

DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH

INTERCULTURAL TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES MILITARY

by

Mickey R. Dansby, Ph.D.
Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

and

Dan Landis, Ph.D.
University of Mississippi

January 1995



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704 0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Service, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank) | 2. REPORT DATE January 1995 | 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final -- June - August 1994 | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Intercultural Training in the United States Military | | 5. FUNDING NUMBERS GN00014-90-J-1422 | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) Mickey R. Dansby and Dan Landis | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER RSP-95-1 | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Directorate of Research Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Patrick Air Force Base, Florida 32925-3399 | | 10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER | |
| 9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22302 | | 10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER | |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | | |
| 12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for publication release; distribution unlimited. | | 12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE | |
| 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This paper discusses the history and philosophy of intercultural relations in the armed forces, current diversity policies, training, and other methods used to implement equal opportunity (EO) and diversity programs in the Services. The programs have been based on five main principles: (1) focus on behavioral compliance with stated policy, (2) emphasis on EO issues as military readiness concerns, (3) understanding that equal opportunity is the commander's responsibility, (4) belief that education and training can bring about behavioral changes, and (5) reliance on affirmative action plans as a method for ensuring equity and diversity. Historical background and the important place of the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute are also discussed. | | | |
| 14. SUBJECT TERMS Intercultural Training, Intercultural Relations, Diversity, Equal Opportunity | | 15. NUMBER OF PAGES 23 | |
| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified | | 16. PRICE CODE | |
| 18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified | 19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified | 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited | |

Intercultural Training in the United States Military

Mickey R. Dansby

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

Dan Landis

University of Mississippi

Abstract

This paper discusses the history and philosophy of intercultural relations in the armed forces, current diversity policies, training, and other methods used to implement equal opportunity (EO) and diversity programs in the Services. The programs have been based on five main principles: (1) focus on behavioral compliance with stated policy, (2) emphasis on EO issues as military readiness concerns, (3) understanding that equal opportunity is the commander's responsibility, (4) belief that education and training can bring about behavioral changes, and (5) reliance on affirmative action plans as a method for ensuring equity and diversity. Historical background and the important place of the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute are also discussed.

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and should not be construed to represent the official position of DEOMI, the military services, or the Department of Defense.

Intercultural Training in the United States Military¹

Mickey R. Dansby

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

Dan Landis

University of Mississippi

"Our nation was founded on the principle that the individual has infinite dignity and worth. The Department of Defense, which exists to keep the Nation secure and at peace, must always be guided by this principle." Thus begins the Department of Defense Human Goals, a brief charter outlining the broad philosophy for equal opportunity and diversity within the Department of Defense. This document, signed by the Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of Defense, service secretaries, and military chiefs of the Services, lists a number of objectives, including: "To make military and civilian service in the Department of Defense a model of equal opportunity for all..." and "To create an environment that values diversity and fosters mutual respect and cooperation among all persons..." The Department of Defense (DoD) strives to implement these lofty goals through two primary means: policy directives and training.

Military training in matters of intercultural diversity and equal opportunity is multi-tiered, starting with basic instruction at the various service entry points (e.g., basic recruit training, Service Academies, ROTC) and continuing through the senior career levels. Although each service develops its own directives and program of training, the core for this training comes from one source: the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida (formerly known as the Defense Race Relations Institute or DRRI). Since 1971, this institution has been responsible for training the equal opportunity advisors who manage and conduct training programs for the Services. In essence, DEOMI "trains the trainers" for DoD (and the U.S. Coast Guard, which falls under the Department of Transportation) in matters of intercultural relations, equal opportunity, and diversity.

¹ The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. Reprint requests and/or comments should be addressed to the first author at: Directorate of Research, Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, 740 O'Malley Road, Patrick AFB, FL USA 32925.

Because of its central role, discussion of DEOMI's work plays a crucial role in developing the theme of this paper.

Our goal in this paper is to give the reader a perspective on the background, philosophy, and status of intercultural training in the military. We begin with the historical background, to set the context for the rest of our discussion.

Historical Background

Day (1983) provided an in-depth review of the development of DEOMI and the Services' race relations training programs. Rather than repeat that material, we shall summarize key elements and update Day's work to give the reader an appreciation of current practice in the DoD. We begin with a thumbnail history of intercultural training in the military.

Integration of the Armed Forces

The foundation of intercultural relations in the military is largely based on the integration of blacks into the Services following World War II. Though minority contributions to America's defense prior to World War II are well documented (see, for example, Binkin, Eitelberg, Schexnider, & Smith, 1982; MacGregor, 1981; Nalty, 1986; and Young, 1982), their participation in World War II and decisions in the post-war period are watershed events in understanding intercultural relations in the military.

Substantial numbers of black servicemembers served during World War II. Over 900,000 served in the Army (almost 9% of the Army during their peak period), about 167,000 in the Navy (around 4%) and over 17,000 in the Marine Corps (2.5%) (Binkin et al., 1982). With limited exceptions, these individuals served in segregated units (Lovejoy, 1977; MacGregor, 1981). Their notable contributions to the war effort, though sometimes clouded by controversy (Hope, 1979; Nalty, 1986; MacGregor, 1981), could not be overlooked. As many black servicemembers returning to their homes suffered discrimination at the hands of a society they had fought to defend, President Truman was moved to action (Nalty, 1986; MacGregor, 1981). Eventually, Truman's concerns resulted in the landmark Executive Order 9981.

