

## Woman-Warrior: Gender Identity Development of Women in the American Military

Victoria R. Culver

*This article reviews current literature that examines how women in the military experience the masculine culture of the military and literature that further describes the experience of women in the military as they implement gender compensation strategies. This article postulates the Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military theory, which explores the military experience of women through a developmental lens and discusses limitations of the theory and applications for higher education.*

In 1944, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act ushered in a new era in higher education and created a shift in the proportion of Americans who attended colleges and universities (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). The bill, also known as the GI Bill, provided educational and other benefits for veterans who served in the armed forces. By creating an opportunity for every veteran to attend college, the bill helped change the mindset of the American people by making college seem accessible for more people than just the elite members of society (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

As the United States entered into war following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, a new generation of combat veterans formed. To meet their needs, the Veterans Education Assistance Act was enacted in 2008 to extend the benefits of the GI Bill to men and women who served in the United States Armed Forces after September 11, 2001 (Cohen & Kisker, 2010; Office of the Press Secretary, 2008). Many of the individuals who have benefitted or will benefit from this act are veterans of the "War on Terror," a blanket term for military actions which occurred as a result of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 (Rumann & Hamrick, 2009).

During these conflicts, women were deployed to combat zones at a

higher rate than ever before (Baechtold & DeSawal, 2009). Currently, women represent over 11% of members of the military who have been deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan (Benedict, 2009; Iraq Afghanistan Veterans of America, 2011a). These women represent over half of active duty women in the military (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics [NCVAS], 2011). During these deployments, women faced greater exposure to the dangers and stressors of war than women in previous wars due to blurry or nonexistent lines between combat and noncombat missions (Baker, 2006). Additionally, as of January 2013, the ban on American women in combat was lifted, allowing women to serve on the front lines of military actions (Stewart & Alexander, 2013). It is predicted that the number of women veterans will increase by about 11,000 per year for the next 20 years (NCVAS, 2011a).

Due to the increase of women serving in the military, there will be more women veterans eligible to enroll in higher education institutions. In 2009, almost 225,000 women veterans used their GI Bill benefits toward an undergraduate or junior college degree (NCVAS, 2011a). Additionally, although men make up the majority of student veterans enrolled in higher education, a greater percentage of women veterans

are enrolling in college than male counterparts (NCVAS, 2013). As more women are exposed to the stressors of war and the number of women veterans grows, it is important for student affairs professionals to take into consideration the unique factors that affect the transition of women veterans from deployment to higher education (Baechtold & DeSawal, 2009).

One particular factor that affects women in the military is the necessity to navigate the masculine culture. Women must overcome the stereotype that females, who traditionally are not supposed to kill or be violent, cannot be soldiers (DeGroot, 2001). Although there have been successful battalions of women, such as the First Russian Women's Battalion of Death, society still does not believe that women have the capacity for violence necessary to be successful soldiers (DeGroot, 2001). In addition, because the military emphasizes that male bonding is essential to small group cohesion, women may have to employ strategies, such as overemphasizing or underemphasizing their femininity, to redefine their gender to assimilate into military culture (Rosen, Knudson, & Fancher, 2003). Women may also face gender discrimination and sexual harassment when working in military units where hypermasculinity is prevalent (Rosen et al., 2003). Specifically, 54% of women in the military experience gender harassment (Lipari, Cook, Rock, & Matos, 2008). Women must navigate a culture where they do not know if it is possible to balance a warrior identity of being a member of the military and a female identity without compromising one or the other. (Herbert, 1998).

Due to this challenge, the gender identity of women veterans may be

altered by trying to conform to the masculine culture of the military. Although, Bem (1983) states most people develop gender schema during early childhood, when women enter jobs that are male-dominant, such as the military, they must learn to redefine what it means to be a woman (Herbert, 1998). Herbert (1998) found that women in the military feel pressure to manage their gender by emphasizing either their feminine or masculine qualities to be successful soldiers. As the population of women with military experience on college campuses grows, it is necessary to examine how these students have developed and will continue to develop their gender identity (Baechtold & DeSawal, 2009). The creation of a theory that explains this gender development will help student affairs professionals be more effective in engaging women veterans and better understand how these students are making meaning of their higher education experience (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton & Renn, 2010). This article reviews current literature related to women in the military and gender identity development and proposes the Gender Identify Development of Women in the Military theory, which examines how women adapt to the masculine culture of the military.

