

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

The 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 the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.  
**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> 10-05-2017		<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b>		<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b> SEP 2016 - MAY 2017	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b>  Military Gender-integration and Training: An Analysis of Training at Marine Corps Boot Camp and Its' Impact on Cohesion, Physical Fitness, and Discipline				<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b>  Arocho, Lisa., Major, USMC				<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>  USMC Command and Staff College Marine Corps University 2076 South Street				<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>				<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b>	
				<b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b>	
<b>12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b>					
<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>					
<b>14. ABSTRACT</b>  Gender-integrated training allows for increased cohesion amongst genders because male and female Marines gain an appreciation for the effort they contribute to the success of their platoon. The male recruits can see that the female recruits are being held to higher standard and being held accountable and vice versa. Gender-integrated training also allows recruits to be pushed beyond their limits. Studies found increase physical performance for female recruits in gender-integrated platoons. Of course, more can be accomplished in terms of setting gender-normalized standards.					
<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b>  Military Gender-Integration and Training; women; gender					
<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b>  40	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b>
<b>a. REPORT</b>	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b>	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b>			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)</b>

MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

---

---

**TITLE:**

Military Gender-integration and Training:

An Analysis of Training at Marine Corps Boot Camp and Its' Impact on Cohesion, Physical  
Fitness, and Discipline

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

**AUTHOR:**

Major Lisa M. Arocho, USMC

AY 16-17

---

---

Mentor and Oral Defense Committee Member: Nathan Packard

Approved: [Signature]

Date: 10 May 2017

Oral Defense Committee Member: Dr. Francis Marlo

Approved: [Signature]

Date: 1 May 2017

## DISCLAIMER

THE OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS EXPRESSED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF EITHER THE MARINE CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE OR ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY. REFERENCES TO THIS STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOREGOING STATEMENT.

QUOTATION FROM, ABSTRACTION FROM, OR REPRODUCTION OF ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DOCUMENT IS PERMITTED PROVIDED PROPER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IS MADE

*Table of Contents*

	Page
TITLE PAGE .....	i
DISCLAIMER .....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
PREFACE.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	v
INTRODUCTION .....	3-4
BACKGROUND .....	5-8
MOS RESTRICTIONS.....	9
Army MOS Restrictions Facts to Analysis.....	9-11
Marine Corps MOS Restrictions Analysis.....	11-13
GENDER-INTEGRATED TRAINING PROGRESS ANALYSIS .....	13-14
Army’s Gender-integration Analysis.....	14-15
Marine Corps’ Gender-integration Analysis.....	15-20
GENDER-INTEGRATION ADVANTAGES AND COUNTERARGUMENT .....	20-26
GENDER-INTEGRATION ARGUMENTS AND COUNTERARGUMENT.....	27-31
GENDER-INTEGRATION RECOMMENDATION .....	31-34
GENDER-INTEGRATION LONG TERM RESULTS .....	34
CONCLUSION.....	35-36
ENDNOTES .....	36-38
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	39-40

## *Preface*

My motivation to research gender-integration and boot camp for the Army and the Marine Corps was inspired by my previous assignment at Parris Island, South Carolina. During my tour as series commander and company commander, I was aware of the separation of training between male and female recruits. Fourth Recruit Training Battalion is the only all-female training battalion in the United States Marine Corps. While there, I noticed a stigma that was pushed down from the drill instructors that male recruits must stay away from females and vice versa. This stigma does not set our Marines up for success as once they leave Parris Island and head off to additional training and follow-on assignments where they will no longer be gender-segregated. It is imperative that Marines, regardless of gender, are trained together from initial training as to develop a mutual respect and to further enhance the cohesion, physical stamina, and discipline of the unit.

Because of my research, I have developed a respect for both gender segregation and integration; however, now that females can assume all combat MOS's, the Marine Corps has an obligation to ensure Marines are set up for success by eliminating gender segregation in any environment. Of course, with full integration, there inherently comes risk. However, the advantages of gender-integration far outweigh possible risks and the arguments against it. Forcing functions should be established to account for dealing with disciplinary issues and increasing physical fitness standards. I would like to thank my MMS Mentor (B. Wolny), CG FACAD (LtCol Glathar), LtCol K. Germano (Ret.), and MMS FACAD (Dr. N. Packard) for assistance with this paper.

## Executive Summary

**Title:** Military Gender-integration and Training: An Analysis of Training at Marine Corps Boot Camp and Its Impact on Cohesion, Physical Fitness, and Discipline

**Author:** Major Lisa M. Arocho, USMC

**Thesis:** Following the Army's lead, the United States Marine Corps needs to move past its history and provide gender-integrated training at the basic training level to increase cohesion, physical fitness, and discipline levels amongst genders to help ease women's transition into combat roles.

**Discussion:** Since the beginning of WWI, women have honorably served in the U.S. military. With the advances and inherently full ability of women to assume all roles, services, the Army has made progress with gender-integration at their basic training, allowing women to train with men; however, the Marine Corps has remained steadfast in continuing gender-segregated training at boot-camp. Although gender-segregated training has some advantages in terms of risk reduction, it does not outweigh the advantages that are achieved in the areas of unit cohesion, physical fitness, and discipline.

**Conclusion:** The advantages of gender-integrated training consist of increases to cohesion, physical capabilities, and discipline.

## INTRODUCTION

Since World War I, women have served in the United States military. Though their numbers were initially low, they served in support roles and their roles evolved from service support functions to non-combat military occupational specialties (MOS). In 2015, the Department of Defense (DOD) shifted its stance on allowing women to serve in combat related MOS. Each service has seen major changes to how they integrated women into their forces, progressed with implementation, and addressed the challenges associated in gender-integrated training.

Although each service has made significant efforts to implement change on behalf of women in the services, the Marine Corps has been vocal in its desire to keep most combat MOS's closed to women. Despite DOD's stance and other services shifting of procedures to provide gender-integrated training, Marine Corps boot camp remains segregated by gender. For almost a century, women's roles in the military have evolved and with it, as have the services handling of women being allowed to assume combat roles.

This research paper examines how the Army and the Marine Corps progressed with women's new roles in the military and how these services implemented their basic training to either gender-integrated and/or gender-segregated training. With all MOS's now opened to women, it is imperative that the Marine Corps reevaluate gender-integrated training to assist in implementing the DOD's decision to allow women into combat roles. While some have argued against gender-integrated training citing concerns over discipline, billeting and disparities in physical fitness, the advantages far outweigh the risks. Gender integrated training will improve unit cohesion and discipline, increase fitness levels, and instill in Marines a mutual respect for their fellow Marines regardless of gender during recruit training and in the operating forces. This paper will show that the United States Marine Corps needs to move past its history and

provide gender-integrated training at the basic training level to increase cohesion, physical fitness, and discipline levels amongst genders to help ease women's transition into combat roles.

## **BACKGROUND (SIGNIFICANT DATES AND LEGISLATION)**

1917-1918 – Women Can Serve in the Military

1948 – Women’s Armed Service Integration Act

1973 – End of the Draft; All Volunteer Force

1991- Women to Fly Combat Missions

1993- Repeal of the “Risk Rule

1993- Women to Serve on Combat Ships

1993: Congress Repealed the Prohibitions for Women Serving in Combat via Aircraft and Ships

1994: Rescind “Risk Rule”; Direct Ground Combat

2013: Secretary of Defense Rescinded Combat Restriction Rule

2015: Secretary of Defense Opens All Jobs to Women; No Exceptions

2016: Implementation Plans for Integration of Women into Direct Ground Combat Roles

## **BACKGROUND**

Since the late 1700's, women have served in roles in the military. Since the beginning of their service, women served in support roles such as nurses to cooks. In 1898, women helped fill the gap as nurses when disease threatened the lives of men during the Spanish-American War. An action because of women filling the gap as nurses created the Army and Navy Nurse Corps in the first decade of the 1900's.