Issued July 26, 1948, Executive Order 9981 called for "equality of treatment for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin." It also established the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services (often known as the Fahy Committee) to serve as a vehicle for implementing the policy by advising the President and the service secretaries on how to "effectuate the policy..." (MacGregor, 1981). Despite its broad powers, the committee faced an arduous task in carrying out its charter due to the opposition of many high-ranking military and civilian officials in the military establishment².

It took the impetus of another war (in Korea) and research supporting integration based on the effectiveness of integrated units during this war to move the desegregation effort from policy to reality. (Both the Army's internal study and a contract study called Project CLEAR supported integration; furthermore, with larger numbers of black soldiers involved in the Korean conflict, efficiency demanded integration as a pragmatic necessity; MacGregor, 1981.) Finally, by October 1954 the Secretary of Defense was able to announce the abolishment of the last racially segregated (active duty) unit in the armed forces (MacGregor, 1981).

President Truman's July 1948 executive order racially integrating the forces had a profound effect on the American military services. Another event leading to a permanent change in the face of America's armed forces occurred in the same year. In June, Congress passed the Women's Armed Services Act of 1948 (P.L. 625; Holm, 1992). When President Truman signed this law, he assured a permanent place for women in the armed forces. Though P.L. 625 placed severe limits on women's service (e.g., their strength could never exceed 2% of the force and women were restricted from serving as general officers; interestingly, during the life of the law, the 2% ceiling was never reached), it made it

² For example, Senator Richard Russell (D-GA) had this to say: "[T]he mandatory intermingling of the races throughout the services will be a terrific blow to the efficiency and fighting power of the armed services.... It is sure to increase the number of men who will be disabled through communicable diseases. It will increase the rate of crime committed by servicemen," (Power of the Pentagon, 1972). Also typical of the early attitude toward women in the military is a 1945 statement by Brigadier General C. Thomas, Director of the Division of the Plans and Policies at Marine Corps Headquarters, who commented, "The opinion generally held by the Marine Corps is that women have no proper place or function in the regular service in peacetime....The American tradition is that a woman's place is in the home" (Stremlow, 1979, p. 1).

possible for women, many of whom had served during World War II, to continue in the services during peacetime. In 1967, P.L. 90-130 removed the limits on women's representation and rank in the services.

The integration efforts, for both race and gender, have resulted in an American armed force whose ethnic/racial/gender diversity is quite different today from the force of World War II. For example, at the end of the war, women comprised 2.3% of the total active military strength (280 thousand out of 12 million; Holm, 1992); by 1971, they were only 1% (about 40 thousand; Holm, 1992); but by March of 1994, they were over 12% (over 198 thousand; DEOMI, 1994). Black members' representation has grown from 5.9% in 1949 (Young, 1982) to 19.3% (over 325 thousand; DEOMI, 1994) in March of 1994. Total minority representation in the active services in March of 1994 was over 28% (471 thousand; DEOMI, 1994).

Although the desegregation of the services after World War II set the services on course for these dramatic changes, the pathway to the future would prove to be full of potholes.

The Civil Rights Era

The desegregation of the Services did not lead to an end of racial discrimination and strife, nor did it result in full integration (from an attitudinal perspective) of minority members (Lovejoy, 1977). By the early 1960's, with the civil rights movement in full swing, pressure to improve conditions for minority servicemembers continued to swell. Proponents of civil rights in the public sector and the Kennedy administration urged DoD to take action to end segregation in reserve units and in the housing, schools, etc., serving military members in communities near military bases (MacGregor, 1981).

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara formed a committee (designated a Presidential committee since DoD requested Presidential appointment of its members) to address the issue (MacGregor, 1981). President Kennedy announced the establishment of the President's Committee on Equality of Opportunity in the Armed Forces on June 24, 1962 (MacGregor, 1981). It is often known as the Gesell Committee, after its chairman, Gerhard Gesell³. The work of this committee had greater support within DoD than did the Fahy Committee, perhaps because it had its roots within the DoD rather

³ Gesell at the time of his appointment was a Washington lawyer and acquaintance of Secretary McNamara's special assistant, Adam Yarmolinsky, and a close friend of Burke Marshall, then head of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

than directly from the executive branch (MacGregor, 1981). The work of this committee established equal opportunity for minority soldiers, both on and off the installation, as a direct command responsibility and linked equal opportunity to military efficiency (MacGregor, 1981). It resulted in DoD Directive 5120.36 (July 1963), supporting equal opportunity for all servicemembers and giving commanders authority to declare "off-limits" those establishments in the civilian community that discriminated on the basis of race, creed, or national origin (Hope, 1979; MacGregor, 1981). The directive also established a focal point for equal opportunity management within DoD and required the Services to develop their own manuals and regulations to implement the policy. Between 1964 and 1966, such regulations were published (Hope, 1979).