### **Literature Review**

In order to develop a theory of gender identity development for women in the military, it is necessary to review the current literature on the topic. First, the experience of women in the military must be examined, with a specific focus on how women experience and react to the masculine culture of the military. Additionally, current gender identity development theories applicable to the

experience of women in the military should be examined. It is important to note that there is a lack of research which examines the experience of women in the military, specifically women who have served or are serving in the military during the War on Terror.

### **The Experience of Women in the Military**

Women in the military must find ways to be successful in the masculine culture of the military (Herbert, 1998; Rosen et al. 2003). Herbert (1998) conducted an extensive study to examine what it means for women to be a part of the military and how they adapt to the masculine culture. Although Herbert's 1998 study was conducted before the War on Terror began, the findings can be applied to the current constituency of military women, and some effects may even be more intense for deployed women who have faced combat (Baechtold & DeSawal, 2009).

By surveying almost 300 women in all branches of the military, Herbert (1998) found that women remain marginalized in the military primarily because of the relationship between the military and developing manhood. She stated that in military culture "it is not enough just to be male; one must be 'more male' than the men in the next squad, platoon and so forth," (Herbert, 1998, p. 8). In addition to operating within a culture that values being masculine, women in the military must also cope with the prevailing military attitude that the best way to challenge masculinity is to accuse someone of being feminine (Herbert, 1998).

Herbert (1998) found that 49% of the women she studied felt a pressure to act either more feminine or more masculine or face a penalty for not meeting gender norms. One pressure that

women experience is gender harassment, such as being verbally insulted based on their gender, which can create constant and harsh stress for women in the military (Street, Vogt, & Dutra, 2009). Some women felt that they needed to act more feminine to ensure they were still seen as a real woman while others felt the need to act more masculine to better assimilate into military culture. Many of the women in Herbert's 2009 study also stated that they were confronted with gender expectations that were contradictory while in the military. Forty-two percent of the women Herbert (1998) surveyed noted that they employed some form of gender management while in the military. Women who employ gender management try to exhibit more masculine or more feminine traits than they would naturally. It is possible that other women were not conscious of the fact that they were trying to manage gender, or they have found exhibiting the least amount of gender to be the most efficient way of coping with the masculine culture and gender expectations of the military (Herbert, 1998). Herbert (1998) identified specific strategies that women implement to exhibit masculinity and femininity, which will be further expounded upon in the explanation of the theory.

Because the War on Terror is still taking place, the amount of research about the experiences of women veterans of this war is limited. However, the findings of Benedict (2009) in relation to the experiences of women fighting in the War on Terror correlate with the experiences of women described by Herbert (1998). Multiple women whom Benedict (2009) interviewed indicated a loss of femininity while in the military. They attributed this loss to several things, such as the unisex uniform of the military

and the need to keep their hair a certain way. Most of the women that Benedict spoke with indicated that they felt they needed to front, or exhibit signs of a fake identity, such as “being a bitch” (Benedict, 2009, p. 48), in order to confront the masculine culture of the military. Benedict (2009) found that, although there are rules preventing drill sergeants from using defamatory language, many still use misogynistic language which further engrains the masculine culture of the military.

Rosen, Krudson, and Fancher (2003) further explained the masculine culture of the military, which links male bonding with group cohesion. The emphasis placed on male bonding is associated with hypermasculinity, which is the “expression of extreme, exaggerated, or stereotypic masculine attributes and behaviors,” (Rosen et al., 2003, p. 325). As Rosen et al. (2003) studied the occurrence of hypermasculinity in the military, they found that it spread during informal socialization between males. They argued that ungendered professionalism could be implemented as a means of building unit cohesion as an alternative to hypermasculinity and male bonding. However, there are obstacles in replacing hypermasculinity, as ungendered professionalism can be difficult to maintain during combat missions and in combat zones where a culture with masculine ideals is likely to develop (Rosen et al., 2003).

