

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

GENDER INTEGRATION OF MALE DOMINATED ENVIRONMENTS:
THE EXPERIENCE OF SA NAVY SAILORS

Charles van Wijk

MA (Clin Psych)

Thesis presented for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in the Department of Psychology
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

November 2005

17 150 VANDU
791857

University of Cape Town

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Purpose of the Study.....	2
1.3. Overview of the Thesis.....	3
1.4. Terminology	4
Chapter 2: Women in the Formal Workplace.....	7
2.1. Introduction	7
2.2. Women at work	8
2.2.1. Historical background	
2.2.2. Current position of women in the workplace	
2.3. Reasons for gender inequality	14
2.3.1. Early theories of gender and feminist responses	
2.3.2. Patriarchy	
2.3.3. Masculinities	
2.4. Men's response to gender integration of the workplace.....	22
2.4.1. Domestic manifestations	
2.4.2. Organisational manifestations	
2.4.3. Interpersonal manifestations	
2.4.4. Intrapersonal manifestations	
2.4.5. Adaptation and support	
2.5. Women's experience of the workplace	43
2.5.1. The price of employment in traditionally male occupations	
2.5.2. Dealing with conditions of acceptance	
2.5.3. Personal-work-family conflicts	
2.6. Conclusion.....	47

Chapter 3: Context of the study: Gender Integration of the South African Navy	
Fleet.....	50
3.1. Introduction	50
3.2. Women in the military.....	51
3.2.1. Modern developments	
3.2.2. The debate against women in the armed forces	
3.2.3. Motivation of women joining the military	
3.2.4. Current international situation	
3.3. South African military and the political situation	68
3.3.1. The changing political dispensation and the creation of a new force	
3.3.2. Public opinion	
3.3.3. Current situation	
3.4. The South African Navy.....	73
3.4.1. Brief description of the SA Navy	
3.4.2. Women in the SA Navy	
3.5. Conclusion.....	80
Chapter 4: Methodology of the Empirical Study	82
4.1. Introduction	82
4.2. The research setting.....	82
4.2.1. Access to the research environment	
4.2.2. The researcher	
4.2.3. Relations of power in the data gathering process	
4.3. Introduction to Phase 1: Pre-integration atmosphere	87
4.3.1. The aim of Phase 1	
4.3.2. Research instruments	
4.3.3. Data analysis	
4.4. Introduction to Phase 2: Experiences of women's presence on ships	99
4.4.1. The aim of the Phase 2	
4.4.2. Research instruments	
4.4.3. Data analysis	
4.5. Conclusion.....	106

Chapter 5: Pre-integrative Atmosphere: Results and Discussion107

5.1. Introduction107

5.2. Administration of instruments, and participants103

 5.2.1. Administration of instruments

 5.2.2. Participants

5.3. Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale109

 5.3.1. Factor analysis

 5.3.2. General

 5.3.3. Comparison between gender

 5.3.4. Comparison of work environments

 5.3.5. Comparison of rank groups

 5.3.6. Comparison of race groups

 5.3.7. Effect of age

 5.3.8. Summary of SATWS findings

5.4. Gender Integration Survey.....118

 5.4.1. Factor analysis

 5.4.2. General

 5.4.3. Comparison between ships

 5.4.4. Comparison of rank groups

 5.4.5. Comparison of race groups

 5.4.6. Effect of age

 5.4.7. Summary of GIS findings

5.5. Sexual Harassment Questionnaire124

 5.5.1. Factor analysis

 5.5.2. Prevalence of sexual harassment

 5.5.3. Co-worker versus supervisor harassment

 5.5.4. Comparison of work environments

 5.5.5. Comparison of rank groups

 5.5.6. Comparison of race groups

 5.5.7. Effect of age

 5.5.8. Reporting sexual harassment

 5.5.9. Summary of SHQ findings

5.6.	General discussion of findings	138
5.6.1.	Naval masculinity	
5.6.2.	Status within the organisation	
5.6.3.	Exposure to gender integration in the work environment	
5.7.	Conclusion.....	141
Chapter 6: Women on Ships: Thematic Analysis		142
6.1.	Introduction	142
6.2.	Participants and data gathering.....	142
6.2.1.	Interviews	
6.2.2.	Focus groups	
6.2.3.	Personal event diaries	
6.3.	Overview of results.....	146
6.3.1.	Effect of participants' different situations on their experiences	
6.3.2.	Generally positive accounts	
6.3.3.	Reflection on interviews and focus groups	
6.4.	Threat to men.....	155
6.4.1.	Threat to identity	
6.4.2.	Threat to lifestyle	
6.4.3.	Threat to morale	
6.5.	Silent issues	159
6.5.1.	Leadership	
6.5.2.	Race	
6.5.3.	National environment	
6.5.4.	Lack of activism	
6.5.5.	Lack of (expressed) warrior ideology	
6.6.	Conclusion	162
Chapter 7: Cultural Symbols as Expressions of Resistance and Adaptation.....		164
7.1.	Introduction	164
7.2.	Rituals	165
7.2.1.	Rituals of initiation	
7.2.2.	Rituals and identity	

7.2.3.	Customs embedded in corporate policies	
7.2.4.	Working together as ritualised expression of integration	
7.3.	Metaphors.....	169
7.3.1.	The Navy is a man's world	
7.3.2.	Forms of address	
7.3.3.	Family	
7.4.	Artefacts	174
7.4.1.	Women's uniforms are impractical	
7.4.2.	Women's uniforms maintain segregation and lesser status	
7.4.3.	Separate uniforms are an expression of organisational resistance	
7.5.	Corporate space	180
7.5.1.	Space as restriction	
7.5.2.	Space as maintaining gender segregation	
7.5.3.	Desegregation of space as a manifestation of resistance	
7.5.4.	Space as common sense	
7.5.5.	The use of 'common space' as an indication of integration	
7.6.	Conclusion.....	187
 Chapter 8: Traditional Manifestations of Resistance.....		189
8.1.	Introduction	189
8.2.	Sexual harassment	189
8.2.1.	Current experiences of sexual harassment on the ships	
8.2.2.	Responses of women	
8.2.3.	Flexible boundaries	
8.2.4.	Differences between shore based and ship based experiences	
8.3.	Special treatment	203
8.3.1.	Distribution of tasks and duties	
8.3.2.	Distribution of discipline	
8.3.3.	Distribution of resources and opportunities	
8.3.4.	The dynamics of special treatment	
8.3.5.	Relative burden	
8.3.6.	Extent of actual special treatment	

8.4.	Conditions of acceptance.....	209
8.5.	Conclusion.....	211
Chapter 9: Mechanisms of Adaptation		213
9.1.	Introduction	213
9.2.	Time and exposure to gender integrated environment	214
9.3.	Creating credibility.....	218
9.4.	Dealing with the double bind: identity construction	221
	9.4.1. Double bind	
	9.4.2. Identity re-negotiation through symbolic representation	
	9.4.3. Paternalistic bargain	
9.5.	Other coping strategies used by women.....	236
	9.6.1. Internal coping strategies	
	9.6.2. External coping strategies	
9.6.	Deflection	240
	9.6.1. Career opportunities	
	9.6.2. Media exposure	
	9.6.3. Direct discrimination	
9.7.	Relationships	243
9.8.	Other factors facilitating adaptation	243
	9.8.1. Normalising the composition of the ship's crew	
	9.8.2. Positive experience	
9.9.	Conclusion.....	245
Chapter 10: Overview and Reflection.....		246
10.1.	Overview and summary of results.....	247
10.2.	Methodological issues	251
	10.2.1. Reflection on methods	
	10.2.2. Limitations of study	
	10.2.3. Future directions	
10.3.	Implications of the study	257
10.4.	Lessens and recommendations for the SA Navy	257

Appendix A: Instruments

Appendix B: Personal Event Diary

Appendix C: Information on Participants in Phase 2

Appendix D: Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale: Factor Structure per Gender

Appendix E: Descriptive Statistics for Student and Retired Respondents' Samples

University of Cape Town

University of Cape Town

ABSTRACT

During the 1990s, the South African Navy integrated women into their ship. The present study investigated the psycho-social experiences of both women and men, in response to the integration of this traditionally male-dominated environment. This was done in two phases: First, the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet was investigated, by focussing on two specific objectives: examining the general attitudes of the fleet towards women's place in the world, and examining the manifestation of resistance by using sexual harassment as a marker. Attitudes towards women were measured by means of the Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale (N=476) and Gender Integration Survey (N=175). Sexual harassment was measured by using a Sexual Harassment Questionnaire (N=306). In the second phase, the personal experiences and actual responses of women and men, emanating from their own involvement in gender integration, were investigated. Accounts of experiences were generated through 20 interviews, 4 focus groups, and personal event diaries of sailors serving on or next to gender-integrated ships (± 12 months after gender integration commenced).

The results of Phase 1 describe an environment with traditional gender-ideological views (i.e. sexist) and widespread sexual harassment. Work-environments with previous gender exposure was associated with more progressive gender ideologies. There were no significant differences between rank, race or age groups. The data gathered during Phase 2 was subjected to thematic analysis. The first broad area of focus that emerged described both resistance and acceptance, from which two themes were derived, namely the use of symbols of corporate culture to express both resistance and acceptance within the organisation, and the use of traditional manifestations of resistance (e.g. sexual harassment). Participants generally gave accounts of positive experiences, and thus participants' responses to the expression of resistance and acceptance emerged as the second broad area of focus, describing the dynamics of adaptation. This produced the third theme, namely the mechanisms of adaptation. These included exposure to gender integrated environments within the Navy, as well as women's ways of resolving conflicting gender-role expectations.

In conclusion, this thesis provides insights into the interplay of resistance, acceptance, and adaptation experienced during the process of gender integration on South African Navy ships.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The following anecdote was told by a South African Naval captain, and referred to an occasion where a group of female sailors were taken onboard his ship during a training exercise. This happened at a time when women in the South African Navy (SAN) were not yet being deployed to sea in operational capacities.

“A group of seamen were responsible for cleaning the galley¹ after meals. No one ever thought this strange, as the ship’s company was always male, and all of the seamen had to do their share of unpleasant tasks - some of them have to chip and paint on the deck, others clean the galley, and so on. When the swans² came onboard, they too had to participate, and some had to join in on the deck with chipping and painting, while others did duties as quartermasters, and so on. It was then that the seamen in the galley started to complain - I first thought it was a joke but then realised they really believed it - that they are doing “women’s work”, while the women on deck are doing “men’s work”. They clearly believed this ‘role-reversal’, as I think they saw it, to be unacceptable, and felt their manhood was being threatened by this situation.”

This anecdote was one of many that circulated among senior naval officers in the middle 1990’s, and it reflected the concern of naval officers for the operational readiness of their forces, should women become part of deployed ships’ companies. Many questions were being asked about “what is going to happen?” This study is an attempt to provide an account of the experiences of those women and men who formed part of the first wave of gender integration onboard SAN ships.

1.1. Background

Over the past few decades, major gains have been made in creating equal opportunities for women in formal employment. In spite of these gains, women still face much resistance from men to their full and equal participation. It is here that the armed forces must rate as one of the strongest bastions of male dominance, creating huge challenges for women who choose this world to forge a career.

¹ Kitchen

² Female sailors

The second half of the twentieth century saw fundamental changes in the way women participated in the military – in contributing to work and in decision-making. These changes were reflected in many industrialised nations and followed global advances in human rights, as well as developments in the labour market. Locally, the second half of the twentieth century saw bitter conflict within South Africa (SA) during the Apartheid era. Political changes in the 1990s brought social changes and greater opportunity for participation by all South Africans in the labour market in general and national security in particular. From 1996, constitutional imperatives opened up previously male dominated environments to female participation, leading to significant changes within the military. One result was the development around sending women to sea on Navy ships.

From 1998 onwards, women have actively participated in SAN deployments. What some might view as a grand social experiment became of interest to stakeholders in a variety of sectors. Although only a small number of women were involved, the sensitivity of the issue generated a high level of interest. Some opinions concerned the effect of gender integration on national security. Others stressed the important influence of gender integration on nation building, by allowing all citizens to participate in creating a Navy that is representative of the country. The potentially positive effects on the fledgling democracy were tempered by the negative experiences of other navies that preceded the SAN in gender integration. Their experiences elicited fears about the well-being of the sailors involved, and the chances of successful integration of gender on ships. The present research evolved from the author's personal involvement in the adjustment of SAN sailors, of both gender, to the new and challenging situation of gender-integrated ships.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

Existing statistics do not give an adequate indication of either the gains or the obstacles on the road to full equality for women in the workplace. This study was motivated by the need to understand the experiences of individuals – both women and men – when women enter traditionally male-dominated environments.

The aim of this thesis, then, is to investigate the psycho-social experience of gender integration on SAN ships. The study unfolded in two phases, each with its distinctive

purpose. Initially, there had been concerns that highly traditional attitudes in the pre-integration environment would be an important obstacle to gender integration. The aim of the first phase was therefore to investigate the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet. It had two specific objectives: Firstly, to investigate the general attitudes in the fleet towards women's place in the world; secondly, to investigate the manifestation of resistance, as evidenced by the occurrence of sexual harassment in the fleet. It is argued that the current prevalence of sexual harassment would give an indication of the levels of active resistance that could be expected when women joined the ships. A quantitative approach was selected to achieve the objectives of the first phase.

The second phase was designed to investigate both women and men's experiences of gender integration. The specific objective was to investigate their personal experiences and responses emanating from their own involvement in the gender integration of SAN ships. This was done through qualitative methods, namely verbal and written reports of personal accounts.

1.3. Overview of the Thesis

Chapter 2 reviews the position of women at work. It reflects on structural power relationships that exist in society, with its resultant male dominance. Women's emergence in the formal work environment challenges men's position, and thus this chapter reviews men's resistance to women's equal participation in the work environment. Women's experiences of this resistance will also be discussed.

Chapter 3 describes the context within which the study took place. The international debate on women in the military and the current international situation are reviewed. Local political and associated military developments are then examined. The South African Navy is introduced, whereafter the chapter traces the history of gender integration in the SAN.

To achieve its central aim, this study incorporated both qualitative and quantitative aspects of research, and thus the relevant methodologies used will be described in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 presents the results and discussion of the first phase of the study (pre-integration atmosphere), while Chapter 6 introduces the results of the second phase (experiences of gender integration).

The themes of resistance and adaptation are discussed in the three chapters that follow. Chapter 7 reports on the way in which symbols of the organisational culture were used to express both resistance and acceptance, whereafter Chapter 8 presents the traditional manifestations of resistance. Chapter 9 examines the psycho-social mechanisms of adaptation that were active in the gender integration process in the SAN environment. And lastly, an overview and reflection on the study will conclude the thesis.

1.4. Terminology

Contemporary South African society is continuously confronted with a wide range of diversity issues, creating a society with a heightened sensitivity to differences and the terminology to describe it. A short note on terminology is therefore appropriate. Naval terms furthermore have their own meanings within the maritime context, and thus, where appropriate, footnotes will be provided to explain their meaning.

“Sex and gender”: The use of the terms sex and gender to differentiate between women and men on biological grounds or social characteristics is problematic, as these terms can create more confusion than clarity. Such absolute differentiation between women and men implies dichotomous and unchangeable categories, ignoring the fact that assigning sex categories is also a social process (Howard & Hollander, 1997).

In this thesis, the term “sex” will be used to refer to the biological characteristics that distinguish female and male, such as reproductive organs or chromosomes. “Gender”, in contrast, will refer to culturally determined behaviours and personality characteristics that are associated with, but not determined by, biological sex. The relationship between sex and gender is thus not seen as automatic; it is emphasized that mediating processes, like socialisation, lead individuals to behave in certain ways (Howard & Hollander, 1997). Gender does not only refer to what a person is, but also to what a person does or enacts on an ongoing basis (Martin & Jurik, 1996). “Doing gender” means creating differences between women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or biological (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 137). Once such differences have been constructed, they are used to reinforce the ‘essentialness’ of gender. The social construction of gender is neither static nor automatic, but needs to be enacted through routine interaction. It is acknowledged that the terms sex and

gender will have different meanings for different people (including the participants of this study).

“Role”: The term “role” has different meanings in social research. In this study, it refers to a “set of prescriptions and proscriptions for behaviour – expectations about what behaviour is appropriate for a person holding a particular position within a particular social context” (Kessler & McKenna, 1978, p. 11). Roles may be divided into achieved roles (e.g. officer, mother, mechanic), which develop through a person’s own effort, or ascribed roles (e.g. Black, women) which are seen as not being under an individual’s own control. Gender roles in contemporary society are usually seen as ascribed roles.

“Race”: The use of race, especially in the South African post-apartheid era, is also problematic. Historically, South African citizens were categorised primarily according to their racial attributes. This changed in the early 1990’s, when the South African government officially abolished race as its primary form of categorisation. Race is “a social definition of social categories of people, typically based on visible physical characteristics” (Rothman, 1993, p. 6). In its dealing with race, the South African National Defence Force faces an ironic contradiction: although it purports not to discriminate on the basis of race, government policies of quotas, affirmative action and fast tracking actually force it to keep statistics on race. The terminology of race therefore stays present in the experiential world of its members, and so becomes important for this study. Race categories are used here, following the definitions of the previous apartheid government, as these definitions still permeate the community under investigation. White refers to people of European descent, who enjoyed the status of full citizens in the apartheid era, while Coloured refers to people of mixed race (and often to all who did not fit in any other category), and Indian to people who trace their ancestors back to India. The term Black is often used to describe all people who experienced racial and ethnic discrimination under apartheid, but here will refer more narrowly to people who perceive themselves as having an African descent. In sailor talk, the terms Black and African are often used interchangeably, referring to people from African descent.

Due to its pervasiveness in society, as well as in the military, there is regular reference in this study to these four race groups. However, it cannot be assumed that they constitute real

delineated cultural entities, as the race groups themselves are often collective descriptions of physical attributes, and may be a grouping of various ethnic and language types.

Having briefly introduced the background to the study, we now turn to a review of the position of women at work.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER TWO: WOMEN IN THE FORMAL WORKPLACE

2.1. Introduction

This chapter will examine the situation of women in the formal workplace. The first section (Section 2.2) will provide a brief overview of the current position of women at work, and close with a view of the current South African situation. It will argue that women have moved out of their traditional sphere – domestic labour – as a result of a number of advances that have supported the entry of increasing numbers of women into the labour force. However, in spite of these advances, the workplace is still characterised by job differentiation and segregation. The reason for this is based on a dichotomy of the sexes, and it is argued that this comes from two popular ideologies: essential biology and social roles. Feminists have responded to these theories by highlighting the social positions of gender in society, and its associated power structures.

The next section (Section 2.3) will explore these gendered power structures in society. This focus comes from feminist analyses, and their concept of patriarchy – namely that the structure of society oppresses women – will be used to explain the inequalities entrenched in society. Modern developments in the social order have challenged the legitimacy of patriarchy, leading to a renewed interest in men's sense of self. Concepts of masculinity will be reviewed to examine the transitional nature of SA society, with its competing masculinities.

The emergence of women in formal employment has elicited strong responses from men, with resistance being the most visible. The third section (Section 2.4) will thus investigate this resistance and the adaptation of men towards the situation of women entering a male dominated workplace. Resistance is evident on many levels, and its manifestations on the organisational and interpersonal level will form the focus of this discussion.

The fourth and final section of this chapter (Section 2.5) will examine the experiences of women themselves. Women have to deal with the strains of men's resistance collectively, as

well as on a personal level. Their experiences in this regard, as well as their adaptation to it, will be reviewed.

2.2. Women at Work

2.2.1 Historical background

Modern industrial societies tend to arrange home and work as separate spheres. In pre-industrial, agrarian societies, in contrast, the household was the centre of economic production. When the industrial revolution of the 1800's moved production out of the home, men, women and children went to work in factories, where men were given the highest skilled, best paying jobs. In the 1840's, social reformers and men's labour unions called for restrictions on the use of women and children as labour. This was partly philanthropic, but mainly political and economical, as they felt that women were taking men's jobs (Martin & Jurik, 1996). In Britain this led to the eventual development of a "family wage", which paid the upper layers of working class men enough so that their wives could stay at home. A similar system for 'preserving the family' developed in the United States (US). Although not all families received the family wage, it did nonetheless have the symbolic effect of designating men as breadwinners and women as homemakers (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

This arrangement led to the exclusion of women from economic and political power. In contrast to that, the past century has seen momentous changes in the fortunes of women in the workplace. Considerable advances have been made with regard to working opportunities, working conditions, and the development of workers. Today, women are entering traditionally male dominated occupations in increasing numbers, as political developments, as well as advances in education and technology, bring about new opportunities.

The post World War II economy experienced declining employment in agriculture and manufacturing, and an increased demand for employment in service industries (retail sales, health, banking, hospitality) and service occupations (secretarial), which increased opportunities for the employment of women (England & Browne, 1992).

These increased employment opportunities came at a time of increased educational opportunities. In South Africa school education was made compulsory for all children only in the 1990's (Neft & Levine, 1997), and girls currently make up 50% of all school children in the country (CEDAW, 1997). The technological advances in modern society have further enhanced opportunities for women. New technologies required less physical strength, enabling more women to compete for jobs. Although more automation means that there are fewer jobs, the lack of skilled men is forcing companies to recruit and retain skilled women (Miller-Loessi, 1997). These developments have been supported by better access to education and training.

Better access to education was primarily a result of the greater participation of women in politics. Despite the fact that white women in South Africa had been allowed to vote since 1931, the second half of the twentieth century saw the political dispensation of Apartheid enacted in South Africa, which deprived the majority of the population – politically, socially and economically. Consequently, the recent history of South Africa was characterised by the liberation struggle, with its focus on equal rights for all. The liberation struggle culminated in the first democratic elections in South Africa in 1994, which subsequently led to a constitution (adopted in 1996) and a legislative environment that supports the full and equal participation of women in all aspects of society. The Constitution is based on the Bill of Rights, which prohibits discrimination and encourages affirmative action. In addition, the new labour legislation provides for equal rights and protection for the employed (e.g. Labour Relations Act, 1995; Employment Equity Act, 1998).

From 1994 onwards, the national government introduced legislation that protected women and improved their position in society; it further passed labour legislation that encouraged women's participation in the workplace. The new labour legislation entrenched affirmative action in SA law, which aimed 'to protect and advance' all people who had been disadvantaged in the past. For example, the SA public service has set transformation targets that include race and gender (CEDAW, 1997).

2.2.2. Current position of women in the workplace

Nonetheless, in spite of new opportunities brought about by recent advances, women still face many obstacles to equal participation in the workplace. Baxter & Kane (1995) identified two markers of inequality: the gender gap in wages, and occupational gender segregation. Occupational segregation can be horizontal (distinguishing between typical 'women's jobs' and 'men's jobs') or vertical (which means that men move to higher level posts, whereas women are concentrated in lower level jobs).

(a) Vertical segregation

Statistics and surveys (Faludi, 1992) demonstrate a large disproportion of men to women in positions of power, influence and control. It is the standard pattern for men to take up positions in the bureaucratic, professional and managerial elites, while women staff the service industries on the ground (Edley & Wetherell, 1995). Martin & Jurik (1996) noted that the gatekeepers (senior positions) who control the allocation of assignments, the development of policies, promotions and so forth, are mostly men.

Vertical segregation leads to men making decisions that are based on their own prejudices. In a recent study, 79% of CEO's agreed that prejudice and stereotypes were among the most identifiable barriers to women's advancement in US corporations. These stereotypes include the beliefs that women lack career commitment, are not tough enough, do not want to work long or unusual hours, are too emotional, and have trouble making decisions (cited in Crampton & Mishra, 1999).

Stereotypes such as these lead to discrimination on two levels— formal and informal. Formal discrimination refers to policies and behaviour that discriminate against women. Policies reflecting unequal pay and inflexible working hours, then, are examples of formal discrimination. As the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) has no formal discriminatory policies in terms of benefits and rewards, this type of discrimination need not be discussed in this study. Informal discrimination refers to mechanisms of discrimination that are not formulated in official policies, but nonetheless present in the (corporate) culture of organisations. For example, the SANDF, like many other companies, does not have adequate

family friendly policies in place, and few organisations are sympathetic to working women's family responsibilities.

(b) Horizontal segregation

Horizontal occupational sex segregation divides the labour market into women's jobs and men's jobs (e.g. construction versus service sectors), leading not only to discrimination in terms of choices, but also in terms of rewards (i.e. pay) (Kemp, 1994). Although changes have taken place over time, segregation has simply become more subtle now (i.e. although both genders have become managers, women often advance in human resources, whereas men do so in technical fields).

In the broader marketplace, some desegregation has occurred, with women making inroads into male dominated occupations. However, breaching male dominated work environments is not easy, eliciting negative attitudes towards women in non-traditional jobs. Multinational ethnographic research reports the universal existence of prescribed roles and behaviours for men and women (Koshal, Gupta & Koshal, 1998). Objectively, individual jobs are not fixed, pre-existing entities, but are socially constructed out of interactions among individuals in the workplace. How tasks are structured in jobs is influenced by two social factors (Miller & Garrison, 1982): perceptions and expectations of employers, and the ability of workers to negotiate their work roles. In a patriarchal economy, where men have more structural power than women, men and women continually reproduce gender inequalities in their daily work interactions, constantly engaging in 'doing gender' (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

The supervisory relationship serves as a good example of how male dominance is maintained: Women doing complex work are still more likely to be closely supervised, which in turn disempowers them to negotiate job-roles. This supervisory arrangement continually "reaffirms men and women's essential natures – men being active, assertive and powerful and women being passive, unassertive and weak" (Miller-Loessi, 1997, p. 9). Closer supervision further suggests that men consider women to be less competent than their male co-workers, which in turn leads to women's exclusion from informal organisational networks (Miller, 1992).

Horizontal segregation as a manifestation of cultural ideology appears very resistant to change. Ironically, Greene, Ackers & Black (2002) described the experience of women who were reluctant to participate in newly structured un-gendered jobs, due to cultural ideologies of what constitutes 'women's' and 'men's' work. Education and beliefs about gender inequality have been advanced as a possible moderating factor of gender ideologies. There is some evidence that education leads to an increased awareness, but not necessarily criticism, of inequalities (Kanter, 1977; Thomsen, Basu & Reinitz, 1995), but this is countered by the argument that education reproduces inequality by encouraging an individualistic and meritocratic orientation (Kanter, 1977).

(c) The South African environment

Within the South African context, recent advances since 1994 have created a situation where – on paper at least – women are totally equal to men, in that they are accorded the same opportunities in formal employment. In reality, however, the situation is still one of discrimination and disadvantage.

The construction of the formal workforce often hinders gender integration within individual organisations, as reflected in the processes and policies in organisations to facilitate full integration. A recent study revealed that 47% of the SA private sector businesses interviewed had no gender policies in place (De Bruin, 1999), resulting in discriminatory policies with regard to decisions on hiring, promoting, and salaries.

Women from ethnic minorities face a double handicap, being discriminated against because of both their gender and ethnicity (Pyant & Yanico, 1991; Segura, 1992). Within the SA context, there is a clear distinction across racial lines in terms of unemployment, illiteracy, and access to services and support (South Africa Survey, 2001/2002).

Societal values are often at play, for example in education. Although girls currently account for more than 50% of pupils in South Africa, cultural and social practices often prevent them from attending school. Add to this a 25% drop-out rate due to pregnancy, and a disproportionate number of girls do not receive equivalent education. They are further disadvantaged in skill training after school, as the lack of childcare support for young mothers

makes training less accessible (CEDAW, 1997). Although developments in education and training have created opportunities for women to gain the skills to enter the workforce, there is still a gender bias in selection for training. Social attitudes affect the types of qualifications that women seek to obtain (most of which still lead to traditional occupations), although more women are now moving into business and engineering (Wirth, 1998).

The realities of a developing country clearly illustrate the disadvantages that women face: two typical (but not unique) South African experiences further the disadvantages of women. The first can be attributed to the disintegration of family life: girls fall pregnant at an early age and leave school, while the babies' fathers continue with their education and may even marry different and better educated women (*Enterprise*, August 1996). The second is migrant labour. Men leave their (often rural) homes to find work in the city. The women stay behind and manage the household and the family, which in itself prevents them finding formal employment. Not only is managing the house and looking after the family a time-consuming activity, but there are far fewer job opportunities in rural than in urban areas (where women are disproportionately located), and much less access to training and education (CEDAW, 1997). In addition, the emergence of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the late 20th century has further placed women in a position of caregiver for infected family members, which prevents them from receiving an education (South Africa Survey, 2001/2002) or participating in the labour market (*Cape Times*, 11 July 2003).

The national employment situation in South Africa does not look positive for women. Fifty percent of economically active women across all the race groups are currently unemployed, compared to 34% of men. Among black women, the figure is even higher, with 75% of black women under 30 looking for work (*Cape Times*, 11 July 2003). Women are more likely than men to be self-employed, and most of them work alone (CEDAW, 1997), where there are no organisational support services. In recent years, however, women's participation in the paid labour force has increased (Smit, 1995), mostly through increased opportunities due to the growth in the female dominated service sector (Miller-Loessi, 1992). Most South African women are employed in service occupations (CEDAW, 1997).

In current South African society, men still dominate the formal workforce. Furthermore, women are still paid less than men for equal work (Mabuza, 2003), and are also concentrated

in the lower ranks. Given that only 22% of managers in South Africa are women (Brink & de la Rey, 2001; Mabuza, 2003), the control of decision-making and resources remains in the hands of men.

(d) The South African Military

The SANDF still reflects significant vertical and horizontal gender segregation (DoD, 2004). The nature of military organisations creates obstacles to achieving equality at senior management level. For example, the military has to “grow their own senior executives” (Dansby & Landis, 1986, p. 211), as the nature of the organisations does not provide for the opportunity to laterally import qualified or experienced women.

2.3. Reasons for Gender Inequality

As we have seen in the previous section, women face pervasive inequalities in formal employment, both horizontally and vertically. There is much modern debate on these inequalities, especially in the feminist movement, which has highlighted the “oppressiveness of the male gender class” (Edley & Wetherell, 1995, p. 3). Feminists are concerned with the subordination of women, and argue that what defines men is their power in relation to women. This power is influenced by men’s social advantages and privileges (Edley & Wetherell, 1995), and inequalities can thus be explained in terms of power and oppression. Modern feminism argues for a social construction of power relationships, and has developed different themes to explain male dominance.

To some extent, feminist analyses of power and oppression developed in response to two earlier arguments in the gender debate. These were arguments for the innate differences between men and women based on biological markers, and the acquired differences due to socialisation. These arguments precede the social constructionist approaches that characterise feminist analyses, and that, although they have been refuted, are still active in the general consciousness of the gender debate.

As these earlier arguments are not central to the thesis, they will only be described briefly in the following section before introducing a feminist analysis of power relations between the

genders. Two important concepts have developed from feminist thinking – patriarchy and masculinity. The ideology of patriarchy refers to the structure of society that oppresses women. However, as the legitimacy of the concept of patriarchy has recently been challenged (Connell, 1995), new interest was generated in theories of masculinity, to try to explain how men reproduce the advantages of the patriarchal society.

2.3.1. Early theories of gender and feminist responses

The gender debate has historically dealt with how women and men differ from each other. Biological perspectives, and later social or sex role theories, have dominated this debate. The most important points of these are summarised below, as are feminist responses to them.

(a) Biological perspectives

The argument that gender differences are based on biology has its starting point in the assumption of a female/male dichotomy. The biological approach holds that men and women are essentially different, and that the difference is cast in biology, through markers like chromosomes, anatomy or physiology. Accordingly, it is argued that physical differences will result in non-physical differences between the sexes.

Biological differences were believed to give men privileges. For example, because of their biologically determined characteristics, only men could do certain work, which excluded women from many spheres of employment. Biology further relegated people to certain roles. For instance, because women could bear children, they were expected to adopt the roles of mother and homemaker. The biological approach placed women as essentially inferior to men, and justified inequality at work.

This approach has been criticised for its consideration of men and women as two unitary categories, and for failing to account for people who find themselves outside the traditional understandings of simplistic biological markers (cf. Howard & Hollander, 1997). Neither does it account for people who have changed their biological anatomy to fit their perception of their own location in the gender field. Categorising men and women in two homogeneous groups disregards the influences of culture, society and socialisation. However, Brittan (1989,

cited in Luyt 2002) warns that, although the essentialist approach has been rejected as overly simplistic, biological determinism does still hold power in the present day gender debate.

(b) Social role and sex role theories

The social approach to gender argued that if the differences between the sexes were not automatic (i.e. biological), then they must be acquired. Consequently, in the field of social thinking about gender, the sex-role theory became popular. This approach describes the different roles that the different sexes play in day-to-day life, and then examines how this role is taken up, or internalised.

The socialisation approach claims that children are not born gendered, but instead learn gendered behaviour from their environment, for example by modelling and imitation (Bandura, 1977), or by means of rewards and punishments for gender specific behaviours (Howard & Hollander, 1997). Through socialisation, children learn the cultural stereotypes about the characteristics of men and women. These stereotypes are not only descriptive (i.e. describing what how members of particular categories are believed to be like), but also prescriptive (i.e. generating two separate sets of behaviours and characteristics, one believed to be appropriate for men, and the other for women). This restricts both women and men to behave in particular ways. Gender sensitised men were drawn to this approach, as they could claim equal oppression of men alongside the feminist movement (Messner, 1997).

This sex-role theory has been severely criticised for its silence on the structural relations of power (Messerschmidt, 1993; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Such criticism pointed out that sex roles are assigned according to conventional sex distinctions, which perpetuate the existing understanding of gender as two opposing categories based on biological markers (Luyt, 2002). As such, it reduces all male and female constructions to one normative standard for each (Messerschmidt, 1993), and does not account for the heterogeneity in modern understanding of genders, namely the differences within the genders and the overlap between them. In spite of such extended critique (cf. Edley & Wetherell, 1995), the sex-role approach is still prominent in the present day gender debate.

(c) Feminist responses

In contrast to the more limiting approaches of biology and social roles, feminists argued that, in order to understand the social position of genders, one also needs to understand the characteristics of the society in which one lives. They argue that it is men's activity in society that produces power. The main axis of power in the contemporary gender order is the overall subordination of women and the dominance of men, creating the structure that the Women's Liberation movement named 'patriarchy' (Connell, 1995). Patriarchy as a cultural ideology influences, and often determines, power interaction between genders, and will be explored in more detail below, because it is particularly relevant in the context of this study. Although the wider debate surrounding feminism falls outside the scope of this thesis, the key concepts of patriarchy will briefly be examined.

2.3.2. Patriarchy

The concept of patriarchy is useful in explaining why there is job differentiation in a society where there are no legal or biological reasons for it. Patriarchy refers not only to men's dominance in the world of work, in the public sphere, in politics, and in culture, but also to inequalities between women and men and patterns of social relations in the family (Edley & Wetherell, 1995). Feminist scholars argue that men are as they are because of these systematic and structured differences in the social and economic positions of women and men, and because of the relationships and processes that sustain these differences (Edley & Wetherell, 1995). Patriarchy encompasses a perspective where women and men enter into relations through a social structure, which exists above the individual actions of particular individuals.

The original meaning of the term referred to the rule of the patriarch or the 'head of the family', but today it is more generally used to denote all the powers and privileges men enjoy as a group in relation to women (Edley & Wetherell, 1995). Walby (1986) described how private patriarchy – where women were directly controlled by their husbands and fathers within the family, was mirrored by a more public patriarchy – where the State controlled, through legislation and administrative procedures, the position of women. This led to a

modern form of patriarchy, which does not exclude women from public life, but rather nonetheless segregates them in public life.

Feminist literature argues that patriarchy lies at the root of discrimination against women internationally (Kemp, 1994). It is argued that the philosophy of patriarchy is deeply embedded in the customs, cultures and religions of all South Africa's peoples, and as such determines how children are socialised into seeing, experiencing and behaving in the world (CEDAW, 1997).

This creates an imbalance of power between the genders, partly manifested in strongly held stereotypes about appropriate occupations for men and women. Women across cultures are held responsible for child rearing and household work from an early age (De la Rey, 1992). In South Africa, local customs, beliefs and traditions create and maintain gender positions (CEDAW, 1997). These values perpetuate expectations about gender, and maintain the gendering of occupations (into masculine and feminine occupations).

Despite the pervasive nature of the patriarchal society, changes have occurred in the power relations of the genders. However, as Connell (1995) points out, this does not herald the crumbling of the structures of patriarchy, but rather the crumbling of the legitimacy of patriarchy. The concept of patriarchy has also been criticised as restrictive, as it does not explain real variations in the construction of masculinities within a particular society, but rather encourages a focus on one type of masculinity only, namely the 'patriarchal' masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993). Recent challenges to the legitimacy of patriarchy have led to an interest in theories of masculinity. Masculinities – as cultural practice – can be viewed as a means through which patriarchal advantages are defended and reproduced (Connell, 1995).

2.3.3. Masculinities

Feminists have argued that men collectively have power over women. Men's studies have shown, however, that not all men have the same amount of power or benefit equally from it, and that power is exercised differently, depending on the location and special arrangement of the relations that are in place (Morrell, 2001).

Connell (1987) pointed out that the advantages and disadvantages of gender divisions are not distributed evenly among men or women, or between men and women. However, he argued, each man nonetheless enjoys a “patriarchal dividend” – the advantage that men in general gain from the subordination of women. Many men, if not actually living up to the cultural notions of dominant masculinity themselves, are still complicit in sustaining this hegemonic masculinity, since they have a great deal to gain from the general subordination of women by hegemonic men (Connell, 1995). However, not all men shared this power evenly.

Connell’s (1987, 1995) concept of hegemonic masculinity refers to the power of certain groups of men to force an interpretation of what masculinity should be, and thus to subordinate or repress other styles of masculine expression, and women more generally. He argued that, while men oppress women in general, some men also dominate and subordinate other men. There is therefore a type or form of masculinity that is hegemonic – one that dominates other masculinities and creates prescriptions of masculinity that are (at least partially) binding.

Connell (1995) believes that hegemony is likely to be established only if there is some correspondence between cultural ideas and institutional power, at least collectively if not individually. In this way, top levels of business, the military and government provide corporate displays of masculinity. It is the successful claim of authority, rather than the use of direct violence, that is the mark of hegemony (Connell, 1995).

This concept of hegemonic masculinity has been criticised as contradictory and unclear (Edley & Wetherell, 1995), and as imprecise and rigid (Morrell, 2001). Nonetheless, it remains indispensable for purposes of analysing relations between men, and between men and wider society (Morrell, 2001).

Hegemony relates to cultural dominance in society as a whole. The interplay between other social categories has led to the recognition of multiple masculinities (Connell, 1995). Minorities, defined in terms of race, class, ethnicity and sexual orientation, all understand that being a man has different meanings for different minority groups and for minorities as distinct from the ruling class (Morrell, 2001). Men construct their masculinities in accordance with their position in social structures, and which therefore determines their access to power and

resources (Messerschmidt, 1993, p. 119). Connell (1995) described three non-hegemonic categories of masculinity: subordinate, complicit and marginalised. Generally speaking, they develop outside the corridors of power (Morrell, 2001).

(a) Masculinities in the South African context

The recognition of multiple masculinities is important for the local context. This is because South Africa's political history gave importance to race and class in dealing with issues of male dominance (Morrell, 2001). The period between 1948 and 1994 was characterised by an institutionalised oppression of race, leading to separate definitions of masculinity in different groups. This, in effect, created a state-sanctioned definition of masculinity, which has become the white middle class hegemony.

The changing political dispensation of the 1990's changed the societal structures of power and influence. The changing political order dethroned the previous hegemonic masculinity of the white middle class (Luyt, 2002), leaving a void and forcing both the previous hegemonic, as well as subordinate masculinities, to undergo redefinition. The pace and scale of changes to South African society in the 1990's created a 'society in transition', which has reduced the power of the dominant masculinity. To fill this void, a number of masculinities began to evolve, with different versions competing for hegemony, including the discourse of aggression (Luyt, 2002; Wood & Jewkes, 2001), the role of sport, and the emergence of heroic masculinity (embodied in Nelson Mandela) (Morrell, 2001).

Within the transitional nature of South African society, the present redefinition of masculinity is also interacting with the positioning of other categories. Masculinity is, for instance, interacting with race, class, age, and history in a process that often reveals "composite, as well as contradictory images of what it is to be a man" (Luyt, 2002, p. 23). These changes in masculine identity are good news for feminists, who argue that, in the interests of social justice and challenging inequalities, men must change, although there is wide disagreement on exactly how they must do so (Edley & Wetherell, 1995).

Morrell (2001) describes changes in the perceptions of masculinity in South Africa through history, and highlights the role of the State as an agent of change. The government that came

into power after the 1994 elections introduced policies to reduce a number of inequalities that separate women from men (Morrell, 2001): Party policies of gender representivity brought about a 25% share of women in parliament. Direct representation increased after the 1999 elections, when parliamentary participation by women grew to 30%. Despite these changes, Morrell (2001) notes that there are widely divergent views of progress made in society.

Although the effect on the government's position on general society is not clear, it did provoke a number of responses from men, which can be grouped into three broad categories: reactive, accommodating, and responsive (Morrell, 2001). *Reactive* responses attempt to reverse the changes in order for men to reassert their previous level of power. *Accommodating* responses attempt to resuscitate non-violent masculinities. *Responsive* responses, lastly, refer to emancipatory masculinities, e.g. the gay movement.

In conclusion, then, the definitions of masculinities in South Africa are currently in flux. There exist multiple, but no clear hegemonic, expressions of masculinities. The same issues may be expected among men in the South African Navy, which, reflects the general population relatively closely and thus shares its same "fragmented status of masculinity" (Gough, 2001, p. 171), with its various responses to social transformation.

(b) Military masculinity

Bonding of men in male-only peer groups is associated with hypermasculinity – expressions of extreme, exaggerated, or stereotypical masculine attributes and behaviours (Messerschmidt, 1993). Morris (1996) demonstrated how the military traditionally had a central group identity structure built around a particular construction of masculinity. This theme of hypermasculinity, with its normative elements of toughness, self-sufficiency, and dominance, pervades military culture (Morris, 1996). The masculinity that is definitive of the military in-group is defined, and achieved, in contrast to the 'other' – in particular, in contrast to women (Barrett, 1996; Morris, 1996). However, recent findings have deconstructed the notion of monolithic masculinity associated with the military, and have demonstrated the variable constructions of masculinities across job specialities in the military (Barrett, 1996).

Morris (1996) described five elements that contribute to the phenomenon of linking military identity with masculinity: Firstly, success in combat historically depended on physical strength, which meant that maleness was associated with military success. Secondly, military service was a mechanism for boys to distance themselves from their mothers or other female caregivers, and affirm their male-ness, which included bonding with all-male, hypermasculine groups. Thirdly, masculinity as dominance, aggressiveness, and toughness as embraced in the military culture, is highly valued in an organisation whose primary reason for existence is war. Fourthly, the particular construction of masculinity in the military creates a group identity that provides the basis for group cohesion between members who otherwise have little in common. Fifthly, an exclusively male, heterosexual group identity may serve to minimise sexual tensions between group members (and so minimise a threat to group cohesion). The military typically has an elaborate system of awards and rituals that reinforce aspects of hegemonic military masculinity (Barrett, 1996).

Within the US Navy, for example, the image of masculinity involves physical toughness, endurance of hardships, aggressiveness, rugged heterosexuality, unemotional logic, and a refusal to complain (Barrett, 1996). It is noteworthy that the presence of women in military units is associated with men perceiving lower levels of group hypermasculinity (Rosen, Knudson & Fancher, 2003). Masculinity in military culture is very public, but never secure, and must be continuously demonstrated (Barrett, 1996), which may influence the high prevalence of behaviours intended to distance men from women (e.g. sexual harassment) in the military context.

(c) South African military masculinity

Patriarchy is still the dominant cultural ideology in the SANDF (Motumi, 1999). However, as in the rest of South African society, the hegemonic masculinity within the SANDF is in flux. The South African military situation is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.3.1.

2.4. Men's Responses to Gender Integration of the Workplace

Women's emergence in male dominated occupations challenged men's dominant social position, as well as their work organisation in terms of public image, group solidarity, and

men's identity within it (Martin & Jurik, 1996). This elicited strong responses from men who wished to maintain the status quo, the most visible being their resistance towards the gender equalisation of the workplace.

Men actively resist losing their dominant and privileged position at work. It is argued that many organisational phenomena and interpersonal interactions are manifestations of male resistance. Although such resistance is evident on many levels and in many spheres, its manifestations in the organisational and interpersonal contexts of work will form the focus of this section. There are many examples of overt hostility to women at work – clear and visible manifestations of male resistance. This study is, however, concerned with the subtle mechanisms for resisting women and maintaining male dominance.

2.4.1. Domestic manifestations

Kemp (1994) argues that, as women engage in paid labour, the patriarchal authority of their husbands and fathers will be reduced. In practice, however, is difficult to achieve, as patriarchal practices and beliefs burden women with the greatest share of household labour, often limiting their participation in paid employment (Edley & Wetherell, 1995). Since most Naval women are young and unattached, resistance at the work-home interface is not a specific focus of this thesis; however, because it plays an important role in maintaining male dominance over women, it will briefly be addressed here.

The influence of the patriarchal nature of society, and the allocation of gender roles, can most clearly be seen in the phenomenon of the *second shift*. This refers to women who work not only in paid employment outside the home, but also literally work a second shift at home, where they are responsible for the biggest part of domestic duties.

Acceptance of women's involvement in the labour force is greater than the acceptance of changes in the domestic division of labour (Kane & Sanchez, 1994). In other words, there is support for women to enter the workforce, as long as they continue to provide domestic labour as well. A recent South African study highlighted the difference between ideological and practical support within family relationships. Many husbands supported the 'idea' of their wives working, but this did not translate into a more equal sharing of domestic responsibilities

(Brink & De la Rey, 2001). Men, it seems, believe in the primacy of their work role. They will thus accept women's employment unless it infringes on their work or family roles or deprives them of female companionship (Willinger, 1993).

2.4.2. Organisational manifestations

Organisations resist gender integration both formally and informally. *Formal* manifestations of resistance within work organisations include policies and practices of hiring employees, and conditions of employment, which often discriminate against female applicants. Affirmative action policies are one way of addressing this formal resistance. However, organisations can also respond to affirmative action policies with subtle forms of resistance, e.g. by hiring a small number of minority groups as tokens. Arguably the greatest source of *informal* discrimination lies in the corporate culture of (male-dominated) organisations – that informal, and sometimes subconscious, body of beliefs within an organisation.

A number of companies have implemented gender awareness education in an effort to promote communication and understanding between men and women in the workplace, and ultimately to ensure women's career advancement. Although these initiatives deserve credit, it is suggested that such programs are not very effective in changing stereotypes and behaviour (Burke & MacDermid, 1996).

This section will examine tokenism and corporate culture as subtle forms of resistance to full gender integration, and then introduce leadership as a key in facilitating either resistance to gender integration or adaptation to it.

(a) Tokenism

Affirmative action is advocated by liberal feminists as one way of overcoming the barriers of under-representation of women at work. The South African government has facilitated the emergence of affirmative action through legislation, and leads by the example of the civil service (i.e. The Employment Equity Act of 1997).

The danger of affirmative action programs is that they may lead to tokenism. Tokens are defined as those members of social groups in an environment dominated by another social group that controls the environment and its culture (usually making up less than 15% of the total group). Members of these categories are regarded as tokens, as they are treated as symbols, rather than individuals (Kanter, 1977). Tokens are usually readily identifiable as members of a specific group, and the dominant group usually holds certain assumptions about the appropriate behaviour and suitable roles of such tokens. Kanter (1977) identifies three processes experienced by tokens— visibility, polarisation, and assimilation.

The *visibility* of women in male dominated occupations makes them feel categorised by others, and as if they represent their category (Kanter, 1977). It also places extra performance pressure on them, since they are more noticeable (i.e. always in the spotlight). When seen as representatives of their category, women's acts carry symbolic consequences – as they affect the way all women in the organisation will be seen or treated (Kanter, 1977). Because of this – the salience of one characteristic (i.e. biological sex) and the stereotyped expectations it elicits – women have to work extra hard to prove their competence as workers. *Polarisation* refers to efforts of the dominant group to exaggerate their in-group similarities and their between-group differences. Efforts by the dominant group to distort the characteristics of the tokens to fit their pre-existing stereotypes about the tokens' social category are referred to as *assimilation* (Kanter, 1977). This includes seeing women in roles believed more suitable to their gender, e.g. such as secretaries, even when the token's true position is known. It may further lead to stereotype induction, where tokens are induced to take on stereotypical roles, with which the dominant group feel more comfortable interacting. Kanter (1977) described four role traps, which encapsulate women in categories men could respond to and understand: mother, seductress, pet (symbolic mascot), and iron maiden.

Tokens experience different demands to those who are in the majority. These demands include greater visibility and exposure, serving as representatives or spokespersons for their category, feeling isolated and outside informal networks, being seen in stereotype roles, and fears of earning the displeasure of the majority group (Kanter, 1990). Women who believe they have been promoted because they are women and not because of their competence, are often less satisfied with their jobs, less committed to the organisation, report greater stress, are more likely to devalue their leadership skills, are more likely to not to take credit for success

at work, and to compare themselves unfavourably with those they believe were selected on merit (Kanter, 1990). Men who believe women are promoted because of their gender rather than their competence are also more likely to diminish the capabilities of women (Heilman, 1995).

Tokenism can be an effective form of subtle resistance. It acts as a visible confirmation of equal opportunity, while entrenching the dominant group's control over the entry of other groups into an organisation (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1986). This danger is extended when individuals are appointed for the purpose of visibility in filling quotas. As such their 'meaning' (attributed identity) is determined not by their personal characteristics, but by what (i.e. which group) they represent.

Kanter (1977) believed that shifting proportions in the total work group are tied to positive organisational and personal outcomes. Where there are more women employed to 'balance the numbers', there will be greater work effectiveness, lesser stress, etc. Other authors posited alternative hypotheses. For example, Blalock's minority-proportion-discrimination hypothesis (1970) holds that increased numbers of the minority group will lead to increased discrimination because of the perceived threat of competition (to the majority group).

The SAN has made a number of senior appointments, including their first female Master at Arms in 1996, and first female admiral in 2003 (Pienaar, 2004). While this creates opportunities for women, it also poses the danger that such appointees become tokens to satisfy the need for visible change.

(b) Corporate culture

Corporate culture is the informal, sometimes subconscious, body of beliefs and expectations that exists within an organisation. It encompasses the values and norms of an organisation – for example, the often hidden attitudes and stereotypes that underlie informal ideas of acceptable management roles for men and women (Vinnicombe & Harris, 2000). The culture is often one where male leadership is the norm, and where, for example, employees have certain expectations of the acceptable communication styles or personalities of a boss (Stinson, 1998).

The military serves as a clear example of a well-defined corporate culture – macho and masculine, competitive and focused on dominating the enemy. One strong belief held by the military, and by other male-dominated occupations, is that their occupation is a man's world and that women have to adapt to it.

Women who threaten this culture – who do not conform to expectation or who are too successful – are considered a threat to men's belief in their own dominance, and are thus resisted fiercely. Corporate culture (belief in male dominance) is deadly to women's aspirations. It may make demands (i.e. long working hours) that are not compatible with women's lives (cf. the concept of the second shift discussed earlier), limit their career expectations, and exclude them from informal networks. A study by Ragins, Townsend & Mattis (1998) found that women managers were twice as likely to report corporate culture as a barrier to women's advancement in the workplace.

Organisational culture, however, is not a monolithic entity. There are usually multiple and competing work cultures intersecting within an organisation (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

1) *Organisational demands*

Corporate culture expects loyalty from its employees, and hard work – after hours – is often required for promotion. Aaron-Corbin (1999) argues that there is a basic incompatibility between employees who have families, and corporations. This stems from the conflicting demands of families and employers, career aspirations and family responsibilities. The balancing act to satisfy both leads to multiple role-conflicts.

One example is the culture of 'presenteeism' – the tendency to stay at work beyond the time needed for effective performance of the job (Simpson, 1998). This culture puts women under pressure, and becomes a powerful weapon of male resistance. Women suffer twice from this. If they are unable or unwilling to compete over presenteeism (i.e. stay as long as the men), they are seen as not being as committed to the organisation as their male colleagues. They also experience exclusion from informal sessions, which reduces their access to information, contacts, and so forth.

There is evidence that women are particularly vulnerable to overload, both in terms of role overload and total workload (Hochschild, 1997). Role overload is the experience of competing or conflicting expectations from multiple roles (e.g. presenteeism vs. parenting). Total workload includes all forms of work, paid and unpaid, vocational and domestic. Role overload and total workload are interrelated, and create obstacles to women in organisational employment.

2) *Credibility*

Men, thinking according to their (often corporate) stereotypes, have certain expectations of how women should and will perform at work. For example, women managers often cite credibility issues – the need to re-establish their credibility in each new work situation (Ragins et al., 1998) – as an important career obstacle. Although these issues are often based on incorrect stereotypes, they act as self-fulfilling prophecies, as men behave towards their female co-workers in ways that confirm their expectations. One example is the interaction of gender and status roles, where a visitor mistakenly identifies a female manager as the secretary). In a patriarchal society, status roles (often associated with men) may lead people to have unconscious, automatic expectations that men occupy positions of authority and therefore use behaviours congruent to that status, whereas women reside in subordinate roles, and therefore use behaviours appropriate to their low-status role (Aguinis & Adams, 1998). Women may thus fail to climb the corporate ladder due to gender and status role expectations, because they are encouraged to use influence behaviours congruent with (gender) expectations but not necessarily associated with effective management (Aguinis & Adams, 1998).

In a survey of female executives (cited in Nelson & Burke, 2000), women identified three factors most critical to their advancement: consistently exceeding performance expectations, developing a style with which male managers are comfortable, and seeking out tough job assignments. Women executives consistently felt they had to overperform to gain and maintain credibility.

3) *Networks*

Women managers cite exclusion from informal networks as a serious career obstacle (Maclaran, Stevens & Cattarall, 1997; Ragins et al., 1998). Women reported a sense of frustration at “never being in the loop”, which could lead to their voluntary separation from organisations (Karambayya, 1998, p. 336). These networks – so-called ‘old boys’ clubs’ – provide insiders with access to information, guidance and support. These informal networks make it difficult for outsiders (women) to become part of organisations or groups. They lack the informal support system, and thus miss out on the shared knowledge and access that comes with it (Shukla & Tripathi, 1994). Mentoring is often proposed as the solution, because having influential mentors is reported as very important, in terms of support and guidance (Ragins et al., 1998). However, due to the shortage of women at the top of organisations, there are relatively few female mentors available (Nelson & Burke, 2000). Men are often reluctant to act as mentors for fear that the relationship may be misconstrued as romantic (Ragins et al., 1998).

4) *Glass ceiling*

The term ‘glass ceiling’ refers to the subtle barrier of negative attitudes and prejudices that prevents women from moving beyond a certain level in the corporate hierarchy (Crampton & Mishra, 1999; Daily, Certo & Dalton, 1999). In South Africa, women (mostly white) fill only 5% of directorships (CEDAW, 1997). This phenomenon is widespread internationally, with woman managers ranging from 30% in the USA to less than 10% in Germany (Wallace, 2000), and it applies to all occupational groupings.

Stereotypes about management and gender roles lie at the root of many attitudes that maintain the glass ceiling (Johnson, 2000). Good managers are often described in mostly masculine terms (task-orientated, aggressive, active, competitive, risk-taking), and it is often assumed that women do not possess these characteristics (Miller-Loessi, 1997). Other beliefs that maintain the glass ceiling include sex stereotyping regarding women’s ability and willingness to accept positions of responsibility, especially when long hours, travel and relocations are involved. This attitude assumes that women are a homogeneous group – with similar interests, ambitions and constraints (Wirth, 1998). Crampton & Mishra (1999) refer to these constraints

as myths. These myths include the attitude that training of women is wasteful when they are likely to leave work to raise a family; that neither men nor women prefer to work for a woman; that women fall apart in a crisis; and that women are not willing to travel extensively for a company (Crampton & Mishra, 1999).

Given that the (male) leadership informs and shapes organisational culture, their resistance to women would include keeping them from such influential positions – hence the glass ceiling. The presence of the glass ceiling, in spite of other advances, indicates the strength and tenacity of the informal culture of gender discrimination (Johnson, 2000).

5) *Expressions of corporate culture*

Alvesson and Billing (1997) described three basic forms in which corporate culture is often expressed and reproduced. *Rituals* are activities that include certain repetitive patterns that contain symbolic and expressive elements (p. 109). Meetings may thus function as rituals, expressing power relations, or corporate values and attitudes. Corporate culture may also be expressed through *artefacts* – physical objects like offices, furniture, logos, and dress codes that convey meaning within an organisation. Dress is a highly gendered artefact, and may serve to convey corporate values on the roles or status of women and men. *Metaphors* are “culturally rich verbal expressions” (p. 109), or verbal symbols, creating “vocabularies to facilitate and guide interpretations” (p. 112) of what is going on in an organisation. For example, an organisational member may be portrayed as a ‘team player’. Higgins & McAllaster (2002) add another dimension of corporate culture, namely *corporate space* – the physical surroundings of a particular organisation.

In gendered organisations, the expressions of corporate culture may become mechanisms for resistance, as Martin & Jurik (1996) described in relation to the police service. They found that the division of space (e.g. bathrooms), the presence of images and symbols (e.g. ‘pin-ups’), rules regarding appearance (e.g. hair length, jewellery), and prescribed uniforms (designed for and tailored to men’s bodies) were clear expressions of the reigning corporate culture.

Organisational dress serves two key functions: it asserts control, and it conveys identity (Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997). Corporate uniforms can become a subtle, yet effective, mechanism of gender-oppression. Some corporate uniforms (e.g. policewomen and men wearing the same clothing) serve to desexualise the workplace, and suppress women's femininity (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Alternatively, corporate uniform may serve to invoke sexuality and accentuate femininity (e.g. the short skirts worn by waitresses) (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Corporate uniforms, like those of the police or military, are important symbols of identity and status within society (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

6) *Corporate culture in the South African navy*

The SAN has a well-defined corporate culture – macho and masculine. It places high value on presenteeism, which because it is often required for mission success, is highly rewarded. This leaves less time for family responsibilities, potentially excluding women from full participation and the rewards that it brings. Although women broke through the glass ceiling – 8% of general/flag ranks in the SANDF are women (Piennar, 2004) – this has happened only recently, and still leaves a shortage of qualified mentors. Lastly, the SAN further applies a rigid expression of corporate culture, through uniform dress and rituals like saluting. These expressions are not always gender friendly, and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.4.1.

(c) **Leadership**

Leadership plays an important moderating role in the integration of women into the workplace. As discussed, male management defines the culture of an organisation, among others by acting as role models for employees (both men and women). Individual employees learn corporate culture by observing role models. Through observation they learn from and adopt similar behaviours and actions (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). Due to a lack of female role models, then, women managers are only exposed to male role models and mentors in management, which further perpetuates the masculine paradigm (Booyesen, 2000).

The commitment of top-level management to gender integration is of vital importance (Baron, Mittman & Newman, 1991), but is often in short supply, thereby creating barriers to true

gender integration in the workplace (Miller-Loessi, 1997). A leadership that is seen to accept and encourage the participation of women shapes a corporate culture of promoting women's opportunities, whereas leaders (managers) who either openly or subtly oppose it, perpetuate resistance in all its forms (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

2.4.3. Interpersonal manifestations

The ideology of patriarchy that drives organisational resistance to women also drives the type of resistance, often subconscious, that is expressed in the *interaction* between the genders. These manifestations of resistance are sometime subtle and sometimes not. This section will focus on expectations of identity expression as condition for acceptance, and sexual harassment, as two examples of interpersonal manifestations of resistance.

(a) Expectations and acceptance: The double bind

Women in the workplace are expected to conform to (men's) gender expectations, specifically with regard to the display of 'feminine' characteristics. This 'condition for acceptance' is a powerful mechanism to maintain women's subservient position in organisations. The conditions of acceptance include appropriate feminine behaviour, appearance, leadership style, and family life, adding more barriers to women's acceptance.