The Vietnam Era

Shortly after the implementation of these policies, the Vietnam War began. With it came increased numbers of black and other minority servicemembers. But many of these servicemembers, inspired by the civil rights era and with enhanced awareness of inequities, were more vocal concerning equal opportunity issues. As they became more militant, racial unrest in the form of riots and incidents occurred across the Services (Binkin et al., 1982; Hope, 1979). Official investigations into the causes of these disturbances resulted in a document (called the Rearden Report after the chairman of the investigating team, Frank Rearden III) supporting charges of discrimination. In response, among other things, the Services were required to establish equal opportunity/human relations officers and human relations councils in all major units, to improve utilization of minority members across the occupational spectrum, and to remove leaders who failed to take action against discrimination (Hope, 1979). Subsequently, other investigations and incidents led to Congressional involvement, culminating in a 1969 directive from the House Armed Services Committee for the DoD to establish mandatory race relations seminars for all servicemembers (Hope, 1979).

In January 1970, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird created the Interservice Task Force on Education in Race Relations to develop a plan to implement the program. Colonel Lucius Theus (a black Air Force officer eventually promoted to major general) chaired the committee, which later came to bear his name. The Theus Committee delivered its report to the Secretary of Defense on July 31, 1970

(Lovejoy, 1977). In September, an implementation committee (the Krise Committee) was directed to test the educational approach outlined in the Theus report. Late that year, Colonel Edward Krise (who became DRRI's first Director), chairman of the committee, delivered a report on the pilot program to DoD. The report gave specific suggestions on how to carry out the Theus Committee's recommendation to establish DRRI (Lovejoy, 1977). A draft DoD directive was developed and the process of "coordination" began within DoD. Finally, spurred by one more racial incident (a particularly destructive riot at Travis Air Force Base in May 1971), the Theus Committee's plan for race relations education was codified into DoD Directive 1322.11 in June of 1971 (Hope, 1979; Nalty, 1986). In the words of one observer, "this directive outlined the most comprehensive race relations education program ever attempted by any major institution in this country" (Hope, 1979, p. 41).

Founding of DEOMI

DoD Directive 1322.11 chartered the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI; later renamed DEOMI) and the Race Relations Education Board (RREB), a high level committee that was to oversee DRRI and provide policy guidance for race relations education (Day, 1983). Others (Day, 1983; Hope, 1979; Lovejoy, 1977) have chronicled the early history of the RREB and DRRI; we shall not repeat it here. Suffice it to say that the establishment of DRRI (DEOMI) marks the beginning of the modern approach to intercultural training in the military. The following discussion updates the descriptions of DEOMI provided by Day (1983) and others (e.g., Hope, 1979; Lovejoy, 1977).

Current Policy, Training Philosophy, and Programs

Day (1983), Lovejoy (1977), and Hope (1979) chronicle the evolution from DEOMI's initial course (lasting six weeks and primarily focusing on black/white issues and individual racism) to the present 16-week course (with broad inclusion of material relating to other racial-ethnic groups, gender issues, institutional discrimination, and organizational development). Between 1971 and the present, DEOMI has gone through a number of organizational changes, but the basic approach to intercultural training in the military has remained the same. DEOMI still "trains the trainers," using small group interaction, lectures, and exercises as the primary training methods. DEOMI graduates still serve as

advisors and trainers in their respective Services. Over the years, however, the size of DEOMI and the scope of its mission have expanded to meet the changing needs of the military. In the next section, we describe current (1995) policy and training practices at DEOMI.

Current Policy

As mentioned previously, the DoD Human Goals outline the broad philosophy for intercultural relations within the military. A number of DoD and service directives provide the regulatory framework for this broad philosophy. The two key documents at the DoD level are DoD Directive 1350.2 (The Department of Defense Equal Opportunity Program, December 1988) and DoD Instruction 1350.3 (Affirmative Action Planning and Assessment Process, February 1988).

DoD Directive 1350.2 amends, cancels, or consolidates a number of previous directives (e.g., DoD Directive 1100.15, The Department of Defense Equal Opportunity Program, and DoD Directive 1322.11, Education and Training in Human/Race Relations for Military Personnel) into a unified policy statement. DoD Directive 1350.2 calls for compliance with standards of fair treatment ("Discrimination...shall not be condoned or tolerated"), establishment of affirmative action programs (with an annual reporting requirement), and "education and training in EO and human relations at installation and fleet unit commands, Military Service accession points, and throughout the professional military education (PME) system..."

Training Philosophy

From its early days, DEOMI's training philosophy has mirrored the military's approach to equal opportunity and cultural diversity. Five main principles provide the foundation: (1) a focus on *behavioral change* and *compliance* with stated policy; (2) emphasis on equal opportunity and intercultural understanding as *military readiness issues*; (3) an understanding that *equal opportunity is a commander's responsibility*, and that the *DEOMI graduate's function is to advise and assist the commander* in carrying out this responsibility; (4) a belief that *education and training* can bring about the desired behavioral changes; and (5) reliance on *affirmative action plans* as a method for ensuring equity and diversity.