### **Related Gender Identity Development**

When examining experiences of women in the military, it is apparent that many of these women are forced to adopt a gender identity that is not natural for them, emphasizing either their feminine or masculine traits (Benedict, 2009;

Herbert, 1998). Edwards and Jones (2009) noticed a similar behavior in college men who feel they must put on a performance to meet society’s expectations of men. Their Grounded Theory of College Men’s Gender Identity Development examines the need college men feel to put on a mask of masculinity and the process in which they engage in order to remove that mask (Edwards & Jones, 2009).

In the first phase of the theory, known as *feeling a need to put on a mask*, men realize that they will not live up to external expectations of what it means to be a man (Edward & Jones, 2009). Men identify insecurities they have about being men and these insecurities cause them to feel like they need to put on a mask to overcompensate and prove their manhood. In the second phase, *wearing a mask*, men act in compliance with societal expectations for men their age, including partying and swearing (Edwards & Jones, 2009). College males wear the mask as a way to retain their manhood and can internalize the societal ideals of what it means to be a man to the extent they act in ways that contradict their own values. During the third phase of the theory, *experiencing and recognizing the consequences of wearing a mask*, men begin to see to the consequences of wearing a mask and realize that wearing the mask inhibits their ability to have relationships, both romantically and platonically (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Employing *wearing the mask* not only damages relationships, but can cause men to lose a sense of authenticity in their identity. In the final phase, *struggling to begin to take off the mask*, men must cope with the idea that parts of their authentic identity do not fit into the societal expectations of what it means to be a man. Several influences may cause the

men to begin to remove their masks, including personal influences, alternate views of masculinity, academic courses, and critical events (Edward & Jones, 2009). To fully remove their mask, men must begin to “transcend external factors” (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 215).

As will be further discussed in the next section with the proposed Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military theory, the process that women in the military experience with regard to managing their gender is similar to the process described by Edwards and Jones (2009). Although the populations of male college students and female veterans are very different, both feel pressure to conform to what they think are either societal or military cultural norms for gender. While other gender identity development theories were researched, the theory of Edwards and Jones (2009) was the most comprehensive and applicable to the experiences of women in the military because it most fully aligned with the experiences described by Herbert (1998) and Benedict (2009).

### **Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military**

The proposed Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military (GIDWM) theory combines the research on the experiences of women in the military with Edwards’s and Jones’s Grounded Theory of College Men’s Gender Identity Development (2009) to create a framework on understanding female veterans’ gender identity development. The phases of the GIDWM theory mirrors the phases of Edwards’s and Jones’s (2009) Grounded Theory of College Men’s Gender Identity Development. However, when applied to the experience of women in the military,

some phases have more than one identity with which women can identify.

In phase one, *feeling the need to put on a mask*, women in the military begin to identify insecurities (Edwards & Jones, 2009). During this stage, women may fall into two identities, *warrior insecurity* or *femininity insecurity*. Women who fall into the *warrior insecurity* identity become aware of insecurities that they feel with regard to living up to the masculine ideals of the military. They question if they have the capacity for violence, the physical capabilities to perform military tasks, and the ability to be taken seriously by their male peers and coworkers (Benedict, 2009; DeGroot, 2001; Herbert, 1998; Rosen et al., 2003; Silva, 2008). Women who fall into the *femininity insecurity* identity become aware of insecurities related to maintaining their identity as a “real woman” (Herbert, 1998). Women in this phase will begin to identify ways that they can compensate for whichever insecurities they are experiencing.