At the same time, men require women to portray 'masculine' characteristics in order to achieve success. This creates the double bind: if they invoke the masculine model, they are more likely to be successful, but then they will not be seen as feminine. They are torn between the expectations of their gender-norm identity (femininity) and the business-norm identity (masculinity). Men, collectively and individually, enact these expectations about women through either the corporate culture, or individual interaction.

This double bind also permeates the military, as described in a study by Herbert (1995, cited in Howard & Hollander, 1997) of the performance strategies of US military women. Half of her sample perceived that they were labelled as lesbian as a penalty for being too. Conversely, those who were not seen as masculine enough, perceived penalties in career limitations and in being judged as inadequate soldiers.

Dress plays an important part in symbolising gender expression. A study by Rucker, Anderson & Kanges (1999) confirmed that, women needed to adopt male symbols if they wanted to succeed in traditional male environments. Women found that “moderately masculine outfits” were best for conveying images of being forceful, self-reliant, dynamic, aggressive, and decisive (the required masculine characteristics). But at the same time, they could not abandon feminine dress to the point of gender-norm violation. This neatly illustrates women’s ‘compromise’ response to the double bind: to be successful, women need to look like men, but not too much.

The military context places strong constraints on individual expressions of identity through the use of appearance. Military personnel dress in a uniform way, which has the potential to restrict the salience of gender. However, military forces often prescribe different uniforms for women and men, which in turn serves to accentuate gender. SAN dress will be described in greater detail in Chapter 3.4.1.

(b) Sexual harassment

Sexual harassment is widespread in many places of work, but has received particular media attention due to a number of high profile cases in the US military. It is arguably the most referenced manifestation of male resistance to women at work. This section thus aims to provide a brief review of some issues of sexual harassment, locating it within the debate on resistance to women.

1) *Defining sexual harassment*

Research on sexual harassment is problematic because there are many competing definitions and conceptualisations of the behaviours that form the visible part of harassment. It was originally seen as limited to situations in which women were threatened with losing jobs in order to extort their sexual cooperation. Over time, it became increasingly understood as any deliberate or repeated sexual behaviour that is unwelcome to its recipient, as well as other sex-related behaviours that are hostile, offensive, or degrading (Fitzgerald, 1993). Generally, most conceptualisations involve a behavioural definition of sexual harassment.

One of the earlier definitions described five categories of sexual harassment (Till, 1980), namely gender harassment, seductive behaviour, sexual bribery, sexual coercion, and sexual imposition or assault. Till (1980) suggested further that these categories could be considered levels of harassment, because they formed a rough continuum of severity. Other writers have since expanded the number of categories, but have retained the same conceptualisation.

The US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission developed the first legal definition of sexual harassment in 1980. It made provision for two categories of behaviours, namely attempts to extort sexual cooperation by means of subtle or explicit threats of job-related consequences (*quid pro quo* harassment in legal terms), and pervasive sex-related verbal or physical conduct that is unwelcome or offensive (resulting in what is referred to as a 'hostile environment' in legal terms) (Fitzgerald, 1993). The relation between the legal and psychological conceptions of harassment was not without problems, though, and created its share of confusion (Fitzgerald, Gelfand and Drasgow, 1995). In response to this, Fitzgerald and her colleagues (Fitzgerald et al., 1995) created a more nuanced conceptual framework, stating that the "behavioural construct of sexual harassment is composed of three related, but conceptually distinct, dimensions: sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, and gender harassment" (p. 430).

In Fitzgerald's framework gender harassment refers to the broad range of verbal and non-verbal behaviours that, although it is not aimed at sexual co-operation, nonetheless conveys insulting, hostile and degrading attitudes about women. This is the most widespread form of harassing behaviour, particularly in non-traditional workplaces. Unwanted sexual attention includes a wide range of verbal and non-verbal behaviours that are offensive, unwanted, and unreciprocated. These two categories form the so-called 'hostile environment' used in legal terminology. Sexual coercion constitutes the extortion of sexual co-operation in return for job-related considerations (the *quid pro quo* in legal terminology).

Unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion are easier to identify, as there are sexual undertones (and often overtones) present. Gender harassment is harassment that is not sexual, but serves to enforce traditional gender roles and control violation of those roles (by both women and men) (Miller, 1997). Miller (1997) identified five manifestations of gender harassment: resistance to authority (e.g. slower co-operation with women superiors), constant

scrutiny (e.g. to catch a woman making a mistake, after which the incident is used to criticise the abilities of women in general), gossip and rumours (e.g. about sexual activity of woman), sabotage (e.g. of equipment to make life difficult for women), and indirect threats (which were mentioned in surveys). Rosen & Martin (1998) showed that gender harassment in the US Army, despite it being regarded as the milder form of sexual harassment, was seen as a chronic and serious environmental stressor for many women.

2) *Prevalence of sexual harassment*

Studies indicate that one in every two women will be subjected to sexual harassment during her academic or working life (Fitzgerald, 1993). The prevalence rates are higher in workplaces where women have traditionally been under-represented, i.e. non-traditional occupations (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Fitzgerald, 1993).

Studies on the prevalence of sexual harassment are often difficult to interpret, as various writers have pointed to the phenomenon that many individuals who experience sexually offensive behaviour fail to acknowledge that they have been sexually harassed. This phenomenon is widespread in the military: one study found that only 30% of women and 8% of men who experienced sexually harassing behaviours acknowledged that they had actually experienced sexual harassment (Rosen & Martin, 1998). The same occurs on South African campuses (Braine, Bless & Fox, 1995; Mayekiso & Bhana, 1997). Non-contact harassment appears to be interpreted, or labelled, less often as sexual harassment (Wilson, 2000).

Studies in the US Military found that sexual harassment rates ranging from 64% to 85% (Hay & Elig, 1999; Pryor, 1995; Rosen & Martin, 1998, 2000). Prevalence rates in the US Military are consistently and significantly higher than that of the civilian average (Nantais & Lee, 1999). South African data on this score is scarce. One study conducted in 1997 on women in the South African Department of Defence (DoD) found that 47.8% of the women surveyed had experienced or observed at least one type of sexual harassment (DoD, 1997).

Sexual harassment is not only the domain of the military. Martin (1990) reported that 63% of policewomen studied experienced sexual harassment while working. Braine et al. (1995) cited evidence of widespread sexual harassment on South African university campuses. Their

finding of race differences in defining sexual harassment was particularly interesting, and it may have implications for the present study. White women experienced more sexual harassment than African and Indian students, which led the authors to speculate that African students, in general, may tend to acknowledge the existence of sexual harassment far less than other groups.

It has long been suggested that minority women would be more likely than non-minority women to experience sexual harassment (MacKinnon, 1979). However, while numerous studies supported this (cited in Bergman & Drasgow, 2003), others supported the hypothesis that no differences exist across race (Piotrkowski, 1998).

3) *Consequences of sexual harassment*

The consequences of sexual harassment included job loss, decreased morale and absenteeism, decreased job satisfaction, damage to interpersonal relations at work, problems with relationships outside work, and a decrease in the psychological and physical health and well-being of female workers (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2001; Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Fitzgerald, 1993; Pryor, 1995). Pryor (1995) classified the effects into four clusters: productivity problems, attitudes towards the organisation, emotional reactions, and relations with the family. Organisational consequences of sexual harassment in the US Navy usually lie in the realm of lost productivity, e.g. sick calls and unintended leave, or reduced individual and work group productivity (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994).

4) *Context of sexual harassment*

Fitzgerald et al. (1995) proposed that two complimentary psychological processes are involved in creating the context for experiences of sexual harassment.

- *Organisational context*

Fitzgerald et al. (1995) argue that “sexual harassment arises largely from organisational conditions that facilitate its existence, not from individual deviances” (p. 439). Three aspects of organisational culture that give rise to greater incidence of sexual harassment, were

identified (Hulin, Fitzgerald & Drasgow, cited in Fitzgerald et al., 1995), namely the risk faced by victims who complain, the likelihood that their complaints will not be taken seriously, and the probability that offenders will not be sanctioned appropriately. Pryor, LaVite & Stoller (1993) showed that lenient management norms are related to higher levels of sexual harassment, and Bergman, Langhout, Palmieri, Cortina & Fitzgerald (2002) demonstrated that organisations that do not tolerate sexual harassment are associated with lower levels of sexual harassment. In the military in particular, organisational practices were shown to affect directly the incidence of harassment (Hunter-Williams, Fitzgerald & Drasgow, 1999).

- **Personal differences**

Environmental conditions only account for a proportion of sexual harassment cases; the individual propensity to harass women is also significant (Pryor & Stoller, 1994). Pryor and his colleagues (Pryor & Stoller, 1994; Bargh, Raymond, Pryor & Strack, 1995) have described the individual characteristics that contributed to the occurrence of sexual harassment. Pryor et al. (1993) also demonstrated that such an individual proclivity to harass can be either facilitated or inhibited by environmental norms.

5) *Locating sexual harassment*

Earlier models of sexual harassment were developed in accordance with specific psychological theories (Garrett & Thomas-Peter, 1992), and included the Natural/Biological model, the Organisational model, the Socio-cultural model (Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982), the Social interaction/Social perception model (Abbey, 1982), and principles from cognitive psychology (e.g. automaticity/misinterpretation) (Bargh & Raymond, 1995). The Natural/Biological model assumes that sexual harassment and other forms of sexual expression are simple manifestations of natural attraction between people. Tangri et al. (1982) found little evidence to support this explanation. The Organisational model assumes that sexual harassment is the result of opportunity structures within organisations (i.e. a hierarchy that gives harassers legitimate power to coerce lower status people). This model, although it does consider the role of organisational power differences, does not take into account the gendered power differences in broader society. The Socio-cultural model links

sexual harassment to the differential distribution of power/status between the sexes in society in general. Sexual harassment is viewed as a mechanism for maintaining male dominance over women, both at work and in broader society. The Social interaction/perception and the cognitive models (Abbey, 1982; Bargh & Raymond, 1995) focus more on individual characteristics, and fall short of explaining the role of gender-based power differences in society.

Following on the socio-cultural model, other authors have located sexual harassment in the broadly feminist analysis of gender and power dynamics (Edley & Wetherell, 1995), arguing that sexual harassment emanates from power differences between men and women at the socio-cultural level and functions to maintain these differences at the organisational level (Rospenda, Richman & Nawyn, 1998). Within this approach authors see sexual harassment as a form of violence against women, used by men (as the privileged group) to sustain their dominance (Connell, 1995). The term violence may be problematic, though, as the majority of harassment is not physically violent but rather reflects intrusive and unwanted sexual attention from which there is frequently no viable escape (Fitzgerald, 1993). Understanding violence against women as overt acts of physical aggression does not give adequate weight to non-violent acts of harassment. It is the full spectrum of sexual harassment that functions as an agent of social control, which arises from and reinforces women's subordinate position in society. It defines women as objects, turns them into victims, and frequently changes their lives (Fitzgerald, 1993). In terms of this approach, sexual harassment acts as an agent of maintaining male dominance over women.

In contrast to the overt violence of extreme sexual harassment (assault, rape), Miller (1997) focuses on gender harassment as men's protest against women in the military. She argues that, although men, structurally, have power in the military (the majority of male personnel hold higher positions), they perceive women as the more powerful group, and act as the oppressed group. As they fear expressing their objections openly, they resort to indirect forms of protest that target women, but is not sexual. Thus they engage in gender harassment rather than sexual harassment.

Miller (1997) argues that gender harassment emanates from a resistance to change in the social power relations in the workplace. It is argued here that the purpose of behaviour within

the broader scope of sexual harassment is the subjugation of women (especially through coercion and assault), while behaviours that reflect gender harassment aim to express resistance. The motivation for resistance will differ between people and contexts, and may refer to changes in power or status (e.g. the equalisation of the respective positions of men and women), changes in traditional sex roles, and changes in work culture and associated masculine identities.

Miller's (1997) argument may have particular significance for the South African situation, as many members of the SAN do feel powerless to resist social changes. There is widespread acknowledgement in the SAN that it is the politicians (outsiders) who make decisions. Military personnel may not protest (e.g. strike), and have very little other control over their own environment, with few formal channels to vent their frustration. In such a situation, then, it is understandable that gender harassment may occur.

However, not all theorists of gender relations agree that sexual harassment actually emanates from the power differences between women and men, as seen in the occurrence of same sex harassment, or female to male harassment. The Sex-role spillover model (Gutek, 1985), for instance, maintains that sex-role socialisation spills over into the organisational environment. Gutek (1985) proposes that gender-role expectations are carried over into the workplace for three reasons: Firstly, gender identity (and its associated gender role) is a more basic cognitive category than work role; secondly, women may feel more comfortable enacting stereotypical sex roles, especially if they believe it will foster greater acceptance at work; and thirdly, men may feel more comfortable falling back on the more familiar role relationships outside work (e.g. spouse, lover, parent) when interacting with women at work. In this sense, workers express behaviours or other attributes expected from them based on their sex (or sex role). For example, the male sex role encourages dominance and aggressiveness, whereas the female sex role encourages subordination and submissiveness.

One outcome of the gender socialisation process may be to create an environment in which harassing behaviours are consistent with the expectations associated with the male sex role (Firestone & Harris, 2003). This has two implications: Firstly, the work environment can be sexualised even if there are no women present, as gender-segregated work environments call attention to gender, and thus men use the work environment to define their own version of

masculine identity, in opposition to the other (feminine). Secondly, in a highly sexualised work environment, sexual harassment can be seen as a direct consequence of sex-role spill-over into the workplace, arising from the gender-based expectations for behaviour (Gutek, Cohen, & Konrad, 1990). Some environments are more likely to become highly sexualised, e.g. where women have male supervisors in male dominated workplaces, and where men have a greater majority in numbers (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998).

Feminist analysis regards sexual harassment as resistance to the emerging power or status of women, and as a mechanism to maintain the relative power differences between men and women. Sexual harassment can also be seen as a type of resistance to change in the workplace – in other words, as a mechanism to maintain the masculine culture of the work environment.

Many work environments, including the military, are masculine constructions of the workplace. Threatening changes to the masculine nature of work result in systematic efforts to exclude others and to sustain the definition of the 'job' as a masculine occupation (Cockburn, 1991). The entrance of women, and the associated presence of sexual harassment, can be seen as the result of men's resistance to the change in the masculine identity of their workplace. For example, the masculinity that defines military groups is defined in contrast to the other (i.e. feminine) (Morris, 1996). Men then engage in harassment to maintain the masculinity of their culture, even if (or specially if) their units are integrated. As masculinity in the military culture is never secure, it must be continuously demonstrated (Barrett, 1996). Messerschmidt (1993) demonstrated how bad behaviour is a resource for accomplishing masculinity, for separating the self from all that is female. This is more likely to happen in situations where men's masculinity risks being questioned (Messerschmidt, 1993).

Even though sexual harassment can be seen as simply resisting the change of the masculine culture of the workplace, gender power differences do play a role – simply being a man confers enough social power to encourage men to harass women.

Pryor, Giedd & Williams (1995), while supporting the argument of sexual harassment as an expression of power or hostility, warn that it is not always about sex and power or resistance. Some instances of sexual harassment may reflect social awkwardness or the lack of social

skills in men who have romantic interests in the women they encounter at work. Such men have no proclivity for sexual exploitation (Brewer, 1992, cited in Pryor et al., 1995). Other instances of sexual harassment may occur due to insensitivity to social cues, where men cannot differentiate circumstances where sexual behaviour is inappropriate (Wyer, 1992, cited in Pryor et al., 1995). In the military environment, two groups of men are more likely to be accused of harassment: Older men, who may not have the necessary skills to communicate appropriately with women, and younger men with a macho self-image, who have difficulties relating to women in a work setting (Schneider & Schneider, 1988).

(c) Other subtle ways of undermining women

A number of other mechanisms to resist the integration of women in the workplace have been identified. They include boundary management, which refers to the separation of women and men both physically and socially, and differential work allocation by individual supervisors (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Paternalism is a further powerful yet subtle way for men to extract submission from women in exchange for acceptance or protection against overt resistance or even sexual harassment (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

2.4.4. Intrapersonal manifestations

The relative deprivation theory provides another framework for understanding the intrapersonal perceptions of gender integration as a threat. This theory proposes that individuals evaluate their social identity by referring to other people or groups in society. When such a comparison produces an unfavourable result, the individual is likely to experience discontent, which may motivate conflict, protest, and even militancy (Durrheim, Foster & Tredoux, 1995). Relative deprivation arises when people perceive a discrepancy between the status that their group currently has, and the status they believe they should be enjoying. It is this gap between 'attainment' or 'achievement' and 'expectations' that lies behind social discontent and prejudice (Brown, 1995). Deprivation is always relative, as social, and not objective, standards are used. It is the perception of relative deprivation that determines collective group reactions to felt injustice – which refers to the perception that one's own group is not doing as well as one believes it should be doing.

Two kinds of comparisons inform people's expectations (Brown, 1995): Temporal comparison occurs when individuals compare their present position with the recent past (in terms of gains/losses made by their group) to their expected position in the future (which is based on past experiences). Inter-group comparison refers to the position of an individual or group relative to the position of similar or other relevant groups. This generates expectations about how well individuals think the in-group should be doing. As subjective norms are used, the absolute standing of a group is not important, but its relative position is. Evaluation can also be distinguished on two levels (Brown, 1995): Egoistic relative deprivation refers to the deprivation felt by an individual who compares his or her personal situation with that of another; fraternal relative deprivation refers to the positions of one's own group in relation to those of other groups.

The relative deprivation theory stresses the role of affective components alongside rational cognitions. The cognitive component (beliefs) comes from making a comparison and then deciding whether a group is relatively deprived or not. The affective component involves how important the belief is to the person. If the dimension of comparison is more important, an individual will attach more affect to that belief (Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). South African studies suggest that the affective component of relative deprivation plays a greater role in the motivation for protest action than do cognitive components (De la Rey & Raju, 1996).

Most studies on relative deprivation have been conducted with ethnic groups (Brown, 1995). A South African study (Van Dyk & Nieuwoudt, 1990), for instance, investigated the experience of relative deprivation when individuals examined the changes in their life circumstances over time. They concluded that "relative deprivation occurs when people feel dissatisfied because their circumstances have deteriorated over time and they feel they are going to deteriorate even more in future" (p. 514). This was seen as a typical reaction of members of a majority group to the increased social mobility of members of a minority group in the same society. In that study, White women believed that their own position has deteriorated over time (in comparison to Black people), that the improvement of other groups' positions was at the expense of their own groups, and that their own future opportunities would be blocked because of it. That study had been done in the period leading up to the

dismantling of apartheid, and highlighted the effect of changes in the macro-environment on individual perceptions.

The emergence of women as equals in the military, and particularly in the SAN, provides men with changing expectations of their own status in comparison to that of women. The threat that they may experience as a result could lead to individualised expressions of resistance. This theme will be explored further in Chapter 6.4.

2.4.5. Adaptation and support

Although the resistance of men towards the gender equalisation of the workforce has stimulated the interest of scholars and researchers, it is not the only response. Some men support working women's ascent, while others, recognising its inevitability, have learned to adapt to it. Some men support and ally themselves with women co-workers. They may, in turn become targets of resistance, though, when other men respond to their 'betrayal of men' by denigrating them as 'mama's boys' or 'women' and questioning their masculinity (Cockburn, 1991).

2.5. Women's Experience of the Workplace

The previous sections have focussed on male power, and women's oppression. When dealing with gender issues, the hegemony of male superiority poses a danger that the voice of the oppressed – the experiences of women – will be drowned. This section will examine working women's experiences of the obstacles of, and their adaptation to, the male dominated world of work. It is aimed at a more personal level, as women's experiences with organisational barriers and co-workers have already been dealt with to some extent in the previous sections.

2.5.1. The price of employment in traditionally male occupations

Jacobs (1989, cited in Martin & Jurik, 1996) observed that the open door for women into the workplace is actually a revolving door. Many women choose to adapt to the demands of the male work organisations by leaving, although data on turnover rates for women and men in traditional male occupations in the USA appear inconsistent (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Many of

these women seek alternative or part-time employment, or find themselves in the service sector, which is traditionally seen as a more appropriate form of employment for women. Other women do not leave the organisation, but request re-assignments that are more comfortable (in terms of work-hours, or levels of danger) (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

Morris' (1998) interviews with Harvard Women MBA's after 25 years revealed the high price exacted by success in male dominated corporations. Half of the women in that study admitted to their marriages breaking up, often due to the conflicting demands of work and relationships. Women consistently had to work harder, repeatedly proving themselves, and consistently had to achieve a higher standard than men, in order to compete. For some, the behaviour and attitudes of their sexist employers became so bad that they eventually resigned. Martin & Jurik (1996) similarly described the price paid by women lawyers: some had to choose settings and specialities deemed more appropriate for women, others delayed or avoided marriage and children, while others left the legal profession altogether.

Women often have to change the way they behave by adapting to the requirements of a masculine organisational culture. One study of women executives in Fortune 1000 companies (Ragins et al., 1998) found a few ways in which women had broken through the glass ceiling: they earned promotion by consistently exceeding performance expectations, repeatedly proving their ability, frequently over-performing, and re-establishing their credibility in each new work situation. They had to learn about and adopt the 'male managerial model', which incorporates masculine styles and characteristics. This often created the double bind³ mentioned earlier – to be successful, women have to be seen as effective (masculine model), but at the same time may not be seen as lacking in femininity.

2.5.2. Dealing with conditions of acceptance

(a) The double bind

The literature (cf. Martin & Jurik, 1996) reveals two general ways in which women can adapt to the double bind: Some women, often those uncomfortable with the rigors of the male

³ The impact of the double bind here refers to negative psychological outcomes, rather than negative career consequences.

dominated environment (Martin, 1980) succumb to the male work culture, and accept the (male) constructions of femininity ('paternalistic bargain') to acquire men's protection and acceptance. They then reproduce the cultural notions of emphasised femininity (e.g. passive, supportive, emotional), and enact gender-appropriate roles (e.g. mother, sister, seductress) (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Acceptance and protection is thus traded for restrictive work assignments, limited roles, and subjugated status.

Other women, in contrast, adapt to the standards of gendered organisations demonstrating their competence by emulating culturally dominated forms of masculine work behaviour (in other words, acting like stereotypical men) (Martin & Jurik, 1996). However, women who demonstrate their equality to male co-workers through 'masculine' behaviour risk facing negative stereotypes (e.g. lesbian) that imply they are not real women (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Competency and equality is thus traded for decreased femininity. Both cases illustrate the extensive power of organisations to mould its workers.

(b) Identification

Another mechanism of dealing with the double bind is identification with a specific group or ideology. Identification with a group demonstrates loyalty and belonging, and is an attempt at gaining acceptance. Martin & Jurik (1996) describe how some policewomen identify with the police work culture, seeking acceptance by being more professional, aggressive, loyal, street orientated and macho than men are. As such women are still criticised for not being real women, this does not always solve the double bind. Some women adopt work-related attitudes similar to men of their race-ethnic group, suggesting that identification with the perspective of the dominant group is a mechanism that subordinates use to cope with discrimination (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

Most women, though, do not fall comfortably in either 'category' of adaptation. Many seek alternative ways of constructing femininity to make it more compatible with images of competent job performance – for example, by presenting themselves as 'professional' (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

(c) Impression management

Self-presentation is important in developing a balanced adaptation to the double bind. This is done through impression management – the “interactional presentation of self” (Howard & Hollander, 1997, p. 98). Quite simply put, individuals present particular selves to particular others for particular reasons. For example, expectations held by women job applicants about the gender role attitudes of male interviewers strongly influenced how these women dressed for the interviews and what gender role attitudes they expressed during the course of the interview (Von Baeyer, Sherk & Zanna, 1981). The use of dress and appearance (and other cultural symbols) is an important tool in self-presentation.

The role of dress and appearance as symbols of identity (masculine and feminine) is an important mechanism that women use to convey meaning. The structural position of women in a patriarchal society may lead women to use clothing in a defensive and inauthentic way (Guy & Banim, 2000), i.e. dressing according to the demands of men, and not as an expression of themselves. Some women may use it to desexualise the workplace interaction, while others again may use it to project power and authority. Clothing can also become a metaphor for organisational belonging (Arthur, 1998), symbolising identification with or alliance to a specific group.

2.5.3. Personal-work-family conflicts

(a) Internal role conflicts

The individual attributes of gendered identity and behaviour are learned in childhood through the processes of social learning. This socialisation process is constantly reinforced by the mass media (Morgan, 1982) and by perceived societal values, which serve to maintain the existing social order. Such sex-role stereotyping moreover stays tenaciously unchanged over long periods of time and across cultures (Prinsloo, 1992).

Societal values and expected behaviours create multiple and conflicting roles. Personal aspirations for promotion may come into conflict with parental responsibilities, and a societal value that puts women there as primarily for childbearing and child rearing may create inner

conflict, as professional ambition becomes incongruent with the expectations of others (and internalised expectations as well). The International Labour Organisation has identified social attitudes and cultural biases as major factors discriminating against women and holding them back from attaining higher-level jobs (Wirth, 1998).

(b) Work-family conflicts

Working mothers need to take more time off work, or to work flexitime to meet their parental responsibilities. As previously discussed, this has a negative effect on their career advancement. Some women counter these demands by delaying the creation of families until they are established in their career, or avoid having them altogether (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

Single parents face a different conflict. Economic necessity creates multiple role-demands, i.e. being a worker and a parent at the same time. It has been argued that single mothers would experience more stress from family role-demands, due to their greater socialisation to family roles, whereas single fathers would experience more stress from work-related role-demands due to their socialisation as breadwinners (Heath & Orthner, 1999).

The threat posed by the growing number of single parent families and the lack of safe and suitable childcare facilities in South Africa has already been identified as a particular concern for the participation of women in the military (DoD, 1997; Heinecken, 1998a; Motumi, 1999).

2.6. Conclusion

This chapter has shown that, in spite of advances to support women's equal participation in the workforce, they still face discrimination in many spheres. In South Africa, since 1994, women may be totally equal on paper, but in reality still face employment discrimination, differentiation, and segregation.

The reasons for such inequality were initially arguments that emphasised the innate differences between women and men, which allegedly place women in a subordinate position to men. Feminist theorising argued that this inequality is located in the power structures of society rather than in biological differences. The concept of patriarchy was shown to be

especially relevant in understanding the structure of society that maintains this 'rule of men'. Changes in society in the late 20th century have, however, had an impact on the power relations between the genders, challenging the legitimacy of patriarchy. The political changes in South Africa further created opportunities for different discourses of masculinities to vie for dominance, thereby creating a society in transition, which allows for potential changes in the power relations between women and men. However, in spite of political advances, men do not appear to be ready to give up power so easily. Men respond to the advances of women by resisting on multiple levels, which serves to maintain the traditional power relations.

Two forms of subtle organisational resistance were discussed, both with particular relevance to the military. Firstly, senior appointments in the SANDF may be perceived as tokens – satisfying the visual demand of integration – thereby creating the danger of the organisation not following through with full gender integration. Secondly, the military has a well-defined corporate culture, with organisation-specific demands (e.g. presenteeism) that are rewarded. It further closely controls the ways of expressing corporate culture, through prescribing uniforms and military customs.

Two forms of subtle interpersonal resistance were also discussed; again both have particular relevance to the military. Firstly, men resist through conflicting expectations for acceptance. Women need to display masculine characteristics to achieve career success, but also has to display feminine characteristics for personal acceptance. Secondly, sexual harassment serves to maintain male dominance over women; it could also serve as an expression of men's construction of their workplace and/or own identity. The reports of widespread sexual harassment in other armed forces make this particularly germane to the SAN.

Women in formal employment face obstacles that include dealing with men's conditions for acceptance, their own role conflicts, and family concerns. Individual advancement in traditionally male environments comes at a price for most women. Women need to deal with the so-called 'double bind' of conflicting expectations, by defining their identity at work. One way of achieving this is through identification with their male co-workers or the organisational culture. Impression management is another powerful tool, and the role of dress and appearance are also important in reflecting identity, by invoking a particular gender identity, suppressing another, or expressing identification with a particular group (e.g. through

the use of corporate uniforms). Military women face further obstacles, in that their choices to control their impression are constrained by the military rules for prescribed dress.

This chapter examined the situation of women in the formal workplace. The next chapter will examine the specific context – both nationally and within the military sphere – that led to and influenced the full integration of women into the SA Navy.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER THREE: CONTEXT OF THE STUDY: GENDER INTEGRATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN NAVY FLEET

3.1. Introduction

This chapter will argue that the integration of women in the Navy was influenced by three broad developments in modern history: the human rights movement, the international debate and experience of gender integration in the armed forces, and local (South African) political developments. The advent of the human rights movement and its equity thrust on modern society has influenced the international debate on equality for women at work, and spilled over into the military domain (Robinson, 1991). This in turn has influenced public opinion, which brought about the opening of the military to women. Their experiences, documented (often sensationally) in the media, further influenced public opinion, creating a feedback mechanism that took the movement forward. The realities of the labour market also played their role in that armed forces needed to recruit women to fill posts (Smith & McAllister, 1991).

The issue of women in the military consequently became important, and remained topical, through the international debate around the experiences of women in the armed forces. It also received much media attention, as the military is traditionally seen as a quintessentially masculine domain. The ferocity of the debate against the inclusion of women in the military serves as an indicator of the resistance women face, and will be discussed in more detail below. Within the SA context, the international debate too served to inform the arguments of SA men in the situation under investigation.

Political developments in South Africa in the 1990's were strongly influenced by the human rights movement, as the changing political dispensation dragged the country from its status as pariah to one of regional leader. A new government with a strong focus on equal opportunity paved the way for women to participate fully in society, as well as in the military (White Paper on Defence, DoD, 1996). In support of this argument, the South African political situation will be discussed briefly. The South African Navy (SAN) will then be introduced,

and the organisation – as the context of this study – will be described briefly. Lastly, we will discuss the position of women in the Navy.

3.2. Women in the Military

3.2.1. Modern developments

Throughout modern history, in times of national emergency, women have served in the military either in official or unofficial capacities. There they have fulfilled the traditional support functions of the military, e.g. cooking and nursing. The First World War saw the advent of women engaging in the 'paper war' – filling administrative functions to release men for fighting (Hoiberg, 1991). These roles expanded during World War Two, with women filling a large number of non-combat roles, including nursing, flying, driving, communications and technical jobs (Hoiberg, 1991). After each war, the women were usually demobilised, and only called on to serve when the next war necessitated their services. Until the end of the Second World War, the purpose of women in the armed forces was to free up men to fight on the front lines.

A number of changes followed in the 1970's and 1980's, some forced by the labour market, others by emerging Human Rights legislation. For example, the end of conscription and the introduction of the all volunteer force in the USA in 1973 created opportunities for women to participate in more non-traditional jobs, although most were concentrated in the traditional fields of administration, medicine and communications (Hoiberg, 1991). Nonetheless, women were still excluded from combat roles. The same evolution took place in most westernised countries.

This happened as the changing labour market forced states without compulsory military service to seek greater female recruitment. It became increasingly difficult to attract young people into the armed services, coupled with the demographic trough during the 1990's as the proportion of people in the 18-24 age group diminished. Technological developments meant that the armed forces had to recruit people with the ability to master such technologies. They further had to retain the people they had trained, given the competitive nature of the public and private labour market (Smith & McAllister, 1991). The need to recruit and retain women

in the armed forces was not always accepted by all, though, and legislation was sometimes required to ensure progress.

The enactment of human rights and equal opportunity legislation during the 1980's (in Australia, Canada and Norway, for instance) furthered the cause for women in the armed services, and led to the opening up of all non-combat career fields, and in some cases, all combat fields as well. This did not come easily, and a number of landmark court cases were necessary to enforce human rights legislation in the military, as happened, for example, with Canada's Human Rights Tribunal ruling of 1989 (Robinson, 1991).

In contrast to the cautious approach of some countries (e.g. USA, Australia and Britain), the Scandinavian and Benelux countries opened all combat positions to women in the 1980's (Barry 1993), although at present women still only participate in small numbers (Hoiberg, 1991; Royal Swedish Navy, 1996; Stuart-Mason, 1992). These changes did not happen universally and in some countries (e.g. Israel, France) the debate on women in the armed forces is far from settled (Heineken, 2000). Segal (1995) argues that women's participation in the military should not be viewed as a pattern of gradual advancement, but rather as cyclical: In times of war their roles expanded, followed by a scaling down of their roles in peacetime.

3.2.2. The debate against women in the armed forces

The debate against the inclusion of women in the military is an expression of the resistance of men to this development. It is essentially a debate about gender ideologies. The application of gender ideologies to the debate on women in the military has been thoroughly deconstructed (see Peach, 1997, for an example); however, it still informs the opinions – and therefore the 'intellectual sources' for resisting women – of men in the military and outside it.

The debate is usually expressed in terms of 'practical concerns'. In addition, it is often emotional, as it challenges deeply held assumptions and beliefs about the nature of war, women and men, and the military. The debate raises competing concerns – of defence capabilities and national security, gender equality and justice, and family and citizen responsibilities (Peach, 1996). There is a comprehensive body of writing on the subject of women and war, but the debate on the subject of sending women into war (which is the

purpose of the armed forces) lies outside the scope of this thesis. In order to create the background for the current study, the more salient arguments will briefly be introduced, though, and where appropriate we will refer to relevant research on the individual arguments.

Opponents to women's participation in the military (especially in combat branches) follow a number of arguments based on differences between men and women (biological and psychological), social/societal values, and military (security) and practical concerns. One theme that permeates these arguments is the role of gender ideology, which seeks to perpetuate the traditional understanding of male and female roles.

Before the individual arguments can be presented, two myths described in feminist literature, which partly explain the resistance against women in the military, must be brought to light, as they underlie some of the arguments in the debate (Peach, 1996): The myth of the masculinity of war maintains that war is manly, and that therefore only men can or should wage it, thus leaving no place for women in the military. A variant of this argument comes from society's stereotyping of the military. Parents send their sons off to the military to 'become a man'. When women participate in the military, they invade this elite male testing ground, and threaten society's concept of achieved manhood.

The myth of protection describes the belief that the purpose of men fighting wars is to protect women. Because some men believe that woman, as the weaker sex, must be protected by men (who are the stronger sex), they experience confusing incongruence when confronted with images of women soldiers.

Women's entrance into the military puts this masculinity under pressure, and is countered with strong resistance in both direct and subtle forms. The arguments against women in the military, manifested as 'practical concerns', can broadly be divided into three groups: essentialist arguments about the differences between women and men, arguments about security concerns, and arguments about acceptance and resistance.

(a) **Essentialist arguments**

1) *Biological differences*

- **Physical strength**

The argument on biological differences points out that the military occupation has historically been a physical occupation, including long marches and carrying heavy equipment. One argument against women is that they lack the physical strength to lift and carry heavy equipment, and to do long marches with heavy weaponry. Although this difference in strength is widely accepted, it can be countered by the argument that strength is not the only criteria for combat jobs, and that not all men are strong enough either. It is therefore argued that not all women can be excluded simply because some of them cannot meet the criteria (Robinson, 1991). The advances in modern technology further require different strengths, allowing people of lesser physical ability to fill combat posts successfully (Barry, 1993).

Research accepts that, in general, women are not as strong as men. However, women who decide to attend US military academies were found to perform significantly better, on a number of physical tests, than women in the general population (Baldi, 1991). It would appear that women, at least those who choose to join the US officer corps, are people who are interested in physical activity, and therefore self-select themselves to military service. Further research at US military academies indicates that women improve significantly more during fitness training than the men do, and that the gap between the fitness scores of the sexes has narrowed significantly over the past decade (Baldi, 1991), de-emphasising the difference between the sexes in fitness and related strength.

- **Health concerns**

A second argument based on biological differences uses the higher incidence of health-related conditions among women as excluding criteria. They claim that higher sick reports would undermine combat readiness, as more soldiers would be unavailable for deployment. Ironically, Treadwell (1954, cited in Hoiberg, 1991) reported that the US Surgeon General at

the time considered the higher use of health care by service women as desirable preventive medicine!

Military statistics follow those of the civilian health sector, with more women reporting with health concerns than men, even after pregnancy-related visits were statistically controlled (Hines, 1991; Hoiberg, 1993; Pierce, 1997; Schwerin & Sack, 1997). The sick calls are not necessarily related to specific female concerns, though, as shipboard women made more sick calls than men in every diagnostic category (Hughey & Patel, 1997). However, there has been a decrease in the difference over the past years (Hoiberg, 1991), and although women on ships still visit the sickbay more than men do, it is less than the comparable rates for civilian women (Nice & Hilton, 1994). However, findings that active-duty US servicewomen have more health problems than those in the reserves or guard (Pierce, 1997) may point to the difficulties confronted by women when deployed in theatres of war. A recent study found that the SAN experienced the same situation, with women on deployed ships visiting the sickbay more than twice as often as men, even when female-specific conditions were controlled (Van Wijk, 2002). The challenging social environment and the lack of adequate hygiene have been suggested as possible explanations (Van Wijk, 2002). Parenthood is also associated with increased health problems (Pierce, 1997), further suggesting that social factors may play a role in the higher incidence of health complaints.

The argument that the unavailability of women due to medical reasons will result in lower unit readiness is balanced by findings that, although women lost more workdays due to health-related reasons (pregnancy included), men lost more workdays for disciplinary reasons. Overall, in the US military, women missed fewer workdays than men (Olson & Stumph, 1978, cited in Rosenfeld, Thomas, Edwards, Thomas & Thomas, 1991). The argument of women's increased risk due to health problems does carry weight in the case of critical persons. For example, female US Air Force (USAF) pilots were grounded more than twice as often as men (McGlohn, King, Butler & Retzlaff, 1997), suggesting serious implications for mission readiness, as the success of the whole team depends on the performance of the combat pilot.

The effect of menstruation is difficult to determine, but US statistics indicate that little time is lost due to it, and it is mostly considered an inconvenience (in terms of hygiene and privacy) (Barry, 1993). Finally, women had fewer alcohol related problems and a lower incidence of

drug abuse (Raiha, 1986, cited in Schumm, Bell, Palmer-Johnson & Tran, 1994), ultimately rendering them more available for deployment than their male counterparts.

- **Pregnancy**

The third argument based on biological differences revolves around the effect of pregnancy on combat readiness. The argument is that the absence of women due to pregnancy related health concerns or care for small babies would render them unavailable for deployment. This would be to the detriment of the mission readiness of units. Historically, women have been discharged from military service when becoming pregnant, leading to a loss of trained skills by the military and self-esteem by the expectant mothers. The labour market and the high cost of training have changed these policies to ensure that the skills of service women are retained. At present, most service women in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) are generally reassigned or transferred to non-deployed posts or tasks once their pregnancy has been confirmed (cited in Tam, 1998).

The argument about a unit's combat readiness is not only ideological. If a pregnant woman is reassigned, it leaves a vacancy in a close-knit team, resulting in either a higher workload for the remaining team members, or the adjustment to a new person in her place. Absence due to pregnancy is exacerbated by the mother's need to care for the newborn baby (cited in Tam, 1998). Research in the military suggests that there is no difference between men and women in time absent from work, even if pregnancy and post partum convalescence leave are included (Thomas & Thomas, 1994). Mothers of small babies have higher absenteeism rates in the civilian sector, but it is not clear whether this is reflected in the military too. Another often cited but unsubstantiated argument raises the fear that servicewomen would deliberately fall pregnant for secondary gain, most often to avoid deployment. Experience during the First Gulf War did not support this, though, and the claim has widely been dismissed (Barry, 1993; Wojack, 2002).

The issue of pregnancy is not only a concern for the unit, but also for the pregnant woman herself (Tam, 1998): Expectant women often experience a lack of social support, as they are geographically separated from their families, while they also have to cope with new role demands (as both mother and soldier). They often also experience a lack of institutionalised

support. Men may have difficulty dealing with pregnant 'brothers-in-arms', and may even resent it, as it confronts them with their own issues around masculinity and femininity, sex-roles and personal beliefs about men supposedly fighting to protect women and children. The pregnant soldier as a member of a non-traditional occupation may, thus, experience her own role-confusion as both mother and soldier.

Management of pregnancy in the military is a problem that is very much alive at present. The effects of policies (reassignment or evacuation from theatres of war) are unclear, and the effect of the work environment on pregnancies (especially toxic environments during deployment) and unit readiness (after a member has been evacuated) are still matters of concern to armed forces around the world (Davis & Woods, 1999).

2) *Psychological differences*

The arguments on psychological differences follow the same biological deterministic thinking. Men and women are thought to have different emotional responsiveness, different ways of experiencing war stress and coping with it, and different personalities that would make women less suitable for the military environment.

- **Emotional responsiveness**

The argument on emotional responsiveness relies on claims around women's greater emotionality over the menstrual period. However, no research among servicewomen could be found to support this claim. The argument that women cannot cope with the stress of war is often based on experiences where (non-combatant) women were the victims of war and suffered most from it, which cannot be assumed as valid for woman soldiers (Peach, 1997).

War always takes its toll, and the research does indicate that woman soldiers suffer greater distress than men in war (Bar-Tal, Lurie & Glick, 1994) and are consequently more vulnerable to psychiatric disorders (Hines, 1993; Norwood, Ursano & Gabbay, 1997; Pierce, 1997; Wolfe, Brown & Kelly, 1993). However, not all research supports this vulnerability, as other studies (Sutker, Davis, Uddo & Ditta, 1995) found no differences between men and women veterans with regard to post traumatic stress disorder symptoms. Women's vulnerability in

war is strongly influenced by social factors. The stress of having a minority status in the theatre of war might contribute to their stress and vulnerability to trauma, as might the cohesion or climate of the unit they belong to (Norwood et al., 1997). If there is resentment to their presence in the unit, they may be more vulnerable than when there is support and high cohesion.

- **Personality**

The argument that gender differences in personalities make women unsuitable for combat relies on stereotyped perceptions of gender-roles and characteristics – men are aggressive, women are sensitive, men fight wars, while women tend to the home fires. Independent of the definition of personality, there appears to be very little evidence of differences between the personality characteristics of men and women, although their behaviour may be socialised to display gender typologies. Female pilots in the USAF displayed different ‘personalities’ to male USAF pilots, and to educated women in general. However, they were more similar to male pilots than to females in general (King, Retzlaff & McGlohn, 1997). This suggests that certain occupations within the armed forces, e.g. pilots, may share common characteristics typical of their occupational field, transcending gender in favour of career applications.

Recent studies (Rosen, Weber & Martin, 2000) suggest that Army women and men are not polar opposites with regards to positive gender-related personality traits, but rather that they share both masculine and feminine traits, with men having more of the masculine traits, and women more of the feminine.

Developments in modern society have changed the way in which men and women express gender ideologies, but have not always changed the underlying beliefs, and entrenched ideologies are thus now argued in ‘practical’ terms, which are deemed more acceptable.

3) *Arguments regarding security concerns*

Of all public institutions, the military has been particularly resistant to allowing women into their ranks, and has raised so-called practical concerns about national security and combat readiness against women’s participation. Unit cohesion, morale and discipline, operational

readiness and prisoner of war (POW) concerns dominate the debate on the practicalities of women in combat. These arguments are, however, often presented as the public face of deeply held ideologies about the place and roles of women and men.

- Unit cohesion

Unit cohesion, sometimes seen as male bonding, is considered one of the most important determinants of mission success in the military. The argument against women's inclusion suggests that the mere presence of women in a combat group would dilute male bonding and decrease its effectiveness. Cohesion in a group is defined as "a certain closeness, or common attitudes, behaviour, and performance that is lacking in other groups" (Hoiberg, 1991, p. 734). Group solidarity, leadership quality, and adequacy of command and supply channels all affect cohesion. Although demographic homogeneity facilitates the development of cohesion (George, 1971, cited in Rosen, Bliese, Wright & Gifford, 1999), the above definition does not mention any gender effects, and it is suggested that gender only becomes an issue when women initially enter traditionally all-male occupations (Hoiberg, 1991).

The exclusion arguments persist through beliefs that unit cohesion will be negatively influenced by sexual attraction between team members, or that the protective attitude of men towards women will interfere with the task, or that the hierarchy will be undermined, leading to problems with discipline and morale. Earlier studies in the 1970's (cited in Rosen et al., 1999), reported little or no significant effect of women's presence on unit performance or operational capabilities. Other authors also found no evidence that cohesion or male bonding was adversely affected by women's presence in military groups (Devilbiss, 1985). In contrast to the exclusion arguments, there is some evidence that buddy or brother-sister relationships, not romantic attachments, are the norm during field training (Devilbiss, 1985; Moskos, 1985). Members of units with more women reported lower scores on alienation, and higher scores in work-satisfaction (Schumm et al., 1994). Devilbiss (1985) argues convincingly that shared experiences, not shared gender, are the primary mechanism in unit cohesion, and anecdotal evidence suggest that women are included in the "affective bonds that create group cohesion" (Titunik, 2000, p. 248). One temporary drawback of gender integration was the effect of sexual harassment sensitisation on cohesion. A study with US aircrews reported that,

although cohesion in mixed-gender squadrons was very high, some male members felt they had difficulty bonding due to a fear of complaints of sexual harassment (Voge & King, 1997).

Kanter's tokenism hypothesis (1977) posits that if the proportion of women in a workgroup increases, it will have positive organisational outcomes for women. Studies in the US Army (Rosen, Durand, Bliese, Halverson, Rothberg & Harrison, 1996) did not find support for this hypothesis. Rather, it supported a competing hypothesis, the minority-proportion-discrimination hypothesis (Blalock, 1970). In terms of this hypothesis, the numerical increase of a minority group would lead to increased discrimination by the majority group because of the perceived threat of competition. Rosen et al. (1999), using meta-analysis, recently found a consistent negative relationship between the percentage of women in a unit and the level of cohesion of that unit, suggesting that the presence of women does have a negative impact on male bonding. However, another study (Rosen & Martin, 1997) found that gender composition did not affect group cohesion.

A 1997 RAND study (Harrell & Miller, 1997) surveyed active duty personnel to determine their experiences of the effect of gender integration on cohesion. Their findings indicate that gender alone did not appear to erode cohesion, but that other factors, mainly ineffective leadership practices, were the main explanations for units' decreased cohesion levels. Gender only became an issue in units that were characterised as being divided into conflicting groups.

Some arguments relating to diminished or lowered discipline and morale are based on the detrimental effect of fraternisation. Fraternisation in the military refers to relations across ranks that are not within the confines of professional contact. This would include socialising after work, undue familiarity between different levels of the military hierarchy, or sexual relations. It is argued that the presence of women would create opportunities for such fraternisation. Harrell & Miller (1997) did find that service members believed that fraternisation was a problem to morale, but that it was usually dealt with by the chain of command.

Romantic relationships between peers pose a more complex problem. It seems to affect unit cohesion when a couple place their relationship above all else, or when it causes resentment among unit members, based on jealousy, etc. The dissolution of such relationships also have

an effect on the morale of the workgroup / team / unit, especially if it ended on unfavourable terms, and if the relevant individuals still need to work together (Harrell & Miller, 1997). Romantic relationships between peers are a special concern within the closed social and physical environment of naval ships.

Morale, often seen as a function of cohesion, refers to the degree to which group members are enthusiastic about and committed to carrying out the duties of that group (Harrell & Miller, 1997). Gender is one of many issues affecting morale, but interestingly it is not one of the primary factors influencing morale, as indicated by the RAND study mentioned above (Harrell & Miller, 1997). The same study has indicated that leadership plays a far larger role in the morale of the unit, while issues relating to workload were also perceived to have an important effect. In particular, Harrell & Miller (1997) identified three gender issues that could affect morale: sexual harassment, double standards (e.g. different standards for physical fitness), and romantic relationships within a unit.

- Operational readiness

Operational readiness in the military refers to the availability of trained human resources and appropriate logistical resources to execute the function of a unit. Operational readiness is of critical concern in a military force designed to prevent war by always being ready for it. Arguments against women in the military view them as unsuitable due to their diminished availability. Harrell & Miller (1997) constructed a useful definition of readiness that comprises a number of attributes, e.g. availability, experience, and stability.

- Availability

The fact that mothers of young children are more absent from work than their male counterparts in the civilian world (Meisenheimer, 1990, cited in Thomas & Thomas, 1994), gave substance to the argument that the integration of women into the military will decrease operational readiness. To counter that, it can be argued that care of dependants is the responsibility of both mother and father. In support, Thomas & Thomas (1994), using a US military sample, found that parental status, not gender, was associated with more absences due to care of dependants, suggesting that both parents share in this responsibility.

While this is a positive development, it is also true that there are twice as many single parents in the US Navy than in US civil society (Rosenfeld et al., 1991). Single mothers experience more stress than married mothers regarding separation from their children prior to deployments (Kelley, Herzog-Simmer & Harris, 1994), but it is not known if this affects their readiness or work performance. Other studies found no difference between women and men with regard to workable arrangements for care of dependants during short-term or long-term deployments (Pliske, 1988, in Schumm et al., 1994). It is not clear whether this included single parents or not. Heath & Orthner (1999) found that when work-family conflict arises, single parents focus their attention on work-demands over family demands. Members of gender-integrated units indicated that single parents of either gender place a burden on the unit, especially as single fathers are numerically more common than single mothers in the military (Harrell & Miller, 1997).

Harrell & Miller (1997) found that gender integration generally had little effect on the number of personnel available to newly integrated units. They did, however, define three causes of attributed gender-related absences, namely pregnancy, single motherhood, and injury/illness.

- Experience

Harrell & Miller's (1997) study of the effect of gender integration on the levels of experience in units found that, although it takes time to grow senior women in the military, their levels of experience did not pose any problem to unit readiness.

- Stability

Stability refers to the degree to which personnel turnover in units minimised. Gender integration did not seem to play a significant role in this regard (Harrell & Miller, 1997), except in the US Navy, where pregnancy did affect the stability of units to some extent.

The Harrell & Miller (1997) study indicated that military members generally did not believe that gender integration was a key factor in operational readiness, and the presence of women was not perceived to have any significant impact on a unit's readiness.

4) *Prisoner of war concerns*

The POW scenario is frequently used as an argument against women in combat posts. Women are believed to be more at risk of sexual violation, and should therefore not be exposed to potential capture by enemy forces. In addition, the 'natural deference to women' argument fears that enemy threats to women POW's may be used as leverage to make male POW's 'talk' (McManus, 1992). Although military women seemed less concerned with sexual exploitation than did their male counterparts (Nantais & Lee, 1999), a survey of 600 US Aircrew indicated that this was a real concern for the majority of male and female aviators (Voge & King, 1997). Nonetheless, two counter arguments are often offered: the experience of women POW's, and the position of civilian women in war-torn areas.

Rhonda Cornum (Cornum, 1996; McManus, 1992) was one of only two female POW's during the First Gulf War. Her story serves both to highlight the real dangers of war, and the spirit to survive it. After the war, she told a presidential commission how she was sexually violated after her capture (while seriously wounded), but emphasised that she did not believe that her experiences should restrict the roles of women in the armed forces. She believes that her personal experiences taught her that "women behave the same when they are captured as men do" (Cornum, 1996, p. 20).

Civilian women are almost never protected in war, and usually more civilians are killed than combatants (Stiehm, 1996). Cooke (1996) summarises various well-known cases of mass-rape of civilian women in war conditions. Female POW's are therefore not necessarily more at risk than civilian women near the front during wartime. Female POW's may even have a better chance to access medical care (cf. Cornum, 1996) than civilian women, who are often relegated to the status of displaced people. Moreover, military women may actually benefit from the protection that their training affords them, in terms of how to deal with such hostile situations.

(b) **Arguments from experiences of gender integration of the armed forces**

Another 'practical' concern states that neither men nor civilian women will accept women into the military. These arguments are mostly *post facto* – after women did enter certain

spheres – and are a collection of lesser arguments (but not necessarily lesser in impact). It is argued that men will express their resentment against women through harassment. Unequal treatment will ensue, creating more problems, which may be exacerbated by the role of ethnic origin. Other women, partners of military men, will also not accept women in the military. All these arguments received much media attention, and are summarised below.

1) *Sexual harassment*

Sexual harassment in the military has received widespread public attention after a number of high profile cases in the USA (e.g. Tailhook and Aberdeen Proving Ground cases), and figures for the US military do appear to be significantly higher than in the civilian population (Nantais & Lee, 1999). Although the prevalence rates of sexual harassment in the military are high (DoD, 1997; Hay & Elig, 1999; Pryor, 1995; Rosen & Martin, 1998, 2000), there is evidence to suggest that the higher percentage of females in military groups is correlated with lower levels of gender harassment (Rosen & Martin, 1997). The military has responded to the increased profile of sexual harassment by creating channels for complaints, and by instituting awareness and prevention programs. However, in spite of extensive channels for complaints, women are still afraid to file harassment charges against men, mostly due to fears of secondary victimisation (Becker, 2000).

The USN fleet's sexual harassment prevention programs did provide some irony. One USN experience found that men on a specific ship received so many lectures about fraternisation and sexual harassment that at first they were afraid to even talk to the women who subsequently joined the ship (Harrell & Miller, 1997; Waller, 1995).

2) *Unequal treatment*

Unequal treatment is perceived to be a problem, ironically but not unexpectedly, by both men and women. In a study of US aircrews, men believed that women are given all the 'breaks', whereas the women believed that the men get the 'breaks'. Women felt they had to perform at a higher level, and that they needed to do more to prove themselves. Men, too, felt they had to work harder, as standards for the women were lower than for them (Voge & King, 1997).

3) *Ethnicity*

Ethnicity, it is argued, creates an extra handicap, as women from ethnic minorities are doubly disadvantaged. Although this issue has not yet been extensively investigated, one US study has found that service women from different (majority and minority) ethnic backgrounds reported the same perception of their experiences in the armed forces (Rosenfeld, 1994).

4) *Responses of partners*

Negative feelings have also been articulated by the female partners of male employees working in gender-integrated environments. The military has received the greatest share of published opposition from military wives to the inclusion of women in military units. Such opposition was expressed not so much on the grounds of the appropriate occupational roles of men and women, but on the 'social' roles of men and women. Military wives expressed concern that close living and working quarters would invite promiscuity, and that long periods of time spent together might lead to adultery. Their fears were grounded not in questioning the fidelity of their husbands, but in a lack of trust in the 'other women' at work (Grossman, 2000; Hertz, 1996). In her study of USAF men and their wives, Hertz (1996) found strong fears by wives that women integrating into their husbands' units would lead to "relationship triangles" (p. 273). Sexual jealousy and insecurity emerged as an important theme in describing wives' opposition to gender integration. In practice, 30% of female US aircrew surveyed experienced difficulties with the spouses of their male colleagues, mostly due to the jealousy of spouses that their husbands were spending so much time with their women colleagues at work and when deployed (Voge & King, 1997). However, not all wives feel this way, and some proponents argue that the physical environment (lack of privacy and space) and the repetitive and tightly regulated work routine (work, eat, sleep, work, eat, sleep) does not allow for indiscretions (Grossman, 2000).

3.2.3. Motivations of women joining the military

Given all the objections to women's participation in the military, it leaves the question why women would actually want to enter the military. There is a paucity in the literature on the motivation of women wanting to join the armed forces. One approach suggested that woman

recruits would be motivated by occupational concerns and economic advantages, which include relatively high wages, fringe benefits, free health care, and job security (Hoiberg, 1991; Williams, 1989). The military is one of the institutions where equal work does earn equal pay, impacting positively on servicewomen's economic status. Other researchers found different reasons unrelated to pay. Some women were attracted to the military because it offered new and exciting challenges, adventure, structure and discipline, as well as an avenue leading out of low-paying, dead-end jobs, stifling family or community environments, or unsatisfactory relationships (Hoiberg, 1991).

The South African situation suggests that two factors are particularly relevant: opportunity and the employment environment. The South African legal situation has created new opportunities for women by encouraging employers to recruit and retain women through policies of affirmative action. Legislation also enforces equal pay for equal work, and provides some support for family commitments (e.g. maternity leave). The high levels of unemployment in the country also lead women to apply for any position available. Anecdotal evidence suggests that women join the military regardless of whether it was their first choice or not, primarily in order to obtain an entrance into the labour market (Van Wijk, 2005).

3.2.4. Current international situation

The South African experience of gender integration has to be seen in the context of international developments. Three countries have arguably had the most influence on gender integration in the SAN. The SAN developed out of the United Kingdom's Royal Navy (RN), whose philosophy and practices are still mirrored in the SAN. The SAN also has close ties with the Royal Australian Navy (RAN), which mirrors the SAN in age and function (although they are somewhat bigger). Their gender integration preceded that of the SAN, and their experience was extensively used when developing the actual gender integration process of SAN ships. The Navy of the United States of America (USN) received much publicity (often negative) when sending their women to sea, and the subsequent media attention influenced the opinions of South Africans when the SAN, too, sent women to sea.

In 1980, all shore positions in the RN were opened to women (Stuart-Mason, 1992), mostly due to anti-discriminatory legislation enacted during the 1970's. In 1990, motivated chiefly

by the RN's recruiting shortfall, all combat positions (excluding submarines) were opened to women, unleashing an uproar of public dissent as witnessed by a flurry of letters to editors and cartoons in newspapers. Some of the strongest opposition came from Navy wives, objecting "vociferously" to the decision (Editorial, 1990, p. 67).

The RAN had the same experience in 1990 when the decision to open all combat related jobs (excluding submarines) to women met with controversy, which played out in the media (Barry, 1993; RAN, 1993; Smith & McAllister, 1991). Of particular interest was a Senate Inquiry into sexual harassment in 1993. It found that "they (RAN) paid adequate attention to the physical aspects of accommodation at sea, but too little attention to the attitudes of men and women who had to deal with fundamental changes in the way they had lived and worked in the Navy" (Barrie, 1995). The lessons learned by the RAN strongly influenced the SAN's approach to gender integration (Navy Office, SAN, personal communication, 2 August, 2002).

Increased involvement of women in the USN came in the wake of the Human Rights movement, and against the backdrop of anti-discriminatory legislation. However, women's increased participation in the armed forces was also in response to labour market forces, often in opposition to public opinion (Williams, 1989), and women in the Navy experienced high levels of harassment and non-acceptance. Women were allowed on non-combat ships from 1978, and in 1994 the USS Eisenhower was the first combat ship to deploy with significant numbers of women, carrying 400 women out of a crew of 5 000. The media attention on sexual harassment kept the spotlight on the military's efforts to achieve gender equality and harassment free workplaces (Morganthau, 1994; *TIME Magazine*, June 2, 1997) and so, too, influenced the SAN's experience, by forming opinions and hardening the beliefs of sailors serving at sea.

Through these experiences, leadership was consistently seen as a crucial factor in facilitating the successful integration of women into male units. The active support of commanders led to better performance by the women, and better acceptance by the men (Barry, 1993; Rosen et al., 1999). The specific mechanism by which this happens is not clear.

The Israel Defence Force is often (incorrectly) cited as the prime example of gender integration. In spite of conscription for both men and women, women are excluded from

direct combat roles (Hoiberg, 1991; Van Creveld, 2000). Women serve in a separate corps, and mostly in a supportive role to release men for combat duty (Landrum, 1979; Zietsman, 1995a). The protective attitudes of the Israeli men are listed as the reason why women are excluded from combat, although shortages in 'manpower' did necessitate the opening of certain non-traditional careers to women in recent years (Zietsman, 1995b).

Within the SADEC region, women have not made significant inroads into the armed forces. For example, there is only one woman officer in the Malawi Army (Chidzalo, 2001).

To put into perspective the experiences of other navies in relation to the South African situation, a number of differences need to be pointed out. Although the SAN history closely follows that of the RN and the RAN, the motivation for gender integration must be seen as the result of the liberation struggle and social transformation within South Africa in the 1990's. The need was therefore not driven by 'manpower' requirements, but by a human rights focus and a need for equal opportunities. This political environment also placed gender integration within the context of the integration of different armed forces from different political backgrounds, with different time scales than other countries, denying the South African military the luxury of gradual expansion of gender opportunities. The next section will examine the South African political and military situation in more detail.

3.3. The South African Military and the Political Situation

The South African military establishment has a history dating back to the seventeenth century, with the modern military establishment combining aspects of both the late eighteenth century Afrikaner republics' citizen forces ('commando's'), and British regular army units ('regiments').