During World War I, over 12,500 women served in the military. While serving, they performed administrative functions, in addition to support roles. Though the Navy and Marine Corps seemed to be on board with the recruitment of women, the Army did not follow in trace. Though this was the beginning of women serving in the Reserve forces, many of them did not receive benefits because they did not serve in uniform. Benefits would not be administered to women until almost 60 years later with the establishment of the Women's Armed Service Integration Act of 1948 where women would be formally recognized as service members. Though there were some significant improvements to the recruitment of women in World War I, the numbers of women serving decreased after World War I and that changed when during World War II in the early 1940's.<sup>1</sup>

During World War II men were on the frontlines of the battlefield, while women stepped up to fill support positions. As support positions were assumed by women, male service members were freed up to serve in ground forces MOS's. Almost half a million women served in World War II. After World War II ended, the military force rapidly dwindled, as did the number of women who remained in the military. Approximately 10,000 of over 250,000 remained. With these few numbers representing women service members, the Department of War (DOW)

needed to determine what to do with the women. The DOW understood the importance that women had been playing in the military since WWI and their contributions did not go unnoticed. The DOW advocated for women to serve during wartime contingencies. The Women's Service Integration Act, passed in 1949, was the result of the DOW's effort to integrate women into the military during wartime contingencies. The Army was the only branch that continued to keep its women in the Women's Auxiliary Corps (WAC) after the 1948, Women's Armed Service Integration Act was enacted. Although the DOW's new legislation integrating women into the military during contingencies was noble and a great start, it still did not fully integrate women into the military during peacetime operations and it did not provide women with the same promotion and pay benefits as their male counterparts. In addition, women were also restricted in terms of MOS opportunities. Despite integrating women into the military during wartime contingencies, women's roles were still not significant because they could not engage in all MOS's. In the early 1950's, approximately 20,000 women served in the active component. Even with recruiting efforts during the Korean War, the number of women serving in the active component slightly increased to approximately 50,000. These roles were limited to support and admin roles.<sup>2</sup>

The number of women in the military dropped from 50,000 to 30,000 between the Korean War and the Vietnam War. In the mid-1960's, following a decline in enlistments, the DOD formed a working group to review the status of women in the armed forces. This working group, known as the Inter-Service Working Group on Utilization of Women in the Armed Services, was tasked with reviewing the DOD's plan to employ and retain women in the military. This was one of the first studies to contribute to the advancement of women in the military. It recognized those factors that held service women back and contributed to lower numbers. One benefit that

this working group identified was that by allowing women to serve in greater numbers reduced the amount of men who would need to be drafted and who may not have wanted to serve. The Inter-Service Working Group on Utilization of Women in the Armed Services reviewed ways for each service to increase the recruitment and retention of women. With the effort to increase the recruitment of women, the DOD's decision to end the draft in 1973 caused the military to become an all-volunteer force. The working group made some substantial recognitions and because of its efforts, the military would later enact regulations that contributed to the progress of women in the military that we now know today.<sup>3</sup>

Unlike wars prior to Vietnam, the role of women serving in the military significantly increased and with this so too did their roles in Desert Shield, Desert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) from 1990's to present day. Women serving were filling administrative and logistics roles that brought them closer to the frontlines. In OIF and OEF, Service members, regardless of gender and MOS's, were faced with an equal opportunity enemy threat. The direct and indirect nature of the enemy posed a significant threat for all service members, including women.<sup>4</sup> An example of women service member's contributions post-1990 was the awarding of approximately 400 Combat Action Ribbons to female Marines for their efforts in support of the war on terror.<sup>5</sup> This number represents women Marine's roles in combat, even before they were authorized to assume all MOS's. With a new threat focused on all service members, Congress realized the impact that the unconventional enemy would have on its force, especially women, and thereby enacted several legislative acts such as allowing women to fly in combat missions and serve on combat ships in the early 1990's to opening up all combat MOS's to women in 2015. With the introduction of the legislation, each service made changes to how it integrated women into its respective forces.

## **MOS RESTRICTIONS ANALYSIS**

In the 1990's several changes for women service members were implemented. Women could fly combat missions in 1991 and serve on combat ships in 1993; however, there were still several limitations they faced over the next two decades. Although women were now able to serve in several combat roles, restrictions for women still existed. The Direct Combat Rule of 1994 allowed commanders to decide on whether these women could serve in direct combat units above the Brigade level only. Because commanders were allowed discretion on making this decision, they often made more restrictive decisions on what to do with women serving in these billets when their units served in direct combat. Often, commanders chose the safer route and did not allow women who served in combat MOS's within their units to deploy. Because commanders were allowed discretion on where they positioned women serving in ground MOS's into their units, there were undoubtedly opportunities for discrimination. In addition, the most significant factor that affected women during this time was their inability to serve in direct combat units. Additionally, as nearly two decades later passed, services have adjusted their stance on women service members especially with the support of the Secretary Defense as he rescinded the rule that allowed women into combat in 2015.<sup>6</sup>

## **ARMY MOS RESTRICTION ANALYSIS**

Although women became integrated into combat MOS's, their inability to operate in combat caused many positions to be closed off to them, thus having an impact on promotion and command opportunities. Women serving in combat MOS's were less likely to be promoted due to these constraints. In 1993, Margaret C. Harrell and Laura C. Miller analyzed the following statistics relating to women opportunities to serve in Army MOS's:

Women can serve in 97 percent of officer career fields and 83 percent of MOSs, but less than 70 percent of all job slots are open to women. This is because approximately 30 percent of the Army's job slots are in combat arms. Approximately 6 percent of women officers and 1 percent of enlisted women are in this aggregated skill grouping. Of the remaining women in the Army, 22 percent of officers and 25 percent of enlisted women serve in combat support skills, and 72 percent of officers and 74 percent of enlisted women serve in combat service support occupations, which include fields traditional for women, such as medical and administrative.<sup>7</sup>

Although a small number of women served in some combat MOS's in the late 2000's, the fact that they could not serve in combat units above the Brigade level decreased their opportunities to serve in these key billets. As a result, most women continue to serve in combat service support and administrative MOS's. Although progress was made for women to serve in combat MOS's, policies such as the combat exclusion policy, severely hindered women's ability to perform in combat; thereby, continuing to limit their promotion and career opportunities.

Although some combat MOS's such as Combat Engineers and fighter pilots became open to women for each service, the DOD authorized services to make decisions on the impact of physical capabilities required for roles and whether women were physically able to perform them. When the DOD allowed the services to make decisions based on physical capability associated with each MOS and whether certain MOS's like infantry and armor were in fact direct combat, they had difficulty determining whether MOS's such as field artillery and combat engineering also constituted direct combat. In 1994, the DOD rescinded the rule that allowed commanders to use their discretion in assigning women to deploy and instead made the decision to allow women serving in those combat MOS to serve in all roles, both in garrison and forward deployed. The DOD argued that these specific combat MOS's (combat engineers and armor) that women were serving in, were not engaged in direct combat. Coincidentally, in 1994 the DOD rescinded the risk rule and laid out the groundwork for what constitutes direct combat.

With the DOD's change in stance, women could serve in direct combat units so long as they were assigned above the Brigade level.

