. First, the use of a purposeful sampling strategy creates implicit constraints in seeking to apply the findings to other populations. Second, as Donmoyer (1990) notes, it is impossible to generalize the findings from studies in which "questions about meaning and perspective are central and ongoing," as has certainly been the case for this research (p. 197).

However, the fact that this study captured the experiences of eight of the ten highest ranking women in the Marine Corps, an indisputably male-dominated organization, cannot be underestimated. The insights gained from these women's career trajectories may be instructive in helping us understand and anticipate the challenges and sources of support that women leaders in other male-dominated contexts may encounter. As a result, the study serves a heuristic function by identifying possibilities and considerations that maybe *transferable or fitting* for future women leaders from all walks of life (Donmoyer, 1990).

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings and themes developed out of this study may provide the foundation for future research on women leaders, regardless of the context. One such study could explore the circumstances of the women who achieved colonel in the Corps, the rank below brigadier general, but did not reach general-level. Other studies could use this study as a basis from which to examine or compare other services' generals, male or female, to those of this all-Marine study. Lastly, a similar study of servicewomen that achieved senior enlisted ranks may further illuminate any differences in factors supporting or challenging women's success in the military. Although the female population is still relatively small in the U.S. Marine Corps (just shy of 8 percent), there is valuable purpose in pausing to give voice to these women and their achievements in what is still, to a large degree, a male-dominated profession.

Significance of the Study

Despite the limitations addressed above, there are four significant implications of this study in two distinct bodies of literature—women's leadership and women in the military. The first point of significance is that it attempts to re-orient the discussion about women in leadership from one of victimization and defeat to optimism and inspiration for future women leaders. In that sense, by exposing these success stories, this study may serve to balance the literature that focuses almost exclusively on barriers and limited leadership opportunities for women.

The second point of significance is that future women leaders will benefit by knowing how women in the past “navigated the labyrinth” to success, in order to eventually achieve a place in the high-status, powerful positions of today's evolving,

contemporary organizations. Specifically, the findings and themes of this study can serve to inform the behavior and thinking of women leaders across the board.

Third, this study provides insight for leaders of organizations and leadership development professionals regarding the influences that result in leadership achievement for women, particularly in male-dominated organizations. Finally, this landmark study appears to be the first attempt to collectively document the stories of U.S. Marine Corps women generals, and thus offers incalculable historical and sociological benefits.

Final Words

The purpose of this chapter was to explore the questions: *How do these women leaders describe their career trajectories in the U.S. Marine Corps, a male-dominated organization?* and *What were the factors that challenged them and how did they overcome them?* I sought to answer this primarily through in-person interviews with each participant, augmented by interviews with professional colleagues, and a review of publically and privately available documents about these women. Their individual case studies, seen in chapter four, were developed to offer a holistic understanding of their lives and careers, while providing a short discussion of some of the prominent factors for success and challenge in their Marine Corps journeys.

This chapter has offered a cross-case comparison of the eight women Marine generals who participated in this study. Three categories were used to examine the similarities and differences in their professional paths: personal, cultural, and institutional. Within each of these categories, more specific factors were examined to demonstrate the divergence and convergence in how they navigated their careers. However, after thorough consideration of these foundations for comparison, it became

clear that only three factors arose consistently for all eight women. These were the willingness to settle for short term career goals, privileging their Marine identity, and a strong affinity with many of the core values in the Marine culture. The one conclusion that can be safely made based on the breadth of this study is that there does not appear to be one predictable or repeatable path for success demonstrated in the careers of the women generals in the Marine Corps.

The U.S. Marine Corps has earned a well-deserved reputation as a “lean, mean, fighting machine,” and an organization that recruits those who yearn to be one of “the few, the proud.” For more than 73 years, this has included women. In that relatively short time, there have been *ten* women that have attained the rank of general, whose stories, until now, have remained untold. The eight extraordinary women Marine Corps generals who so generously gave of their selves to make this study possible offer an unprecedented look at what highly successful women can do in the face of uncommon challenges. May their stories and insights serve to inspire leaders in all spheres of life.

REFERENCES

- Adams-Ender, C. (2001). *My Rise to the Stars*. Lake Ridge, VA.: Cape Associates Incorporated.
- Amos, J. (2013). *Statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee on the Impact of Sequestration*. Delivered on 13 February 2013. Washington, D.C. Retrieved on 23 July 2015 from <http://www.hqmc.marines.mil/Portals/142/Docs/130212%20CMC%20Statement%20to%20SASC%20on%20the%20Impact%20of%20Sequestration.pdf>
- Amos, J. (2014). Foreward. United States Marine Corps, *Leading Marines MCWP 6-11* (p. ii). Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Marine Corps.
- Archer, S. L. (1989). Gender differences in identity development: Issues of process, domain and timing. *Journal of Adolescence*, 12(2), 117-138.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of management review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 157-170. doi: 10.1037/a0018806
- Barnes, T. R. (2003). Strategies for developing white men as change agents for women leaders. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership*. (pp. 181-189). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Barreto, M., Ryan, M. K., & Schmitt, M. T. (Eds.). (2009). *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Barsh, J., & Yee, L. (2012). *Unlocking the full potential of women at work*. Retrieved from <http://www.mckinsey.com/careers/women/~media/Reports/Women/2012%20WSJ%20Women%20in%20the%20Economy%20white%20paper%20FINAL.ashx>.
- Binkin, M., & Bach, S. J. (1977). *Women and the military*. Washington: Brookings Institution.
- Blackmore, J. (2002). Troubling women: The upsides and downsides of leadership and the new managerialism. In C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Women and school leadership: International perspectives* (pp. 49-70). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Blount, J. M. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency, 1873-1995*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Brass, D. J., & Krackhardt, D. (1999). The social capital of twenty-first century leaders. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge and L. Wong (Eds.), *Out-of-the-box leadership: Transforming the twenty-first-century army and other top-performing organizations* (pp. 179-194). Stamford, Conn: Jai Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this 'We'? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 83-93.
- Brickson, S. (2000). The impact of identity orientation on individual and organizational outcomes in demographically diverse settings. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 82-101.
- Brooks, D. L., & Brooks, L. (1997). *Seven secrets of successful women*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Burke, P. J. (1980). The Self: Measurement Requirements from an Interactionist Perspective. *Social psychology quarterly*, 43(1), 18-29. doi:10.2307/3033745
- Catalyst. (2014). Fortune 500 Positions Held by Women. New York: Catalyst. Retrieved from <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/fortune-500-ceo-positions-held-women>
- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). (2013). Director's Advisory Group on Women in Leadership Unclassified Report. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/reports/>
- Cook, B., & Kim, Y. (2012). *The American college president-2012* (7th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Daly, A. J., & Finnigan, K. S. (2010). A bridge between worlds: Understanding network structure to understand change strategy. *Journal of Educational Change*, 11(2), 111-138.
- Day, D. V., & Harrison, M. M. (2007). A multilevel, identity-based approach to leadership development. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(4), 360-373. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.08.007>
- Denzin, N. (1978). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of management review*, 35(4), 627-647.

- DeRue, D. S., Ashford, S. J., & Cotton, N. C. (2009). Assuming the mantle: Unpacking the process by which individuals internalize a leader identity. *Exploring positive identities and organizations: Building a theoretical and research foundation*, 217-236.
- Doll, Y. (2007). *United States Army women general officers: A phenomenological study of their career ascension and leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3286253)
- Donmoyer, R. (1990). Generalizability and the Single-Case Study. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 175-200). New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.
- Dougherty, J.S. (2014). *Female officers who achieved general officer status in the U.S. Army: A multiple-case study of motivation and success strategies* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3617138)
- Dunwoody, A., & Collins, T. (2015). *A higher standard: Leadership strategies from America's first female four-star general* (First Da Capo Press edition. ed.). Boston, MA: Da Capo Lifelong, a member of the Perseus Books Group.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*(14), 807-834. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.004
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2004). Women and men as leaders. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 279-301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007a). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007b). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(9), 63-71.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 216-224. doi: 10.1037/a0018957
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers. *Psychological issues*.

- Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(2), 243-251. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.243
- ethos [Def. 1]. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster Online*. In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved August 21, 2015, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ethos>.
- Federal Glass Ceiling Commission. (1995). *A Solid Investment: Making full use of the nation's human capital: The environmental scan: A fact-finding report of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Frank, B. M. & United States Marine Corps (USMC). (1983). Oral History Interview: Brigadier General Margaret A. Brewer, USMC (Ret). History and Museum Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. Washington, D.C.
- Friedan, B. (1974). *The feminine mystique* (10th anniversary ed.). New York: Norton.
- Friese, S. (2011). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS.ti*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gallagher, C., & Golant, S. K. (2000). *Going to the top: A road map for success from America's leading women executives*. New York: Viking.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success*: Penguin UK.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Griffiths, S., & Kennedy, H. (1996). *Beyond the glass ceiling: Forty women whose ideas shape the modern world*. Manchester; New York, New York: Manchester University Press; Distributed exclusively in the USA and Canada by St. Martin's Press.
- Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S., & Platow, M. (2011). *The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence, and power*. Hove, East Sussex England; New York: Psychology Press.
- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership* (1st ed.). New York, N.Y.: Doubleday Currency.
- Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). *The managerial woman* (1st ed.). Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hill, L. (2003). Are we preparing ourselves to lead? In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership* (pp. 144–167). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and social psychology review*, 5(3), 184-200.
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social psychology quarterly*, 255-269.
- Hogg, M. A., Van Knippenberg, D., & Rast, D. E. (2012). Intergroup leadership in organizations: Leading across group and organizational boundaries. *Academy of management review*, 37(2), 232-255.
- Holm, J. (1992). *Women in the military: An unfinished revolution* (Rev. ed.). Novato, CA: Presidio Press.
- Hoyt, C. (2013). Women and leadership. In P. Northouse (Ed.), *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.) (pp. 349-382). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hymowitz, C., & Schellhardt, T. D. (1986). The corporate woman (a special report): Cover-the glass ceiling: Why women can't seem to break the invisible barrier that blocks them from the top jobs. *The Wall Street Journal (Eastern Edition)*, 24.
- Ibarra, H., Snook, S., & Guillen Ramo, L. (2010). Identity-based leader development. *Handbook of leadership theory and practice*, 657-678.
- Iskra, D. M. (2007). *Breaking through the "brass" ceiling: Elite military women's strategies for success* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3297349)
- Johnson, R. E., & Yang, L.-Q. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of management review*, 35(2), 226-245.
- Kennedy, C. J., & McConnell, M. (2001). *Generally speaking: A memoir by the first woman promoted to three-star general in the United States Army*. New York: Warner Books.
- Khan, S., & VanWynsberghe, R. (2008). Cultivating the Under-Mined: Cross-Case Analysis as Knowledge Mobilization. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(1). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/334>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections*, 22(1), 28-51.