Between 1948 and 1990, the South African government followed a policy that became known as 'apartheid'. This policy led to unfair political discrimination against a large part of the country's (non-white) population. Popular unrest followed, but was violently suppressed by the state. This gave rise to the creation of the armed wings of political parties who sought to oppose the state's official military force. The apartheid policy also provided for the separate

development of indigenous people, which was enacted through the development of the so-called Independent Homelands⁴, which in theory became independent states.

Resistance against the state's policies became known as the liberation movement. The government's suppression of the liberation movement was accompanied by human rights abuses. The liberation movement's fight against this government oppression embedded a strong human rights culture in its members. When the African National Congress (ANC) came to power in 1994, the Bill of Rights became the centrepiece of the new Constitution.

These political developments in the twentieth century led to the creation of a number of armed forces, which reflected the political situation at the time. The South African Defence Force (SADF) was by far the largest, and was the official armed force of the state (1961-1994). During the 1970's and 1980's, the SADF was involved in military action externally as well as internally. The SADF was a male-centred force, which was accentuated by the male conscription policy during the 70's and 80's. It had a strong ideology of political inspired racial and gender dominance.

The government policy of the Independent Homelands led to the creation of four official defence forces for these four homelands. Thus the Transkei Defence Force, the Ciskei Defence Force, the Venda Defence Force, and the Bophuthatswana Defence Force came into being. They were modelled on the SADF, and were to a large extent trained by the SADF as well. They too were mostly male.

Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) evolved as the military arm of the African National Congress. It was involved in underground activities against the apartheid government and the SADF. This conflict led to a movement in exile, and many of their members were therefore trained in other countries (Africa, Cuba, Eastern Europe). This gave them a different perspective from those who remained in South Africa. Due to MK's ideological position, many women joined its ranks and were trained and utilised with the men (Motumi, 1999).

⁴ The Homelands were geographical areas of land inhabited by specific ethnic groups, where the apartheid government imposed self-rule, and which were expected to act as a state within the geographical state of South Africa. The four homelands each had their own "defence force", while the governments were often seen as aligned with the apartheid government.

The Azanian People's Liberation Army (APLA) evolved as the military wing of the Pan African Congress, and was also involved in underground activities against the apartheid government and the SADF. Like MK, they were also a movement in exile, often trained in other countries, and also incorporated women. Both MK and APLA had a strong culture of fighting for human rights, with its associated promotion of non-sexism (Motumi, 1999).

3.3.1. The changing political dispensation and the creation of a new force

After the apartheid government lifted the ban on free political activity in 1990, there was an acute awareness that previous combatants from all sides of the political spectrum needed to be brought under a central command in a unified force. When the ANC-led government came to power in 1994, a new organisation came into being and was called the South African National Defence Force (SANDF). All serving members of the seven armed forces were incorporated into its structure. The current SANDF consists of four services – the SA Army, the SA Air Force, the SA Navy, and the SA Military Health Services. These services each have their own functions, uniforms, culture and traditions, and operate fairly autonomously from each other (DoD, 2004).

The integration process had a number of implications. Men and women from different backgrounds, with different experiences and different values were brought together. The resultant rich mix of ideas gave form to the expectations of what people wanted their society to look like, which strongly emphasised the introduction of the human rights culture of equality for all (Motumi, 1999). To enhance the visibility of integration, affirmative action programs were launched, and people of colour were promoted to senior positions in the organisation. Representivity, also in terms of gender, became an important goal of the fledgling organisation. This was often in response to the expectations of those members of the new SANDF who had previously fought for equal rights for all people. The new Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) gave further impetus to the program of equal opportunities, and led to the final breaching of the male bastions of exclusivity – specifically, the infantry, armour, air and seaward units (Pienaar, 2004).

Although affirmative action is effective in creating opportunities for women in the workplace, its effectiveness in breaking down stereotypes is questionable, as men may believe a woman is

appointed merely because she is a woman. A survey of officers in the SANDF revealed that 79% of them (91% of white officers, 27% of black officers) believed that affirmative action was undermining the competency and effectiveness of the SANDF (Heinecken, 1998b, 1998c). It is interesting that the greatest number of negative attitudes came from the white officers, who potentially have more to lose. The affirmative action policy, designed to create openings for women in organisations, may create the danger that women who are promoted may be seen as not deserving of the promotion because of the policy.

Gender integration was just one (albeit very visible) part of the total integration of the post-apartheid South African military communities into one parliament-controlled force. The entrance of women into all spheres of the SANDF has to be seen as part of a wider thrust of changes in the focus, policies, practices, and personnel composition of the organisation.

The SANDF developed elaborate policies to guide its conduct, firmly based on the constitution of the country. These policies include references to equal opportunities, racial discrimination, and sexual harassment. In 1997, a Chief Directorate of Equal Opportunities was created, headed by the SANDF's first female general, with the purpose of developing, managing and monitoring equal opportunity initiatives and policies. In the same year, the Gender Forum was established, with the responsibility to establish structures for dealing with service-specific gender issues, to monitor gender discrimination in bases and units, and to identify those barriers that limit women from advancing to higher echelons (Klopper, 2000). Women currently comprise $\pm 20\%$ of the SANDF (DoD, 2004).

In spite of strong formal policies, the rapid pace of integration had one drawback. The speed of the process did not allow for an evolution of involvement, and many aspects of daily interaction were not covered by policy, thus placing the responsibility on individuals and local commanders to deal with unfamiliar situations. As the changes in practice have outpaced the changes in stereotypes and beliefs, traditional beliefs are still pervasively prevalent throughout the military. It has been argued that, given the complexity and sensitivity of the issues surrounding women in the military, South African policy has been remarkable in its simplicity and boldness, perhaps riding roughshod over a number of complex issues, which might have benefited from more in-depth research (Cilliers, Schutte, Heinecken, Liebenberg & Sass, 1997). However, it is suggested that the macro-changes in the country have eased the changes

in the organisational culture – giving it reason and importance (e.g. nation building), and that the sweeping changes in the organisational culture have eased the gender integration process.

In spite of changes in SA society, patriarchy is still the dominant cultural ideology in the SANDF (Motumi, 1999), with a significant number of soldiers endorsing beliefs that women are inferior or that men are naturally more dominant than women (Van Breda, 2002). In contrast to an entrenched patriarchal ideology, the dominant masculinities within the SANDF are in flux (cf. the emergence of public service or support of the African renaissance as alternative ideologies). Coupled with the absence of war, this could imply a toning down of the previous hypermasculinity of the military.

3.3.2. Public opinion

The pace of the changes in the country and in the military have sometimes meant that government policy is ahead of public opinion. One example is found in the Human Science Research Council (HSRC) omnibus survey in 1996, which reported on the question whether military women should be allowed to volunteer for combat duty (Cilliers et al., 1997), and which found that a great number of respondents were against it. Political parties with predominantly white support were more supportive of proposition, whereas only 5% of ANC supporters were in favour. This was surprising, considering the role of women in MK and the strong role of women in the national (ANC-controlled) government. Similar responses were found when analysed by race, with white respondents more supportive than respondents from the other race groups. There was very little difference between the views of men and women.

Three surveys were published on military populations in South Africa. In an opinion survey of DoD women, the majority believed that both genders could fulfil any job or task in the DoD, but there was divided support for combat roles for women (42% said yes, and 40% said no) (DoD, 1997). A survey on the attitudes of officers towards gender integration (Heinecken, 1998b, 1998c) supported this divided opinion (48% were opposed to women in combat roles, 40% were supportive). Women were more supportive than men (57% of women supported the idea, but only 38% of men did). Naval officers were more supportive than officers from other services, possibly due to the fact that naval personnel are less exposed to the horrors of direct combat in wartime. The support of naval personnel was confirmed in another survey

two years later (Van Rensburg, 1999). Support for women in combat has subsequently increased, especially among African members of the DoD (Van Rensburg, 1999). It is interesting that very senior officers were the least likely to believe that there should be a requirement for women to be in combat, and were of the opinion that they should only be utilised in support roles (Van Rensburg, 1999). The role of leaders in forming organisational culture has been discussed previously, and is a point that clearly poses some challenges for the SANDF.

3.3.3. Current situation

Gender integration of the SANDF needs to be seen as part of the macro-developments within SA society – both within the national legislative and military environments. Legislative developments have exerted a strong influence on patriarchal society, priming men in the SAN to accept the improved status and participation of women in civil society. Within the military environment, the integration of races, different political forces, and the restructuring of the military have served to ‘normalise’ the demographics of the force. Gender integration was simply one part of it. It was, in a sense, overshadowed by potentially more sensitive changes, e.g. the integration of previously opposing armed forces and different races.

South African society in the early 20th century is still a society in transition. It is challenging the culture of masculine dominance, and encouraging a culture of equal opportunity. This demands a re-negotiation of identities and especially that of masculinity, which will, in turn, influence the non-acceptance of or adaptation to women in the Navy. This is no quick task, as public opinion tends to trail behind real developments in the military, which may account for resistance and opposition to women in the military. The specifics of the SAN – the context within which such interactions may play itself out – will now be discussed.

3.4. The South African Navy

3.4.1. Brief description of the SA Navy

The SAN has its roots in the United Kingdom’s Royal Navy, as was mentioned earlier, and naval terminology and traditions can usually be traced back to the RN. The SAN came from

humble beginnings, having been formed in 1922, when the Union of South Africa, then a British dominion, created its own seaward defence arm, when three small ships *and its men* were officially commissioned as the South African Naval Service (Goosen, 1973). During the Second World War, the Navy grew dramatically, and it was maintained after the end of the war. On January 1, 1951, it was renamed the South African Navy (Goosen, 1973).

The SAN is a strictly hierarchical organisation, and two distinct groups can be identified, namely officers and ratings. Officers are selected on higher academic ability and performance, undergo intensive training throughout their career, carry more responsibility, and are higher paid than ratings. They form the command cadre of the force. Officers currently comprise $\pm 8\%$ of the Navy. Promotion is attained by training (qualification), experience, and performance.

Ratings are the seamen – doing the hard work onboard the ships, maintaining the equipment in the workshops, firing the weapons and protecting the bases. The lower ranks are grouped under the term junior ratings/rates, the middle ranks grouped under the term senior ratings/rates, and the most senior ranks under the group called warrant officers. The different rank groups have different levels of responsibility, status, and benefits. There are a wide number of applications, called musterings, available for a sailor. ‘Musterings’ refers to occupational fields (e.g. technical, weapons, communications, administration).

Different musterings have different duties and requirements. The technical and combat musterings typically operate heavy equipment and were traditionally seen as the masculine domains. At present, fewer women work in these musterings. The support musterings include catering and administrative or clerical duties, and were traditionally areas where women were allowed.

Sailors serve in units, which may be fighting ships or shore-based installations. The ships are considered the “sharp point” of the Navy, and are the traditional male domain. They adhere to strict military discipline, and often see the shore-based sailors as lacking in both discipline and status. The operational (sea-ward) and training units are typically perceived as more disciplined, whereas the support and technical units often tend to follow closer to the organisational structures and discipline of comparable civilian institutions.

The Navy operates a number of ships. Smaller vessels, for example mine countermeasure vessels (typically with a crew of 30-50), are used for mine clearance operations and fishery patrols. Larger ships are used for operational support (crew between 80 and 120, depending on the mission), and can deploy for extended periods of time.

On all ships, the different rank groups 'mess' together – eat, sleep and socialise in the same area. Junior and senior ratings each have their own 'mess', which is often only a small space that serves as dining room, recreational area, TV room and even sleeping quarters on the small ships. Officers have a wardroom, which serves the same purpose and is also used as their office. Sleeping arrangements differ between the classes of ships. In the smaller ships, there is one cabin for all junior rates, with bunk-type beds. Senior rates often have cabins that sleep four. On the large ships, the cabins for junior rates often accommodate eight people, and senior rates sleep four or two to a cabin. Officers typically share two to a cabin. The larger ships have one or more central facilities with shower and toilet stalls in one room. On the small ships, there is typically a separate toilet and shower, each with its own door. Officers and ratings have separate facilities.

While ashore, sailors wear white uniform in summer and black uniform in winter. Men's white uniform consists of trousers, shirt and flat shoes, whereas women wear a one-piece dress with stockings and heeled shoes. The black winter uniform for men again consists of trousers, shirt and jacket, and flat shoes, and for women of skirt, blouse and jacket, with stockings and heeled shoes. Onboard ships, sailors wear a heavy-duty blue uniform. The trousers and shirts are of a different cut for men and women; all women generally prefer to wear men's 'blues', as they deem the women's version unflattering and impractical. Women's uniform has been a constant source of complaints, and in 2001 Project African Warrior was launched to research and design uniforms for South African women soldiers (Steenkamp, 2001).

English is the command language of the Navy, meaning that all official communication, from training to day-to-day work to tactical operations, is done in English. For clarity, the term *Navy* refers to the organisation that is focussed on maritime military operations. It includes many activities in support of maritime interests, as well as shore installations and land bases. This has to be distinguished from the *Fleet*, which refers to that arm of the Navy that actually

does the seaward operations – the ships – as well as the functions that directly support these operations). This study concerns itself with the fleet.

The categories of rank, mustering and unit form an important part of the way in which an individual sailor defines him- or herself. Naval personnel will often describe themselves in terms of their rank, or musterings, or applications, and are referred to by others in the same terms. This individual identity is expressed through their uniforms, with badges indicating affiliation to specific groups within these categories. The collective identity, however, is more difficult to define. The SAN is not involved in any war, and most sailors have had no experiences of war. They are mostly engaged in search and rescue efforts, and humanitarian operations (e.g. transporting food and medical supplies after natural disasters)⁵. There is no real sense of being “warriors”, and the discourse of masculine domination through military action is largely absent in their collective expression.

3.4.2. Women in the SA Navy

(a) History

The history of women in the SAN started with the establishment of the South African Women’s Auxiliary Naval Service (SWANS) on 9 October 1943. The motivation was to fill vacant posts and to free men from shore-posts to serve at sea during the Second World War. These women were employed in three areas – communications, clerical, and technical (e.g. harbour defence operations) (Laver, 1982). The term “swans” was officially sanctioned in 1943 to describe women in the Navy (Laver, 1982).

The SWANS remained a separate auxiliary naval unit for many years, and only in 1973 were women allowed to join the SAN as permanent militarised members (Laver, 1982). The term “swan” was also used for full-time women sailors, and only in the 1990’s did it cease as the official designation of a woman in the Navy. Although there is no official distinction between the sexes in the present day Navy, the term swan is still extensively used in the sailors’ vernacular to refer to women in uniform.

⁵ The strike craft squadrons, traditionally the sharp end of the Navy, undergo combat training, but did not participate in this study due to operational non-availability.

Although women have served as full members of the Navy in shore appointments since 1973, and have occasionally trained on ships, they never held any permanent position onboard naval vessels until 1997. Women in the Navy *per se* are therefore not a new introduction, while women serving at sea are. The new Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) played the defining role, when in 1996 women were allowed in positions that were previously reserved for men only. The SAN, in line with the Labour Relations Act, moreover allows for “beneficial discrimination”, in providing separate (i.e. gender-private) ablution and sleeping facilities for the sexes.

(b) The process of gender integration of the Fleet

The SAN considered the establishment of an appropriate service environment as its biggest challenge in the process of gender integration. This referred to the following (Nel, 1995):

- a) The physical environment, which included the provision of separate accommodation and ablution facilities, and required structural engineering changes to the ships involved.
- b) The organisational environment, which included the organisation of the ships themselves, their routines and the way in which they were ‘manned’.
- c) The social environment, which required men and women onboard to be taught new rules of behaviour, and develop ways to enforce them.

According to SAN planning (Manning, 1996), the integration of females was to start on the larger ships which, because of their size and structure, were the most suitable for accommodating females. The smaller ships needed more structural changes, and would be integrated last. Submarines were exempted from gender integration due to the practical problems of accommodating different sexes onboard.

During 1996, the personnel division was tasked to identify suitable candidates, with the applicable qualifications, to transfer to the ships. Bridging training was offered to women who were not qualified to give them the opportunity to serve as well (Manning, 1996). The original plan was that senior ratings and officers would join the ships before the junior ratings, in order to adjust themselves and have time to learn the ship’s geography and routine. This was meant to give them confidence and authority in advising and guiding juniors (Manning,

1996). In reality, though, the junior ratings came aboard before the senior ratings (although they were sometimes preceded by officers), but this did not cause any documented problems.

From 1997, preparation for changing interpersonal interaction was done in the form of sexual harassment briefings to the whole ship's company. The aim was to sensitise the crew to the issues involved. Sexual harassment briefings were done in great detail, and led to much humour afterwards. Anecdotal evidence suggests that very few cases of sexual harassment onboard the vessels have been reported since women sailors joined the ships in 1997/1998. No official public records are available.

(c) Gender policies in the SA Navy

In the White Paper on Defence (DoD, 1996) the "DoD acknowledges the right of women to serve in all ranks and positions, including combat roles" (p. 36), and further states that the DoD is committed to the goal of overcoming the legacy of gender discrimination. The SAN as part of the SANDF conforms to the same policies of equal opportunity as the rest of the public service. Fast tracking is one instance where the Navy has taken the lead in accelerating the promotion of senior officers. The Navy further "actively encourages" (SA Navy Info Bulletin 40/01, 2001) women to be employed within the seagoing environment, and provides the necessary education, training and development.

The South African constitution prohibits any form of discrimination, and names sexual orientation as a particular example. In line with the constitution, the SAN also declared that no discrimination would take place on the grounds of sexual orientation (Naval Order: Pers No 3/2001). The SAN does not, however, have an official policy on childcare, nor formal arrangements for the situation of single parents (Directorate Fleet Human Resources, SAN, personal communication, 26 April, 2005).

At the time of gender integration of the ships, the informal SAN policy regarding consensual romances within the same unit made provision for the transfer of one member of the couple to another unit. If specific operational circumstances required, couples might be allowed to serve together for limited periods. There were a few occurrences of consensual romances, which were mostly dealt with through the normal transfer processes between ships, and

therefore no records exist of specific actions in response to such relationships. There is currently no formal policy on consensual romances within the same unit, although fraternisation is officially discouraged (Directorate Fleet Human Resources, SAN, personal communication, 26 April, 2005).

After the experiences of other navies, the SAN expected sexual harassment to be a major obstacle to gender integration. The policy on sexual harassment in the Navy is comprehensive and well known to its members. The SAN follows a strong behavioural definition. Sexual harassment is defined by using two principles, namely the unwelcome or offensive nature of the behaviour, and the sexual nature of such behaviour. The SAN policy states that all offensive behaviour of a sexual nature may constitute sexual harassment, whether directed to the offended individual or simply observed by him or her. The policy also deals in detail with gender harassment and unwanted attention (resulting in a hostile work environment), as well as with more coercive behaviours (SA Navy, 1997). It provides guidelines for managing potential or actual harassing situations, and a clear channel for the management of complaints. The way the policy uses the behavioural zones, or the so-called traffic light metaphor, for handling difficult situations⁶, is particularly interesting. It is based on the system used by the US Navy (NAVPERS 15620; Pexton, n.d.), but is the object of much derision among sailors, and not often utilised on the ships.

In the SAN, formal channels for complaints of sexual harassment refer to the chain of command, usually meaning the divisional officer or other appropriate officer (e.g. Personnel Officer), or the Military Police. Informal channels would refer to reporting an incident to an immediate supervisor (e.g. a senior rating), or coxswain of a ship⁷, or chaplain or social worker. Once a commanding officer becomes aware of a complaint, it is his/her responsibility to investigate the case and deal with it appropriately (SA Navy, 1997). All fleet personnel have attended training opportunities for sexual harassment awareness, and have signed a formal acceptance of the policy. There are no known prevalence studies for sexual harassment in the SAN.

⁶ This refers to the use of three colours to classify and respond to sexual approaches: sailors would refer to behaviours or situations as red, yellow, or green, depending on the level of discomfort or unwantedness of such behaviour. It was intended that the use of these colours in the general talk of sailors would regulate behaviours with sexual undertones.

⁷ Senior non-commissioned officer on ship

Formal organisational policies are indebted to the experiences of other countries. For example, a number of the SAN officers responsible for drawing up these policies attended courses at the US Defence Equal Opportunity Management Institute (cf. Dansby & Landis, 1996), and were influenced by what they learned from others' experiences there.

To a large extent, few formal policies had been developed to regulate or guide the daily interaction on the ships. Individual captains of ships developed their own, and provided valuable structures to guide the behaviour in a novel situation (novel for both women and men). These policies covered numerous aspects of ship life, from daily routines to the use of ablution facilities, rules for entering and using certain cabins, appropriate clothing and grooming, and channels for communication and problem solving. Because they originated in the needs of particular ships, there was some variance between the evolving cultures on different ships.

Some formal discriminatory policies still existed in the SAN at the time of integration. Men and women were restricted in the kind of uniform they were allowed to wear, and although individual commanders did have some leeway in determining the dress of the day, official policy still lagged behind.

The SAN has changed much in the past few years. Women currently comprise 11% of the Navy, and are distributed across the different fields. They form 23% of the support branches, 15% of the engineering branch, 10% of combat operators, and 1% of technical personnel. Women comprise 7.5% of senior officers, 11.5% of junior officers, 4.5% of warrant officers, 6.7% of senior ratings, and 14.6% of junior ratings. (Navy Office, SAN, personal communication, 2 August, 2002)

3.5. Conclusion

This chapter described the context of the study. It introduced the international debate on women in the military, which highlights the resistance to women in the armed forces. The overview of the international debate surrounding women's participation in the military dealt briefly with essentialist arguments, security concerns – as the public face of underlying gender attitudes – and so-called concerns of practical experiences of acceptance and resistance.

These arguments served to inform, and are often reflected in, the arguments of South Africans against women in the SANDF.

It was argued that the South African experience of gender integration was further informed by the internal political developments over the past decade and by the broader process of socio-political integration of the military. External factors, most notably the experiences of other navies, have also informed the South African experience. Gender integration is but one aspect of a larger process (political, cultural), which is drawing on the human rights culture of the liberation movement, as well as the many changes within the military environment in post-1994 South Africa.

This chapter also described the environment into which women entered when they joined the ships of the South African Navy. Now that the scene is set, the next chapter will describe the methodology used in the study.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will introduce the research setting, as well as the effect of the researcher on the data gathering process (Chapter 4.2). It will then present the research methodologies used in this study. The present study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to achieve its aims. Since personal reality is constructed by individuals and within specific contexts, the qualitative approach was useful for understanding the experiences of individuals in a newly gender-integrated environment (as discussed in Chapter 4.4). However, gender integration in the Navy is not just about individual experiences, but also about structural change. Individual experiences are informed by the beliefs and attitudes of different groups within the structural system (i.e. the Navy) and a quantitative approach was used to investigate these beliefs (as discussed in Chapter 4.3). In this study, then, the two approaches were used to answer different questions; therefore functioning as parallel processes of investigation (Ponterotto & Grieger, 1999). The quantitative data (e.g. group attitudes) provided a 'backdrop' to the narratives of individual participants. As such, they were influenced by each other, as reality – whether group attitudes or individual experiences – is constructed through negotiation. In this study, each tradition tapped into constructs that also informed the other, but they were used separately to illuminate different realms of reality (e.g. group beliefs versus individual experiences).

4.2. The Research Setting

In the late 1990's, women went to sea for the first time as full-time sailors. In the decade prior to this, women were gradually integrated into the shore-based part of the SAN. They worked in offices, in training institutions, and in the protection services. This integration was gradual, both in speed and in terms of the number of women involved. By the time this study commenced, women were already an integral and accepted part of the 'shore-Navy'.

The ships, in contrast, were still very much all-male environments. Serving on ships was seen as the epitome of being a Navy sailor, that which separated the 'men from the rest'. Allowing

women to enter this world created a threat to the men, and led to some angst and resistance on their part.

Women were allowed on ships after the new South African Constitution was passed into law. The new constitution came into effect in 1996, but due to a number of issues (e.g. availability of women, training programs, changes to the ships) women only started to be placed on ships at the end of 1997. At first, this only happened on the larger ships, and women were joining the ships in small numbers. Over time, though, more women completed their training, and more ships were structurally adapted to accommodate both genders. Structural changes to the smaller ships allowed more women the opportunity to go to sea, which they did.

This study consisted of two phases. The first phase investigated the atmosphere at the time of actual integration, when the women's arrival on the ships was imminent (± 1 month before women boarded the ships). This investigation was done through the use of quantitative methods, as described in Section 4.3. Quantitative methods were chosen based on practical considerations, which required the assessment of the attitudes and opinions of a large group of people. The second phase took place between 12 and 18 months after the first phase, and investigated the experiences and effects of the women's presence on the ships. For this purpose, a more personal approach using qualitative methods was used, and will be discussed in Section 4.4.

4.2.1. Access to the research environment

The strict hierarchical structure of the military provided a series of gatekeepers (cf. Silverman, 2001) through which access had to be negotiated. All research within the DoD had to be approved by the Chief Director Counter Intelligence (CI). The individual instruments and samples had to be contracted with CI, stipulating very specific parameters of use. Changes in the research protocols (due to the availability of ships) required re-contracting, resulting in a time lapse between quantitative and qualitative data gathering. This further meant that no interviews could take place during the first phase, and that they were only permitted in time for the second phase. The Chief Director CI did express some concern with regard to the cultural and gender sensitivities in the SANDF. However, after the final contracting, there was no further interference from them.

The local gatekeepers (senior officers who controlled access to the participants) were mostly male officers, and were the most vulnerable should issues be identified that put the SAN in a poor light. However, I received nothing but cooperation from them, leading to the question why this was so. It might be that political pressure (e.g. a focus on transparency within the DoD) or the national environment (with its focus on equal opportunities and so forth) motivated them. It might also indicate real support for gender integration, which would in turn influence the atmosphere within those units controlled by them.

4.2.2. The researcher

Researchers are as much part of the subject of their own studies as the 'matter' they study, being both influential to and influenced by the research process. Furthermore, I am not only a researcher, but also an active participant in the environment under scrutiny, as I work in that environment, and influence it in other capacities. In this study, then, I cannot distance myself from the subject matter, as I am part of that world and interpret that environment from within it (cf. Katila & Merilainen, 2002). As personal perspectives influence studies, from design through to interpretation and reporting (Suzuki, Prendes-Lintel, Wertlieb & Stallings, 1999), a note on my own involvement and identity is necessary before describing the study any further.

In 1997, the SAN approached me to assist ships in their preparation for gender integration. My initial limited involvement led to a desire for a deeper understanding of the experiences of individuals caught in this process. The present study then evolved from my personal interest to gain understanding for use in my daily practice.

Although I approached the study with a pro-gender integration stance, I approached the interviews (and other data gathering opportunities) in as neutral a state of mind as was possible, in an effort to elicit relatively unbiased experiences and thoughts. It is not clear how well my stance was known to the respondents. My involvement did, though, have some indirect effects on the data gathering process. I was known to a large number of the participants in the surveys (Phase 1). Although the surveys were conducted in large groups with total anonymity assured, respondents knew that it was 'my' survey. My access to the ships was further influenced and facilitated by personal relationships built up with senior

officers on the ships (the gate-keepers) for that purpose, which may have influenced the willingness of certain respondents to participate (during Phase 2).

My identity became relevant through the interplay of a number of social categories. I was a white, male psychologist working for the SA Military Health Services, with the SAN as my biggest client. As such, I wore a military uniform, with the status of an officer, without being a soldier or sailor. I was an insider, a member of the military, but I was also an outsider, being a psychologist and not a sailor.

My identities – white, male, psychologist, officer – may have influenced the study in a number of ways. This thesis has as its point of departure a qualitative, constructionist, and interpretative approach. ‘I’ am therefore part of any interpretation. ‘I’ met the participants with / in all their social categories, as they met me with / in all my social categories (or identities). In their interviews, they constructed their stories not only through their interpretation of themselves and their experiences, but also in response to what I meant to them (i.e. as psychologist, or officer, or male, and so forth). As such, I influenced their responses because of who I was, in the same ways as they influenced mine because of who they were. Individual participants would thus have seen me through all their stereotypes of my social categories, and which ones ultimately became salient would have differed for each participant.

As the second part of the study relied on interpersonal interaction to elicit data, certain interviewer-interviewee relations, especially the social identities of the interviewer, require further exploration. My position of practitioner-researcher could be seen as both privileged and problematic (Holland & Scourfield, 2000): familiarity might be a challenge to an open questioning perspective, even creating expectations in participants of what the researcher might want to hear. Or it might serve to gain in-depth information more quickly and allow participants to be more frank than what they would have been with an outside expert. The effect of my identities on the participants would definitely have influenced their presentations in the interviews. Although this is a natural bias that cannot be helped, a brief look at some of my identities may illuminate possible biases.

4.2.3 Relations of power in the data gathering process

Participants' interpretation of 'me', as well as my presentation of myself, raised the danger of their (or my) implicit positioning of the researcher as superior (Finchilescu, 1995), in my case as an 'officer', or 'psychologist' (seen as the 'expert'). The extent to which this happen defies measurement, though, and I could only counter it through sensitivity to the issue.

The race of an interviewer affects responses to race-related questions, but not necessarily to other questions (Anderson, Silver & Abramson, 1988; Groves, 1989). The interviewees represented people from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, but, as the focus of the questions was gender and not race, my race was probably less salient than my gender. My age was the same as the average for the interviewees. Research on the effects of interviewer gender (Kane & Macaulay, 1993) found that both women and men give more egalitarian responses to female interviewers than to male interviewers. A possible explanation refers to the concept of 'polite conversation' and suggests that it is done so as not to offend an interviewer. Kane & Macaulay (1993) argue that other power issues moderate the effect of gender – that social power is transcended by interviewer power, so that the gender of the interviewer has a lesser effect than the position of authority (as interviewer).

I believe that a different identity and the social stereotypes relating to it have played a more significant role than gender in influencing interviewees accounts. I suggest that the identity of 'psychologist' superseded gender in this context (even though the interviews focused on gender-related issues), based on two factors: Firstly, at that time I was responsible for psychological services to ship-based sailors, and was known primarily by that identity. Secondly, being interviewed by a psychologist would have activated all the social stereotypes of this profession, and created a particular context for the negotiations of roles. This may have facilitated the interview process and the recounting of personal experiences. I would like to believe that the positive rapport – as seen in the sharing of experiences – supports this idea.

In spite of this, the power issues cannot be denied. I had interviewer power – I asked the questions, they told their stories. I had military power – I was the officer, they the ratings (or officers junior to me). I had authority power – I was the psychologist, they not. I also had the social power, in terms of gender and education. Even if some identities were less salient than

others, all must have played their role during the interviews. It must be noted however, that the effect of this on the data remain inscrutable.

4.3. Introduction to Phase 1: Pre-integration Atmosphere

The first phase of the study took place at the time when women were poised to join the first ships.

4.3.1. The aim of Phase 1

The aim of this thesis as a whole is to investigate the psycho-social experience of gender integration of the SAN ships. In relation to this, the aim of Phase 1 was to investigate the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet. Here it refers to the prevailing gender-related attitudes and behaviour that characterised the fleet at that time.

(a) Theoretical context

The SANDF still maintains a highly patriarchal cultural ideology (Motumi, 1999; Van Breda, 2002). When political developments (like the SA scenario) place the status quo – male dominance of the workplace – under threat, men respond by resisting efforts of gender equalisation of the workplace. Their resistance flows from their attitudes and beliefs towards the place (roles and status) of women in society (Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Martin & Jurik, 1996). This result in behaviours that manifest their resistance, for example, sexual harassment (Miller, 1997; Rospenda et al., 1998). To counter the threat of women and to contain the emerging position of women in their workplace, men create an inhospitable environment (Edley & Wetherell, 1995).

(b) Objectives of Phase 1

Based on the aim of Phase 1, specific objectives were formulated. The first objective was to investigate the general attitudes of the fleet towards women's place in the world. It also expanded the focus on sexism to include specific related opinions to the presence of women on Navy ships. This was done through methods that measured sexist attitudes, which were

defined as attitudes that place women in a position of inferiority relative to men. It is proposed here that highly traditional attitudes will facilitate a greater expression of resistance once women enter the male dominated space of Navy ships.

The second objective was to investigate the manifestation of resistance, as evidenced by the occurrence of sexual harassment in the fleet. This was achieved by measuring the prevalence of sexual harassment. Research data from other studies suggests that sexist attitudes do not necessarily translate into equivalent behaviours (Buhrke, 1988; Goldberg, Katz & Rappeport, 1979). However, this thesis argues that the current prevalence of sexual harassment would give an indication of the levels of active resistance that might be expected when women join the ships. A quantitative approach was selected to achieve the objectives of the first phase.

(c) Research considerations in Phase 1

A number of research issues were taken into consideration during Phase 1.

1) *Power and identity*

Threats against patriarchal ideologies are essentially threats to power and identity. Phase 1 therefore also investigated the role of various military and social categories in understanding power and identity. Both rank and race categories are important markers of power and identity, and various groups were compared to establish the influence of race and rank on the beliefs and expressions of members of the fleet. There is always the danger that such analysis is not a true reflection, as it is based on pre-decided and pre-enforced categories (e.g. 'race'). However, these categories are part of the experiential world of the sailors, and therefore reflect an internal social construction that influences their experiences and identities.

The variables of rank, race and exposure to gender-integrated environment will be used in the analysis (see Chapter 5) to investigate issues of power and identity.

2) *Exposure to gender-integrated work environments*

The effect of exposure to an equal-status gendered work environment was also investigated. Three groups were involved in this regard: ship-based personnel, shore-based personnel, and those involved in training. The shore-based group represented administrative workers, working in an office environment, who had been working with and alongside women for many years. The training group had been involved in training women for a number of years as well, and also had women on their staff, albeit less than other shore units. The training units were included because it is in such units where military indoctrination – teaching the values and norms of the military environment – takes place. It is also the place from which any change in attitude would be formally implemented through awareness programs, and so forth. The ship-based group comprised the men serving on the ships.

3) *Resistance*

Resistance (through sexual harassment) is seen as a manifestation of traditional or sexist attitudes. The term resistance is defined as opposition to change. The exact nature of the change being resisted by men is often ambiguous, though, and may mean different things to different men and in different contexts. In this study, it is used to refer to changes in status (i.e. the equalisation of women's status in the military) that threaten men's power status, as well as to changes in traditional sex roles. The last mentioned change is associated with changes in the masculine and military identity and culture.

4) *The use of categories*

Phase 1 has broadly used the gender-as-variable or gender-as-category approach. This approach has been criticised (Alvesson & Billings, 1997), and the use of categories has already been described as problematic in Chapter 1. The use of these categories results in the dilemma of using existing (pre-determined) social constructions to understand the experiences of that social construction. However, I chose to use it in this study because of the highly gendered nature of the military environment, especially after the gender integration of operational units. The focus on differences, accompanied by an us/them attitude, highlighted

gender categories, and was used here because it reflected the participants' understanding of their world.

4.3.2. Research instruments

(a) Selection of instruments

The literature review revealed corporate culture as a significant obstacle to equality in the workplace. One way of assessing the corporate culture of an organisation is by measuring its attitudes and beliefs about the roles, place, and status of men and women. The threat to men's position or status may lead to men's resistance towards women. To fulfil the objectives of Phase 1, methods were required to measure sexist attitudes and the experience of sexual harassment in the fleet.

1) *Measuring sexism*

A plethora of attitude scales is available that deal with sexism, sex roles, gender identity, and so forth. The Attitudes towards Women Scale (AWS) (McHugh & Frieze, 1997; Spence & Helmreich, 1972) is arguably the most widely used scale in this field, being used cross-culturally and cross-nationally. However, it is becoming dated, and recent criticism indicates that its usefulness is diminishing (Beere, 1990; Spence & Hahn, 1997). The Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale (Beere, 1990; Beere, King, Beere, King, 1984) (SRES) was developed to measure sex role egalitarianism, and correlates strongly with the AWS ($r=.86$) (King & King, 1997). It has sound psychometric properties, but McHugh & Frieze (1997) warn that it seems to measure non-egalitarian ideologies, and that it is not clear how the scale is conceptually related to more modern interpretations of sexism. The Sex Role Attitudes in the Army scale (Woelfel, Savell, Collins & Bentler, 1976) specifically measures attitudes towards women in the military, but is also becoming dated and does not adequately address modern developments in the measurement of sexism.

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997) (ASI), the Modern Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995) (MSS) and the Sexist Attitudes towards Women Scale (Benson & Vincent, 1980) (SATWS) were all developed to investigate more modern

interpretations of sexism. The ASI distinguished between benevolent (but sexist) and hostile attitudes towards women, while the MSS contains items that deal with denial of gender discrimination. The SATWS measures attitudes that place women in a position of relative inferiority to men by limiting their social, political, economic and psychological development. It is more comprehensive than the AWS, and many other measures of sexist attitudes (McHugh & Frieze, 1997). A previous unpublished study (Van Wijk, 1998) compared the ASI, MSS and SATWS, using a stratified sample of 297 SAN personnel (mean age 30.71 years, ± 9.76). The ASI and MSS produced poor Cronbach alpha coefficients (0.67 and 0.53 respectively), while the SATWS showed promise with a Cronbach alpha of 0.84.

Criticisms against the 'older' scales (AWS, SRES), and the poor internal reliability scores of the 'modern' sexism scales in the SAN samples, lead to selection of the SATWS to measure sexist attitudes in this study.

However, the SATWS measures a more general attitude towards women, and was not expected to provide insights into Navy-specific issues. Another scale was therefore constructed for Phase 1 to measure attitudes particular to ship-related issues. The 45 item Gender Integration Survey (GIS) was designed to measure how respondents felt about women in the SAN. These two instruments were thus used to describe the environment into which women moved in the late 1990's in the SAN fleet.

The use of scales developed in other cultures and countries is recognised as problematic (Gibbons, Hamby & Dennis, 1997). Cross-cultural differences in the meaning of items may render results invalid. For example, the SATWS was developed in the USA, and was used in this study with only one alteration: "South African" replaced the word "American" in one item. The SAN constitutes a highly educated group, both in academic schooling and further specialised training. They are also exposed to American culture through the television, which is a favourite pastime for sailors. These two factors were believed to moderate (to some extent) the possible effects of cross-cultural differences in the meaning of items.

A number of criticisms have been levelled against the use of attitude scales. For example, the SATWS assesses attitudes in terms of endorsement of gender-prescribed roles, and women tend to have fewer traditional attitudes on such scales. Its use becomes problematic, since

gender-prescribed roles differ between groups, and there are inherent response differences between men and women. Research data also suggests that sexist attitudes do not necessarily translate into equivalent behaviours (Buhrke, 1988; Goldberg et al., 1979). In spite of these criticisms, such scales are still an economical and relatively effective way to describe the attitudes of larger groups of people.

2) *Measuring sexual harassment*

The measurement of sexual harassment has a number of inherent problems (cf. Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Fitzgerald, 1993; Fitzgerald et al., 1995).

The first obstacle is the lack of clear and unified definition. To resolve this, some surveys ask whether respondents have experienced any items on a list of sexual harassment behaviours (i.e. to choose behaviours from a list). This had its own problems, as such an approach determines neither seriousness nor the frequency of behaviours. For example, a single occurrence would not necessarily be enough to create a hostile environment. Seriousness of sexual harassment is in itself a difficult term, as there is not clarity on what it is based – outcome or frequency. Another frequent problem is that behaviours tend to differ from survey to survey (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Fitzgerald et al., 1995).

The second obstacle is the absence of a universal interpretation of specific behaviour as constituting sexual harassment. To resolve the problem of interpretation, surveys ask respondents directly whether they have been sexually harassed, and then leave the respondent (as the target of harassment) to interpret sexual harassment. This solution in turn creates the problem of underestimating behaviours that are clearly sexual harassment, but are not labelled as such by its target.

Surveys that leave the interpretation of unwanted sexual behaviour as sexual harassment to respondents tend to produce lower harassment rates (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994). Such interpretations are influenced, among others, by a) the characteristics of perpetrator, b) the type and frequency of behaviour experienced, and c) the consequences of that behaviour to the target (both professionally and personally) (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994). There is substantial disagreement on what constitutes sexual harassment across gender. Women and

men differ widely in what they interpret as sexual harassment, with women interpreting a wider range of behaviours as harassment than men, and also experiencing specific behaviours in the workplace to be more serious than men do (Pryor et al., 1995). Men generally have much narrower definitions of sexual harassment, and are less likely to evaluate any particular situation as being harassing (Fitzgerald, 1993).

The third obstacle consists of methodological differences among studies. For example, different surveys use different wording to ask whether sexual harassment has occurred; there are also differences in how the rate of sexual harassment is calculated, and different time periods surveyed (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994).

Variants of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) (e.g. Stark, Chernyshenko, Lancaster, Drasgow & Fitzgerald, 2002) are arguably the most widely used instruments, particularly in military studies, to assess sexual harassment. However, for the present study a separate survey was developed, based on three considerations:

- 1) The sexual harassment survey was intended to give an indication of resistance towards women. As discussed in Chapter 2, a broad scope of sexually harassing behaviours (especially sexual coercion and assault) is used to maintain the dominance of men over women. Miller (1997) argues that gender harassment emanates from resistance to change in the social power relations in the workplace. This study therefore required a measurement that would lean more towards unwanted sexual attention and gender harassment, as expression of resistance, rather than sexual coercion and assault, which were seen as expressions of dominance.
- 2) An important underlying principle to this study was to hear the 'voices' of women. A new survey would allow women to contribute to its construction, based on their own experiences and expectations.
- 3) When initial permission for the present study was sought, the Chief Director CI expressed discomfort with certain aspects of the existing sexual harassment scale (SEQ) that were presented, which eventually resulted in the construction of a new scale for this study.

To satisfy these considerations, a Sexual Harassment Questionnaire (SHQ) was developed for this study, based on the SAN's definition of sexual harassment. As such, it leaned heavily on the behavioural concepts contained in the SAN's policy on sexual harassment.

The fact that sexual harassment research regularly relies on quantitative methods is often criticised. This is, for example, because it limits the questions that can be asked (i.e. with regard to the frequency of experiences or behaviours) (Pryor & McKinney, 1995). However, as with attitude scales, such methods are still an economical and relatively effective way to describe the occurrence of sexual harassment within large groups of people.

(b) Description of the instruments used in the empirical study

1) *Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale*

The SATWS (Benson & Vincent, 1980; McHugh & Frieze, 1997) is a comprehensive 40-item scale that addresses six components of sexism. Sexism is defined as attitudes that place women in a position of relative inferiority to men by limiting their social, political, economic and psychological development. The six components are:

- 1) attitudes that women are genetically inferior (biologically, emotionally, intellectually) to men;
- 2) beliefs in the premise that men are entitled to greater power, prestige and social advantage;
- 3) hostility towards women who engage in traditionally masculine roles and behaviours or who fail to fulfil traditional female roles;
- 4) lack of support and empathy for women's liberation movements and the issues involved in such movements;
- 5) utilisation of derogatory labels and restrictive stereotypes in describing women; and
- 6) evaluation of women on the basis of physical attractiveness information and willingness to treat women as sexual objects.

The scale is presented in Appendix A.

The authors of the scale, and other researchers (e.g. Buhrke, 1988), found it unproductive to make use of the above subscales, and only used the total scale. Items are scored on a 7-point Likert-type format (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Twenty-four items are sexist statements, while 16 are non-sexist, and require the scoring to be reversed. Total scores range from 40 to 280, with higher scores indicating greater sexism. Good validity and reliability (alpha coefficients of between 0.90 and 0.94), as well as low social desirability influences have been reported (Benson & Vincent, 1980; Buhrke, 1988). Men consistently produce higher scores than women, and no significant patterns due to socio-economic status were found (Jones & Jacklin, 1988). The scale's usefulness lies in its comprehensiveness, and will give an indication of attitudes, which focus among other things on women in non-traditional roles. It is furthermore reported to have good psychometric properties, with a comprehensive underlying theory, and good validity and reliability (Beere, 1990).

2) *Gender Integration Survey*

In contrast to the SATWS' enquiry into general sexist attitudes, the GIS was used to measure various beliefs and attitudes about women in the SAN in particular. The statements were rated on a 7-point scale, and focused on attitudes towards women in the SAN, their abilities, their treatment, the problems they face, their roles, and their perceived difficulties around interactions. The items were formulated in response to issues raised in the available literature, personal experiences of the researcher, and discussions with the coxswains (senior non-commissioned officers on a ship) in the fleet. The coxswains were the key individuals who would be responsible for integrating women into ships' routines and daily life. They were asked, in informal conversation, what issues they had come across in the past, or expected to deal with in the near future. Issues accompanied by relevant examples, or repetitive issues (from more than one source), were included in the list of items. A number of items reflecting the researcher's experience in clinical consultation were also incorporated to complete the questionnaire. The formulated items were thereafter shown to role-players within the fleet (coxswains and human resource management officers), to refine the wording and check for relevance. Items were included if they tapped opinions specific to the Navy context, and were not represented in the SATWS.

The resulting 45 statements were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). As was the case with the SATWS, some items were sexist statements, whereas others were non-sexist and required scoring to be reversed. Total scores ranged from 45 to 315. Higher scores indicate greater sexism. The survey produced satisfactory internal consistency, reported in Chapter 5. The scale is presented in Appendix A. A factor analysis was done to determine the underlying dimensions (also reported in Chapter 5).

3) *Sexual Harassment Questionnaire*

The problems of measuring sexual harassment were discussed earlier. The two major difficulties were differing definitions, and the use of behavioural lists versus interpretations of sexual harassment. This study followed the SAN definition of sexual harassment. The questionnaire presented a behaviour list, and asked respondents to indicate the frequency with which such behaviours had been experienced within the previous six months. The questionnaire did not require the individual to indicate the seriousness of the behaviour, which was in line with the purpose of the questionnaire, namely to gauge the organisational atmosphere. Respondents were not asked to interpret behaviour as sexual harassment *per se*, but were instructed that the questionnaire items referred to behaviours that was unwanted, or made them feel uncomfortable.

The items came from two sources. Most were collected during a series of preparatory workshops held in the SAN prior to gender integration, which was facilitated by officers trained by the US Defence Equal Opportunity Management Institute. The personal experiences and reports received by the attendees in the fleet and their expectations of what might realistically be found in the fleet (both ashore and onboard ships) were collated to form the Sexual Harassment Questionnaire (SHQ). The workshops aimed to provide a structure for women to deal with sexual harassment, and their experiences and expectations formed the majority of items for the questionnaire. Items from the author's personal experiences from his clinical practice completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire eventually consisted of 38 statements of behaviours, rated on a 4-point scale in terms of how often it occurred (1=never, 2=seldom, 3=often, 4=always), with higher scores indicating more sexual harassment. There was also a question about secondary

victimisation. The instructions limited behaviour to the previous 6 months. The SHQ distinguished between co-worker and supervisor harassment, and only dealt with opposite-sex harassment. The term 'sexual harassment' was not used in the instructions or in any of the behavioural items, and only introduced in the question on secondary victimisation.

The 38 items typically support concerns of unwanted sexual attention and gender harassment rather than sexual coercion and assault. While this was in line with the purpose of the questionnaire (namely, to give a measure of resistance), it also reflected the experiences in the fleet at the time. There were no public records of sexual assault, and if it did happen, it was kept quiet, resulting in the absence of such histories in the fleet. The SHQ was constructed prior to gender integration, and the items reflect the (possible naive) expectations of women and men in the period leading up to actual integration. Before the questionnaire was administered, the formulated items were shown to 18 women in the SAN to refine the wording and check for relevance. The questionnaire produced satisfactory internal consistency, as reported in Chapter 5. The SHQ itself is presented in Appendix A. Factor analysis was done to determine the underlying dimensions (also reported in Chapter 5).

The questionnaires provided space for biographical data, such as age, unit categories (i.e. administration, training, ships), rank group, culture (African, Coloured, Indian, White) and gender, in order to allow for comparisons between groups.

4) *Pilot study*

The final versions of the three instruments – SATWS, GIS, SHQ – were piloted with a group of 30 female and 30 male sailors. During post-administration discussion with the group, two points were emphasised by participants: Firstly, the sailors commented that language might be a problem, since not all sailors onboard the ships have English as their first language. In practice, though, it would have been impractical to translate the scales into the 11 official languages (some spoken by only a few people in the fleet). It was thus decided that, as all official communication onboard ships is in English, and all training has been done in English, the questionnaires would be administered only in that language. Of the sixty people in the pilot group, only 21 had English as their first language, but none of them found any words in the instruments that they did not understand. Secondly, they also commented on the range of

the Likert-type scale (7 points), which they felt was too wide. They indicated that a three- or five-point scale would suffice. Nonetheless, the 7-point scale was retained, as a previous unpublished study on other naval groups indicated that the full scale (from 1 to 7) did not present any problems (Van Wijk, 1998), and as a wider scale would also be more reliable (Nunnally, 1970). Lastly, the group was also asked to comment on the relevance of the items, and invited to add any issues they believed to be important, but that had not been included. They all indicated their satisfaction with the items, both in terms of relevance and comprehensiveness.

4.3.3. Data analysis

The completed questionnaires were subjected to statistical analysis, using the STATISTICA 6.1 software package. Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to determine internal reliability. The three questionnaires were then subjected to factor analysis, using the maximum likelihood method. This particular method was chosen because of its desirable mathematical and statistical properties (Cliff, 1987; Cudeck, 2000). Since two of the questionnaires had been newly developed specifically for this study, and as the third had been standardised on an American population, the factor analysis was conducted to explore the underlying dimensions of each questionnaire. The threshold for inclusion of items was guided by practical considerations, in order to make factors theoretically meaningful (Dawis, 2000).

For each measure, comparisons between subgroups (e.g. gender, rank, race, work-environments) – categories that are important in the (self) identity of Navy sailors – were analysed by using inferential statistics, namely t-tests for independent samples and ANOVAs. Where appropriate, significant differences between groups were ascertained using Tukey's HSD test for post-hoc comparisons. Tukey's test is considered the "favourite pairwise test for many because of the control it exercises over alpha" (Howell, 1997, p. 377). Effect size is indicated by Eta squared (η^2), while it is acknowledged that Eta squared is a biased estimate of effect size. In the case of age, Pearson's correlation was used to ascertain the relations between age and the scores on the instruments. The description of the participants, as well as the administration of the instruments is reported together with the results, which are presented in Chapter 5.

Multivariate analyses could have helped to cut down on Type I errors (Weinfurt, 1995), and to provide potentially interesting interaction effects (Huberty & Morris, 1992). However, Rosenthal & Rosnow (1991, Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1989) argue against the use of omnibus multivariate analyses (e.g. MANOVA), which they believe are too commonly used to test null hypotheses that are scientifically almost always of doubtful value. They argue that, since it seldom happens that a set of findings does not provide a single significant finding, the test is of limited value. The current study thus followed the advice of Rosenthal & Rosnow (1991) and Hallahan & Rosenthal (1996) who recommend the use of analyses of variance separately for each dependant variable.

On a practical level, some variable categories (i.e. some rank and race groups) had very small numbers, and if more than one dependant variable were to be entered into a multivariate analysis, some subgroups would become too small for meaningful analyses. Given the potential risks of misinterpretation in such a case (Gueorguieva & Krystal, 2004), it was decided to err on the conservative side, following the advice of Wilkinson & Task Force on Statistical Inference (1999) to choose the simpler method that is appropriate for the data.

4.4. Introduction to Phase 2: Experiences of Women's Presence on Ships

The aim of this thesis as a whole is to investigate the psycho-social experience of gender integration of the SAN ships. In the light of this, the aim of Phase 2 was to examine the actual experiences of gender integration, of both women and men.

4.4.1. The aim of Phase 2

The second phase of the study took place after women had been serving on ships for between 12 and 18 months. At the time of the second phase of the study, only a few ships carried female sailors, while the rest did not.

(a) Introduction

The second phase was designed to investigate both women and men's experiences of gender integration. Experiences are personal, individualised, interactions with the world. They are

reconstructed through words, and through words can be accessed by others. It is the verbal description of experiences that formed the data of Phase 2. Following on the investigation started in Phase 1, the experiences and expressions of resistance (and/or acceptance) were the focus of this phase. Women and men experienced resistance to and acceptance of women on the ships. At the same time, both women and men had to develop ways to adapt to the new challenges of the changing dispensation, which became the focus of this investigation.

(b) Objective of Phase 2

Based on the aim of Phase 2, the following specific objective was formulated. This phase investigated the personal experiences and manifested responses of women and men in terms of their own involvement in gender integration. This was done through qualitative methods – specifically, verbal and written reports of personal accounts.

(c) Research setting of Phase 2

Sailors from three ships participated in Phase 2 of the study. Two ships had carried women for 12-18 months. One was classified as a large ship (Ship A) with 90 crew members (but none of the 5 women were available at the time of the study). The other one was classified as a small ship (Ship B), with 9 women and 30 men. The small ship provided the opportunity to interview both women and men 12 to 18 months after the women had joined the ship. The third ship (Ship C) was the sister ship of the small vessel, and had not carried any women prior to the time of the study. She matched the crew of the small gender-integrated ship (Ship B) in all regards except gender composition. Their interviews provided the opportunity for comparisons with the gender-integrated ships. Interviewees on the small gender-integrated ship (Ship B) further kept a diary for 4 successive weeks after their interviews.

4.4.2. Research instruments

(a) Interviews

The interviews were open discussions on issues pertaining to individuals' experiences of gender integration. The process and participants are described in Chapter 6.

(b) Focus groups

Focus groups are defined as “a research technique that collects data through group interaction on a topic determined by the researcher” (Morgan, 1997, p. 6). They are essentially group interviews that rely not on alternating questions and answers, but the explicit use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group (Morgan, 1997). Focus groups are regularly used for marketing research into consumer behaviour (Greenbaum, 1998, 2000), but have gained popularity in social science research due to their ability to provide researchers with access to forms of data not readily available during interviews or participant observations (Morgan, 1997; Pugsley, 1997).

Their use is controversial, though, with suggestions that the technique fails to provide hard data, and that the opinions expressed are not representative of the larger population from which the group is drawn, due to the size and idiosyncratic nature of group discussion (cf. Pugsley, 1997). In spite of these criticisms, it has a number of advantages (Morgan, 1997): It is cost effective, and because it is ‘focussed’, produces data on the topic of interest. Its reliance on interaction also allows it to produce more insights into complex behaviours and motivations. Its heavy reliance on group dynamics may also be a disadvantage, though (Morgan, 1997): The group dynamics itself may influence the nature of the data it produces (i.e. through processes of conformity or polarisation), and the role of the moderator maintaining the ‘focus’ may further influence the group’s interactions.

Focus groups have been proved to be useful in exploring sensitive topics (Pugsley, 1997), and were thus used in this study as a method to access the experiences of a larger group of people in a short period of time.

(c) Personal Event Diaries

1) *Background*

Diaries are used to research various phenomena, ranging from the transition from home to boarding school (Fisher, Frazer & Murray 1984), alcohol consumption and sexual activity (Leigh, 1993), and self-report of physical symptoms (Gijsbers-van Wijk, Huisman & Kolk,

1999). Diaries are mostly structured, and are designed to elicit information on specific variables (DeLongis, Hemphull & Lehman, 1992). They are used for specific periods of time, from a few days (Martin & Watson, 1997), to as long as 10 weeks (Skowronski, Betz, Thompson & Shannon, 1991). Entries are usually scored quantitatively.

Entries are typically required on a daily basis, and ordered around a specific structure depending on the purpose of the study: sometimes entries are quantified (Fisher et al., 1984), sometimes feelings and behaviour are rated to determine relationships between variables (Alloy, Just & Panzarella, 1997; Martin & Watson, 1997), while others require yes/no answers or scaled alternatives to facilitate a factor analysis of the items in the diary (Robbins & Tanck, 1982). Duck (1991) describes how structured diary-logs are used to quantify the experiences of social interaction, asking respondents to rate various aspects on a Likert-type scale. While it is possible to describe an interaction in detail, little attention is paid to the meaning of interactions.

Diaries have a number of advantages: They give more accurate descriptions than retrospective studies, as the events are recorded at the time they were experienced (or close to it) (Alloy et al., 1997; Fisher et al., 1984). Further, there is no artificial stimulation of a laboratory environment, as the events come from the real lives of the respondents (Skowronski et al., 1991) and the real-life context enhances the ecological validity of the data.

The longitudinal use of diaries can further explore how reports of social interaction change as relationships develop (Duck, 1991). Two main advantages were intended with the use of diaries in the present study: Firstly, they were used to provide information over a longer time period, without the distortion of memory, and secondly, to allow information to be compiled without the presence of the researcher, and therefore free of any interference his presence might cause.

The motivation of respondents to comply with daily entries becomes problematic when experiments run over a longer time period. Little spontaneous evidence of resistance or irritation on the part of respondents was found, though, when using a diary over a 10-day period (Robbins & Tanck, 1982), although there is evidence of the extra burden of keeping a diary: in a two-week study, for instance, entries declined after the first week (Fisher et al., 1984). Diaries that had to be completed at specific times were also more often incomplete,

apparently because of the time specifications (respondents were asleep at the time, or too busy to complete that specific entry) (Martin & Watson, 1997). One way of overcoming non-compliance was to collect diaries on a weekly basis (for a ten-week study) (Skowronski et al., 1991), or to use shorter sampling periods over a longer term (as suggested in Fisher et al., 1984). To address motivation in the present study, the researcher visited the ship on a weekly basis to collect the previous week's dairies from the participants and give them the diary for the following week.

DeLongis et al. (1992) pointed to two effects that the use of diaries might have on the respondents: The sensitisation effect suggests that participation in completing a diary may heighten the participants' awareness of the issue under investigation (e.g. pain symptoms). The fatigue effect, in contrast, suggests that, as record keeping continues over time, participants may report symptoms less often, growing tired with the record keeping.

Most studies used diaries to quantify experiences, rather than for narrative or content analysis. The present study used the diaries to gather information for thematic analysis. For this, the instructions had to be guiding rather than prescriptive, and focussed on the narrative of individual entries. The purpose of the diaries was to provide material reflecting the immediate experiences of the respondents.

2) *Diaries*

The diaries were named "Personal Event Diaries" to counter any negative connotations of keeping a traditional diary, which were seen as too feminine (by both the men and women), and with the aim of enhancing their compliance with entering experiences. The diaries were set out as follow (to ensure both compliance and freedom of expression):

Space was provided on the first page for biographical details, followed by space for seven daily entries. Each entry consisted of 2 parts. The first part was a rating scale (from 1 to 10), on which the participant indicated his or her experience of personal well-being, to be completed at the end of each day. Its sole purpose was to enhance compliance. For the second part, the participants were requested to relate any observations of positive or negative

interaction between crewmembers, or between supervisors or subordinates that they had witnessed during the day.

Participants were instructed to make their entries after the last watch (shift) of the day, or at any time that they had the opportunity to write down their experiences. They were encouraged to make an entry at least two times a week. The Personal Event Diary is presented in Appendix B.

3) *Pilot study*

The diaries were piloted with a group of 6 sailors from another ship, who kept the diary for 5 days. During discussion with this group, two points were emphasised: Firstly, confidentiality was very important, and was dealt with in some detail. It was also dealt with in detail when briefing participants in this study. Secondly, the pilot group indicated the impracticality of expecting an entry every day, and all indicated a preference of entering an incident when they experienced it (e.g. more than one per day but often nothing for many consecutive days).

4.4.3. Data analysis

The interviews, focus groups and diaries were subjected to thematic analysis. This was done while broadly following the guidelines put forward by Neuman (2000). First, the interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim from audio-tape. This process led to 'cleaned data' being analysed, as the talk on the tapes had to be reconstructed (e.g. punctuation added) to ensure that it made sense in the written form (Denscombe, 2001). In line with the focus on themes, other factors of 'narrative' – pacing, pausing, volume, intonation and emphasis – were not transcribed. A few of the first transcriptions were shown to the interviewees, in order to refine transcribing practices. Coincidentally, it also served as a weak form of member validation (Seale, 1999), where interviewees could verify the accuracy of the data records. The personal event diaries were already in written form, and were added to the newly transcribed data. The interviews, focus groups, and diaries were conducted and/or completed in a mixture of Afrikaans and English, as is spoken on the ships. The researcher is fluent in both languages.