In reviewing the Army's MOS restrictions, since the early 1990's, approximately 30% of women serving in the Army served in combat roles; the remaining women served in combat service support, medical, and administrative MOS's. The lack of combat roles during this period due to the Combat Exclusion policy no doubt resulted in limited promotion and career opportunities for women. Even with DOD rescinding the "Risk Rule" in 1994, women still faced limitations because they could not serve below the Brigade level. Now that the analysis on how the Army incorporated women into its service after the authorization of key legislation in support of women service members, it is important to analyze how the Marine Corps also incorporated women.

## **MARINE CORPS MOS RESTRICTION ANALYSIS**

Similarly to Army, the Marine Corps also faced combat restrictions for women. A little more than half of the MOS were opened to women; for the approximately 40% that were not, these MOS's were closed due to MOS and unit restrictions. Margaret C. Harrell and Laura C. Miller analyzed the following statistics as it applies to women opportunities to serve in Marine Corps MOS's:

These changes resulted in the opening of a total of 93 percent of Marine Corps officer and enlisted occupations to women, for 101,000 gender-neutral positions. However, this represents only 62 percent of all billets in the Marine Corps. Of the remaining 38 percent, 20 percent are closed because of MOS restrictions, and the remaining 18 percent are closed due to restriction on assignment to those units. The majority (43,000) of the new positions resulted from the change in law permitting women to deploy aboard combatant ships, as this change opened the rotary wing aviation units and AV-8 Harrier squadrons to women.<sup>8</sup>

With DOD's changes in stance regarding opening combat roles for women, the Marine Corps made some progress in what they could affect. Those MOS's that would require deployment on ships were affected because ship modifications in support of women had since not been made. Another consideration was the increase of women in the force. Similarly to the Army, because of the combat exclusion rule, opportunities for promotion and command were limited.<sup>9</sup>

Restrictions in the combat MOSs still existed because of the likelihood to serve in direct ground combat. With this stance, several MOS's from infantry, armor, to artillery were still closed due to the services ability to make decisions on what MOS's could not be fulfilled by a woman due to them being unable to serve during direct ground combat. As a result, if a woman assumed a combat MOS, then she had to serve in a unit above the Brigade level. An advancement made in the early 1990's, was the DOD's decision to allow women to serve in combat aircraft. This decision had an impact on each service. In addition, when the DOD decided to allow women on combat ships, this also positively affected the Marine Corps due to its expeditionary nature and reliance on combat ships for operations. Despite these significant advancements for women, they still were not able to serve in combat MOS's such as infantry and artillery. With DODs changes in stance and progress made by the Marine Corps, it was still evident in each branch of service that each service had their own way of employing its units and that there was a potential for bias to exist by the unit commander in terms of the risk level they would take when assigning women to combat units. Similarly to the Army, there were some changes to commander's ability to employ its units when the DOD rescinded the risk rule in 1994. This decision allowed for Marine Corps women to serve in direct combat units so long as they were assigned above the Brigade level. Now that the analysis on how the Marine Corps incorporated women into its service after the authorization of key legislation allowing women to

serve on combat aircraft and vessels and later, when all MOS's were opened to women, it is important to analyze how the Army and the Marine Corps evolved their training to implement women's new roles in the military.

In reviewing the Marine Corps MOS restrictions since the early 1990's, approximately 20% of MOS's were closed to women serving in the Marine Corps. These MOS's were closed due to DOD restrictions on assignments for women. Similarly to the Army, most women served in combat service support, medical, and administrative MOS's. The lack of combat roles now due to the Combat Exclusion policy no doubt resulted in limited promotion and career opportunities for women. Even with DOD rescinding the "Risk Rule" in 1994, women still faced limitations because they could not serve below the Brigade level. Although there were some limitations that existed, the Marine Corps did achieve advancements in assigning women on combat aircraft and combat ships. Now that the analysis on how the Army and Marine Corps incorporated women into their services after the authorization of key legislation allowing MOS advancements for women, it is important to analyze how these services adjusted their boot camps to incorporate women in their service.

## **GENDER-INTEGRATED TRAINING ANALYSIS**

In a survey conducted in 1997 by the National Defense Research Institute, they surveyed over 670 military males and over 240 military females on whether gender-segregated training should take place at basic training and they found that, "one quarter of military women and nearly 40 percent of military men supported segregation on both the officer and enlisted levels. However, 54 percent of the men and 67 percent of the women thought training should be integrated on both levels. While the majority support integration, there is a substantial minority in the population we sampled favoring segregation."<sup>10</sup> Though there is significant support for both gender-

integrated and gender-segregated training, each service has implemented what works for them. Valuable lessons have been learned from the Army and the Marine Corps' decision to support gender-integrated or gender-segregated training and can be applied if future mandates require gender-integration at the basic training level for each service.

## **ARMY'S GENDER-INTEGRATION ANALYSIS**

In the mid-1990s, the Army began its gender-integrated training for non-combat MOS's. It integrated its initial training for soldiers serving in combat service and combat service support MOS's, while keeping those men who would serve in combat arms MOS's initial training segregated. After the Women's Army Corps (WAC) was disbanded in 1978, women that joined trained with male recruits; however, that changed two years later when the Army transitioned to gender-segregated training in 1982. The Army transitioned because they felt that it impacted the performance of the men because they found the training to be less stringent; however, in 1994, the Army transitioned back to gender-integrated training for combat support and combat service support related MOS's. Combat MOS's remained gender-segregated.<sup>11</sup>

The Army made the decision to begin integrated training in 1994. In accordance with Margaret C. Harrell and Laura C. Miller, they analyzed a five-month long gender-integration study that took place at Fort Jackson. The results of this study found no negative effects of gender-integration and no significant difference in gender performance outcomes; the positive outcome of this test resulted in the Army transitioning its basic training from gender-segregated training to gender-integrated.<sup>12</sup>

In 2016, Kris N. Kamarck, a manpower analyst, conducted a study on the subject for Congress. She found improvements in the number of women Army service members who were

now able to serve in combat MOS's, such as Field Artillery and Combat Engineers. As recently as 2016, a year after all MOS's were opened to women, her study showed both enlisted and officer women in the Army applying for the infantry MOS. Of the women that applied and tried for these positions, 10 officers completed the infantry officer course and 13 officers completed the first integrated Armor Basic Officer Leader Course.<sup>13</sup> This study demonstrates the progress with women in the services since the implementation of the combat exclusion rule to the Secretary of Defense opening all jobs to women in 2015.

In reviewing the Army's gender-integration analysis, prior to the mid-1990's, it incorporated gender-segregated training; however, in 1994 they made the decision to transition to gender-integrated training after the results from a study on gender-integrated training was completed and found to be beneficial and produce no significant differences when men and women were trained together. Gender-integration proved to be more fruitful with DOD's implementation of the 2015 decision to allow women to serve in all MOS. Since the decision to allow women to serve in all MOS's, the Army has seen significant increases in women serving in combat MOS's. Now that the analysis on how the Army transitioned from gender-separated training to gender-integrated training is complete, it is important to analyze the Marine Corps' decision to remain with gender-integrated training.

## **MARINE CORPS TRAINING GENDER-INTEGRATION ANALYSIS**

Studies on the effectiveness of gender training proved evident in the late 1990's when several studies conducted by Congress found this to be the case. The Marine Corps chooses to conduct gender-separated training to prevent disciplinary problems that are typically associated with gender-integrated training. The other services that provided gender-integrated training were

faced with disciplinary issues and the leadership spent more time trying to correct issues associated with mixed gender; while, the Marine Corps felt that it alleviated these types of issues through gender-segregated training because the focus and emphasis remained on training. In a study conducted by the DOD, The Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense (Kassebaum Report) in 1997, opposition of gender-segregated training felt that those who advocate for it are basing their decisions on politics. For example, having to address issues of gender-integrated training caused more problems for the training staff as they may spend more of their time focusing on distractions associated with male and female recruits as opposed to the primary mission of training recruits. The Marine Corps has long been an advocate for gender-segregated initial training for the primary reason of avoiding distraction and allowing the instructors to focus on the main mission of training.<sup>14</sup>

The Marine Corps is known for producing quality trained Marines by providing the input such as high performing leadership from its drill instructors to its unmatched training specifications. Recruits are assessed throughout training and must meet criteria to complete each phase and to earn the title of United States Marine. The Marine Corps, “the Crucible,” is the model test that recruits endure as their final examination before they become Marines.