- Lyman, L. L., Ashby, D. E., & Tripses, J. S. (2005). *Leaders who dare: Pushing the boundaries*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Madsen, S. R. (2008). *On becoming a woman leader: Learning from the experiences of university presidents* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, 38(1), 299.
- McLeod, S. A. (2008). Social Identity Theory. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html
- Meyerson, D. E. & Ely, R. J. (2003). Using difference to make a difference. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership*. (pp. 129-143). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC). (2011). *From representation to inclusion: Diversity leadership for the 21st-Century Military*. Arlington, Va.
- Morrison, A.M., R.P. White, E. Van Velsor, & The Center for Creative Leadership. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC). (2010). *Statistics: Women in Congress*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nwpc.org/statistics>
- Naval History and Heritage Command (NHHC). (2015). Retrieved on 19 July 2015 from <http://www.history.navy.mil/research/library/online-reading-room/title-list-alphabetically/z/z-grams-list-policy-directives-issued-admiral-zumwalt/z-gram-116.html>
- Nkomo, S. M., & Cox, T. (1996). Diverse identities in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*: 338-356. London: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—one's own. *Educational researcher*, 17(7), 17-21.
- Peshkin, A. (2000). The nature of interpretation of qualitative research. *Educational researcher*, 29(9), 5-9.

- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 8(1), 5-23.
- Proudford, K.L. (2007). Isn't she delightful? Creating relationships that get women to the top (and keep them there). In B. Kellerman, D. L. Rhode and S. D. O'Connor (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change* (pp. 431-451). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, a Wiley Imprint.
- Rhode, D. L. (2003). The difference "difference" makes. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership* (pp. 3-50). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rhode, D. L. & Kellerman, B. (2007). Women and leadership: The state of play. In B. Kellerman, D. L. Rhode and S. D. O'Connor (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change* (pp. 1-62). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, a Wiley Imprint.
- Riggio, R. E. (2008). Leadership development: The current state and future expectations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(4), 383-392. doi: 10.1037/1065-9293.60.4.383
- Rimm, S. B., Rimm-Kaufman, S., & Rimm, S. B. (2001). *How Jane won: 55 successful women share how they grew from ordinary girls to extraordinary women* (1st ed.). New York: Crown Business.
- Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Sanchez-Hucles, J. V., & Davis, D. D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 171.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). pp. 443-466. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social psychology quarterly*, 224-237.
- Stremlow, M.V. & United States Marine Corps (USMC). (1986). *A history of the Women Marines, 1946-1977*. History and Museums Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. Washington, D.C.

- Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The relevance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 558-564.
- Sykes, D. J. (1998). *Family involvement in early childhood interagency collaborative efforts: Nine case studies* (Order No. 9834082). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (304442224). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.sally.sandiego.edu/docview/304442224?accountid=14742>
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, 33(1), 1-39.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33(47), 74.
- Turner, R. H. (1978). The Role and the Person. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(1), 1-23. doi:10.2307/2777976
- The White House Project. (2009). *White House Project report: Benchmarking women's leadership*. Retrieved from http://www.in.gov/icw/files/benchmark_wom_leadership.pdf
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1991). A report on the glass ceiling initiative. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Marine Corps (USMC). (2014). *Leading Marines MCWP 6-11*. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Marine Corps.
- United States Marine Corps (USMC). (2015). Marine Corps Concepts and Programs. Retrieved on 1 September 2015 from <https://marinecorpsconceptsandprograms.com/almanac>
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 25, 243-295.
- Walsh, E. (1995). *Divided lives: The public and private struggles of three accomplished women*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Willenz, J. A. (1983). *Women veterans: America's forgotten heroines*. New York: Continuum.
- Williams, K. B. (2004). *Grace Hopper: Admiral of the cyber sea*. Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press.

Women in Military Service to America (WIMSA). (2015). Retrieved on 19 July 2015 from <http://www.womensmemorial.org/H%26C/History/wwii%28mcwr%29.html>

Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI). (2014). *Women in the military: Where they stand* (9th ed.). Washington, D.C.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A**Study Announcement and Solicitation Correspondence**

Letter mailed from MCHF to the women generals announcing Dissertation Grant award.

June 11, 2014

General Marine, USMC (Ret)
111 XXXXXX
City, ST 00000

Dear General Marine:

The Marine Corps Heritage Foundation recently awarded a Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship to Retired Marine Colonel Marianne Waldrop, who is a Ph.D. candidate at University of San Diego. The focus of her dissertation will be case studies on the nine women who have attained the rank of general in the United States Marine Corps. The Marine Corps History Division has endorsed her project since there is not a lot of existing literature about women in the military in leadership positions, particularly in the Marine Corps.

The Foundation's Board of Directors' Awards Committee approved Colonel Waldrop's fellowship and I hope that you will make every effort to assist with her research so this information is available to future generations.

Semper Fidelis,

Robert R. Blackman, Jr.
Lieutenant General, United States Marine Corps (Ret)
President and CEO, Marine Corps Heritage Foundation

Email request from me sent by MajGen Tracy Garrett to women generals in September 2014.

August 1, 2014

Dear Generals of the Corps,

I am a student at the University of San Diego who is embarking on a doctoral study at the University of San Diego in the coming 18 months. I believe you have received information from both MajGen Tracy Garrett, via email in February 2013 and a letter in June 2014 from MajGen Rusty Blackman of the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation regarding my academic pursuit. I would like to introduce myself, my study interest and provide you a little more detail about my timeline.

I am a retired Marine Corps colonel. I served in the intelligence community from 1987 to 2011. I retired from 3d Marine Aircraft Wing, MCAS Miramar in August 2011, immediately becoming a student at the University of San Diego, in the School of Leadership and Educational Sciences in the Leadership Studies program. As of May 2014,

I have completed 51 hours of course work and am proceeding into the dissertation phase of my Doctoral degree. In May 2014, I was notified that I was selected as the 2014 General Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr. Memorial Dissertation Fellowship for my study of women Marine Corps general officers. I anticipate that this will allow me to travel to each of the locations of my general participants to conduct in-person interviews.

Below, I am providing an updated short description of my study. After considering this, I am very hopeful that each of you will agree to participate in an in-person interview with me in the coming year.

My goal is to fill a significant gap in the body of literature about women in the military with a dissertation that tells of the supports, challenges and strategies that each of you encountered in your careers that enabled you to achieve general rank in the Marine Corps. Currently, aside from some media articles or oral histories that are archived in the Library of Congress, the meaningful stories of all the Marine Corps' Women generals is not readily accessible to future women of our armed forces, much less, the Marine Corps. It is my hope that you will agree to be identified in my research. My desired end state is that we tell your stories that reveal how you succeeded. The stories of your advocates, supports and, through acknowledgement of your challenges, the strategies that you employed to overcome those hurdles, obstacles.

There will be certainly more to follow, but at this time, I am hoping that this will be sufficient to for you to want to engage in future discussion with me about your interest and participation in my study. Because of the logistical and academic milestones of the dissertation process, I must successfully defend my dissertation proposal and receive approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) before I can begin to engage in official interviews with any of you.

My goal is to be able to defend my proposal in October or early November 2014, immediately confirm IRB approval and begin scheduling in-person interviews with the generals who agree to participate in late 2014 or in 2015.

Out of respect for your privacy, I am asking that you reach out to me via any of my contact information below to further discuss your questions or to express your interest in supporting this study. Marianne Waldrop, 2951 Brandon Circle, Carlsbad, CA 92010; waldropms@aol.com or waldrop@sandiego.edu and cell phone: 252-646-4379 home phone: 760-434-5475.

Thank you for considering my request for your support of this study. I am hopeful that I will hear from all of you in order to ensure that the women Marine generals' stories are told and offer inspiration to our future women leaders.

Very Respectfully,

Marianne Waldrop,
Col USMC (Ret)

APPENDIX B**Primary Research Participant Interview Protocol**

Guidelines for the Interview

This guide is not intended to be a script to be strictly followed. It will be used to ensure that basic areas of interest are addressed in the course of the interview and that certain types of information and sentiments are covered. Initially, the “grand tour” question will be posed to the research participant. The additional topics and questions will be covered, as necessary, in the order that they are listed below, if they have not been previously addressed during the grand tour discussion.

Researcher informs the primary research participant of the following:

Recorder is turned on

This interview is being conducted by Marianne Waldrop for her dissertation study of the women generals of the U.S. Marine Corps. I am interviewing General XXXXX on DD/MM/YYYY at HH: MM. Thank you for your participation in this study.

Per your previous consent, this interview will be recorded for transcription purposes.

You have agreed to be identified for the purposes of this research. Do you still consent to this?

This interview is intended to last no longer than 90 minutes. If additional information is needed, we will mutually determine how and when future contact can be made to gain the needed information. So, if you are ready...

Grand tour question:

I'd like to have you share in your own words an overview of your journey to becoming a general in the Marine Corps. Maybe you could begin by telling me how you got into the Marines in the first place and then we'll go from there.

You are welcome to do this by way of a written timeline, if you prefer.