The importance of the researcher's immersion of himself in the data (Mostyn, 1985) became clear through several rounds of reading. The aim of the first round of reading (and repeated re-reading) of the transcripts was to identify and extract key themes. A second round of reading to find both shared and divergent experiences/understanding of the themes across the transcripts followed. A third round of reading was used to identify quotes to illustrate the experiences reflected. A fourth and final round of reading checked that the themes described were in fact representative of the data. Because the influence of the researcher on structuring data is acknowledged (Wolcott, 1994), special care was taken in the reading and re-reading of the data to minimise this risk.

The transcriptions of the interviews, focus groups, and personal event diaries were used to provide a reflection of individual experiences and perceptions of gender integration. Following the intent of qualitative analysis to let the data speak for itself, no specific questions were imposed, except to ask, "What did the participants experience?" Their stories became the data from which the themes were developed.

(a) Considerations in presenting the analysis

The fact that only 9 women participated created the danger that the 'voice' of women might be drowned out by the sea of men who form the vast majority of the group under investigation. The 9 women did, however, constitute the total available population of seagoing women at the time, and special care was taken to point out their 'voices' when reporting the results of the study.

The small number of women participants forced a decision about reporting the data in the form of case studies, or as themes across cases. With so many shared experiences between the participants, however, it was decided to report them as themes, and where needed, to intersperse the themes with individual stories.

The themes reported in Chapters 6 to 9 do not represent exclusive categories, as the experiences informed each other. The themes therefore do not stand alone, but are inter-linked with one another. For ease of reading, the themes will be described in separate chapters (7, 8 and 9).

Using extracts from transcriptions is always limited to the extent that they are presented out of context (Denscombe, 2001). Quotes from the interviews and diaries will thus only serve as illustrations of a point⁸. Some indication of the context of each extract will be given. In addition, Afrikaans quotes were translated into English. The origins of the quotes will be indicated as follows: the letters A, B, and C will refer to the ship, and the number to the specific participant. Details of the participants can be found in Appendix C.

Many other wide-ranging issues were also presented during the interviews and focus groups, e.g. career trajectories, and so forth. The present analysis, however, will be limited to the experiences and perceptions that related to gender integration per se.

4.5. Conclusion

This chapter introduced the research setting in which this study took place. In keeping with the belief that the researcher's 'self' is part of the study, the researcher's own position was made transparent, and possible influences on the data gathering and later analysis and interpretation were discussed.

The methodologies of the two phases were then presented. Phase 1 made use of scales and surveys to achieve its aims, while Phase 2 used a qualitative approach, which included interviews and focus groups, to gather data. The next chapter will present the results and discussion relating to the pre-integration atmosphere.

⁸Generally speaking, unless otherwise indicated, quotes were only used when they represented the 'voice' of more than one participant.

CHAPTER FIVE: PRE-INTEGRATION ATMOSPHERE: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

Chapter 4 discussed the methods used in Phase 1 of the study. This chapter will first describe the respondents who participated in Phase 1 of the study. It will then present the findings of the SATWS, GIS and SHQ, to support the aims of investigating the pre-integration gender-related attitudes, and manifestation of resistance to women, in the fleet. The chapter will conclude with a general discussion of the findings.

5.2. Administration of Instruments, and Participants

5.2.1 Administration of instruments

The three instruments – Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale (SATWS), Gender Integration Survey (GIS), and Sexual Harassment Questionnaire (SHQ) – were administered as a booklet under the title “Relationships between men and women”. The booklets were completed anonymously, but did provide space for biographical data. All the questionnaires were completed in groups.

5.2.2. Participants

The questionnaires were administered to a sample of three groups – ship-based, shore-based administrative, and training personnel. The groups were stratified in terms of rank and race, i.e. the proportional sample sizes of the subgroups for rank and race represented the proportion of that subgroup in the general fleet. The descriptive statistics for the sample can be found in Table 5.1.

The study set out to involve the largest proportion possible from the available population of the three work environments in the sample groups. The administrative and training units represented a large part of those units’ available populations. Exact figures are difficult to

determine, as “availability” depends on operational demands. Consultations with senior personnel of these units suggest that about 80% of the different units were represented. The ship-based respondents represented 98% of their respective ships. The total group only represented the fleet, and not the SAN as a larger organisation. Nonetheless, it did accurately represent the fleet community into which the women entered at the time.

A total of 476 SATWS scales (23.7% women, 76.3% men) were completed. Women were over-sampled in order to achieve better statistical power (women comprise approximately 11% of the fleet). The average age of the group was 30.24 years (SD=8.99), with the average age of the women 30.72 years (SD=11.09) and of the men 30.09 years (SD=8.24).

Within the same sample, the GIS was administered to all available ship-based personnel (who were all male), resulting in 175 completed instruments. The average age of this group was 29.55 years (SD=7.47).

The same sample that completed the SATWS also completed the SHQ. Men who did not work with women at all in the previous six months did not complete the SHQ, resulting in 306 completed SHQ questionnaires (39.5% women, 60.5% men). The average age of the group was 31.04 years (SD=9.8), with the average age of the women 31.16 years (SD=11.16) and of the men 32.96 years (SD=8.86).

It was decided to administer the SHQ on the men in the sample for a number of reasons. Firstly, the questionnaire asked about experiencing certain behaviours, but did not indicate that the respondent necessarily had to be the intended target of the behaviour. Men could therefore report the presence of certain behaviours, without ever been harassed themselves (e.g. “How often does your co-worker(s) tell sexually orientated stories when you are in their company?”). Secondly, the questionnaire also inquired into behaviours indicative of more general gender harassment, which men may observe just as much as women (even though they may not label it as harassment) (e.g. “How often are jokes, cartoons or calendars of a sexual nature displayed on the notice boards or circulated through the unit where people meet and work ?”).

The three instruments used to examine the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet were discussed previously. Unless otherwise indicated, all comparisons between subgroups were done using single factor between-subject ANOVA calculations. Where significant differences were found, scores were subjected to Tukeys' HSD test for post hoc comparisons. For the SATWS and GIS, where there were no women in the group (e.g. ships), or small numbers of women in certain categories (e.g. women officers), or discrepant numbers in different subgroups (e.g. race), the 1-way ANOVA was done for men only. The results of the SATWS, GIS, and SHQ are presented in the following sections.

Table 5.1: Descriptive percentages for the fleet sample

Variable	Category	SATWS			GIS	SHQ		
		Total group	Women	Men	Men	Total group	Women	Men
Rank	Junior ratings	54.2%	60.2%	52.3%	53.1%	52%	55.4%	49.7%
	Senior ratings	33.8%	32.7%	34.2%	26.3%	39.2%	38%	40%
	Warrant officers	2.1%		2.8%	8.0%			
	Officers	9.9%	7.1%	10.7%	12.6%	8.8%	6.6%	10.3%
Work-environment	Administrative	25.4%	57.5%	15.4%		40.8%	55.4%	31.4%
	Training	21.4%	42.5%	14.9%		36.3%	44.6%	30.8%
	Ship-based	53.2%		69.7%		22.9%		37.8%
Race	African	24.4%	24.8%	24.3%	22.3%	25.8%	24.0%	27%
	Coloured	38.2%	31.9%	40.2%	41.2%	38.9%	35.5%	41.1%
	Indian	2.5%	0.9%	3.0%	3.4%			
	White	34.9%	42.5%	32.5%	33.1%	35.3%	40.5%	31.9%
Total N		476	113	363	175	306	121	185

5.3. Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale

The SATWS is a 40-item measurement of sexism. Items are scored on a 7-point Likert format (strongly disagree to strongly agree), with total scores ranging from 40 to 280. Higher scores indicate greater sexism. The full scale can be found in Appendix A. The full-scale Cronbach alpha coefficient was satisfactory at 0.84.

5.3.1. Factor analysis

As previous published studies reported total scores only, the responses of this study were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The items were factor analysed using the maximum likelihood method, with varimax rotation. From this, a two-factor structure emerged (Table 5.2). Three items loaded below 0.3, and were excluded from further analysis. Together, the two factors accounted for 23.11% of the total item variance. All item-total correlations were greater than 0.2; the Cronbach alpha coefficients can be found in Table 5.2. When the scores were analysed for each gender separately, essentially the same basic factor structure emerged. The results of the per-gender analysis can be found in Appendix D.

Factor 1 refers to beliefs about the equality of the sexes. The items included can be placed in 3 groups – items that support the belief that there is more to women than their appearance in terms of their sex role, items that deal with women’s equal ability to men, and items that deal with women’s equal rights and status to men. The items in factor 1 reflect a combination of progressive views, with high scores indicating a rejection of progressive views.

Factor 2 refers to beliefs in male superiority. The items included again fall into 3 groups – items that reject women’s challenge to male dominance and thus the status quo, items that deal with beliefs in male superiority and dominance, and items that deal with women’s place (role and status) in society. The items in factor 2 reflect strong sexist views. High scores indicate higher sexism.

The items in each factor were totalled, indicating the degree to which respondents hold the beliefs that make up each factor. The factor totals were used for further analysis.

Table 5.2: Factor loadings for varimax two-factor solution

Item	Loading
Factor 1: Equality of the sexes (Cronbach alpha = 0.85) (Eigenvalue = 5.03)	
19. Women should have all the same rights as men.	0.68
20. I see nothing wrong with a woman who doesn't like to wear skirts or dresses.	0.67
26. If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.	0.65

27. I like women who are outspoken.	0.64
35. I think a woman could do most things as well as a man.	0.64
17. I dislike it when men treat women as sexual objects.	0.61
37. I think women have a right to be angry when they are referred to as a "broad".	0.61
25. On the average, women are as intelligent as men.	0.59
31. Women can handle pressure just as well as men can when making a decision.	0.53
14. Men are just as easily influenced by others as women are.	0.50
40. If I had a choice, I would just as soon work for a woman as for a man.	0.37
6. It bothers me when a man is interested in a woman only if she is pretty.	0.35
3. Our society puts too much emphasis on beauty, especially for women.	0.34
22. Women should be prepared to oppose men in order to obtain equal status.	0.34
Factor 2: Male superiority / dominance (Cronbach alpha = 0.85) (Eigenvalue = 4.21)	
9. Men are instinctually more courageous than women in the face of danger.	0.59
16. Men will always be the dominant sex.	0.55
15. I think women should be more concerned about their appearance than men.	0.53
4. Women shop more than men because they can't decide what to buy.	0.52
10. I think that women should spend a lot of time trying to be pretty.	0.52
18. I think that the husband should have the final say when a couple makes a decision.	0.51
24. I think that women are naturally emotionally weaker than men.	0.51
5. Most women's libbers are hopping on the bandwagon of protest just for the fun of it.	0.49
7. It bothers me to see a man being told what to do by a woman.	0.47
30. A working wife should not be hired for a job if there is a family man who needs it.	0.46
33. A woman's place is in the home.	0.45
23. I am suspicious of a woman who would rather work than have children.	0.44
29. It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy.	0.44
32. Men are naturally better than women at mechanical things.	0.42
8. I think that having children is a woman's greatest fulfillment.	0.40
21. Women should be handled gently by men because they are so delicate.	0.40
36. I think that men are instinctively more competitive than women.	0.39
39. I see nothing wrong with men who are primarily interested in a woman's body.	0.39
2. I get angry at women who complain that South African society is unfair to them.	0.35
28. I see nothing wrong with men whistling at shapely women.	0.35
12. Women rely more on intuition and less on reason than men do.	0.34
38. It would make me feel awkward to address a woman as "Ms."	0.33
13. Women should not be as sexually active before marriage as men.	0.31

The original scale was developed with six components (described in Chapter 4), although that structure was never demonstrated in published studies. The current study found two factors, but no other indications to support more components. It is possible that, as the current sample came from a very homogenous background (the military), the two factors may reflect the sample's specific issues around the subject of sexist views. It does support the suggestions of previous researchers to rather use total scales (Benson & Vincent, 1980; Buhrke, 1988), in this study represented by the two factor scores.

5.3.2. General

At first glance, the total scores of the two factors appeared surprisingly low (Table 5.3). The "equality of the sexes" factor produced a mean score below the scale midpoint, possibly indicating agreement with beliefs in the equality of the sexes. While women did score significantly lower than men, men still scored lower than the midpoint (Table 5.5). The "male superiority" factor produced a mean score exactly on the scale midpoint, which possibly also did not support the inference that there were strong beliefs in male superiority in this population. As with the beliefs in equality, the scores of the female participants did pull the totals down, but again other influences may account for the low mean totals.

As this study made use of factor scores, it was not possible to compare the results with previous published findings. It was therefore decided to compare the results with two other samples that were thought to be at more extreme ends on the sexism-egalitarianism continuum: retired people and university students in psychology. Benson & Vincent (1980) previously described college students as the least sexist, and the age group over 60 as the most sexist of all the samples they studied. These two samples are described in Appendix E. When the totals of both genders were used, there were significant differences in the scores for "equality of the sexes" [$F(2,642)=38.06$; $p<0.001$; $\eta^2=0.11$] and "male superiority" [$F(2,642)=43.44$; $p<0.001$; $\eta^2=0.12$]. The results can be found in Table 5.4. Sailors and retirees held weaker beliefs in the equality of the sexes than university students ($p<0.01$), and sailors also held weaker beliefs than retirees ($p<0.01$). Both sailors and retirees further had stronger beliefs in the superiority of men than the university students ($p<0.01$). The SAN sample thus appears to be more sexist, according to their SATWS scores, than the samples of students and retired people.

When the scores of the men were compared, there were significant differences for “equality of the sexes” [$F(2,431)=15.55$; $p<0.001$; $\eta^2=0.07$] and “male superiority” [$F(2,431)=27.08$; $p<0.001$; $\eta^2=0.11$]. The results can be found in Table 5.5. Sailors and retirees held weaker beliefs in the equality of the sexes than university students ($p<0.01$). Both sailors and retirees had stronger beliefs in the superiority of men than the university students ($p<0.01$), and retirees further had stronger beliefs in the superiority of men than sailors ($p<0.05$). The last finding was surprising, and sailors’ lower scores (relative to the retirees) may be suggestive that the emergence of women in the fleet is changing the discourse of masculinity in that environment.

When the women were compared, there were significant differences in the scores for “equality of the sexes” [$F(2,208)=3.69$; $p<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.03$.] and “male superiority” [$F(2,208)=6.53$; $p<0.01$; $\eta^2=0.06$]. The results can be found in Table 5.6. Sailors held weaker beliefs in the equality of the sexes ($p<0.05$), and stronger beliefs in the superiority of men than the university students ($p<0.01$). This can be attributed to the sailors’ relatively lower levels of education, as well as their age (which is associated with higher scores, cf. Benson & Vincent, 1980). However, female sailors are closer to students in terms of age, but closer to retirees in terms of scores on the SATWS. It could also be speculated that exposure to a sexist environment (i.e. the armed forces) influence women’s beliefs, more than their age group would otherwise suggest.

Table 5.3: Descriptive statistics of the SAN sample on the SATWS

	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Scale midpoint
Equality of the sexes	476	43.22	16.46	14	95	56
Male superiority	476	92.03	22.34	23	147	92

Table 5.4: Comparisons of three groups (on the SATWS)

	N	Equality of the sexes		Male superiority	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Military	476	43.22	16.46	92.03	22.34
University students	85	27.61	8.08	67.99	17.51
Retired people	84	37.33	16.11	88.43	23.32

Table 5.5: Comparisons of the men in the three groups (on the SATWS)

	N	Equality of the sexes		Male superiority	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Military	363	47.01	15.66	95.90	20.35
University students	27	30.07	8.92	69.63	18.03
Retired people	44	46.27	14.61	103.36	12.58

Table 5.6: Comparisons of the women in the three groups (on the SATWS)

	N	Equality of the sexes		Male superiority	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Military	113	31.04	12.68	79.58	23.95
University students	58	26.47	7.47	67.22	17.37
Retired people	40	27.50	11.31	72.00	21.31

5.3.3. Comparison between genders

Men scored significantly higher than women on both factors in the direction of increased sexism. The results can be found in Table 5.7. Cross-cultural and cross-national studies of gender role ideology have found that women have more liberal attitudes towards women's roles (Gibbons, Hamby & Dennis, 1997). It is therefore not surprising that women scored lower than men on both factors (Table 5.7), which confirms the finding of Benson & Vincent (1980) and Jones & Jacklin (1988). Further, this difference is probably magnified in this sample, as men with traditional beliefs (i.e. in male superiority) tend to gravitate towards the armed forces.

Table 5.7: Comparisons of women and men's scores (on the SATWS)

	N	Women		Men		t-value*	p-value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Equality of the sexes	476	31.04	12.68	47.01	15.66	9.88	0.001
Male superiority	476	79.58	23.95	95.90	20.35	7.13	0.001

* t-test for independent samples

5.3.4. Comparison of work environments

The SATWS sample was made up of respondents from three work environments, namely administration, training, and ships. As there were no women on ships, only the scores of the male respondents were analysed. There was a significant difference in the scores for “equality of the sexes” [$F(2,360)=43.69$; $p<0.01$; $\eta^2=0.06$] and “male superiority” [$F(2,360)=4.29$; $p<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.01$]. The results can be found in Table 5.8. Sailors in the ship environment held weaker beliefs in the equality of the sexes than sailors ashore (for both administrative and training environments; $p<0.01$). They further held stronger beliefs in the superiority of men than the men in administration ($p<0.05$). The men in the administrative branch had had longer-term exposure to women as their equals. This exposure may have led to more egalitarian views, as Jones & Jacklin (1988) previously found with the SATWS.

Table 5.8: Comparisons of scores between work environments (on the SATWS)

	N	Equality of the sexes		Male superiority	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Administrative	56	34.91	13.36	87.55	23.72
Training	54	38.18	13.99	90.94	25.64
Ship-based	253	49.23	16.37	94.61	19.82

5.3.5. Comparison of rank groups

The SATWS sample consisted of four rank groups, namely junior ratings, senior ratings, warrant officers and officers. Due to the small number of women in the senior rank categories, only the scores of the male respondents were analysed. There was a significant difference in the scores for “equality of the sexes” [$F(3,359)=3.37$; $p<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.03$], but beliefs in “male superiority” did not show any significant differences [$F(3,359)=3.25$; $p=0.08$; $\eta^2=0.03$]. The results can be found in Table 5.9. Warrant officers held significantly less egalitarian beliefs than all the other groups ($p<0.05$). There were no other significant findings.

Officers scored lowest (although not significantly) on both factors. It has been suggested that officers, because of their rank, career orientation, and closeness to the military and political

leadership, may generally respond in the direction of social desirability and political correctness in the context of gender integration (Kummel, 2002).

Table 5.9: Comparisons of scores between rank groups (on the SATWS)

	N	Equality of the sexes		Male superiority	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Junior ratings	190	47.39	15.01	98.87	19.36
Senior ratings	124	45.99	15.99	93.62	21.47
Warrant officers	10	61.40	17.45	91.50	19.63
Officers	39	44.72	15.89	89.82	19.85

5.3.6. Comparison of race groups

The SATWS sample consisted of four race groups, namely African, Coloured, Indian and White. Again only the scores of the male sample were used, as there were not sufficient women from all four groups. There were no significant differences between the groups with regard to equality of the sexes [$F(3,359)=1.52$; $p=0.21$; $\eta^2=0.01$], nor with regard to the superiority of men [$F(3,359)=0.58$; $p=0.63$; $\eta^2=0.004$]. The results can be found in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10: Comparisons of scores between race groups (on the SATWS)

	N	Equality of the sexes		Male superiority	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
African	88	45.41	12.47	94.72	21.27
Coloured	146	48.64	17.93	96.80	18.87
Indian	11	52.18	22.50	102.00	21.35
White	118	45.70	13.85	95.11	21.41

5.3.7. Effect of age

Correlations between the two factors of the SATWS and age were calculated for the total group, and women and men separately. There were no significant correlations between age and beliefs in the equality of the sexes, or beliefs in male superiority (Table 5.11).

Age is often significantly correlated to gender-role attitudes, with younger people holding less sexist attitudes (McHugh & Frieze, 1997). It is therefore surprising that no significant correlation was found between age and the scores on the SATWS. This contrasts with other research using the full-scale SATWS, where age did play an important role (Benson & Vincent, 1980; Jones & Jacklin, 1988). A number of factors may have contributed to this. The present sample differs markedly from the typical samples usually used, namely university students. The age range of the present study differs from typical university samples, but was still fairly restricted, and other factors, like education, were not controlled. The military environment itself may also help to explain the lack of effect of age in this sample. Both younger and older respondents in this sample were all part of the same organisation, one that encourages and maintains common attitudes throughout the career (and lifespan) of its members. All naval personnel are exposed to the same indoctrination, and are rewarded for adhering to it (e.g. through promotion). Self-selection could also play a role; this means that those individuals who are comfortable with the culture and values of the organisation stay, while those whose own views do not fit that of the organisation, leave. Given these reasons, the respondents in this study can therefore be expected to hold common attitudes, irrespective of age.

Table 5.11: Correlation between age and the SATWS*

	Total group (r-coefficient)	Women (r-coefficient)	Men (r-coefficient)
N	476	113	363
Equality of the sexes	-0.01	0.03	-0.10
Male superiority	-0.01	0.18	-0.09

* significance for all correlation coefficients at $p > 0.05$

5.3.8. Summary of SATWS findings

The factor analysis of the SATWS data produced two meaningful factors: beliefs in the equality of the sexes, and beliefs in male superiority/dominance. The military group scored higher on both factors than the student sample, and higher than the retired group with regard to equality of the sexes.

Ship-based sailors scored higher on sexism than shore-based sailors in respect of both beliefs in the equality of the sexes, and beliefs in male superiority. This may have been because the men on the ships had less (if any) exposure to women as their equals at work. Their gender isolation at work has also denied them the environment where the presence of women colleagues could challenge their beliefs of male superiority. Men working ashore, in contrast, have had more exposure to women and thus held more egalitarian views.

In conclusion, the ships that were about to receive women for the first time were environments with a higher level of sexism than the land-bases from which the women came, suggesting that those women would have difficulties in adjustment and well-being once they came onto the ships. While these attitudes reflect the situation in the fleet in general, the next section will deal with the situation on the ships in particular.

5.4. Gender Integration Survey

The GIS is a 45-item instrument measuring specific opinions regarding women on ships. Items are again scored on a 7-point Likert format (strongly disagree to strongly agree), with total scores ranging from 45 to 315. Higher scores indicate greater sexism. The full scale can be found in Appendix A. The full-scale Cronbach alpha coefficient was a satisfactory 0.77.

5.4.1. Factor analysis

A maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation produced a three-factor structure (Table 5.12). The three factors together accounted for 28.53% of the total item variance. A cut-off point of 0.4 for item loadings was then chosen for practical reasons (Dawis, 2000) and items loading <0.4 were excluded from further analysis. Twenty-one items failed to load on any of the factors. All retained item-total correlations were greater than 0.2; the Cronbach alpha coefficients can be found in Table 5.12.

Items loading substantively on Factor 1 referred to beliefs that the Navy is a 'man's world'. It contains beliefs about the Navy as a 'masculine' environment, and a number of wide-ranging reasons why women do not belong on ships.

Factor 2 incorporated fears that men would be relatively deprived when women came onto the ships. The factor conveys a sense of men's belief that "it's not fair, women will have the advantage", and includes reasons to oppose women's arrival on ships.

Superficially, factor 3 refers to support of women on ships. Two items have to do with direct support, while two other items reflect paternalistic support. However, the four items together do not form a cohesive construct, and show poor internal reliability. They were thus discarded, and the further analysis only used the first two factors.

As with the SATWS, the items in each factor were totalled, indicating the degree to which respondents held the beliefs that made up that factor. The factor totals were used for the subsequent analysis.

Table 5.12: Factor loadings for varimax three-factor solution

Item	Loading
Factor 1: The Navy is a man's world	
(Cronbach alpha = 0.82)	
(Eigenvalue = 9.20)	
11. Women should rather be at home looking after children than serve onboard Navy ships	0.75
14. Swans do not belong onboard ships because they lack the physical strength to do the job	0.74
17. Women will never really be accepted into the Navy as it is a "man's world"	0.72
4. The Navy is a "man's world"	0.68
12. Women should not serve on ships due to the possibility of intimate relationships (with men) forming while at sea	0.68
9. Women should not serve on ships because of the potential of falling pregnant	0.65
35. It will do the Navy harm to have women serving in all ranks and positions at sea	0.56
40. Allowing women to go to sea will weaken the Navy	0.55
20. The partners (wives, girlfriends) of male sailors are against the presence of swans onboard	0.42
38. Having women on a ship will benefit that ship	0.42
7. Men give more support to each other than to their female colleagues when they go to sea	0.40
Factor 2: Fear of relative deprivation	
(Cronbach alpha = 0.86)	
(Eigenvalue = 1.80)	
19. Swans receive preferential treatment onboard ships	0.71
27. Swans expect preferential treatment onboard ships	0.69
39. Male rating gets punished more severely than female ratings	0.61

16. Seagoing women tend to get the cushy jobs onboard ships	0.59
21. Women have more medical problems, which make them a liability onboard ships	0.51
33. Women should not serve on ships because they get emotional at certain times of the month	0.51
22. Women onboard ships mean that men get crowded into fewer cabins	0.47
31. While on deployment, women will be less effective as they will tend to worry more about their families/dependants	0.47
18. If mothers deploy to sea, it will have a detrimental effect on their children	0.45
Factor 3: Support for women on ships (Cronbach alpha = 0.55) (Eigenvalue = 1.83)	
24. A male sailor should help a woman if she struggles to complete her task	0.56
23. It is necessary to have a senior woman onboard to protect junior ratings	0.52
32. Women should serve on ships because of the new constitution	0.44
41. I personally like the fact that a growing number of women are joining to serve on ships	0.43

5.4.2. General

Because of its ship-specific nature, there were no comparison groups available for the GIS. Results from this survey will be used for intra-group comparisons only. The total scores of the factor that the “Navy is a man’s world” produced a mean score below the scale midpoint, possibly suggesting limited agreement with beliefs in the Navy as a masculine domain (Table 5.13).

In contrast, the factor called “Fear of relative deprivation” produced a mean score that was elevated over the scale midpoint. The fears of losing status, privileges, or opportunities to women were all strongly supported. Ideologically, then, respondents appeared to be possibly less resistant to the idea of women on ships, but feared the impact on their individual positions. This dichotomy of ideology versus practice may not be a uniquely South African experience, as the same phenomenon has been observed in other recently gender-integrated armed forces, as evidence by reports from the German Bundeswehr (Kummel, 2002).

Table 5.13: Descriptive statistics of the GIS

	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Scale midpoint
Navy as man’s world	175	39.54	14.55	14	77	44
Fear of relative deprivation	175	40.38	11.63	9	63	36

5.4.3. Comparison between ships

As the GIS was only administrated to the ship-based male respondents in the sample, no comparisons between work environments were possible. The two factors in the GIS specifically refer to opinions about women on ships, and the scores of the participating ships were compared. The GIS scores came from three different ship environments: One large ship, and two smaller sister ships (one already prepared for gender integration, one to stay all-male).

There was a significant difference in the scores for the “Navy as a man’s world” factor [$F(2,172)=9.69$; $p<0.01$; $\eta^2=0.10$] and the “fear of relative deprivation” factor [$F(2,172)=9.70$; $p<0.01$; $\eta^2=0.10$]. The results can be found in Table 5.14.

The respondents on the large ship expressed significantly weaker beliefs in the Navy being a man’s world than did the respondents on either of the two smaller ships ($p<0.01$). There was no significant difference between the beliefs held by the respondents on the two small ships with regard to the Navy being a man’s world. In the past decade, women did occasionally accompany the big ships (e.g. as public relations officers). The previous exposure to women could have ameliorated men’s beliefs in the Navy as a masculine domain, but it is not known how many of the current participants had previously sailed with women.

The large ships also expressed less fear of relative deprivation than the small male-only ship ($p<0.01$) and the small gender-integrating ship ($p<0.05$). The same reasons may apply – the men on this ship had sailed with women before, and might have seen firsthand that they did not suffer extreme consequences.

The two small sister ships were not significantly different in terms of beliefs that the Navy was a man’s world or in their fears of relative deprivation once women came onboard the ships. It is of note that the level of fear of potential deprivation was as strong on the ships that did not have immediate ‘threats’. Their concerns might have been projected into the future, based on the realisation that women would eventually come onto their ships as well, or might reflect their concern for their own career promotion, which might include a tour of duty on a gender- integrated ship, and competition from the women for promotion posts.

Table 5.14: Comparison between the ships (on the GIS)

	N	Navy as man's world		Fear of relative deprivation	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Large ship	121	36.55	13.71	37.92	11.37
Small male only	32	47.97	12.98	46.31	9.37
Small integrating	22	43.68	15.89	45.27	11.80

5.4.4. Comparison of rank groups

The GIS sample consisted of four rank groups, namely junior ratings, senior ratings, warrant officers and officers. There were no significant differences between the groups with regard to the belief that the Navy was a man's world [$F(3,171)=1.00$; $p=0.40$; $\eta^2=0.02$] or the fear of relative deprivation [$F(3,171)=2.41$; $p=0.07$; $\eta^2=0.04$]. The lack of significant difference between the ranks may indicate that all the men share the same views and fears (Table 5.15).

Table 5.15: Comparisons of scores between rank groups (on the GIS)

	N	Navy as man's world		Fear of relative deprivation	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Junior ratings	93	41.03	13.63	42.46	10.24
Senior ratings	46	38.63	15.70	38.89	9.96
Warrant officers	14	34.50	11.26	36.14	17.15
Officers	22	38.32	17.38	37.36	14.89

5.4.5. Comparison of race groups

The sample consisted of four race groups, namely African, Coloured, Indian and White. There were no significant differences between the groups with regard to the belief that the Navy was a man's world [$F(3,171)=0.08$; $p=0.97$; $\eta^2=0.001$], nor with regard to fears of relative deprivation [$F(3,171)=0.43$; $p=0.73$; $\eta^2=0.01$] (Table 5.16). The lack of significant difference between the race groups may indicate that the men as a group share the same views and fears.

Table 5.16: Comparisons of scores between rank groups (on the GIS)

	N	Navy as man's world		Fear of relative deprivation	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
African	39	40.56	13.55	41.79	10.52
Coloured	72	39.19	14.72	39.31	11.81
Indian	6	39.50	19.28	41.83	9.66
White	58	39.28	14.83	40.60	12.43

5.4.6. Effect of age

No significant correlations were found for age and the belief that the Navy is a man's world. There was, however, a significant negative correlation between age and fears of relative deprivation ($r=-0.21$; $p<0.05$). Older men held less fears of relative deprivation, but as they are also the more senior sailors, they have potentially less to be deprived of. Younger men who have more to lose are those with the strongest beliefs in possible deprivation (Table 5.17).

Table 5.17: Correlation between age and the GIS

	r-coefficient
N	175
Navy as man's world	-0.12
Fear of Relative deprivation	-0.21*

* $p<0.05$

5.4.7. Summary of GIS findings

Factor analysis of the GIS produced two meaningful factors – a belief in the Navy as a man's world, and a fear of relative deprivation. The first factor (Navy as man's world) received less support than the second factor (Fears of relative deprivation). The male sailors appeared (to some extent) ideologically supportive of gender integration, but still expressed practical fears about issues that would affect their personal work situation.

The lowest scores on these factors came from the large ships that had previous exposure to women on board. This previous exposure may have influenced the experiences, and

consequently the opinions of sailors on those ships, making them more positive than their counterparts on the smaller ships. Their direct experience may further have challenged their fears of possible negative consequences to their personal situations.

As they have sailed with women previously, they have seen first hand that the Navy is not men's exclusive world any more. Strong beliefs in the Navy as a man's world would have been at odds with their experiences, creating cognitive dissonance. This discomfort would have required a re-alignment of their opinions to solve the incongruence with their experience in reality.

There was little difference across the rank and race categories. Age did correlate with a fear of relative deprivation, in that older men were less threatened by it. This might have been a function of their position in the organisation, where age is usually associated with senior status. Their status would therefore negate the threat of relative deprivation. Younger men, however, would be more threatened by the potential of deprivation, and could therefore be expected to resist women more actively.

5.5. Sexual Harassment Questionnaire

The SHQ measured sexual harassment through clearly defined behaviours, in line with the definition of sexual harassment that is used in the SAN. The SAN policy states that all offensive behaviour of a sexual nature may constitute sexual harassment, whether directed to the offended individual or simply observed by him or her. The questionnaire consisted of 38 items, to be completed in terms of frequency (never=1, seldom=2, often=3, always=4). There was also a further item regarding secondary victimisation. The full scale can be found in Appendix A. The full-scale Cronbach alpha coefficient was satisfactory at 0.93. As had been done with the other two instruments, it was decided to subject the SHQ to a factor analysis, in order to discover a more nuanced rendering of the dynamics involved in the experience of sexual harassment in the fleet.

5.5.1. Factor analysis

A three-factor structure emerged after a maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation (Table 5.18). The three factors together accounted for 42.40% of the total item variance. They became theoretically meaningful when including items with a loading of >0.5 . Lower loadings confused the differentiation, especially between co-worker and supervisor harassment. All retained item-total correlations were greater than 0.2; the Cronbach alpha coefficients can also be found in Table 5.18.

Factor 1 comprises items referring to direct, individual sexual harassment from supervisors. This includes both unwanted physical contact, and requests for sexual favours. In the theoretical framework, the type of sexual harassment contained in this factor refers to 'unwanted sexual attention', with supervisors being identified as the source of the harassment.

Factor 2 refers to experiences of verbal gender harassment. This includes an environment saturated with sexist and sexual comments. Both supervisors and co-workers act as the source of the harassment.

Factor 3 is formed by items referring to direct, individual sexual harassment from co-workers. Like factor 1, it includes both unwanted physical contact, and requests for sexual favours. The type of sexual harassment contained in this factor refers to 'unwanted sexual attention', with co-workers being the source of the harassment.

The items in each factor were totalled, indicating the degree to which respondents experience the sexual harassment that make up each factor. The factor totals were used for the analysis that follows.

Table 5.18: Factor loadings for varimax three-factor solution

Item	Loading
Factor 1: Unwanted sexual attention from supervisors (Cronbach alpha = 0.86) (Eigenvalue = 11.32)	
20. How often do you get touched by supervisor(s) in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?	0.82
32. How often does your supervisor(s) engage in activities like blowing kisses, licking lips in a	0.79

sexual manner?	
18. How often do you get pinched, patted, hugged or kissed by you supervisor(s) in your work environment?	0.68
30. How often does your supervisor(s) stare at you in a sexually suggestive manner?	0.61
10. How often does your supervisor(s) request unwanted sexual favours from you (from a kiss to more serious)?	0.59
22. How often do you feel supervisor(s) get physically too close to you (unnecessarily)?	0.53
Factor 2: Verbal gender harassment (Cronbach alpha = 0.87) (Eigenvalue = 2.41)	
36. How often does your supervisor(s) make crude sexual remarks?	0.75
24. How often does your supervisor(s) tell sexually orientated stories when you are in the company?	0.73
35. How often does your co-worker(s) make crude sexual remarks?	0.72
23. How often does your co-worker(s) tell sexually orientated stories when you are in the company?	0.65
6. How often does your supervisor(s) tell sexist jokes in you company?	0.62
38. How often does your supervisor(s) make crude sexist remarks?	0.58
37. How often does your co-worker(s) make crude sexist remarks?	0.56
5. How often does your co-worker(s) tell sexist jokes in you company?	0.51
Facto 3: Unwanted sexual attention from co-workers (Cronbach alpha = 0.89) (Eigenvalue = 1.96)	
15. How often does your co-worker(s) engage in unasked for adjustments to your dress or uniform?	0.70
21. How often do you feel co-worker(s) get physically too close to you (unnecessarily)?	0.69
29. How often does your co-worker(s) stare at you in a sexually suggestive manner?	0.68
19. How often do you get touched by co-worker(s) in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?	0.67
31. How often does your co-worker(s) engage in activities like blowing kisses, licking lips in a sexual manner?	0.60
13. How often does your co-worker(s) make sexually suggestive noises in the company of the opposite sex?	0.59
17. How often do you get pinched, patted, hugged or kissed by your co-worker(s) in your work environment?	0.59
9. How often does your co-worker(s) request unwanted sexual favours from you (from a kiss to more serious)?	0.56
11. How often does your co-worker(s) repeatedly invite you on a "date" after you clearly said no?	0.53

7. How often does your co-worker(s) use unwanted "terms of endearment" (like "bokkie, skattie, love, etc") with you?	0.50
--	------

5.5.2. Prevalence of sexual harassment

According to questionnaire responses, 33.78% of women and 14.05% of men experienced at least one incident of direct supervisor harassment in the preceding 6 months. Over the same time, 78.51% of women and 80% of men experienced at least one incident of gender harassment, and 84.3% of women and 51.35% of men experienced at least one incident of direct co-worker sexual harassment. The figures can be found in Table 5.19.

The occurrence of gender harassment closely mirrors the experience of the US Army (79% of women and 68% of men) (Rosen & Martin, 2000). It is considerably higher than the 48% reported after a previous survey in the DoD (DoD, 1997), and this is probably due to a more objective behavioural definition of sexual harassment used in the current study, which did not rely on respondents' interpretations of sexual harassment.

According to the questionnaire responses, sexual harassment is widespread, as experienced by a large number of respondents. The high numbers point to the ubiquitous nature of the phenomenon. The questionnaire does not indicate intensity, but the presence of offensive behaviours.

Table 5.19: Prevalence of sexual harassment in preceding 6 months

	Total group		Women		Men	
	No*	Yes**	No	Yes	No	Yes
Supervisor harassment	78.10%	21.90%	66.12%	33.78%	85.95%	14.05%
Verbal gender harassment	20.59%	79.41%	21.49%	78.51%	20.00%	80.00%
Co-worker harassment	35.60%	64.40%	15.70%	84.30%	48.65%	51.35%

* percentage of respondents indicating 'never'

** percentage of respondents indicating 'seldom', 'often' or 'always'

As could be expected, more women than men experienced at least one incident of supervisor (Yates corrected $\chi^2 = 15.68$, $p < 0.01$) and co-worker (Yates corrected $\chi^2 = 33.20$, $p < 0.01$)

sexual harassment. Both women and men experienced the same high occurrence of gender harassment (Yates corrected $\chi^2 = 0.03$, $p=0.86$).

Although no public figures of complaints of sexual harassment in the SAN are available, the high scores on the SHQ stand in contrast to anecdotal reports of the lack of formal complaints within the organisation. Because women tend to interpret a wider range of behaviour as sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, 1993; Mayekiso & Bhana, 1997; Pryor et al., 1995), the questionnaire asked if certain behaviour was present, and not necessarily whether it was interpreted as sexual harassment at the time. The value of the behavioural definition of items lies in its provision of a clearer indication of what does occur, and not the interpretation of such behaviour.

At the same time, though, the high scores of the men may also be a result of the behavioural definition of the questionnaire items. As previously mentioned, the questionnaire instructed respondents to report behaviour that was experienced. Individuals may thus have experienced behaviour as described by the items, and reported it without interpreting it as sexual harassment per se. Wilson's (2000) study with university students found that 93% of men reported being on the receiving end of negative remarks or jokes (by women). US Military studies have also indicated that men experience being harassed by women (and other men) (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2001). Although the nature of the items in the questionnaire does not allow for such analysis, it is possible that the high verbal gender harassment scores also include the experiences of men being harassed by women.

The finding that many men experienced incidents of offensive behaviour may indicate that women do not exaggerate the amount of sexual harassment they experience. It does not mean that all men interpreted the actions as offensive or problematic, but it does point to the pervasive presence of such behaviour in the fleet.

5.5.3. Co-worker versus supervisor harassment

Most sexual harassment came from co-workers, and not supervisors. This supports studies in the US military (Firestone & Harris, 2003; Lipari & Lancaster, 2003; Pryor, 1995) that found that unwanted sexual attention usually came from peers. A number of factors are believed to

be involved in this phenomenon. Co-workers have daily contact, creating familiarity, which may lead to sexual harassment expressed as over-familiarity. There is continuous opportunity for co-worker interaction, and the close proximity in living and working onboard ships or in barracks also creates the potential for interaction of a sexual nature.

Sexual harassment is primarily about power (Edley & Wetherell, 1995), and the opportunities of the work environment may simply facilitate the expression of harassment (Rospenda et al., 1998). Supervisors have institutionalised power, and may not need to resort to sexual harassment to maintain their position. In contrast, co-workers lack institutionalised power. Previous studies indicated that, on the shop floor, sexual harassment takes the form of creating a hostile environment, rather than coercion, as masculinity is situationally constructed with the resources available in the context (DiTomaso, 1989). Therefore, co-workers may not need institutionalised power. Sexual harassment has previously been described as a power imbalance that stems from a patriarchal society where men inherently have more informal power than women (Fineran, Bennett & Sacco, 2003). It has further been suggested that the strong emphasis on male attributes in defining a 'good' soldier may give males enough power to engage in harassment, in spite of it being against military policy (Firestone & Harris, 2003). Table 5.20 shows the comparison of co-worker and supervisor harassment⁹. In contrast to the present study, other researchers have described sexual harassment by supervisors – not peers – as the norm in the military (Nantais & Lee, 1999).

Table 5.20: Sources of harassment (on the SHQ)

	N	Supervisor		Co-worker		t-value*	p-value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Total group	306	1.10	0.30	1.31	0.43	6.80	p=0.0001
Women	121	1.20	0.44	1.49	0.54	4.48	p=0.0001
Men	185	1.04	0.10	1.19	0.29	6.75	p=0.0001

* t-tests for dependent samples, by variables

⁹ Totalled item scores in each factor were divided by the number of items in the factor.

5.5.4. Comparisons of work environments¹⁰

The SHQ sample was made up of respondents from three work environments, but women were only present in two, namely administration and training. The responses of men on ships were thus not included in the analysis of work environment differences.

There were no significant differences between the work environments with regard to supervisor harassment [$F(1,234)=1.02$; $p=0.31$; $\eta^2=0.004$], verbal gender harassment [$F(1,234)=0.01$; $p=0.95$; $\eta^2=1.98$], or co-worker harassment [$F(1,234)=0.16$; $p=0.69$; $\eta^2=0.0007$]. The work environment does not seem to influence the expression of experiences of sexual harassment. The results are presented in Table 5.21.

Table 5.21: Comparisons of scores between work-environments (on the SHQ)

	N	Supervisor harassment		Verbal gender harassment		Co-worker harassment	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Admin	125	6.85	2.06	12.62	4.12	13.81	4.78
Training	111	6.59	1.92	12.58	4.78	13.57	4.55

5.5.5. Comparison of rank groups

The SHQ sample consisted of three rank groups, namely junior ratings, senior ratings and officers. The total sample did not report any significant differences in their experience of supervisor harassment [$F(2,303)=2.07$; $p=0.13$; $\eta^2=0.01$], but reported significant differences in their experience of verbal gender harassment [$F(2,303)=6.14$; $p<0.01$; $\eta^2=0.04$] and co-worker harassment [$F(2,303)=12.74$; $p<0.01$; $\eta^2=0.08$]. The results can be found in Table 5.22. Junior ratings experienced more verbal gender harassment than officers ($p<0.05$), and more co-worker harassment than senior ratings ($p<0.01$) and officers ($p<0.01$).

For women, rank is often part of their (lack of) status and power, and their rank may therefore have a direct influence on their experiences of sexual harassment. As their experiences were thought to be an indicator of men's possible resistance through sexual harassment, their scores

¹⁰ The analysis of work environments, rank, race, and age makes use of the totals of factor items.

were analysed separately. The results derived from the women's scores are found in Table 5.23. The women did not report any significant differences in their experiences of supervisor [F(2,118)=0.71; p=0.49; $\eta^2=0.01$] and verbal gender harassment [F(2,118)=1.57; p=0.21; $\eta^2=0.03$] across ranks, but only for direct co-worker harassment [F(2,118)=6.03; p<0.01; $\eta^2=0.09$]. Officers experienced significantly less verbal gender harassment than junior ratings (p<0.05), but not significantly less than senior ratings. Junior ratings experienced more direct co-worker harassment than all the other rank groups (p<0.05), which is supported by studies in the US Navy (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Lipari & Lancaster, 2003).

Officers often move in different physical spaces as junior ratings, and may therefore be less exposed to verbal gender harassment. Their status also sets them apart, and they might not see any harassment – either directed at them or witnessed by them. They are also the group responsible for enforcing the policy, and it may thus be that they do not want to see any sexual harassment, as it would mean they are not performing to organisational expectations.

Junior ratings experienced more direct co-worker harassment than did the other rank groups. Their lower status in the organisation makes them more vulnerable, and often goes hand in hand with weaker enforcement of existing discipline. It is also on this level that most of the women are concentrated. More contact creates opportunity for more harassment. Male junior ratings are further the most threatened by the ascent of women in the SAN, as evidenced by the negative correlation of age and fear of relative deprivation. They may therefore feel the need to resist women's emergence as equals more actively, and as a consequence engage more often in sexually harassing behaviour (resulting in more female junior ratings experiencing co-worker sexual harassment).

Table 5.22: Comparisons of full sample scores between rank categories (on the SHQ)

	N	Supervisor harassment		Verbal gender harassment		Co-worker harassment	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Junior ratings	159	6.77	2.03	13.28	4.81	14.21	5.20
Senior ratings	120	6.51	1.63	12.11	4.14	11.92	2.77
Officers	27	6.07	0.38	10.37	2.10	11.37	1.86

Table 5.23: Comparisons of women's scores between rank categories (on the SHQ)

	N	Supervisor harassment		Verbal gender harassment		Co-worker harassment	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Junior ratings	67	7.39	2.91	13.07	4.99	16.28	6.37
Senior ratings	46	7.11	2.44	12.15	3.93	13.37	3.40
Officers	8	6.25	0.71	10.38	2.56	11.50	1.07

5.5.6. Comparison of race groups

The SHQ sample consisted of three race groups, namely African, Coloured and White. There were no significant differences between the race groups on supervisor harassment [$F(2,303)=0.83$; $p=0.44$; $\eta^2=0.01$], verbal gender harassment [$F(2,303)=0.16$; $p=0.19$; $\eta^2=0.01$], or co-worker harassment [$F(2,303)=0.15$; $p=0.22$; $\eta^2=0.01$]. The results can be found in Table 5.24.

The literature indicated possible different experiences of sexual harassment by different race groups. In western samples, women of colour tend to experience more sexual harassment, while Black women in South African samples reported less sexual harassment than their White counterparts. To investigate the SAN sample, the scores of the women were then analysed separately. The results of the women-only group can be found in Table 5.25. There were no significant differences between the race groups on supervisory [$F(2,118)=1.81$; $p=0.17$; $\eta^2=0.01$] or co-worker harassment [$F(2,118)=2.58$; $p=0.08$; $\eta^2=0.04$]. There were, however, significant differences between the different races' experiences of verbal gender harassment [$F(2,118)=3.64$; $p<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.06$].

African women experienced significantly less gender harassment than Coloured women ($p<0.05$), with a further tendency to experience less than White women ($p<0.10$). There were no significant differences between the scores of Coloured and White women. The finding that Black women experienced less gender harassment supports the study of Wyatt & Riederle (1995), but contrast with most studies comparing Black and White women in first world countries, where women of colour reported higher rates of sexual harassment (Cortina, Swan, Fitzgerald & Waldo, 1998; Mansfield, Koch, Henderson & Vicary, 1991; Paludi, 1996), a finding also reflected in the US military (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2001).

Studies on South African university campuses indicate that African students tend to acknowledge the existence of sexual harassment far less than other groups (Braine et al., 1995, Mayekiso & Bhana, 1997). It has been suggested that may be due to their endorsement of the traditional sex-role orientation (Malovich & Stake, 1990). However, this study did not find any indication on any of the SATWS or GIS factors that African sailors are more sexist than other race groups.

Table 5.24: Comparisons of full sample scores between race groups (on the SHQ)

	N	Supervisor harassment		Verbal gender harassment		Co-worker harassment	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
African	79	6.49	1.62	11.85	4.41	13.66	5.04
Coloured	119	6.77	2.86	13.02	4.92	13.13	4.77
White	108	6.51	1.21	12.58	3.88	12.55	3.05

Table 5.25: Comparisons of women's scores between race groups (on the SHQ)

	N	Supervisor harassment		Verbal gender harassment		Co-worker harassment	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
African	29	6.97	2.51	10.66	3.81	14.62	6.33
Coloured	43	7.81	3.51	13.42	5.67	16.28	6.36
White	49	6.81	1.58	12.90	3.39	13.76	3.44

5.5.7. Effect of age

Correlations between the three factors of the SHQ and age were calculated first for the total sample, and then separately for the women and men. A significant negative correlation was found between age and verbal gender harassment, and co-worker harassment (Table 5.26). Younger respondents experienced more gender harassment and more co-worker harassment, which supports other studies that found the same (Hargrow, 1997).

DiTomaso (1989) found that younger women, who were perceived as more threatening (in terms of competing for the same jobs as men), were more likely than other women to be subjected to sexual harassment by their peers. In the context of this study, younger respondents would generally have more junior rank, making them more vulnerable to sexual

harassment, as they have less power to respond appropriately. Also, younger men expressed greater fear of relative deprivation, and the finding of younger women experiencing more sexual harassment is suggestive of sexual harassment as men's response to the threat of relative deprivation.

Table 5.26: Correlation between age and sexual harassment (on the SHQ)

	Total group (r-coefficient)	Women (r- coefficient)	Men (r- coefficient)
N	306	121	185
Direct supervisor harassment	-0.08	-0.11	-0.04
Verbal gender harassment	-0.17*	-0.18*	-0.16*
Direct co-worker harassment	-0.23*	-0.30*	-0.19*

* $p < 0.05$

5.5.8. Reporting of sexual harassment

With such high levels of behaviours that could be construed as sexual harassment, it was noteworthy that there appeared¹¹ to be so few formal complaints. If this is indeed so, it would support findings in the US military and elsewhere, where only small percentages of victims make formal complaints (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Harris & Firestone, 1997; Schneider, Swan & Fitzgerald, 1997). Three factors could contribute to this, namely the interpretation of behaviour as harassment, the severity of the behaviour, and fears of secondary victimisation.

(a) Interpretation of behaviour as sexual harassment

The SHQ gave an indication of the presence of behaviours, but not whether they were necessarily interpreted as sexual harassment. If women did not interpret behaviours as harassing, they would not have reported it formally.

(b) Severity of the behaviour

Previous studies have suggested that more extreme behaviours (e.g. attempted rape) are more likely to be regarded as harassment and to be reported, while milder forms of harassment are

¹¹ No public records of sexual harassment complaints in the SAN are available

seen as not important enough to report (Brooks & Perot, 1991; McKinney, 1990; Rubin & Borgers, 1990). The SHQ does not give an indication of the prevalence of such extreme behaviours, and the SHQ items that indicated harassing behaviours may have been considered not important enough to report formally.

(c) Secondary victimisation

The SHQ provides some suggestion that secondary victimisation does play a role. Eight women indicated that they personally had experienced secondary victimisation after complaining about sexual harassment (6.61% of the women in the sample). A further 3 men indicated that they had personally observed secondary victimisation of women after complaints about sexual harassment had been made (1.62% of the men in the sample). While it is not known what kind of harassment they reported, the respondents did use the open space provided on the SHQ to highlight three aspects of secondary victimisation that are believed to deter individuals from reporting sexual harassment:

- 1) Emotional blackmail: The threat (made by others) that the victim will be responsible for the dire negative consequences to the perpetrator was listed most often: *"victims don't report sexual harassment because they don't want to be responsible for fellow-workers losing their jobs"*.
- 2) Organisational responses: The perceived lack of organisational support led to further reluctance to report sexual harassment. A number of respondents cited examples where they believed complaints were "squashed" (i.e. not processed) by middle managers before the complaints reached a level where they could not be ignored.
- 3) Social consequences: The potential social consequences, such as rejection by friends and family, compelled individuals not to report sexual harassment, e.g. *"women [victims] are afraid to tell boyfriends or families for fear what they might think"*. Some respondents felt "shamed" by the experience, and tried to avoid any reminder of it.

The perception that there is a lack of formal action against perpetrators by the SAN echoes similar findings in the US Military (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Pryor, 1995). A number of explanations have been proposed. Sexual harassment as dominance behaviour holds that harassment involves power over a person's life. Harassment is then not reported due to fear of the perpetrator's power. As power is inherent in military relationships in any event, this would be common for the military (Lewallen, 1991). In apparent contrast to this, Fitzgerald et al. (1995) reviewed a number of studies and found some evidence that victims are more likely to report supervisor harassment (as opposed to co-worker harassment). These authors argued that fear was the reason of non-reporting – fear of retaliation, fear of not being believed, fear of hurting one's career, and fear of being ashamed and humiliated. They cite a previous study in the USN, where one-third of the victims reported that they had been humiliated in front of others when they complained of being harassed.

Perpetrator power does not have to be organisational power (as in supervisory), as the structure of society may afford men power simply because they are men. In such a situation, co-worker sexual harassment would then be reported less, even if the perpetrator did not have institutionalised power.

The same situation described in Fitzgerald et al. (1995) is reflected in South African academia. Braine et al. (1995) found that students did not report sexual harassment out of fear of being accused of provocation, fear of not being believed by authorities, fear of intimidation, and fear of retaliation. Recent studies further confirmed the role of secondary victimisation: women do not lodge formal complaints to protect themselves from scrutiny and being blamed for inviting a sexual advance, and also to protect their own careers (Becker, 2000). US military women who reported harassment often reacted with feelings of shame, humiliation and wanting to leave the force. Many do in fact leave within one year of the incident (Becker, 2000). The SA survey (DoD, 1997) suggested that women were uncertain whether their complaint would be handled confidentially.

The role played by the fear of secondary victimisation emphasises the power issues involved in sexual harassment, and forces attention on the understanding of sexual harassment as keeping women in their (subordinate) place (Edley & Wetherell, 1995), in contrast to an understanding of harassment as simple acts with sexual overtones.

5.5.9. Summary of SHQ findings

The SHQ produced three meaningful factors: unwanted sexual attention from supervisors, verbal gender harassment, and unwanted sexual attention from co-workers. The findings suggest that sexual harassment is pervasive in the SAN, with 84% of women experiencing at least one incident of unwanted sexual attention from co-workers, and 78% of women experiencing at least one incident of verbal gender harassment (80% of men also experienced at least one incident of verbal gender harassment). One reason for these high scores lies in the nature of the questionnaire, which inquired into behaviours, but did not ask respondents to interpret them as sexual harassment. The main source of harassment was co-workers, who had the opportunity to harass. Male sailors may also feel more disempowered by the emergence of women as their equals, and therefore resist them more actively through harassing behaviours. Women were not new in the two environments investigated by means of the SHQ (namely the training and administrative areas), but their role became more important in the period prior to the study, both through the increase in numbers, and in the promotion of women to more senior positions. The resistance through sexual harassment is probably not so much resistance to their presence, but to the emerging equalisation of gender status.

There were no differences between the work environments. Throughout, female junior ratings experienced more co-worker harassment than the other rank groups. It could be speculated that their co-workers – male junior ratings – perpetrate the most sexual harassment. This group would be most threatened by the women, and would be actively resorting to sexual harassment to resist them. In addition, younger people experienced more co-worker and gender harassment. Their lower status (as junior ratings) made them more vulnerable, and also exposed them to the group who was most threatened by them – the male junior ratings, who would then resist them even more.

In spite of the widespread occurrence of behaviour that could be interpreted as sexual harassment, it appeared that few formal complaints were made, and it was argued here that this was primarily due to the fear of secondary victimisation. Such fear is not irrational, as 6.61% of the women indicated that they had personally experienced some form of secondary

victimisation. This highlights the importance of power issues in understanding the role of sexual harassment in the workplace.

5.6. General Discussion of Findings

Phase 1 of the study had two objectives: to investigate the general attitudes in the fleet towards women's place in the world; and to investigate the manifestation of resistance to women, as evidenced by the occurrence of sexual harassment in the fleet.

The general attitudes in the fleet were measured by means of the SATWS and GIS, which produced two meaningful factors each. Beliefs in the "equality of the sexes" were generally not well supported, while beliefs in "male superiority" were comparable to those of a group of retirees. The belief in the "Navy as a man's world" did not receive as strong support as attitudes expressing "fears of relative deprivation". When organisational developments affect an individual's personal position, status, privilege or career ambitions, it becomes harder to support beliefs that are potentially limiting. The fear of relative deprivation thus serves to explain why sailors, in spite of the ongoing transformation of South African society, still resist the incorporation of women, as evidenced by the high level of behavioural indicators reported through the SHQ.

Manifestation of resistance was measured by means of the SHQ. The prevalence of sexual harassment in the fleet is pervasive, and on par with reports from other military forces (Hay & Elig, 1999; Rosen & Martin, 1998, 2000), as well as from academic institutions in South Africa (Braine et al., 1995; Mayekiso & Bhana, 1997). The reasons for not complaining – secondary victimisation and inadequate organisational response – support other studies that report the same dynamics (Becker, 2000; Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; DoD, 1997; Fitzgerald, Swan & Fischer, 1995; Pryor, 1995).

The fact that most sexual harassment came from co-workers is of importance for the future. As mentioned previously, the naval work environment creates 'opportunities' that facilitates the priming of co-worker harassment – daily contact, greater familiarity, continuous opportunity, and the close proximity of living and working together. These conditions are

even more pronounced on ships, which may result in high levels of sexual harassment once women enter the ship environments.

Reflecting on the results of all three instruments, three theoretical issues appear to be important in illuminating the attitudes and experiences of different groups. These three issues – naval masculinity, status or position, and exposure – are implicated through all three instruments.

5.6.1. Naval masculinity

The absence of a specific warrior ideology in the SAN was mentioned in Chapter 3. However, naval masculinity can be constructed in other ways, where the behaviours of sailors (e.g. sexual harassment) is not linked to the concept of warrior, but rather to the concept of the Navy as distinct from the 'other' (i.e. possibly 'civilian'). Analysis of individual items of the SHQ reveals the presence of pervasive sexual talk and sexual suggestive material. Sixty-one percent of respondents heard co-workers tell sexist jokes, 58% heard them tell sexually orientated stories, and 38% heard co-workers making crude sexist and sexual remarks at work. Further, 33% of respondents observed sexual jokes, cartoons and calendars in the workplace.

Messerschmidt (1993) postulated that bad behaviour becomes a resource for doing gender, especially in situations where men's masculinity is at risk. With the de-gendering of the SAN, individual men's masculinity is not obvious anymore through group identity ("sailor"), and they therefore need to enact behaviour (e.g. sexual harassment) to preserve their masculine identity. In the fleet, with the total (paper) equality of women, sexual harassment can become a resource for the situational construction of masculinity.

5.6.2. Status within the organisation

Status, as determined by age and rank (often associated) and workplace, was of particular interest in this phase of the study. Younger men expressed greater fears of relative deprivation, reflecting the situation in European armed forces (Kummel, 2002). It can be argued that their low status or position in the organisation makes the emerging status of women a greater threat to their own career ambitions or personal self-esteem. Hardened sexist

attitudes and increased sexually harassing behaviour may become their way of resisting the challenge of women to their place in the organisation. Ship-based men – occupying the elevated status of last male bastion in the fleet – are also more sexist (i.e. having a strong belief in ‘male superiority’), which may lead them to view women assailing their status position as particularly threatening. Increased threat, as perceived by men, may be associated with expressions of resistance.

Status does not only effects men’s attitudes and proclivity to harass, but also women’s experiences of sexual harassment. Their lesser status makes them more vulnerable to harassment, as well as to secondary victimisation.

5.6.3. Exposure to gender integration in the work environment

Land-based units are more progressive in their views regarding gender relations, in contrast with ships, and likewise large ships are more progressive in contrast to smaller vessels. It can be argued that the progressive groups in each case had more exposure to women in their work environment. Women were working in the administrative branches as men’s equals for a long time, and large ships had women accompany them before. Exposure then becomes associated with more progressive views. It could be speculated that exposure will reduce resistance. It is worth noting that the larger ships had lesser fear of relative deprivation. In line with modern developments in the Contact Hypothesis (Brown, 1995), it could be argued that their exposure to women has challenged their (negative) expectations and reduced their fears.