Now that the other services have begun to implement gender-integrated training, the Marine Corps has remained firm on its gender-segregated training model. In an article by retired U.S. Navy Captain Lory Manning in 2001, she found that even though the Kassebaum report recommending gender-segregation as the preferred course of action for each service, the Marine Corps was the only service to continue on with the Kassebaum report recommendation.<sup>15</sup> Despite previous gender-integrated studies, the proponents of gender-integration, such as

Brigadier General Evelyn Foote (Ret.) who served as the commander of a mixed-gender basic training battalion in the late 1970's, did not believe recruits needed to be housed in separate barracks and she also believed that if a soldier raises their right hand to take their enlistment oath, regardless of rank, then they should be afforded the same training opportunities. Those in support of gender-segregation, such as Elaine Donnelly who served as a member on the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), felt that teams worked better when they slept in the same area and since women could not sleep in the same area as men, then this would impact their ability to perform as a team; hence, why the proponents preferred gender-segregation. Incorporating gender-segregated training based upon the need for males and females to not have the same sleeping quarters would only benefit the Marines at boot camp; however, would have insignificant impact on the Marines post-graduation as they would now be in gender-integrated units. In this sense, this would be the first-time males would train with females and vice versa. This new gender-integrated environment that the new Marines experience can have the potential for issues to the unit and the commander. <sup>16</sup>

In her 2016 study, Karmarck shared the following statistics regarding the Women in Service Review (WISR) implementation; this review was designed to ensure MOS standards were gender-normalized which would later come into play in 2015 with the authorization of women to assume all MOS's:

In 2012, as part of the WISR implementation, the U.S. Marine Corps temporarily opened its Infantry Training Battalion (ITB) and Infantry Officer Course (IOC) to female volunteers. At the end of the Marine Corps experiment, 29 female officers had attempted the course but none had graduated. The Marine Corps reported that 98% of the women dropped from the IOC were due to physical performance failures and one woman dropped due to injury. The pass rate for women in the enlisted Marine Corps Infantry Training Battalion (ITB), which is regarded as a less strenuous course than the IOC, had been 35.9% over the testing period compared with a 98% pass rate for males entering the course. As of the Secretary of Defense decision to open all combat roles to women, the

IOC and ITB are open to all men and women who meet the MOS classification standards.<sup>17</sup>

Because of the WISR, women could attend enlisted and officer infantry courses. Though the pass rates were few in comparison to their male counterparts, this implementation was a good starting point in that it allowed women a chance to be equal to their male counterparts. Though they had difficulty meeting the physical standards, this doesn't mean that they will never meet the standards. Evidence proves that women will train harder and become stronger if standards are raised. For example, LtCol Kate Germano, Former Fourth Recruit Battalion Commanding Officer, assessed that from the time recruits enter the Delayed Entry Program they were introduced to lower expectations. The differences in physical fitness performance measures on the initial strength test attributes to these low expectations. Seeing females held to a lower standard can negatively impact how male Marines perceive their female counterparts. These initial perceptions can follow them throughout their careers and it makes it extremely difficult for a male Marine to see a female Marine as an equal.<sup>18</sup> When women's ability to do pull-up's in the past was tested, very few would attempt them; however, now, they are training to it and it is uncommon to see a female Marine who cannot complete a single pull-up. Although the initial statistics regarding women's performance in ITB and IOC showed poor pass rates due to a lack of physical performance and injury, this does not negate that fact that the Marine Corps has to advance its physical fitness training and conditioning for women for them to be successful in these programs. For women to be successful at ITB and IOC, expectations are going to have to be raised. Studies have shown positive results for females who were forced to perform at a higher standard. Physical fitness standards in the Marine Corps must change and adapt to a gender-neutral standard to account for women's new role in the military.

Another study on integrating women into combat MOS's was a yearlong study conducted by the Marine Corps in 2014. This study is known as the Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force (GCEITF). The purpose of this study was to test women's physical abilities to serve in closed combat MOS's. After completing MOS school, approximately 100 female marine volunteers and 200 male marine volunteers formed a unit similar to the construct of a Battalion Landing Team where the focus was on the ground combat element. For four months in Camp Lejeune, NC, research teams observed and analyzed female physical performance compared to males using gender-neutral standards in these otherwise closed MOS's for females. The focus for the GCEITF was on tasks that ranged from the operation of weapons systems, load-bearing tasks, to live fire exercises. Once the four-month period in North Carolina concluded, the GCEITF then transitioned to its last phase at 29 Palms, CA for additional assessments in an environment that closely mimicked a field environment. The study showed that males performed better than all female units and male and female integrated units within the GCEITF. Though the study concluded in 2015, the results of the study are being used by the Marine Corps to further address the gender-integration issue; however, the Marine Corps remains steadfast in its gender-segregated training approach.<sup>19</sup>

The Marine Corps has long advocated for gender-segregated training. Studies, such as the Kassebaum report, attributes the Marine Corps success with gender-separated training is its ability to reduce disciplinary issues typically associated with gender-segregated training. In addition, cases made on the Marine Corps behalf identify one of the benefits of gender-segregated training is that the focus of the training staff is maintained at training recruits and not having to take the time on addressing issues that have nothing to do with training Marines. Despite those who advocate for gender-segregated training, some argue that the Marine Corps

fails to improve cohesiveness and physical fitness level of its recruits with its gender-segregated training. Despite DOD's 2015 decision to allow women to serve in all MOS, only a few women have been successful due to high physical fitness performance required for combat MOS's; however, studies have shown that through time and with increasing standards, women will succeed in serving in these MOS's. Now that the analysis on how the Army and Marine Corps implemented training at boot camp, the next section of this paper will focus on gender-integration advantages and arguments.

### **GENDER-INTEGRATION ADVANTAGES & COUNTERARGUMENTS**

The first benefit of gender-integration is improved unit cohesion. In article by Lory Manning in 2001, she found that integrated training allows for greater cohesion within the training platoon. She noted that recruits would challenge each other, which ultimately led to greater teamwork and cohesion. She also found that women were more cohesive in gender-integrated environments than gender-segregated environments.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps, cohesion in integrated training can be attributed to each gender wanting to make sure they do not look bad in front of each other and they prove that they have the same mental and physical abilities. This can help with cohesion because each gender learns to appreciate the effort and contribution of each member regardless of gender; thereby, increasing the cohesion of the platoon. In article written by retired Army Colonel Brian J. Reed in 1999, he discovered that in addition to improvements with performance, improvements with teamwork and cohesion were found in gender-integrated platoons. He assessed higher levels of cohesion in gender-integrated environments because each member of the team, regardless of gender, helped each other out in team building exercises, thereby increasing the cohesion of the platoon. Colonel Reed also recognized that despite no significant improvement, there were still levels of stability in the cohesion and level of teamwork

for males. Although the significance and improvements seem to mostly benefit the females, he still identified gender-integrated training environments as a gainful situation if the females are improving, while both sexes are gaining a greater level of cohesion, teamwork, and mutual understanding of each other.<sup>21</sup> In the GCEITF study, mentioned earlier in the document, analysts found that during the transition to the last phase of the experiment while at 29 Palms, CA, female marines demonstrated higher cohesion levels than males in a handful of the closed MOS's; however, these numbers slightly reduced toward the last two months of the exercise.