If they do not mention in responding to the grand tour question, inquire about:

Tell me about how you think your family, upbringing, and/or education influenced your decision to pursue the Marine Corps as a profession. (RQ 1)

What was your experience of the social attitude/legal prohibitions regarding women in the military at the time you joined? How did social attitudes or laws change and how did they influence your career? (RQ 1)

Tell me about what you believe motivated you to join the Marine Corps or to stay as long as you did? (RQ 2a)

Tell me about any beliefs you hold personally, professionally or socially that may have had an influence on your achievement. (RQ 2b)

Tell me about any of your personal traits or characteristics that you believe had an impact on your career in the Marine Corps and how. (RQ 2c)

Tell me about any personal behaviors you employed that may have contributed to your achievement in the Marine Corps. (RQ 2d)

Tell me about any relationships in your personal life or career that you believe had an impact on your career in the Marine Corps and how. (RQ 2e)

Tell me about how the Marine Corps as an institution and/or culture influenced you and your career. (RQ 2f)

Tell me about how your occupational specialty (professional job in the Marine Corps) influenced your advancement in the Marine Corps. (RQ 2f)

Tell me about professional opportunities that you believe made a difference in your career and how. (RQ 2f)

Tell me about your professional goals or your plan for the Marine Corps and when and how you developed them. (RQ 2g)

Tell me about formative challenges you faced in the Marine Corps and how you managed them. (RQ 2g)

If there was one thing that you would tell future women Marines who aspire to make the Marine Corps a career and attain general-level rank, what would it be? (RQ 1)

Is there anything about your Marine Corps career that you would like to add that has not already been addressed? (RQ 1)

*If you have nothing else, that concludes our interview. Thank you very much. **Recorder off.***

APPENDIX C

Supporting Research Participant Interview Protocol

Guidelines for the Interview

This guide is not intended to be a script to be strictly followed. It will be used to ensure that basic areas of interest are addressed in the course of the interview and that certain types of information and sentiments are covered. Initially, the “grand tour” question will be posed to the research participant. The additional topics and questions will be covered, as necessary, in the order that they are listed below, if they have not been previously addressed during the grand tour discussion.

Researcher informs the supporting research participant of the following:

Recorder is turned on

This interview is being conducted by Marianne Waldrop for her dissertation study of the women generals of the U.S. Marine Corps. I am interviewing XXXXX on DD/MM/YYYY at HH:MM. Thank you for your participation in this study.

Per your previous consent, this interview will be recorded for transcription purposes.

Your identity will remain confidential for the purposes of this research, unless you have otherwise authorized.

This interview is intended to last no longer than 30 minutes. If additional information is needed, we will mutually determine how and when future contact can be made to gain the needed information. So, if you are ready...

Grand tour question:

Please tell me how you know General XXXX and what factors or qualities you perceive supported her leadership achievement in the Marine Corps.

If they do not mention in responding to the grand tour question, ask about:

Tell me about what you believed motivated her about the Marine Corps.

What behaviors did she employ that may have been beneficial or remarkable?

What do you know about any beliefs she held about herself or her work?

Describe her personal characteristics that could be attributable to her success.

Describe any relationships that you observed that may have been helpful to her.

Tell me about any strategies or tactics she employed, professionally or personally.

What, if anything, about General XXXX, would like to mention that hasn't already been discussed or inquired about?

If you have nothing else, that concludes our interview. Thank you very much.

Recorder off.

APPENDIX D**Career Timeline for BGen Margaret Brewer, USMC (Ret.)**

Timeline for BGen Margaret A. Brewer, USMC (Ret.)

1 Jul 1930	Born in Durand, MI and raised in Michigan and attended Catholic High School in Baltimore, MD
1947	Attended University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, student <i>and a member of the Zeta Tau Alpha sorority</i>
Jun 1950	Attended Women Officer Training Course-Junior, (WOTC), Marine Corps Base (MCB) Quantico, VA, six weeks
Jul 1951	Attended 3 rd WOTC-Senior, MCB Quantico, VA, six weeks
Jan 1952	Graduated from University of Michigan, <i>Bachelor of Arts in Geography</i>
11 Mar 1952	Commissioned a 2 nd lieutenant, <i>due to Korean conflict personnel shortage, she did not attend Women Officer Indoctrination Course (WOIC)</i>
May 1952	Transferred to Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), El Toro, CA, Communication Watch Officer, <i>attended 1-week Cryptographic Refresher Course in San Diego, CA</i>
Nov 1952	Assigned military occupational specialty (MOS) (2520), Assistant Communications Officer, <i>one of the first women assigned to this MOS</i>
Jul 1953	Activated the 19th Woman Reserve (WR) Platoon, WM Communications Platoon, 2 nd Signal Company, Brooklyn, NY, Assistant Inspector-Instructor
5 Oct 1955	Assumed Command, Woman Marine Company, Headquarters and Service Battalion (H&S Bn), Fleet Marine Forces, Atlantic (FMFLANT), Camp Elmore, Norfolk, VA
Jun 1955	MOS administratively changed from 2520 to 2502
Apr 1956	Changed MOS to Administration (0115)
1956	Promoted to captain (Capt)
8 Mar 1957	Assumed Command, Woman Marine Company, Headquarters Battalion (HQ Bn), Marine Corps Base (MCB), Camp Lejeune, NC; <i>collateral duty Women Marines Specialist Inspector at Cherry Point, NC</i>
May 1958	Assigned to Recruiting Station Lexington, KY, 5 th Marine Corps Reserve and Recruitment District, woman officer selection officer (WOSO), <i>summer assignments as platoon commander for women officer candidates, Quantico, VA</i>
Dec 1959	Transferred to MCB Camp Pendleton, CA, Commissioned Officers Mess (Open), Officer in Charge, Camp Del Mar (Main) & Treasurer for Club system
Sep 1961	Promoted to major (Maj)
Apr 1963	Transferred to Woman Marine Detachment (WMD), Headquarters Company, MCB Quantico, VA, Executive Officer (XO)
17 Jun 1965	Assumed Command, WMD, MCB Quantico, VA
Aug 1965	MOS 0115 reverted to secondary MOS; granted primary MOS 0130
Jun 1966	Transferred to 6 th Marine Corps District, Atlanta, GA, Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Dec 1966	Promoted to lieutenant colonel (LtCol)
Mar 1968	Transferred to HQ Bn, HQMC, Arlington, VA, Deputy Director of Women Marines
Dec 1970	Promoted to colonel (Col)
Apr 1971	Transferred to Marine Corps Education Center (MCEC), MCB Quantico, VA, Special Assistant to Director

Jun 1972	Reassigned within MCEC, MCB Quantico, VA, Chief of Support Department, <i>(combined G-1, G-4 staff position)</i>
1 Feb 1973	Assumed Directorship of Women Marines (WM), <i>7th and last, disestablishing the position to achieve full gender integration in the Corps on 30 June 1977</i>
1 Jul 1977	Reassigned to Division of Information, HQMC, Washington, DC, Deputy Director
Apr 1978	Nominated for appointment to brigadier general (BGen) by President Carter and General Louis H. Wilson, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC), <i>the first woman to reach the general ranks in the U.S. Marine Corps</i>
11 May 1978	Promoted to BGen, assumed Directorship of Division of Information, HQMC
1 Dec 1979	Division of Information redesignated as the Division of Public Affairs (PA), <i>renamed Director of Public Affairs</i>
1 Jul 1980	Retired to Springfield, VA <i>served on Board of Directors of Catholic Charities of Arlington County and the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation</i>
2 Jan 2013	Passed away in Greenspring Village, Springfield, VA at the age of 82

APPENDIX E**Career Timeline for BGen Gail M. Reals, USMC (Ret.)**

Timeline for BGen Gail M. Reals, USMC (Ret.)

1 Sep 1935	Born in Syracuse, New York
May 1953	Graduated from Manlius High School, Manlius, NY
Sep 1953-Sep 1954	Attended and graduated from Powelson Business Institute, Syracuse, NY
30 Sep 1954	Enlisted in the Marine Corps in Syracuse, NY and shipped to boot camp Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island (MCRD PI), SC
Dec 1954	Graduated from boot camp <i>awarded MOS: 0131 Administrative Clerk</i>
14 Dec 1954	Transferred to Marine Corps Base (MCB) Quantico, VA, assigned to Development Center, Advanced Research Group as Administrative Clerk
Sep 1955	Promoted to Private First Class (PFC)
Nov 1955	Transferred to Headquarters Battalion (HQ Bn), Headquarters Marine Corps (HQMC), Henderson Hall, Arlington, VA, assigned as Secretary to the Chief of Staff (COS)
1 Mar 1956	Meritoriously promoted to Corporal (Cpl) E-3
1 Nov 1956	Meritoriously promoted to Sergeant (Sgt) E-4
Jan 1959	Transferred to Headquarters, U.S. European Command, Paris, France, assigned as Chief Clerk, J-3 Operations
13 Dec 1959	Promoted to Sergeant (Sgt) E-5
Feb 1961	Transferred to HQ Bn, HQMC, Henderson Hall, Arlington, VA, assigned private secretary to the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps (ACMC)
May 1961	Selected for Meritorious Commissioning Program (MCP)
20 Jun 1961	Reported to Women Officer Training Course (WOTC), MCB Quantico, VA, student WOTC-Junior
4 Aug 1961	Graduated 15 th WOTC-Junior, commenced WOTC-Senior, MCB Quantico, VA
15 Sep 1961	Graduated 15 th WOTC-Senior and commissioned a 2 nd lieutenant (2 nd Lt)
9 Nov 1961	Graduated from 15 th Women Officer Indoctrination Course (WOIC), MCB Quantico, VA, <i>assigned the MOS: 0180 (Administration)</i>
Nov 1961	Assigned to WOTC, MCB Quantico, VA, Adjutant and Company Commander (Co CO)
Dec 1962	Promoted to 1 st lieutenant (1 st Lt)
Jan 1964	Assumed command, Women Marine Company, HQ Bn, Henderson Hall, HQMC, Washington D.C.
Jul 1966	Promoted to captain (Capt)
Jan-Jun 1967	Attended Women's Army Corps (WAC) Officer Career Course, Fort McClellan, AL , student
Jun 1967	Transferred to Women Officer School (WOS), MCB Quantico, VA, Instructor
Nov 1967	Transferred to MCB Twentynine Palms, CA, Base Adjutant
Oct 1968	Transferred to Marine Security Guard Bn (MSG Bn), Bravo Company (B Co), Beirut, Lebanon assigned as Personnel Officer (PersO)/Admin Officer-overseas <i>MSG billets were recently opened to women</i>
23 Sep 1969	Promoted to major (Maj)