Exposure (on the large ships) could further have created the opportunity for attitude change through the discomfort of cognitive dissonance. The Cognitive Dissonance Theory holds that individuals will try to resolve any emotional dissonance created by an incongruence of attitude and experience (Harmon-Jones, 2000). As sailors on these ships have seen women successfully challenge the exclusivity of the masculine domain, beliefs not in support of this (women’s challenge) would create discomfort. It could be hypothesised that they would have changed their attitude to reduce the discrepancy with experiences, in order to reduce the emotional dissonance (Beauvois & Joule, 1999).

5.7. Conclusion

The first phase of the study investigated the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet. The findings describe an environment with traditional ideological views, manifested through traditional resistance through widespread gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention. In general, lower organisational status among men is associated with a greater fear of women's integration, and a greater proclivity for resistance in the form of sexual harassment. Lower organisational status among women is associated with greater vulnerability to such harassment. Generally, lesser exposure to women as equals was associated with more sexism, and although it was not clear whether that would translate into greater fear of relative deprivation or more sexual harassment, it might be expected.

The data points to a number of implications for the actual integration of women and men onboard the ships: The sailors on the ships scored in the direction of increased sexism compared to land-based sailors. The women who are entering the world of the ships are therefore entering into an environment where men hold – relatively to the land-based men – more traditional attitudes about women's relative inferiority. These women have been working ashore, in an environment with less sexism. They may thus meet a stronger resistance than what they are used to when they join the ships' crews, which could in turn result in a difficult time of adjustment for them.

The above expectations must be tempered by the knowledge that the ships do apparently hold surprisingly progressive views for a traditionally male-dominated environment. The actual experiences of women and men after the gender integration of the ships will thus be the focus of the following four chapters.

CHAPTER SIX: WOMEN ON SHIPS: THEMATIC ANALYSIS

6.1. Introduction

Phase 2 of the study took place after women had been serving on ships for between 12 and 18 months. At the time of this study, women were serving on only four ships, representing 45% of the ships that were operational. This phase was designed to investigate the personal experiences and opinions of women and men directly affected by gender integration.

Chapter 4 introduced the methods used in the second phase of the study. This chapter will present the participants and data gathering process of this phase (Section 6.2). It will then provide an overview of the results (Section 6.3), to create a framework for interpreting the findings. The themes emanating from the data should be seen as a response to the perception of gender integration as a threat, which will be dealt with in Section 6.4. This chapter sets the framework for reporting the main findings of Phase 2 in Chapters 7 to 9. As such it also reviews certain silent issues (Section 6.5) – those issues that were expected to gain prominence in the analysis of the data, but did not.

6.2. Participants and Data Gathering

Three procedures were used to gather information:

1. Interviews
2. Focus groups
3. Personal event diaries

Forty-seven respondents took part in this phase of the study. The interviews and focus groups used different respondents. However, the interviewees from Ship B were also asked to complete the personal event diaries. The composition of the sample is shown in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Composition of sample

Rank groups	Ship A (integrated)	Ship B (integrated)		Ship C (male only)
	Male	Female	Male	Male
Officers		3	0	2
Warrant officers	5			
Senior ratings	7	1	2	2
Junior ratings	15	5	4	1
Total participants	27	9	6	5

One woman and four men had children that lived with them. More details on the participants can be found in Appendix C.

6.2.1. Interviews

All the women (N=9) on the small gender-integrated ship (Ship B) volunteered for the interviews, as did six male ratings (no male officers were available at the time). The men were generally more reluctant to become involved in 'interview' research, which was in line with previous observations (Brown, 2001). The interviews took place over a three week period, and were conducted in a private cabin onboard the ship during working hours. Interviews typically lasted between 60 and 120 minutes. All interviews were audio-taped, and afterwards transcribed. At the end of each interview, the respondents were asked to complete personal event diaries. Probably because rapport had been well established by this time, they all agreed.

Five sailors on the all-male sister ship (Ship C) were also interviewed to compare their opinions with those of the gender-integrated ship. They had not yet had women onboard. A good-natured rivalry existed between the two ships, which was accentuated by the arrival of women on one of them. The interviews took place over two days, and were conducted in an office on the naval base, during working hours. Interviews typically lasted about 60 minutes, were audio-taped, and afterwards transcribed.

Each interview was preceded with an explanation of the study, addressing issues of confidentiality, and discussing the use of the audio-recorder. After all their questions and concerns had been addressed, and their consent obtained, the audio-recorder was activated.

The interviews were opened by asking the respondents to briefly describe their naval background and then to “share their experiences of gender integration” with the researcher. The invitation to “tell their story” appeared to encourage the participants, and led to wide-ranging and open discussions (cf. Brown, 2001). The interviews were open (i.e. non-directive) discussions, and included the whole range of questions types, from basic descriptive questions to structural and paradigmatic questions (cf. Janesick, 2004). The interviewer followed the lead of the respondents, exploring issues along the way. At the end of the interviews, respondents were asked to make recommendations for the future.

The role of language in qualitative research can be complicated, as individuals use language not only to portray meaning, but also to give meaning to their experiences (Punch, 1998). On the technical level, the interviews were conducted in English and/or Afrikaans, although sailors speak in a naval idiom that often sounds estranged from formal English. Within the SAN, words have further special meaning within specific contexts – partly due to military indoctrination during basic training, where new recruits learn the naval vernacular. This is further developed and encouraged through the existence and perpetuation of an ‘insider culture’, which results in certain words having meanings beyond their official description. My position of working within the naval environment thus had one obvious benefit, in that I was fortunate enough to be able to communicate (at least to some extent) in that language, which built rapport, but more importantly led to a more nuanced expression by the respondents of their experiences. The transcriptions of the interviews and focus groups revealed the richness and nuances of the naval idiom, and contributed to a deeper level of meaning in the experiences they recounted.

6.2.2. Focus groups

The aim of the focus groups was to gain / obtain an account of the experiences and beliefs of members serving on the large gender-integrated ship (Ship A). These discussions took place shortly before they departed on a long operational deployment, during the same time period that the interviews took place on Ships B and C. Only men were involved, as no women were available at the time of the study.

Focus group members were recruited through their departmental heads (who acted as gatekeepers) who indicated which of their employees might be available and willing to participate. The sailors approached were keen to volunteer. They felt that, as their ship was one of the first to carry women, they needed to put the record straight on their experiences.

Four focus groups were held with male sailors – one with junior ratings from mixed-gender departments on the ship (N=8), one with junior ratings from male-only departments (N=7), one with senior ratings (N=7), and one with warrant officers (N=5). Groups were formed from homogeneous rank and gender populations, but were mixed in terms of cultural background and musterings. Focus groups lasted for ±90 minutes and discussions were audio-taped for later transcription. The discussions were conducted onboard the ship, where group members were given time off work to attend.

The focus groups aimed to elicit issues that were relevant to the experience of gender integration. It focussed on expectations and asked the question: “How do you feel about the upcoming deployment with women in the ship’s company?” Where appropriate, group members were invited to share their opinions on the implications of integration and equality. An unstructured approach to the ensuing discussion was followed, in the same style as the interviews.

A number of factors may have facilitated the frank and energetic discussion that characterised each group. Firstly, the focus group members all knew each other. They often worked in the same departments, and some of the older men had served with each other for many years. Secondly, care was taken that people of the same status (rank) formed each group. Thirdly, the group members had shared experiences of the topic, and were able to engage in discussion on a basis of common exposure. Fourthly, many of the group members knew of me, and I was therefore not a stranger to them or their world. Lastly, the emotive nature of the subject undoubtedly also helped to fuel the discussion.

6.2.3. Personal event diaries

The diary period followed immediately after the interviews on Ship B. All the interviewees (N=15) agreed to participate. It ran for a 4-week period (28 days), which included one short

coastal patrol for the ship. The rest of the time was spent in harbour, with occasional day-trips. This followed the general program typical for the ship. To ensure confidentiality and increase compliance, the researcher collected the diaries at the end of each 7-day period, and handed out the diaries for the next one.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the diary content was transcribed for thematic analysis. Unfortunately, at the end of the 4-week period, few of the original 15 sailors involved in completing the diaries were still onboard the ship, as some had been transferred to other ships, some went on training courses, and two left the Navy. Among all participants, compliance was poor, with relatively few experiences being recounted.

6.3. Overview of Results

Participants of both genders were in some way aware of the threat that the presence of women on warships posed to men. However, this was only explicitly referred to in the accounts of men on the male-only ship. The threat of gender integration was formulated by them as a threat to the 'naval way of life', and will be dealt with in Section 6.4 by way of introducing the themes reported in Chapters 7-9.

Reading the accounts of the responses to the presence of women, and the way in which both women and men dealt with it, led to the emergence of the themes of the qualitative analysis. In response to the perceived threat of women, the first broad focus of *resistance and acceptance* emerged from the thematic analysis. From this two themes were derived.

The first theme dealt with the use of symbols of corporate culture to express both resistance and acceptance within the organisation. The themes of resistance and acceptance may seem 'obvious', but they became of significant interest here because of the way in which it was expressed – namely through the enactment of naval culture. The SAN is rich in symbolism¹². The military itself is steeped in traditions of rituals, metaphors and artefacts. Daily military interaction is expressed, facilitated, and regulated by symbols of the military culture. Examples include saluting as symbolic gesture (ritual) of respect and submission to military

¹² This symbolism is defined here as 'expressions of naval culture'.

discipline, while uniforms act as symbols for identification, and so forth. In the accounts of the participants, resistance and acceptance were expressed as manifestations of naval culture. This theme – corporate symbols as expression of resistance and acceptance – will be explored in Chapter 7, which will detail the experiences of gender integration through the interpretation of the symbols of naval culture (i.e. rituals, metaphors, artefacts and physical space).

The second theme dealt with traditional manifestations of resistance. This included issues such as sexual harassment, special treatment of women, and conditions of acceptance. These traditional forms of resistance will be explored in Chapter 8.

Women and men's response to the expressions of resistance emerged as the second broad focus, namely the *dynamics of adaptation*. Participants on the gender-integrated ships generally rendered positive accounts of their experiences. In their view, the process of gender integration was progressing well. The dynamics that enabled this positive coping produced the third theme, explored in Chapter 9, namely the mechanisms of adaptation.

Chapter 6 will conclude with reference to so-called 'absent' issues – those issues that were surprisingly silent, given the particular context (see Section 6.5).

6.3.1. Effect of participants' different situations on their experiences

Before the findings are reported, the issue of divergent perspectives across accounts needs to be mentioned. Three factors that influenced the accounts will be presented, to serve as a cautionary note in generalising the results: Accounts were informed by personal histories and individualised perspectives, by the difference between training and ship environments, and by the role of the ship-specific environment.

(a) The role of personal histories and individualised perspectives

Participants did not always share common perspectives. Personal histories sometimes influenced interpretations of experiences. For example, adjustment onboard ships was facilitated by comparable cultural backgrounds – a factor outside the current naval environment – as a junior female sailor explained in a discussion on adjustment:

I have to say that the women on board were not really like me. I am, how shall I say it, a character on my own. [Interviewer: Was your adjustment easier than for other women?] O yes, I think so. I really think so. I was raised very Afrikaans, and the military lifestyle is not much different from the lifestyle at home, so it wasn't really a big problem for me [to adjust].
(B7, female)

The effect of cultural backgrounds raises questions about the representivity of the reported opinions and experiences. Different experiences, like the one cited above, often formed what Seale (1999) termed "negative instances", or deviant cases. Such deviance mostly flowed from individual or unique experiences, and contributed to the richness of the field under investigation.

Apart from mentioning their personal histories, some participants also acknowledged individualised views. Although some individuals tried to support their version of events by invoking the support of others (i.e. "ask anyone"), many made it clear that their accounts did not necessarily reflect the experience of all. A sailor on the all-male ship ends his discussion on a female captain with a qualification by stating that his opinion may actually be contrary to that of many other people: "As I said, I think it can work on this ship. I actually believe that I can adjust to that. But I do not speak for anyone else. Definitely not." (C3, male)

(b) The difference between training and ship environments

All of the female officers related negative experiences during their officers' training. The male trainee officers let the women feel that they were a burden, and that had to be carried to 'make it' during the training period. Female achievers during officers' courses were not encouraged, and felt left out of the group. They were tolerated more easily as long as they acted like 'the weaker sex', but as soon as they excelled, their performance disturbed the status quo expected by the men, and created an imbalance that the men tried to correct by shutting out the females (as a group).

I was top student and many of the guys were really unhappy about it. They were often nasty to me. There were many men who say it's fine, but deep inside it is difficult for them to see

that you are actually kicking dust in their eyes. As long as the woman is not doing as well as he is, then it's fine, but as soon as she excels, then he gets uncomfortable. (B3, female)

The small number of females made the situation worse, as it accentuated their distinctiveness from the men in the group, and also diminished their effect on the power balance. This made it easier to exclude them gradually from the group, and consequently female officers under training felt very lonely.

Initial training is the place/time where military indoctrination typically takes place. Training is proposed as a re-masculinising process, turning boys into men (Neville, 2003), but when women enter the arena, conflict arises, as their presence detracts from the development of naval (or military) masculinity. Male candidate officers thus resented the presence of women, leading to greater resistance during the training period.

Masculinity during training was defined in physical terms (physical fitness, physical toughness), and through endurance (not complaining). One strong mechanism of indoctrination was the weekly divisional competitions. Such competition was often lost or won due to the physical prowess (or its absence) of the division, and women were perceived to be a liability in this regard.

Life on the ships, however, was very different from officers' training, and female officers experienced the absence of the indoctrination dynamics from the training environment (e.g. competition and dominance over others). The ship-environment reflected a 'changing discourse' (Carey, 1994): the dominant discourse during training – viz. indoctrination of military/masculine identity and values (e.g. physical fitness, competitiveness) – made way for a discourse of hard work and performance. During training, group acceptance was determined by conformity to masculinity; on ships, acceptance (into the male world) was determined by hard work.

All the women officers also related how, once they were on the ship, rank was the only thing that counted, which they interpreted as positive. The female officers had generally positive accounts of gender integration on the ships, which can be attributed to a number of factors. Women officers, while undergoing training, had to contend with male resistance to their

efforts to enter into the very masculine world of Navy officers. After completing their training, however, such women received their commissions and thus gained entry into the officers' corps. Once inside, the interpersonal dynamics changed, leading to their increased acceptance on the ships, which was further facilitated by the changing discourse of the new environment.

It could also be argued that their reported positive experiences once on ships may simply be a 'relative positive' in contrast to their previous negative experiences during training, and they thus need to be interpreted with caution.

(c) The role of the ship-specific environment

Individual ships differ from each other in size, structure, function, human complement, and history. Such differences informed the accounts of participants, leading to some ship-specific perspectives, which cannot always be generalised across ships.

1) *Different experiences between small and large ships*

The experiences on the small ships differed from those on the large ships, an issue that was commented on by sailors from both. One difference was the number of crew available for doing the work. More crewmembers meant more 'protection' for women on the larger ship, as there were more men to do the hard work. Ships with fewer crewmembers required women on the smaller vessels to "get their hands dirty". In this case, unequal treatment (work allocation on the large ship) was facilitated by the physical environment, while in a different context (on the small ships), the gender separation when hard work was required, seemed absent, as described by a female officer on ship B:

The big ships – those females live a very sort of sheltered life on board the ship, you know. They won't get chosen to go do something that is a man's job, even though they're trained to do that specific thing. On board this ship it's different, you know, you have to do it, if there's nobody else, you will just get in there, and our females, if they had to pull up a rope with like, you know, there is none of the guys to help you. On a big ship, you won't find a female on the rope deck. (B12, female)

A second difference was facilitated by the actual size of the ship. The amount of space available influenced the degrees of interaction. Large ships had more space, and more opportunity for people to keep apart. On the smaller ships there was limited space, and full integration was forced by the realities of the ship's construction. A female rating experienced this:

When I was on [Ship A], you worked with guys but you still didn't really interact with them as often because it's a big ship. But coming here you interact with them all the time. (B14, female)

Not only does size matter, but the different functions of the respective ships also allow a differing social and formal organisation to evolve. On the large ships, there is more rigid separation between rank groups and more emphasis on formal discipline, while the small ships have far greater interaction between the ranks, and a strong focus on informal discipline.

2) *Different experiences between all-male and gender-integrated ships*

As could be expected, sailors on all-male and gender-integrated ships respectively also reported different experiences and attitudes. Men on the gender-integrated ship expressed positive experiences, and generally did not see a threat from the presence of women. The men on the male-only ship expressed strong resistance to women joining their ship, even temporarily, and perceived a real threat to their lifestyle (Section 6.4). A female sailor reported on the difference in attitude and expectations:

I wanted to sail with them [Ship C], and the guys weren't happy about it. They're okay with this ship being a female ship but they're scared that we're going to invade their privacy as well, and, okay, I can understand, like, where on their ship it's totally different to our ship. Ja, they definitely feel different towards it, yes. (B14, female)

Exposure was often cited as an explanation for the experiences of men onboard the gender-integrated ships. Their exposure to working and living with women put their fears to (relative) rest, as their 'doomsday' expectations did not realise. Exposure also allowed time

for crewmembers to adjust to the changing situation. This led to different perspectives on the gender-integrated ships, as a female sailor explained:

There is, I think the people on board our ships has already accepted it. They know – I don't know if they got used to it and saw that it is not so bad as what they thought, but I know on the other ships there is still objection against women and so on. (B8, female)

One sign of the changing perspectives of men on the gender-integrated ships was the 'normalisation' of task allocation during emergency drills. Where men without the exposure would still see women in terms of their gender, men on the gender-integrated ships regarded a woman as another sailor who needed to do whatever needed to be done.

Okay, with us, we normally just get detailed¹³. If it was my buffer¹⁴, if you're standing in the right or the wrong place, whichever way you were, you must go, because essentially we're all trained to do that. But then again, for example, if the buffer from [Ship C] was standing in, he would probably not do that, because he's not too sussed¹⁵, he doesn't know what our strengths and capabilities are. But on our ship, if you're in that spot, go. They don't think, "Okay she's a female", it's like, "You go, get down there", you know, so in that respect I would say no, they don't think of the gender, but then again, if it was somebody that wasn't used to us, they would probably get somebody else to do it. It's just because they're used to us, I mean, now I don't think they view us as a gender anymore. They just view us as "Right, you are on hand, you are a number, you must do that". (B13, female)

On the all-male ship, men were generally more sceptical about women's ability to deal with crisis situations. They quoted an incident on an integrated ship where the night duty watch¹⁶, consisting mostly of women, allegedly mishandled an emergency when the ship started to take on water. The beliefs in the superiority of men over women in the case of emergencies clearly surfaced here, and became a rallying point for disgruntled men. The effect of this one experience – alluded to in a number of accounts from Ship C – created expectations of future behaviour that informed their resistance to gender integration.

¹³ Tasked

¹⁴ Deck manager

¹⁵ Well-informed

¹⁶ Sailors on duty during the night shift

This particular account stood in clear contrast to a women officer who gave a very positive version of the involvement of women in the same incident. The contrast underlines the different perspectives of male-only and gender-integrated ships. Each group interpreted events in a self-serving manner: all-male ships used a lens that coloured the experience to fit their expectations, while the gender-integrated ships interpreted the experience to protect their own sense of integrity.

6.3.2. Generally positive accounts

Surprisingly, accounts of the initial experiences on the ships were generally positive. Women had originally been apprehensive about how they would be received by the men, but all the women interviewed related that, to their relief, they were received in a positive way.

It was okay. I mean, everybody was friendly, you didn't really expect them to be that friendly. I don't really, like, make friends easily so but everybody sort of were happy. We had to convert the ship, things like that, it was okay, no problems for me whatsoever. (B14, female)

It could be expected that this state may be the balance at which sailors would arrive after a period of adaptation. However, this situation was reportedly there from the start, and did not change much over the succeeding 18 months. Chapter 9 will explore the possible dynamics for this situation. For the interpretation of the thematic analysis, it needs to be noted that, in spite of certain experiences and expressions of resistance, most participants believed gender integration to be proceeding exceptionally well.

The generally positive accounts of women create the potential of tension with reported negative experiences of both women and men. Although women and men both sensed some resistance to the acceptance of women, the overall impression of their accounts portrays a positive feeling towards their experiences. Stories of resistance should therefore be seen in this light.

6.3.3. Reflection on interviews and focus groups

Miller (1997), in her research on gender integration, found that men were reluctant openly to air views that might be contrary to official policy. Men believed that the organisation would censor unofficial views with negative career consequences. In 1994, for instance, the press had reported the resistance of male naval officers to female officers on board a SAN ship during a diplomatic deployment (Youngusband, 1994a, 1994b). Such resistance was not in line with official naval policy, and some officers were reprimanded after the article appeared. It was therefore expected that men would express negative attitudes in private, while expressing a positive opinion in public, in line with official naval policy. However, contrary to these expectations, individual men in private mentioned that they personally had no problem with women, but that, when men talk together, different opinions (i.e. resistance) were expressed.

You do get the occasion when guys all sit together and moan about the women – chick stuff, but that's once in a while, it doesn't happen very often. You'll hear the guys, "Well, they shouldn't be here in the first place and what are they doing here." But privately they don't mind it that much. (A2, male)

This becomes difficult to explain, and in a sense summarises the problem of contextual influences that permeates this study. Men's negativity in group-talk may be a response to peer pressure to say the right (i.e. negative) thing. Or perhaps the quote is in itself the response to perceived pressure to say the right (positive) thing in public. The quote might further represent only a certain group's experience, which may differ across small and large ships, all-male and gender-integrated vessels, or simply represent an idiosyncratic view.

While all the participants seemed honest in their own expressions, the issue of senior officers toeing the party line was raised in a focus group with warrant officers:

I can also tell now because of my job I get to know the [senior officers] very well. And I can tell you now that a lot of them are totally against females, totally against it. But to their credit they don't show it outside of their office. They would never say anything outside their office. They come out with the party line and say yes we must have females. (A4, male)

The effect of senior officers presenting two positions – supportive in public, resistant in private – is problematic. The first danger is the effect of subtle resistance, in how they deal with issues of gender integration. The second danger is their influence, in subtle ways, as role models to other supervisors on the ships. Chapter 5 indicated that officers in general are the least sexist, but warrant officers the most. The focus group who reported on the difference between the private and public statements of senior officers were warrant officers, who might have been particularly sensitive to such subtleties, as it reflected their personal position.

6.4. Threat to Men

The theme of resistance must be seen as a response to gender integration being perceived as a threat. This threat – the threat to the ‘naval way of life’ – in essence expressed fears of potential loss, which unfolded in a number of ways: there was, firstly, the perceived threat to the symbols of sailor identity, secondly, the perceived threat to the lifestyle onboard the ships, and thirdly, the perceived threat to good relations among crewmembers.

Relative Deprivation theory provides a framework for understanding why gender integration was viewed as a significant threat. In the present study, men on the male-only ship formulated their concerns by comparing the present situation to their anticipation of relative deprivation in the future. This was an unusual form of temporal comparison, in that the present was being compared to the anticipated future, but not with the past, nor with other groups (e.g. women, or men on gender-integrated ships). Comparisons were also egoistical, with men concerned with their personal deprivation. They did not compare their future situation with that of men on the gender-integrated ship (fraternal comparisons), nor with the position of women. Less fraternal comparisons (i.e. more egoistical comparisons) are associated with less action in response to deprivation (Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). This may contribute to the low levels of open protest among the men on the ships.

The prediction of target groups for comparisons is a weakness in relative deprivation theory, and often only seen in post hoc analysis (Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). It was therefore interesting that, although women were seen as the reason for the deprivation, they were not used as the referent group for comparison. Men’s comparisons were purely to themselves in the future. A further weakness of relative deprivation theory is the restricted range of

emotional responses researched (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). The men on the male-only ships expressed emotions of concern (in terms of what they might lose in future) rather than anger or outrage at perceived injustices. It could be speculated that the reason for the changes (i.e. integrating into the Navy) in the first place was the redress of past injustices (to women), thereby undermining the legitimacy of men's objections.

Issues of relative deprivation were raised by the men on the all-male ship, who were arguably the least disadvantaged, in contrast with men on gender-integrated ships, or women, who were potentially more deprived. Women, never having had access to ships before, might not have seen their position as deprivation, whereas the advantaged men had more to lose, and were therefore more concerned about their anticipated deprivation.

Responses to the GIS (reported in Chapter 5) highlighted the fears of relative deprivation raised by the men on both gender-integrated and male-only ships. In the post-integration picture, only the sailors on the all-male ship expressed fears of potential deprivation. This raised the question as to whether the men on the gender-integrated ships no longer saw this as a threat, or whether they adapted to the threat so successfully that it did not feature in their general consciousness. Their adaptation will be explored in Chapter 9.

It was further interesting that the threat of women was never explicitly expressed as a threat to men's gender status or position in society, but formulated in more personal terms – as threats to their own self-identity as a 'sailor', threats to their comforts and lifestyle, and threats to the good teamwork and interpersonal relations onboard the ships.

6.4.1. Threat to identity

The 'Navy way of life' was often seen as an expression of the identity of being sailors. The Navy has always been a man's world, and the identity of the men in it is tied to its rituals and customs. The changing rituals and metaphors as a result of integration thus threatened the very identity of the men on the ships, which some men saw as a crumbling of their identity as 'sailors', e.g. as men who swear and drink. *If I get upset and I swear or whatever, I don't want to be limited to withdraw my swearing because there's women on board the ship. (C1, male)*

Men did not refer to their identity as 'masculine', but the underlying implication equating the sailors' way of life with being 'manly' was ever present. Women, it was feared, would restrict men in their 'wild sailor' behaviour. One particular custom was an important expression of the sailor identity: when in a foreign¹⁷ port, men conduct a 'run ashore', which often takes the form of serious drinking. They believed that the involvement of women would change the very nature of the custom, thereby laying siege to their own identity.

But you know, when you go to foreign ports and that, the guys want to go and have their party, come back, I mean, they fall around, it's one big party. Now you get women involved and they look at you, and stories go out, and you can't, stuff like that. (C1, male)

The above example also illustrates the difference between the male-only and gender-integrated ships. Within South African culture, drinking alcohol is a common expression of normative (i.e. hegemonic) masculinity, and as such is contrasted to inferior masculinities that do not endorse drinking alcohol (Kaminer & Dixon, 1995). As a result, the possibility that they might have to stop or reduce their drinking behaviour because of the presence of women might also be construed as a threat to the sailors' masculine identity. This was emphasised by the sailors on the all-male ship. In stark contrast to this, the men and women from the gender-integrated ship in fact recounted stories of going out together when in foreign ports, having no less fun, and often doing no less mischief than before the integration of women.

6.4.2. Threat to lifestyle

Men feared losing their comfort and privacy through changes in their lifestyle. They cited examples on other ships where smaller cabins were given to women, who did not occupy all the bunks. This resulted in men sharing cabins, and even sleeping on the floor, thereby greatly increasing their discomfort. Men also feared the intrusion in their lifestyle, specifically when it came to walking around in the nude when moving between the showers and their cabins, talking in any way they wanted, and even waiting for the bathrooms.

¹⁷ Referring to any port away from their base.

Ja. It's actually a sore point. For me, I want to walk around in my ship, at the moment I can walk around naked if I want to. I don't want to be limited because there's women onboard the ship. (C1, male)

These fears were not unfounded, as Neville (2003) found in the Irish Naval Service: towels made way for T-shirts and so forth as bathroom attire, and men became – at least in the presence of women – more self-conscious about language.

Men further feared that they would have to work harder to 'make up' for women who would not be able to do a 'man's job': *In general, the men now has to do extra work because the women can't keep up. (C5, male)*

6.4.3. Threat to morale

Chapter 3 discussed the argument that that the mere presence of women in a combat group would dilute male bonding and so decrease its effectiveness. Men on the all-male ships feared, moreover, that women would lower morale, a fear that found resonance with the objections of other armed forces (Hertz, 1996). They believed that the presence of women would undermine the good spirit and teamwork that defines the atmosphere on their ship.

Ja, you know at the moment on our ship, we've got a good morale on our ship. You bring a female into your environment and then, you know, the morale sort of drops because of this and that. (C1, male)

There is no evidence that the entry of women into any SANDF unit affected the morale in a negative way. It was also interesting to note that no sailor on the integrated ships referred to decreased morale. Consequently, it seems that the fear of lowered morale seems to exist more as an argument to exclude women from certain ships, rather than being a reality. In fact, many positive experiences were reported after women had joined the ships:

[on initial entry on the ship] The guys were actually great. They told us that we were like a big morale booster to them because they never used to sit in the mess and talk nonsense and

joke around and when we were there then suddenly all of them were there and we used to talk nonsense and play cards. (B13, female)

The concept of cohesion (one defining aspect of morale) was never explicitly discussed by the respondents, but the data seem to support Devilbiss' (1985) hypothesis that shared experiences and interdependency fosters cohesion in military teams, irrespective of gender distinctions.

6.5. Silent Issues

The context of gender integration – both internationally and nationally – would dictate certain expectations from the experiences of participants. In this light, a number of noteworthy absences were found in the accounts of participants.

6.5.1. Leadership

The role of leadership (i.e. officers) was seen as crucial in influencing the experiences of other countries during the gender integration of their armed forces. In contrast, the influence of local leadership was only referred to once, during a focus group with warrant officers on the large gender-integrated ship. It appeared that the local leadership element played only a small role in daily interaction and adjustment, and that their influence was not significant in practice. This may imply that the norms of the ship's crews were negotiated internally (as determined by senior ratings), and not imposed from the outside (by officers).

On a different level, senior leadership (seen as faceless high-ranking officers at the Navy Office) were, however, indirectly seen as resistant to gender integration by providing restrictive policies for women on issues like privacy and career promotion.

6.5.2. Race

Given the historical political background of South African society, it is somewhat surprising that the issue of race received very little attention from participants. Race was only mentioned twice: in both cases by female officers who expressed some concern regarding acceptance and

race. They felt that African men did not accept their presence, but explained their perception that the resistance to gender was intimately linked with cultural ideologies of authority. Female officers of all races believed that African men did not like taking orders from women, and that they resented their positions of authority. The women attributed this resentment to the cultural backgrounds of those men.

But I think from their traditional background the woman doesn't tell you what to do. So I think it is difficult for them too to get used to this. (B3, female)

But at the same time, military discipline superseded such resistance, and the officers also observed that African men did follow their orders, even when they clearly did not like it: *They know in the Navy, when the lieutenant says you have to do it, then you have to. (B3, female)* On the ships, military norms (e.g. authority in rank) transcended personal positions and facilitated the adaptation of women and men onboard. Military doctrine holds that all social differences (e.g. gender, age, race) are subordinate to rank, and thus military doctrine unwittingly and ironically enforces equal treatment based on the constructions of rank (cf. Titunik, 2000).

It needs to be noted, though, that the absence of references in the data to race does not mean that race is not a burning issues within the SANDF. The silence in this regard may in fact indicate that the sensitivity around the issue has forced it underground, rendering the race discourse unavailable to this study.

6.5.3. National environment

The changes in policy that opened the way for women to serve at sea were a direct result of the changes in the national environment – the new constitution, government's commitment to equal opportunity, and so forth. It was therefore particularly interesting that the participants seemed uninterested in the broader national debate and the socio-political developments regarding women.

Only one direct reference was made, in this case to the role of parliament, who was surprisingly seen as unsupportive. The female interviewee perceived parliament's role in

allowing women to go to sea based purely on the need to satisfy the constitutional imperative, and not because of any real support for the individual women at sea. Allowing women on ships was thus seen simply as window dressing.

They [DoD] never thought this whole women at sea, women career planning, they never thought it through properly. It was just because some big person up top in parliament said, "Right-o, we want girls at sea." Okay, do it, now you're here. Now we are here, now what? They're [parliament] like, "I don't know. That's not my problem." (B13, female)

6.5.4. Lack of activism

The women participating in this study were at the forefront of standing up for women's rights, using opportunities, and so forth. Yet, in spite of them playing a pioneer role, there was a lack of evidence of strong activism, which may be associated with their lack of interest in the national debate on gender equality. Women did not rock the boat, and seldom asserted themselves outside individual interaction. This was reinforced by the example of older women, who achieved more status or power (i.e. senior rank) by playing according to the rules. It appears that assimilation into the system was rewarded, and was seen as rewarding by younger women. This supports the observation by Titunik (2000) that "military women tend to spurn the appellation of 'feminist' and are, in general, neither 'crusaders nor radicals'" (p. 246).

6.5.5. Lack of (expressed) warrior ideology

Although there was no direct inquiry into specific masculine ideologies, it was interesting that there was no reference to any 'warrior' ideology. The SANDF is not engaged in any war, and made clear its opposition to offensive activities (DoD, 1996). The SAN is currently mainly utilised in humanitarian operations. This may in part explain the ease of gender integration in the SAN, as compared with that of other forces, e.g. the US military, which is characterised by an ideology of 'hypermasculinity' (Rosen, Knudson & Fancher, 2003). There are indications that humanitarian missions may be associated with greater ease of gender integration (Rosen et al., 2003). The current low levels of active resistance to women may be associated more

with the current mission of the fleet (mainly humanitarian), where the absence of an expressed warrior identity may lessen the need to maintain the hypermasculine culture.

Recent findings have deconstructed the notion of monolithic masculinity associated with the military (Barrett, 1996), and, when seen against the current transitional nature of South African society, may indicate that the lack of a hegemonic masculinity has resulted in the absence of unified resistance to women in the fleet.

However, the absence of a warrior identity does not mean an absence of other forms of hypermasculinity. The data does suggest that the SAN environment has its own brand of hypermasculinity, which includes heavy drinking, cursing and swearing, and pervasive sex talk and presence of sexually suggestive material (reported in Chapter 5). These hypermasculine behaviours all contribute to what sailors refer to as being in a “man’s world”.

6.6. Conclusion

The second phase of the study took place between 12 and 18 months after women went onboard ships. It used a qualitative approach, which included interviews, focus groups, and personal event dairies. The interviews and focus groups proved good sources of information, while the personal event diaries were not successful, with poor compliance reported.

The accounts produced by the interviews and focus groups generally reflected positive experiences. Two major environmental influences left their mark on the accounts. The different experiences between the training and ship environments could be attributed to (among others) the changing discourse of acceptance in each sphere: the training environment emphasised the indoctrination of military (masculine) identities, while the ship environment highlighted the link between acceptance and hard work. On ships, then, women had a more equal chance to excel and be accepted.

The differences between the types of ships also influenced the experiences of the participants: the size of the ships, and the resultant size of the crew forced degrees of involvement in hard work (more dirty work on the small ships), allowing women to overcome the scepticism of the men, and gain acceptance through hard work. The integration status of the ships also affected

experiences, as the male-only ships expressed greater verbal resistance to the presence of women onboard, and perceived women as a threat. The self-serving perspectives of the different ships became apparent when sailors on the male-only ship saw failure and disaster, whereas the sailors on the gender-integrated ship saw success – when describing the same incident. These ship-specific divergent perspectives of the same incident could be the result of individuals' efforts to resolve the cognitive emotive dissonance created by incongruent attitudes and experiences (Harmon-Jones, 2000).

Men on the male-only ship perceived the presence of women onboard as threatening, and formulated this as a threat of potential loss, in terms of the naval way of life. They compared their own position in the present to their anticipated own position in future. The threat was expressed in personal terms, referring to the threat to their sailor (i.e. masculine) identity, threat to their comfortable (naval) way of life, and threat to the good morale present on their ship.

There was a noticeable absence of an expressed warrior ideology, which was thought to be due to the transitional nature of hegemonic masculinity in contemporary South Africa, and the current humanitarian mission of the fleet, which has decreased the need for a hypermasculine warrior culture. Although the warrior identity was absent, though, hypermasculinity was still present, albeit expressed in other forms, which served to maintain the ideology of the Navy as a man's world.

Two broad foci emerged from the accounts of women's and men's responses to this threat (posed by women), namely resistance/acceptance, and the dynamics of adaptation. The next chapter will explore the first theme, specifically the use of the symbols of naval corporate culture to express resistance and acceptance within the organisation.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CULTURAL SYMBOLS AS EXPRESSIONS OF RESISTANCE AND ACCEPTANCE

7.1. Introduction

In spite of the positive experiences recounted by women, it would be naïve to assume that gender integration went as smoothly as they believed. Careful reading of their accounts leaves one with the impression that women did not always recognise resistance or acknowledge it as such. One reason is that it was often clothed in organisational symbolism, which is a term used in this study to refer to expressions of naval culture. This chapter will thus explore the experiences of gender integration by interpreting specific symbols of naval culture.

This theme incorporates both resistance and acceptance. The differences in perspectives across accounts clearly came to the fore here: some participants saw (and used) corporate symbols to express their resistance to gender integration, whereas others saw (and used) them to express acceptance. The way in which single incidents were interpreted from both angles depended on the individuals' perspectives, and meant that the experiences of resistance and acceptance were inseparable.

Acker (1998) suggests that symbols in organisational culture fulfil many functions – e.g. to explain, express, reinforce, or oppose gender divisions (or lack thereof). Military structures in general, and SAN policies specifically, left little space for protest or open opposition. Men who opposed the presence of women on warships had to 'go underground' with their opinions rather than airing them openly. As such, they used expressions of the very culture that prohibits protest, to protest against women. The use of corporate symbols became, for some, an act of active opposition, for others, an expression of acceptance. At the same time, the extent to which women used the same symbols to express their experiences indicates the extent to which they already felt integrated into the sea-going fleet. This chapter will explore the theme of cultural symbols as an expression of resistance and acceptance, using rituals, metaphors, artefacts and corporate space.

7.2. Rituals

Rituals are cultural activities that include certain repetitive patterns that contain symbolic and expressive elements (Alvesson & Billing, 1997, p. 109). Within the Navy context, rituals are used, among others, to express inclusion and identity.

7.2.1. Rituals of initiation

On the small ships, women were subjected to the same rituals of initiation as men. Women were apprehensive about how they would be received by the men, prior to joining the ship. They knew they were entering an environment that could be hostile, and were generally prepared for the worst. One young woman initially thought she got the worst:

The first time I came here, I'll never forget it. We came on board the ship, and the chief bosuns' mate¹⁸, he just looked at me and he said to go to stores to get an overall. Fine, go off, myself and my friend, off we go, go fetch our overall, come back. First job, bilges¹⁹. I don't know if they purposely threw rotten pieces of meat or something down there, we were fishing out that stuff and now we didn't want to act all squeamish, because then we knew they were going to nail us. Just shut up and pick up the stuff, you know, really, it was gross. Then at about half past nine, "Get up" "Okay, now what?" "Get up." "Okay." "Get up, wash your hands, get out of your overalls, make neat." (B13, female)

In one sense, this example constituted a form of extreme equality. Rituals of initiation were typically used for two purposes: as a condition of acceptance, and as an equaliser. The acid test for any new member of the ship's company was to clean the bilges. Sailors had to pass this 'test', and once they had proved themselves, were accepted as part of the team. Cleaning the bilges was also seen as the ultimate equaliser for new sailors. No exceptions were thus made for the women joining the ship, a fact the woman relating the story appreciated afterwards in hindsight. Women saw it as both a test that they had passed, and as "a way in", because they were indeed accepted afterwards.

¹⁸ Deck manager, often referred to as the 'Buffer'.

¹⁹ The space in the bottom of the ship, to which water and waste drain.

Although women's interpretations were positive (at least in hindsight), the question remains whether men applied these rituals as 'tests' or as a form of 'protest'. Was it a normal (i.e. gender-neutral) use of ritual, or a case of active resistance? Most likely, it was a little of both. In other words, the men made sure that the women felt the full brunt of the test, but once they had 'passed' the test, they were accepted into the ranks.

But then they were like really hard on us as well, and we got all the crappy cleaning – all the junk work, just – they wanted to see if we were going to moan, and they were waiting for us to get upset or something. And then, I'd say after about a week of that, they laid off, then they were normal. (B13, female)

Women needed to dispel the men's fears that they would be squeamish and unable to cope with the demands of shipboard life. The condition of acceptance seemed to lie in women demonstrating that they were not stereotypical women. This they did, leading to their acceptance (see Chapter 9 for further exploration of women's adaptation to such demands).

7.2.2. Rituals and identity

The issue of gender integration being a threat to the 'naval way of life' has been introduced in the previous chapter. This 'way of life', as was emphasised, is an expression of the identity of male sailors, revolving around the idea that 'the Navy is a man's world'. Expressions of naval culture are therefore also expressions of their own identity. Women threatened this identity because their presence meant that these rituals had to change. One example is the so-called "Crossing of the line ceremony", an internationally used ritual of sea life. This refers to the occasion when a ship crosses either the equator or the polar circles. Sailors who have never 'crossed the line' before are subjected to a 'ceremony', where they are smeared ('painted') with a concoction consisting of engine oil and rotten food (usually brewed for days in advance). The ritual is often accompanied by manhandling, lots of raucous laughter and teasing comments, and in the past, with elements of potential embarrassment or humiliation. After gender integration, however, the SAN had to effect changes to their version of the ceremony to accommodate women.

[Previously the men on their way to Antarctica] . . . they [men] had to go through it. They had to do everything. Everything. They had to take the cold, there was no warm water, now the water gets specially warmed for them [women]. Just for them. Yes, then they start to 'paint' from the youngest person, right, he gets 'painted', and then the rest follow. No, but now, maybe the women, they go first. They go first and then come the other boys, which is wrong. And you cannot squeeze them in, or 'paint' them, because all the eyes are on them, when you, I mean, we almost had trouble, that's way it's not fun anymore. (A1, male)

As a result of these changes, the men felt the ceremony lost its ritual meaning, and became just another activity that had to be completed before they reached their destination. To counter such challenges to their identity, the men tried hard to maintain their culture through other rituals. If they could not do so through onboard rituals where the mere presence of women had already changed things, then they did so through other traditional activities, like sport days. Sports days thus retained its character as men doing masculine activities through the type of sports played. Women had little success in challenging this situation. A female senior rating described her unsuccessful efforts when confronting her captain: *I asked him, I said the women must also participate in the sport. Everyone must do sport. But I lost that one, and now if they have sport days, it is rugby and cricket. (B5, female)*

In other rituals, like parades, women were involved without changing the ritual much. Initially they were included in such rituals by fulfilling the stereotypical 'female role', such as being used as ushers for example. This became a form of token inclusion, maintaining the masculine nature of the march-past, while still paying lip service to gender inclusion. This gradually changed, though, and women now regularly form part of parades in all respects.

7.2.3. Customs embedded in corporate policies

The divisional (supervisory) system is a Navy custom with its own ritual expressions. Sailors adhere closely to the divisional hierarchy, and older men often become father figures for the younger men in their divisions. Some men used this to exclude women, arguing that only women should supervise women:

You can't have females on board the ship unless you've got a female DO²⁰. There are certain female things that they are not prepared to discuss with you which, I mean, you've got to respect that. They are having a bad day, like every woman has their bad days, five days a month, and they are having a bad day, they just can't come to you and say, "Look, I've got a problem". They feel embarrassed. You do need a female on board that they can talk to. (A4, male)

Others argued that such an interpretation of the custom is clear discrimination, and that it has no place in the Navy:

I think we are over-sensitive about it. We expect this change to happen and in most cases for the sailors to be more accommodating of swans being on board. Yet we speak about the fact that they need special guidance and special moments for their five days a month. I mean, come on. If you've got a problem we are all grown people, say it. If you can't say it to me as a DO because I'm young or not married or something like that, then speak to the EXO²¹ or to the Captain. I don't see the need for a senior swan to look after them. They fall within the legal system and the guidelines of the Navy. (A4, male)

All women participants agreed with the last extract, seeing no need for a separate, gender-based divisional structure. This issue deals with mentoring, which was previously identified as an area where women experienced discrimination (Ragins et al., 1998). Women saw the argument for the need of a senior female to act as divisional officer as resistance to their integration. They labelled it organisational resistance, deflecting from the personal resistance as expressed by some men.

7.2.4. Working together as ritualised expression of integration

Neville (2003) described how men in the Irish Naval Service retained work as a sign of distinction, and used it to ensure recognition and status. In contrast to her experience, a number of men in the South African group interpreted working together as a ritualised expression of full integration and acceptance: *Actually they work, they work with us. It's not*

²⁰ Supervisor

²¹ Second in command of ship

like they're standing aside. (B2, male) For the women, working in teams, regardless of gender, for example during fire drills, was seen as an expression of ultimate integration. Their view is that, when women and men have to fight for their lives, gender will not count. Some women have found their full inclusion encouraging:

Okay, with us, we normally just get detailed²². If it was my buffer²³, if you're standing in the right or the wrong place, whichever way you were, you must go, because essentially we're all trained to do that. On our ship, if you're in that spot, go. It's just because they're used to us, I mean, now I don't think they view us as a gender anymore. They just view us as "Right, you are on hand, you are a number, you must do that". (B13, female)

It is noteworthy that this is attributed to men being 'used' to women, introducing the contact and exposure element to successful integration. This will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 9.

7.3. Metaphors

Alvesson and Billing (1997) described metaphors as "culturally rich verbal expressions" (p. 109), or verbal symbols, creating "vocabularies to facilitate and guide interpretations" (p. 112) of what is going on in an organisation. Coffey & Atkinson (1996) suggested the use of metaphors to examine how individuals and groups organise and express their experiences. Three metaphors emerged from the data: the first provides illumination of the ambivalence within the fleet towards gender integration; the second indicates the use of metaphor to presume acceptance' and the third illustrates metaphors as mechanisms of adaptation.

7.3.1. The Navy is a man's world

The often-used metaphor of the 'Navy is a man's world' refers to both identity – where people do masculine things, and space – as a place where only men are present (see Section 7.5 for a discussion of the meaning of corporate space).

²² Tasked

²³ Deck manager

There were divided perspectives on the relevance of this metaphor, underscoring the ambivalence towards gender integration. One woman officer responded as follows to the question "Is the Navy still a man's world?": *No, but more than 50% of the men still think so. (B12, female)* She represented a deviant view (at least an expressed deviant view), as other sailors (both women and men) understood that the South African Navy was no longer being seen as a 'man's world'. Many men expressed surprisingly modern ideas:

But – if you actually think like that – this ship was catered for the purpose of men, you know, but this is the Navy. The Navy is catering for everybody. And a ship must change. Because the ship was made for men doesn't mean it's right. (A2, male)

This comment was made during a focus group, and was supported (both verbally and non-verbally) by other members of the group. This reflects the general view of the broader fleet, where the lower level of support for this GIS factor ("the Navy is a man's world") suggested that the notion of male exclusivity is fading.

As the metaphor of a man's world receded within the broader fleet's perception, differences in ships' integration situations gave rise to new inter-ship metaphors in response to the perceived threat to status identity. The men on the male-only ship used their all-male status to enhance their own status identity (that of 'real sailors') by touting the superiority of their position, and ridiculing the men on the gender-integrated ship. They also used the metaphor of the 'love boat', implying that intrigue, romantic relationships and a lack of military masculinity were common on that ship.

Sometimes they [male-only ship] say, "Hey this is a love boat. You have got women." You know – that is what they say! And that is what they say. "This is the love boat! How do you work if there is women?" All those things. (B6, male)

One man, presenting an isolated view, lamented the loss of his masculinity, contrasting homosexuals with 'real men'. *Let me say, they are making moffies²⁴ of us man. You have to change for them [women]. You cannot show you are a man. You cannot be yourself, you*

²⁴ Homosexuals

have to adjust to them. You become a moffie. (A1, male). This was the only participant to invoke homosexuality as a metaphor of diminished masculinity. The absence of support from other sailors for such positions may be an example of what Morrell (2001) terms 'responsive reactions' to the changes in men's position in South African society; in other words, men may be more accepting of alternative masculinities.

The fading ideology of the Navy being a man's world stands in apparent contrast to the expressions of hypermasculinity in this environment, as described in Chapter 5. Three factors may illuminate this: Firstly, it is objectively true that the Navy is no longer exclusively the domain of men, as there are women all around them, wearing the same uniform. This means that men need to change their attitude to prevent the discomfort of cognitive dissonance (cf. Beauvois & Joule, 1999). This may also lead to expressions of hypermasculinity, as men try to maintain their own sense of manliness. Secondly, the behaviour described in Chapter 5 (pervasive sex talk and presence of sexually suggestive material) was significantly reduced on the ships at the time of the study (as will be described in greater detail in Chapter 8). Thirdly, behaviours such as heavy drinking and swearing might be viewed as part of military culture, and might therefore not be interpreted as particularly masculine activities, but rather as military activities. This might also explain why the women also participated so wholeheartedly in such activities. Given the above, it is clear that gender integration of the Navy has meant that it is no longer exclusively a 'man's world'.

7.3.2. Forms of address

The ways in which officers are addressed carries significant meaning. It denotes respect, it acknowledges their authority, and it serves to maintain the higher status of officers. Officers are generally addressed by their specific rank, but may also be addressed as "sir" by ratings (irrespective of the officer's actual rank)²⁵. One female officer remarked how this form of address came to have strong metaphorical value for her and other female officers. She recounted a few cases where she had been addressed as "sir". To her it was simply a culturally appropriate way to address an officer. She also viewed it as extremely positive, as it conveyed to her that she was seen as an officer first, and then as a woman.

²⁵ Female officers are usually addressed as "ma'am"

It is actually nice if they don't differentiate, because it feels to me that they accept me as a combat officer, not as a female combat officer, officer period. (B3, female)

In the same way, being called the “man running the ship” was not perceived as negative or offensive, but seen as acceptance that she is an officer, nothing more and nothing less. It is not clear if men meant it in such a positive way, as their use of ‘male address’ could also be interpreted as resistance – for example, as not recognising the gender of women officers, refusing to allow the gendering of their ship, and so forth. Interestingly, women consistently presumed such behaviour to express acceptance, which may explain why they rendered such positive accounts of gender integration.

Historically, female sailors were referred to as SWANS. Although the term is not officially in use anymore, it was still in widespread use in the fleet, and men generally referred to female sailors as “swans” in their accounts. On the surface, it simply reflected the sailors’ vernacular at the time. But it also indicated separation between the sexes: men referred to other men by using their rank, but often referred to women only as “swans”, thereby continuing to enforce a separate identity on them. On the part of the women, however, there was no evidence to indicate women’s opposition to the continuous use of this term.

7.3.3. Family

Coffey & Atkinson (1996) focused on analysing the outcome of metaphors in terms of the function and meaning these impart. An analysis of the metaphors used by the participants in this study revealed that such metaphors function not only as descriptions, but also as prescriptions.

One surprising metaphor was often invoked to describe relations onboard ships, namely that of being a ‘family’: *It is just like we were all brothers and sisters. (B13, female)* Women and men alike saw themselves as siblings – sisters and brothers. The family metaphor as description was invoked often, and carried a number of symbolic meanings. For many, it symbolised acceptance: *We are becoming like a family, they [women] get treated like part of the ship's crew. (A2, male)*

On a prescriptive level, too, this metaphor fitted the context extremely well. It invoked feelings of one-ness and of being part of the same team. It also invoked the principle that blood is thicker than water, and thus that shipmates are more important than sailors on other ships. As a result, it was often used to regulate (prescribe) appropriate behaviour, e.g. men do not sexually harass their 'sisters', and moreover protect their 'sisters' against such harassment from others. The sibling relationship also served to focus attention away from sexuality, and eased the interaction between male and female sailors at sea. The same taboo as that which prevents sister-brother sexual relations thus operated, too, between female and male sailors on the same ship. It is noteworthy that both women and men used the same metaphor as strategy to desexualise shipboard life.

You know what I mean, the people on the ship is like a family, [the officer] is like your father.
(B7, female)

Even when we're at sea, I don't look at them as if they are women, I look at them as brothers and sisters on a social level. (A2, male)

By regulating interactions between men and women, then, the family metaphor served as a powerful mechanism to facilitate adjustment of both parties. It also served a second purpose, as it was sometimes invoked to regulate women's 'place' in the family, e.g. as the little sister who needs protection.

Closely related to the family metaphor was the 'big brother' metaphor. This stereotypical symbol was usually used to describe the paternalistic attitude of men when in the presence of other men who were not part of their ship. The subtle use of this metaphor to express male superiority and realign power-relations will be further discussed in Chapter 9. Here it merely illustrates the use of "big brother" and "mother hen" metaphors in regulating (or enforcing) (a)sexual relations onboard the ship.

I'd say that our guys, they're more used to used to us so then they never view us in that feminine light, but still that big brotherly instinct comes out. For example, foreign port, . . . okay now we're going to a club, everybody's enjoying themselves – don't let anybody look at us. Don't let anybody even think of coming to have a conversation with us, because then

suddenly we've got like 30 big brothers and they're all going to beat the crap out of this guy, you know. So it's like, you just dance with the guys and then at the end of the evening we're like mother hens, make sure he's got his wallet, make sure his jacket is on, you know. (B13, female)

7.4. Artefacts

Alvesson and Billing (1997) described how corporate culture is expressed through artefacts – physical objects that convey meaning within an organisation. Dress is a highly gendered artefact, and serves to convey corporate values about the role or status of women and men. Military people are identified by, and identify with, their uniforms. It makes visible their status, through rank and mustering, and gives them a sense of belonging – to the Navy in general, but also to particular subgroups as well. In the context of gender, uniform is of particular significance.

While ashore, South African sailors wore white uniforms in summer and black uniforms in winter. The men's white uniform consists of trousers and shirt, whereas that worn by women is a one-piece dress with stockings and heeled shoes. The black uniform for men consists of trousers, shirt and jacket, whereas women wear skirt, blouse and jacket, with stockings and heeled shoes. When at sea, sailors wear a heavy duty blue uniform. The trousers and shirts are of different cut for men and women, but all the women participants remarked that they preferred to wear the men's "blues", as they deem the women's version unflattering and impractical.

Women effectively saw their uniforms as artefacts of oppression. The naval uniform was a symbol of the real naval culture, and women were constantly barred, symbolically, from that culture by being prohibited from dressing in the symbols of that culture (even when wearing other symbols, e.g. rank insignia, qualification badges). For women, their uniform was not an expression of their identity, but a separate identity that had been forced on them. The women in this study were consistently negative about their uniforms, and the lack of change they could effect on it. They raised a number of objections to the uniform.

7.4.1. Women's uniforms are impractical

Life onboard ships is characterised by the presence of wind, gangways and stairs. All the women complained that the uniform dress was simply impractical:

It is totally impractical to walk around the ship in a dress and I think it is – especially in this wind and weather, and often I have, when ships come alongside, I have to stand on the monkey deck²⁶ and the wind blows there! With one hand you cling to your hat, and with the other you cling to your dress, and with the other you have to use the microphones. It is very unpractical on a ship. (B3, female)

The use of dresses on ships moreover created constant opportunity for humiliation. All the women respondents had an embarrassing or humiliating story to recount about dresses and stairs. These stories ranged from deep humiliation to simple inconvenience and discomfort:

When we come on board in the mornings, you peek if someone is downstairs, then you run as fast as you can down the stairs, and in the afternoon when you come back, you peek to see if someone is going to come to the steps soon, and then you run again up the stairs to get to the top. We're used to it to some extent, I mean, you still grab your dress tight and so on, you know, but it is still uncomfortable. (B7, female)

Negotiating steps required constant vigilance, as women had to remember to take care when going up or down. Some women managed potentially embarrassing situations by letting the men go up before them. For senior women, though, protocol made this more difficult, as juniors are expected to give way to seniors, and officers are required to go before ratings.

Women did, of course, find ways of dealing with this – coming early to change into work dress (trousers for the ratings), or wearing cycling shorts under their dresses. In addition, all the women complained that their uniforms were uncomfortable, and all preferred to wear the men's blues while at sea, which they deemed more comfortable than those cut specifically for the women.

²⁶ Area from which ships are controlled during close-in manoeuvring.

Women's uniforms were further seen as high maintenance, in contrast to the men's uniforms, adding the inconvenience of regular washing to the clothing's inherent discomfort.

The dress gets dirty quickly, not dirty, but it looks scruffy. You wear it once and it is creased and you have to iron it, and then it is too long and then it is too short, and then it is this and then it is that, where pants don't give so much problems. I mean the men wear their uniform for a week, they just change their shirts a few times, but the trousers they wear for a week at a time. (B7, female)

7.4.2. Women's uniforms maintain segregation and lesser status

Dress confers identity on individuals, as it communicates positions within social structures (Roach-Higgins & Eichner, 1992). Uniforms kept women in a separate category, which maintained the salience of gender in a very visible way. In spite of their impracticality, the women were expected to wear dresses, because that is "what women wear": *[on the white dress] It's symbolising that you're a female, you know? (B9, female).*

One piece of uniform that has particular significance is the sword that officers wear for ceremonial purposes. The sword is an artefact with deep historical meaning, and is handed to officers when they receive their commission. It is the mark of authority, and bestows status and respect on those who wear it. Swords are only worn with men's Dress Uniforms, and previously women were excluded from wearing swords as it was deemed unseemly to wear it with a dress. This created an artificial separation between male and female officers. Women laboured hard to overcome this separation, in the face of fierce male resistance to maintain their separate identity:

It was a helluva a debate. Cdr [X], she actually wrote a letter saying that because we said, "We train the whole year with a sword, we goes through everything that the guys do. Why aren't we allowed to go with sword on parade? That is our right as Officers, we earn that sword and that is, I won't say our trademark, but the insignia of being an Officer, you get the sword." And it was a big problem and we discussed it and we said we want to go in ice

*cream suits*²⁷ and then, okay, things that I could hear from guys, comments like that, up until now, it was like, “Ja, you know, they want everything, now they want our clothes as well! You know, females!” (B12, female)

The female uniform code also affected women’s own sense of identity and status. Firstly, it identified them primarily as women and not as sailors, thereby relegating them to a lower status. The uniform dress (and hat) was also seen as degrading. It did not allow women the status that goes with a uniform, and they in fact felt that it relegated them to another status – for example, that of nurse.

*For one, these white dresses. I’m in the Navy, I’m not a nurse, okay. I don’t know, it is the dress actually, that is very degrading. It makes you look like a – I think the correct word in English would be a “waif” and our hats, I don’t know, it looks to me just like a ‘doily’*²⁸. (B7, female)

The dress was further degrading, as it did not look as smart as the men’s uniform. The women were thus overshadowed by the men in their smart suits, and again felt relegated to second class officers: *[on parades] The men look so smart with the ice-cream suits – and here we stand with our common dresses and it is really, you just don’t feel positive* (B3, female). Women felt that their dresses associated them with the status of not being true sailors, but merely auxiliary personnel. Their dress also decreased their authority, as military uniform depicts authority through badges of rank and achievement.

*Now imagine I become an instructor, you have a group of horny little seamen fresh from [basic training], you must stand in front of them wearing a dress. They’re not going to be a damn interested in what you say, they’re going to be checking out your ankles, calves, and they’re going to be working out your dimensions, you know. But if you present, say, authority figure by wearing the pants and the anchors*²⁹, because I mean the minute you see an anchor, you jump, I just feel that that only enhances your authority and then you’ll be able to stand with the other instructors and form the same front. (B13, female)

²⁷ Formal dress uniform, sometimes also referred to as ‘step-outs’.

²⁸ Slang for a ‘tea-cosy’.

²⁹ Rank insignia of Leading Seamen and Petty Officers.

7.4.3. Separate uniforms are an expression of organisational resistance

Although female officers made some headway in breaking down this discriminating separation, most other efforts in changing the dress code for women were less successful. Many vented their frustration at an apparent lack of understanding and support from the powers that be.

From when I joined the, it was 4 years back, they said the new uniform, we are getting it. We are still waiting for it, and it is totally impractical to walk around the ship in a dress and I think it is, I mean, the women have been on board ships for years, and by this time they know it, but they don't do anything about it. They get asked time and again, this is the situation, this is what we want to do, may we do it, and then nothing happens. (B12, female)

Organisational resistance was seen to come from the far-away hierarchy, and persisted in spite of the support of local leaders. For example, when the captain of one ship allowed women to wear trousers on the ship, a faceless senior female officer quickly overruled it.

At one stage we actually hassled and hounded our captain, and eventually he said, "Just wear it" and we did until some senior woman saw us and sent a signal, "Thou shalt not". (B13, female)

It appeared that a new uniform was developed, but not implemented, and most women knew about it. That in itself was again seen as discrimination and oppression. Women tried to take their own initiative, and were even willing to pay for their own uniforms, but were given the cold shoulder.