Researchers could not account for the change in cohesion results because too many factors such as training site movements came into play.<sup>22</sup> Currently in Marine Corps' boot camp, billeting is segregated in gender-segregated platoons. Even if the Marine Corps transitioned to gender-integration, then they it would not require gender integrated billeting to exist for cohesion to take place. According to LtCol Kate Germano, gender-integrated billeting is unnecessary and gender-integration and enhanced cohesion can be achieved without it. In past years at Parris Island there was some gender-integration as it related to companies on track with each other taking physical fitness test, hikes, and classroom instruction together. This is the type of integrated training that she finds to be the most advantageous because it allows both male and female recruits to gain mutual respect because they see that both groups are being challenged.<sup>23</sup>

The counter argument to gender-integration increasing cohesion is identified in studies such as the Kassebaum report. The Kassebaum report highlights that the Marine Corps gets it right with its gender-segregated training because it allows for greater cohesion and less disciplinary problems. For example, the Marine Corps is the only branch that still has training where females are separated from the males except when it comes to being on track with them. In other words, they start off on training day one and graduate on track with each other. They will be at the same

rifle range but not be integrated with the males. The platoons are separated by gender. This allows for visibility that both genders are engaged in the same type of training but reduces the amount of disciplinary problems that may result with gender-integrated training and living.<sup>24</sup> Although there are some valid points to the Marine Corps effectiveness in training its recruits, this type of training does not consider the advancements that women have made in the military. Since women could attend boot camp in the 1970's, they were in gender-segregated training; however, during this time, they were restricted to serve in combat MOS's. Now, in 2017, women can serve in all MOS's. These women will be leading men in combat in all MOS's; how can they lead men in combat if they fully don't have their support or respect? For support to be established, it must be established from the very beginning of the transformation process. Recruits must learn to work in a cohesive environment starting at the recruiting office with the delayed entry program to their transition to boot camp. Being at the same rifle range as the males does not meet the mark; it is not the same as if the females were integrated within the males. Both males and females are told to stay away from each other from the training staff to prevent disciplinary problems; this alone creates a barrier that will take years to overcome. Recruits need to train in gender-integrated environments to appreciate what the other goes through, to share the failures and successes while at boot camp; this is the only way that a level of mutual respect can be achieved and cohesiveness to be gained that can last an entire career.

The second benefit of gender-integration is improved physical fitness. As mentioned earlier in this document, gender-integration studies identified men not being challenged enough when in gender-integrated platoons; however, new studies found that this was not the case. In a 1992, a study conducted for the Navy and the Army, women's performances in gender-integrated environments improved while there were slight improvements for males.<sup>25</sup> This study is relevant

for identifying those challenges that women face when applying for combat roles, such as the SEALs or infantry. Since women have been allowed to assume these roles, the ones that have been unsuccessful are due to their inability to pass the stringent physical fitness standards. Like with anything, women have and will adapt to any challenge. They will push their levels of physical fitness training and eventually achieve succeed in these stringent physical fitness tests and make the dream of achieving these newly opened combat roles a reality. According to LtCol Germano, she believes that if we hold female Marines to lower standards then they will inevitably perform to that standard and that if we hold them to a higher standard, then they would rise to that standard. For example, she found that once she started to demand higher expectations from her recruits at the rifle range and once she started working with the rifle range coaching staff and her drill instructors to demand more of the female recruit's abilities, she saw a sharp rise in rifle range statistics.<sup>26</sup> The same holds true for physical fitness standards. As analyzed earlier in this document, if we hold recruits to higher physical fitness standards, then they will achieve it.

The counter argument to gender-integration increasing physical fitness is that physical gender differences are not considered. For example, Colonel Stremlow assessed each service difference in physical fitness standards that tend to be increased depending on the combat nature of the service. She highlights the tough standards of the Army and the Marine Corps, while also emphasizing the Navy's less stringent physical fitness standards.<sup>27</sup> It is undoubtedly true that the physical fitness standards of the Marine Corps and the Army are the highest out of the other services. This directly relates to both services direct roles on the ground, combat related missions, and the type of stamina required to fulfill MOS's such as the infantry and artillery. Though there are some valid points to differences in physical gender differences and its impact

on performance standards being met, this argument does not consider studies conducted that demonstrate women's success if they are held to a higher standard. Another example of physical fitness differences between male and female marines was demonstrated at the conclusion of the GCEITF study, the analysis shows that women are capable of performing physical tasks such as load bearing exercises and live fire for closed MOS requirements; however, they still could not perform on the same level as male marines.<sup>28</sup> The results of this study demonstrate the need for the Marine Corps to implement gender-neutral standards in advance of a marine's career. It needs to consider physical limitations between genders and to ensure each gender is getting the most out of physical training, the Marine Corps needs to create gender neutral standards in which both female and male Marines must adhere to. Lastly, the CGEITF also demonstrated that injuries obtained by female marines during the study were attributed to them not being physically ready.<sup>29</sup> This can be alleviated through the establishment of gender-neutral standards from the beginning of their experience in the Marine Corps. It is important to remember that up until volunteering for the GCEITF study, the female marines that participated in the study were held to different physical fitness standards than their male counterparts and then as volunteers of the study they were required to complete gender-neutral standards with little time to prepare themselves. Improving female marine physical fitness abilities will not come easy and must start prior to boot camp. The Marine Corps will need to recruit a higher quality candidate. If a recruit does not meet the gender-neutral standards, then they should go through a designated remedial physical fitness-training program prior to boot camp. This program can be as simple as improving the current delayed entry program and enhancing its physical fitness program to achieve gender neutral standards.

The third benefit of gender-integration is improved discipline and gained mutual respect. With gender-integration, there undoubtedly comes a separate set of problems such as sexual harassment. The Kassebaum report highlights some of these problems associated with gender-integration. It is the first time that young males and females are placed together in a tight knit environment. Though there is supervision by the drill instructors, there can never be 100% certainty that there will be infractions due to the mixing of the genders. Unfortunately, males and females will engage in inappropriate behavior and they will need to be appropriately disciplined, on the same token, what about the possibility of homosexual activity in platoons. There is a risk of infractions, sexual and non-sexual, that will occur with segregated training and those will need to be appropriately handled as well. Once again, there can never be 100% certainty that no infractions will exist either during gender-integrated or gender-segregated training. To reduce risks associated with gender-integrated training and for the leadership (drill instructors, company leadership) to focus their energy on training and not on disciplinary problems, they must be trained accordingly on how to handle minor to major infractions and still yet continue to keep the focus on training. For gender-integration to be successful, there also must be gender-integration within the drill instructor ranks. Males should have female drill instructors and vice versa. These drill instructors will have to set the appropriate tone of mutual respect and not focus on telling males and females that they can't interact. It is also highly beneficial that male recruits see female drill instructors perform and portray to them that they are as just as demanding, physically fit, and competent as the male drill instructors. This will undoubtedly be something that they take away with them throughout their careers and positively impact their views on women Marines. Both genders must interact to build cohesion and form a highly functioning team. Integrated training is essential for mutual respect to exist between each

gender during boot camp, post boot camp, and for the entire career duration of the service member. In addition to this being beneficial for male recruits, it would also be beneficial to male drill instructors because their mind set can change when they see female recruits performing up to standard and pushing themselves to high limits. This could consequently affect how male drill instructors engage with their male recruits on the direct and indirect message of how they perceive females. If they change their stance and message to a sign of mutual respect for female recruits and female Marines in general, then they ultimately push that message to their male recruits and help shape mindsets at initial training so it will never be an issue for them in the future.

