



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY
FORT BLISS, TEXAS 79918-1270



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

January 15, 1992

Office of the Commandant

General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., U.S. Army Retired
1 Towers Park Lane, Unit #2306
San Antonio, Texas 78209

Dear General Haines:

I am enclosing the four research papers that reached the finals of the Haines Award for your information. The winning paper "Women in Combat", written by SGM Don M. Dickson, SGM Gary M. Layton, MSG Murrel Bigger, and MSG Robert F. Echrich will also be forwarded to the Commanders at TRADOC and Combined Arms Command for their information.

Biographies for each winning research team member are attached.

Thank you for your continued support of the award program and your interest in the Academy.

Fredrick E. Van Horn
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commandant

Enclosure



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY
FORT BLISS, TEXAS 79918-1270



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

ATSS-C

15 January 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR Commanding General, U.S. Army Training and
Doctrine Command, Fort Monroe, VA 23651-5000

SUBJECT: General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., Award

1. The General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., Award, recognizes the student group from each Sergeants Major Course class which prepares and presents the highest quality research paper and briefing on an issue of importance to the U.S. Army.
2. The Haines Award for Class 38 was presented to SGM Don M. Dickson, SGM Gary M. Layton, MSG Murrel Bigger, and MSG Robert F. Eckrich for their paper entitled, "Women in Combat". I am providing a copy of this paper to you for your information. The Research Team was honored on 10 January 1992, at the Class 38 Graduation Ceremony.
3. This research paper is available for publication. Releases may be obtained from the Academy Public Affairs Office, DSN 978-8391, or Commercial, (915) 568-8391.
4. Thank you for your support of the Academy and the Haines Award Program.

Encl

FREDRICK E. VAN HORN
COL, FA
Commandant



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY
FORT BLISS, TEXAS 79918-1270



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

ATSS-C

15 January 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR Commanding General, U.S. Army Combined Arms
Command, Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-5000

SUBJECT: General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., Award

1. The General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., Award, recognizes the student group from each Sergeants Major Course class which prepares and presents the highest quality research paper and briefing on an issue of importance to the U.S. Army.
2. The Haines Award for Class 38 was presented to SGM Don M. Dickson, SGM Gary M. Layton, MSG Murrel Bigger, and MSG Robert F. Echrich for their paper entitled, "Women in Combat". I am providing a copy of this paper to you for your information. The Research Team was honored on 10 January 1992, at the Class 38 Graduation Ceremony.
3. Thank you for your support of the Academy and the Haines Award program.

Encl

FREDRICK E. VAN HORN
COL, FA
Commandant



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY
FORT BLISS, TEXAS 79918-1270



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

ATSS-C

16 January 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR Sergeant Major of the Army, HQ, Department of the
Army, RM 3E677, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.
20310

SUBJECT: General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., Award

1. The General Ralph E. Haines, Jr., Award, recognizes the student group from each Sergeants Major Course class which prepares and presents the highest quality research paper and briefing on an issue of importance to the U.S. Army.
2. The Haines Award for Class 38 was presented to SGM Don M. Dickson, SGM Gary M. Layton, MSG Murrel Bigger, and MSG Robert F. Echrich for their paper entitled, "Women in Combat". I am providing a copy of this paper to you for your information. The Research Team was honored on 10 January 1992, at the Class 38 Graduation Ceremony.
3. Thank you for your support of the Academy and the Haines Award program.

Encl

RONNIE STRAHAN
CSM, USA
Command Sergeant Major

10-23-91

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
United States Army Sergeants Major Academy
Fort Bliss, Texas 79918-1270

ATSB-BA-STU (351)

1 November 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR Commandant, USASMA, Ft. Bliss, TX 79918-1270

SUBJECT: Women In Combat

1. Thesis Statement: America's negative stand on women in combat deals in myth and not reality; studies on women's physical abilities, personality and interpersonal relationships, plus a look at history, show women are fit for combat.
2. Discussion: A close look at women's physical and mental capabilities reveals the difference between myth and reality about women as combatants. On the surface, women seem less capable than men at performing effectively in combat. However, scientific studies and history show little difference between men and women in their ability to perform under combat conditions.
3. Conclusion: Evidence clearly shows that there are differences between men and women with respect for various traits. Even where the differences are greatest, some women possess the traits to the same degree as some men. History shows women are fit for combat, and studies of physical, personality and interpersonal relationship differences do not prove different.
4. Haines Award: I do/do not request that the Haines Award Selection Board consider this paper for the General Haines Award for excellence in research.