Especially important in the military's approach to intercultural training is the emphasis on education as a means to achieve *behavioral change* and *compliance* with directives (Hope, 1979; Lovejoy, 1977; Thomas, 1988). Though the Race [later *Human*] Relations Education Board has been abolished, DoD Directive 1350.2 reemphasizes DEOMI's educational function and charters the Defense Equal Opportunity Council (DEOC) to provide policy advice and guidance on EO matters. The DEOC, in its present form, includes the Deputy Secretary of Defense as its chair and the service secretaries, under secretaries, selected assistant secretaries, Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Director of Administration and Management as members. Among DEOC's four objectives is the charge to "assist in developing policy guidance for education and training in EO and human relations for DoD personnel" (DoD Directive 1350.2, December 23, 1988, p. 4-1).

The belief that EO and cultural understanding are *military readiness issues* is clearly iterated in DEOMI's current mission briefing (given to distinguished visitors to the Institute); but this idea was evident in the 1971 issue of DoD Directive 1322.11 (which established DEOMI). That directive says the education program is designed to prevent racial problems from impairing "combat readiness and efficiency" (Hope, 1979). A negative EO climate is thought to detract from readiness by leading to racial incidents or other disruptive events, while a positive EO climate may be an enhancer of readiness by improving cohesion and other organizational factors (Knouse, 1994)⁴.

DoD Directive 1350.2 also reinforces the concept that *equal opportunity is a commander's responsibility*. The directive identifies the chain of command as the "primary and preferred channel for correcting discriminatory practices and for ensuring that human relations and EO matters are enacted" (p. 2). Commanders are also given broad powers in dealing with discrimination (affecting military members, their families, and DoD employees) arising from nonmilitary sources (such as housing or service providers, various organizations associated with the military, etc.). The desire to help commanders with this responsibility led the first DEOMI staff to develop a handbook for commanders, designed to be

⁴ Although this is a quite reasonable rationale, it is important to note that it has never been subjected to an empirical test, even though cohesion does seem to be related to unit effectiveness (Siebold & Lindsey, 1991). One of the problems has been the lack of agreement on what constitutes cohesion. In addition, it has been difficult to carry out a field test under realistic conditions.

"supportive of the commander's responsibility to develop a program in race relations" (Lovejoy, 1977, p. 106). This Commander's Notebook contained a statement that the EO program "must be...consistent with the philosophy and behavior of the local commander..." (Day, 1983, p. 246). The DRRI Program of Instruction identified one of the major objectives as giving the students the "capability and judgment to work with commanding officers in determining the specific needs of a race relations...program" (Hope, 1979, p. 42).

As we have discussed previously, the belief that *education and training* can bring about behavioral changes leading to enhanced intercultural relations permeates DEOMI's history. The primary purpose of the Theus committee was to develop a plan for an education program to improve race relations (Lovejoy, 1977), and DRRI and HREB were subsequently founded to implement this plan. The Krise Committee, charged with planning the implementation, "was responsible for a significant innovation...that of concentrating on behavioral rather than attitude change" (Lovejoy, 1977, p. 24). According to Judge L. Howard Bennett, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights at the founding of DRRI and perhaps the driving force behind the philosophy of behavioral change through education, the educational program could work by providing greater understanding, appreciation, and respect among the groups that make up the military (Hope, 1979).

Use of *affirmative action plans* to manage EO and diversity has also been a standard practice in the military Services. DoD Directive 1350.2 establishes 10 reporting categories for which the Services must provide plans and assessments on an annual basis. The categories include: (1) Recruiting/Accessions, (2) Composition, (3) Promotions, (4) Professional Military Education (PME), (5) Separations, (6) Augmentation/Retention, (7) Assignments, (8) Discrimination/Sexual Harassment Complaints, (9) Utilization of Skills, and (10) Discipline. Details of the reporting process are spelled out in the supplement to the directive, DoD Instruction 1350.3. DEOMI's curriculum includes training for EO advisors on these requirements and how to implement affirmative action programs.

Staffing

Current DEOMI staff includes 70 military and 35 civilians, divided into 7 primary directorates (Training, Curriculum, Support, Research, External Training, International Affairs, and Civilian EEO).

In addition, at any given time, there may be as many as 300 students enrolled in the courses described below.

Training Programs

Over the years, DEOMI has adapted to the times, providing expanded or specialized training programs and adding research and consulting capabilities to meet the needs of the Services. The present course offerings include the following:

- 1. The Equal Opportunity Staff Advisor Course.** This is the linchpin of DEOMI's training programs. A resident course of 16 weeks' duration, it is designed to train equal opportunity staff advisors for commanders throughout all Services. It evolved from DEOMI's original course (discussed previously) and is thought to epitomize the "DEOMI experience." While a variety of training techniques are used, the focus is on small group exercises, practicums, and lecture presentations. Students are led through a carefully designed curriculum, designed to develop intrapersonal awareness, interpersonal understanding, and organizational skills. It covers cultural factors and unit cohesion (139 hours), communication skills (62 hours), staff advisor skills (50 hours), leadership (31 hours), and service-specific skills (20 hours). In addition, there is an extensive guest lecture series (94 hours) covering diverse topics related to EO in the military.