Because I know the main thing was money, and then we got our DO³⁰ here to phone, because she was also so up in arms about this story and we asked her, "What's happening?" So she phoned up to Pretoria and then we asked, because we were prepared to pay and to have the stuff made and then all we needed was the specs and they turned around and said they're not prepared to give it to us because of some long crappy reason. So we like, hello, we're trying

³⁰ Supervisor

to look smart, we're trying to be proud of our uniform, we're trying to make an advancement here and they just also, right there, they cut it off. That's it. (B13, female)

Some of the women expressed anger at the fact that others – either older women (part of the establishment), or women at the Navy Office who had no understanding of the realities of their lives, determined their uniform code.

Even, like, okay, I don't even wear my white high heel shoes and I get stopped time and time again by some old warrant³¹ – this woman who's falling apart, "Ja, you must wear high shoes," and I just tell her straight, "But Warrant, I am at sea." And I give her this long sippy story about how it is a safety hazard and I broke my ankle already, and all this crap. And I said, "You come to my ship, Warrant and you will see for yourself how impractical and how dangerous it is!" And eventually she gets tired of my story and she leaves me, you know. (B13, female)

And then we did wear the tropical³², we feel as if we're part of the guys. Everybody said that we looked smart and then somebody turned around and said, "No." I mean, some female in Pretoria made that decision. I bet you she doesn't even know what this ship looks like, but she said, "No, no, no. You must wear it [dress]." (B13, female)

When men determine the dress code and require women to wear impractical or uncomfortable uniforms, it could be regarded as a subtle form of resistance. Moreover, such men could claim that it is a requirement of the organisation, without having to acknowledge that it is in fact men who control decisions on corporate dress (Martin & Jurik, 1996). However, in some of the cases quoted above, it was women who controlled these decisions and who were making life difficult for female sailors by enforcing cultural artefacts from outside the culture that it was supposed to symbolise. The anger expressed by the female sailors above was thus directed at 'other' women who were undermining them.

³¹ Warrant Officer

³² White uniform worn by men in summer

7.5. Corporate Space

Higgins & McAllaster (2002) described how corporate culture is expressed through corporate space – the physical surroundings of a particular organisation. Corporate space, in this case the navy as a man's world, can refer to both identity – where people do masculine things, and space – as a place that only men are present. Naval ships are designed, both structurally and socially, to accommodate men. This included, for example, the existence of one open cabin for all (for each rank group), and also the custom of walking around without clothes. Men understood this consciously: *I'll say it's clear that this boat is actually for men (A1, male), but not all men agreed that it needed to be thus:*

But – if you actually think like that – this ship was catered for the purpose of men, you know, and this is the Navy. The Navy is catering for everybody. And a ship must change. Because the ship was made for men doesn't mean it's right. You must make it [work] properly. (A2, male)

Still, ships were built for men, and as such, naval corporate space is not only metaphorically 'masculine', but also practically for 'men only'. The use of the metaphor was important to denote identity, as discussed in Section 7.3. Apart from that, the use of the actual space also became a powerful expression of resistance and acceptance. Within that context, space acquired different meanings – namely restriction, maintaining gender segregation, resistance, common sense, and indication of integration – issues, which will be discussed later in this section.

The SAN ships were designed with a one-sex environment in mind, allowing for little privacy and individual space in its accommodation of people. Before women joined the ships, structural changes had to be made to provide some form of gender privacy (but not necessarily individual privacy). The physical construction of the gender-integrated ships provided for separate sleeping facilities, shared ablution facilities (which the occupier could lock for privacy), and a common mess area, which served as both dining room and recreational space.

On the smaller gender-integrated ship, there had previously been one big cabin with ±20 bunks. This was divided into two cabins – one for men, and one for women. Women were

generally comfortable with this arrangement – *It's alright. We've have got a knock-and-wait system, but it's alright. The guys abide by it. They don't come in unless they hear a loud, "Come in" (B9, female)*, but some were against separate sleeping quarters, and argued strongly for greater integration.

Women's views on the bathroom arrangements were positive, and they did not see shared ablution facilities as uncomfortable or as an issue at all. The practical situation demanded sharing, and it was thus seen as normal and everyday. One female officer even joked that she found that the men spent much more time in the bathroom than the women.

Men's views were mostly positive as well. Again it was recognised that the practical situation required sharing, and that it was normal and everyday: *We know that the women are going to the shower and they go in there, the door is locked, and that's all there is to it. (B11, male)* Personal experience, as emphasized in Chapter 6, played an important role in perceptions: men on the integrated ships used the word "normal" a number of times to describe their status quo.

7.5.1. Space as restriction

The initial SAN policy stated that women had to have their own (private) sleeping accommodation, which could have been interpreted as an example of the construction of physical division along the lines of gender (Acker, 1998): when women could not be kept off the ships any longer, they were restricted to specific parts of it. Interestingly, this insistence that women had to have their own space was seen by the woman themselves as restrictive. The greatest resistance from women to the separate sleeping arrangements came from the career obstacles this represented. If there were no separate sleeping quarters available, they would not be able to serve on that ship in a permanent capacity, thereby forgoing exposure opportunities that might influence later promotion.

The implications of only having certain ships available for women were twofold. There were only a limited number of promotion posts that women could apply for, in other words, they could only be considered if such a post was on certain (i.e. gender-integrated) ships. They were also restricted in the limited exposure they could have to different ships and operations.

They thus not only missed out on the adventure and experience that such stimulation could bring, but also complained that such exposure was in fact a requirement for senior promotions later in their career.

I am proud that I was one of the first five that started this, but I also think it is unfair that they changed the ships, threw the women on it, and said, there you go. They never thought about promotion, and they never thought where we will work one day, because they never thought that men can move from ships to ship, but we can't. There was one example of a guy who got a killick's³³ post above a girl who was already overdue for the promotion, all because she was a girl and she could only come here [gender-integrated ship]. It is the same problem I am sitting with now. (B7, female)

Other women experienced similar frustrations at not being allowed to transfer to other (gender-integrated) ships, because they had to be replaced by another female, given that it would be a 'female bunk' that now had to be filled by the replacement. This situation was consequently seen as an expression of resistance from the organisation, and their frustrations were directed to the faceless hierarchy, rather than to the local commanders.

7.5.2. Space as maintaining gender segregation

In contrast to the women who were arguing for more integration, men used social space to maintain gender segregation. Most men were in favour of maintaining separate accommodation. In doing so, they often cloaked their insistence on segregation as 'support to women'. This included strong patronising attitudes, and became a form of 'benevolent patriarchy'. Their arguments were based on the essential natures of women and men. The first essentialist argument presents women's need for privacy.

(a) Women need privacy

Women were believed to 'need' more privacy, which then required a separate sleeping compartment. The notion of a 'female space' was mentioned a number of times by men. The

³³ Leading Seaman

reasons for men wanting women to have a separate space were never clearly articulated, though. On the surface, men expressed their objections to shared accommodation as concern for the safety and comfort of women. Some men indeed understood the challenges facing women on a Navy ship, and propagated a female space in genuine support of the women living in a masculine space (the ship). Yet others used it to emphasise women's essential difference (e.g. not being able to cope in an 'open' ship), and used concern for privacy as a way to restore their own patriarchal position, at least in their own minds (i.e. the ship in general was still a male place, with only certain sections allocated to women). It was interesting that the sleeping place was constantly proposed as the female space, which in effect relegated women to the "bedroom".

They need privacy, they must have their own place. I mean, women are so different biologically . . . (B6, male)

I think definitely the cabin idea. Also, from the emotional side, for them, they can sort of equalise when they go into their sort of spot and they can share experiences and sort of, . . . , so definitely to sort of calm things down they definitely need their own space. (C4, male)

Proposals in favour of the creation of such a special female space implied further sexist attitudes: Giving women a special space implied that the rest of the ship was 'male space'. It also implied that women were not able to cope with the demands of shipboard life, and therefore needed to have their own space to 'recover'.

The older men (warrant officers) used a moral argument to insist on separate sleeping areas, with their morals based on what they perceived were the right and wrong ways of doing things in society: *They still have the right to have their own privacy, so I don't see the logic in having a male sleeping in one compartment with you. It's just not right. (A2, male)*

Women rejected the constraints placed on them by the privacy argument and argued in favour of increased integration. Some argued that they would be able to maintain themselves in common sleeping spaces, and that formal separation would in any way not prevent deliberate indiscretions. They also presented the 'backup plan' of using the toilets if they needed real privacy. The inconvenience of using the bathroom for privacy weighed less than the discomfort associated with their current sleeping accommodation.

I don't see why they had to do that accommodation story up top there anyway. We are all big people, okay. Honestly, now if somebody's going to catch on nonsense, they're going to do it anyway. Regardless of if there are doors and if there's partitioning, they're still going to do it. We are all big people, I'm sure we've all seen how the male and female anatomy works. If we really are ashamed of ourselves, go and change in the flippin' toilet. I think that accommodation story, it's made the berthing uncomfortable, it doesn't smell good, there isn't sufficient ventilation, . . . (B13, female)

Some women maintained that there was no real privacy onboard ship anyway, and that there was no point in artificially maintaining private facilities. Other arguments claimed proof of success on other ships to support their position that privacy should not be an argument for exclusion.

Because on the [large ship] alright, they've got bunks like that and all they do is put a curtain rail on top and a curtain. I don't see why it can't work. If you need your privacy, you're not going to get any, you're on board this ship. The only privacy you get is when you're on the toilets or when you're showering. That's it. That's all you need. It's not like we're sleep in sexy, flimsy underwear on the ship anyway. We all sleep in shorts and T-shirts and tracksuit pants. There ain't nothing glamorous with that. (B13, female)

I mean, in the British Navy men and women share bunks³⁴. They shower together. It is not an issue. (B7, female)

Notwithstanding the last remark, though, the sharing of facilities is a difficult and unresolved issue in the Royal Navy, implying that, at least in this case, incorrect beliefs were invoked to strengthen the argument. The SAN has recently amended their policy on privacy, which currently dictates that ablution facilities must be lockable from the inside, and that sleeping bunks must have a curtain or other screening device (*SA Navy Info Bulletin* 40/01, 2001).

³⁴ Sharing of bunks refer to women and men sleeping on separate beds but in the same sleeping area.

(b) Boys will be boys

The second essentialist argument introduced the notion that boys will be boys. The nature of men – i.e. how men are and how they behave – was cited as a reason why separate facilities were necessary. It is significant that the younger men gave accounts that portrayed men as sexual beings who see women primarily through that lens. The implication is that men cannot be held responsible for what might happen in shared accommodation or ablution facilities.

I'm sure some guys will rip the curtain away, things like that will happen. (B1, male)

The guys would get hellava distracted and things will start happening, and just now there'd be a lot of maternity leave on the ship. (B10, male)

While this may have shown some refreshing honesty on the side of some young men, it also implied that the women would participate. In other words, they not only described the nature of men, but also included a perspective on the nature of women – as primarily sexual beings as well. According to this view, boys will be boys, and girls will be girls, and “... just now there'd be a lot of maternity leave on the ship (B10, male). Nonetheless, this assumes that women would want to participate in anything the men might have planned.

The women had scant respect for the men's objections: *They'll just have to learn to live with it and to be considerate of each other and then it will work. It doesn't need to be a big issue. It will only be a big issue if people make it a big issue. (B3, female)*

7.5.3. Desegregation of space as a manifestation of resistance

A deviant view on the all-male ship proposed the total integration of women into their world, without any form of privacy. Although this would ostensibly ‘allow’ women more opportunities, this position did feel as though it had been designed as a form of retaliation, in other words, getting women back for invading their world, and hoping that it would put them off from going to sea.

It shouldn't be a problem. If the woman wants to be at sea, and she wants to be like the men, then she must live like us. I don't see why there should be hers and his and things like that. If you look at the foreign navies, I think all the women and guys just share anything that goes, even bunks and that. Just climb into his bunk or whatever. (C1, male)

Sailors maintaining positions such as these invoked the experiences of other navies to justify their views. However, such accounts of other navies were almost always incorrect. Apart from the incorrect 'facts', such arguments were based on the belief that the Navy is still a man's world, and that women would have to adapt to it. The argument in favour of total sharing required women to adjust to men and to become like men, rather than women and men adapting to a new, reciprocally adjusting way of life, as was generally the case on the gender-integrated ships.

7.5.4. Space as common sense

The common sense of separate spaces became the defence of many participants, who did not spend much time in analysing it. Two pragmatic thoughts were often present: Separate space is "fair to both genders", and "if it ain't broke, don't fix it".

Some men believed that separate sleeping arrangements were fair to women. It allowed them space to do private things (e.g. change), without creating opportunities for possible embarrassment or harassment. In the same way, it provided privacy for the men, but also protected them against 'accidents' (e.g. walking in on women changing) and related fears of accusations of sexual harassment. Men found adequate proof that the status quo (versus separate sleeping areas) was working well: *From the time I have been on the ship, no one has tried to molest a swan, and no one tried to spy on people or made peepholes where they sleep and so on. Nothing of that has ever happened. (B2, male)*

7.5.5. The use of 'common space' as an indication of integration

The use of the common spaces – the messes – became signals of normalisation. When women and men started to socialise together in the recreational spaces, it was seen as a sign of successful integration.

At first when we got women, the women were more like apart from us. They never joined us in the messes, watch TV with us. Later on, like I said, they came down and we socialised. And as they [two of the women] moved off the ship, they actually felt a bit sore, to move because why we got attached to each other at a later stage. (A1, male)

7.6. Conclusion

Within the naval context, expressions of the corporate culture were used to demonstrate and interpret both resistance and acceptance. For some, they became a vehicle for underground resistance, for others evidence of successful integration. Rituals of initiation, as we have seen, may have been acts of resistance, but once completed, resulted in acceptance. Some rituals did change due to women's presence, which men interpreted as changing their (male) identity. In response to such challenges, other rituals were maintained to reflect and strengthen masculine identity. The ritual of working together was cited as a signal of full integration.

Metaphors, like the "Navy is a man's world", were receding on the macro-level. They were replaced, at times, with other metaphors on a micro-level, e.g. the "love boat," to maintain differences in status. Women experienced military (albeit also gendered) forms of address as indicating acceptance and inclusion. The family metaphor played a dual purpose: it was used to indicate inclusion ('acceptance'), but also served as a mechanism of behaviour regulation (an issue that will be explored further in Chapter 8).

Uniforms acted as artefacts of identification and status. The existence of separate uniforms for women and men was clearly demonstrated as a form of oppression. It was seen as a mechanism of the organisational hierarchy to maintain segregation and subjugated status. Surprisingly, however, it was not always men who were seen to control decisions about women's dress, but senior women in the hierarchy as well.

Corporate space came to have different meanings for different people. Women saw it as an expression of restriction in terms of opportunities and advancement. It was also used to maintain gender segregation, by citing essentialist differences between women and men as the reason for this segregation. Some men propagated extreme desegregation as an expression of

resistance, while many others saw shared use of common areas as an indication of successful integration.

This chapter demonstrated the use of organisational symbols to express the ambivalence of resistance and acceptance. The next chapter explores the more traditional expressions of resistance, as perceived by the participants on the ships.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER EIGHT: TRADITIONAL MANIFESTATIONS OF RESISTANCE

8.1. Introduction

Chapter 7 explored the disguised expression of resistance and acceptance as manifested through the symbols of organisational culture. The traditional manifestations of resistance – sexual harassment, special treatment, and conditions of acceptance – were however also present, and as significantly, also sometimes absent. This chapter will explore the experiences of these more traditional expressions of resistance.

8.2. Sexual Harassment

As previously discussed, sexual harassment can be seen a form of routine policing of women, and as a way of keeping them in their (subordinate) place. All indications from the literature are that high rates of harassment are the norm for the military. Chapter 5 described the pervasive nature of sexual harassment in the shore-based fleet. Perpetrators were mostly co-workers, with both motivation and opportunity to harass their female shipmates. Motivations included perceived threats to their masculine identity and the Navy way of life, and feelings of disempowerment. Opportunities were plentiful, as co-workers had daily contact with each other and thus greater levels of familiarity, and because of the close proximity of living and working together. As these factors are enhanced on the ships, reports of pervasive harassment were expected during Phase 2 of the study. Surprisingly, this did not materialise as expected.

8.2.1. Current experiences of sexual harassment on the ships

In contrast to the high incidence of behaviours that could be construed as sexual harassment, as reported through the SHQ, the direct personal experience of the women in the study showed that such harassment was limited. Their experiences of sexual harassment mostly consisted of comments and remarks of a sexual nature: *The only experience I had with sexual harassment was the occasional comment, that kind of thing. (B3, female officer)* Surprisingly, a number of the women even reported a total absence of sexual harassment: *I haven't*

experienced anything about sexual harassment and even my peers, my friends, they haven't actually complained about it. (B4, female officer)

Both quotes came from female officers, thus supporting the SHQ results (Chapter 5) that, in the fleet, officers were less likely to be victims of sexual harassment. Most likely, this was because authority in rank protected them. As could be expected, the same situation played itself out on the ships: female officers knew that the men would be more careful of saying something inappropriate to an officer than to a junior rating. Correct relations between the officers and ratings are very important on ships, and the fact that women officers reported little or no sexual harassment is thus not surprising. Against expectations, however, some ratings reported the same lack of sexual harassment from their male colleagues: *No, it [sexual harassment] hasn't happened to me yet. (B14, female junior rating)*

Although the last quote seems to suggest that sexual harassment does not exist onboard ship, it does leave open the possibility for future harassment. A total denial of the existence and importance of sexual harassment represents something of a deviant case, but it does find resonance in the accounts of most women who did not *interpret* a wide range of behaviour as sexual harassment *per se*.

In contrast, men saw more harassment of women than the women reported themselves. Men, moreover, reported that sexual harassment was only verbal, including "men's talk" (e.g. crude jokes), name-calling, and 'indirect' harassment (innuendoes):

I have seen guys that are a bit more bold, pass the odd comment and they're not saying, "Hey, phew [whistle] you" or something like that, but just slight innuendoes, you know. Definitely seen that. But I haven't seen, personally, any touching or, you know, stuff like that, nothing serious. I've just heard guys passing comments and stuff like that. (B10, male)

The contrast between what men and women experienced was curious. A few possibilities may account for this:

(a) Interpretation of behaviour

It is possible that the women saw the behaviour, but that they did not interpret it as sexual harassment. A study by Braine et al. (1995) suggested that individuals who experienced sexually offensive behaviour might fail to acknowledge that they had been sexually harassed. However, in spite of this, the present findings are still surprising, since women have been reported to interpret a wider range of behaviours as sexual harassment than men would (Fitzgerald, 1993; Pryor et al., 1995). One woman provided a clear example of how some may fail to interpret harassing behaviours (as defined by the SAN policy) as sexual harassment: A female junior rating reported using 'terms of endearment' herself (and that they were reciprocally being used towards her), but strongly rejected this as sexual harassment. She interpreted it as an expression of good relations among friends. Fitzgerald et al. (1995) further reported that women use denial and reattribution as strategies to deal with harassment, which may have been the case in the present study.

(b) Sensitisation to gender issues

Another reason for the different experiences of men and women is that the men may have been more sensitised, due to recent awareness programs. They may therefore have recognised and identified more behaviours as sexual harassment. Conversely, women may have become more desensitised as a result of daily exposure to a gender-integrated environment, as a strategy to help them cope.

Using the framework of Fitzgerald, Gelfand & Drasgow (1995), it was noteworthy that the sexual harassment reported almost exclusively involved gender harassment between peers. There was little unwanted sexual attention, and no sexual coercion (quid pro quo harassment) reported. No contra-power sexual harassment (Rospenda et al., 1998) was reported, which can be attributed to the hierarchical status in the military, which transcends all other power constructions (e.g. based on gender, race, class, education).

8.2.2. Responses of women

Various researchers reported that formal complaints were the most infrequent strategy of dealing with sexual harassment, and that they were only used when all other approaches had failed (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994; Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Pryor, 1995). Women on the ships reported the same, namely that complaining was the last resort. They mentioned one case where a woman had complained of sexual harassment, but there had been no response to her complaint. Her experience fits in with the results of the SHQ, where respondents commented on the inadequacies of organisational responses to complaints.

Yes, I'm almost 5 years in the Navy, and in that 5 years I've only put in a statement once against a man after he made physical moves on me. He tried to hug me, literally – but nothing came of it [the complaint]. So, what is the use of it to have a system if the system does not work, and I'm not the only one who complained about him. (B7, female)

In support of previous reports (Becker, 2000; Fitzgerald et al., 1995), other women commented that if they were sexually harassed, they would probably not complain for fear of secondary victimisation, and especially of having to defend themselves if a disciplinary hearing should take place. Some feared that they would not be believed anyway.

I don't think I would take it higher or so, because at the end of the day you are the victim, you are the one in the wrong. You have given him provocation and all those things. (B5, female)

The SHQ elicited a number of comments regarding secondary victimisation, and while none of the participants interviewed reported such experiences, their fears were based in their collective consciousness, the intuitive 'knowledge' that women would suffer twice if they did report sexual harassment.

It is speculated that race may also play a role, creating a 'double handicap' for women to overcome. For example, White USA correctional officers were more likely to report sexual harassment than their Black counterparts (Belknap, 1991). While the reasons for this are not clear, Martin and Jurik (1996) argue that it lies within the power relations manifested between multiple identities of gender and race (e.g. women of colour may face a double handicap).

Although in the present study race did not appear in the accounts of sexual harassment, the multi-racial composition of the group (and of the gender-integrated ships) must be acknowledged.

In ironic contrast to women's fears of secondary victimisation, men on the big ships saw women as more powerful than they saw themselves: they perceived the organisational response to be always in favour of the women: *Say for example if they [women] charge you, your chance is very slim that you would survive it, because they won't really listen to your side of the story. (A4, male)* Such perceptions of reverse power exerted by women reflected experiences of soldiers elsewhere (Harrell & Miller, 1997; Miller, 1997).

These men also feared that women might use this power against men they did not like, by accusing a man of sexual harassment and having him punished without him necessarily being guilty. While there was no evidence that it ever happened in the SAN, this fear may have been a powerful reason why there were so few cases of sexual harassment on board the ship.

Especially if a woman doesn't like you, you're doing anything that slightly, remotely, suggests sexual harassment, she will slap you with a charge and basically there's nothing you can do, if a woman slaps sexual harassment, you have to do your damndest to prove you didn't do nothing. (A2, male)

Apart from reporting sexual harassment, victims can engage in a number of strategies to manage the harassment. Fitzgerald et al. (1995) classified response strategies as either internally focused or externally focused. Internally focused strategies attempt to manage cognitions and emotions associated with events, and include endurance (i.e. ignoring the situation and doing nothing), denial (pretending it has not happened or that it has no effect), detachment, reattribution (reinterpreting a situation as not harassing), and illusionary control (blaming oneself for harassment). Externally focused strategies are problem solving in nature and include avoidance, which is the most common strategy, appeasement (putting off the harasser by means of humour or delays without directly confronting him), assertion (requesting the harasser to stop, or using verbal attack), seeking institutional or organisational relief, which is the most infrequent response, and seeking social support by discussing harassment with co-workers or family. They found that the least confrontational responses

were the most common, and formal complaints the least common. Studies in the military identified coping responses as seeking external assistance, confronting the harasser, leaving the field (e.g. requesting a transfer), avoidance, and going along with the harassment (Pryor, 1995). The most common response in the military seems to be to avoid the perpetrator, and secondly to tell the perpetrator(s) to stop (Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994).

No such accounts of avoidance or seeking support were voiced in the present study. Women cited the value of verbal assertiveness as the most effective way of dealing with sexual harassment on the ships. Being able to speak out when it happened, and to voice their objections, spread the message that such behaviour was not acceptable.

[when men pass comments] In that regard, you as a woman, you must just be rude. You have to put them in place right there. Cause it's going to happen, they'll try their luck. You must be able to tell them back just as fast. (B5, female)

Speaking out in this way helped to reduce the incidence of sexual harassment. Female sailors were not shy to voice their dissatisfaction with behaviours or conversations. In this way, women regulated the boundaries of what was acceptable behaviour, and disallowed behaviour that was not acceptable. Both women and men told of incidents where women gave as good as they got. Doing so not only kept harassment in check, but also ensured their acceptance by the group.

But I think with a bunch of girls on board on the ship, we're a very vocal bunch and we will, like, say something quite quickly, so I don't think they've much scope to try. (B13, female)

But what I must say the swans we have had onboard, is a good quality of swan. You understand, they will tell you where to get on and where to get off. (A4, male)

Endurance was also cited as a useful strategy. Women described the need to develop 'a thick skin', and the ability to let comments roll off them: *[In response to an incident of sneering] It's not nice. It's just something that you either have to ignore or take it to heart and then leave it, because you can't change it. (B9, female)*

Women cited many examples where they behaved like men in order to cope with sexual harassment, although they did not always frame it in such terms. They emphasised, for instance, the need for so-called 'masculine' qualities like assertiveness to ensure their survival in this environment. They also acted like men, by 'giving as good as they got', as a result of which they were accepted by the men, and were less harassed as a result. The more they 'looked' like a man, the less feminine they were. This in turn meant that they were no longer regarded as sexual beings, which in turn led to a cessation of harassment. This issue will be expanded on in Chapter 9.

One man reported how women used humour to deal with sexual harassment: *We had a yeoman³⁵ here, a huge yeoman woman. So when she came on board, they stand at the bottom and shout "Wobbly Dolly" or whatever, but then they run away. So she couldn't say who it is and they just sit there, but then afterwards, she started throwing the same things back, and then, like, after the second week, you see the midshipmen having lunch, "Isn't that too little for you?" stuff like that, so, and she could take it, and then she would say, "Just leave half of yours, I want to still help you," something like that, so that's how they bond, and that's it. You seem to get that sense of humour down there below. (B11, male)*

Although in this account it had a successful outcome, the use of humour to deal with sexual harassment is a double-edged sword. Women may use humour to create distance between themselves and the men who harass them, and also to avoid the negative images that plague women who do report harassment. It may, however, backfire when women eventually do report harassment, as supervisors may claim that there is no record that she had found such behaviour offensive before (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

8.2.3. Flexible boundaries

In spite of the limited reports of actual sexual harassment, participants expressed strong opinions about issues pertaining to the sexual harassment policy. In this regard, they introduced arguments for and against current policy – some arguing for more flexible boundaries, others for more rigid guidelines. Both men and women were sometimes

³⁵ Sailor responsible for communications.

frustrated by the definitions of appropriate behaviour. In spite of formal policies, sailors saw appropriate behaviour as dependant on the context within which it took place. Part of the frustration was found in the various understandings of the boundaries of sexual harassment. Some women argued for a flexible attitude to behaviour, feeling that naval policy did not take into account informal interaction on the ships. The use of terms of endearment between friends and close colleagues was cited as an example of this. At the same time, other women acknowledged that this did have its problems: flexibility makes it difficult to distinguish between friendly banter and actual harassment.

Again it depends on a person to person relationship, for example, me and one of my best friends, and he will shout out loud "Yes, you sexy beast" for instance, and then I say "Oh shut up", you know, no big issue. That is not an issue for me, but if someone else would do it, I'll get really upset. So, it depends on a person to person relationship, and you cannot really do that, because then they are going to say "yes but he said so, so why can't I say so too". It's difficult. (B7, female)

Although formal policy with strict guidelines did exist, it was seen as out of touch with everyday reality on the ships. It was further not seen to regulate daily interaction, but rather as a form of protecting senior officers when incidents did occur. The inadequacy of formal policy was expressed in a number of ways:

So remember we filled in one form, we are not allowed to do this, we are not allowed to do that. And the rubbish they put down on that form, it's pathetic really. I mean, if I must go according to those forms and I see a female fall down the steps, I'm going to step aside and let her fall and break her neck. I say, "Hey, I'm not allowed to touch you, you must fall and break now." (A3, male)

It's pathetic. I think basically it was brought in not only to protect the female, but also to protect the powers to be. So if they have a thing, they can turn round and say, "But Cdr So-and-so did you inform your people?" That is basically just to protect themselves. (A3, male)

In the focus groups, men discussed their discomfort with the subjective nature of defining harassment and said that they felt it was personally offensive. They believed it placed them in

a situation where they never knew how to behave towards a female sailor, creating the opportunity for disruption of interpersonal interactions.

This is what makes it difficult, sexual is as interpreted by the person who is receiving it. If it causes offence to that person. So if you put your arms around a swan, and she's fine with it, then it's not sexual harassment but if she's uncomfortable, then it is. (A2, male)

In reality, in spite of formal rules, women worked within the context of flexible boundaries, where dealing with sexual harassment boiled down to personal management of situations. Their own individual discomfort determined their definition of sexual harassment and thus their actions when it occurred. The downside to such flexibility was the burden it placed on women to manage degrading incidents themselves. They needed to decide individually how to manage difficult situations. This suited the men well, and they argued strongly for this, as it took the burden away from them to act appropriately. Effectively, though, this meant that women were victimised a second time.

I don't think it [sexual harassment policy] can be enforced all that well. Now I think it's up to the female to take the whole situation and think about it and think whether she should bring up the charge against the guy or something. Ja, the female must bring up a complaint if she has got a complaint. (B10, male)

In practice, women were mostly left to deal with incidents of sexual harassment on their own, and as discussed, used a variety of strategies to do so.

It was significant from the focus groups and interviews that the official policy and its enforcement was a much greater issue on the big ship (who did it 'by the book') than on the small one. The small ship had greater proportional gender integration than the big vessel, and less physical space to work in. This forced the group to develop its own norms in terms of appropriate gender interaction, and furthermore facilitated the enforcement of the norms, resulting in less concern about the formal organisational position and policies, than was the case on the big ship.

8.2.4. Differences between shore-based and ship-based experiences

The lack of evidence of widespread sexual harassment onboard the ships during Phase 2 of the study contrasted sharply with anecdotal (or 'hearsay') evidence of sexual harassment on the shore bases, a finding that is also supported by the SHQ in Phase 1. However, it reflects a similar experience in the US, where researchers found fewer indications of sexual harassment in newly gender-integrated units, than in the total military at the time (Harrell & Miller, 1997). A number of factors may explain this contrast within the fleet between the shore bases and the ships.

(a) Denial

Women (and men too) on the ships may simply be in denial over the extent of sexual harassment in everyday life. The presence of sexual harassment in a military unit could further have potentially life-threatening effects on chain-of-command (authority) issues. Although no such evidence was found in this study, it could be argued that servicewomen and men could not afford to acknowledge the presence of sexual harassment.

(b) Organisational norms

In the period between Phase 1 and 2 of this study, the SAN rolled out their sexual harassment awareness program – first to all the ships involved in gender integration, and later to all ships in the fleet. The sexual harassment policy was further disseminated in high-level briefings, with great emphasis placed on the fact that commanding officers (CO's) would be held responsible for preventing and managing problems that might occur.

Pryor et al. (1995) argue that sexual harassment is more likely to occur where it is perceived as socially permissible. This refers to local norms, which are mostly defined by reactions of local leaders. In other words, it would be perceived as permissible if management condones or tolerates such behaviour. They found that in the military, more sexual harassment occurred when CO's were perceived as encouraging sexual harassment, than when CO's were perceived as indifferent or neutral, and the least sexual harassment was experienced when CO's were perceived to discourage harassment. They concluded, with others (Fitzgerald et

al., 1995; Prior, LaVite & Stoller, 1993), that local social norms, as indexed by perceived attitudes of local management, influence the incidence of sexual harassment.

Official norms on the ships would strongly prohibit sexual harassment. There was in fact a stricter enforcement of the sexual harassment policy onboard the ships³⁶, where the SAN feared the risk was the greatest. Due to the awareness programs and the CO's disciplinary responsibility, sailors on the ships may further have been more sensitised, and therefore enacted less sexual harassment. Some men did report being over-sensitised, though, due to prior fears of excessive harassment and the resulting awareness programs on the ships, a finding that supports the experience of the USN (Waller, 1995).

(c) The imperative of good working relations

The low incidence of sexual harassment could furthermore be due to the close proximity of people living and working together onboard the ships, where behaviour is regulated by the necessity of sound interpersonal relations. Spending long periods of time together on small ships places a heavy strain on relationships, and emphasises the importance of not offending shipmates, with whom one has to maintain good working relations.

The use of the family metaphor – introduced in Chapter 7 – may also have influenced the behavioural interaction on board the ships. If an individual sees his or her social unit as a family, they may enact less actual sexual harassment, with the underlying argument that one does not harass one's own sister. The family metaphor may also influence the definition of sexual harassment. Therefore, if such behaviour is present, it is not defined as offensive, but as part of the normal interaction that occurs between family members: *You know, it's like a little family, brothers and sisters teasing each other whatever, like that. (B11, male)*

(d) Informal system of behaviour regulation

The nature of social life onboard the ships creates the need for close regulation of behaviour. Sailors, irrespective of gender, live and work in close proximity to each other. They further

³⁶ This was done, for example, through regular inspections to deter the display of offensive visual material, and frequent reminders of the policy during meetings of the ships' companies.

share an awareness of the immediacy of danger. From this foundation a strong ethos develops, including both a respect of privacy, and an active discouragement of divisive subgroups. This is maintained through an informal process of indoctrinating new arrivals. Sailors are usually not aware of these processes, but nevertheless enforce them strongly.

The informal regulation of behaviour – ensuring compliance with what is deemed appropriate – became an important mechanism to facilitate the low incidence of open resistance, especially as expressed through sexual harassment. Direct supervisors dealt with sexual harassment, whether based on their own observations or subordinates' complaints, immediately and informally on the ships. Although it is not clear how often this in fact did happen, many perceived it as adequate for smaller transgressions. Sailors generally saw a lesser need for the formal enforcement of policy, as informal mechanisms has already taken care of the behaviour it wanted to regulate.

I can't say it [formal policy] is effective because it's never been used in that sense. I'm not saying that it won't work, I'm just saying that I've never seen it being used on this ship yet. And like, in my opinion, I would say that if there are any problems, which I know that this women said, like, "I don't like the way he spoke to me," maybe it's like personal, or something like that, then it is there, go to the coxswain³⁷, "Come in, did you say this?" They both come in, "Okay, right, you have a choice now, you know that you're wrong, do you accept an apology?" "Right, okay." The thing is also that it's, let's put it this way, the one woman might accept his apology, the next one might not and then it's going to go further, you know, but so far it hasn't gone, or maybe it's never been, that it was such, they say it was sexual harassment but it was just maybe she felt offended that this guy, maybe, in the manner that he spoke to her, or the language that he used when he spoke to her. Ja, I can't say that papers work in that sense because we've never gone that far. (B11, male)

The same informal system is also used with outsiders: If women were to complain about being bothered by men from other ships, their supervisors would go across and have a private word with that person. In that way, potential sexual harassment was prevented, also contributing to the lower levels of harassment experienced.

³⁷ Senior non-commissioned officer on ship, responsible for discipline, among other things.

Coxswain will just go to tell their coxswain, or tell him even, to stay away from the woman, then they get all the women together and they say, "If that person, or any of them come there, you see they're making a nuisance when you're on duty, or whatever, come and inform us and we will, like you know". (B11, male)

It was never clearly stated why this system came into being in the first place. This raised the question whether the informal system was there to undermine the formal disciplinary system, or to support it. The supervisors were invariably male, and could have used it as a subtle way of maintaining their dominance over the women. There was general consensus, though, that the informal system of discipline had great value, and it was thus seen as another part of the pervasive informal disciplinary system in existence on board the ships. This informal system has evolved to regulate appropriate behaviour in the confined world of the ships, to the benefit of all. As an extension of this, it may have arisen to compensate for the lack of visual enforcement of formal discipline. While the reason for its development was not clear from the data, the informal system was considered a powerful mechanism to facilitate women's entrance into the male world of the ships.

(e) Ship-specific constructions of masculinity

In line with Messerschmidt's (1993) position, namely that bad behaviour is a resource for accomplishing masculinity, sexual harassment can be seen as a mechanism to maintain a construction of masculinity in opposition to the other, the feminine. On ships, in the absence of women, masculinity was not always constructed as 'not being feminine', but through elements such as technical competence and career accomplishments. When women entered the ship environment, however, they were new and inexperienced, and posed less of a threat to men's constructions of masculinity. Men, in turn, had less need to harass women to construct their otherness as men. If this is true, it can be speculated that, as women develop, both in competence and career progression, they may experience more sexual harassment, as men's definitions of masculinity on ships change.

(f) Measurement and interpretation of sexual harassment

In the Phase 1 survey, sexual harassment was behaviourally defined. Actions were reported irrespective of whether the individual felt them to be harassing or not. In the interviews, the subjective view was elicited, and respondents did not always interpret behaviour that might have occurred as sexual harassment, and therefore did not have much to report. Although little sexual harassment was reported by participants in these interviews, their accounts provided evidence of behaviour that outsiders might label as sexual harassment, even though the participants themselves might not interpret it as such.

The SHQ further elicited an indication of the presence of behaviour, and not its frequency. It could therefore have provided a skewed picture by reporting behaviour that was seldom seen, and of low intensity (in terms of impact on victim, which was not measured).

Whereas the accuracy of personal observations is difficult to validate, it may be interesting to note that the researcher, in the course of his work as psychologist for the fleet, provided counselling and support to many victims of sexual harassment in the fleet. However, they all came from land-based units, suggesting that the ships may indeed encounter less sexual harassment.

The interpretation of behaviour as inappropriate is particularly difficult in the South African patriarchal society. A previous study on family violence within the SANDF found that 21% of female respondents did not believe that behaviours like a man choking his wife, breaking one or more of her bones, stabbing her with a knife and punching her in the face, were abusive (Van Breda, 2002). Van Breda (2002) reported that there was widespread distortion of what constitutes violence in the family. It can be speculated that some confusion also exists in the SANDF with regards as to what behaviour constitutes sexual harassment. The victims or perpetrators may thus not identify behaviours that well-informed individuals would recognise as clear harassment, as such.

It is furthermore possible that sexually harassing behaviour is so much part of everyday life within the fleet, that it is not labelled as such anymore. There was some suggestion in the interviews that what outsiders may consider as sexual harassment was just “men being men” –

especially military men being military men. Their behaviour was then interpreted not as the targeting of individual women, but as young men just fooling around. It needs to be cautioned, though, that this argument was never clearly formulated as such by any participant.

(g) Status of sailors

Carey (1994) and Walshok (1987) (cited in Carey, 1994) found that blue-collar workers tend to experience less sexual harassment. Instead, 'peer-like' relationships tend to develop, characterised by a high degree of camaraderie, with little active harassment, isolation or exclusion. This stands in contrast to white-collar workers, where sexual harassment seems more widespread.

On naval ships, ratings are basically blue-collar workers (often involved in manual, repetitive tasks), while officers may be considered white-collar. The status of the ratings may contribute to the further understanding of the low levels of sexual harassment reportedly experienced.

In conclusion, sexual harassment did not appear to be a widespread manifestation of resistance onboard the ships. Women reported very little harassment, and although men reported a little more, it was only sporadic verbal harassment that was acknowledged to be present. This section discussed women's responses and possible reasons for the low incidence of sexual harassment on the ships. The reasons for the low incidence may be due to the same mechanisms that facilitated adaptation onboard the ships, which are discussed in Chapter 9.

8.3. Special treatment

Special treatment is another traditional manifestation of resistance. Life and work onboard ships are physically demanding. Due to the real differences in physical strength between women and men, special treatment is a 'safe' form of resistance, as it is easily cloaked in arguments of "support" and "good management", while still suppressing women's equal participation. Participants experienced special treatment in three spheres – allocation of work, discipline, and resources.

8.3.1. Distribution of tasks and duties

Only a minority of the women participants in this study consciously experienced inequalities in the allocation of work. An often-cited example referred to fire fighting drills. Men would go in to fight the fire, while women would do 'lesser' work, like boundary cooling and rolling out fire hoses. During fire fighting sailors are detailed to do certain tasks, and women interpreted their exclusion as an indication of a lack of trust.

It's been proven over and over, even in exercises, women get used for upper deck cooling and the men climb into the fearnaught³⁸ suits, because they have to go in there. We don't make the choice, if it depended on us, we would climb into the fearnaught suit first, but we don't make the choice, others do. It doesn't keep me back, but it does make me aware that the men, that they actually don't trust the women. (B7, female)

Men's accounts echoed this experience: men will enact the hero roles, while women form the supporting cast. A number of reasons were put forward for this, some referring to men's greater physical strength (the fire fighting equipment is very heavy), others referring to the trust mentioned above.

In spite of examples like this, women saw more equal treatment in the allocation of work than men did. Generally they saw themselves as being in the same situation as the men: whoever is available does the work. In contrast, men saw more special treatment in the distribution of work. The younger men in particular believed that the women got off with lighter, easier work, while the men had to do the hard, heavy work: *The heavier work will be given to the guys, or the dirty work will be given to you, you know, and the women will do the cleaner work. (B2, male)* This supports studies in the US Military which indicated that junior men are more likely to believe women are given less dirty work and more special attention (Harrell & Miller, 1997).

³⁸ Protective suit worn for fire fighting.

Other men reported equal treatment on the surface, with men still doing the heavy work in practice: *As I say, when it came to physical work, they pulled their weight but all the real heavy stuff was done by guys. (B10, male)*

It was not always clear whether men were unhappy about this situation (of unequal work allocation). Although never openly expressed, it is in fact possible that they viewed this distinction (e.g. only men able to do 'heavy' work) favourably, as it bestowed recognition and status on them (cf. Neville, 2003).

8.3.2. Distribution of discipline

Men experienced inequalities in the distribution of discipline: where men would be punished, a woman's insubordination would be overlooked. Men further believed that when women are punished, they receive lighter punishments than the men: *We [male and female junior rating] were both away from the bridge³⁹ . . . So, she got a reprimand, and I was charged for it, which I thought was really unfair. (B2, male)*

In contrast, this was not an issue for women at all, and none of them referred to any disciplinary matters during the interviews.

8.3.3. Distribution of resources and opportunities

A minority of men, restricted to those on the big ships, perceived unequal treatment in the distribution of resources. Female sailors occupying their own cabins and receiving their own bathrooms was a particular complaint. The contrast between the perceptions of women and men were striking: women saw unequal treatment in the limitation of ships available to them, while men saw unequal treatment in women getting positive answers to their requests for posts and transfers to shore-duty.

And they always get everything right. Put in the request today, tomorrow it is approved. You've done that request five years ago and they say to you, "No." And the situation hasn't

³⁹ Command centre of ship.

changed that much. But for me I didn't get that. No. She's female, one time they go. There was one female, she was here, also in the Communications branch, she was alright but she says, "Oh, I'm tired now, I want to go." And she goes. Gone. (A3, male)

8.3.4 The dynamics of special treatment

In the accounts of the women participants, there was little reference to special support from men, and therefore little awareness of resistance through special treatment. It was the men – mainly younger men – who keenly felt the unfairness of unequal treatment. In this case, their fears of increased burden (having to work harder) focussed their attention on special treatment, formulated not so much as resistance to women, but as an indication of the burden placed on men. Special treatment – inequality – held different meanings for different people.

(a) Special treatment as manifestation of resistance

Women saw men's efforts to 'help' them as direct resistance. In their view, not allowing them to try to complete certain tasks expressed the men's lack of trust, but also denied women the opportunity to prove themselves, in order to gain that trust. There is irony in never being given the opportunity to try. By not allowing women access to certain roles or responsibilities, men could never be proven wrong, and could therefore maintain their arguments against women. At the same time, there is also irony in the fact that women can never be proven incapable either, allowing them to complain about the status quo without having to defend themselves against experiences that might show them as indeed incapable of completing certain tasks.

Men from non-integrated ships argued that women did not have the physical strength, and needed to be given the lighter work, whereas the men would be strong enough to do the hard physical work. In contrast, the men on the gender-integrated ships displayed less concern about physical strength, citing their experience that was not such an insurmountable obstacle. They employed a more subtle argument to express their attitudes of male superiority: they argued not that women were unable to do the job, but that they were not as able as men. They reinforced the argument by their belief that women did not cope as well with pressure as men.

They'd put a guy to go in first . . . they're able to cope with a bit of pressure. Women do start to crack up a little quicker than the guys when under pressure. (B10, male)

The extent to which special treatment really occurred in practice is uncertain. In spite of the younger men's complaints, few of the female participants expressed particular concern regarding unequal treatment, or placed less emphasis on it. In fact, some women interpreted their perceived lack of special treatment as acceptance. This leads to the question of the extent of actual special treatment, which will be dealt with at the end of the section.

(b) Men's defence

Men generally took responsibility for the unequal treatment, but like good politicians, put their own 'spin' on events, providing two accounts for the special treatment they give women.

1) *Helping to express support for women*

Men put forward the view that helping women was an expression of support. Men believed that getting women out of the way, and doing the work themselves, was thus an indication of their support for women. In contrast, women saw this as unsupportive, through not being given a chance by the men to even try to complete a task, thereby maintaining the women-as-weaker-sex status quo. This became a form of benevolent sexism – supporting women in a way that maintained male dominance.

It's just that sometimes you find out that men tend to think that you can't do it, like probably if we had to proceed to sea handling the ropes, then you'll try to do it but they say, "Oh, just move." They don't give you the actual chance to do it, so obviously you won't get that much experience, because they always think, "Ag no man, she's too soft, move out of that." I think it's a man's attitude. They are not being supportive. If they were, they would just leave you, then if they see that you are struggling, then probably then they can give you some help there. (B4, female)

2) *Good management*

There was a conscious debate between the importance of fair allocation of tasks (equal work for all) and the acknowledgment that the differences between the genders had to be managed constructively. It was understood by most men that when they were detailed to do a really heavy task, it was often a manifestation of good management of varying physical abilities.

You obviously get the guys doing the more physical jobs and the women tend to get the easier work sometimes. But only if they can't handle it. Obviously if they can't lift the 50 litre cylinder, you obviously are going to give it to the stronger guy. (B1, male)

While all acknowledged that this was practical – it gets the job done – many individuals felt that good management could become unfair. Women wanted to prove that they ‘can make it’ – not only as a gender issue, but also for their own self-esteem. But good management prevented them from having the chance to do so.

8.3.5. Relative burden

As mentioned, only a few women expressed particular concern regarding unequal treatment. It was the men who were more aware of it, but interpreted it not in terms of what women did not have to do, but rather in terms of the ‘fact’ that men had to do more. Special treatment was a tangible form of increased burdening. As mentioned before, it was the younger men who were more keenly aware of this, as it was on their level where the hard physical work took place, and where they would potentially have to work harder than the women. This is also in line with European findings (Kummel, 2002).

Some [men], they did accept women. Some they didn't. Well the reason is maybe we have got four heavy things to lift and there are two guys and two women, really we must first take our stuff up and come back and help them on their way. (B6, male)

There was a tension between the accounts of male participants: On the one hand were interpretations of special treatment as resistance, apparently in conflict with other interpretations of special treatment as increased burden. This provided an insightful

indication of the ambivalence about male control. Men had no consensus about which gender had control: Did it lie with men who actively resist, or were men helpless victims of gender integration?

8.3.6. Extent of actual special treatment

The extent to which special treatment occurred in any significant sense is unclear. Women tended to say they experienced less, which may indicate either the absence of special treatment, or women's denial, as its presence would indicate resistance and lesser acceptance onboard the ships. Younger men tended to experience it more, which again may indicate its presence, or men's need to believe it, as it would fit their perception that only men were able to do the more difficult 'man's' work. The men's fears of being increasingly burdened may further have focused their attention on any incident of special treatment, leading to an overestimation of its occurrence onboard the ships.

8.4. Conditions of Acceptance

Naval life is strenuous and potentially dangerous. Newcomers on ships must meet strong criteria (e.g. competence) before they are accepted and trusted as part of a ship's crew. While these criteria are applied to both men and women, more was required from women. One example demonstrates the almost impossible standards women had to meet for acceptance. Apart from including the usual demands for job competency, it also required open-mindedness (e.g. to cope with male language), physical strength, and femininity.

Ja, I've met a couple which are here, they're definitely competent. I have seen Leading Seaman [X], I did basic training with her, she, to me, I think is the right sort of profile; open-minded to an extent where whatever language goes on or whatever references, not directed to her, obviously, but, you know, where people can relax and say what they want to say when they want to say it, and she's physically capable, she's one of the very few on my basic training that could handle herself, athletic, and yet feminine at the same time, so I think she's got the right sort of equilibrium. (C4, male)

Men's insistence that women should only be allowed onboard their ship if they met certain criteria gave them a 'legitimate' argument against opening their ship to 'invasion' by women. Competence was the most important condition, although this was often defined or measured in masculine terms. Women who could 'do the job' were welcome: *I've definitely not got a problem with women on board ships, as long as they can pull their weight, it's not a problem. (C1, male)* This condition seem fairly general to integrating workplaces, as it is also present in other navies (Neville, 2003).

The rituals of initiation have been discussed before, and acted as tests to women. If they could "take it like men", they were accepted into the group. Sexual harassment was another test. Both women and men recounted incidents where women gave as good as they got. That granted them acceptance into the group, and led to a cessation of the harassment.

Like, okay, for example, if he must say "That bitch do this", I say, I will swear right back, "Shove it man", or you know, if I don't like somebody then I'll refer to him by any other name I see fit to, it's just one of those things. (B13, female)

Ironically, "giving as good as they get" was seen as a man's way of dealing with teasing and ridicule, and being able to respond in kind was women's ticket to being accepted. Women who chose this response in effect had to become like the men in order to be accepted and to end the sexual harassment. Giving as good as they got led to acceptance in the fleet context, but may be a double edged sword, as the strategy may not always be to everyone's liking and led to rejection by some, as Neville (2003) found in the Irish Naval Service.

Women had to 'become like men' in many ways. Masculine traits – '*able to stand her [his] man*' or '*the best man for the job*' – became the criteria for acceptance. The quoted phrases invoke masculine traits of assertiveness and technical competence, and reflected men's conditions of acceptance. This appeared to be a strategy to place women in a double bind: if they behaved gender-appropriately (in a feminine way), they were not accepted as equals on the ship. If they behaved in a masculine way (and did a 'man's' work), they would not be accepted as a woman or as a person. However, there was no evidence indicating that all women necessarily experienced this as a particular problem.

Women ashore did not appreciate the pressures of adapting to this environment, and ship-based women were often hurt by the shore-based women's judgemental attitude. Two participants recorded an incident in their diaries where a land-based female sailor remarked that *'all the girls on the [Ship B] are bitches'*, apparently referring to their efforts to make it in a man's world. This attitude may also indicate the success of ship-based women in meeting the conditions of acceptance – leading in turn to shore-based women's criticism of those who did 'make it'. This criticism reminds of the Tall Poppy Syndrome⁴⁰ (Mouly & Sankaran, 2002), where shore-based women engaged in strategies of 'levelling' the success of ship-based women. Although this was a single incident, it does suggest that the women on ships found ways to deal with the conditions of acceptance, which will be explored in more detail in Chapter 9.

It is interesting that women did not always experience the conditions of acceptance as resistance. Some perceived it as their 'ticket' in – once they had passed the test, there was no longer a problem. This finding needs to be tempered by a note of caution on the participating group. The women who were interviewed were those who were on the ship for a period of time. They had therefore in all probability 'passed' a number of tests. The women who experienced the worst resistance (in terms of the conditions of acceptance) might have left the ship after a shorter period of time.

8.5. Conclusion

The accounts of participants elicited three traditional forms of resistance, which were explored in this chapter. Sexual harassment was mostly experienced in the form of verbal harassment – remarks of a sexual nature. Surprisingly, some women did not experience any sexual harassment. When it did occur, women mostly dealt with it through verbal assertiveness, while the ship as a whole relied on the informal system of behaviour regulation to contain sexual harassment. Difficulties with the boundaries of what constitutes harassment in specific micro-contexts were discussed, and a number of reasons were proposed to explain the low incidence of sexual harassment. These included the local norms, the imperative of maintaining good relations at work, and the role of interpretation.

⁴⁰ When one person cuts an apparently successful person 'down to size', usually as an expression of professional envy.

Special treatment was identified in three spheres. Women and men found examples of special treatment in the distribution of work, whereas men found further evidence of special treatment in the distribution of discipline and resources. Women interpreted such inequality as resistance, but did not identify special treatment as a major concern. Men acknowledged their own role in the unequal allocation of tasks, but defended their behaviour by interpreting it as either supportive actions or good management. Unequal treatment was a greater concern for men, kept in their focus due to their fears that they would have to carry an increased burden.

Men resisted women by placing equal standards as conditions of acceptance. Women felt that they had achieved those standards, as they generally felt accepted. The conditions were typically based on competence, and often defined in terms of masculine traits. Women therefore had to act like men, placing them in the conflicting position of acting 'like men', without losing sight of their gender identity.

In conclusion, traditional resistance was present, but not nearly as much as was expected. It is argued that the reasons for this lie in the mechanisms of adaptation that came into play, which forms the theme of Chapter 9.

CHAPTER NINE: MECHANISMS OF ADAPTATION

9.1. Introduction

Common sense and the experiences of other navies have created expectations that women on ships would have a difficult time. Firstly, resistance was expected to the threat posed by women to men's position and status. Secondly, ignorance and inexperience was expected, as it was likely that neither women nor men would know how to handle the new situation onboard the ships. Inexperience would also have been a double-edged sword: men's fear that they might be accused of discrimination might have made them take special care to support women's adjustment; alternatively, it might have led to less support in order to express their resistance to the gender integration of their ships.

Chapter 7 explored the resistance that was expressed through cultural symbols, but also revealed the means of acceptance that exist within naval culture. Chapter 8 presented the more traditional forms of resistance, but revealed that there was much less of this than had been expected. Participants, especially men, were aware of opposition to women's presence, but little active resistance was reported, particularly by the women. Surprisingly, men sometimes saw resistance on the part of other men when women themselves did not.

Phase 2 of the study elicited generally positive accounts of experiences from the beginning of gender integration, and definitely of experiences at the time of the study (12-18 months after gender integration). However, in spite of these positive views, the fleet was still a masculine environment, where the presence of women challenging the status quo created tension. This tension can be seen most clearly in the double bind of the sometimes conflicting masculine and feminine roles adopted by women sailors.

Women found ways of resolving this, adjusting and even thriving on the ships. The mechanisms through which such tension was resolved are the theme describe in this chapter. The chapter starts by reviewing the effects of time, and the changes wrought by exposure to a gender-integrated environment. Thereafter, women's responses to the conditions of acceptance (Chapter 8) – continually re-creating credibility – are introduced. Identity

negotiation was the primary mechanism of dealing with the double bind, and will be explored in detail. This will be followed by a discussion of individual coping strategies used by women. A number of other factors aiding adaptation will conclude the chapter.

9.2. Time and Exposure to Gender-integrated Environment

The passage of time brought increased acceptance of the situation by both sides. One female junior rating had sailed on the ship one year before the study, had gone on a training course, and had recently returned: *Oh yes, I think we are more accepted than a year before, yes. Next year it would be even better. (B8, female)* Her experience was mirrored by a number of other respondents who all indicated that the men were more accepting now than they had been in the past. Fear of the unknown was cited as a reason that men had been so resistant at first, and why they became more acceptant over time. Their fears were allayed by their exposure to the new situation, leading to close ties with the women with whom they worked.

The experiences on the ships reflect the characteristics of successful integration as proposed by the intergroup contact theories. Allport (1954) introduced the Contact Hypothesis, with its central premise being that the best way of reducing tension and hostility between groups is to bring them into contact with each other in various ways. Allport originally identified four key conditions to reduce prejudice, but these have been modified over time, raising the danger that the theory might become a laundry list of conditions. Such a development can often be attributed to what Pettigrew (1998) calls writers' confusion of facilitating with essential conditions. Current research defines four conditions as essential for effective intergroup contact (Brown, 1995). When these conditions are present, the following four processes are thought to explain the change through intergroup contact (Pettigrew, 1998):

a) *Learning about the out-group:*

Learning (in other words, achieving disconfirming evidence of stereotypes) corrects views of the out-group. Men on the ships often used the term 'learning' when referring to their changing attitudes towards women. Learning that women can do equal work was an important catalyst for this type of learning.

The guys on [Ship C] don't know about women. They still need to learn that they can work with women. I know exactly how to work with women, I know what they can do. (B15, male)

b) *Changing behaviour:*

New situations require new behaviour. Individuals resolve the dissonance between old prejudices and new behaviour by revising their attitudes. Primarily one condition – enough repetition – is required for this to be effective. Men who have served with women over a longer period – and who have thus had more time for repetition of new behaviours – were seen as more accepting, while the sailors who had newly transferred to the integrated ships were more wary. More time also allowed the sailors to come to terms with a changing environment.

Well, because a lot of the guys are still rotating, and the people are not happy with it especially, like, the new guys that come. The ones that's been here since we've been here, they're okay with it, you know, they've dealt with the situation. (B14, female)

c) *Generation of affective ties:*

The positive emotions aroused by intergroup friendships are pivotal to this process (see Section 9.7 for discussion of onboard relationships).

d) *In-group reappraisal:*

Optimal intergroup contact provides insights about in-groups as well as out-groups. Individuals realise that in-group norms and customs are not the only way of managing the social world. This new perspective reshapes their view of the in-group, and may lead to fewer provincial views of out-groups.

In the environment studied herein, the above four processes were active, as evidenced by the accounts of both women and men. Acceptance was signalled by equal treatment (or the perception of equal treatment), although it is not always clear whether equal treatment was the cause or consequence of acceptance: *Yes, initially it worked like that [preferential treatment for women], but it is less now, everyone just gets treated the same now. (C5, male)*

Another signal of change happened when women and men started to socialise together in the ship's mess. Time spent together in the shared recreational areas was evidence of successful change and adaptation. *Later on, like I said, they came down [to the mess] and we socialised. It took us about almost a year to get into – but we got attached to each other at a later stage.*
(A1, male)

Other manifestations of acceptance were expressed as 'getting used to' women, and the changes associated with their presence. The men saw the 'getting used to' part as the critical factor that ensured good adjustment by all. Not only did the men have to get used to the women – for example by wearing a towel on their way to and from the showers – but the women also had to get used to the men – who were now walking around in their towels to the shower. Once this happened, gender lost some of its impact, and the men saw the women more as shipmates and less as a separate group forced on their company from the outside.

But the women got used to the guys so quickly, and the men quickly got used to the women. When they [people from other ships] ask me – how is it with women [on board]? Then I say to them, you look past the women, you see these people are part of your [ship's] company.
(B15, male)

It is argued here that these processes were effective because the four conditions essential for effective intergroup contact (Brown, 1995) were present:

a) *Social and institutional support:*

Those in authority should be seen to support the relevant norms of acceptance (i.e. egalitarian norms, equal opportunities). Official naval policy and disciplinary procedures were strongly supportive of the new situation and the norms that underlie it. 'Appropriate' behaviour was enforced and maintained, especially through the informal regulation of behaviour (see Section 8.2.4). In the broader context, the present government's attitudes, the new constitution, and a section of the wider national environment were also supporting a new social order.

b) *Acquaintance potential* :

This is also called “friendship potential” (Pettigrew, 1997, 1998). Contact only works when it is of sufficient frequency, duration, and closeness to permit the development of meaningful relationships between the members of the various groups. The effect is thought to be achieved through three mechanisms: Close interpersonal relationships have their own inherent rewards; they lead to the acquisition of new and more accurate information about the out-group; and they lay the foundation for disconfirmation of negative stereotypes about out-groups. Naval ships are well suited for this kind of interaction. Women and men live and work together over a significant period of time. Socialising in the shared recreation areas has been mentioned previously, and facilitated informal contact that led to greater acceptance. Working together, and also suffering together, strengthened the bonds between sailors from both genders. Cold nights on the deck, long working hours in bad sea conditions, and shared mischief created a feeling of camaraderie that transcended gender and enhanced acceptance.