STEVEN J. GOMEZ
SGM, USA
Faculty Advisor

SGM Don M. Dickinson
Chairperson
SGM Gary L. Layton
MSG Murrel Bigger
MSG Robert F. Eckrich

OUTLINE

THESIS: America's negative stand on women in combat deals in myth and not reality; studies on women's physical abilities, personality and interpersonal relationships, plus a look at history, show women are fit for combat.

I. Physical Strength

II. Personality

A. Aggression

B. Dependency

C. Emotionality

III. Interpersonal Relations

IV. History

Women in Combat

The modern AirLand Battle doctrine used on today's nonlinear battlefield extends the size of the combat zone immensely. Can women survive physically and mentally on this newly defined battlefield?

America's negative stand on women in combat deals in myth and not reality; studies on women's physical abilities, personality and interpersonal relationships, plus a look at history, show women are fit for combat. The idea that women are physically and emotionally unfit for combat is more a social point of view than fact.

The first characteristic often cited as limiting the combat performance of women is their lack of physical strength. Individuals' levels of physical strength and aerobic capacity are important to the military because they affect performance of some tasks (Segal 18).

Most women cannot perform intense physical military tasks as easily as most men. This includes such tasks as lifting heavy objects, road marching with heavy loads, running, and throwing. The women who can perform these physically demanding tasks require more time for task completion (Schrader 51).

Women can not match men in performing military tasks that place a premium on size, strength, and cardiovascular endurance. When planning these kinds of tasks, a leader considers the soldier's capabilities in terms of fitness level and gender (Schrader 51).

However, you can improve a woman's level of physical fitness through a good training program. Thirteen female soldiers from administrative and clerical backgrounds participated in a three week physical training program. This program helped them reach the U.S. Army doctrinal requirements for loading and firing the 105 and 155 millimeter howitzers. At the end of the program the women met or exceeded requirements on the rate of fire for both howitzers (Segal 18).

"Energy metabolism (process of converting food to energy) is a complicated process. No differences exist between genders in how the metabolic systems work. However, during similar physical work, men and women place different requirements on the body's two major energy systems" (Schrader 50).

"Anaerobic metabolism is the short-term energy system that does not require oxygen. It's the primary energy source for high intensity activities, like sprinting" (Schrader 50).

"The other system, aerobic metabolism, is for long-term energy production and uses oxygen. It's generally in use during activities of low to moderate intensity lasting longer than four minutes, such as jogging" (Schrader 50).

"An example of how men and women use these systems differently is during exercises at the same intensity: a vigorous unit run. Usually, women fatigue sooner because they work at a higher percent of their aerobic capacity than males. To keep up at high intensities, women must rely on the anaerobic energy system. This results in quick fatigue because lactate accumulates in muscles" (Schrader 50).

You can overcome the problem if you base intensity and workloads on individual aerobic power. This way both sexes work at the same percent of their total ability. Solution: ability groups. This allows men and women to effectively train together; they will fatigue at about the same rate (Schrader 50).

During World War II, the enemy captured 80 military nurses who spent four years as prisoners of war (POWs) (Climons). They all survived to return home. True physical inferiority would cause one to doubt women could survive long periods of harsh living conditions that POWs experience. However, these women did survive under these conditions.

There is no substantial evidence that women are physically inferior to men. Women live longer than men, have a higher level of resistance to disease and stress, and adapt easier to their environment (Morgan 557). Any husband who will make the effort will realize that his wife puts in an average 99.6 hour work week (Morgan 557). The average work week in America is only 40 hours long! The point is, evidence shows that women have the physical ability to endure in many situations.

Exclusion of all women from particular jobs because of the average lower strength of women is not a sound idea. The military should allow women to have these jobs if they perform at the level of strength the job requires (Segal 21).

A male or female cannot overcome, sustain, and excel in a variety of situations unless they are physically capable of doing

so. In addition to physical differences in gender, there are personality differences in gender that affect attitudes about women in combat.