In DEOMI's early years, students were generally volunteers. Currently, students may volunteer, but many, especially from the Army, are simply assigned EO duties as part of their normal career rotation. Assignment to EO duties varies by service (for example, Army graduates serve for only two or three years as EO advisors, then return to their original military specialty; Air Force graduates serve for a career). Most of the students are mid- to senior-grade noncommissioned officers, with the largest numbers coming from the Army. As with all DEOMI courses, civilians employed by the Services may also attend. Few officers (other than DEOMI staff and some reserve components officers) have attended the course during recent years. However, the Army sent 16 officers to the course in 1994, reversing a trend away from officer involvement in EO programs. These officers are to serve at the major command level throughout the Army. Another watershed event in 1994 was the training of Marine Corps EO advisors in this course for the first time (though Marines had participated in other DEOMI courses and a

few Marine officers had graduated from the 16-week course because they were to join the DEOMI staff). The American Council on Education recommends 23 semester hours of undergraduate credit for graduates of this course.

Although the 16-week resident course is the crown jewel in DEOMI's course offerings, several other courses supplement it.

2. The Reserve Components Course. This course is designed to parallel the Equal Opportunity Staff Advisors Course, yet be offered on a schedule that is compatible with reserve component training. It consists of two resident phases at DEOMI, each two weeks long, plus a nonresident, correspondence phase. The graduates are qualified to serve as EO advisors in the various reserve components (e.g., National Guard, Reserves). Its curriculum and training methods are similar to those for the 16-week course. Students may be officers or mid- to senior-grade noncommissioned officers.

3. The Equal Opportunity Program Orientation for Managers. This is a two-week course designed to acquaint program managers at the higher levels of command with EO issues. It includes an orientation to such topics as prejudice and discrimination, program management, and service policies. Students are typically senior noncommissioned officers or officers in the grades of O-3 (lieutenants from the Navy and Coast Guard; captains from the other Services) to O-6 (captains in the Navy or Coast Guard; colonels in the other Services).

4. Equal Employment Opportunity Courses. Beginning in 1994, DEOMI assumed responsibility for training civilian employees of the Services who are responsible for equal employment opportunity (EEO) programs. There are three courses, designed to serve the needs of EEO advisors at different strata (from counselor to managerial levels) in the EEO system. The courses are each two weeks long and cover cultural awareness, EEO complaint processing, EEO law, communications skills, counseling skills, and dispute resolution techniques.

5. Senior Noncommissioned Officer Equal Opportunity Workshop. This is a one-week course that orients senior noncommissioned officers toward EO issues. The students are typically first sergeants, master chiefs, sergeant majors, or chief master sergeants. They have considerable influence

over the day-to-day management of personnel within their commands and can contribute much toward the human relations climate. The course uses many guided discussions, exercises, and case studies to involve the students in their own learning process.

6. Senior Executive Leaders Equal Opportunity Training. In March of 1994, the Secretary of Defense (Mr. Perry) issued a memorandum calling for DEOMI to train newly selected admirals and general officers, as well as Senior Executive Service personnel, in EO topics. The two-day workshops are designed to give these senior leaders personal insight into broad EO and diversity issues and to help them become more effective as senior managers within the Services.

7. Mobile Training Teams. Since 1990, DEOMI has conducted a number of mobile training seminars at the request of military and civilian agencies. The mobile training interventions are focused on the specific needs of the organization. For example, perhaps a unit has a need for sexual harassment and sex discrimination training. A team from DEOMI will develop an appropriate program and deliver it on site. The requesting unit pays the travel costs for the team, but there is no charge for the training. Members of DEOMI's staff are also available for consultation to help identify training needs and other EO/diversity concerns within the units.

Other Services

Besides its extensive training programs, DEOMI offers a number of other services to help military commanders improve the EO and diversity climate within their commands. These services include the following:

1. Research. When DEOMI was founded, research (in the sense of student and program evaluation) was an integral part of the institution. It was used to validate and develop curriculum, to assess the impact of training on students and those in the field, and to supplement curriculum materials. After the institute programs were well established, the interest in research waned, however. In 1986, the research program was reinstated, and a research directorate was established. The research services include conducting original research on areas of interest in military EO, monitoring and disseminating findings, and providing resource materials to policy makers, commanders, EO advisors, and other interested individuals. Adjunct researchers from the Services and civilian institutions of higher learning

augment the DEOMI research staff through internships, summer faculty research programs, and the DEOMI visiting professor (sabbatical) program.

The summer research program, currently administered through the Office of Naval Research, has been the vehicle through which the Research Directorate is able to magnify its efforts to provide a research input to the military's equal opportunity programs. Since the initiation of the summer program in 1987, close to 30 university faculty members have participated, several of them more than once. Approximately 20% were from Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs) and a number of the remainder were members of minority groups on the faculties of predominately white institutions. The research topics have been quite broad, reflecting the interests of both DEOMI and the individual faculty member. At least one effort, the measurement of equal opportunity climate (discussed below and in other sources such as Dansby & Landis, 1991) has had significant impact on the various services. Thirteen of the summer projects have dealt with aspects of equal opportunity climate; thirteen have also focused on women's issues, including sexual harassment; five researched accessions policy and the same number dealt with racial disparities in the system of military justice. The remainder looked as such diverse topics as evaluating the DEOMI curriculum (2 projects), Hispanic issues (2 projects) and equal opportunity policy (3 efforts).