Jan 1971	Transferred to Women Recruit Training (WRT) Bn, MCRD PI, SC assigned as Executive Officer (XO), interim Commanding Officer (CO)
Jun 1973	Transferred to Marine Corps Command & Staff College (CSC), Quantico, VA, student
Jun 1974	Transferred to Inspection Division, HQMC, assigned as Head, Administrative Branch
Feb 1975	Promoted to lieutenant colonel (LtCol)
15 Sep 1977	Assumed command, WRT Bn, MCRD PI, SC
Oct 1979	Transferred to HQMC, assigned as Asst. Head, Human Resources Branch, Manpower Dept.
1979-1981	<i>Collateral duty: Special Assistant for Women to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower</i>
1 Aug 1980	Promoted to colonel (Col)
Aug 1981	Attended Naval War College (NWC), Newport, RI, student
Jul 1982	Transferred to 1 st Marine Aircraft Wing (1 st MAW), Okinawa, Japan, assigned as Assistant Chief of Staff (AC/S) G-1 (Administration)
Aug 1983	Transferred to Marine Corps Development and Education Command (MCDEC), MCB Quantico, VA, assigned to Education Center as the AC/S Personnel and Services
1984	Reassigned as MCDEC, A/CS G-1
10 Dec 1984	Reassigned as MCDEC, Chief of Staff (COS)
15 May 1985	Frocked to brigadier general (BGen) aboard The Basic School, Quantico, VA
18 May 1985	Awarded honorary Doctor of Science in Business Administration from Bryant College, Smithfield, RI
Jun 1985	Assigned as Director, Manpower Plans and Policy Division, HQMC, Washington, DC
1 Jun 1986	BGen Promotion effective date
7 Jul 1988	Assumed command, Marine Corps Base, Quantico, VA
31 May 1990	Retired from Quantico, VA, taking up residence in Arlington, VA

APPENDIX F**Career Timeline for LtGen Carol A. (Wiescamp) Mutter, USMC (Ret.)**

Timeline for LtGen Carol A. Mutter, USMC (Ret.)

17 Dec 1945	Born Greeley, CO
Jun-Aug 1966	Attended Woman Officer Candidate Course (WOCC), Quantico, VA, student
Jun 1967	Graduated from Colorado State College with <i>Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics Education & minored in Physics</i> ; commissioned a Second Lieutenant (2 nd Lt)
Jun 1967	Married 2 nd Lt Gerritt Wiescamp, Marine Corps officer from Colorado
Sep-Oct 1967	Attended 21 st Woman Officer Basic Course (WOBC), Quantico, VA, <i>received the MOS: 4000, Basic Data Processing Marine</i>
Oct 1967	Assigned to Data Processing Installation (DPI), Quantico, VA for on the job training
Jan 1968	Transferred to Data Processing Installation-3 (DPI-3), Camp Pendleton, CA
1968	Attended Data Processing Officer Course, Indianapolis, IN, <i>awarded MOS 4002, Data Processing Officer</i>
May 1969	Promoted to first lieutenant (1 st Lt)
Jun 1970	Augmented as a regular commissioned officer
Apr 1972	Transferred to Woman Officer School (WOS) Quantico, VA, Platoon Commander (Plt Cmdr), Instructor at WOS and Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) Leadership Course
1972	Promoted to captain (Capt)
Jan-May 1973	Attended Amphibious Warfare School (AWS), student, Quantico, VA
Jun 1973	Transferred to Marine Corps Tactical Systems Support Activity (MCTSSA), Camp Pendleton, CA, held five billets during tour
7 May 1977	Married Major James Mutter, USMC
1978	Promoted to major (Maj)
Aug 1978 – May 1979	Attended Marine Corps Command and Staff College (CSC), Quantico, VA, student
Early 1979	Awarded new primary MOS 3402, <i>Finance Officer</i>
May 1979	Transferred to Marine Corps Development Center, Quantico, VA, Financial Management Officer
May 1981	Transferred to 1 st Marine Aircraft Wing (MAW), Okinawa, Japan, Comptroller, <i>selected for lieutenant colonel in a colonel's position</i>
Apr 1982	Promoted to lieutenant colonel (LtCol)
Jun 1983	Transferred to Fleet Marine Forces, Atlantic (FMFLANT), (now called Marine Forces Command) Norfolk, VA, Deputy Comptroller
Aug 1984-May 1985	Attended Naval War College (NWC), Newport, RI, student, receiving <i>Master of Arts in National Security and Strategic Studies</i> ; <i>Concurrently received Master of Science in Business from Salve Regina College, Newport, RI</i>
May 1985	Transferred to Marine Corps Finance Center, Kansas City, MO, Deputy Program Manager (PM) & PM for Automated Pay and Personnel Systems
May 1988	Transferred to U.S. Space Command, Colorado Springs, CO, J-3 (Operations) Directorate, Command Center Crew Commander/Space Director, Division Chief, <i>first woman to qualify as Space Director</i> ; <i>received joint duty credit</i>
Oct 1988	Promoted to colonel (Col)
Aug 1990	Transferred to III Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) and 3d Marine Division (MARDIV) Okinawa, Japan, serving as Comptroller for both commands

Jun 1991	Promoted to brigadier general (BGen)
Jun 1991	Transferred to Marine Corps Research, Development and Acquisition Command (MCRDAC), Quantico, VA, Deputy Commander (CG) and Program Manager (PM) for Marine Air Ground Task Force, Command and Control (C2) Systems (MCRDAC now called Marine Corps Systems Command (MARCORSYSCOM))
May 1992	Assumed Command, 3 rd Force Service Support Group (FSSG), III Marine Expeditionary Force, U.S. Marine Forces Pacific, Okinawa, Japan, <i>first woman general to command a major deployable tactical command in any service</i> (3 rd FSSG now called 3rd Marine Logistics Group (MLG))
Jul 1993	Col Jim Mutter, USMC retires
1994	Promoted to major general (MajGen), <i>first woman Marine to attain this rank and the senior woman on active duty across entire DOD</i>
Jun 1994	Assumed Command, MARCORSYSCOM, Quantico, VA
23 July 1996	Appointed to lieutenant general (LtGen), <i>first woman promoted to three-star general in the Marine Corps, 1st LtGen and 2nd woman three-star across entire DOD.</i>
23 Jul 1996	Transferred to Manpower and Reserve Affairs (M&RA), Headquarters Marine Corps, Pentagon, Washington, DC, Deputy Chief of Staff (DC/S,M&RA) (DC/S, M&RA now called Deputy Commandant, M&RA)
9 Nov 1998	Retirement parade conducted aboard Quantico, VA
1 Jan 1999	Retired to Brownsburg, IN

APPENDIX G**Career Timeline for LtGen Frances (Fran) Wilson, USMC (Ret.)**

Timeline for LtGen Frances (Fran) Wilson, USMC (Ret.)

	Born Nassau County, Long Island, NY, <i>father USAF officer and raised in Arlington County, VA</i>
Nov 1971	Graduated from Michigan State University with <i>Bachelor of Science in Sociology</i>
Nov 1972	Attended Officer Candidate Course (OCC), commissioned 2 nd lieutenant (2 nd Lt)
1973	Attended Women Officer Basic School (WOBS), Marine Corps Base (MCB) Quantico, VA, <i>student honor graduate and recipient of the class Leadership Award</i>
Dec 1974	Attended Air Traffic Control Officer Course (ATCOC), Glynco, GA, and was <i>designated MOS: (7220), ATC Officer</i>
1974	Transferred to Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Yuma, AZ, ATCO
Jan 1975	Transferred to MCAS Kaneohe Bay, HI, ATCO
1976	Promoted to captain (Capt)
Aug 1978	Transferred to Marine Corps Development and Education Center (MCDEC), Instructional Management School, instructor
Aug 1979	Attended Amphibious Warfare School (AWS), Quantico, VA, student
May 1980	Attended Administration Officer Course, Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD) Parris Island, SC, student
Jun 1980	Transferred to 3 rd Marine Division (MARDIV), III Marine Amphibious Force (MAF), Okinawa, Japan, Staff Secretary (Staff Sec)
Jul 1980	Received her Doctorate from the USC Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Ed.D
Jun 1981	Transferred to U.S. Naval Academy, Company Officer, Asst. Professor Professional Development
Nov 1981	Promoted to major (Maj)
Aug 1984	Attended College of Naval Command and Staff (C&S) College, Naval War College, Newport, RI, student
May 1985	Transferred to Manpower and Reserve Affairs (M&RA), HQMC, Washington, DC, manpower management analyst
Jan 1987	Transferred to Joint Staff, Washington, DC, Special Assistant to General and Flag Officer Matters (GFOM)
1988	Assumed Command, 4 th Recruit Training Battalion (4 th RT Bn), Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD), Parris Island, SC
1990	Selected for the Federal Executive Fellowship, Brookings Institute
Jul 1991	Transferred to Headquarters, Marine Forces Pacific (MARFORPAC), Camp H.M. Smith, HI, Requirements and Program Officer
Jul 1993	Assumed Command, Headquarters and Service Battalion (H&S Bn), MARFORPAC, Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii
Jan 1995	Transferred to Roles and Missions Coordination Group, Requirements and Plans, HQMC, Washington, DC, member
1995	Reassigned to Joint Chief of Staff, Pentagon, Washington, DC, Secretary of the Joint Staff
Aug 1997	Promoted to brigadier general (BGen)
1997	Assumed Command, Marine Corps Base (MCB) Quantico, VA
1999	Assumed Command, 3 rd Force Service Support Group (3 rd FSSG), III Marine Expeditionary Force (III MEF), Okinawa, JP

2001	Assumed Directorship, Manpower Management Division, M&RA, HQMC, Washington, DC <i>Collateral duty: USMC representative to the Secretary of Defense's Reserve Force Policy Board</i>
Oct 2002	Promoted to major general (MajGen)
2003	Assumed Commandancy, Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF),
14 Jul 2006	Promoted to lieutenant general (LtGen)
14 Jul 2006	Assumed 12 th Presidency, National Defense University (NDU), Fort McNair, VA
Sep 2009	Retired after 37 years of service from NDU to Virginia Beach, VA

APPENDIX H**Career Timeline for MajGen MaryAnn Krusa-Dossin, USMC (Ret.)**

Timeline for MajGen MaryAnn Krusa-Dossin, USMC (Ret.)