The counter argument to improved discipline and gained mutual trust in gender-integrated training is that in gender-segregated training, both genders are engaged in the same type of training but this reduces the amount of disciplinary problems that may result with gender-integrated training and living.<sup>30</sup> In addition, studies such as the Kassebaum report, highlights that male recruits who sleep in the same barracks usually win awards due to the cohesion and level of teamwork involved with the structure.<sup>31</sup> These studies show advantages for increased cohesiveness. Although there are some valid points regarding discipline within a gender-integrated training environment, these are still inherent risks that can be faced in either a gender-integrated or gender-segregate training environment. Risks such as sexual harassment and other disciplinary issues can only be reduced with continued leadership and by setting a tone that these types of behaviors will not be tolerated and those who violate will be disciplined and potentially removed from service. Unfortunately, risk is not something that can be eliminated and it does not change depending on whether gender-integration and/or gender segregation exists.

## **GENDER-INTEGRATION ARGUMENTS & COUNTERARGUMENTS**

Analysis of arguments for and against gender integration clearly shows that the benefits outweigh the risks and that involved leadership can mitigate the risks. The first argument for gender-integrated training is that it will improve unit cohesion in the operating forces.

According to retired Colonel Mary V. StremLOW, she assessed that without truly gender-integrated units, cohesion suffers because training did not occur. How can the Marine Corps expect cohesion of its troops, when they do not train together from the start? She attributes this factor to lack of morale within the unit.<sup>32</sup> Another argument with the loss of cohesion in the squad bay is that cohesion cannot fully be gained because recruits are not sleeping in the same barracks and competing against each other in that environment. If cohesion can't fully be obtained with different barracks, then its impact will not be realized and cohesion in the platoon will be lost.

The counter argument to the impact on gender differences and its effect on cohesion is the lack of integrated billeting spaces. One could argue that the impact on cohesion exists with the current construct of the barracks with separate male and female billeting facilities. Not being in the same barracks does impact the cohesiveness between the sexes. The Kassebaum report noted that split-training units, where males and females train together but do not reside in the same barracks caused confusion and less cohesion.<sup>33</sup> Although there are some valid points with this argument, LtCol Germano argues that cohesion can be achieved without co-ed billeting. As evidence, she cites the past few years at Parris Island where some male and female companies were on track with each other taking Physical fitness test, hikes and classroom instruction together. This is the type of integrated training that LtCol Germano finds to be the most

advantageous because it allows both male and female recruits to gain mutual respect because they see that both groups are being challenged.<sup>34</sup>

The second argument of gender-integrated training is accounting for the differences in physical fitness standards for each gender by lowering the standards for females. The Marine Corps is known to have lower fitness standards for women. If training were to be integrated in the Marine Corps, then a program of instruction must be developed to account for the different physical fitness standards that exist between men and women. In a 2013 study on gender-separation for the Marine Corps led by Major Jose E. Almazan, he assessed that with gender-integrated training environments, services must take into account the physical differences between females and males while still finding the balance of pushing them to their limits.<sup>35</sup> For example, this kind of assessment could mean when conducting physical fitness training in gender-integrated platoons, drill instructors will be forced to facilitate two separate physical fitness programs of instruction to ensure males are not being held back for reaching physical fitness peaks because they are being hindered by female lower standards. Unfortunately, there are not enough days in the training cycle, amount of drill instructors, and money for two separate standards to exist in gender-integrated platoons.

The counterargument for gender-integrated training in accounting for differences in physical fitness standards for each gender is represented in the Kassebaum report. This study identified that differences in physical fitness standards within gender-integrated platoons can create a loss of cohesion. If either gender feels that one is receiving special treatment from the other, then they are more apt to feeling resentment, which in turn affects unit cohesion.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, in gender-integrated platoons each gender can be pushed to their limits without having to hold back and/or achieve unrealistic standards all the while maintaining unit cohesion because standards

are the same. Although there are some valid points with this argument, if the Marine Corps implements gender neutral standards, then it will ensure recruits will be physically ready for boot camp, making physical capabilities a non-issue. Recruits who can perform to the standard will assist with cohesion within the platoon because for each gender to succeed, they must meet the same standards. This is an important goal because now that each gender can assume any combat MOS, they are still required to meet gender-neutral standards so why wait to that point. It is important for them to develop their physical fitness abilities in advance of the start of boot camp. Why have reduced physical fitness standards at boot camp for women, when they will eventually have to meet gender neutral standards in applying for combat MOS's? Studies have shown that if we set elevated expectations for each gender, then they will achieve it. If we set the performance standards low, then they will only do what is expected.

The third argument against gender integration is the misguided belief that it will result in inherent risks such as sexual harassment. As the Kassebaum report highlights, sexual harassment scandals have occurred in gender integrated environments. Some critics believe the main and most damaging issue is the potential for sexual harassment when integrating the genders. The main purpose of boot camp is to train the service member; how can effective training be accomplished if the leadership of the platoon must now focus their efforts on correcting behavior within the platoon? These types of behaviors can have profound consequences.<sup>37</sup> It is evident that there are just too many risks with gender-integrated training on its impact on the discipline of the unit. As identified in the Kassebaum report, sexual harassment is one of the main reasons why the study recommended training to be separated. An example of discipline eroding in a gender-integrated unit is the Army's sexual harassment scandal in the 1990's. Sexual harassment issues at its advanced training site, like the Marine

Combat Training focus, took place at Aberdeen, Maryland. These issues caused the nation, congress, and the DOD to be alert to what was going on with training in the military. Despite the training site as being advanced, it was still gender-integrated training. These issues raised significant concerns as to whether integrated training faced too many problems to overcome.<sup>38</sup> An example of a service that demonstrates disciplinary rates while conducting gender-segregated training is the Marine Corps. The Kassebaum report identifies the Marine Corps, the only service still conducting gender-segregated boot camp, as more disciplined because this type of training fosters an environment that drill instructors can focus on training and not on having to deal with disciplinary problems associated with gender-integrated platoons.<sup>39</sup> Proponents of gender-segregated training argue that discipline seems to be more effective in gender-segregated training as demonstrated by the Marine Corps. They feel that the focus of boot camp should be on training and not on dealing with issues such as sexual harassment.

The counterargument to the associated risks with gender-integration is valid; however, gender-segregation can cause more disciplinary problems if over looked. For example, in gender-segregated training, discipline can be diminished if drill instructors tell recruits not to talk each other and stay away from each other. This is mostly the norm in gender-segregated training where drill instructors want to avoid disciplinary issues amongst recruits of different genders, so they instill fear instead of discipline. If drill instructors create this atmosphere, then how can mutual trust be gained throughout new Marines' careers? The recruits will perceive each as the enemy and try to avoid each other because they don't want to get in trouble. They will also avoid each other because they don't want others to get the perception that they are doing something wrong. Although the majority will always try to do the right thing, there will be perpetrators who take advantage of the situation and commit sexual harassment; thereby,

removing the focus on training to dealing with the problems within the unit. The bottom-line is that risk is inherent in both gender-integrated and gender-segregated training. Risk cannot be eliminated; however, leadership can be trained to help reduce disciplinary issues. Another way to mitigate the risk of disciplinary issues in gender-integrated training is through the integration of male and female leadership; this will establish a mutual respect amongst recruits because there will consequently be a blind obedience to their leadership regardless of gender. This obedience will translate through their careers as they will have those model leaders and subordinates of the opposite sex who have demonstrated professionalism and leadership that can't go unrecognized.