2. Climate Analysis. The Directorate of Research also conducts the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Analysis Survey (MEOCS) program (Landis, 1990; Dansby & Landis, 1991; Landis, Dansby, & Faley, 1993). MEOCS is an organizational development survey covering equal opportunity and organizational effectiveness issues. It is offered free to commanders of military organizations. DEOMI provides a confidential feedback report to the commanders and maintains a database of survey results by service. The feedback report provides comparisons between unit and database results, as well as internal comparisons (e.g., minority-majority, men-women) to help commanders better plan actions to improve the climate. This voluntary program has been quite popular with commanders (over 2300 requested the survey between June 1990 and January 1995), resulting in a database of nearly 300,000 records. MEOCS is discussed further in other sources (e.g., Dansby & Landis, 1991).

3. Electronic Bulletin Board. The electronic bulletin board allows EO advisors, service leadership, researchers, and interested others to access and share information. Many of the research publications, statistics, case studies, and other resources are available for download. Also, the system serves as a vehicle for networking and E-mail among EO advisors and DEOMI staff.

4. EO Conference and Research Symposium. The Worldwide Equal Opportunity Conference (hosted by DEOMI December 5-9, 1994) was meant to be the first of many such conferences. In addition to training programs, seminars, and workshops, a research symposium was also conducted. Paper presentations and panel discussions contributed toward increased awareness of EO/EEO research and sharing of ideas for future projects and practical application.

5. Library. Over the years, the DEOMI library has developed an extensive collection of materials relating to EO and diversity issues. It contains over 12,000 books and 250 periodicals, as well as CD-ROMs for 1500 periodicals and 100 ethnic newspapers. Its selected journals, books, reports, and CD-ROM resources are perhaps the best source for military EO information in the world. The library is a resource for staff, students, and adjunct researchers.

6. National/International Initiatives. Since 1993, DEOMI has also provided consultation and assistance for national and international efforts to improve intercultural training and understanding. In 1994, a separate directorate was established to further the national/international goals of the Institute. DEOMI teams have worked with universities, police departments, fire departments, the Department of Justice, Chambers of Commerce, schools, youth groups, and other agencies to help improve the diversity climate. In the international arena, DEOMI has consulted with agencies from Russia and other former Eastern Bloc nations, South Africa, Canada, Great Britain, and Germany. These efforts support national democratization initiatives.

Summary and Discussion

In this paper, we have described the history and philosophy of intercultural relations in the armed forces, the current policies, and the training programs and methods used to implement the programs. Central to the military training effort is the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

(DEOMI), a unique institution dedicated to training and research in equal opportunity and diversity issues within the military. Since 1971, DEOMI has served as a focal point for intercultural training.

In keeping with the military culture, intercultural training in the services, as we have indicated, is a pragmatic business. Using a system of centralized training (based at DEOMI) for the trainers and decentralized delivery at various levels throughout the services, military leaders hope to influence the *behavior* of servicemembers to maintain *compliance with stated policy*. And that policy endorses principles of equity, opportunity, and fair treatment, not limited by a person's color, race, ethnicity, or gender.

Many would argue that this approach has made the military the most successful major institution in America in implementing the goal of equal opportunity for people of all racial/ethnic backgrounds. Indeed, in March of 1994, there were 54 minority generals and admirals serving on active duty (DEOMI, 1994; there were also 11 women in the general/flag officer ranks). This representation at the most senior levels of the services is even more impressive given that the military must "grow its own" generals and admirals. There is no opportunity for lateral recruitment from other societal institutions; all general/flag officers must come through the ranks, a process that takes about 26 years. Therefore, the current generals and admirals started in the system about 1968. Based on the numbers of minority officers within the personnel "pipeline," we predict the number of minority general/flag officers will double by 2005 (if force levels are maintained at predicted levels). General Colin Powell, an African-American who rose to the highest military position in the nation, serves as an important and symbolic reminder that minority members with the right abilities have the opportunity to reach the top in today's military services.

Clearly, the integration of women and minorities into the military has been a success. In examining the reasons for this situation, Kauth and Landis (1994) pointed out four possibilities that, taken together suggest patterns to be followed by other organizations:

1. Speedy change is better than slow incremental policies. The integration of blacks was achieved in a fairly fast fashion due to wartime needs. Women, on the other hand have had to endure a much slower process to no clear benefit.

2. Providing opportunities for contact (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1976) acts to weaken prejudice and lay the foundation for later integration policies. Hence, the

experience of whites who served with blacks in the Second World War made acceptance of integration possible in 1948.

3. Making salient the contrast between segregationist policies and the fundamental precepts of the society can act to increase dissonance around the past practices. Having fought a world war to eliminate racism, the country was less willing to accept segregation at home. Gunnar Myrdal (1944) called this an "American Dilemma."