I'm thinking now of when we've been at sea where we are doing like maybe even night-hunting⁴¹ where we have to be at 7 o'clock at night right till 4 o'clock and we had to stay on the deck, with them you find the same camaraderie. For when it was only men, “Hey, (whisper) get a little coffee there for us and bring it here in two cups, man.” “Okay, hold on.” You'll find that even now with the woman, “Ja, man, make hot chocolate and wait, I'm going to help you.” Like that, you know, everyone is cold, we've got to have people there in case they find a mine or something now. So that shows that they, they've bonded with the ship and the men. (B11, male)

c) *Equal status*:

To be successful, contact needs to take place, as far as possible, between equal-status participants. Many prejudice and stereotypes of out-groups comprise beliefs about their perceived inferiority. If contact involves unequal-status relationships, where the out-group person is in an inferior position, it may reinforce existing stereotypes rather than challenge them. The experiences of working together on an equal footing, and generally receiving (perceived) equal treatment was mentioned before. Contact onboard the ships mostly takes place between members of more or less the same rank groups. Time spent off duty is always

⁴¹ For sea-mines

spent with members of the same rank – either in the recreational areas (allocated by rank), or in the sleeping quarters (again determined by rank). Crewmembers also come to the ship with equal training and qualification, and according to policy, are appointed according to the same merit.

d) *Cooperation (“common goals”)*:

When members of different groups are dependent on each other to achieve common goals, they have significant reasons to develop friendlier relations with each other. To this can be added that the outcome of the cooperative endeavour needs to be successful to maximise positive attitude change. Participants cited doing heavy work in uncomfortable conditions as evidence of this factor.

9.3. Creating Credibility

Men on the ships, initially, made it clear that acceptance was conditional. If a woman could prove that she could do the job, she might be accepted. This condition of credibility was fully internalised by women sailors, who believed that in order to achieve any measure of credibility, they had to ‘prove’ themselves continuously. To achieve this, women had to conquer three particular challenges to their credibility:

The **first challenge** was the presence of affirmative action and the perception of tokenism in the fleet. A minority of men perceived women’s career progression as the result of affirmative action, rather than of hard work and perseverance. It was especially junior men – who had to compete with women for promotion – who wanted to believe this. Women feared this accusation, and countered this by working extra hard. This did not go unnoticed. Older men, especially, saw women’s promotions as rewards for good performance: *I’ll tell you why, because they work harder. (A4, male)* Other research found the same response (Bradley, 1980, cited in Levine & Moreland, 1998).

Although male participants seldom if ever referred to female sailors as tokens – i.e. as representing or symbolising their entire gender category – female participants feared that their male colleagues might hold this belief. They recognised the danger of visual salience – i.e. of being a lone woman among men – and thus symbolically representing all women sailors. As a

result, some women directed their frustration towards those men who saw women as a collective before acknowledging them as individuals, whereas other women directed their frustrations towards women they believed were 'letting the side down'. One diary entry reads:

"AB [X] came to me and complained about [her supervisor]. She feels stressed out and is concerned that she will have an outburst soon if she does not get away from the ship. She has a history of shying away from work and this might just be a ploy. I am convinced that she uses her tears to get her own way and if this does not work, she throws a tantrum. I dislike women like this, since it 'proves' to men that we are too emotional and should not be on ships. This makes me very angry." (female officer)

The above entry supports findings in the US Military where hardworking women were annoyed and frustrated with women who put in less effort, as they felt the high visibility of all women meant that the poor performance of some women reflected upon all women in the unit (Harrell & Miller, 1997).

The **second challenge** was to counter the expectation that women are physically less able to do the requisite work. Women had to dispel many stereotypical expectations in this regard, and did so by 'getting their hands dirty'. Over time men recognised this, and changed their attitudes. It was noteworthy that it was not so much the ability to do hard work, but the perceived willingness to do it, that resulted in women being accepted. Most men understood that women are not physically like men, but often referred to certain incidents where women tried, and often suffered, to do their part: *That time when they carried these railway sleepers onboard. There is a whole lot of males standing there. I turned around and I said to her, "Hang on, I'll get one of the guys to carry it." And she said, "No, I'll do my part. I'm not scared to carry." (A3, male)*

Female sailors often had to work harder than their male colleagues to gain the same respect. Women were acutely aware of this: *Ja. It was like, you know that saying, a woman has to work twice as hard to get half as far? (B13, female)* This reflects the experiences of women in the USAF (Harrell & Miller, 1997; Voge & King, 1997). A number of men recounted stories where women volunteered for unpleasant tasks to make their point: *They were the ones who*

volunteered to do the shit jobs all the time. In that way gaining the people's respect because they worked. (A4, male)

The salience of gender also forced the issue of working harder. Women felt pressured to work hard because they stood out. They could not hide in the masses as some men did, but were permanently in the public eye. While some were burdened with the pressure (as previously described by Saenz, 1994), others were energised by it: *Because you stand out, you can't hide. You can't do anything, because you stand out all the time, so you have to make sure that while you're standing out, you're standing out well. (B13, female)*

In spite of their hard work, women experienced the need to re-establish their credibility in each new work situation (previously described in Ragins et al., 1998). Having proved themselves to be both willing and able, women had to do so again and again: *... because we constantly have to prove ourselves. (B14, female)*

This last point stands in contrast to the views of the men, who felt that the women working with them had progressed beyond the point where they had to prove themselves all the time. The men generally felt that they had by that stage accepted the women. Although this might not have been the perception of the women, it does explain why men expressed so little resistance. In their view, the women had 'made it'.

The **third challenge** was one faced by women in authority, namely to gain respect. There was consensus that women in positions of authority were held to higher standards. Respect for such women was based on what they knew and how much experience they had gained, and both women and men felt that such women had to know more, and have experienced more than the people of whom they were in charge. *She must know her story, meaning that she must know her story more so that the person she takes over from. She must be sharp, whoever she is. (B13, female)*

Apart from needing to have superior knowledge, a strong personality was also seen as an important condition for success. Men believed – and women were keenly aware of this – that women are softer than men, and that men would therefore take more chances with women supervisors than with male supervisors. A strong personality was seen as the ability to take

charge of people or situations. In effect, women were required to attain a masculine personality in order to be successful: *She must know her story and also she mustn't be a pushover. Basically you must have a Maggie Thatcher-type person that is not going to take bullying from anybody, because the minute she backs down, they're all going to run all over her.* (B13, female)

This was the same requirement male officers had to meet, but it seemed that female officers were scrutinised more closely, and therefore had to meet higher standards than their male counterparts.

Women managed to match all three challenges, and proved that they were credible and reliable workers. They did so by consistently working harder than men, and by being seen to be working harder. By doing so, they gained the acceptance of men, resulting in less open resistance to their presence.

9.4. Dealing with the Double Bind: Identity Construction

9.4.1. Double bind

The double bind refers to the mechanism of maintaining women's subservient position in organisations by means of conflicting expectations. On the one hand, in order to be accepted, women were expected to conform to (men's) gender expectations. They had to display 'feminine' characteristics, including behaviour, appearance, and leadership styles. On the other hand, they were required to manifest 'masculine' characteristics in order to achieve work success. Consequently, women in the Navy felt torn between the expectations of their gender-norm identity (femininity) and their business-norm identity (masculinity). Classical double bind often refers to negative career consequences. South African legislation prevents this (even encourages the opposite through policies of affirmative action). In this context, the power of the double bind lies in the negative psychological outcomes – to self-esteem, sense of belonging, groups acceptance, and so forth.

(a) Salience of gender

Onboard ships, a number of social categories vie for primacy in the hierarchy of categories that exist in the social structure. Typically, rank is the most dominant category, followed by mustering (type of work). In a world with only one gender category, the inclusion of a second gender category thus became highly significant. Moreover, women entered the sea-going Navy in small numbers, and thus their 'womanhood' or feminine identity became a very important factor, prompting intense discussions among their male co-workers. As a result, both women and men experienced gender as being extremely salient, superseding all other categories.

This new hierarchy of categories (i.e. with gender being more important than rank) was rigidly maintained, at least initially, as senior men set an example by, for instance, deferring to junior women in narrow alleys onboard the ship. The salience of gender was also experienced in 'complaining behaviour', which is common onboard ships, and accepted without a second thought. However, men 'heard' it more clearly when it was women who complained, and their actions were suddenly brought to general awareness: *So, there's bitching and moaning, which is normal, even the men would do that now. It's the same thing, but with a woman it stands out more clearly. That's how it goes. (B11, male)*

1) *Men's initial constructions of women's identity*

Initially, men saw women primarily in their gender category, and used a number of stereotypical feminine attributes to describe them, especially with reference to their traditional roles in society. The social categories identifying them were rigidly maintained, and the role of upbringing – socialisation – was presented as the cause of this. Men generally still saw women's identities linked to the roles they (should) fill. As these were the traditionally 'feminine' roles, they led to a gendered construction of work (cf. Acker, 1998). Men, for instance, believed that women wanted to fulfil, and were better at, roles involving caring (catering), and roles involving clerical duties (communications and administration). At the same time, men believed that women did not fit into, and would not enjoy, the more masculine roles of engineering and deck work (e.g. painting).

I think the women they are more on the paperwork. I think that is more of their interest. If you make them stewards, then they are happy, but if you give them paint they will do it, but they will complain. (B6, male)

Some women also experienced such role-bound gender perceptions in the Navy. One woman described her experience that all the 'softer' posts (e.g. stewards, communications, and so forth) were filled with women who did not necessarily want to be there, but could not get into other branches. Subtle pressure, like encouragement from superiors and male colleagues, was used to limit women to certain applications that are traditionally more 'feminine', leading to the danger of "role-entrapment" (Levine & Moreland, 1998). One young female steward explained:

Many of my friends who are also stewards, are also unhappy where they are because they want to do something else. Many of them want to be gunners, or ERATS⁴², but you get pulled into it [catering] because they think you fit there . . . so you get encouraged to go in a certain direction. (B8, female)

Women, especially older women, also felt the expectation to assume a 'mother' role and thus to take up the responsibility of caring and comforting. *Yes, now there is that expectation that you have to play mommy to them. So they come to me with their problems, they come and talk to me. (B5, female)*

Men attributed their automatic role allocation of women to upbringing and socialisation. They believed that women were socialised to do certain kinds of work, just as they believed that men were socialised to do other kinds of work. In the absence of women, however, men were willing to cross the boundaries and do traditional female work, such as washing the dishes after meals, and so forth. But when women arrived, men became resistant to this, subtly insisting that women do the women's work (in the kitchen), while men do the men's work (on the deck).

⁴² Engine room attendants

Yes, men don't mind to do traditionally women things, if there are no women around; then it is no problem. But the minute there is a woman, then suddenly, "no, you know I cannot do this now", it is as if they are saying, "it's going to diminish my image or my ego, so I don't want to do it anymore". (B3, female)

Initially at least, women were still seen as women, and therefore expected to take on a feminine role. This created tension, since women (as discussed previously) were only accepted after demonstrating their competence and willingness to work hard – in other words, when acting like men.

2) *Women's construction of their own identity*

In contrast to the men, women expressed their own identities in simpler terms: on the ships they were "sailors", and off it, "women". They easily made this split between being a sailor at work and a woman at home. They consistently saw themselves as sailors primarily, and only as women (as primary category) in social contexts outside the Navy.

Like you won't see yourself as a women totally while you are on the ships or so, when you are in your work area, many don't see themselves as women, but as just part of the crew, you must do your work and so on. Actually, when you are at work, and your wear your uniform, then you see yourself as a sailor. (B8, female)

It was clear throughout that female sailors' self-identity was defined within specific contexts. Being a sailor on the ship, and a woman off it, was of great importance. The naval uniform was particularly important in determining or exposing the salience of their sailor-versus-gender identity. Wearing their uniform identified them as sailors, while wearing civilian dress exposed them as women.

(b) **Women's responses to the double bind of conflicting gender role expectation**

Chapter 2 discussed the two general ways of adaptation to this double bind: Some women succumb to the male work culture, and accept the (male) constructions of femininity (the so-called 'paternalistic bargain') to acquire men's protection and acceptance. Acceptance and

protection were thus traded for restrictive work assignments, limited roles, and subjugated status. Other women adapted to the standards of gendered organisations, and demonstrated their competence by emulating culturally dominated forms of masculine work behaviour (i.e. acting like stereotypical men). Competency and equality were thus traded for decreased femininity.

At times, the female sailors accepted the paternalistic bargain, but identity re-construction became the primary mechanism of dealing with their double bind. They employed two specific strategies to facilitate their daily identity negotiations, namely efforts to reduce the salience of their gender, and identification with the sailor's identity.

9.4.2. Identity re-negotiation through symbolic representation

(a) Reducing the salience of gender

Burrell (1984, cited in Acker, 1998) suggests that the suppression of sexuality is one of the first tasks a bureaucracy sets itself, and cited historical evidence that women were excluded from the workplace in an attempt to erase sexuality in that environment. The current study showed how women, after entering the workplace, also attempted to minimise sexuality.

The first strategy women used to resolve conflicting gender role expectations was to reduce the salience of their gendered identity on an individual level. They thus went to great lengths to desexualise the workplace by reconstructing their self-identities.

1) *Changing constructions of women's identity*

Identities and perceived identities changed over time. These changes were generally attributed to exposure to the ship environment: changing descriptions of self due to their identity being defined in naval terms and categories.

Men reported that, over time, the women changed to become more like the group as a whole, and thus in effect more like the men. Their identity, as seen by men, was moving from feminine-defined characteristics, to masculine-defined characteristics, essentially from soft

and sweet, to rough and loud. The men argued that this happened through actual changes in behaviour.

Some of them change into real tomboys. They become a lot more boisterous. They let out a swear word or two. They are not scared to use it. They become less feminine. (B1, male)

[after being on board for a few weeks]:

Then she looks like a man basically. Yes, I can see, a little more rough, you have to fit in with the guys, drink more, also go wild, you know, . . . , you know, I think it's just an effort to try and fit in with the guys, can party just as hard as you can, I can drink as hard as you. Yes, they change. (B2, male)

Women also reported changes in their self-perception. They highlighted the changing pre-eminence of social categories for defining identity. Military (often used synonymously with masculine) constructs became more important than gender: *You become – not harder, but you are not your old self, you are more military, you are first a sailor and then a woman. (B8, female)*

Women thus felt the need to change themselves, their identities and behaviour, in order to become part of the group on board their ships: *The guys were, like, what were you doing here? That kind of attitude. You had to fit in with them. (B5, female)*

The women interpreted their changes as growth, becoming more assertive and self-confident. The men saw it differently, reporting that over time, women changed to become more like men. Women had to take on masculine characteristics to cope and be accepted. Nonetheless, they did not express an awareness that the environment, or the men, were motivating such changes.

Ironically, but not surprisingly, men regarded the women losing their femininity as negative. This, too, was a double bind for women: women who became 'masculine' were accepted as sailors, but men still expected of them to 'be women'. They were therefore penalised by not being accepted as full women by their shipmates, as well as by shore-based and civilian women. The women who stayed 'feminine', in contrast, were not accepted as fully fledged

sailors. The negative consequences of not fully filling both roles were not necessarily career consequences (as experienced by other navies, cf. Herbert, 1995, cited in Howard & Hollander, 1997), but personal consequences in terms of their sense of belonging, need for acceptance, and self-esteem.

An alternative view was at times alluded to, but never clearly formulated. It holds that the changes were mostly a case of perception. As women and men came to know each other better, they could see each other's identity more clearly, and therefore recognise an apparent different identity. This view, however, does not take into account the pressure on women to adapt to the world of men.

2) *Learning as agent of changing identity construction*

In broad terms, women's changing identity constructions was a response to the forces of the masculine dominated environment. Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) provides useful insights to explain the interactional aspects of changing perceived identities. This theory emphasises the role of people as agents of reinforcement in learning the values and norms of society. This role is likely to be more effective, when rewards or punishments are administered by influential others. The theory also emphasises the role of modelling and imitation: for instance, people learn by observing the behaviour of real or symbolic models and imitating those behaviours. The observed consequences of a model's behaviour also reinforce certain behaviours. This theory can be used to illuminate the changing identities using both constructs of reinforcement and modelling:

a) *Reinforcement*

Women who displayed masculine behaviours were more readily accepted by the ship's society, and more able to cope personally with life in this environment. Becoming more like men brought rewards: men appeared to accept 'masculine' females more easily, even while they professed not liking women with masculine traits. Such changes were also used as a coping strategy, which led to further reinforcement of the newly learned behaviour.

b) *Modelling and imitation*

The lack of female role models on the ships hindered social learning, as there were no women to imitate. In their absence, men became the models whose behaviour was imitated. This too may have facilitated the shift by women to a more masculine approach, as women saw what behaviour helped men to cope, and then imitated it.

The lack of appropriate role models may also explain other types of cross-gender interaction. As neither men nor women had models of appropriate gender interaction on ships, older men with daughters fell back on utilising that particular model, which explains their paternalistic approach to young women sailors. Such men thus reported that they treated them like their daughters, by, among other things, trying to protect them from the harshness of the ship life (e.g. swearing, hard physical labour).

The tandem influences of reinforcement (e.g. acceptance) and modelling of behaviour were apparent in a number of interviews. Various men saw the changes in the women who joined their ships as the result of these dual influences. As such, the changes were seen as a conscious attempt to fit in by becoming 'one of the boys'. But they were also seen as a natural consequence to the environment to which the women were now being exposed. In that context, men's behaviour was the norm, and it rubbed off on the women almost without them realising it.

Take, for instance, language. Most women don't really swear and carry on like that, but on a ship there's a lot of swearing that happens. It's just a fact. In the military there's a lot of swearing, and I don't care what anybody says, with all the amount of swearing that takes place and stuff on the ship, when women are exposed to that every day, they also start swearing, so their language does deteriorate. Behaviour-wise, they get a bit more rowdier as well, because they're exposed to rowdiness the whole time. So I would say they do change, yes . . . I think mainly because they're exposed to it, and it's sort of a subconscious thing.
(B10, male)

It is likely that shore-based female sailors observed the changing identity construction of ship-based female sailors. Two diary entries, referring to the same incident, mentioned negative comments made by a shore-based female sailor ("*sea-going swans are bitches*"). As

discussed in Chapter 8, this could be an indication of the extent of identity reconstruction, as witnessed by outside women.

(b) Identification

Martin & Jurik (1996) described how some policewomen identified with the police work-culture, seeking acceptance by being more professional, aggressive, loyal, street orientated and macho than their male colleagues. They suggested that identification with the perspective of the dominant group was a mechanism that subordinates used to cope with discrimination (Martin & Jurik, 1996). Identification with a specific group or ideology demonstrated loyalty and belonging, and was thus an attempt to gain acceptance. In this study, identification was the second strategy used by female sailors to resolve the double bind of conflicting gender role expectations.

For example, swearing is traditionally associated with sailors, and is in many cases still used by naval men to identify themselves as 'sailors'. It was noticeable that a number of women used swear words liberally throughout their interviews. Although it is possible that this is simply a result of their exposure to the prevailing culture onboard the ship, it is argued here that they also used it to identify with the culturally dominant group. Other women, in contrast, placed heavy emphasis on professionalism, by referring to qualification and training, and experience gained on the ships as a way of creating an alternative identity to the extreme of over-identification. In spite of this, all the women interviewed resorted to resolving resistance through identification with the organisational culture – embracing naval customs and traditions, language, and so forth. Identification through language proved to be highly effective, as a senior rating on Ship B reports:

But as, like you say, in the beginning, that's how it was, but even now, they're part of the men now, it's not a matter of even, even the language on the deck, they talk and swear just as much as the other sailors and it's about whatever, so, you know, so they've already adapted to it, this is the way these guys talk. They just speak the same, so at the moment it's all one now, you know, in that sense, they've all come as one. The first week or so, they all, you know, like, "Gee, these men," but eventually they see, "But hey, the other women. They're all swearing, they're all in the one clique, and they're together." (B11, male)

Identification with men also meant a dis-identification with the women who were not ship-based. Ship-based women defended themselves against the negative comments of shore-based women by attacking their inability to 'make it' on ships. Sea-going women were generally negative about naval women staying ashore, describing them as afraid – of men, of hard work, of being sea-sick, and of being shown up as incompetent. This negative stance of ship-based women needs to be understood within the context of the dynamics of minority groups as observed by Kanter (1977): sometimes, the price of acceptance, "the price of being 'one of the boys' is a willingness to also be 'against the girls'" (p. 979). Derogatory remarks towards shore-based women must therefore be seen as an effort of ship-based women to identify with ship-based men.

(c) Symbolic representation

Within these two strategies of identity negotiation discussed above (namely reduction of gender salience and identification), symbolic representation became the primary mechanism of re-negotiating identities. This happened through the use of self-presentation and the use of metaphors. Chapter 7 revealed how metaphors were used as a mechanism of adaptation, and also how uniforms were used as symbolic artefacts of oppression. The following section presents the use of clothing as women's (symbolic) response to identity constructions.

1) *Self-presentation*

It is argued here that women attempted to resolve the double bind of conflicting gender role expectations by changing or re-constructing (i.e. desexualising) their identities in response to the dynamics of the masculine environment. It then follows that the new identities need to be presented to that environment in order to become effective. Self-presentation is important in developing a balanced adaptation to this double bind. This is done through impression management – the "interactional presentation of self" (Howard & Hollander, 1997, p. 98). Individuals present particular selves to particular others for particular reasons. For example, Von Baeyer et al. (1981) found that expectations about gender role attitudes strongly influenced how their (female) respondents dressed and what gender role attitudes they expressed. The use of dress and appearance (and other cultural symbols) are important tools in self-presentation.

The role of dress and appearance as symbols of gender identity (masculine or feminine) is an important mechanism that women use to convey meaning. Some women may use it to desexualise workplace interaction, while others again use it to project power and authority. Clothing can also become a metaphor for organisational belonging (Arthur, 1998), symbolising identification with or alliance to a specific group. Goldstein-Gidoni (1999) showed how gendered identities are constructed through clothing/dress in various cultures, and that particular forms of dress typify ideal womanhood. Within the African context, too, dress is important in signifying identity (Durham, 1999). Clothing with special meaning becomes symbolic of an entire culture (Goldstein-Gidoni, 2001). Corporate uniforms, like those of the police or the military, are important symbols of identity and status within society (Martin & Jurik, 1996).

The meaning of dress is not always clear, due to the automatic and pervasive nature of self-presentation (Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). In this context, however, it was clearly used to desexualise the environment. Women wanted to be seen as 'sailors', not 'women', and used symbolic impression management to affect this. As reported, some took great care to present themselves as 'not sexual' through their appearance and actions. Women wanted to be seen as a sailor or a colleague, not as a female object.

[Female junior rating on what men say when she has to wear uniform dress when going ashore]: ... you are not wearing overalls anymore. "Wow, she is a girl after all!" It's like, "Ahh man. I hate them to see me like this." (B13, female)

The discomfort expressed by this participant echoes the observations of Carey (1994), who described women's increased self-consciousness about the female form when dressing down (e.g. discarding the big mannish clothes that hide their female form).

A number of observations on the appearance of women onboard ships support their use of clothing to desexualise the environment. Women dressed themselves in neutral or masculine civilian clothes (e.g. jeans and running shoes), and shied away from dresses and skirts wherever possible. When wearing their sea-gear, most chose to wear the men's cut. They often wore bulky clothing (e.g. standard issue bulky sea-jackets) even in warm weather, and all had short hair to minimise the femininity in their self-presentation. Carey (1994) observed

that such masculinising of appearances led to increased acceptance among blue-collar workers, which seemed to reflect the aim of South African women sailors too. The women proudly wore their qualification, mustering and rank badges, which, to many, are the ultimate expression of the symbolic identity of true sailors.

The perceptions that uniform dress is an artefact of oppression have been discussed in Chapter 7, when it was noted that all the women preferred to wear the bulky ('masculine') sea-wear whenever possible. There is irony in the observation that, although women experienced their uniforms as oppressive and highly gendered, they too used clothing – both civilian and military sea-wear (shirt, trousers, sea-jackets) – to desexualise the female form and thus to escape the exaggerated gender salience of the fleet.

Rucker et al. (1999) explained that, to succeed in traditional male environments, women needed to adopt male symbols. Women found that 'moderately masculine outfits' were best for conveying images of being forceful, self-reliant, dynamic, aggressive, and decisive (the masculine characteristics required onboard ships). But, at the same time, they could not abandon feminine dress to the point of gender-norm violation. Business dress was viewed in a positive light, if it de-emphasised sexuality. This included layering and minimal skin exposure, i.e. covering up the female form (Rucker et al., 1999), as also seen among the participants on the ships. Women's self-presentation did not only rely on appearances though. As mentioned previously, they further immersed themselves in a very masculine workplace by imitating the men's behaviour – 'talking the talk' (e.g. swearing) and 'walking the walk' (e.g. drinking).

9.4.3. Paternalistic bargain

Although women mostly strove to desexualise interactions with their shipmates, it was in specific instances sometimes easier (and potentially beneficial) to accept the paternalistic bargain. This phrase refers to the process whereby women accept men's constructions of femininity in return for men's protection and acceptance.

On the ships, paternalism was not described as oppressive, as a way of 'putting women in their place', but rather as displaying benevolent attitudes, by 'helping women out', although

this kept them in their place (e.g. by rewarding feminine behaviour). Paternalism was seen in protectionism and invoking gender identity.

(a) Protectionism and power relationships

Male sailors would tease their female shipmates, argue with them, scoff at them while on the ship, but would, as soon as they were among other people, become very protective. This was the case for both officers and ratings, although officers would do it more subtly. The family metaphor was often invoked to explain this:

It's like a little family thing, you know. If the women should say, "Hey, this guy's being a nuisance now" and she can't shake him off, then one of them [male shipmates] will go and say, "Hey, just cool down", or whatever. (B11, male)

The big brother instinct sometimes got a little out of hand, when men became overprotective: *For example, foreign port . . . don't let anybody even think of coming to have a conversation with us, because then suddenly we've got like 30 big brothers and they're all going to beat the crap out of this guy, you know. I mean the guys, they do look after us, they will never let us like go to the shops alone, they will always make sure that we're safe, and that we walk in two's and there's always at least four of them circling us like a Mafia, so in that regard they're very protective of us, very, very protective. (B13, female)*

The big brother metaphor was cited often, and was usually attributed to 'instinct'. It was also an opportunity for men to play out their masculine role stereotypes, giving them the chance to 'protect' women, who were then relegated to the position of the weaker sex that needs protection. In that way, the men could realign the power relationship in their favour, which had been taken away onboard the ship.

Two arguments were offered by the men to account for their actions. Socialisation was strongly held as the primary reason for their protectiveness – they had been 'brought up' to show deference to women, and saw their behaviour as good manners that had nothing to do with masculine power or self-image. The second argument was based on the buddy-system typical of armed forces. If there was any trouble, shipmates were expected to help each other

out, and men argued that women were a natural extension of their ship, therefore needing their assistance.

It was clear, though, that acceptance of the paternalistic bargain was very context specific: it happened only when the ship's crew went ashore as a group. It was seldom visible in the daily life onboard the ships, although men appeared continuously sensitive to the issue of their female shipmates being bothered by sailors from sister ships.

It's, like, we're lying now together, two ships, there's men that are always on our ship just because we've got the women, okay, and where our shipmates will still cover that women where she, you know, like, she don't like, you'll hear one of the women say, "This guy, he's going to come and stand and nag me," or something. So when they come and say, "Hello! How are you?", that guy [male shipmate] already knows he will say, "Come, come. Go further, we've got work to do here." So they already cover, you know, because she's not interested and he's making a nuisance of him, you know what I mean? (B11, male)

Men create the paternalistic bargain in order to re-align the perceived power distribution among the two genders on the ships. The word 'perceived' is used intentionally here, as the women may have been playing the game better than the men. On a superficial level, women and men saw the protective behaviour of the men as an indication of acceptance. However, on a more dynamic level, women only acquiesced to this arrangement when it suited them – for example, when needing physical protection in a foreign port. While maintaining equality onboard the ship, allowing men to give conscious protection ashore also gained their complicity. Fulfilling the role of protector ashore was furthermore important for the public image of men as 'real men', and allowing them to feel more masculine ashore also enhanced their acceptance of women.

By acquiescing to the paternalistic bargain in specific contexts, women gained protection and acceptance, while never really giving up their equal status on the ships. To protect themselves from protectionism spilling over into the daily life on ships, women limited their complicity to very specific contexts, only accepting the paternalistic bargain at times when doing so did not threaten the perception of their competency among their male colleagues.

(b) Invoking gender identity

Women also invoked their gender identity for other reasons, in aid of their adaptation onboard ships. Some female sailors learned that in special circumstances it could be to the advantage of the group (e.g. their ship), if they invoked their gender identity. They then used their femininity to get things done that otherwise might not have happened. Some of the senior men also realised this, and used it to their advantage. For example, if they could not get a spare part, they would send one of their women sailors to try, who invariably met with more success.

I will honestly tell you, the one time we came alongside and it like this small little shackle that we needed, it's referred to as a bow shackle on the strike craft and my buffer sent two guys over to go on the strike craft to go and get it. Suddenly none of the strike craft had. So I laughed, I said to them, "I'll bet you money, I'll go and get it." And I went, and I came back with eight, you know. "Ja, but it's because you're female." So I said, "I can't help it if it's a man's Navy and I'm in the minority, because if it was a woman's Navy you would have gotten it right." So seriously, if we can't get anything out of them then my buffer will invariably send one of us over and we'll come back with it. (B13, female)

In spite of the advantage of being seen as a woman before being seen as a sailor, and occasionally using it, women still expressed their disgust with the male response to them using their feminine skills: *They [male officers] are pigs because a woman in the Navy just has to flutter her eyes, and smile, and she can get anything, and that's a fact. (B7, female)*

Invoking the feminine gender identity was thus a double-edged sword, creating the danger of re-gendering the work environment. Women took care to use it only when it would advantage the group (namely ship's crew), thereby denying the men on their crew the opportunity to criticise their presentation of femininity. As long as they used it to the group's advantage, it made women more valuable as shipmates, not less.

Other women saw the importance of never invoking their gender identity. They clearly experienced better adjustment at work when they acted like sailors, getting their hands dirty and acting like men. Not drawing attention to their gendered identity, and working on the

same terms as the men, was thus important for their self-esteem, proving to themselves (and probably also to men) that they could 'make it' in that world.

Because if you're worried about how your hair's going to look, and your nails are long and pretty and you don't want to touch a paintbrush, they'll annihilate you. I'd say that if you were a worker, it's fine, but if you're going to be little Miss Priss and sit in your white dress all day, "I can't do that cause my hands are going to get dirty", I think they're going to throw you overboard. Especially the guys, they'll run all over you. (B13, female)

The women were aware of the fact that their efforts to desexualise the workplace and to be fully recognised as fellow shipmates might be undone. They were also aware that this danger was present all the time, and thus some women sailors reacted strongly when female sailors invoked their gender identity, as it brought up issues of tokenism (where one woman is seen as representing all women). Women who used their femininity to gain individual advantage were frowned upon by other women, who feared that it would entrench the stereotypes they were working so hard to change.

We had one girl come here, she just pushed out her chest, the guys all swarmed around her. She didn't stay long, good thing too. (B13, female)

9.5. Other Coping Strategies used by Women

Women sailors who were willing to go to sea found themselves thrown into a situation where they had little power, little experience, and sometimes little support. They developed, individually, a number of strategies to cope with the situation as they experienced it. The change in their self-presentation was already discussed above, but other coping strategies were also reported. Some came from within themselves (e.g. learning to be assertive), while other strategies relied on external resources (e.g. using the organisation's divisional systems to gain formal recognition of and responses to their concerns).

9.5.1. Internal coping strategies

(a) Coping through developing masculine characteristics

As discussed in Chapter 2, masculine leadership with its focus on performance, domination and control is seen as best suited for vertical and hierarchical structures like the military (Booyesen, 2000). Successful women in business have to learn the 'male managerial model', which incorporates masculine styles and characteristics (Ragins et al., 1998). This usually implies that women have to change, adapting to the requirements of a masculine organisational culture. Jurik (1988), for example, studied women correctional officers who 'act aggressively to succeed' (cited in Martin & Jurik, 1996). Women on SAN ships identified three masculine characteristics they had to develop to cope with the masculine workplace.

1) *Being assertive*

Learning to be assertive proved to be an invaluable coping strategy. Female sailors, officers and ratings alike, noted the importance of responding as fast and as strongly as the men. The context forced women to be more verbally assertive. This was reported at length during the interviews, but was also noted in the diaries, pointing to its importance for coping in the day-to-day sense. The image of 'standing your man' was often invoked, and pointed to the expectation that women had to become like men in order to survive in a man's world.

Oh yes, I have much more self-confidence. I was very shy and reserved, but I quickly learned that's not going to work, here you have to stand your man, otherwise they are going to keep on hammering you and hassling you, until you tell them "this is enough". Really, I have much more self-confidence. (B3, female)

Men, too, experienced the greater assertiveness of their female shipmates: *No definitely, they will tell you straight away what they think of you whereas if they weren't on board they wouldn't do that. (B1, male)* Men especially noted it when women asserted themselves by responding with a comment equal to the one received from men. Such assertiveness impressed them, and led to greater acceptance by the men.

2) *Being thick-skinned*

Being thick-skinned, in other words, less sensitive and not so easily upset, also helped women to cope with the daily demands of shipboard life. Firstly, it made them less like 'typical women', who are expected to be sensitive and emotional, and thereby reduced the salience of gender onboard the ships. Secondly, it helped them to be more accepting of the status quo, instead of becoming angry or frustrated about it.

[In response to negative comments]: It takes a lot to make me feel uncomfortable. It's like water off a duck's back. Yes, it doesn't help to get angry over nothing, you just going to hurt yourself. (B7, female)

The comment is so typical, but I will take it like water off a duck's back." (Diary entry, female)

3) *Being hard-working*

A previous section (Chapter 9.3) dealt with the issue of women having to prove themselves as a group. Some women also used hard work as a form of internal coping mechanism. Working hard and persevering despite difficulties had its own rewards, firstly because of job satisfaction, and secondly because it stopped the men criticising them or questioning their ability.

There are many things that I can't do, there are things that I can't carry. I suffer carrying a 25-litre water can. I suffer, I carry it, but I suffer, where the men carry two at a time. It takes me longer, but I still get the work done. (B7, female)

(b) Coping through the use of humour

The danger of using humour to deal with gender issues was discussed in Chapter 8. Nonetheless, none of the potential negativity was evident on the ships. Humour was a powerful way of dealing with difficult situations, and was employed regularly by both women and men. In one example, a female rating used unconventional humour by invoking female

stereotypes to tease men: *You know, if one of the guys is really cranky then I'll tell him "Hey, is it that time [of the month]?" you know, so it goes both ways. (B13, female)*

(c) Coping through cognitive re-attribution

When women were put down, they made use of cognitive re-attribution to deal with the potentially damaging effects of such remarks. Re-attribution refers to the way in which a hurtful remark or behaviour is turned around to reflect on the person who initiated it. When men kept women from participating in certain work, it was thus because the men did not trust the women, not because the women could not do the work.

[describing scenario where women were not allowed to go in to fight fire]

What it does do is to make me aware that the men do not actually trust us women. Yes, they like, it's a women, if anything falls on her she won't be able to get up or, you know, and then, at the end of the day I think – without blowing my own horn – at the end of the day I think that if a women has to go in, they will choose me first. (B7, female)

Hurtful comments by shore-based women sailors were also reattributed to the latter's own fears and inadequacies. A diary entry responded to comments of shore-based women that "sea-going swans [were] bitches": *Frankly I'm not surprised at her comment – she obviously is scared of the workload and won't be able to take the punch of being here. (Diary entry, female)*

9.5.2. External coping strategies

External resources, like using the organisation's divisional (supervisor) systems, became tools for coping with potentially difficult situations. This gave complaints or suggestions formal recognition, and led to formal responses. Incidents where unfair treatment or victimisation may have occurred were thus managed through the divisional system, making the process transparent and consistent. One diary entry praised the contribution of the divisional system: *This incident with the swan – she complains of unfair treatment, [her supervisor] says it's just normal discipline. They took it to the divisional system, which supported him. She's not happy, but she accepts it. (Diary entry, male)*

9.6. Deflection

One thread that ran through all the accounts of the women was their experiences of organisational discrimination. Individual issues of resistance and acceptance consistently gave way to a focus on organisational inequalities, even when the last mentioned had lesser actual personal impact. The focus on organisational resistance appeared useful to deflect experiences of interpersonal resistance. In a sense, this relates to themes from early psychological theorising, for instance, protecting the self from unwanted feelings (Kazdin, 2000). It shares certain characteristics of defence mechanisms, e.g. denial and externalisation of affect. However, the traditional defence mechanisms (denial, projection, etc.) generally refer to an individual's own feelings towards or about outside objects (Kazdin, 2000). Deflection, as encountered on the ships, can best be described as reverse displacement – where feelings of one object towards the self are displaced to become the feelings of another object towards the self.

This particular phenomenon – a focus on organisational resistance instead of interpersonal resistance – has to do not with intra-personal, but with interpersonal threats. In this study, it will be termed 'deflection' – focussing on the perceived feelings of an outside agency, to protect against the awareness of potentially harmful feelings of the inside agency. As this happens within the interpersonal domain, the focus on the inside agency – personal relationships on the ship – gives way to a focus on an outside agency – in this case, the faceless organisation. Women, and sometimes men too, relayed gross inequalities in the way that the organisation (the SAN) managed the gender-integrated situation. Three instances of organisational discrimination were often introduced to deflect from more personal forms of resistance, namely career opportunities, media exposure, and examples of direct discrimination.

There are a number of possible reasons why the organisation was selected as the target for deflection. The senior military hierarchy is far removed from the lives, and often consciousness, of ordinary servicemen and women. Its faceless attribute makes it easier to deflect to them, as there is no interpersonal implication for individuals. There was also more organisational discrimination in reality, often through ignorance and inexperience. The

SAN's lack of prior experience manifested itself in the absence of many policies and processes that needed to be in place, but initially were not.

9.6.1. Career opportunities

Restricted promotion opportunities were a popular complaint: As only a few ships were structurally prepared for receiving women, women had fewer opportunities for promotion, which required broader experience and available postings. They could therefore only gain experience in a smaller field of work, and were only eligible for more senior posts on a limited number of ships. Naval policies further limited their choices by, for example, requiring a senior female officer to be onboard a ship before junior females were allowed, leading to some bitterness: *But on the [large ship], that for me was bitter, you know, because they like told us, "No, that it was a manning problem and they can't find women, a senior rated women to come to the ship."* (B13, female) Focussing on the organisation's resistance thus gave women an opportunity to deny the resistance of men on other ships.

9.6.2. Media exposure

Female officers who were exposed to media coverage, felt negative about the fact that they received such coverage (even though the reporting was often very positive). Efforts by the Navy Office to promote the image of women in the Navy was seen by the women involved as oppressive and degrading, relegating them again to their gender category, and not recognising their primary identity as sailors. They often felt that it created a gender issue where there was none. The frustrations of women were not directed to the journalists for the questions they asked, but to the Navy Office for allowing this to happen (and in fact for setting it up). The following experience of a female officer highlights her frustrations:

There is another thing – it irritates me no end if people from a TV station, or whatever, comes here, then they want to interview me, and it becomes a scene of women in the Navy is so wonderful. It irritates me. They always want to speak to the woman, the woman in the Navy, and so they distinguish the woman from the man the whole time. There are interviews with us the whole time, and we are sort of placed there [by the Navy Office], everyone wants to talk to us, and I feel it is totally wrong.

When the [TV crew] came and they only asked me how I felt as a woman – I thought they would ask how I thought as navigator, but they asked ‘as a woman’. And I didn’t know what to say, you know, it doesn’t feel any different than what it feels like for the men, and it made me upset that they hammer on it all the time. (B3, female)

To add insult to injury, senior women in the Navy Office were interviewed and asked to comment on the experiences of women at sea. This frustrated the actual sea-going women, as they could not identify with these senior officers, who did not represent sea-going women at all.

Another thing, if there are newspaper articles and so on, they actually don’t speak to the women who are actually on the ships. If they ask for opinions from the women in the Navy or on the ships, then it is women in Pretoria who has never put a foot here, who has to say how they feel about being at sea, or being amongst the men, and how they feel about the uniform, and so on. Then I hear on the news or in the paper what the feelings are of the women in the Navy or at sea! And I think – no-one came to speak to us. It is one or other officer in Pretoria that does these things, who doesn’t know what is goes on here, and that is a problem for me. (B3, female)

To some extent they felt that their own voices were not heard, but more importantly, they felt that such actions kept the gender issues alive, while they wanted them to be normalised (as some of them believed it was on the ships). Men’s negative responses to the women in the news were consequently deflected to the Navy Office, in a sense making the organisation the scapegoat for interpersonal friction. Although there were no studies that focused on interpersonal friction due to the attention paid to sailing women by the media, Titunik’s (2000) study of the military did observe that when the press highlighted women’s activities in the military, the women experienced greater alienation within the military.

9.6.3. Direct discrimination

There were a few isolated examples of institutionalised gender discrimination. Naval policy still required female officers to sign their letters as “(miss)” after their rank. They saw this as direct discrimination, denying them the authority of rank equal to their male peers. They

argued that readers of their correspondence would immediately see the reference to gender, which would then activate all the stereotypes and beliefs associated with gender status. Negative responses to their correspondence were attributed to discriminatory organisational policies, and not to the attitudes or behaviour of recipients.

Even if letters, I mean, it's stupid to me, if I have to write a letter, I always have to write there "wadda, wadda, wadda, brackets Miss XYZ, you know. You still have to write, even if it's just a letter applying for leave, it's like still you have to put the Miss in. (B12, female)

9.7. Relationships

In accordance with previous observations (Devilbiss, 1985), women and men onboard the ships tended to develop buddy or brother-sister relationships. Cross-sex friendships were the normative relationship on the gender-integrated ships. This supports experiences elsewhere, which reported the development of buddy relationships devoid of sexual connotations between women and men on coast guard ships (Safilios-Rothschild, n.d., cited in Devilbiss, 1985).

The extent of social integration on the ship contrasts sharply with other reports, where gendered socialisation in the work environment was the norm (Greene, Ackers & Black, 2002). This may be partly proof of the effectiveness of women sailors desexualising their work environment, but is also the result of the total interdependence of shipboard life.

9.8. Other Factors facilitating Adaptation

A number of other factors also contributed to facilitate adaptation. Some were responses to simple human needs, like enjoying the company of the opposite sex, while others came from changes in the broader naval and national contexts.

9.8.1. Normalising the composition of the ship's crew

For the younger generation, gender integration was not a new challenge. The men came straight from school, where they had studied with girls on an equal footing. They then did

basic training with women, where they were also required to support the women in their teams (basic training puts heavy emphasis on teamwork). By the time they arrived on the ships, they had already been conditioned to work next to women, as they did during training. A young female sailor expressed it neatly: *The guys that come in now, they know they know that there is going to be females there, so they will have it in their head when they join, they're used to it, you know, and expect it.* (B9, female)

Most of them did not know any other environment (i.e. ships without women): *I was always with women here, never been to a men's ship. So I cannot say how it is there. Here, this is like normal, they do the same as us.* (B2, male)

Young men frequently used the word "normal" to describe the situation, and some compared it to life elsewhere: *[in discussion of women on ships] This is like every day, like normal life.* (B2, male) It was the younger men with whom most of the daily contact took place, and their positive stance toward the women was reflected in the experiences of both young women and men.

9.8.2. Positive experience

Men mentioned a number of other reasons why they were so positive about having women on board their ships. Men enjoyed the new influences, the different kinds of talk, and the new interactions they had with women. They also saw the benefits of receiving good advice for their own relationships, reflecting the experiences elsewhere (Harrell & Miller, 1997). In addition, being with a woman at sea, seeing her suffering the same way as their male colleagues, and missing her family as much, but still coping, *"makes you more relaxed about things back home."* (A3, male)

Because it's also nice when you're a unit out at sea to hear to see how women think and how she feels about being deprived, away from her family, because we just talk about 'my wife' and 'my girlfriend' but it's also nice to hear somebody talking about 'my boyfriend' or 'my husband'. (A2, male)

9.9. Conclusion

A number of factors are evidence of the effectiveness of the mechanisms of adaptation used by both genders onboard Navy vessels: the generally positive accounts of gender integration by all participants, the low incidence of overt hostility and resistance, and the experience of equality that women respondents reported.

Women's identity re-negotiation in order to desexualise the workplace appeared to be a particularly successful mechanism. A number of the men indicated that they saw the women on the ships primarily as co-workers, and while acknowledging their different gender, saw them in their professional capacity – in other words, as colleagues and sailors, and not as sexual objects (A2, males):

Speaker 1: Women are accepted on board.

Speaker 2: Sometimes the women, even when we're at sea, I don't look at them as if they are women, I look at them as brothers and sisters on a social level.

Speaker 1: I look at them as colleagues, that's all.

Further, throughout the interviews and discussions there was remarkably little reference to women sailors as sexual objects. This was significant, given the stereotypes associated with sailors. The fact that there was significantly little sexual harassment on the ships (Chapter 8) may provide tantalising support that the women's suppression of their own sexuality, as well as the metaphorical structuring of the gender-relationships, may have created a situation where sexual harassment was curtailed.

In facing the challenges of entering a male-dominated environment, both women and men have found ways in which to adapt and thrive, thereby opening new opportunities to women in the SAN. Their success can be seen in the developments at the time of writing where all musterings on all surface ships were opened to women, and the first women had been selected to serve on submarines.

CHAPTER TEN: OVERVIEW AND REFLECTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the psycho-social experiences of women and men in response to the gender integration of male-dominated environments, using SAN ships as focus. This was done in two phases: The first phase investigated the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet by focussing on two specific objectives: examining the general attitudes of the fleet towards women's place in the world, and examining the manifestation of resistance using sexual harassment as marker. Attitudes towards women were measured using the Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale and the Gender Integration Survey. Sexual harassment was measured using a Sexual Harassment Questionnaire (SHQ). Respondents came from three work environments within the fleet: administrative staff, training staff, and ship-based sailors.

The second phase took place 12 to 18 months later. It investigated the personal experiences and manifested responses of women and men emanating from their own involvement in gender integration. Accounts of experiences were generated through interviews, focus groups, and personal event diaries. The participants were all serving sailors on naval vessels, and were all affected by the process of gender integration. They came from all the rank groups, across three ships, and represented most career fields in the fleet.

Although this kind of research had never been done before in the SANDF, the SAN is not the first Navy in the world to experience gender integration. It was argued that this research was necessary because the features influencing the South African context carry different weights from issues in other countries' experiences. Three features are particularly important: Firstly, South African society is still very patriarchal (CEDAW, 1997), in some instances more so than other (Western) societies that have experienced gender integration of their armed forces. Secondly, the South African experience of gender integration needs to be seen against the broader socio-political background of the 1990's, as forming part of national social changes over a broad spectrum of civil society. Thirdly, the composition of the SANDF is particularly relevant, in that it now incorporates, amongst others, previous freedom fighters and their ideologies of human rights and equal opportunities for all (Motumi, 1999).

Within this context, this thesis aimed to provide an understanding of the experiences of gender integration. This chapter will draw on the analyses reported in Chapters 5 to 9 to provide a reflection on the overall aims and objectives.

10.1 Overview and Summary of Results

The first phase of the study investigated the pre-integration atmosphere in the fleet, and described an environment with traditional ideological views, manifested through traditional resistance by means of widespread gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention. While investigating the general attitudes towards women in the pre-integration atmosphere, four meaningful factors were identified. Three of them can be considered to be 'ideological factors'. Beliefs in the "equality of the sexes" were generally not well supported, while beliefs in "male superiority" were equal to those of a group of civilian retirees. Beliefs in the "Navy as a man's world" formed the third ideological factor.

Many of the male respondents expressed a "fear of relative deprivation" (the fourth factor), and were concerned about a loss of status, privileges, or opportunities to women. This may have contributed to the high levels of apparent resistance towards gender integration. It appeared that, irrespective of whether men might have been willing to support gender integration ideologically, they resisted its practical effect on their personal situation at work, fearing their own circumstances would decline.

Sexual harassment (particularly gender harassment) as measured by the SHQ was rife in the fleet. Three meaningful factors were identified: unwanted sexual attention from supervisors, verbal gender harassment, and unwanted sexual attention from co-workers. These reports were hypothesised to be the result of the behavioural definition of sexual harassment that was used, which did not require respondents to interpret particular behaviour as sexual harassment, but simply to report its presence. The high levels of sexual harassment were nonetheless seen as indicative of pervasive resistance to women, and might have been due to fears of personal deprivation on the part of the male sailors.

An alternative hypothesis could also contribute to understanding this finding: There were indicators the fleet being a hypermasculine environment, in which case the sexual harassment experiences may more simply be a spill-over into the gender-integrated environment.

Within the study sample, there were also significant differences between work environments. Environments with previous gender exposure appeared to be associated with more progressive gender ideologies. Naval personnel on the gender-integrated land bases reported lower scores on sexism than sailors on the ships. This led to the expectation that there would be more manifested resistance on the ships, due to their strongly held traditional gender ideologies. In reality, though, Phase 2 revealed a different picture.

The data gathered during the second phase (by means of interviews, focus groups, and personal event diaries) was subjected to thematic analysis. The first broad area of focus that emerged described resistance and acceptance, from which two themes were derived, namely the use of symbols of corporate culture to express resistance and acceptance within the organisation, and the use of traditional manifestations of resistance (e.g. sexual harassment).

The first theme – the use of corporate symbols – revealed the use of rituals, metaphors and corporate space to enact and maintain both resistance and acceptance. It also emphasised women's experience of their uniform as a corporate artefact of oppression and segregation. Resistance and acceptance were often two sides of the same coin. Where there was resistance, it was often subtle and open to interpretation. For example, some rituals were designed, and used, by men to maintain the masculine culture (i.e. sport days), while women used other existing rituals to gain acceptance (i.e. rituals of initiation). While certain metaphors reflected increased acceptance (i.e. the family metaphor), men at times replaced receding broader ideological metaphors (i.e. the Navy as a man's world) with situation-specific metaphors on a micro-level to maintain their version of male superiority (i.e. the love-boat). Metaphors were not only used to reflect resistance or acceptance, but also to regulate appropriate behaviour on ships, by reflecting the dominant norms of the time (i.e. the ship's company functioning as a family). Space was also used to express both resistance and acceptance, and as such held different meanings to different people. Some (mostly women) constructed the use of gender-specific space as restrictive, while others (mostly men) constructed it as supportive of women.

The second theme encapsulated traditional manifestations of resistance. In contrast to the pre-integration rates of sexual harassment, very little manifested resistance through sexual harassment was reported on the ships. A number of reasons were put forward for this, including the verbally assertive responses of women, the organisational norms at the time (i.e. sexual harassment was not tolerated), the interdependence of sailors, the informal system of behaviour regulation, ship-specific constructions of masculinity, and the interpretation of sexual harassment. Some resistance was nonetheless expressed through special treatment of women. Ironically, this was presented as support to women, thereby creating a safe form of opposition (i.e. a benevolent patriarchy). Some young men believed they did not resist though special treatment, but because of it, and saw it as a form of reverse discrimination. There was further reference to resistance through conditions of acceptance – placing high standards, defined in masculine terms, on women before they were accepted.

Participants generally rendered positive accounts of their experiences, and sailors' responses to the expression of resistance and acceptance emerged as the second broad area of focus, describing the dynamics of adaptation. This produced the third theme – the mechanisms of adaptation – that revealed an array of mechanisms used by women to adapt to and cope with their situation. Time and exposure to gender-integrated environments was important. The importance of exposure finds support in the results of the pre-integration environment, where units with more exposure provided different results. Gender-integrated land bases, for instance, scored lower on sexism scales than ships-based sailors. Further, large ships – with previous exposure to women sailing for specific tasks – scored lower on scales of sexism and relative deprivation than smaller ships without that exposure.

Women responded to the conditions of acceptance by working very hard to create and maintain credibility. This was done very successfully, as evidence by the role this played in easing the resistance of men.

The accounts of the participants further revealed two powerful mechanisms by means of which women effectively resolved the demands of the double bind of conflicting expectations. This double bind refers to the maintenance of women's subservient positions in organisations, through the use of conflicting expectations. Women were expected to display gender-appropriate ('feminine') characteristics, but at the same time required to portray 'masculine'

characteristics in order to achieve work success. The first mechanism used identity construction and re-negotiation, and did it so through reducing the salience of gender onboard ships (by desexualising the workplace), and through identification and symbolic representation (in appearance and behaviour). The second mechanism used the paternalistic bargain, referring to women's acceptance of men's constructions of femininity in return for men's protection and acceptance. The women on ships used the paternalistic bargain in such a way that benefited women, in spite of their occasional perceived surrender to the notion of male superiority.

Apart from a number of individual coping skills, two other mechanisms were presented as important too: deflection and friendships. The use of deflection proved valuable in allowing women to externalise resistance from male co-workers to the faceless organisation (often represented by the distant Navy Office). This allowed them to live with the dual trends of acceptance versus ambivalence often present in the attitudes and behaviours of men. Friendships across gender boundaries became the normative relationship on the gender-integrated ships, and provided reciprocal support to all involved. This was an extension of the already existing relationships between the men, and was facilitated by the realities of shipboard life.

The issue of unit cohesion gained prominence in Phase 2 of the study. Chapter 3 described unit cohesion as an important determinant of mission success in the military. This study found no evidence that the presence of women on ships diluted bonding or decreased their units' effectiveness. To the contrary, it found strong cohesive bonds between male and female sailors, which were experienced as buddy relationships, or expressed by means of the metaphor of brother-sister relationships. It appeared to occur, in part, through a process of suffering together, and partying together. This supports Devilbiss' (1985) argument that shared experiences, not shared gender, are the primary mechanism in unit cohesion. As described in Chapter 9, ships were most cohesive when being active at sea (e.g. mine hunting).

Threats to morale – often seen as a function of cohesion – also appeared unfounded. Harrell & Miller (1997) identified three gender issues that could affect morale, namely sexual harassment, double standards, and romantic relationships within a unit. Phase 2, however,

revealed low levels of perceived sexual harassment, and very few references in the data to either double standards or romantic relationships on ships. These three issues therefore do not seem particularly significant in the SAN.

In conclusion, the pre-integrative atmosphere was characterised by traditional sexist attitudes, elevated fears of relative deprivation, and a high prevalence of sexual harassment. In contrast, the post-integration experience reflected less than expected sexism, with women and men rendering generally positive accounts of their experiences. It was significant that women sometimes reported less resistance to their presence than the men did. The low post-integration experience of sexual harassment was unexpected, too, while it was again noteworthy that women sometimes reported less sexual harassment than men observed. This may have been due to women not recognising or interpreting certain actions as sexual harassment, as well as women becoming desensitised to harassment as a coping strategy

10.2. Methodological issues

The major challenge in this study lies in explaining the difference between the results of Phase 1 and Phase 2, as well as the difference between the results of Phase 2 and prior expectations based on the experiences of other navies. The experience of other navies predicted high levels of sexism and sexual harassment, and Phase 1 of this study did indeed support the expectation of high levels of sexual harassment. Yet the reports from the ships during Phase 2 indicated very little active sexual harassment.

On a macro-level, some of these differences could be ascribed to the context of the South African national environment generally, and the Navy environment in particular: Firstly, the current South African socio-political situation influenced gender ideologies within the Navy as a result of the new Constitution of 1996, as well as the government's aggressive equal opportunity agenda, both of which were facilitating changing national values to support the emergence of women in all spheres of society. The Navy's responses in terms of its organisational doctrines (e.g. equal opportunity policies) would have exposed sailors to more progressive attitudes. Secondly, Naval officers are generally more supportive of gender integration than officers of other services (Heineken, 1998b, 1998c, Van Rensburg, 1999), a finding that has been reported internationally (Kummel, 2002). Thirdly, the composition of

the Navy could have played a role, as it includes previous members of the liberation movement with ideologies of human rights and equal opportunities for all (Motumi, 1999). Fourthly, the SAN has also learned from the experiences of other navies, most notably the Royal Australian Navy (Barrie, 1995), which could further have facilitated the process of gender integration. Fifthly, the general will to exclude women from the military may be more the result of a stereotype, as the findings of this study resonate with recent similar positive attitudes towards the inclusion of women found in the German military (Kummel, 2002). Lastly, research within the USN found that the ethnic composition of units (in terms of the percentage of Black people) was associated with perceptions of lower group hypermasculinity (Rosen, Knudson & Fancher, 2003). The sample used in the current study represents a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds, which may have further suppressed the emergence of a hegemonic hypermasculinity, which in turn is reflected in, for example, the lower reported incidence of sexual harassment

On a micro-level, there are probably other psychological factors and mechanisms that did not come to the fore in this study, and which future research may identify.

10.2.1. Reflection on methods

The three instruments used in the quantitative approach were all self-report measures, which increases the potential for artefactual results through response tendencies, faking and social desirability. In this study, though, the instruments proved successful, in terms of producing meaningful results, and showing good internal consistency, thus increasing confidence in the findings.

The Gender Integration Survey was developed specifically for sailors in the SAN, and measured their opinion towards women on Navy ships. Because it targeted a very specific group, there were no reference groups available. Its results were used specifically for intra-group comparisons.

The Sexual Harassment Questionnaire was developed for this study, mainly for two reasons (detailed in Chapter 4):

a) Most sexually harassing behaviours (especially sexual coercion and assault) aim to maintain the dominance of men over women. This study was interested in sexual harassment as an indication of resistance towards women, and thus followed Miller's (1997) argument that gender harassment is associated with resistance to change. However, this study required a measurement that would lean more towards unwanted sexual attention and gender harassment, as an expression of resistance, rather than outright sexual coercion and assault, which were seen as expressions of dominance. The decision not to address sexual coercion or assault was in line with the purpose of the questionnaire (namely to gain a measure of resistance), but also reflected the experiences in the fleet at the time. As there were no public records of sexual assault, there was no presence of such histories in the fleet. It was noteworthy that Chapter 8 also revealed the absence of such experiences on the ships (and presumably from the collective consciousness of the ship-based sailors too).

b) It was believed that allowing women to contribute to the construction of a new survey, based on their own experiences and expectations, would give them a greater 'voice' in the investigation of their experiences.

Using a new instrument did create certain limitations: Firstly, because it had never been used elsewhere, it could not be compared directly with any meaningful referent groups. Secondly, it also created questions regarding the problem of interpretation (namely whether reported behaviour is seen by the participants as harassment). The behaviour list approach nonetheless provided an indication of a hostile environment, irrespective of whether it was perceived as harassment or not. Thirdly, the questionnaire did not indicate the seriousness of the behaviour for the affected victim. Although it was in line with the purpose, namely to gauge the organisational atmosphere, it can still be seen as a shortcoming that will need attention in future research.

The qualitative approach in Phase 2 used interviews, focus groups, and personal event diaries. The men's openness to air views that might be contrary to official policy was discussed in Chapter 6. In conclusion, the interviews and focus groups led to open and honest discussions, proving to be very fruitful, and eliciting a large volume of information. Participants seemed honest in their own expressions, sharing a wealth of experiences and their interpretations of it.

The success of the interviews and focus groups make these useful techniques for future research in military contexts.

The personal event diaries, in contrast, proved less successful. A number of participants left the ship before the diary period had been completed, which were seen as fairly typical for the ships. However, even amongst those participants who completed the 28-day period, compliance was poor. The rating scales – whose main purpose was to enhance motivation and compliance – were completed irregularly and did not provide any meaningful data. More importantly, fewer incidents were entered than anticipated. Entries further became less as time progressed, which is in line with the fatigue effect described by DeLongis et al. (1992). There was no difference between the compliance of women and men, or in the number of entries they made. Proportionally more men than women left the ship before the 28 days were over.

Apart from the fatigue effect, a number of other reasons can be put forward to explain the poor compliance. Sailors are practical people, and there is general consensus among them that they 'hate to write', and joined the Navy in an effort to find work where they do not have to write. There was no external reward offered for their participation, and they may have felt that there was no gain or benefit in completing the diaries. Although diaries are often used for unobtrusive observation (Bell, 1998), they are strange to the world of the Navy where 'logbooks' refer to sailing data and diaries are not used at all, making their presence highly visible and resulting in low usage. Informal discussion revealed that keeping diaries, by whichever name it is called, was still considered a 'girlie' thing to do, and shunned by all (women included). It was noteworthy that the women did not want to be involved with a stereotypical female activity, and made quite a point of not being associated with gender-stereotyped behaviour in general. The use of personal event diaries is not recommended for groups of this kind.