## **GENDER-INTEGRATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

For the Marine Corps to move past its history and provide gender-integrated training at the basic training level to increase cohesion, physical fitness, and discipline levels amongst genders to help ease women's transition into combat roles it needs to take the following steps:

1. Leadership Integration: Integrate male and female leadership within gender-integrated training platoons. This will establish a mutual respect amongst recruits because it will encourage a blind obedience to leadership regardless of gender. This obedience will translate through their careers because they now have a solid example of model leaders and subordinates of the opposite sex.
2. Accept Risk through Effective Leadership: Although there will be risks associated with gender-integration such as sexual harassment and other disciplinary issues, these can only be reduced with continued leadership and by setting a tone that these types of behaviors will not be tolerated and those who violate will be disciplined and

potentially removed from service. Unfortunately, risk is not something that can be eliminated and it does not change depending on whether gender-integration and/or gender segregation exists.

3. Gender-Integration but Separate Billeting: Gender-integration should exist for all requirements except for billeting. Billeting should be kept separate as to account for the existing infrastructure and fiscal austerity that the DOD faces today. All training events should be integrated from that point recruits leave their squad bays for the day. Perhaps a solution to the billeting issue is a phased approach that would integrate billeting structures but separate barracks spaces can be implemented in the future; however, for right now, the Marine Corps needs to start with making small change to what it can affect now to start effectively gender integrating Marine Corps boot camp.
  
4. Physical Training Normalization Standards: To consider physical limitations between genders and to ensure each gender is getting the most out of physical training, the Marine Corps needs to create gender normalized standards that both female and male Marines must adhere to. This will not come easy and must start prior to boot camp. The Marine Corps will need to do a better job recruiting solid recruits. If a recruit does not meet the adhered gender normalized standards, then they should go through a designated remedial physical fitness-training program prior to boot camp. This program can be as simple as improving the current delayed entry program and enhancing its physical fitness program to achieve gender normalized standards.

The Marine Corps should establish guidelines stating what minimum gender normalized requirements must be met before a recruit ships to boot camp. It is not realistic to assume that every recruit will meet the perfect standard that is set; however, they must meet a percentage of the standard that is weighted based on studies from previous physical fitness tests for recruits who achieve success with physical training at boot camp. For example, if the gender normalized minimum standard for pull-ups by either gender is 20, then the recruit must be able to perform 60-70% of that requirement while at the delayed entry program prior to being shipped off to boot camp. Those recruits who fail to meet the standard cannot be shipped off to boot camp and must undergo additional physical fitness improvement program hosted by the recruit station and meet the minimum requirement/percentage before being shipped to boot camp.

The implementation of gender-normalized standards will ensure recruits will be physically ready for boot camp, making physical capabilities a non-issue. Recruits who can perform to the standard will assist with cohesion within the platoon because for each gender to succeed, they must meet the same standards. This is an important goal because now that each gender can assume any combat MOS, they are still required to meet gender-normalized standards so why wait to that point. It is important for them to develop their physical fitness abilities in advance of the start of boot camp. Why have reduced physical fitness standards at boot camp for women, when they will eventually have to meet gender normalized standards in applying for combat MOS's? Studies have shown that if we set elevated expectations for each

gender, then they will achieve it. If we set the performance standards low, then they will only do what is expected.

## **GENDER-INTEGRATION LONG-TERM RESULTS**

Incorporating gender-integrated training at boot camp will slowly change the process of equality between sexes in the Marine Corps. If boot camp is gender-integrated from the start, then the new recruits will never know what being “different” truly means. They must achieve the same standards; obey orders regardless of the gender directing the orders, thus making their transition to the operating forces easier because they don’t have negative ideas about the performance standards of the opposite sex. With gender-integrated training, all they have known throughout their training is equality, where if gender-integration is only possible after boot camp and at the start of Marine Combat Training, then this still creates inequality in their minds because of their boot camp experience. Gender-integration will make female recruits/Marines who meet gender established norms respected at all ranks and to never feel “less” of a Marine than their male counterparts.

Although Marine Corps boot camp remains gender-segregated, it has to make these changes to allow for continued progress of women in its forces. According to LtCol Germano, gender-integration organizational culture improves by creating the mutual respect that is inherent with cohesion.<sup>40</sup> The ability for recruits to have role models in each gender would also improve organization culture because it is these recruits who will be the future of the Marine Corps during a time when women will play their most important roles since WWI.

## CONCLUSION

Women have served in the United States Military since World War I. Their roles have varied from administrative and support MOS's to combat MOS's. Women's role in the military has significantly evolved and now authorizes women to serve in all MOS's. With women now able to serve in all capacities, services such as the Army and the United States Marine Corps have made years of progress in the way they integrate women in their respective services. Though this has not been an easy road for both services and its women, these services have recently evolved and made changes to how they integrate women into their training. Today, the Army has implemented gender-integration at the boot camp level, where the Marine Corps has remained steady in keeping its boot camp gender-segregated. Studies have proved the advantages and arguments associated with gender-integrated training; however, the advantages of gender-integration prove to outweigh any argument.

Gender-segregated training allows the focus to be on training and reduced disciplinary problems; however, detracts from the cohesion that males and females can experience in gender-integrated training environments. This lack of cohesion can negatively shape the Marines view of each other throughout their careers. In addition, gender-segregated training physical fitness standards for females are significantly lower than they are for their male counterparts. Though there are physical differences between genders, studies have shown that if you hold each gender to a higher standard, then they will push themselves to achieve that standard. This will undoubtedly increase the Marine Corps role as a great fighting force as well

as increase the mutual respect gained between the sexes because there is a commonality to the standard that each gender achieved. Lastly, in training environments males are often taught to look at females as the weaker gender because they do not meet the same standards, this undoubtedly causes males to feel dominant over female Marines and have a reduced level of respect for them. This lack of discipline and respect can account for issues such as sexual harassment.

Gender-integrated training allows for increased cohesion amongst genders because male and female Marines gain an appreciation for the effort they contribute to the success of their platoon. The male recruits can see that the female recruits are being held to higher standard and being held accountable and vice versa. Gender-integrated training also allows recruits to be pushed beyond their limits. Studies found increase physical performance for female recruits in gender-integrated platoons. Of course, more can be accomplished in terms of setting gender-normalized standards. Lastly, gender-integrated training allows for increased discipline and establishes mutual respect because at this level leadership will also be integrated and allow for recruits of each gender to have a model of a strong male and female marine. In addition, it will allow recruits to have a respect for each other because of the commonality in training that they encounter.

The advantages of gender-integrated training far outweigh the arguments for it. If the Marine Corps can shape its boot camp to be gender-integrated, it will help shape the organizational culture of the corps. A level of cohesion, physical fitness, and discipline will be achieved and followed from boot camp to rest of the Marine's careers. This will undoubtedly change the way women are perceived in the Marine Corps and assist in their journeys for equality as they take on all roles, especially combat MOS's.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Anne W. Chapman, *Mixed-Gender Basic Training: The U.S. Army Experience, 1973-2004*. (Fort Monroe, Va.: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, 2008), Chapter 1, <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0825/2008034776.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Jeanne Holm, *Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution*, (Rev. ed. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1992), 44-55.

<sup>3</sup> Holm, 190-191.

<sup>4</sup> Chapman, 83-86, 156-161.

<sup>5</sup> Beth Wolny, “*Female Marines Awarded the Combat Action Ribbon (CAR)*,” (Headquarters Headquarters Marine Corps, MCFI, 2015), 1.