4. The role of top leadership cannot be overemphasized. President Truman provided strong leadership which when combined with the tradition of military compliance with civilian authority led to efforts to produce change.

5. Efforts to institutionalize nondiscriminatory behavior (the subject of this paper) are important. In the military, this was accomplished by:

a. Development of a cadre of people whose *raison d'être* was to eliminate discrimination. While this approach eventually caused problems with the chain of command, the foundation was established for equal opportunity to be an important aim of the service. Paradoxically, because this cadre was composed of a disproportionate number of minorities and women, they were sometimes not taken seriously by commanders.

b. Development of a body of knowledge about minority groups and women which could be used to counter stereotypes when they arose in the field...

c. Development of a technology directed toward changing behavior and attitudes. This technology consists of curricula, lesson plans, group exercises, films, and videotapes. (modified from Kauth & Landis, 1994)

Despite these successes, the senior leadership in the military understands the need to press its efforts in this area. In a pivotal memorandum to all the services, Secretary of Defense Perry stated it this way: "Equal opportunity is not just the right thing to do, it is also a military and economic necessity... The Military Services have led our nation in expanding opportunities for minority groups... However, I believe we can and should do better..." (March 3, 1994 memorandum from Secretary of Defense William J. Perry to all service chiefs and department heads). In the memorandum, one of five initiatives designed to accomplish this objective states the Secretary's desire that all personnel receive equal opportunity training, and specifically mentions training for senior leaders (generals, admirals, and Senior Executive Service civilians). DEOMI's programs serve as the fulcrum for leveraging the training across the services.

The military approach to intercultural training, while recognizing the importance of affective predispositions and responses, is clearly focused on behavior. Through education designed to enhance intercultural sensitivity and awareness, and through sanctions designed to ensure compliance, military

leaders desire to intervene in the intercultural behavior process to support principles of equity and diversity. The hope is that such behaviors, with continued reinforcement, will strengthen, especially if the social system supports such interactions.

Balance theories of attitude change (e.g., Heider, 1958; Osgood & Tannenbaum, 1955; Festinger, 1957; Brehm & Cohen, 1962), especially cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957; Brehm & Cohen, 1962), predict some positive attitude change as a result of behavioral compliance if the compliance is not perceived to be the result of extreme coercion or large incentives and if the new behavior is seen as central to the individual's self-perception. The perceptions of coercion and incentive are individual matters; some military members who come into the services with negative attitudes toward EO policies may justify their counterattitudinal intercultural behaviors based on the level of coercion or incentives, while others may change their attitudes if coercion and incentives are perceived as weak. In any case, from the military perspective, if behavioral interventions lead to increased positive affect toward others from diverse backgrounds, it would be a bonus. But attitude change, per se, is not the stated goal.

No program, particularly one as complex and far reaching as the military's human relations efforts, is free of problems which may limit overall effectiveness. We will mention just two. First, the theoretical orientation of the DEOMI curriculum was fundamentally set in the 1970s. Hence, the discussion of the conceptual underpinnings of intercultural or equal opportunity training include a focus on dissonance and institutional discrimination. The group exercises tend to reinforce a view of racism that is "traditional" to use McConohay's (1986) term. Contact theory is briefly, if at all, mentioned and there is virtually no recognition of the newer conceptualizations derived from Tajfel, Brewer, Gaertner, Larwood, and others (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Brewer & Miller, 1984; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Larwood & Gattiker, 1985; Larwood, Gutek, & Galliker, 1984). These approaches have been shown (e.g., Amir and his colleagues) to be quite useful in changing both attitudes and behaviors.

A second issue revolves around the organization and utilization of research on equal opportunity issues. The permanent research staff across DoD focused exclusively on equal opportunity issues is quite modest, given the size and importance of the issue. At DEOMI, the current staff consists of two

Ph.D. level research psychologists (one of whom is the Director and the other a military officer scheduled to retire shortly), three MA level researcher/administrators (one of whom is a military officer) and several noncommissioned officers and secretaries who perform the various administrative duties necessary to keep the operation on track. Several of the staff spend most of their time ministering to the MEOCS database and in preparation of survey feedback reports for commanders. Until recently (1993), the director was an Air Force lieutenant colonel and thus subject to rotation every three or four years. These staff are supplemented by summer researchers (see above) who are in residence for 10 weeks and a recently added full-time sabbatical leave faculty member (who spends an academic year in the Directorate). Under these circumstances it is very difficult to maintain a coherent and consistent research program. As compensation, the directorate has placed most of its effort into the development and enhancing of the MEOCS, leaving other issues to be handled on an "as time is available basis." What the group does, it does well, considering the limited resources; but, it has hardly reached its potential as the military's center for equal opportunity research, a role that was envisioned for it by the DEOC in 1987, and a role that was assigned without the necessary funding.