Once women begin to employ the compensation strategies for their insecurities, they have entered phase two, *wearing the mask*. In this phase, women “covered aspects of their true selves that did not meet society’s expectations and presented to society an image that did fit the expectations” (Edwards & Jones, 2009, p. 216). As with phase one, this phase has two identities, wearing the *warrior mask* and wearing the *femininity mask*. In the *warrior mask* identity, women who feel insecurities about their ability to be a warrior and a soldier employ strategies to meet society’s and the military’s perceived expectations of being a warrior. Most of these strategies emphasize the woman’s masculinity (Herbert, 1998). Some examples of strategies that were identified by women

in Herbert's study were rarely wearing makeup, keeping hair trimmed short, participating in "male" sports, swearing, working out, and drinking. In the *femininity mask* identity of phase two, women who feel insecurities about their ability to be a real woman implement strategies to meet what they perceive as society's expectations of being a woman. These strategies, such as wearing makeup, wearing traditional feminine clothing, like dresses and lingerie, playing up or downplaying their sexuality, and avoiding vulgarity, emphasize the woman's femininity (Herbert, 1998). Benedict's concept of "fronting" provides evidence that some women serving during the War on Terror are in phase two of GIDWM. The term fronting refers to the "unnatural act they have to put on, day in and day out... to live up to the role of soldier" (Benedict, 2009, p. 141). Benedict described one woman who stated the experience of fronting was like wearing an unauthentic personality.

In the third phase, *recognizing and experiencing the consequences of wearing a mask*, women begin to realize that there are consequences to wearing a mask and employing strategies to reshape and adapt their gender identity to meet society's expectations. Women may begin to realize that they are losing their "true selves" in the performance of wearing the mask (Edwards & Jones, 2009). They also begin to understand that wearing a mask might be harmful to both platonic and romantic relationships. For example, women who identify with the *femininity mask* in phase two might be employing a strategy of dating men to feel feminine (Herbert, 1998). If women are just dating men to seem or feel more feminine, then it is likely that they are not in an authentic relationship. As women begin to realize the consequences of their actions, they

may try to develop a personal definition of what it means to be a warrior, a woman, or a woman-warrior (Edwards & Jones, 2009).

As women begin to develop their definitions of being a warrior, a woman, and a woman-warrior, they enter stage four, *struggling to take off the mask*. In this stage, women acknowledge specific aspects of their true selves that are covered by the mask, and begin to transcend external expectations of gender identity (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Because *struggling to take off the mask* requires women to develop an authentic gender identity, it is difficult for them to do so before they are no longer influenced by external factors. Some senior women of the military may be in this stage because, as Herbert (1998) stated, they are significantly less likely to employ strategies associated with wearing either a *warrior mask* or a *femininity mask*. Junior women in the military may not experience this phase until they leave the military and experience dissonance between their true identity and the strategies they implemented while in the military. The dissonance they experience will often cause them question their employment of compensation strategies. Women in this stage may also question their ability to fully regain their true identity. Benedict (2009) found several women who had employed gender compensation strategies and were struggling to recover their authentic identities after returning from serving in the War on Terror.

It is important to note that GIDWM theory is non-linear. Women can cycle through the first two phases numerous times as they experience insecurities related to either their identity as a warrior or as a woman. As Herbert (1998) discovered, women may employ

Model of the Theory of Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military		
Phase	Description	
<b>Feeling the need to put on a mask</b>	Women begin to identify insecurities related to one, or both, of two identities	
	<i>Warrior insecurity:</i> insecurity focuses on living up to the masculine ideals of the military and potential inability to serve as a warrior:	<i>Femininity insecurity:</i> insecurity focuses on potential inability to maintain an identity as a real woman while serving in the military
<b>Wearing a mask</b>	Women begin to employ compensation strategies related to insecurities identified in the <i>feeling the need to put on a mask</i> phase	
	<i>Warrior mask:</i> compensation strategies focus on meeting society's and the military's perceived expectations of being a warrior	<i>Femininity mask:</i> compensation strategies focus on meeting what they perceive as society's expectations of being a woman
<b>Recognizing and experiencing the consequences of wear a mask</b>	Women begin to realize that they are losing aspects of their true selves by wearing a mask and that wearing a mask can be harmful to their relationships with others	
<b>Struggling to take off the mask</b>	Women begin to transcend external expectations of their identity and come to terms with their true selves. They fully develop a personal definition of what it means to be a woman, a warrior and a woman-warrior	

different strategies in varying situations and can, at times, employ strategies to compensate for insecurities in both their identities. Thus, it is possible that a woman in the military may be in both identities of the first two phases simultaneously. However, at any given time, most women only employ strategies for either their warrior identity or their identity as a woman (Herbert, 1998), making it rare for women to be in both identities concurrently. Additionally, women in the military may experience the GIDWM theory both consciously and unconsciously. As Herbert (1998) reported, some women knowingly employ strategies to seem more feminine or more masculine, while other women may employ strategies without realizing it.

The Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military theory applies gender identity development to women in the military. Herbert's 1998 study, although extensive, only focused on describing how women experience the masculine culture of the military. Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military theory aims to describe the process of development that women in the military experience, as a result of the masculine culture of the military.

**Limitations**

The key limitation of this study is that it applies a theory focused specifically on the gender identity development of men to the gender identity development of women. However, the process that is examined by Edwards's and Jones's

Grounded Theory of College Men's Gender Identity Development (2009) is representative of the experience of women in the military. As noted in the proposed GIDWM, many of the strategies employed by women in the military are similar to strategies employed by the men described in the Grounded Theory of College Men's Identity Development (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Additionally, both GIDWM theory and the theory of Edwards and Jones (2009) focus on gender identity development in a context where hypermasculinity is the norm. An additional limitation is that the original study conducted by Edwards and Jones (2009) had only ten participants. However, these ten participants were representative of multiple races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and socioeconomic classes. Thus, GIDWM theory should be applicable to a diverse group of women. Because the research used to frame the experience of women in the military is based on the experience of women in the American military, it cannot be assumed that this theory is applicable to women internationally.

Despite the research conducted by Benedict (2009), another key limitation is the lack of research on the experience of women who have been deployed as part of the War on Terror. Much of the research focusing on women who have been members of the military during the War on Terror is anecdotal. If research with similar methods to Herbert's 1998 study could be conducted again, and focused on women in the military since September 11, 2001, it could provide a broader understanding of the experience of women veterans enrolling in institutions of higher education now and in years to come. Additionally, research should be conducted to further validate GIDWM theory. By studying the

experience of women in the modern military, researchers could further examine if their experience aligns with and confirms the theory of GIDWM. As the number of women veterans, especially women with combat experiences, continues to grow, it will be necessary for student affairs professionals to have a theory through which they can frame their interactions with women veterans on a college or university campus.

### **Implications**

By studying the Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military theory, student affairs professionals can prepare for the influx of women student veterans. GIDWM theory provides a context for what women veterans experience with regard to gender identity both while serving in the military and once they have left the military. It is likely that many women veterans will experience phases three and four of GIDWM while enrolled in an institution of higher education, if they choose to attend, because many will not reach those phases until after their military service. It will be important for student affairs professionals to ensure that women veterans are receiving an adequate amount of challenge and support as these women work through dissonance related to their gender identity (Sanford, 1966). Student affairs professionals, both within veteran services offices and other areas of campus, will be able to use GIDWM to inform their practice while working with women veterans.

### **Conclusion**

As an increased number of women begin to experience an active role in combat, it

is necessary for further research to be conducted on how an experience in the military affects a woman's identity. The repeal of a military policy banning women in combat and frontline positions of the military modernizes the United States military to the realities of the War on Terror (Stewart & Alexander, 2013). Additionally, many women veterans who served in the military during the War on Terror have already experienced heavy combat due to blurry and non-existent frontlines of the war (Baker, 2006). Studies should be conducted which provide qualitative analysis of the anecdotal experiences of women who served during the War on Terror to identify patterns involving changes in their identity.

As DeGroot (2001) stated, "women are changed by their military service" (p. 31). While in the military, women have been forced to question whether they can successfully be both a warrior and a woman (Herbert, 1998). It is the duty of student affairs professionals to help women veterans work through dissonance and recognize that they may be making meaning very differently than other female students at an institution. Until further research is conducted the Gender Identity Development of Women in the Military theory can serve as a framework through which student affairs professionals can gain a better understanding of how women with military experience are making meaning of their gender.