<sup>6</sup> Chapman, 64.

<sup>7</sup> Margaret C. Harrell and Laura L. Miller, United States, and National Defense Research Institute (U.S.). *New Opportunities for Military Women: Effects Upon Readiness, Cohesion, and Morale*. (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1997), 20.  
<http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy1109/97032067-t.html>.

<sup>8</sup> Harrell and Miller, 27.

<sup>9</sup> Chapman, 11-17.

<sup>10</sup> Harrell and Miller, 86.

<sup>11</sup> Chapman, 72.

<sup>12</sup> Harrell and Miller, 18.

<sup>13</sup> K. N. Kamarck, *Women in combat: Issues for Congress*, CRS Report for Congress R42075 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, December 13, 2016), 16, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42075.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> United States DOD, (*Kassebaum Report*) *Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Defense, 1997), Basic Training Organization Chapter, <http://www.dod.mil/pubs/git/report.html>.

<sup>15</sup> Lory Manning and Roscoe Bartlett, “Q: Has the Military's Gender-Integrated Basic Training Been Successful?,” *Insight on the News* 17 (31) (2001): 40-43, <http://search.proquest.com/lomc.idm.oclc.org/docview/205917235?OpenUrlRefId=info:xri/sid:wcdiscovery&accountid=14746>.

---

<sup>16</sup> Chapman, 120-132.

<sup>17</sup> Kamarck, 16.

<sup>18</sup> C.J. Chivers, "Lt.Col Kate Germano on the Marines and Women," *The New York Times.com*, July 28, 2015, [https://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/07/28/lt-col-kate-germano-on-the-marines-and-women/?\\_r=0](https://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/07/28/lt-col-kate-germano-on-the-marines-and-women/?_r=0).

<sup>19</sup> *Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force Experimental Assessment Report*, ES-1 – 2.

<sup>20</sup> Manning and Bartlett, 40-43.

<sup>21</sup> Brian J. Reed, "Gender-integrated Basic Training: A Theoretical Analysis of the Continuing Debate." *Minerva* 17 (2) (1999): 18, <http://search.proquest.com.lomc.idm.oclc.org/docview/222836201?OpenUrlRefId=info:xri/sid:wcdiscovery&accountid=14746>.

<sup>22</sup> *Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force Experimental Assessment Report*, 72.

<sup>23</sup> Kate Germano, "Integration of Marine Corps Recruit Training: One Shot to Get it Right," *Military Times.com*, January 20, 2016, <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2016/01/20/us-military-afghanistan-gets-green-light-targeting-islamic-state-offshoot/79067120/>.

<sup>24</sup> Kassebaum Report, Basic Training Organization Chapter.

<sup>25</sup> Reed, 18.

<sup>26</sup> Kate Germano, "Integration of Marine Corps Recruit Training: One Shot to Get it Right," *Military Times.com*, January 20, 2016, <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2016/01/20/us-military-afghanistan-gets-green-light-targeting-islamic-state-offshoot/79067120/>.

<sup>27</sup> Mary V. StremLOW, *Coping with Sexism in the Military*. (Military opportunity series; Military opportunity series. New York: RoPub. Group, 1990), 64-66.

<sup>28</sup> *Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force Experimental Assessment Report*, ES-1.

<sup>29</sup> *Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force Experimental Assessment Report*, ES1.

<sup>30</sup> Kassebaum Report, Basic Training Organization Chapter.

<sup>31</sup> Kassebaum Report, Basic Training Organization Chapter.

<sup>32</sup> StremLOW, 41.

---

<sup>33</sup> Kassebaum Report, Basic Training Organization Chapter.

<sup>34</sup> Kate Germano, “Integration of Marine Corps Recruit Training: One Shot to Get it Right,” *Military Times.com*, January 20, 2016, <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2016/01/20/us-military-afghanistan-gets-green-light-targeting-islamic-state-offshoot/79067120/>.

<sup>35</sup> Major Jose E. Almazan, “*Gender Separation*,” *Strategic Initiatives Group Study v.3*, staff study, August 15, 2013.

<sup>36</sup> Kassebaum Report, Basic Training Requirements Chapter.

<sup>37</sup> Kassebaum Report, Teaching Professional Relationships Chapter.

<sup>38</sup> Manning and Bartlett, 40-43.

<sup>39</sup> Kassebaum Report, Teaching Professional Relationships Chapter..

<sup>40</sup> Kate Germano, “Integration of Marine Corps Recruit Training: One Shot to Get it Right,” *Military Times.com*, January 20, 2016, <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2016/01/20/us-military-afghanistan-gets-green-light-targeting-islamic-state-offshoot/79067120/>.

---

## Bibliography

- Almazan, Jose E. "Gender Separation." Strategic Initiatives Group Study v.3. Staff Study, August 15, 2013.
- Chapman, Anne W., and United States. *Mixed-Gender Basic Training: The U.S. Army Experience, 1973-2004*. Fort Monroe, Va.: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, 2008. <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0825/2008034776.html>.
- C.J. Chivers. "Lt.Col Kate Germano on the Marines and Women." *The New York Times.com*, July 28, 2015. [https://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/07/28/lt-col-kate-germano-on-the-marines-and-women/?\\_r=0](https://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/07/28/lt-col-kate-germano-on-the-marines-and-women/?_r=0).
- Germano, Kate. "Integration of Marine Corps Recruit Training: One Shot to Get it Right." *Military Times.com*, January 20, 2016. <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2016/01/20/us-military-afghanistan-gets-green-light-targeting-islamic-state-offshoot/79067120/>.
- Harrell, Margaret C. *The Status of Gender-integration in the Military: Analysis of Selected Occupations*. Santa Monica, CA, 2002. Rand<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1380/>.
- Holm, Jeanne. *Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution*. Rev. ed. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1992.
- Kamarck, K. N. *Women in combat: Issues for Congress*. CRS Report for Congress R42075, Washington, DC: Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, December 13, 2016. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42075.pdf>.
- Manning, Lory and Roscoe Bartlett. 2001. "Q: Has the Military's Gender-Integrated Basic Training Been Successful?" *Insight on the News* 17 (2001). <http://search.proquest.com.lomc.idm.oclc.org/docview/205917235?OpenUrlRefId=info:xri/sid:wcdiscovery&accountid=14746>.
- Marine Corps Operational Tests and Evaluation Activity. *Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force Experimental Assessment Report*, 2015. <https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/wisr-studies/USMC%20-%20Line%20Of%20Effort%203%20GCEITF%20Experimental%20Assessment%20Report2.pdf>
- Reed, Brian J. 1999. "Gender-integrated Basic Training: A Theoretical Analysis of the Continuing Debate." *Minerva* 17 (2) (1999). <http://search.proquest.com.lomc.idm.oclc.org/docview/222836201?OpenUrlRefId=info:xri/sid:wcdiscovery&accountid=14746>.

---

Rogan, Helen. *Mixed Company: Women in the Modern Army*. Beacon paperback, 642; Beacon paperbacks, 642. Boston: Beacoess, 1982.

Simon, Rita J. *Women in the Military*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transactioblishers. 2001.

Spencer, Dorothy E. *Toward the Army of the 1980s : A Study of Male Attitudes Toward Women As Combatants, 1978*.

Stremlow, Mary V. *Coping with Sexism in the Military*. Military opportunity series; Military opportunity series. New York: RoPub. Group, 1990.

United States DOD. (*Kassebaum Report*) *Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Dept. of Defense. <http://www.dod.mil/pubs/git/report.html>.

Wolny, Beth. "*Female Marines Awarded the Combat Action Ribbon (CAR)*." Headquarters Headquarters Marine Corps MCFI, 2015.