According to Frieze Et Al (1978), personality refers to the pattern of organization of various traits and behaviors found in an individual. The study of sex differences in personality focuses on how the average female differs from the average male for particular traits. Three personality traits that have some relation to performance in military service are aggression, dependency, and emotionality (Frieze 17).

The first personality trait we will examine in relation to performance in the military is aggression.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) define aggression as actions whose central theme is in the intent of one individual to hurt another. Maccoby and Jacklin conducted a review of 66 studies in the psychological literature dealing with aggression. This review shows that boys and men are more aggressive than girls and women. Whiting and Pope (1974) also found that boys are more aggressive than girls in a cross-cultural study of six different cultures. In all six cultures, the study shows boys are more likely than girls to counter attack when verbally or physically attacked (Whiting 15).

Thus, it is clear that males are more aggressive than females, on the average. However, there is considerable controversy whether the roots of this gender difference are biological or social (Segal 5).

There is biological literature on the relation of sex hormones to aggressive behavior. Biologists gave female animals abnormally high doses of either male or female hormones during their prenatal or postnatal period. The female animals that received these doses of hormones were more aggressive than female animals that did not receive such doses. The same type hormones given to male animals resulted in decreased levels of aggression. Therefore, it cannot be the high levels of male or female hormones alone that are the sole motivators of aggressive behaviors (Rohrbaugh 73).

Another biological study compares the hormone levels of two monkeys after one defeats the other in a fight. The hormone level of the dominant monkey rises while the hormone level of the defeated monkey falls dramatically (McCoby 43).

This evidence suggests that there are social as well as biological components to aggressive behavior.

The social learning theorists takes a counterview to looking at aggression from a biological perspective. The counterview is that all human behavior comes from learning. A person observes people around him or her and tries out these people's behaviors. If the person receives rewards, then he or she will continue the behavior. If the person receives punishment, he or she will cease the behavior. The person develops a habit hierarchy. Whatever behavior received rewards most frequently in a particular situation in the past appears at the top of the hierarchy.

Therefore, this behavior is more likely to occur in a similar situation in the future (Bandura 42).

The social learning view of the development of aggressive behavior denies the role of hormones in sex differences in aggression. According to the social learning viewpoint, males and females are equally aggressive in their underlying motive. The difference being, they carry out the desire to hurt others in different ways. Society reinforces the two sexes for different forms of aggression. Society allows girls to show hostility in subtle ways and encourages boys to show it more directly by physical attack (Rohrbaugh 20).

The controversy over whether aggression is primarily a biological or social phenomenon is still open for argument. There is some evidence to support both sides of the issue. It is clear that men display more aggressive behavior than women, on the average. There is also a range of aggressiveness within each gender. It is unclear whether aggressive individuals make the most effective and disciplined soldiers. Therefore, sex differences in aggressiveness does not support assigning individuals to particular military jobs or units based on gender (Segal 7).

The next personality trait we will examine in relation to performance in the military is dependency.

Dependency is a reliance on others for help, approval, and attention (Nevill 1974). Individuals who are highly dependent are not effective decision-makers and may not perform well as military leaders (Neville 7).

Society believes females are more passive, dependent, and easily influenced than males (Frieze Et Al 1978). However, empirical evidence does not verify this stereotype. Oetzel (1966) reviewed thirteen observational studies of sex differences in dependency among children. Six showed no sex differences in dependency behaviors, while the rest were even as to which sex was more dependent (Oetzel 18).

Most ratings studies find that teacher, parents, and peers rate females as more dependent than males. This may be the results of expectations derived from cultural stereotyping. Since raters expect females to be more dependent, they rate them as such. In addition, expectations might bias raters' perceptions of specific behavior; that is, they perceive non-dependent behavior in a female as dependent. The evidence does not support the stereotype; therefore, the belief that women are more dependent than men affects attitudes and behavior. This explains the resistance to women in traditionally male roles, especially those involving the exercise of leadership and authority (Weitz 8).

The last personality trait we will examine in relation to performance in the military is emotionality.