8 Nov 1952	Born and raised in Gary, Indiana
May 1974	Graduated from Texas Christian University (TCU) with <i>Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Sociology</i> and moved to Chicago, IL to work with family
24 Jun 1975	Attended Officer Candidate School (OCS), Quantico, VA, <i>female only course</i>
1 Aug 1975	Commissioned a 2 nd lieutenant (2 nd Lt) and attended The Basic School (TBS), Lima Company (L Co.), Quantico, VA, student, assigned <i>Military Occupational Specialty: 5803 Military Police (MP)</i> , <i>one of first 3 women officers in the field</i>
Nov 1975	Temporarily assigned to Security Department, Quantico, VA
Jan 1976	Attended Military Police Officers Basic Course, Fort McClellan, AL, student
Feb 1976	Transferred MCAS El Toro, CA, Security Department, Platoon Commander
1 Jul 1977	Promoted to 1 st lieutenant (1stLt)
Dec 1978	Married husband, Paul Dossin, aboard MCAS El Toro, CA
Jan 1979	Transferred to Marine Aircraft Group (MAG)-15, 1 st Marine Aircraft Wing (1 st MAW), Iwakuni, Japan, Training & Human Affairs Officer
Jul 1979	Reassigned to Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Iwakuni, Japan, Headquarters and Headquarters Squadron (H&HS), Provost Marshal's Office, S-3 (Operations Officer)
1 Oct 1979	Promoted to captain (Capt)
Aug 1980	Gave birth to son, Michael, dispensary, Iwakuni, Japan
Feb 1981	Transferred to Marine Corps Base (MCB), Camp Lejeune, NC, Director, Family Service Center (FSC) – <i>first program of its kind in the Marine Corps</i>
1981	Earned <i>Master of Science in Human Relations</i> from Golden Gate University, Camp Lejeune, NC
Jan 1984	Attended Military Police Officers Advanced Course, Fort McClellan, AL, student
Aug 1984	Transferred to MCB Camp Lejeune, NC, Provost Marshal's Office, Administrative Officer and Operations Officer
Sep 1985	Attended School of Police Staff and Command, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL – <i>unique for DOD quotas, only woman</i>
Dec 1985	Assumed position of Provost Marshal, MCAS New River, NC
1 Jul 1986	Promoted to major (Maj)
Aug 1987	Attended Marine Corps Command and Staff College, Quantico, VA, student
Jul 1988	Assumed position of Provost Marshal, MCAS Yuma, AZ
14 May 1991	Assumed Command, H&HS, MCAS Yuma, AZ
1 Aug 1992	Promoted to lieutenant colonel (LtCol)
Aug 1992	Transferred to MCB Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, Headquarters and Service (H&S) Battalion (Bn), Executive Officer (XO) and Deputy (Dep) Camp Commander for Camps Foster & Lester
29 Jun 1993	Assumed Command, H&S Bn, MCB Camp Butler, and Camps Foster and Lester
Jul 1995	Attended Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), National Defense University (NDU), student, receiving <i>Master of Science in National Resource Strategy</i>
Jul 1996	Transferred to Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff (CJCS), Operational Plans and Interoperability Directorate, J-7, Pentagon, Washington, DC, Action Officer

1 Dec 1997	Promoted to colonel (Col)
Jul 1998	Assumed Command, Security Bn, MCB Camp Pendleton, CA, and Assistant Chief of Staff (A/CS) for Installations, Security & Safety (IS&S)
Jul 2000	Assumed Directorship, Marine Corps Community Services (MCCS), MCB Camp Pendleton, CA
Jul 2002	Transferred to Marine Corps Public Affairs, Headquarters, Marine Corps (HQMC), Washington DC, Dep Director
1 Feb 2003	Promoted to brigadier general (BGen)
13 Jun 2003	Assumed Directorship, Marine Corps Public Affairs, HQMC, Washington, DC
29 Sep 2006	Frocked to major general (MajGen)
6 Sep 2006	Assumed Command, MCB Camp S.D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan
22 Jul 2007	Promoted to major general (MajGen)
1 Oct 2010	Retired from Okinawa to Florida after 35 years of service

APPENDIX I**Career Timeline for MajGen Angela (Angie) Salinas, USMC (Ret.)**

Timeline for MajGen Angela (Angie) Salinas, USMC (Ret.)

6 Dec 1953	Born Alice, TX; raised in Vallejo, CA and graduated from St. Vincent Ferrer High School
Aug 1972	Started college at Dominican College, San Rafael, CA
4 May 1974	Enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves
7 May 1974	Shipped to MCRD Parris Island, SC for boot camp (8 weeks)
10 Jul 1974	Graduated Boot Camp (Platoon 5B) with MOS <i>Legal Services Clerk (4421)</i> , <i>Awarded the Molly Marine Award for being an exemplary Marine</i>
Jul 1974-May 1976	Transferred to Marine Air Reserve Training Detachment, Alameda, CA as Legal Assistant receiving temporary additional duty (TAD) orders to Base Legal, Camp Pendleton, CA (Jul-Sep 1974)
May 1976	Graduated from Dominican College with <i>Bachelor of Arts in History</i>
Jun-Sep 1976	Moved to San Antonio, TX working with Parks and Recreation
1976-1977	Activated in Reserves with Inspector-Instructor Duty (I&I), 4 th Reconnaissance Bn, San Antonio, TX, Legal administration
1977	Selected for Enlisted Commissioning Program (ECP) as Sergeant (E-5)
Oct 1977	Attended Officer Candidate School (OCS) (C Co.), <i>candidate in first gender-integrated course</i>
Dec 1977	Graduated OCS & commissioned a Second Lieutenant (2 nd Lt)
Jan 1978	Attended the first gender-integrated class at The Basic School (TBS) (C Co.) and was <i>designated military occupational specialty (MOS): (4430) Legal Officer</i>
Jul 1978	Transferred to 2 nd Marine Aircraft Wing (2 nd MAW) Cherry Point, NC, Legal Services Officer
May 1980	Transferred to Women Recruit Training Command (WRTC), Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD), Parris Island, SC, Series Commander, Executive Officer (XO) and Operations Officer (OpsO) – <i>introduction of grenades and weapons for first time for familiarization</i>
Dec 1982	Promoted to Captain (Capt)
Jun 1983	MOS changed from 4430 Legal Officer to 0180 Administrative Officer
Aug 1983	Transferred to Amphibious Warfare School (AWS) Quantico VA, student
May 1984	Transferred to 3 rd Maintenance Bn, 3 rd Force Service Support Group (FSSG), Okinawa, Japan, Adjutant
1 Jun 1985	Transferred to 1 st Maintenance Bn, 1 st FSSG, Camp Pendleton, CA, Adjutant
Jun 1986	Assumed Command, H&S Co., 1 st Maintenance Bn
Oct 1987	Transferred to Headquarters, 1 st FSSG, Dep. AC/S G-1
Jun 1988	Transferred to Recruiting Station (RS), Charleston, WV as XO, <i>1st woman in Recruiting Command</i>
Jul 1989	Assumed Command, RS Charleston, WV, <i>1st woman to command a recruiting station</i>
1 Aug 1989	Promoted to Major (Maj), <i>selected from below zone</i>
21 Jul 1991	Transferred to Naval Command and Staff College, Naval War College, Newport, RI, student, <i>Masters in National Defense Strategy</i>

20 Jun 1992	Transferred to Manpower Management (MM) Officer Assignments (MMOA), Headquarters, Marine Corps (HQMC), Combat Service Support (CSS) Monitor, <i>first woman to serve as the monitor for majors in MMOA</i>
Jul 1993	Transferred to CJCS, Deputy Spec Asst. for GOFO Matters
1 Sep 1994	Promoted to Lieutenant Colonel, <i>selected from below zone</i>
1 Aug 1996	Assumed Command, 4 th Recruit Training Battalion, MCRD Parris Island, SC <i>Accomplishments: adopted women DI Campaign cover, instituted 3d Recruit training Company, first to incorporate "The Crucible" into women's recruit training, enlarged & renovated battalion property, redesigned Battalion colors</i>
Jul 1998	Transferred to U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA, student
Jun 1999	Transferred to III Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF), Okinawa, Japan, AC/S G-5 (Plans Officer), first woman Marine to serve as AC/S G-5
Oct 1999	Promoted to Colonel (Col)
Aug 2000	Transferred to MCRD San Diego, CA, Base Inspector
May 2001	Assumed Command, 12 th Marine Corps Recruiting District, San Diego, CA, first woman Marine to command a recruiting district
Aug 2004	Transferred to Marine Corps Recruiting Command (MCRC), Quantico, VA, Chief of Staff (COS)
2 Aug 2006	Promoted to Brigadier General (BGen), first Hispanic woman to be promoted to BGen in U.S. Marine Corps (USMC), <i>6th woman in USMC</i>
4 Aug 2006	Assumed Command, MCRD San Diego, CA and of Western Recruiting Region (WRR), <i>first woman to command a USMC recruit depot & recruiting region</i>
28 Aug 2009	Transferred to HQMC, MM Division Director, Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA), HQMC, Quantico, VA
12 May 2010	Promoted to Major General (MajGen), <i>4th woman in USMC</i>
1 Sep 2013	Retired to San Antonio, TX
July 2015	Became the Chief Executive Officer, Girl Scouts of Southwest Texas

APPENDIX J**Career Timeline for MajGen Tracy (Mork) Garrett, USMCR (Ret.)**

Timeline for MajGen Tracy (Mork) Garrett, USMCR (Ret.)