## References

- Baechtold, M., & DeSawal, D. M. (2009). Meeting the needs of women veterans. In R. Ackerman and D. DiRamio (Eds.) *Creating a Veteran-Friendly Campus: Strategies for transition and success* (pp. 35-43). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Baker, H. (2006). Women in Combat: A Culture Issue? Unpublished Master's Thesis. Carlisle Barracks, PA: US Army War College. Retrieved from <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA449305>.
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs*, 8(4), 598-616.
- Benedict, H. (2009). *The lonely soldier: The private war of women serving in Iraq*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- DeGroot, G. J. (2001). A few good women: Gender stereotypes, the military and peacekeeping. *International Peacekeeping*, 8(2), 23-28. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13533310108413893>.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development* 50(2), 210-226. Retrieved from [https://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/journal\\_of\\_college\\_student\\_development/v050/50.2.edwards.html](https://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/journal_of_college_student_development/v050/50.2.edwards.html).

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Herbert, M.S. (1998). *Camouflage isn't only for combat: Gender, sexuality, and women in the military*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Iraq Afghanistan Veterans of America (2011). Women in the military. Retrieved from <http://iava.org/content/women-military>.
- Lipari, R.N., Cook, P.J., Rock, L.M. & Matos, K. (2008). *2006 Gender relations survey of active duty members*. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. Retrieved from [http://www.ncdsv.org/images/DOD\\_GenderRelationsSurveyOfActiveDutyMembers\\_2006.pdf](http://www.ncdsv.org/images/DOD_GenderRelationsSurveyOfActiveDutyMembers_2006.pdf).
- National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics (2013). Women Veteran Profile. Washington, D.C.: Department of Veterans Affairs. Retrieved from [http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/Women\\_Veteran\\_Profile5.pdf](http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/Women_Veteran_Profile5.pdf).
- National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics (2011a). America's Women Veterans: Military Service History and VA Benefit Utilization Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Department of Veterans Affairs. Retrieved from [http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/Final\\_Womens\\_Report\\_3\\_2\\_12\\_v\\_7.pdf](http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/Final_Womens_Report_3_2_12_v_7.pdf).
- National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics (2011b). Educational Attainment of Veterans 2000 to 2009. Washington, D.C.: Department of Veterans Affairs. Retrieved from [http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/education\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.va.gov/vetdata/docs/SpecialReports/education_FINAL.pdf).
- Office of the Press Secretary (2008). President Bush Signs H.R. 2642, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008. Retrieved from <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2008/06/20080630.html>.
- Rosen, L. N., Knudson, K. H., & Fancher, P. (2003). Cohesion and the culture of hypermasculinity in U.S. army units. *Armed Forces & Society*. 29(3). 325-351. Retrieved from <http://afs.sagepub.com/content/29/3/325.full.pdf+html>.
- Rumann, C. B., & Hamrick, F. A. (2009). Supporting student veterans in transition. In R. Ackerman and D. DiRamio (Eds.) *Creating a Veteran-Friendly Campus: Strategies for transition and success* (pp. 25-34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sanford, N. (1966). *Society and self*. New York, NY: Atherton Press.
- Silva, J. M. (2008). A new generation of women?: How female ROTC cadets negotiate the tensions between masculine military culture and traditional femininity. *Special Forces*. 87(2). 937-960.
- Street, A. E., Vogt, D. & Dutra, L. (2009). A new generation of women veterans: Stressors faced by women deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 29. 685-694.
- Stewart, P., & Alexander, D. (2013). Pentagon lifts ban on women in combat. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/24/us-usa-military-women-pentagon-idUSBRE90N0SI20130124>.

*Victoria R. Culver plans to graduate from the Indiana University HESA program in 2014. She received a B.S. in Mathematics and a B.S. in Psychology from Missouri State University. At Indiana University, Bloomington, Victoria works as a Graduate Assistant for Student Programs within the Indiana University Alumni Association and with the Association of College Unions International.*

The Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association © 2013