According to cultural stereotypes, women are more emotional than men, while men are more rational than women. Emotionality interferes with the ability to function effectively under stress and in crisis situations. The more specific traits which tend to define emotionality are those society sees as more characteristic of women. These include: sensitivity, anxiety, depression,

moodiness, and fearfulness. Other traits of emotionality because they indicate volatile emotional behavior are aggression and antisocial or sociopathic behavior. These latter traits, which are more characteristic of males than females, rarely arise in discussions of sex differences in emotionality (Segal 9).

On those traits which are part of the stereotype of women's emotionality, the evidence on sex differences is inconclusive. In studies using rating-scale measurements to test sex differences in fearfulness, females appeared to be more fearful. However, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found inconsistent sex differences when they reviewed results of various observational studies of fearfulness in children (Oetzel 22).

Cultural expectations require men not to be afraid and not to cry. Because of this, women may be more willing to report anxieties and fears on self-rating scales than men. Studies using physiological measures like increases in heart rate, pulse, and respiration, have not shown consistent sex differences in emotionality (Frieze 26).

Society assumes that women are less capable than men of performing under stress of violent situations such as combat. There is no evidence to substantiate such a claim. On the contrary, there is evidence that military women can perform on a par emotionally with their male peers (Segal 10).

Commanding an entire Army installation requires emotional stability. Emotional insecurity certainly would not lead to success in command. An emotionally weak character could not

serve well as a Military Police (MP) battalion commander entering Iraq early in the recent hostilities.

Brigadier General Evelyn Foote recently culminated her outstanding career as the Post Commander of Fort Belvoir, Virginia (Climons). Lieutenant Colonel Mary Maier lead her MP battalion into Iraq ahead of invading forces to set up traffic control points (Becraft). These women and others defy the old excuse that women cannot hold up under the emotional stress of combat.

Whether women can survive and work effectively in combat deals with issues related to interpersonal relationships (Devilbiss 528). Along with the physical and personality differences in gender, interpersonal relationships between genders affect attitudes about women in combat.

The assumption is that women present in a military unit (in nursing roles) will hinder its combat effectiveness. Scientific investigations determine that combat support and combat service support units with women do not differ in overall performance (Segal 209).

There is a belief that men will risk their lives, or the mission, to protect women in battle. This is an assessment by men who have never served with women; therefore, they can only presume this would happen (Devilbiss 11).

The concept of battle protection also touches on the notion of male bonding. This is an argument frequently raised against women in combat and particularly against gender-integrated combat units. Lionel Tiger concludes that there are two biological

"bonding processes": (1) Male-male bonding for maintaining social order; and (2) male-female bonding, for reproduction. This insinuates that the presence of women in previously all-male groups will interfere with the male-male bonding process (Tiger 84).

Other studies that examined interpersonal relationships in mixed-gender groups show that men and women develop "brother-sister" type relationships. These men and women developed friendships rather than sexual relationships (Bettleheim 32).

Information on all-male groups in battle show some are very effective and some are ineffective. There are factors other than cohesion that influence combat effectiveness. Therefore, the degree of cohesiveness in a group must take into account factors other than gender (Devilbiss 530).

Women who perform the same tasks as men in a combat environment challenge traditional notions of "women's work/women's place". Men and women know that both the presence and the work of women in this situation is not the norm (Devilbiss 532).

Because they are exempt from combat, women do not share the same risks as men do. Men recognize and promote this higher status and put down women by constant verbal and behavioral cues (Devilbiss 536).

When a man "loses it", fellow men will make excuses for him ("he's under pressure", "he misses his girl"). When a woman "loses it", men generalize beyond the individual to her gender ("just like a woman", "women can't cope"). The fact is women,

just like men, can, and do, cope with stressful situations. Individual rather than gender-related differences make people cope with situations in different ways (Angrist 215).

When men and women are together in a group their relationships are in line with society norms. Men excuse their profanity, are very polite, and offer women assistance carrying gear or moving equipment (Devilbiss 538).

In time, however, different norms begin to emerge, and the situation becomes characterized by "every person for him/herself". Obscenities (on the part of both men and women) become common, and offers to help are few and far between. The emerging norms suggest that gender is less important and working and living together are more important. As men and women begin to share daily tasks, the prejudice of the men drops dramatically. A new set of norms emerge - a sort of "we're all in this together". This is a push toward equality and interdependence: everyone swears and everyone helps out (Devilbiss 538).