15 Feb 1956	Born in Ft Belvoir, VA Raised in a Marine family in various locations across the country. Settled in the Seattle area in 1972.
Aug 1974	Received a four-year Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) Scholarship-Marine Option and attended the University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Jun 1978	Graduated from University of Washington with a Bachelor of Arts in English; Commissioned a 2 nd lieutenant (2 nd Lt)
Feb 1979	Graduated from The Basic School (TBS), Quantico, VA, student
Mar 1979	Attended Logistics Officers Course, Camp Johnson, CA, student
Apr 1979	Transferred to Headquarters Battalion (HQ Bn), 1 st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, CA, Platoon Commander (G-4)/Asst. G-4 Operations Officer (Asst Ops O)
Jun 1980	Promoted to 1 st lieutenant (1 st Lt)
May 1981	Gave birth to 1 st son, Ola, at Camp Pendleton, CA while on active duty
Jun 1981	Resigned active duty commissioned and transitioned to the Selected Marine Corps Reserve (SMCR) and moved to Seattle, WA
Sep 1981	Assigned to 4 th Landing Support Battalion (4 th LSB), Naval Station Sand Point, Seattle, WA, S-4A/Maintenance Management Officer (MMO)
Mar 1983	Promoted to captain (Capt)
Aug 1984	Gave birth to 2 nd son, Peder, in Seattle, WA
Aug 1984-Jun 1985	Reassigned to Headquarters & Service Company (H&S Co.), 4 th LSB, Executive Officer (XO)
Sep 1985	Assigned to Mobilization Operational Readiness Deployment Test (MORDT), Headquarters Detachment 1 (HQ Det-1), Seattle, WA, Logistics inspector
Jun 1986-May 1988	Assumed Command, H&S Co. 4 th LSB
1986	Attended Reserve Amphibious Warfare School (AWS)
Jul 1989	Assigned as the Assistant Training Officer (ATO), Mobilization Training Unit (MTU) Washington State-1 (WA-1), Seattle, WA
Sep 1989	Assigned to MORDT, HQ Det-1, Seattle, WA, Senior inspector
Aug 1990	Promoted to major (Maj)
Sep 1992	Reassigned as 4 th LSB, Battalion Operations Officer (S-3) and XO
1994	Attended Reserve Command and Staff College (CSC)
Sep 1995-Jul 1997	Assigned to Marine Air-Ground Task Force (MAGTF) Staff Training Program (MSTP), Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) Detachment, Quantico, VA
1995	Attended Reserve MAGTF Intelligence Officer's Course (MIOC)
Dec 1995	Promoted to lieutenant colonel (LtCol)
1996	Attended Advanced Logistics Officers Course (ALOC)
1996-1998	Appointed by Secretary of the Navy to Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board, Member
1997-1998	Attended Naval War College, Newport, RI, student in residence, Masters in National Security and Strategic Studies
Aug 1999-Sep 2001	Assumed Command, 4 th LSB, Joint Base Lewis McCord, WA

Jun 2000	Commander, Combat Service Support Detachment-44 (CSSD-44), Combined Arms Exercise (CAX) 7-00, Twenty-nine Palms, CA
Oct 2000	Promoted to colonel (Col)
Mar 2001	Commander, CSSD-44, Exercise Express Sword, Fort Bragg, NC
Mar 2002	Assigned to 12 th Marine Corps Recruiting District (12 th MCD), San Diego, CA, Reserve Special Staff Officer
Oct 2002-Aug 2004	Assumed Command, 4 th Force Service Support Group (FSSG) Forward (West), Camp Pendleton, CA
Feb 2003-Jun 2003	Mobilized and assumed Command, 1 st FSSG (Rear), Camp Pendleton, CA
Sep 2004	Mobilized in support of 1 st FSSG (Deployed/Main), Camp Pendleton, CA, COS while deployed to Taqaddum (TQ), Iraq
Apr 2005	Demobilized; assigned to 4 th Marine Logistics Group (4 th MLG), New Orleans, LA, Deputy Commander
2005	Attended Executive Center of Excellence in Logistics and Technology (LOGTECH), University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
2006	Attended Executive Strategy, Syracuse University
Jan 2007	Assumed Command in “acting” capacity, 4 th MLG
Apr 2007	Promoted to brigadier general (BGen)
Sep 2007	Mobilized in support of Headquarters, Marine Corps (HQMC), Inspector General of the Marine Corps, Washington, DC
Sep 2008	Assumed Command, Marine Forces, Europe (MARFOREUR) & Marine Forces, Africa (MARFORAF), Stuttgart, GE
Sep 2009	Assumed Command, 4 th MLG, New Orleans, LA
Jul 2010	Promoted to major general (MajGen)
1 Nov 2011	Assumed Command, Force Headquarters Group (FHG), Marine Forces Reserve (MFR), New Orleans, LA
Aug 2012	Assigned to U.S. Africa Command (US AFRICOM), Stuttgart, GE, Special Advisor to the Commander
2012	Attended Seminar XXI, MIT Center for International Studies
June 2014	Retired from Stuttgart, GE to Port Townsend, WA

APPENDIX K**Career Timeline for BGen Marcela J. (Velasco) Monahan, USMCR (Ret.)**

Timeline for BGen Marcela J. (Velasco) Monahan, USMCR (Ret.)

25 June 1963	Born in Salt Lake City, Utah
Jun-Aug 1983	Candidate in Platoon Leaders Course-Junior (PLC-Jr)
May 1984	Graduated from California State University-San Francisco, CA with <i>Bachelor of Business Administration/International Finance</i> and commissioned as a 2 nd Lieutenant (2 nd Lt)
Sep 1984	Attended The Basic School (TBS), student
Mar 1985	Assigned to Education Command, Quantico, VA, Protocol Officer
Oct 1985	Attended Logistics Officer Course (LOC), Little Creek VA, student
Jan 1986	Transferred to 1 st Landing Support Battalion (1 st LSB), 1 st Force Service Support Group (1 st FSSG), Camp Pendleton, CA, Co C Platoon Commander, CSSD HQ Commandant and Operations Officer; Asst. Battalion (Bn) Operations Officer (S-3A); Shipping & Receiving Platoon Commander, Beach & Port Company;
Jul 1987	Reassigned to Headquarters & Service Bn, 1 st FSSG, S-4 and Maintenance Management Officer (MMO)
1987	Awarded augmentation as a regular commissioned officer
1988	Transferred to 4 th Recruit Training Battalion, Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD) Parris Island, SC (PISC), Series Commander, Company Commander, Battalion S-4 (Logistics Officer)
1 Jun 1989	Promoted to Captain (Capt)
17 Jun 1989	Married Capt John Monahan, USMC; <i>1st Lt Marcela Velasco to Capt Marcela Monahan</i>
Aug 1990	Resigned from active duty commission; moved to Quantico, VA for husband to attend Amphibious Warfare School (AWS)
13 Sep 1990	Birth of first child, Bridget, born Ft. Belvoir, VA
Oct 1990	Transfer to the Marine Corps Individual Ready Reserve (IRR)
Jan-Apr 1991	Mobilized ISO Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm (DS/DS). Assigned as S-4 Combat Replacement Battalion, Camp Pendleton, CA
1 Jul 1991	Joined Selective Marine Corps Reserve (SMCR). Assigned 1st Medical Battalion, Camp Pendleton, CA, S-4A, Headquarters & Service (H&S) Co. Commander
16 Oct 1992	Birth of second child, Kiley, born San Clemente, CA
26 Jan 1993	Reassigned to Provisional Support Battalion, Camp Pendleton, CA, S-4 Officer
2 Jun 1994	Birth of third child, Patrick, born San Clemente, CA
8 Nov 1994	Assigned to The Basic School (TBS), Quantico, VA, Instructor
1 Aug 1995	Promoted to Major (Maj)
28 Mar 1996	Birth of fourth child, Mary Grace, born Ft. Belvoir, VA
15 Aug 1996	Assigned to Amphibious Warfare Technologies (AWT), Marine Corps Systems Command (MCSC), Quantico, VA, Assistant Imperatives Manager
26 Jul 1997	Birth of fifth child, Kathleen, born Ft. Belvoir, VA

2 Aug 1997	Assigned to Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC) Special Projects Directorate, Headquarters Marine Corps (HQMC), Interpreter/Project Officer
Sep 1998- Sep 1999	Assigned to 3d Marine Division, Okinawa, Japan, Project Officer in G-3
6 Sep 1998	Birth of sixth child, Shannon, born Camp Courtney, Okinawa, Japan
Oct 1999-Aug 2001	Assigned to II Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) Augmentation Command Element (MACE), Camp Lejeune, NC, G-4 Plans Officer
29 Nov 1999	Birth of seventh child, Cecilia, born Jacksonville, NC
2000	Promoted to Lieutenant Colonel (LtCol)
Sep 2001-Jun 2004	Assigned to Inspector-Instructor (I&I) 25 th Marine Regiment, Worcester, MA, Peace-Time War-Time Support Team (PWST) Officer in Charge (OIC) and subsequently reassigned as Regimental Logistics Officer (S-4) & Regimental I&I
Oct 2001-Aug 2003	Mobilized on active duty as Regimental G-4 (Logistics Officer) and Regimental I&I in support of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF)
20 Apr 2004	Birth of eighth child, Margaret, born in Concord, MA
Jul 2004	Assigned to Marine Logistics Command, 4 th FSSG North East Det., Redbank, NJ, Transportation/Movement Officer
Feb 2005	Transferred to MAGTF Staff Training Program (MSTP), Quantico, VA, AC/S C/J1/4/7/8
Aug 2006	Promoted to Colonel (Col)
Nov 2008-Mar 2010	Mobilized on active duty with II Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) Forward (Fwd)/ deployed Jan 2009-Jan 2010 Multi-National Forces-West (MNF-W), AC/S G-7 (Engineers) Al Asad, Iraq
Apr-Sep 2010	Assumed Reserve Command, 4 th Marine Logistics Group Forward East (4 th MLG Fwd East), Camp Lejeune, NC
Oct 2010	Promoted to Brigadier General (BGen) in US Marine Corps Reserves
Nov 2010	Assigned to Marine Corps Combat Development Command (MCCDC), Quantico, VA, Deputy Commanding General (DCG)
Mar 2011	Assumed Directorship of Joint Capabilities Assessment & Integration Division, Washington DC
Jul 2013	Mobilized on active duty with Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA), Director, Manpower Management (MM), Quantico, VA
Sep 2014	Retired from Quantico and works in Arlington VA