10.2.2. Limitations of the study

Phase 1 of the study used instruments that, by necessity, presented pre-constructed meanings of certain situations, in order to elicit specific answers. The resulting response-effects (Schwarz, Grooves & Schuman, 1998) may in part explain the discrepancies between this type

of data and the data obtained from the interviews, whose structure allowed individuals to construct their own meaning.

Due to practical constraints, not all survey respondents complete all three scales. Because of it, this study sacrificed potential correlations between measures for a more targeted administration of the scales. The inability to do proper correlative analyses is recognised as a limitation of this study.

The data gathered could also have been contaminated by various agendas of self-presentation. Some of the scores found in Phase 1 could have been an effort of participants to let the fleet 'look good', by presenting themselves in a favourable (i.e. more progressive) light. Similarly, the positive accounts expressed in Phase 2 could have been the result of participants presenting themselves as progressive people, either to make the ship look good, or to deny any personal discomfort with the process of gender integration. However, the consistency of the results over both quantitative and qualitative methods indicates that other factors – for example, the national and organisational environments – may have exerted strong influences over them.

The contracting process with Military Counter Intelligence resulted in one specific methodological limitation in this study, namely the 'snapshot approach' utilised. The research took place at specific points in time, creating the danger of temporal isolation of the data, and potentially limiting the generalisability of the findings. Although the mobility and subsequent availability of sailors prevented a longitudinal research design, it is recommended that future research use a longitudinal approach to identify temporal sequencing of resistance, acceptance, and adaptation.

All the sea-going women – at the time of the study – participated in the study. However, their small number could also restrict the generalisability of the conclusions. Future research could gather data over a longer period of time, or at different times, to offset this limitation.

The previous paragraphs introduced the limitations of generalisability. Chapter 6 discussed the influences of participants' different situations (e.g. different ships) on the accounts of their experiences. The data of Phase 2 is therefore only representative of the experiences of the

ships involved. It is not clear to what extent the findings could be generalised to other environments. Investigating the experiences of other groups – both in the other services of the SANDF and in the civilian world – and comparing them to the present sample, would be required before any conclusions from the present group can be generalised with confidence.

In retrospect, one unforeseen limitation did occur during this study. Phase 2 of this study was retrospective in nature. The interviews and focus groups enquired into experiences of the previous twelve months. It is therefore to be expected that recent experiences will have influenced the construction of recollections of prior experiences. The personal event diaries were designed to counter such effects by providing a real-time account of experiences. It is here that the error occurred, as the low motivation to complete the diaries was not foreseen, and the diaries – in retrospect – added little value to the study.

10.2.3. Future directions

Three questions were raised by this study, creating avenues for further research. Firstly, the question remains why the South African findings differ so much from other international experiences. Earlier in this chapter it was suggested that broader socio-political changes on the national level, and the composition of the SAN, might have played a role. Examining the influence of these factors in a more systematic manner could provide insight into the role of socio-political influences on psychological processes.

The second question concerns itself with whether the gender integration situation will change in future. It could be argued that, as the broader integration processes are completed, gender will again become more salient, which may change the experiences of the women and men involved. Further research at different time-periods in future could give meaningful answers to this question.

Thirdly, there is the question about the experiences of other South African organisations. Studies on other comparable military and civilian organisations could give an indication on the generalisability of these findings and also whether the South African societal context produces unique factors that influence the South African experience.

10.3. Implications of the study

A number of useful insights were gained from this study. Firstly, the study highlighted the influences of the national social and political context on research within the ambit of South African psychology. This serves to caution researchers not to interpret findings in isolation of the broader social process in the community involved.

Secondly, the study described the divergence between the expression of gender ideology, as reported by sexism scales, and personal experiences on the ships, which were often ones of acceptance. Reported traditional ideologies do not necessarily translate into behaviour that actively resists more progressive gender ideology. Although other factors, like military discipline, may have influenced this, it does again caution against using survey results to predict actual behaviour.

Thirdly, the value of the study lies in an increased understanding of the mechanisms that facilitate human adaptation, especially in situations that elicit ambivalent responses of resistance and acceptance. In this study, the use of individual mechanisms was complemented by the use and/or interpretation of organisational symbols to facilitate integration.

10.4. Lessons and Recommendations for the SA Navy

Understand the micro-environment. The study showed that the ship environment is different from that of the land units. The physical environment creates differences, as does the unique culture and prior (gender) exposure of each ship. Ships therefore require special application of rules, especially with regard to interpersonal conduct.

Use enhanced education in preparation for gender integration. It appeared that the sexual harassment awareness program was not very effective. New generations of sailors on the ships will require constant awareness programs, but such programs need to take into account the ship-specific lifestyles, routines, and physical lay-out, if they are to be an effective tool in guiding appropriate behaviour.

Facilitate change. Cultural symbols are powerful mechanisms – positive and negative – to portray, maintain, or change cultural ideologies. The meaningful use of these symbols to facilitate equality, inclusion and appropriate behaviour must be encouraged and reinforced. However, as these symbols are also powerful mechanisms to maintain patriarchal dominance, they need to be used responsibly and with caution.

Increase understanding of the mechanisms of adaptation. More study is needed to understand the mechanisms of adaptation (both positive and negative). Successful mechanisms need to be encouraged and enhanced, to foster more effective adaptation onboard the ships. Better guidance, through awareness or formal education, of and by local leaders (e.g. ships' officers, senior warrant officers) in terms of facilitating adaptation, would further support the efforts of sailors facing the challenges of successful gender integration.

In conclusion, the SA Navy has come a long way in its attempt to give full expression to the equal opportunity principles in the South African constitution. However, there is still a long way to go, and it will require organisational will, and sustained efforts to succeed fully.

REFERENCES

- Aaron-Corbin, C. (1999). The multiple-role balancing act. *Management Review*, 88(9), 62.
- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions to friendly behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 830-838.
- Acker, J. (1998). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organisations. In K.A. Myers, C.D. Anderson, & B.J. Risman (Eds.), *Feminist foundations: Toward transforming sociology* (pp. 299-317). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Aguinis, H., & Adams, S.K.R. (1998). Social-role versus structural models of gender and influence. *Group & Organizational Management*, 23(4), 414-447.
- Alloy, L.B., Just, N., & Panzarella, C. (1997). Attributional style, daily life events and hopelessness depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 21(3), 321-344.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Alvesson, M., & Billings, Y.D. (1997). *Understanding gender in organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, B.A., Silver, B.D., & Abramson, P.R. (1988). The effects of race of the interviewer on race-related attitudes of Black respondents in SRC/CPS national election studies. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52, 289-324.
- Antecol, H., & Cobb-Clark, D. (2001, Winter). Men, women, and sexual harassment in the U.S. Military. *Gender Issues*, 3-18.
- Arthur, L.B. (1998). Dress and the social construction of gender in two sororities. *Clothing and Textile Research Journal*, 17(2), 84-93.
- Baldi, K.A. (1991). An overview of physical fitness of female cadets at the military academies. *Military Medicine*, 156(1), 537-539.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall.
- Bar-Tal, Y., Lurie, O., & Glick, D. (1994). The effect of gender on the stress process of Israeli soldiers during the Gulf War. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 7, 263-276.
- Bargh, J.A., & Raymond, P. (1995). The naive misuse of power: Non-conscious sources of sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 85-96.
- Bargh, J.A., Raymond, P., Pryor, J.B., & Strack, F. (1995). Attractiveness of the underling: An automatic power association and its consequences for sexual harassment and aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 768-781.

- Baron, J.N., Mittman, B.S., & Newman, A.E. (1991). Targets of opportunity: Organisational and environmental determinants of gender integration within the California civil service, 1979-1985. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(6), 1362-1401.
- Barrett, F.J. (1996). The organisational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the US Navy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3(3), 129-142.
- Barrie, C.A. (1995). Letter to Vice Admiral Simpson Anderson, Chief of the SA Navy, dated 28 December 1995. Pretoria: Navy Office.
- Barry, M.S. (1993). Do we really want equality of employment for our women in the armed services? *Australian Defence Force Journal*, 101, 5-21.
- Baxter, J., & Kane, E.W. (1995). Dependence and independence: a cross national analysis of gender inequality and gender attitudes. *Gender and Society*, 9(2), 193-215.
- Beauvois, J.L., & Joule, R.V. (1999). A radical point of view on dissonance theory. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive dissonance: Progress on a pivotal theory in social psychology* (pp. 43-70). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Becker, E. (2000, July). Women in military say silence on harassment protects careers. *Salut*, 35-36.
- Beere, C.A. (1990). *Gender roles: A handbook of tests and measures*. Connecticut, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Beere, C.A., King, D.W., Beere, D.B., & King, L.A. (1984). The Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale. *Sex Roles*, 10, 563-576.
- Belknap, J. (1991). Women in conflict: An analysis of women correctional officers. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 2, 89-116.
- Bell, L. (1998). Public and private meanings in diaries. In J. Ribbons & R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research* (pp. 72-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Benokraitis, N.V., & Feagin, J.R. (1986). *Modern sexism: Blatant, subtle and covert discrimination*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall.
- Benson, P.L., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the Sexist Attitude toward Women Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5(2), 276-291.
- Bergman, M.E., & Drasgow, F. (2003). Race as a moderator in a model of sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(2), 1076-1098.
- Bergman, M.E., Langhout, R.D., Palmieri, P.A., Cortina, L.M., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (2002). The (un)reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 230-242.

- Blalock, H. (1970). *Towards a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: Capricorn.
- Booyesen, L. (2000). Female managers: A very different kind of leader. *Management Today Yearbook*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Braine, J.D., Bless, C., & Fox, P.M.C. (1995). How do students perceive sexual harassment? An investigation on the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg campus. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 25(3), 140-149.
- Brink, B., & De la Rey, C. (2001). Work-family interaction strain: Coping strategies used by successful women in the public, corporate and self-employed sectors of the economy. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 31(4), 55-62.
- Brooks, L., & Perot, A.R. (1991). Reporting sexual harassment: Exploring a predictive model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 31-47.
- Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Brown, S. (2001). What makes men talk about health? *Journal of Gender Studies*, 10(2), 187-195.
- Buhrke, R.A. (1988). Factor dimensions across different measures of sex role ideology. *Sex Roles*, 18(5/6), 309-321.
- Burke, R.J., & MacDermid, G. (1996). Gender awareness education in organisations. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 1071-1074.
- Carey, M. (1994). Gender and power: Boys will be boys and so will girls. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 4, 105-127.
- Chidzalo, M. (2001). Malawi's women soldiers remain optimistic. *Salut*, 8(1), 16-17.
- Cilliers, J., Schutte, C., Heinecken, L., Liebenberg, I., & Sass, B. (1997). Public attitudes regarding women in the security forces and language usage in the SANDF. *African Security Review*, 6(3), 3-14.
- Cliff, N. (1987). *Analyzing Multivariate Data*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jonanovich, Inc.
- Cockburn, C. (1991). *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organisations*. Ithaca, NY: International Labour Relations Press.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996.

- Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW): First South African Report (1997). Pretoria: Department of Welfare.
- Cooke, M. (1996). Subverting the gender and military paradigms. In J.H. Stiehm (Ed.), *It's our military, too! Women and the US Military* (pp. 235-29). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cornum, R. (1996). Soldiering: the enemy doesn't care if you're female. In J.H. Stiehm (Ed.), *It's our military, too! Women and the US Military* (pp. 2-23). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cortina, L.M., Swan, S., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Waldo, C. (1998). Sexual harassment and assault: Chilling the climate for women in academia. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 419-441.
- Cramptom, S.M., & Mishra, J.M. (1999). Women in management. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(1), 87-106.
- Cudeck, R. (2000). Exploratory factor analysis. In H.E.A. Tinsley & S.D. Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Multivariate Statistics and Mathematical Modeling* (pp. 65-95). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Culbertson, A.L., & Rosenfeld, P. (1994). Assessment of sexual harassment in the active duty Navy. *Military Psychology*, 6(2), 69-93.
- Daily, C.M., Certo, S.T., & Dalton, D.R. (1999). A decade of corporate women. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 93-99.
- Dansby, M.R., & Landis, D. (1996). Intercultural training in the military. In D. Landis & R.S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training, 2nd ed.* (pp. 203-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davis, L.J., & Woods, A.B. (1999). Military women's research. *Military Medicine*, 164(1), 6-10.
- Dawis, R.V. (2000). Scale construction and psychometric considerations. In H.E.A. Tinsley & S.D. Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Multivariate Statistics and Mathematical Modeling* (pp. 65-95). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- De Bruin, W. (1999, 8 October). Women in business. *Finance Week*, 43-53.
- De la Rey, C. (1992). Culture, tradition and gender: Let's talk about it. *Agenda*, 13, 79-80.
- De la Rey, C., & Raju, P. (1996). Group relative deprivation: cognitive versus affective components and protest orientation among Indian South Africans. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 136(5), 579-586.

- Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology, 4th ed.* (pp. 788-828). New York, McGraw-Hill.
- DeLongis, A., Hemphill, K.J., & Lehman, D.R. (1992). A structured diary methodology for the study of daily events. In F.B. Bryant, J. Edwards, R.S. Tindale, E.J. Posavac, L. Heath, E. Henderson & Y. Suarez-Balcazar (Eds.), *Methodological Issues in Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 2* (pp. 83-109). New York: Plenum Press.
- Denscombe, M. (2001). *The Good Research Guide*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Department of Defence (1996). *White Paper on Defence*. Pretoria: Department of Defence.
- Department of Defence (1997). *Survey on opinion of DoD women concerning some gender-related issues*. Pretoria: South African Medical Service, Department of Defence.
- Department of Defence (2004). *Annual Report 2003-2004*. Pretoria: Department of Defence.
- Devilbiss, M.C. (1985). Gender integration and unit deployment: A study of GI Jo. *Armed Forces and Society, 11*(4), 523-552.
- DiTomaso, N. (1989). Sexuality in the workplace: Discrimination and harassment. In J. Hearn, D.L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sherrif & G. Burnell (Eds.), *The sexuality of organisations* (pp. 71-90). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Duck, S. (1991). Diaries and logs. In B.M. Montgomery & S. Duck (Eds.), *Studying Interpersonal Interaction* (pp.141-161). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Durham, D. (1999). The predicament of dress: Polyvalency and the ironies of cultural identities. *American Ethnologist, 26*(2), 389-411.
- Durrheim, K., Foster, D., & Tredoux, C. (1995). Conceptions of legitimacy as a variable mediating the relationship between relative deprivation and militancy. *South African Journal of Psychology, 25*(2), 106-111.
- Editorial (1990). Women at sea. *Journal of the Royal Navy Medical Service, 76*(2), 67.
- Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1995). *Men in perspective: Practice, power and identity*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- England, P., & Browne, I. (1992). Trends in women's economic status. *Sociological Perspectives, 35*(1), 17-51.
- Faludi, S. (1992). *Backlash: The undeclared war against women*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Finchilescu, G. (1995). Setting the frame: Gender and psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology, 25*(3), 133-139.

- Fineran, S., Bennett, L., & Sacco, T. (2003). Peer sexual harassment and peer violence among adolescents in Johannesburg and Chicago. *International Social Work, 46*(3), 387-401.
- Firestone, J.M., & Harris, R.J. (2003). Perceptions of effectiveness of responses to sexual harassment in the US military, 1988 and 1995. *Gender, Work and Organization, 10*(1), 42-64.
- Fisher, S., Frazer, N., & Murray, K. (1984). The transition from home to boarding school: A diary-style analysis of the problems and worries of boarding school pupils. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 4*, 211-221.
- Fitzgerald, L.F. (1993). Sexual harassment: Violence against women in the workplace. *American Psychologist, 48*(10), 1070-1076.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Gelfand, M.J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*(4), 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*(1), 117-138.
- Garrett, T., & Thomas-Peter, B. (1992, July). Sexual harassment. *The Psychologist, 319-321*.
- Gibbons, J.L., Hamby, B.A., & Dennis, W.D. (1997). Researching gender-role ideologies internationally and cross-culturally. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 151-170.
- Gijsbers-van Wijk, C.M.T., Huisman, H., & Kolk, A.M. (1999). Gender differences in physical symptoms and illness behaviour: A health diary study. *Social Science & Medicine, 49*, 1061-1074.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 119-135.
- Goldberg, P.A., Katz, J.F., & Rapoport, S. (1979). Posture and prediction on the Attitudes toward Women Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3*(4), 403-406.
- Goldstein-Gidoni, O. (1999). Kimono and the construction of gendered and cultural identities. *Ethnology, 38*(4), 351-370.
- Goldstein-Gidoni, O. (2001). The making and marking of the 'Japanese' and the 'Western' in Japanese contemporary material culture. *Journal of Material Culture, 6*(1), 67-90.
- Goosen, C.J. (Ed.) (1973). *South Africa's Navy*. Cape Town: WJ Flesch & Partners.

- Gough, B. (2001). 'Biting your tongue': Negotiating masculinities in contemporary Britain. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 10(2), 169-185.
- Greenbaum, T.L. (1998). *The handbook for focus group research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenbaum, T.L. (2000). *Moderating focus groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greene, A., Ackers, P., & Black, J. (2002). Going against the historical grain: Perspectives on gendered occupational identity and resistance to the breakdown of occupational segregation in two manufacturing firms. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 9(3), 266-285.
- Grossman, E.M. (2000). Is there room on submarines for women? *Christian Science Monitor*, 92(46), 3-4.
- Groves, R.M. (1989). *Survey errors and survey costs*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gueorguieva, R., & Krystal, J.H. (2004). Move over ANOVA. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 61(3), 310-317.
- Guimond, S., & Dubé-Simard, L. (1983). Relative deprivation theory and the Quebec nationalist movement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(3), 526-535.
- Gutek, B.A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B.A., Cohen, A.G., & Konrad, A.M. (1990). Predicting social-sexual behaviour at work: A contact hypothesis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(3), 560-577.
- Guy, A., & Banim, M. (2000). Personal collections: Women's clothing use and identity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(3), 313-327.
- Hallahan, M., & Rosenthal, R. (1996). Statistical power: Concepts, procedures, and applications. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 34(5-6), 489-499.
- Hargrow, A.M. (1997). Speaking to our realities: From speculation to truth concerning African-American women's experiences of sexual harassment. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B, The Sciences and Engineering*, 57(7-B):4707.
- Harmon-Jones, E. (2000). An update on cognitive dissonance theory, with a focus on self. In A. Tesser, R.B. Felson, & J.M. Suls (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on self and identity* (pp. 199-232). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Harrell, M.C., & Miller, L.L. (1997). *New opportunities for women: Effects upon readiness, cohesion, and morale*. United States Department of Defence, National Defence Institute, RAND.

- Harris, R.J., & Firestone, J.M. (1997). Subtle sexism in the US Military. In N.V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practices and prospects for change* (pp. 154-171.). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hay, M.S., & Elig, T.W. (1999). The 1995 Department of Defence sexual harassment survey: Overview and methodology. *Military Psychology, 11*(3), 233-242.
- Heath, D.T., & Orthner, D.K. (1999). Stress and adaptation among male and female single parents. *Journal of Family Issues, 20*(4), 557-587.
- Heilman, M.E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 10*, 2-36.
- Heinecken, L. (1998a). *Social equality versus combat effectiveness: an institutional challenge for the military*. Paper presented at the South African Political Science Association Research Colloquium, University of Pretoria, 9-11 September 1998.
- Heinecken, L. (1998b). *Inequality and diversity: SANDF officers' attitudes towards integration, affirmative action, gender and language*. Paper presented at the South African Sociological Association Congress, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg, 30 June-3 July 1998.
- Heinecken, L. (1998c). The challenges of transformation: SANDF officers' attitudes towards integration, affirmative action, women in combat and language usage. *Scientia Militaria, 28*(2), 220-235.
- Heinecken, L. (2000, May). Women in combat – Time to face the facts. *Salut, 20-23*.
- Hertz, R. (1996). Guarding against women? *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 25*(2), 251-284.
- Higgins, J.M., & McAllaster, C. (2002). Want innovation? Then use cultural artefacts that support it. *Organizational Dynamics, 31*(1), 74-84.
- Hines, J.F. (1993). A comparison of clinical diagnoses among male and female soldiers deployed during the Persian Gulf War. *Military Medicine, 158*(2), 99-101.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1997). *The time bind*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hoiberg, A. (1991). Military psychology and women's role in the military. In R. Gal & A.D. Mangelsdorff (Eds.), *Handbook of Military Psychology* (pp. 725-739). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Holland, S., & Scourfield, J.B. (2000). Managing marginalised masculinities: Men and probation. *Journal of Gender Studies, 9*(2), 199-211.
- Howard, J.A., & Hollander, J. (1997). *Gendered situations, gendered selves*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Howell, D.C. (1997). *Statistical methods of psychology, 4th ed.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Huberty, C.J., & Morris, J.D. (1992). Multivariate analysis versus multiple univariate analyses. In A.E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Methodological issues & strategies in clinical research* (pp. 351-365). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hughey, M.J., & Patel, T.G. (1997). Changes in women's health care aboard one ship. *Military Medicine, 162*(10), 671-674.
- Hunter Williams, J., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Drasgow, F. (1999). The effects of organisational practices on sexual harassment and individual outcomes in the military. *Military Psychology, 11*(3), 303-328.
- Janesick, V.J. (2004). *Stretching exercise for qualitative researchers, 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, R. (2000). Ascent of woman. *People management, 6*(1), 26-31.
- Jones, G.P., & Jacklin, C.N. (1988). Changes in sexist attitudes towards women during introductory women's and men's studies courses. *Sex Roles, 18*(9/10), 611-622.
- Kaminer, D., & Dixon, J. (1995). The reproduction of masculinity: A discourse analysis of men's drinking talk. *South African Journal of Psychology, 25*(3), 168-174.
- Kane, E.W., & Macaulay, L.J. (1993). Interviewer gender and gender attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 57*, 1-28.
- Kane, E.W., & Sanchez, L. (1994). Family status and criticism of gender inequality at home and at work. *Social Forces, 72*(4), 1079-1102.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*(5), 965-990.
- Kanter, R.M. (1990). Token women in the corporation. In J. Heeren, & M. Mason (Eds.), *Sociology: Windows on society* (pp. 186-294). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Karambaya, R. (1998). Caught in the Crossfire: Women and corporate restructuring. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 15*(4), 333-338.
- Katila, S., & Merilainen, S. (2002). Resisting patriarchal articulations of professional identity. *Gender, Work and Organisation, 9*(3), 336-354.
- Kazdin, A.E. (Ed.) (2000). *Encyclopaedia of Psychology, Vol. 2.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kemp, A.A. (1994). *Women's work: Degraded and devalued.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

- Kelley, M.L., Herzog-Simmer, P.A., & Harris, M.A. (1994). Effects of military-induced separation on parenting stress and family functioning of deploying mothers. *Military Psychology, 6*(2), 125-138.
- Kessler, S.J., & McKenna, G.C. (1978). *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach*. New York: John Wiley.
- King, L.A., & King, D.W. (1997). Sex-role egalitarianism scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 71-87.
- King, R., Retzlaff, P.D., & McGlohn, S.E. (1997). Female United States Air Force pilot personality: The new right stuff. *Military Medicine, 162*(10), 695-697.
- Klopper, E. (2000, September). Women making peace in Africa. *Salut, 14-16*.
- Koshal, M., Gupta, A.K., & Koshal, R. (1998). Women in management: A Malaysian perspective. *Women in Management Review, 13*(1), 11-19.
- Kummel, G. (2002). Complete access: Women in the Bundeswehr and male ambivalence. *Armed Forces and Society, 28*(4), 555-573.
- Landrum, C.S. (1979). The Israeli fighting women. *Air University Review*. Washington, DC: US Air Force.
- Laver, M.P.H. (1982). *Sailor-women, Sea-women, SWANS*. Simon's Town: Swans History Publication Fund.
- Leigh, B.C. (1993). Alcohol consumption and sexual activity as reported with a diary technique. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*(3), 490-493.
- Levine, J.M., & Moreland, R.L. (1998). Small groups. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 2, 4th ed.* (pp. 415-469). New York: McGraw-Hill Co, Inc.
- Lewallen, R.D. (1991, Fall). Sex, power & ethics. *The Air Journal, 57-66*.
- Lipari, R.N., & Lancaster, A.R. (2003). *Armed Forces 2002 Sexual Harassment Survey*. (DMDC Report No. 2003-026). Arlington, Va: Defence Manpower Data Centre.
- Luyt, R. (2002). *Hegemonic masculinity and aggression in South Africa*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Mabuza, B. (2003). Increasing the Participation Rate of Women in the Economy. In G. Lewis (Ed.), *Women in Business: A DTI Special Report*. Pretoria: Department of Trade and Industry
- MacKinnon, C. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University press.

- Maclaran, P., Stevens, L., & Cattarall, M. (1997). The "glasshouse effect": Women in marketing management. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 15(7), 309-317.
- Malovich, N.J., & Stake, E.J. (1990). Sexual harassment on campus: individual differences in attitudes and beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14, 63-81.
- Mansfield, P.K., Koch, P.B., Henderson, J., & Vicary, J.R. (1991). The job climate for women in traditionally male blue collar occupations. *Sex Roles*, 25, 63-79.
- Martin, R., & Watson, D. (1997). Style of anger expression and its relations to daily experience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(3), 285-294.
- Martin, S.E. (1980). *"Breaking and entering": Policewomen on patrol*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Martin, S.E. (1990). *On the move: The status of women in policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Martin, S.E., & Jurik, N.C. (1996). *Doing justice, doing gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mayekiso, T.V., & Bhana, K. (1997). Sexual harassment: Perceptions and experiences of students at the University of Transkei. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(4), 230-235.
- McGlohn, S.E., King, R.E., Butler, J.W., & Retzlaff, P.D. (1997). Female United States Air Force pilots: Themes, challenges, and possible solutions. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, 68(2), 132-136.
- McHugh, M.C., & Frieze, I.H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 1-16.
- McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles*, 23, 421-438.
- McManus, J.F. (1992, August 10). Women are different!. *The New American*.
- Messner, M.A. (1997). *Politics of masculinities: men in movements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Messerschmidt, J. (1993). *Masculinities and crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Miller, J. (1992). Gender and supervision. *Sociological Perspectives*, 35, 137-162.
- Miller, J., & Garrison, H. (1982). Sex Roles: The division of labour at home and in the workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 8, 237-262.
- Miller, L.L. (1997). Not just weapons of the weak: Gender harassment as a form of protest by army men. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(1), 32-51.

- Miller-Loessi, K. (1992). Towards gender integration in the workplace: Issues at multiple levels. *Sociological Perspectives*, 35(1), 1-15.
- Morgan, D.L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morgan, M. (1982). Television and adolescents sex-role stereotypes: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 947-955.
- Morganthau, T. (1994, November 14). The military fights the gender wars. *Newsweek*, 42-43.
- Morrell, R. (2001). The Times of Change: Men and masculinity in South Africa. In R. Morrell (Ed.), *Changing men in Southern Africa* (pp. 3-37). Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Morris, B. (1998, October 12). The tales of the trailblazers. *FORTUNE*, 107-122.
- Morris, M. (1996). By force of arms: Rape, war and military culture. *Duke Law Journal*, 45(4), 651-771.
- Moskos, C. (1985). Female GI's in the Field: Report from Honduras. *Society*, 22(6), 28-33.
- Mostyn, B. (1985). The content analysis of qualitative research data: a dynamic approach. In M. Brenner, J. Brom, & D. Cantor (Eds.), *The research interview* (pp. 115-146). London: Academic Press.
- Motumi, N. (1999). Gender equality: A challenge to the Department of Defence. *African Security Review*, 8(3), 23-31.
- Mouly, V.S., & Sankaran, J.K. (2002). The enactment of envy within organisations: Insights from a New Zealand academic department. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 38(1), 36-56.
- Nantais, C., & Lee, M.F. (1999). Women in the United States Military: Protectors or protected? *Journal of Gender Studies*, 8(2), 181-191.
- NAVPERs 15620 (n.d.). *Resolving Conflict: Following the light of personal behaviour*. Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office.
- Neft, N., & Levine, A.D. (1997). *Where women stand: An international report on the status of women in 140 countries*. New York: Random House.
- Nelson, D.L., & Burke, R.J. (2000). Women executives: Health, stress, and success. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 107-121.
- Neuman, L.W. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, 4th ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Neville, P. (2003). 'In with the new, only more so . . .': the politics of change and gender in the Irish Naval Service. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 12(2), 115-124.
- Nice, D.S., & Hilton, S. (1994). Sex differences and occupational influences on health care utilization aboard US Navy Ships. *Military Psychology*, 6(2), 109-123.
- Norwood, A.E., Ursano, R.J., & Gabbay, F.H. (1997). Health effects of the stressors of extreme environments on military women. *Military Medicine*, 162(10), 643-648.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1970). *Introduction to psychological measurement*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Paludi, M. (1996). *Sexual harassment on college campuses*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Peach, L.J. (1996). Gender ideology in the ethics of women in combat. In J.H. Stiehm (Ed.), *It's our military, too! Women and the US Military* (pp. 156-194). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Peach, L.J. (1997). Gender and war: are women tough enough for military combat? In C.B. Brettell & C.F. Sargent (Eds.), *Gender in cross cultural perspective* (pp. 20-29). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(2), 173-185.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Reviews in Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pexton, P. (n.d.). *Sexual Harassment: Drawing the line*. Springfield, VA.: Navy Times.
- Pienaar, N. (Ed.) (2004). Special edition: Women in Defence. *SA Soldier*, 11(8).
- Pierce, P.F. (1997). Physical and emotional health of Gulf War veteran women. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, 68(4), 317-321.
- Piotrkowski, C.S. (1998). Gender harassment, job satisfaction, and distress among employed White and minority women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 33-42.
- Ponterotto, J.G., & Grieger, I. (1999). Merging qualitative and quantitative perspectives in a research identity. In M. Kopala & L.A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Using qualitative methods in psychology* (pp. 37-48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pratt, M.G., & Rafaeli, A. (1997). Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered social identities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(4), 862-898.
- Prinsloo, C.H. (1992). The tenacity of sex-role stereotypes. *South African Journal of Psychology* 22(2), 76-86.

- Pryor, J.B. (1995). The psychosocial impact of sexual harassment on women in the US Military. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 581-603.
- Pryor, J.B., Giedd, J.L., & Williams, K.B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 69-84.
- Pryor, J.B., LaVite, C.M., & Stoller, L.M. (1993). A social-psychological analysis of sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 42, 68-83.
- Pryor, J.B., & Stoller, L.M. (1994). Sexual cognition processes in men high in the likelihood to sexually harass. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 163-169.
- Pryor, J.B., & McKinney, K. (1995). Research on sexual harassment: Lingering issues and future directions. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 605-611.
- Pugsley, L. (1997). Focus groups, young people and sex education. In J. Pilcher & A. Coffey (Eds.), *Gender and qualitative research* (pp. 114-130). Avebury: Aldershot.
- Punch, K.F. (1998). *Introduction to social research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pyant, C.T., & Yanico, B.J. (1991). Relationship between racial identity and gender-role attitudes to black women's psychological well-being. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 38(3), 315-322.
- Ragins, B.R., Townsend, B., & Mattis, M. (1998). Gender gap in the executive suite: COE's and female executives report on breaking the glass ceiling. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(1), 28-42.
- Roach-Higgins, M.E., & Eichner, J.B. (1992). Dress and identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10(4), 1-8.
- Robbins, P.R., & Tanck, R.H. (1982). Further research using a psychological diary technique to investigate psychosomatic relationships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(2), 356-359.
- Robinson, S.M. (1991). *Canada's military women: The struggle for equity*. Paper presented to the Learned Society, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, 3 June 1991.
- Rosen, L.N., Bliese, P.D., Wright, K.A., & Gifford, R.K. (1999). Gender composition and group cohesion in US Army units: A comparison across five studies. *Armed Forces and Society*, 25(3), 365-386.
- Rosen, L.N., Durand, D.B., Bliese, P.D., Halverson, R.R., Rothberg, J.M., & Harrison, N.L. (1996). Cohesion and readiness in gender-integrated combat service support units: The impact of acceptance of women and gender ratio. *Armed Forces and Society*, 22(4), 537-553.
- Rosen, L.N., Knudson, K.H., & Fancher, P. (2003). Cohesion and the culture of hyper-masculinity in US Army units. *Armed Forces and Society*, 29(3), 325-351.

- Rosen, L.N., & Martin, L. (1997). Sexual harassment, cohesion, and combat readiness in US Army support units. *Armed Forces and Society*, 24(2), 221-244.
- Rosen, L.N., & Martin, L. (1998). Psychological effects of sexual harassment, appraisal of harassment, and organizational climate among US Army soldiers. *Military Medicine*, 163(2), 63-67.
- Rosen, L.N., & Martin, L. (2000). Personality characteristics that increase vulnerability to sexual harassment among US Army soldiers. *Military Medicine*, 165(10), 709-713.
- Rosen, L.N., Weber, J.P., & Martin, L. (2000). Gender-related personal attributes and psychological adjustment among US Army soldiers. *Military Medicine*, 165(1), 54-59.
- Rosenfeld, P. (1994). Effects of gender and ethnicity on Hispanic women in the US Navy. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134(3), 349-354.
- Rosenfeld, P., Thomas, M.D., Edwards, J.A., Thomas, P.J., & Thomas, E.D. (1991). Navy research into race, ethnicity, and gender issues: a historical review. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 407-426.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R.L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis, 2nd ed.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rosnow, R.L., & Rosenthal, R. (1989). Statistical procedures and the justification of knowledge in psychological science. *American Psychologist*, 44(10), 1276-1284.
- Rospenda, K.M., Richman, J.A., & Nawyn, S.J. (1998). Doing power: The confluence of gender, race and class in contrapower sexual harassment. *Gender and Society*, 12(1), 40-60.
- Rothman, R.A. (1993). *Inequality and stratification: Class, color, and gender.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall.
- Royal Australian Navy (1992). *Employment of women at sea: Implementation plan.* Canberra: Royal Australian Navy.
- Royal Australian Navy (1993). *Creating a better workplace for the Royal Australian Navy. Briefing pack.* Canberra: Royal Australian Navy.
- Royal Swedish Navy (1996). Officer quality – a high priority. *NAFO Special Issue 2/96.*
- Rubin, L.J., & Borgers, S.B. (1990). Sexual harassment in universities during the 1980's. *Sex Roles*, 23, 397-411.
- Rucker, M., Anderson, E., & Kangas, A. (1999). Clothing, power, and the workplace. In K.K.P. Johnson & S.J. Lennon (Eds.), *Appearance and power: Dress, body, culture* (pp. 59-77). New York: Berg.

- Saenz, D.A. (1994). Token status and problem-solving deficits: Detrimental effects of distinctiveness and performance monitoring. *Social Cognition, 12*, 61-74.
- Schlenker, B.R., & Pontari, B.A. (2000). The strategic control of information: impression management and self-presentation in daily life. In A. Tesser, R.B. Felson, & J.M. Suls (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on self and identity* (pp. 199-232). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schneider, D., & Schneider, C.J. (1988). *Sound off*. New York: E.P Dutton.
- Schneider, K.T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1997). Job related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 401-415.
- Schumm, W.R., Bell, D.B., Palmer-Johnson, C.E., & Tran, G. (1994). Gender trends in the US Army and a discussion of implications for readiness and retention. *Psychological Reports, 74*, 499-511.
- Schwarz, N., Groves, R.M., & Schuman, H. (1998). Survey methods. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 1* (pp. 143-174). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schwerin, M.J., & Sack, D.M. (1997). Shipboard women's health care: provider perceptions. *Military Medicine, 162*(10), 666-670.
- Seale, C. (1999). *The quality of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Segal, M.W. (1995). Women's military role cross-nationally, past, present, and future. *Gender and Society, 9*(6), 757-775.
- Segura, D.A. (1992). Chicanas in white collar jobs: You have to prove yourself more. *Sociological Perspectives, 35*(1), 163-182.
- Seventy-five percent of young black women seeking work, says Cosatu (2003, July 11). *The Cape Times*, p. 3.
- Sex in the military. (1997, June 2). Special Issue. *TIME Magazine*, 24-31.
- Shukla, A., & Tripathi, A. (1994). Influence of gender and hierarchical position on interpersonal relations at work. *Psychological Reports, 74*, 1280-1282.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data, 2nd ed.* London: Sage Publications.
- Simpson, R. (1998). Presenteeism, power and organisational change. *British Journal of Management, 9*, Special Issues S37-S50.
- Skowronski, J.J., Betz, A.L., Thompson, C.P., & Shannon, L. (1991). Social memory in everyday life: Recall of self-events and other events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(6), 831-843.

- Smit, R. (1995). Stress in die dubbelinkomstegesin. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 26(4), 134-143.
- Smith, H., & McAllister, I. (1991). The changing military profession: Integrating women into the Australian Defence Force. *ANZJS*, 27(3), 369-391.
- South African Institute of Race Relations (2001). *South African Survey 2001/2002*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.
- South African Navy (1995). *Employment of women at sea*. Pretoria: H.C. Nel.
- South African Navy (1996). *Equal gender representation in ships of the South African Navy*. Pretoria: I. Manning.
- South African Navy (1997). *C Navy policy directive to prevent and deal with sexual harassment in the SA Navy*. Pretoria: SA Navy Office.
- South African Navy (2001). *Naval Order: Pers No 3/2001: Equal Opportunities and Affirmative Action*. Pretoria: SA Navy Office.
- South African Navy (2001, September 27). *Women at sea in the SA Navy*. SA Navy Info Bulletin 40/01. Pretoria: SA Navy Office.
- South African Yearbook 2002/2003* (2002). Pretoria: SA Government Communication and Information System.
- Spence, J.T., & Hahn, E.D. (1997). The Attitudes toward Women Scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 17-34.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. (1972). The Attitudes toward Women Scale. *JSAS: Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2, 66-67.
- Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O.S., Lancaster, A.R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (2002). Towards standardized measurement of sexual harassment: Shortening the SEQ-DoD using item response theory. *Military psychology*, 14(1), 49-72.
- Steenkamp, W. (2001, May 27). Girls in uniform made to measure. *Sunday Times*.
- Stiehm, J.H. (1996). The civilian mind. In J.H. Stiehm (Ed.), *It's our military, too! Women and the US Military* (pp. 270-294). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Stinson, S. (1998, February 23). How women in charge 'manage'. *New Orleans City Business, Supplement Women*, 11A.
- Stuart-Mason, U. (1992). *Britannia's Daughters*. London: Leo Cooper.
- Sutker, P.B., Davis, J.M., Uddo, M., & Ditta, S.R. (1995). Assessment of psychological distress in Persian Gulf troops: ethnicity and gender comparisons. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 64(3), 415-427.

- Suzuki, L.A., Prendes-Lintel, M., Wertlieb, L., & Stallings, A. (1999). Exploring multicultural issues using qualitative methods. In M. Kopala & L.A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Using qualitative methods in psychology* (pp. 123-133). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Swim, J.K., Aikin, K.J., Hall, W.S., & Hunter, B.A. (1995). Sexism and Racism: Old fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.
- Tam, L.W. (1998). Psychological aspects of pregnancy in the military: A review. *Military Medicine*, 163(6), 408-412.
- Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R., & Johnson, L.B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38, 33-35.
- Taylor, D.M., & Moghaddam, F.M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations*, 2nd ed. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Thomas, P.J., & Thomas, M.D. (1994). Effects of sex, marital status, and parental status on absenteeism among navy enlisted personnel. *Military Psychology*, 6(2), 95-108.
- Thomsen, C.J., Basu, A.M., & Reinitz, M.T. (1995). Effects of women's studies courses on gender-related attitudes of women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19(3), 419-426.
- Till, F. (1980). *Sexual harassment: a report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.
- Titunik, R.F. (2000). The first wave: gender integration and military culture. *Armed Forces and Society*, 26(2), 229-257.
- Van Breda, A.D. (2002). *Family violence in the South African National Defence Force*. Paper presented at the XXXIVth International Congress of Military medicine, Sun City, South Africa, 15-20 September 2002.
- Van Creveld, M. (2000). Armed but not dangerous: Women in the Israeli military. *War in History*, 7(1), 82-99.
- Van Dyk, A., & Nieuwhoudt, J.M. (1990). The relationship between relative deprivation and the attitudes of rural Afrikaans-speaking women towards Blacks. *The Journal of Psychology*, 124(5), 513-521.
- Van Rensburg, A. (1999, December). The role of women in combatant situations. *Salut*, 13-14.
- Van Wijk, C.H. (1997). *Comparison of the ASI, MSS and SATWS using a sample of navy sailors*. Unpublished research report: Institute for Maritime Medicine, Simon's Town.

- Van Wijk, C.H. (2002). *Sex differences in health care utilisation on board South African Navy ships*. Paper presented at the XXXIVth International Congress of Military Medicine, Sun City, South Africa, 15-20 September 2002.
- Van Wijk, C.H. (2005). *The motivation of South African Navy women to serve at sea*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Vinnicombe, S., & Harris, H. (2000). Ascent of woman. *People management*, 6(1), 28-30.
- Voge, V.M., & King, R.E. (1997). Interpersonal relationship and prisoner of war concerns of rated military male and female aircrew. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, 68(10), 879-885.
- Von Baeyer, C.L., Sherk, D.L., & Zanna, M.P. (1981). Impression management in the job interview: When the female applicant meets the male (chauvinist) interviewer. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7, 45-51.
- Walby, S. (1986). *Patriarchy at work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Walker, I., & Pettigrew, T.F. (1984). Relative deprivation theory: An overview and conceptual critique. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 201-310.
- Wallace, C.P. (2000, April 10). Germany's glass ceiling. *TIME Magazine*, 76.
- Waller, D. (1995, April, 17). All hands on deck. *TIME Magazine*.
- Weinfurt, K.P. (1995). Multivariate Analysis of Variance. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 245-276). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Wilkinson, L., & Task Force on Statistical Inference (1999). Statistical methods in psychological journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, 54, 594-604.
- Williams, C.L. (1989). *Gender differences at work: Women and men in non-traditional occupations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Willinger, B. (1993). Resistance and change. In J.C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, Work, and Family* (pp. 108-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wilson, F. (2000). The social construction of sexual harassment and assault of university students. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(2), 171-187.
- Wirth, L. (1998). Women in management: Closer to breaking through the glass ceiling? *International Labour Review*, 137(1), 93-102.

- Woelfel, J.C., Savell, J.M., Collins, B.E., & Bentler, P.M. (1976). *A preliminary version of a scale to measure sex-role attitudes in the Army*. Arlington, VA.: Army Research Institute for the Behavioural Sciences.
- Wojack, A.N. (2002, November-December). Integrating women into the infantry. *Military Review*, 67-74.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wolfe, J., Brown, P.J., & Kelley, J.M. (1993). Reassessing war stress: Exposure and the Persian Gulf War. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49(4), 15-31.
- Women on the March (1996, August). *Enterprise*, 16-21.
- Wood, K., & Jewkes, R. (2001). Dangerous love: Reflections on violence among Xhosa township youth. In R. Morrell (Ed.), *Changing men in Southern Africa* (pp. 317-336). Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Wyatt, G.E., & Riederle, M. (1995). The prevalence and context of sexual harassment among African American and White American women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 309-321.
- Younghusband, T. (1994, July 12). Join the Navy to see the world – not women. *Weekend Argus*.
- Younghusband, T. (1994, July, 13). Not on your Nellie! *Sunday Tribune*.
- Zietsman, C. (1995a, March). "Men Only". *Salut*, 24-27.
- Zietsman, C. (1995b, October). Operating in a man's world. *Salut*, 26-29.

Appendix A
Instruments

University of Cape Town

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

PART ONE

To ensure anonymity, please do NOT write your name on the questionnaire.

Please indicate your gender

Male	1
Female	2

Please indicate your age

--

Please indicate your cultural background

African	1
Coloured	2
Indian	3
White	4

Please indicate your rank group

Junior rating	1
Senior rating	2
Warrant officer	3
Officer	4

Please indicate your workplace

Administrative	1
Training	2
Ship-based	3

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below. Encircle your answer at every statement. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Answering all the questions is very important.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neither agree or disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree

1. If I had a daughter, I would discourage her from working on cars.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I get angry at women who complain that South African society is unfair to them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Our society puts too much emphasis on beauty, especially for women.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Women shop more than men because they can't decide what to buy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Most women's libbers are hopping on the bandwagon of protest just for the fun of it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. It bothers me when a man is interested in a woman only if she is pretty.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. It bothers me to see a man being told what to do by a woman.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I think that having children is a woman's greatest fulfilment.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Men are instinctually more courageous than women in the face of danger.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I think that women should spend a lot of time trying to be pretty.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I can really understand why there needs to be a women's liberation movement.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Women rely more on intuition and less on reason than men do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Women should not be as sexually active before marriage as men.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Men are just as easily influenced by others as women are.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. I think women should be more concerned about their appearance than men.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Men will always be the dominant sex.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I dislike it when men treat women as sexual objects.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I think that the husband should have the final say when a couple makes a decision.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Women should have all the same rights as men.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I see nothing wrong with a woman who doesn't like to wear skirts or dresses.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Women should be handled gently by men because they are so delicate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Women should be prepared to oppose men in order to obtain equal status.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I am suspicious of a woman who would rather work than have children.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I think that women are naturally emotionally weaker than men.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. On the average, women are as intelligent as men.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. I like women who are outspoken.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. I see nothing wrong with men whistling at shapely women.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. A working wife should not be hired for a job if there is a family man who needs it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. Women can handle pressure just as well as men can when making a decision.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. Men are naturally better than women at mechanical things.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. A woman's place is in the home.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. I think that many TV commercials present a degrading picture of women.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. I think a woman could do most things as well as a man.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. I think that men are instinctively more competitive than women.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. I think women have a right to be angry when they are referred to as a "broad".
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. It would make me feel awkward to address a woman as "Ms."
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. I see nothing wrong with men who are primarily interested in a woman's body.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. If I had a choice, I would just as soon work for a woman as for a man.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PART TWO

Please indicate your ship

OTQ	1
UHT	2
UZK	3

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women serving on SA Navy ships. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below. Encircle your answer at every statement.

Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Answering all the questions is very important.

1 strongly disagree 2 moderately disagree 3 slightly disagree 4 neither agree or disagree 5 slightly agree 6 moderately agree 7 strongly agree

1. Men's style of management is more effective than that of women
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Male sailors are not as neat as female sailors
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Female sailors in general have weaker physical strength than male sailors
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. The navy is a "man's world"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Female members (sometimes undeservedly) get promoted quicker than their male peers
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. After women have served on ships for some time, the men will be more accepting of them
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Men give more support to each other than to their female colleagues when they go to sea
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Swans are more conscientious workers than male sailors
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Women should not serve on ships because of the potential of falling pregnant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Sexual harassment is not tolerated in the workplace
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Women should rather be at home looking after children than serve onboard navy ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Women should not serve on ships due to the possibility of intimate relationships (with men) forming while at sea
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. When it comes to gender-integration, I use my supervisor or head of department's opinion as guide for my own opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Swans do not belong onboard ships because they lack the physical strength to do the job
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. For seagoing swans with children, family priorities come before work priorities
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Seagoing women tend to get the cushy jobs onboard ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Women will never really be accepted into the navy as it is a "man's world"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. If mothers deploy to sea, it will have a detrimental effect on their children
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Swans receive preferential treatment onboard ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. The partners (wives, girlfriends) of male sailors are against the presence of swans onboard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Women have more medical problems, which make them a liability onboard ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Women onboard ships mean that men get crowded into fewer cabins
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. It is necessary to have a senior woman onboard to protect junior ratings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. A male sailor should help a swan if she struggles to complete her task
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. Men and women need separate ablution facilities (as opposed to one facility with locks used by men and women separately)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. Women are unlikely to report sexual harassment because they are told it is "disloyal to squeal on your shipmates"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. Swans expect preferential treatment onboard ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Men do not like to take orders from higher-ranking females
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. During deployment, women should be utilized in "safe" jobs onboard the ship (like in the support branches, not on deck)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. The female personnel on navy ships have been sufficiently prepared for serving onboard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. While on deployment, women will be less effective as they will tend to worry more about their families/ dependants
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. Women should serve on ships because of the new constitution
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. Women should not serve on ships because they get emotional at certain times of the month
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. The male personnel on navy ships have been sufficiently prepared for having women onboard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. It will do the navy harm to have women serving in all ranks and positions at sea
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. For seagoing swans with children, family priorities should come before work priorities
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. Society supports the fact that women serve on navy ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. Having women on a ship will benefit that ship
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. Male rating gets punished more severely than female ratings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. Allowing women to go to sea will weaken the navy
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. I personally like the fact that a growing number of women are joining to serve onboard ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42. Women are motivated to join the navy to be like "GI Jane"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. In the case of a disaster at sea, women should not necessarily be rescued before men
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44. It is easy to understand why swans are still concerned about societal limitations of women's opportunities
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45. My direct superiors support gender-integration onboard ships
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PART THREE

The South African Navy, in cooperation with the Institute for Maritime Medicine, is investigating the effects of gender-integration (mixed sexes) in the SA Navy.

This questionnaire consists of 40 questions on relationships in the workplace. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. It is very important to answer all the questions.

Remember that all the questions refer to behaviour or situations that are unwanted, or make you feel uncomfortable or humiliated. The co-workers and supervisors in the questions refer to those of the opposite sex.

To ensure anonymity, please do NOT write your name on the questionnaire.

Answer the following questions by making an X over the appropriate block. All the questions refer to your present work environment (ship or unit), over the past six months.

Example

- a. How often do you join your co-workers for tea during stand-easy ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	X
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

The X over no 4 means that you always join your co-workers for stand-easy.

Questions

1. How often does your co-worker(s) make uninvited or offensive remarks on your dress/uniform?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

2. How often does your supervisor(s) make uninvited or offensive remarks on your dress/uniform?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

3. How often does your co-worker(s) make offensive remarks on your physical appearance ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

4. How often does your supervisor(s) make offensive remarks on your physical appearance ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

5. How often does your co-worker(s) tell sexist jokes in you company ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

6. How often does your supervisor(s) tell sexist jokes in you company ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

7. How often does your co-worker(s) use unwanted "terms of endearment" (like "bokkie, skattie, love, etc") with you ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

8. How often does your supervisor(s) use unwanted "terms of endearment" (like "bokkie, skattie, love, etc") with you ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

9. How often does your co-worker(s) request unwanted sexual favours from you (from a kiss to more serious) ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

10. How often does your supervisor(s) request unwanted sexual favours from you (from a kiss to more serious) ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

11. How often does your co-worker(s) repeatedly invite you on a "date" after you clearly said no ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

12. How often does your supervisor(s) repeatedly invite you on a "date" after you clearly said no ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

13. How often does your co-worker(s) make sexually suggestive noises in the company of the opposite sex?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

14. How often does your supervisor(s) make sexually suggestive noises in the company of the opposite sex?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

15. How often does your co-worker(s) engage in unasked for adjustments to your dress or uniform?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

16. How often does your supervisor(s) engage in unasked for adjustments to your dress or uniform?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

17. How often do you get pinched, patted, hugged or kissed by your co-worker(s) in your work environment?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

18. How often do you get pinched, patted, hugged or kissed by you supervisor(s) in your work environment?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

19. How often do you get touched by co-worker(s) in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

20. How often do you get touched by supervisor(s) in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

21. How often do you feel co-worker(s) get physically too close to you (unnecessarily) ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

22. How often do you feel supervisor(s) get physically too close to you (unnecessarily) ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

23. How often does your co-worker(s) tell sexually orientated stories when you are in the company ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

24. How often does your supervisor(s) tell sexually orientated stories when you are in the company ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

25. How often do you receive sexually orientated greeting cards, faxes of p-mail from co-worker(s) ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

26. How often do you receive sexually orientated greeting cards, faxes of p-mail from supervisor(s) ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

27. How often are jokes, cartoons or calendars of a sexual nature displayed on the notice boards or circulated through the unit where people meet and work ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

28. How often is sexually orientated material left where you will see it ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

29. How often do your co-worker(s) stare at you in a sexually suggestive manner ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

30. How often do your supervisor(s) stare at you in a sexually suggestive manner ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

31. How often does your co-worker(s) engage in activities like blowing kisses, licking lips in a sexual manner ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

32. How often does your supervisor(s) engage in activities like blowing kisses, licking lips in a sexual manner ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

33. How often does your co-worker(s) engage in hand or finger gestures of a sexual nature ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

34. How often does your supervisor(s) engage in hand or finger gestures of a sexual nature ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

35. How often does your co-worker(s) make crude sexual remarks ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

36. How often does your supervisor(s) make crude sexual remarks ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

37. How often does your co-worker(s) make crude sexist remarks ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

38. How often does your supervisor(s) make crude sexist remarks ?

Never	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	Always	4
-------	---	-----------	---	-------	---	--------	---

39. Have you ever been threatened or ridiculed or humiliated when wanting to make a complaint after being sexually harassed? If YES, please explain why and by whom (i.e. co-workers of supervisors).

.....
.....
.....

40. Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation.

University of Cape Town

Appendix B
Personal Event Diary

University of Cape Town

PERSONAL EVENT DIARY

Personal information

Name:

Age:

Gender:

Rank:

Department (posting):

Instructions

Diary entries: it may be the easiest to write down your experiences after your last watch of the day, or otherwise at any time that you have the opportunity to sit down without disturbance to write.

Content: for a day's entry, please write the date, and rate the questions on the scale provided. Then write down your observation of interaction between others, and/or your own experience of an interpersonal situation.

Your own experiences may include situations where you:

Either felt put down, or praised, or unfairly treated, or good about yourself, or hurt, frustrated or angered by someone else;

Or any experience where you felt you achieved something. You can also write down any worries or concerns you thought of during the day.

Please complete the rating scale at the end of each day. It is often difficult to write down an experience every day, if possible please try to make an entry into the diary at least two times per week.

Appendix C
Information on Participants in Phase 2

University of Cape Town

PARTICIPANTS

Focus groups: large gender integrated ship

- A1: Junior ratings working in mixed gender departments
- A2: Junior ratings that never worked in mixed gender departments
- A3: Senior ratings
- A4: Warrant Officers

Interviews: Gender integrated ship

- B1: E.S., Male junior rating, 19, White, English, single
- B2: J.H., Male junior rating, 21, White, Afrikaans, single
- B3: K.Z., Female officer, 27, White, Afrikaans, single
- B4: L.N., Female officer, 20, African, SeSotho, single
- B5: L.R., Female senior rating, 27, Coloured, English, married (1 child)
- B6: M.M., Male junior rating, 26, African, Zulu, single
- B7: M.L., Female junior rating, 22, White, Afrikaans, single
- B8: M.I., Female junior rating, 22, White, Afrikaans, single
- B9: N.J., Female junior rating, 19, White, English, single
- B10: P.O., Male junior rating, 24, White, English, single
- B11: R.E., Male senior rating, 30, Coloured, English, engaged (1 child)
- B12: S.J., Female officer, 22, Coloured, English, single
- B13: S.T., Female junior rating, 22, Coloured, English, single
- B14: S.D., Female junior rating, 23, Coloured, English, engaged
- B15: W.G., Male senior rating, 29, Coloured, English, single

Interviews: All-male ship

- C1: B.C., Male senior rating, 35, White, English, married with children
- C2: B.A., Male junior rating, 21, Coloured, Afrikaans, single
- C3: P.P., Male senior rating, 28, Coloured, Afrikaans, married with children
- C4: T.I., Male officer, 24, White, English, single
- C5: S.V., Male officer, 28, White, Afrikaans, single

Appendix D

Sexist Attitudes Towards Women Scale: Factor Structure per Gender

University of Cape Town

Factor loadings for varimax two-factor solution (women only)

Item	Loading
Factor 1: Equality of the sexes (Eigenvalue = 5.28)	
26. If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.	0.66
19. Women should have all the same rights as men.	0.63
35. I think a woman could do most things as well as a man.	0.60
27. I like women who are outspoken.	0.58
20. I see nothing wrong with a woman who doesn't like to wear skirts & dresses.	0.56
37. I think women have a right to be angry when they are referred to as a "broad".	0.52
31. Women can handle pressure just as well as men can when making a decision.	0.44
17. I dislike it when men treat women as sexual objects.	0.42
14. Men are just as easily influenced by others as women are.	0.39
3. Our society puts too much emphasis on beauty, especially for women.	0.38
22. Women should be prepared to oppose men in order to obtain equal status.	0.34
6. It bothers me when a man is interested in a woman only if she is pretty.	0.33
25. On the average, women are as intelligent as men.	0.32
Factor 2: Male superiority / dominance (Eigenvalue = 3.55)	
21. Women should be handled gently by men because they are so delicate.	0.68
10. I think that women should spend a lot of time trying to be pretty.	0.67
15. I think women should be more concerned about their appearance than men.	0.63
24. I think that women are naturally emotionally weaker than men.	0.62
9. Men are instinctually more courageous than women in the face of danger.	0.61
23. I am suspicious of a woman who would rather work than have children.	0.54
4. Women shop more than men because they can't decide what to buy.	0.52
30. A working wife should not be hired for a job if there is a family man who needs it.	0.52
38. It would make me feel awkward to address a woman as "Ms."	0.50
18. I think that the husband should have the final say when a couple makes a decision.	0.47
33. A woman's place is in the home.	0.46
16. Men will always be the dominant sex.	0.45
7. It bothers me to see a man being told what to do by a woman.	0.44
8. I think that having children is a woman's greatest fulfillment.	0.44
13. Women should not be as sexually active before marriage as men.	0.39
29. It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy.	0.36
39. I see nothing wrong with men who are primarily interested in a woman's body.	0.35
32. Men are naturally better than women at mechanical things.	0.33

Factor loadings for varimax two-factor solution (men only)

Item	Loading
Factor 1: Equality of the sexes	
(Eigenvalue = 4.26)	
19. Women should have all the same rights as men.	0.66
20. I see nothing wrong with a woman who doesn't like to wear skirts or dresses.	0.64
27. I like women who are outspoken.	0.64
25. On the average, women are as intelligent as men.	0.61
17. I dislike it when men treat women as sexual objects.	0.60
35. I think a woman could do most things as well as a man.	0.59
26. If a husband and wife both work full time, the husband should do half of the housework.	0.58
37. I think women have a right to be angry when they are referred to as a "broad".	0.58
14. Men are just as easily influenced by others as women are.	0.46
31. Women can handle pressure just as well as men can when making a decision.	0.46
40. If I had a choice, I would just as soon work for a woman as for a man.	0.44
3. Our society puts too much emphasis on beauty, especially for women.	0.31
Factor 2: Male superiority / dominance	
(Eigenvalue = 4.13)	
9. Men are instinctually more courageous than women in the face of danger.	0.59
16. Men will always be the dominant sex.	0.55
18. I think that the husband should have the final say when a couple makes a decision.	0.50
7. It bothers me to see a man being told what to do by a woman.	0.49
29. It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy.	0.49
5. Most women's libbers are hopping on the bandwagon of protest just for the fun of it.	0.48
4. Women shop more than men because they can't decide what to buy.	0.47
10. I think that women should spend a lot of time trying to be pretty.	0.47
15. I think women should be more concerned about their appearance than men.	0.46
33. A woman's place is in the home.	0.42
8. I think that having children is a woman's greatest fulfillment.	0.41
24. I think that women are naturally emotionally weaker than men.	0.41
30. A working wife should not be hired for a job if there is a family man who needs it.	0.40
32. Men are naturally better than women at mechanical things.	0.40
12. Women rely more on intuition and less on reason than men do.	0.39
36. I think that men are instinctively more competitive than women.	0.39
23. I am suspicious of a woman who would rather work than have children.	0.38
2. I get angry at women who complain that South African society is unfair to them.	0.36
38. It would make me feel awkward to address a woman as "Ms."	0.32

39. I see nothing wrong with men who are primarily interested in a woman's body.

0.32

University of Cape Town

Appendix E

Descriptive Statistics for Student and Retired Respondents' Samples

University of Cape Town

Descriptive statistics for student and retired respondents' samples

Sample	N	Age		% women	% men
		Mean	SD		
Student respondents ¹	85	20.42	2.26	68.2%	31.8%
Retired respondents ²	84	66.14	4.90	47.62%	52.38%

1 Second year psychology students.

2 From a community not involved in the military, and none of participants had any past service in the armed forces.

Respondents were not asked to indicate race, as it did not appear to be a meaningful category in the main sample.

University of Cape Town