When they go through a common experience, male-female bonding of a nonsexual nature normally occurs. This common experience is crucial, and gender incidental, to interpersonal bonding in this situation. A combat effective unit bases cohesion on commonality of experience, shared risks, and mutual hardships, not on gender distinctions (Broyles 55).

A strong commitment by leaders to gender integration will reduce the interpersonal problems women experience. They must pay particular attention to eliminating sexual harassment and improving women's quality of work life.

Society can debate about the physical and personality differences in gender and how interpersonal relationships between genders affect combat readiness. The one thing that is clear is the lesson that history teaches about how effective women are in combat.

One can ascertain from history that women are not thought of as warriors today. There has been a drastic change in their role as warriors and protectors since before Christ (BC). For example, Queen Boudica of the Dcenti tribe rebelled against the Romans in 60 to 61 AD. She stated, "This is combat I, as a woman, plan to do; let the men live in slavery if they will" (Fraser 43). Boudica would actually shame the men that were in her presence. The Romans could not believe the braveness of this woman. How she could motivate her warriors toward swift and vicious attacks. "The Boudician revolt was the most serious rebellion against Roman rule, next to the Batavian revolt" (Fraser 77).

Another great lady, Eleanor of Aquitaine, was to ascend to the throne of England in 1137 after her father's death. "She offered thousands of knights to the Second Crusade". She also joined the Crusade with her ladies in tow (Fraser 23).

This was a distraction to the warriors and when the Third Crusade began they did not allow women; however, she was Queen of England and wife to Henry II for forty years. She set an example for women of courage.

Not only have women been notable during ancient time. Their accomplishments continue through more modern times.

Even in days of Queen Baudica "confrontation with the theme motherhood and unsuitability of the mother to do battle prevailed" (Fraser 332). However, many Warrior Queens as previously mentioned were successful in battle. Some historians believe that most of these women's instincts were to battle on behalf of their children. Whatever the reason they fought in past history, women proved they can be successful in battle.

Must we forget the heroines that contributed to the birth of this nation, such as Molly Pritcher? During the American Revolution many women followed their husbands around military camps. Significantly, "Molly Pritcher followed the men to the Battle of Manmouth, 28 June 1778" (Gruer 340). "Her husband, an artillery gunner, fell from being overcome by heat. Molly took his place and continued to fire his gun. She received a pension of \$40 a month in 1822 for her service by the Pennsylvania Legislature" (Gruer 341).

Another heroine was Clara Barton; during the Civil War she performed her role as the "Angel of the Battlefield". "She and a handful of women defied Army Regulations and of male doctors to serve on the battlefield. In 1861 they convinced the Lincoln administration to hire women nurses to take care of the many wounded. Clara and her nurses would carry supplies and care for the wounded on the field of battle" (Gruer 402).

Our society soon forgot these admirable contributions by women. There is no arguing that certain combat related jobs

are not suitable for all women due to their physical stature. However, women should be able to voluntarily serve in jobs within their capabilities.

Throughout American history, society continues to protect women from combat.

World War II saw France, Germany, and Britain use women in combat roles, eventhough few records show how they performed. At the beginning of World War II, America did use some women in subversive roles such as espionage and sabotage.

Britain drafted 240,000 women in World War II to "free up men" for combat roles. Those drafted women manned antiaircraft sites, flew planes, drove trucks and tanks in combat zones (Saywell 77).

Israelis, whom tend to be a matriarch society, "sent girls into battle". "During the Iran-Iraq war, due to a shortage of recruits, women were sent to battle" (Fraser 18). Therefore, if the situation dictates, some countries do not hesitate to use women. However, these countries failed to record the results of women's accomplishments. To further illustrate the will of women, there have been great female leaders of nations in modern times.

The U.S. Department of Defense claims there were 7,465 women in Viet Nam; 6,250 served as Army Nurses. Viet Nam had no distinct difference between front line (combat) and rear area (noncombat). The whole country was a combat zone. At least seven Army Nurses died in Viet Nam (Goldman 226).

"During the Carter administration in 1980, he sought to

register women for the draft" (Goldman 238). Military services received pressure to increase their acceptance of women. "The Supreme Court was challenging the constitutionality of drafting only males for future wars" (Goldman 238).

Most recently women went to war in Desert Shield/Desert Storm, although none went in "official" combat roles. They drove resupply convoy trucks, manned air defense sites, flew helicopters, and of course, filled "traditional women's jobs". Like Viet Nam, women in Saudi were in a combat zone. Two women became a POW, a woman died piloting a helicopter, and a woman died in a "SCUD" attack.

Desert Storm included 22 women helicopter pilots as part of the invading force (Becraft). Navy women piloted helicopters and support aircraft (Becraft). Air Force women piloted and crewed a variety of support aircraft (Becraft). Marine Corps and Army women provided a wide array of ground support (Becraft). Even Coast Guard women involved themselves in port security (Becraft).

Were these women emotionally inferior to men under these trying conditions? We think not. Even in 1989 women were performing their military duties as competently as were military men (Office of the Secretary of Defense).

Commanders have a stressful job. Few can deny that commanding a battalion, company, squadron or battery is a job one can do without physical strain. Women piloted reconnaissance helicopters and resupply aircraft, worked many hours to keep logistics, intelligence, transportation, and communications support up. They enabled front line units to succeed during

operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and they were all grueling endeavors. Women did all the above and more during operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. They encountered the same risks as did their male counterparts while doing so. Those in positions of know, from military commanders to the President of the United States, stated that their performance was outstanding.

American women in combat roles continues to be a political issue rather than an issue of qualification or ability. The Congress, not the military leaders, decided women's role in the military when they granted women full status in the military. Military leaders told Congress women should be in the military; they performed well and held vital positions of importance. At the time the generals had no special conditions for women in the military. The Congress added on the restrictions of women in combat, women on ships and aircraft, and the restrictions on jobs they could hold.

In conclusion, the evidence clearly shows that there are differences between men and women with respect to various traits. Even where the differences are greatest, some women possess the traits to the same degrees as some men. History shows women are fit for combat. Studies on physical, personality and interpersonal relationship differences do not prove different.

Works Cited

- Angrist, Shirley S., "The Study of Sex Roles", Journal of Social Issues, 1969.
- Bandura, A., and R.H. Walters, Social Learning and Personality Development, 1963, New York: Holt.
- Becraft, Carolyn, "Army Women Have Earned Right to Fight", Army Times, June 17, 1991.
- Bettleheim, Bruno, Children of the Dream, 1969, New York: MacMillan.
- Broyles, William, "Why Men Love War", Esquire, 1984.
- Climons, Marlene, "Combat: Debate on Woman's Role", Army Times, January 11, 1990.
- Devilbiss, M.C., "Gender Integration and Unit Deployment: A Study of G.I. Jo:", Armed Forces Society, Vol. No. 4, Summer 1985.
- Frazer, Antonia, The Warrior Queens, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1988.
- Frieze, Irene H., et al, Women and Sex Roles: A Social Psychological Perspective, 1978, NY: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Goldman, Nancy L., Female Soldiers - Combatants or Noncombatants?: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives, 1982, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E., and C.N. Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences, 1974, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Morgan, Robin, Sisterhood is Powerful, 1970, Random House.
- Nevill, E., "Experimental Manipulation of Dependency Motivation and Its Effect on Eye Contact and Measures of Field

Dependency". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
2, No. 2, 72-79.

Oetzel, R.M., "Annotated Bibliography". in E.E. Maccoby, ed. The
Development of Sex Differences, 1966, Stanford: Stanford
University Press.

Office of the Secretary of Defense, Military Women in the Depart-
ment of Defense, Vol. VII, July 1989.

Rohrbaugh, J.B., Women: Psychology's Puzzle, 1979, New York:
Basic Books.

Schrader, Henry C., "Male & Female Soldiers: Physical Differ-
ences", Army Trainer, Summer 1990.

Segal, Mady W., Scientific Knowledge Applicable to Decisions
Regarding Women in the Military, A Report to the Secretary
General, NATO, 1985.

Tiger, Lionel, Men in Groups, 1969, New York: Random House.

Whiting, B., and C. Pope, "A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Sex
Differences in the Behavior of Children Aged Three to Eleven",
1974, Journal of Social Psychology.