APPENDIX L**Career Timeline for BGen Loretta (Lori) E. Reynolds, USMC**

Timeline for BGen Loretta (Lori) E. Reynolds, USMC

24 Nov 1964	Born and raised Baltimore, MD
May 1986	Graduated U.S. Naval Academy with <i>Bachelor of Science in Political Science</i> and commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps
May 1986-Aug 1987	Attended The Basic School (TBS) <i>awarded military occupational specialty (MOS): 2502, Communications Officer</i> and Basic Communications Officer Course (BCOC), Quantico, VA
Sep 1987	Ordered to 1 st Marine Division Communications Company; assigned to Fleet Augmentation Program (FAP) with Base Communications Center, Camp Pendleton, CA, Communications Watch Officer
Jun 1988	Returned to Division Communications Company, 1 st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, CA, Communication Center Platoon Commander, Multichannel Platoon Commander, Operations Officer, and Radio Officer
Aug 1990	Transferred to Marine Wing Communications Squadron 18, 1st Marine Aircraft Wing (1 st MAW), Okinawa, Japan, Executive Officer (XO) and Commanding Officer (CO) of Detachment Alpha
Oct 1990	Promoted to Captain (Capt)
Sep 1991	Transferred to Marine Corps Systems Command (MCSC), Project Officer
Jul 1994-May 1995	Attended Command and Control Systems Course, Marine Corps University, Quantico, VA
May 1995	Assigned to Officer Candidate School (OCS), Candidate Platoon Commander
Sep 1995	Transferred to 9th Communication Bn, 1st Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Intelligence Group (1 st SRIG), Camp Pendleton, CA, Battalion S-3A Assistant Operations Officer (Asst OpsO) and Bravo Company Commander
Jun 1997	Assumed Command, Recruiting Station (RS) Harrisburg PA, 4th Marine Corps District- <i>frocked to the rank of Major to assume command of RS</i>
Oct 1997	Promoted to Major (Maj)
Aug 2000	Attended Naval Command and Staff College (NCSC), Naval War College, Newport, RI
Jun 2001	Transferred to Command, Control, Communications and Computers (C4) Division, Headquarters Marine Corps (HQMC), Quantico, VA, Strategic Plans Division, Deputy Division Head and Action officer
Apr 2003	Promoted to Lieutenant Colonel (LtCol)
8 Jun 2003	Assumed Command, 9 th Communications Bn (9 th Comm Bn), I MHG, Camp Commando, Kuwait, while Battalion was deployed for Operation Iraqi Freedom-1 (OIF I)
Feb 2004-Mar 2005	Deployed in support of OIF-2.1, Camp Fallujah, Iraq, Commanding Officer (CO), 9 th Comm Bn
Aug 2005	Attended U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA, student, Army War College
May 2006	Transferred CJCS, Communications (J6), Washington, DC, Desk Officer, Current Operations Division and Division Chief
Aug 2008	Promoted to Colonel (Col)
Aug-Nov 2008	Attended Joint Professional Military Education II (JPME II), Joint Armed Forces Staff College (JAFSC), Norfolk, VA

Mar 2009	Assumed Command, I MEF Headquarters Group (I MHG), Camp Pendleton, CA
Mar 2010- Mar 2011	Deployed I MHG to Afghanistan in support of I MEF Forward, Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), Regional Command Southwest (RC-Southwest), Commanding Officer, I MHG (Fwd)
May 2011	Promoted to Brigadier General (BGen)
Jun 2011	Assumed Command, MCRD Parris Island, SC and Eastern Recruiting Region
Jul 2014	Transferred to Office of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (OUSD Policy) South/Southeast Asia, Washington DC, Principle Director
Sep 2015- current	Assumed Command, Marine Corps Forces Cyberspace Command (MARFORCYBER), Fort Meade, MD
Apr 2016	Selected for promotion to major general (MajGen) (2-stars)

APPENDIX M**Career Timeline for BGen Helen G. Pratt, USMCR**

Timeline for BGen Helen G. Pratt, USMCR

27 Aug 1963	Born in Charleston, SC; father was a U.S. Naval Academy graduate, who selected the U.S. Marine Corps, serving for 23 years. Pratt was raised mainly on the east coast (Quantico, VA; Camp Lejeune, NC; Ft Benning, GA; Patrick AFB, FL)
May 1986	Graduated from University of Central Florida, <i>Bachelor of Art in Education</i>
Jun 1986-July 1987	Worked at the University of Central Florida Health Center
Aug 1987-Jun 1988	Taught school in Apopka, Florida-Orange County Public Schools
Aug 1988	Graduated from Officer Candidate School (OCS), and commissioned second lieutenant (2ndLt), Quantico, VA
1988-1989	Attended The Basic School (TBS), Quantico, VA, student, <i>awarded the military occupational specialty (MOS): 3502, Motor Transport Officer</i>
1989	Attended Motor Transport Officers Course (MTOC), Camp Johnson, NC
May 1989	Transferred to 7 th Motor Transport Battalion (7 th MTBN), 1 st Force Service Support Group (1 st FSSG), Camp Pendleton, CA, Bravo Company (B Co) Platoon Commander (Plt Cmdr)
Aug-Nov 1989	Assigned temporary additional duty (TAD) to MEU Service Support Group 13 (MSSG 13), Camp Pendleton, CA, Motor Transport Officer Detachment Commander
Nov 1989-Sep 1990	Reassigned to 7 th MTBN, B Co Executive Officer (XO)
Sep 1990-Apr 1991	Deployed with 7 th MTBN in support of (ISO) Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm (DS/DS), S-4A and Armory officer, Headquarters and Service (H&S) Company Commander, Port Al Jubayl, Saudi Arabia
Apr-Jul 1991	Assumed Command, A Co, 7 th MTBN, 1 st FSSG, Camp Pendleton, CA
Jul 1991-Feb 1992	Reassigned as Adjutant, 7 th MTBN
Feb 1992	Transitioned from Active Duty to Selected Marine Corps Reserve (SMCR)
Mar 1992-Sep 1993	Assigned to Direct Support Motor Transport Company A (-) (A Co (-)), Orlando, FL, 6 th MTBN, 4 th Force Service Support Group (4 th FSSG), Plt Cmdr
1993	Promoted to captain (Capt); employed with Walt Disney World
Sep 1993-Sep 1995	Reassigned as Maintenance Officer, A Co (-), Orlando, FL, 6 th MTBN
1994-current	Employed with Orange County Public Schools, Glenridge Middle School, teacher; <i>Received Master of Art in Exercise Physiology and Wellness</i>
Sep 1995-Sep 1997	Reassigned as XO, A Co (-), Orlando, FL, 6 th MTBN
Sep 1997-Sep 1999	Assumed Command, A Co(-), Orlando, FL, 6 th MTBN
1998	Redesignated MOS from 3502, Motor Transport Officer to 0402, Logistics Officer
Oct 1997	Promoted to major (Maj)
Sep 1999-Sep 2000	Assigned to 4 th FSSG, New Orleans, LA, G-3 (Operations) Action officer
Oct 2000-Sep 2002	Transferred to Headquarters & Service Battalion (H&S Bn), Marietta, GA, 4 th FSSG, Operations Officer (G-3)
2000	Completed Command and Staff Non-Resident Program
Sep 2002-Jan 2003	Transferred to 4 th Maintenance Battalion (4 th Maint Bn), 4 th FSSG, Charlotte, NC, XO

2002	Received certification in Educational Specialist Degree (Ed.S) in School Psychology, transitioned from teacher to crisis counselor
Jan-Apr 2003	Mobilized and deployed ISO Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF-1) Transportation Support Coordination Center, Marine Logistics Command (MLC), Camp Fox, Kuwait, as Assistant Officer-in-Charge (AOIC), Transportation Support Coordination Center (TSCC)
Apr-Aug 2003	Mobilized ISO 2 nd FSSG, Camp Lejeune, NC, Deputy G-3
Aug 2003-Sep 2004	Reassumed position as XO, 4 th Maint Bn, 4 th FSSG, Charlotte, NC
Nov 2003	Promoted to lieutenant colonel (LtCol)
Sep 2004-Jun 2005	Assumed Command, 4 th Maint Bn, Charlotte, NC
Jun 2005-May 2006	Mobilized 6 th Civil Affairs Group (Provisional) (6 th CAG (P)), Camp Lejeune, NC, XO
Aug 2005-Mar 2006	Deployed ISO Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) 4.1, Provisional 6 th Civil Affairs Group (6 th CAG), Camp Blue Diamond, Ramadi, Iraq, XO, <i>assigned the MOS of 0530 Civil Affairs Officer</i>
Jun 2006-Aug 2008	Transferred to Marine Forces Europe (MFE), Stuttgart, Germany, Individual Mobilization Augmentee Detachment (IMA Det), Assistant Chief of Staff (AC/S) for Logistics (G-4)
Aug 2007-Jul 2009	Enrolled in top level school (TLS), Army War College-Distance Education Program, student, <i>Master of Art in Strategic Studies</i>
Aug 2008-Aug 2010	Transferred to 4 th Marine Logistics Group (MLG), New Orleans, LA, AC/S G-4, <i>also served as member of Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board (MCRPB)</i>
1 Mar 2009	Promoted to colonel (Col)
2010	Completed Advanced Joint Professional Military Education (PME)
Aug 2010-Apr 2012	Assumed Command, 4 th Civil Affairs Group (CAG), Washington, DC
2011	Mobilized and deployed 4 th CAG ISO 2 nd Marine Division Forward (MARDIV Fwd), Helmand Province, Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), <i>dual hatted as 2nd MARDIV G-9</i>
Apr-Aug 2012	Transferred to Force Headquarters Group (FHG), Marine Forces Reserve (MFR), New Orleans, LA, Deputy Commander
Aug 2012	Assigned to 4 th MLG, MFR, New Orleans, LA, Deputy Commander
Sept 2013- current	Reselected for member of Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board (MCRPB)
2 Jul 2014	Assumed Command, Force Headquarters Group (FHG), MFR, New Orleans, LA
5 Sep 2014	Promoted to brigadier general (BGen)
18 Nov 2014	Assumed Education Command (EDCOM), President, Marine Corps University, Quantico, VA and remains Commander, FHG, <i>dual-hatted</i>