If equal opportunity research is underfunded at DEOMI⁵, the situation elsewhere in DoD is hardly better. The Army Research Institute (mentioned earlier) has conducted little significant research in the equal opportunity arena since the later 1970s (Thomas, 1985). To our knowledge, the only Navy program is centered at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) in San Diego (Rosenfeld, Thomas, M.D., Edwards, Thomas, P.J., & Thomas, E.D., 1991), an excellent effort which is being scaled back at this time. Except for an occasional graduate thesis, the situation is even grimmer in the Air Force. All of these considerations must make us cautious in anticipating high impacts from the EO research programs described in this paper.

The long-term result of the military's program remains to be seen. What will happen to intercultural relations as the force reductions continue? How will societal demographic and attitudinal

⁵ The total DEOMI (operating) budget (FY 94) is about \$2.5 million. Even with the addition of the salaries and benefits for the assigned military personnel on staff, the total is considerably less than \$7.0 million. Considering the size of the active duty and reserve force, this amounts to less than \$3 annually per servicemember. At the same time, one must be mindful of the fact that this amount is greater than is being spent by any other governmental agency, at any level!

changes impact the military of the future? Will there even be a need for such training as the 21st century unfolds? How will increases in the numbers of women in the military affect intercultural relations in the military? Will backlash from majority men (the "reverse discrimination" concerns) have a significant impact on the services? Will policies regarding homosexual participation be revised, and how might this affect the services? (Kauth & Landis, 1994) All these and other questions remain to be answered. Truly, at least for intercultural relations and training in the military, these are interesting times.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Binkin, M., Eitelberg, M. J., Schexnider, A. J., & Smith, M. M. (1982). *Blacks and the military*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Brehm, J. W., & Cohen, A. R. (1962). *Explorations in cognitive dissonance*. New York: Wiley.
- Brewer, M. and Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller and M. Brewer, *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Day, H. R. (1983). Race relations training in the U.S. military. In Landis, D., & Brislin, R. W. (eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training (volume II): Issues in training methodology*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Dansby, M. R., & Landis, D. (1991). Measuring equal opportunity in the military environment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 389-405.
- DEOMI (1994). *Semi-annual race/ethnic/gender profile of the Department of Defense active forces, reserve forces, and the United States Coast Guard* (Statistical series pamphlet no. 94-4). Patrick Air Force Base, FL: Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gaertner, S. L. & Dovidio, J. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. Dovidio & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Holm, J. (1992). *Women in the military: An unfinished revolution*. Novato, CA: Presidio.
- Hope, R. O. (1979). *Racial strife in the U.S. military: Toward the elimination of discrimination*. New York: Praeger.
- Kauth, M. & Landis, D. (1994, August). *Applying lessons learned from ethnic and gender integration to the United States Military*. Paper presented in a workshop "Gays and lesbians in the military: Psychological perspectives on implementing the new policy" given at the 1994 American Psychological Association Convention, Los Angeles.
- Knouse, S. B. (1994). *Equal opportunity climate and total quality management: A preliminary study* (DEOMI Research Pamphlet 94-3). Patrick Air Force Base, FL: Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.
- Landis, D. (1990, January). *Military equal opportunity climate survey: Reliability, construct validity, and preliminary field test*. Oxford: University of Mississippi, Center for Applied Research and Evaluation.
- Landis, D., Dansby, M. R., & Faley, R. H. (1993). The Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey: An example of surveying in organizations. In P. Rosenfeld, J. E. Edwards, & M. D. Thomas (Eds.),

- Improving organizational surveys: New directions, methods, and applications.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Larwood, L. & Gattiker, U. E. (1985). Rational bias and interorganizational power in the employment of management consultants. *Group and Organization Studies*, 10, 3-17.
- Larwood, L., Gutek, B. & Gattiker, U. E. (1984). Perspectives on institutional discrimination and resistance to change. *Group and Organization Studies*, 9, 333-352.
- Lovejoy, J. E. (1977). *A history of the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI)*. Patrick AFB, FL: Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.
- MacGregor, M. J. (1981). *Integration of the Armed Forces, 1940-1965*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army.
- McConohay, J. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. Dovidio & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American Dilemma*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Nalty, B. C. (1986). *Strength for the fight: A history of black Americans in the military*. New York: The Free Press.
- Osgood, C. E., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1955). The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. *Psychological Review*, 62, 42-55.
- The power of the Pentagon (1972). *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 34-35.
- Rosenfeld, P., Thomas, M. D., Edwards, J. E., Thomas, P. J. & Thomas, E. D. (1991). Navy research into race, ethnicity, and gender issues: A historical review. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 407-426.
- Siebold, G. L. & Lindsay, T. J. (1991). Correlations among ratings of platoon performance. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Military Testing Association*, (pp. 67-72). San Antonio, TX: U.S. Air Force Armstrong Laboratory Human Resources Directorate and the U.S. Air Force Occupational Measurement Squadron. October 28-31.
- Stremlow, M. V. (1979, March). *A history of women marines 1946-1977*. Washington, DC: History and Museums Division, Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, p. 1.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worshel (Eds.). *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thomas, J. A. (1988). *Race relations research in the U.S. Army in the 1970s: A collection of selected readings*. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Young, W. L. (1982). *Minorities and the military: A cross-national study in world perspective*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.