APPENDIX N**U.S. Marine Corps Women Generals at a Glance**

Women U.S. Marine Corps Generals at a Glance
as of 17 September 2015

Name of General	Date entered service	Source	Undergraduate Education	Degrees held	Nature of Service: Active Duty (AD)	Marital Status	Spouse Occupation	Number of Children	Military Occupational Specialty (MOS)	Years as General Officer	Years of Service
Brewer, Margaret A., BGen	1952	WOTC-Jr. & Sr.	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	Bachelor of Arts in Geography	AD	Single			Communications (2520/2502)	1978-1980	28
Reals, Gail M., BGen	1954 1961	Enlisted MCP*	Powelson Business Institute - 1 year	Certificate in administration; Honorary Doctorate, Bryant College; in retirement earned her Bachelor of Arts in Public Policy, George Mason University	AD	Single			Administration (0141) Adjutant (0180)	1985-1990	36
Mutter (Wiescamp), Carol A., LtGen	1967	WOCC	Colorado State College, now University of Northern Colorado	Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics Education & minored in Physics; Master of Arts in National Security and Strategic Studies; Master of Science in Business; honorary Doctorate degree from University of Northern Colorado	AD	Married	USMC		Data Processing (4002) Finance (3402)	1991-1999	31
Wilson, Frances, LtGen	1972	OCC	Michigan State University	Bachelor of Science in Sociology; Masters in Education; Masters in Psychology; Masters in Business Management; Masters in National Security & Strategic Studies; Doctor of Education from Univ of Southern California	AD	Married	USN		Air Traffic Control (7220)	1997-2009	37
Krusa-Dossin, MaryAnn, MajGen	1975	OCC	Texas Christian University	Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Sociology; Master of Science in Human Relations from Golden Gate University; Master of Science in National Resource Strategy	AD	Married	USMC	1	Military Police (5803)	2003-2010	35
Salinas, Angela, MajGen	1974 1977	Enlisted ECP**	Dominican College	Bachelor of Arts in History; Masters in National Defense Strategy	AD	Single			Legal (4430) Adjutant (0180)	2006-2013	39
Garrett (Mork), Tracy, MajGen	1978	NROTC	University of Washington	Bachelor of Arts in English; Masters in National Security and Strategic Studies	Res	Married	Civilian	2	Logistics (0402)	2007-2014	36
Monahan (Velasco), Marcela V., BGen	1984	PLC-Jr.	California State University-San Fran	Bachelor of Business Administration/International Finance	Res	Married	USMC	8	Logistics (0402)	2010-2014	30
Reynolds, Loretta E., BGen	1986	Academy	US Naval Academy (USNA)	Bachelor of Science in Political Science; Masters in National Strategic Studies x 2 from Naval and Army War Colleges	AD	Single			Communications (2502/0602)	2011-	29+
Pratt, Helen G., BGen	1989	OCC	University of Central Florida	Bachelor of Science in Education; Masters of Arts in Exercise Physiology and Wellness; Masters of Arts in Strategic Studies	Res	Single			Motor Transport (3502) Logistics (0402)	2014-	26+

* Meritorious Commissioning Program
** Enlisted Commissioning Program

APPENDIX O

Timeline of Milestones for Women Marine Corps Generals

Laws and Regulations	Year	Women's Accomplishments and Milestones
Congress passes the Women's Armed Services Integration Act PL-623 instituting a 2% cap on women in U.S. Armed Forces and permitted women temporary promotions to O-6 (colonel)	1948	
Executive Order 10240 required the discharge of women who became pregnant or become a parent by adoption, adoption or custody of minor child/step child more than thirty days/year	1951	
	1952	Brewer commissioned 2ndLt from Women Officer Training (Junior/Senior) Course (WOTC)
	1954	Reals enlisted and attended boot camp Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD), Parris Island, SC
	1961	Reals commissioned 2ndLt via Meritorious Commissioning Program (MCP)
Women's Armed Services Integration Act PL-623 of 1948 was modified by PL 90-130, lifting the 2% cap on women in U.S. Armed Forces; women authorized permanent promotion to O-6 (colonel) and became eligible for promotion to flag/general officer rank	1967	Mutter commissioned 2ndLt from Women Officer Candidate Course (WOCC)
1st two women were promoted to the rank of brigadier general (1-star) in the U.S. Armed Forces, both U.S. Army colonels	1970	Brewer promoted to colonel
CNO Z-Gram #116 opened Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) to women; more occupational specialties open to women	1972	Wilson commissioned 2ndLt from Officer Candidate Course (OCC)
	1974	Salinas enlisted and attended boot camp MCRD Parris Island, SC; Garrett accepted a 4-year Marine-option NROTC scholarship
	1975	Krusa-Dossin commissioned 2ndLt from Officer Candidate School (OCS)
Congress passes PL 94-106 opening US Naval Academy to women; Second Circuit Court rules unlawful for U.S. Marine Corps to mandate discharge of pregnant Marines	1976	
	1977	Salinas commissioned 2ndLt from Enlisted Commissioning Program (ECP)
	1978	Brewer 1st woman to be appointed to brigadier general (1-star) in the U.S. Marine Corps; Garrett (Mork) commissioned 2ndLt from Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC)
Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) mandated women to compete for promotion with the men for promotion to general ranks	1980	Brigadier General Brewer retired after 28 years; Reals promoted to colonel
	1981	Garrett (Mork) transferred to Selected Marine Corps Reserve (SMCR) as a 1stLt
	1984	Monahan commissioned 2ndLt from Platoon Leaders Course (PLC)
	1985	Reals is first woman to be competitively selected for and promoted to brigadier general (1-star), 2nd woman to hold the rank
	1986	Reynolds commissioned 2ndLt from U.S. Naval Academy (USNA)
Department of Defense (DOD) Risk Rule opened 30,000 new jobs to women	1988	Mutter promoted to colonel; Pratt commissioned 2ndLt from OCS
	1990	Brigadier General Reals retired after 36 years; Monahan transferred to Marine Corps Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) as a captain
	1991	Mutter became 3rd woman promoted to brigadier general (1-star)

Laws and Regulations	Year	Women's Accomplishments and Milestones	
	1992	Pratt transferred to SMCR as a 1stLt	
Drafted legislation to repeal the combat ship exclusion (Title 10 USC 6015); Marine Corps opens combat aviation jobs to women	1993	(Year not verified: Wilson promotion to colonel)	
DOD 1993 risk rule rescinded opening 45,000 Marine Corps jobs to women & PL 103-446 established Center for Women Veterans within Department of Veterans Affairs	1994	Mutter became 1st woman Marine promoted to major general (2-star)	★
First woman Marine aviator pinned, 1stLt Sarah Deal, CH-53E helicopter pilot	1995		
	1996	Mutter became 1st woman in DOD to be selected for lieutenant general (3-star) and 1st promoted to lieutenant general in the Marine Corps and 2nd in U.S. Armed Forces	★
	1997	Wilson 4th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star); Krusa-Dossin promoted to colonel	★
	1999	Lieutenant General Mutter retired after 31 years; Salinas promoted to colonel	
	2000	Garrett (Mork) promoted to colonel	
	2003	Krusa-Dossin 5th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star)	★
	2006	Salinas 6th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star); Krusa-Dossin promoted to major general (2-star); Monahan promoted to colonel	★
	2007	Garrett became 7th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star), 1st woman Marine Corps Reserve general officer	★
	2008	Reynolds promoted to colonel	
National Defense Authorization Act established Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) to study minority opportunities in the services	2009	Lieutenant General Wilson retired after 37 years; Pratt promoted to colonel	
"Don't Ask, Don't Tell" provision repealed & counter-intelligence (0210/11) specialties opened to women	2010	Salinas promoted to major general (2-star); Garrett promoted to major general (2-star); Monahan 8th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star), 2nd in the Marine Corps Reserve; Major General Krusa-Dossin retired after 35 years	★
	2011	Reynolds 9th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star)	★
Exception to policy made to 1994 Memorandum opening over 1,100 jobs to women	2012		
Secretary of Defense announced intention to lift the Combat Exclusion Policy in January 2016	2013	Brigadier General Brewer passed away	
	2014	Pratt became the 10th woman Marine promoted to brigadier general (1-star) and 3rd in the Marine Corps Reserve; Major General Garrett retired after 36 years; Brigadier General Monahan retired after 30 years	★
Secretary of Defense opened all military jobs to women effective 1 April 2016, marking the end of the Combat Exclusion Policy	2016		

Key Milestones

APPENDIX P

Coding Cycles and Codes

1st Cycle Coding Categories	Codes (18)	2nd Cycle Coding Categories	Codes (12)
institutional factors	supports, barriers, organizational factors, situational factors	institutional culture	Supportive culture, challenging culture
		institutional structure	Supportive structure, Challenging structure, professional relationships
personal actions	strategies & tactics, behaviors, command, leader style, learning, Communications, work-life balance	agency	strategies, work-life balance, personal relationships, networks, personal characteristics, identity
human capital	Personal characteristics, motivations, Beliefs, background, identity		
social capital	personal relationships, professional relationships, networks		
		Life story	background

Institutional Review Board Project Action Summary

Action Date: February 25, 2016 *Note: Approval expires one year after this date.*

Type: ☐ New Full Review ☐ New Expedited Review ☒ Continuation Review ☐ Exempt Review
☐ Modification

Action: ☒ Approved ☐ Approved Pending Modification ☐ Not Approved

Project Number: 2014-03-208

Researcher(s): Marianne Waldrop Doc SOLES
Dr. Lea Hubbard Fac SOLES

Project Title: Understanding Women Leaders in a Male-Dominated Profession: A Study of the United States Marine Corps Women Generals

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board
University of San Diego
herrinton@san Diego.edu
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, California 92110-2492

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu