

The definitive version of this article is published and available online as:  
Woodward R. and Winter, T. Gender and the Limits to Diversity in the Contemporary  
British Army. *Gender, Work and Organization* 2006, 13(1), 45-67.  
<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118574319/abstract>

# Gender and the limits to diversity in the contemporary British Army.

Rachel Woodward and Patricia Winter

Revised paper resubmitted to *Gender, Work and Organization*  
October 2004

**Authors:** Dr Rachel Woodward is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. Dr Patricia Winter is a Lecturer in Film Studies in the School of Arts, Design, Media and Culture at the University of Sunderland, UK.

**Address for correspondence:** Dr Rachel Woodward, SAFRD, Agriculture Building, University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK.

Tel: +44 (0) 191 222 8354 Fax: +44 (0) 191 222 6720 Email: [r.e.woodward@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:r.e.woodward@ncl.ac.uk)

## **Gender and the Limits to Diversity in the Contemporary British Army**

### **Abstract**

This paper considers equal opportunities and diversity management policies in the contemporary British Army. The paper examines these policies for what they indicate not only about policy frameworks for women's military participation, but also for what they tell us about the construction of ideas about gender and difference within that organisation. The paper sets out contextual information on women in the British Army, and describes the research methodology on which this paper is based. It looks at the evolution of equal opportunities policies and the more recent shift towards diversity management policies in the Army, focussing on their contributions towards female equity. The paper examines the consequences of the shift towards the management of diversity, noting how the embrace of ideas of diversity management is ultimately limited by the Army's construction of female difference. It concludes with a discussion of the issues of female and military specificity in relation to the management of diversity.

### **Key words**

Gender, military, diversity, British Army, equal opportunities.

## **Introduction**

The in-house newsletter distributed to equal opportunities advisers in the British Army was adamant;

[...] to our civilian friends Diversity is a new and delicious wine in smart bottles; to us it is a rather fine vintage that we have always had in the cellar but sometimes forget to drink (Army, 2002a, p.2).

In claiming 'diversity' as its own, the newsletter confirmed a conceptual and linguistic shift which had started five years previously, when the Army began talking less about equality of opportunity and more about the management of diversity. This shift, a step change, had been made in good faith by an organisation stung by criticisms about levels of discrimination in its ranks. This shift can be 'read' for its practical implications in terms of personnel management within the Army. But in addition, the military interpretation of diversity management, locating diversity within the traditions of the British Army, tells us much about the construction of ideas about gender and difference within that organisation. In the course of the shift to diversity, many of these ideas have become more visible. It is these constructions of gender and gender-based difference, as developed and sustained in policies on equal opportunities and diversity, which constitute the focus of this paper.

Our core argument is that this shift to the management of diversity in the British Army is ultimately limited in scope and ambition by that organisation's construction of female difference as problematic, and by that organisation's construction of itself as necessarily different as a consequence of its role in the legitimised use of violence. We start by providing some contextual information on our research into gender and gendered difference in the British Army. We go on to look at the evolution of the Army's equal opportunities and diversity management policies, noting the salient features of both as they are applied in a military context. We then examine the consequences of the shift to diversity management, focussing on what a reading of this shift tells us about the construction of gender and female difference within this traditionally masculinist organisation. We conclude with a discussion of the issues of female and military specificity in relation to diversity management.

## **Researching the construction of gender in the British Army**

By April 2004, there were 18,390 women serving across the three Armed Forces – 8.9% of all military personnel (10.5% officers, 8.6% other ranks). Women comprise 7.5% of the regular Army (8,420 in total, 10.4% of officers, 7.0% of other ranks), and of the three Armed Forces has the lowest proportion of women amongst its trained strength (DASA, 2004). In the Army, 70% of

posts are open to women.<sup>1</sup> Posts in the infantry, the Royal Armoured Corps and Household Cavalry, the RAF Regiment and the Royal Marines General Service are closed to women. Across the rest of the British Army, women are unevenly distributed between the different Corps and Arms, with higher proportions in the Royal Logistics Corps, the Adjutant General's Corp, Intelligence and medical services, and much lower proportions in artillery and engineering regiments. This uneven distribution is a direct reflection of the pattern of women's military participation; women have served in health and medical units since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but have only been allowed to serve in artillery and engineering regiments since 1998. The patterns of women's participation in the British Army mirror broader trends in the gendered division of labour in advanced capitalist economies (such as Britain), with a rise in the female proportion of the labour force and the segmentation of that female labour force, with women constituting higher proportions of those employed in service occupations (often of lower socio-economic status) and lower proportions in higher-status, technical and professional positions. As with the Army, the changing position and greater participation of women in the British labour market over time is the direct result of labour market restructuring and changing social relations, which has meant greater demand for women as employees, but uneven distribution across different sectors of the economy (see, for example, Game and Pringle, 1983; Walby, 1986; Brown and Pechman, 1987; Crompton et al, 1996; Crompton, 1997).

Negotiations over gender have marked women's military inclusion and participation at every stage and in every sphere (for overview of history and recent policy developments, see Dandeker and Segal, 1996; Woodward and Winter, 2004). The research on which this paper draws investigated contemporary negotiations within the British Army over gender identities (male and female) specifically in policies aimed at women's military participation.<sup>2</sup> We were particularly interested in the narratives and discourses about gender circulating within Ministry of Defence (MoD) and Army personnel policies, and how they might structure and explain women's military participation. This research was not about women's experiences of Army life, but rather about the wider institutional frameworks and discourses around which those experiences are structured.

---

<sup>1</sup> Women constitute 9.1% of the Naval Service (3,730 in total, 8.2% of Officers and 9.3% of Other Ranks) and 11.7% of the RAF (6,240 in total, 12.4% of officers and 11.5% Other Ranks) (all figures DASA, 2004). 96% of RAF posts and 73% of Royal Navy posts are open to women. This paper concentrates on the British Army and the specificity of the constructions of discourses of gender therein. Where possible, we distinguish between Ministry of Defence statements (which cover all three Armed Forces) and statements made by and solely about the Army. Differences in the imagination and construction of gender between the three Armed Forces are beyond the scope of this paper, but would present an interesting area of investigation in its own right.

<sup>2</sup> We acknowledge funding received under the ESRC and MoD Joint Grant Scheme, R000223562, 'Gendered bodies, personnel policies and the culture of the British Army'. The end-of-award report and other outputs are available via the ESRC's REGARD database. The views expressed in this article are our own.

This research drew on an established theoretical framework which sees gender – what it means in social, political and cultural terms to be male or female – as socially constructed rather than biologically innate. This theoretical framework sees ideas and narratives about gender as constituted and expressed through discourses – systems of concepts which give meaning to entities and activities. These discourses about gender are understood as embodied and corporeal, performed and expressed, time and place-specific, fluid and constantly open to negotiation (Butler, 1993; Connell, 1995; Weedon, 1987; Kimmel et al, 2004). The research was grounded in a theoretical approach which understood the discursive construction of gender as a cultural practice. ‘Army culture’, a blunt term for a complex of practices structuring the ‘way of life’ of that institution, was seen as instrumental in shaping discourses of gender, and their circulation within debates on women’s military participation.

This approach to the study of gender is not unusual within cultural studies or feminist social science, and furthermore there is a growing body of literature which addresses women’s labour market participation and experiences in organisations with explicit reference to issues of embodiment and representation, power and negotiation (see for example Witz, 1992; Halford et al, 1997; McDowell, 1997; Halford and Leonard, 2001). However, within contemporary Anglo-American military sociology, it has been less common to view gender issues as issues of cultural construction and representation. Women’s military participation has been examined, more usually, with reference to women’s experiences of contemporary military life (see for example Herbert, 1998), or via arguments and polemics on the rights and wrongs of women in the military (see for example Elshain, 1987; Steihm, 1989; Gutman, 2000), or via accounts of the institutional incorporation of women (for example, Cnossen, 1994; Segal, 1995; Dandeker and Segal, 1996; Iskra et al, 2002). Analyses which look at gender as a social construction within a military context have started to investigate military masculinities (for a good introduction to this large literature, see essays in Higate, 2003) but there has been less attention to military femininities particularly within the British context (although see Muir, 1993). Most accounts of equal opportunities and diversity policies within armed forces are primarily descriptive, concerning policy frameworks and procedures (see for example Dansby et al, 2001), although see Soeters and van der Meulen (1999) for a discussion of differences in the interpretation of ‘diversity management’ in different national military contexts. This paper is predicated on an understanding that policies and procedures cannot be understood without also considering the cultural and political contexts in which they evolve.

As stated above, the research on which this paper draws was concerned with understanding negotiations over gender identities in the contemporary British Army. We chose to focus on policies affecting women’s military participation as a window onto the development and circulation

of these ideas and narratives about gender, gender difference and female gender identities. The choice of policy as a window was dictated by practicalities. The study was essentially a small, pilot project for a more ambitious ethnographic study. We wanted to explore ideas circulating in military culture, but without at that stage undertaking detailed, participatory or ethnographic fieldwork on the lived experience of soldiering for men and women. Policies on women's participation were chosen because, we would argue, they reflect official government and military positions (and thus discourses) about women's participation, and because they are codified, documented instruments which we knew prior to the research would either be either freely available, or classified as 'unrestricted' and therefore available to us on inquiry. We chose to focus on specific policy instruments and areas which spoke directly about women's participation, these being: Physical Selection Standards (Recruits) (PSS(R) – see Footnote 5); equal opportunities; the expansion of posts open to women; and the prohibition of women in direct combat posts.

To this end, the research methodology rested on two activities. The first was the collection of policy documents in the areas outlined above. Such documents ranged from recruitment literature and advertisements, through to Army training directives, Army general recruiting instructions, and Parliamentary Defence Committee reports and proceedings. The documentation collected was analysed both for its factual content, but also for its discursive content; documents were examined in order to see not only *what* was said, but *how* it was said. We were thus alert to issues of language and presentation. The second activity was to interview relevant individuals within the Army with responsibilities for the development and/or implementation of the policies with which we were concerned. This involved the identification of post-holders and thus named individuals within the Army, followed by semi-structured interviews with these individuals about their responsibilities as post-holders with respect to the policies in question. So, for example, we interviewed representatives of the Employment directorate, individuals responsible for recruitment and training issues, and individuals involved with equal opportunities/diversity training. Interviewees were chosen on the basis of their responsibilities as post-holders, we were not seeking 'representative' views from men and women, or to measure attitudes towards women's military participation. Interviewees included both men (10) and women (3). All but one were officers, ranging from Captain to Colonel. However, without exception, and without prompting from the interviewer, all respondents reflected freely on their own perceptions and experiences of gender relations within the Army, and of themselves as gendered subjects within that institution. All but two of the interviews were taped, transcribed, and then analysed for factual and discursive content. In the interests of protecting the anonymity

of our respondents, direct quotations are only identified by sex and rank.<sup>3</sup> The aim of these two activities was to tease out an understanding about how gender was constructed at a discursive level.

### **From equal opportunities to the management of diversity**

#### *Equal Opportunities policies in the British Army*

The development of an explicit and proactive equal opportunities policy in the British Army has its roots in revelations about high levels of racism in the British Armed Forces, rather than as the result of direct concerns about the treatment of women or the opportunities open to them.<sup>4</sup> Following concerns raised by the Commission for Racial Equality about levels of racism in the Army, an Equal Opportunities Action Plan was launched in October 1997, which set out objectives and mechanisms for monitoring compliance on a range of measures to combat harassment and discrimination on the basis of ethnicity and sex, and to ensure equality of opportunity for all. In a parallel development, the introduction of Physical Selection Standards (Recruits) (PSS(R)) in 1998 provided what the Army termed a 'gender free' model for the assessment of physical capabilities of all recruits.<sup>5</sup> Another significant measure was the announcement in 1997 that from April 1998, the proportion of posts open to women in the Army would be increased from 47% to 70%. Women could now serve in the Royal Artillery, the Royal Engineers and the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers.

---

<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, because of the (understandable) reticence of some of our interviewees about having the transcripts of their interviews circulated beyond the research project, it was agreed with the ESRC Data Archive (Qualidata) that the full dataset would not be deposited following completion of the research.

<sup>4</sup> Much Army policy documentation and practice on equal opportunities and diversity deals with issues relating to minority ethnic personnel as well as to the equal treatment of men and women. We don't deal with experiences of minority ethnic personnel, or with equal opportunities and diversity policies as they affect minority ethnic personnel here; see Dandeker and Mason, 2001, 2003; Zugbach and Ishaq, 2000; Hussain and Ishaq, 2002). Minority ethnic personnel currently (at 2004) constitute 4.9% of the British Armed Forces, a total of 9,320 people who self-identify as a member of a minority ethnic group. Of these, 2.4% are employed in the Naval Service, 6.9% in the Army and 2.5% in the Royal Air Force (DASA, 2004). Dandeker and Mason (2001, 2003) suggest that the objectives of diversity policies for ethnic minorities and for women in the British Army are rather different, with goals of representation (albeit delegative) for ethnic minorities, as opposed to issues of opportunity for women. There are currently no statistics available from the Defence Analytical Services Agency on the number of minority ethnic women currently serving in the British Armed Forces.

<sup>5</sup> PSS(R) tests recruits against a number of tasks (including a run, heaves on a bar, lifting a heavy object) in order to measure aptitude or ability for a particular career employment group. It controls for gender (is 'gender free') in that the tests are taken by both men and women, and performance is judged against job-related criteria, rather than through different pass rates for men and women. PSS(R) has been praised by the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) as a model for other Armed Forces and employers where physical standards are required, and was initiated as a result of sustained lobbying by the EOC on this issue.

These policy frameworks for expanding opportunities for women's participation were accompanied by very explicit public policy statements on equal opportunities. The 1999 Defence White Paper provides a good example of this:

The Armed Forces place the highest priority on equal opportunities. [...] Our aim is to achieve universal acceptance and application of a working environment free from harassment, intimidation and unlawful discrimination in which all have equal opportunity based on merit, consistent with our legal obligations, to realise their potential in contributing to the maintenance and enhancement of operational effectiveness. (MoD, 1999)

The White Paper therefore established equal opportunities in a military context as being about issues ranging from recruitment needs, legal obligations and moral standards, to good management and notions of fairness. These ideas were codified explicitly in the Armed Forces Overarching Personnel Strategy (AFOPS) implemented in 2000 as a direct result of recommendations made in the 1998 Strategic Defence Review (MoD, 2000). During 2000, the Chief of the General Staff's Equal Opportunities Directive was also published, again making an explicit commitment to equality of opportunity for all personnel (CGS, 2000). At this time, equal opportunities training was also introduced, integrated at all levels from Phase 1 Basic (undertaken by all recruits to the ranks) through to Education for Promotion courses and officer training. An Individual Training Directive (ITD(A)10) sets out the Army's policy on equal opportunities for those undergoing basic training:

The Army is fully committed to Equal Opportunities and to providing a working environment free from discrimination and harassment as well as equality of opportunity for all Army personnel within the framework of the law, irrespective of sex, marital status, race, ethnic origin or religious belief. Army policy is crystal clear – discrimination and harassment of any kind is not to be tolerated. (ITD(A)10, pp.10-11).

Pamphlets setting out definitions of equal opportunities and advice on how to respond if harassed or bullied are distributed widely amongst recruits, containing either identical or almost identical wording to the quotation above. These set out a definition of equal opportunities which constructed it as an issue of fairness and freedom from harassment. This definition emphasised that equal opportunities was about an individual's ability to do their job, and about removing barriers which could impact more harshly on some groups of people than others. The leaflet also contains an explicit description of what equal opportunities, in the military view, was not about: 'pretending everyone is the same, giving advantage to certain groups, lowering standards or setting quotas'. These messages are backed up by training delivered at the Joint Equality and Diversity Training Centre (JEDTC) (formerly titled the Tri-Service Equal Opportunities Training Centre (TSEOTC) which provides training for all senior officers (Brigadier and above), and for those delivering training and advice on equal opportunities at unit level.

In summary, these equal opportunities policies are pragmatic, explicit, rigorously codified in policy documentation, and (it would appear) readily implemented because of the pre-existence of a reliable chain of command within the organisation, ensuring the flow (at the level of documentation at least) of information down the command chain.<sup>6</sup> Significantly, they define a direct relationship between equal opportunities policies and combat or operational effectiveness (i.e. the ability of a unit to carry out its assigned mission, role or function):

The Army is to promote an environment which is free from discrimination, harassment and intimidation, in which every individual has an equal opportunity to contribute to operational effectiveness. (GCS, 2000, p.1)

This direct relationship is enshrined by law. The Armed Forces have legal exemption under the 1975 Sex Discrimination Act on the grounds of 'an act done for the purpose of ensuring the combat effectiveness of naval, military or air forces'. In all Army definitions and statements of equal opportunities, therefore, we find statements which make clear this link (MoD, 1998, 1998b, 1999, 2000). Equal opportunities in its Army guise, then, is bounded strictly by the Army's definition of its core mission. Where the provision of opportunities for equity in the employment and treatment of *all* soldiers is perceived by military judgement to be contradictory or incompatible with that core mission, equal opportunities is subsumed under the demands of combat effectiveness.

#### *Towards the management of diversity*

As the policies and procedures for equal opportunities have evolved, so has the language through which they have been expressed. This linguistic shift centring around talk of the management of diversity, reflects directly developments in human resource management. The move to diversity is not ubiquitous, and has tended to be confined to the private sector (see Jackson, 1992; Kandola and Fullerton, 1998), networking organisations and government agencies (Sanglin-Grant, 2003). The Army is not alone as a public sector organisation which has

---

<sup>6</sup> Limits to this commendable policy framework also exist in the practical application of those policies. There is evidently a lag between the institutional response to demands for equity in the Forces and responses in practice. For example, 15% respondents to the Army's 2001 Continuous Attitude Survey, still reported sexual harassment. Furthermore, regular focus groups conducted by the Army reported that women still lacked confidence in the system in place to deal with equal opportunities and complaints of transgression, and saw no improvement (Army, 2002a). Anecdotal evidence and speculation amongst current and former personnel, collected during the course of the research, pointed to the key role of 'opinion-formers' – senior personnel amongst the ranks (Non-Commissioned Officers) – in inducing a cultural change more tolerant of the presence of non-white and non-male soldiers, and to the concerns that change at this level was not happening fast enough. One interviewee talked of how inducing change in the Army with respect to equal opportunities was like 'turning a supertanker'. Resistance to the idea of equal opportunities amongst traditionalists caricatured equal opportunities as 'political correctness'. Speculation was also expressed about whether closer monitoring of harassment and equity in treatment had led to harassment disappearing underground. For Peter Bracken, himself a former Army officer and a critic of the tone and content of much Army equal opportunities policy, the focus on 'upholding standards' places as a consequence a premium on the avoidance of detection for transgression of those standards (Bracken, 2000).

embraced the idea of the management of diversity with enthusiasm (see for example Liff and Dale, 1994; Liff, 1999; Dickens, 1999).

The move to the management of diversity is evident in the language of policy documents such as the 1999 Defence White Paper and in the 2000 AFOPS. Indeed, the AFOPS documentation makes clear its own origins as an Armed Forces response to contemporary diversity policies in the private sector. As part of Defence Mission, the AFOPS explains how 'We must recruit and retain the best people for the job from a diverse society' (MoD, 2000). This linguistic shift was sealed with the renaming of the former Equal Opportunities Action Plan as the Diversity Action Plan (2001-05) in 2001, and an explicit statement therein of the Army's move 'from equal opportunities into diversity'. In accordance with this shift, the term 'diversity' now has currency within Army discussions of equality issues. The newsletter to equal opportunities advisors within units, is named *Equality and Diversity*. The Army's external website uses the two terms together. Army representatives interviewed as part of this research highlighted this shift.

This shift to diversity is conceptual as well as linguistic. According to one Army spokesperson, the use of the term was intentional to mirror civilian trends by talking of the management of diversity, which presupposes the existence of a legal framework for compliance with equal opportunities responsibilities (in accordance with the Army's own legislative position), and which then allows for the management of issues of equity by explicitly recognising differences. This conceptual step was presented to us as evolutionary in this regard, rather than revolutionary. It was presented as being predicated on a recognition that 'women are not the same as men: they are neither better nor worse, they are different' (Army, 1997), and about recognising and working with that difference rather than either providing special treatment for one group or arguing that those differences themselves do not exist.

Army EO policy lists those minorities whom CGS says you must not treat unfairly. Diversity policy says that if you treat all your people fairly and with respect, they will work harder. It recognises differences in people's abilities and needs, but believes that the sum of those abilities improves the performance of teams. That makes it more than worthwhile to work on overcoming individual weaknesses. (Army, 2002a, p.2)

Army statements on the management of diversity are adamant on the difference between equal opportunities, which is presented as the codification of rights and provisions to ensure that minorities are not treated less fairly than the majority, and diversity, which is presented as a managerial strategy to get the best out of everyone, where difference is recognised but used in order to fulfil wider military objectives. This argument fits entirely, of course, with the Army's motto: 'Be the Best.'

EO policy says that some minorities have equal rights i.e. to education, training and jobs etc. Diversity policy would say that notwithstanding those rights, all people have different needs; dealing with these makes the individual more productive. EO policy gives minorities an opportunity to challenge inequality through the courts. Diversity policy is a management ethos which recognises inequality and tackles it wherever it occurs. (Army, 2002a, p.2)

The management of diversity in the Army is not just about recognising difference, however. The management of diversity in the Army, as a human resource management strategy, is presented by the Army as reflecting a number of issues surrounding recruitment, the management of performance, and the standards and values which are taken to reflect the Army's moral core.

In terms of recruitment, and as with equal opportunities, the management of diversity in an Army context is essentially a pragmatic response, not only to wider conceptual shifts in civilian human resource management strategies, but also to wider social trends to which the Army as a recruiting organisation has had to respond. The Army is quite clear that diversity is about

Recruiting more people who meet our standards. Retaining more people with the right qualities, and therefore getting a better return on our investment. (Army, 2002a, p.1)

The management of diversity in this respect is presented as being about attracting a diversity of talent into the Armed Forces, rather than about defining social difference:

The eradication of discrimination, harassment and intimidation, and the provision of genuine equality of opportunity, creates the conditions for the Army to recruit and retain the very best quality of officers and soldiers, and to make the most of their diverse talents and abilities. (CGS, 2000, p.4)

What Dandeker and Mason (1999, 2003) and Dickens (1999) call the 'business case' for diversity is clear in the 1999 Defence White Paper:

The Armed Forces need to recruit, promote and retain the highest quality personnel. They need, therefore, to recruit from the widest pool of talent, which includes personnel of different race, ethnic origin, religion, gender or social background. The Services require a demanding mix of skills and experience; individuals can provide these irrespective of their ethnic background or gender. (MoD, 1999, p.38).

This chimes with observations in the wider diversity management literature, which sees diversity management strategies as essentially a means by which the commercial sector has developed ways of addressing issues of social difference in such a way as to use it for competitive advantage (Prasad, 2001).

In terms of management, as with equal opportunities, the Army's understanding of diversity is again based on pragmatism; diversity management is a managerial tool for maximising the performance of every individual. The shift to diversity management is portrayed as not merely a new initiative, one amongst many, but rather as a deliberate strategy for playing to an individual's strengths whilst developing other (weak) areas.

This requires each person to be managed individually for his or her personal needs. The style of management respects the individual and ensures that they are treated fairly and with dignity. All these "new" ideas should already be covered under good robust leadership and the military ethos. We would therefore like to make the link that diversity is not a marginal policy for women and ethnic minorities, but the translation of the best practices of leadership and the military ethos. (Army, 2002a, p.1)

This construction of a link between a new managerial strategy and traditional military values is significant, because it allows the management of diversity to be incorporated into an Army narrative about its ethos and culture. We have already noted how the shift to the management of diversity from equal opportunities was presented by the Army as an evolutionary step. In accordance with the ideas bound up in that choice of language, the shift has also been presented as a natural one, where the move to diversity is presented as merely eliding new shifts in human resource management practices to established military practice:

[...] if you think of the military ethos, and define what the ethos is, what are the constituent parts of that ethos? You think about commitment, loyalty, respect for others, discipline, self-discipline, a moral integrity and so on, these things sit absolutely within the context of what equality and diversity is all about, which is treating people fairly. (Male Army officer, research interview, 2002).

This military ethos is documented explicitly in a set of publications which clarify the Values and Standards of the British Army (Army, 2002b, c and d). These values and standards are defined as selfless commitment, courage, discipline, integrity, loyalty and respect for others. Documentation setting out Standards of Conduct elaborate on these by making explicit the Service Test (to establish whether an individual's actions have impacted on operational effectiveness); the requirement of personnel to adhere to the law; the establishment of an environment free from discrimination, harassment and bullying; the establishment of appropriate standards of social conduct including avoidance of social misbehaviour, drug misuse, alcohol abuse and irresponsible indebtedness; limits on contact with the media; and proscriptions on other unacceptable behaviour. By wrapping up the respectful treatment of others within a codified set of standards about behaviour, 'demonstrating fair play, by ensuring that everyone is treated with respect', the management of diversity is presented as a reflection of wider Army practice, which in turn is portrayed as providing the conditions under which all members of a team are able to contribute towards the wider objectives of the Army.

### **The consequences of the shift to 'diversity'**

The linguistic and conceptual shift made by the Army from equal opportunities to the management of diversity is one that has been made in good faith; it reflects an assessment by those responsible for equality policies that the shift to diversity is an appropriate and progressive one. That there are political consequences of this shift for the provision of equity for women soldiers should not be taken as a direct criticism of the motivations behind this shift. However, these consequences raise conceptual problems for women's military participation and therefore require consideration.

Discourses of diversity can obscure issues of power and structural inequality in the construction of social difference. For critics, talk of diversity management equates all differences whatever their basis. It removes consideration of the power relations which lie behind the social construction of difference and minimises discussion of the sources of disadvantage (Sinclair 2000; Prasad et al, 1997; Prasad, 2001). Differences are taken as given, with little consideration of their social (i.e. constructed) origins. This is in direct contrast with the discourses of equal opportunities, which aimed to ameliorate the consequences of structural inequalities of social origin, and which demanded intervention. For critics (or cynics), the equation of all differences means that managerial strategies emphasising diversity can be little more than a 'good-looking cover for inaction' (Myers, 1997). A consequence of this is that diversity management may be seen as less overtly political and thus more palatable for many. That diversity management provides a more palatable way of addressing the consequences of social disadvantage is undeniable; as we have seen, the Army's portrayal of the shift to diversity stresses the appeal of diversity to all in contrast to the (supposed) appeal of equal opportunities to the few. The move to diversity is also a way of avoiding the accusations that equity policies had been driven by some sort of 'political correctness', an issue pointed out to us by our interviewees. The problem, however, is that the structural sources of social disadvantage are left unattended. Attention is diverted from the construction of difference through social practice, and towards the management of that difference. The existence of social difference, thus unconsidered and unattended, is then assumed as a given, rather than understood as the outcome of social practice.

The equation of all difference, the (non)consideration of the sources of difference, and the depoliticization of the issue, which are all consequences of the shift from equal opportunities to the management of diversity, has important ramifications for women soldiers. This is because the non-analysis of the sources of difference have allowed an essentialist interpretation of gender difference to hold sway, to occupy discursive space unchallenged. In short, we would argue that the problem lies not with the statements that 'men and women are different', but in the

conceptualisation of the origins and causes of this difference. The Army's construction of gendered difference follows a distinct and alternative logic to that through which other types of social difference based on ethnicity or sexuality are constructed. Sex and gender become conflated.

At first sight, it would appear that the discourse of diversity which circulates around the shifts to the management of diversity acts to minimise or even trivialise differences, with its emphasis on the argument that all are different. By stressing the diversity of all soldiers, there is potential for gender to be downgraded as an axis of difference. There is much that is positive in this conceptualisation of difference for women soldiers, in that this entails potential for their markers of difference – primarily their physical difference – to be sidelined as a point of identification, to the point where they are accepted within the team for what they are as individuals and for what they do as soldiers, rather than for what they represent as women in the Army. The adoption of PSS(R), outlined above, reflects this very point; PSS(R) marks a point in a discourse of diversity where gender difference can be recognised, dealt with, and overcome. In this respect, gender-free physical selection standards are remarkable for the way that gender difference can be downgraded as an axis of difference.

However, there are clear limits to this. Key documents on equal opportunities establish female difference as immutable: 'women are not the same as men'. In fact, gender difference, far from being minimised, is marked out in military discourse as the factor which ultimately limits women's military participation. The exclusion of women from combat positions is the primary site marking this limit. The construction of gender difference is revealing here, for what it says about cultural constructions of gender within the Army. The 2002 statement on *Combat Effectiveness and Gender* stated quite clearly that physical abilities (or otherwise) were not the primary motivation for the continued exclusion of women from direct combat positions – some women would be anticipated to pass the physical selection tests for infantry posts, albeit a tiny 1% proportion. The issue of physical ability was not in question. Rather, the 2002 statement made clear that women would continue to be excluded because of assumptions about their qualities *as women*. Their gender difference was immutable in this respect.

The argument went as follows. Success in direct combat actions rested not only on the fighting abilities of the unit under conditions of extreme hardship, but crucially on the cohesion of that unit.

The key point is that in battle, each individual in a team, while under extreme pressure including pervasive uncertainty and imminent fear of death, must summon up the continuing determination to go forward with an absolute focus and impose their will on the enemy. They must then go on to do so again and again over a period of days or even

weeks. Even the smallest failure at this level can affect adjoining teams and thus spread to threaten the objectives of the larger unit. We have no way of knowing whether mixed gender teams can develop the bonds of unconditional trust, loyalty and mutual support that must be strong enough to survive the test of close combat. Nor can we tell what will be the impact of the other members of a team if a member of the opposite sex is killed or maimed. Moreover, there is no way of testing to find out, since no conceivable trial could simulate the full effects of close combat' (MoD, nd, npn)

The exclusion is not because of anything that they may or may not *do*, physically or morally, to the unit to disrupt the discipline of that unit:

Women are excluded from ground combat not because of the impact on discipline, but primarily because of the risks to the cohesion of small teams under the extreme and violent conditions of close combat. (MoD, 2002).

Our reading of these explanations is that they rest on essentialist arguments about women, which interpret female difference as disruptive to cohesion by their very presence. Women and men, according to this argument, are indeed different; by being non-men, women are intrinsically disruptive to unit cohesion.

This understanding of female difference contrasts markedly with Army perceptions of other kinds of difference based on sexuality or ethnicity, which are constructed as social in origin and thus ultimately surmountable by the fighting unit. Arguments which had long been promoted by the Army to maintain the exclusion of (out) gay men from direct combat units had rested on the same argument about the incompatibility of non-heterosexuals within the unit because of perceptions of the disruptiveness of such difference to the unity of the team. The lifting of the ban on gay men and lesbians in the Armed Forces, forced by a ruling from the European Court of Human Rights in January 2000, removed that argument and resulted in the establishment of a Code of Conduct for Forces personnel which replaced the blanket exclusion with the Service Test (outlined above). Non-visible social difference is thus no longer a problem to unit cohesion. Visible social differences, primarily those constructed around skin colour, have also been rendered a non-issue by diversity and equal opportunities policies.<sup>7</sup> Gender difference, in contrast to other types of differences, is constructed as essential rather than social in origin. Diversity strategies, constructed as the valuing of individual difference because of what that understanding can bring to the performance of the team, are not incompatible *per se* with unit cohesion:

---

<sup>7</sup> As Dansby et al (2001) note, with respect to the exclusion of African American personnel from US Army combat units, similar arguments about the supposed incompatibility of African American soldiers in (otherwise white) combat units were overturned on the grounds that such exclusions were essentially racist, and unit cohesion and combat effectiveness were in no way affected by visible social differences based on skin colour. This is not to say that racism isn't a problem still in the US military or British Armed Forces, but rather to emphasise that policy now makes explicit statements against racism.

[...] given that working in the appalling operating environment that we're called upon to operate in, people hang together through that mutual trust and respect which emanates from valuing people in themselves and understanding them (Male Army officer, research interview, 2002).

However, it would appear that there are limits to this acceptance of diversity. Some differences can be overcome:

[...] diversity is about recognising that people are different, but that good management can help them to reach their full potential, making them more useful members of their own team (Army, 2002a, p.2)

Gender difference, defined as essential rather than social, does not come into this category. To return to the point made above, the shift to diversity turns attention towards the management of difference (in this case, management by non-inclusion in direct combat units) rather than consideration of the conceptualisation of that difference (i.e. the origins of the perceptions of men and women as different, and the consequences of that).

We would not suggest that the experience of incorporation of other types of difference has necessarily been straightforward. One could argue, as Dandeker and Mason do, that all types of difference which deviate from a white, male, heterosexual norm are in some way problematic to the Army because of the problems such differences throw up for certain culturally-defined military values:

Discipline, authority and conformity are central to the social integration of military units and organisations. They are key aspects of the notions of comradeship and esprit de corps that are core components of military self-image and organisation. These characteristics of military organisations tend, in principle, to give rise to problems when confronted with *difference* – a fact that may help to explain some of the difficulties they have encountered with the integration of female, gay and related 'others'. (Dandeker and Mason, 2003, p.14)

Although we would not disagree with this observation as such, we would emphasise the point that the Army's conceptualisation of difference sees some differences as more fundamental and immutable than others; female difference would be a case in point:

[...] at the end of the day, we know that a bloke's a bloke and a woman's and woman and actually there's a much greater difference between men and women [...] than there is between somebody who's white and somebody who's black. (Male Army officer, research interview, 2002)

The limits to women's military participation on the grounds of their gender difference are seen most starkly in the debate over the exclusion of women from direct combat positions. However, it

would be incorrect to see the combat exclusion debate as the sole site for the construction of female difference – and the rendering of that difference as problematic – within the Army. Arguably, the construction of female difference as inherently problematic permeates right across Army culture. This, understandably, is a contentious statement. Yet it would appear to us that an understanding of gender difference as first, immutable, and second, as problematic shapes at the very least the form and function of diversity and equal opportunities policies, and more widely the experience of the majority of women personnel. One (male) interviewee for this research termed the Army ‘institutionally sexist’ in this regard. Others were less direct in their observations, but many pointed to elements of this. One woman officer talked of how female physicality was interpreted as a deviation from a male norm, with breasts discussed as ‘appendages’. Another woman NCO talked of problems faced by women as a result of stride length, with women’s participation constructed as problematic because of their greater propensity for pelvic fractures induced because of their physical inability to conform to (male) stride lengths. Anxieties about menstruation (‘hygiene’), particularly during field exercises, were also common amongst (male) interviewees. On many counts, female difference was constructed as problematic where it worked against conformity to a uniform (male) ideal. In short, we would speculate (and would concur with Dandeker and Mason’s observations (2001) on this) that where women can be either made like or represented as being like men, that difference can be accommodated. Where female difference is understood as significant in its deviation from a male norm, it is constructed as problematic.

### **Concluding observations on female and military specificity**

We turn now to discuss some implications of these conclusions. To restate the central problematic of this paper, what discourses of gender circulate within policy debates and strategies aimed at women’s military participation, and what are the wider consequences of these conceptualisations of gender? We limit our observations to two issues; the first concerns the management of diversity through the development of strategies which allow for new military roles for women. The second concerns the location of conceptualisations of male and female difference within military arguments about its rights and requirements to be different itself from other public sector organisations, on account of its role in the use of controlled, legitimised violence.

One consequence of current diversity strategies, in combination with the Army’s status with regard to equal opportunities legislation, is that it allows for women’s military participation, but within defined limits. Critics of the combat exclusion faced by women, Britain’s Equal Opportunities Commission amongst them, argue that full participation of women across the whole

Armed Forces is necessary and desirable, for reasons of equity and citizenship and in accordance with the spirit of equal opportunities and diversity strategies (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998). The Ministry of Defence and Army remain opposed to this position, but, faced with the logic of diversity policies, with their emphasis on the potential that difference offers as a resource to organisations (see de los Reyes, 2000), and faced with the logic of accommodating female difference defined in opposition to a male norm, have been prompted to consider what military roles the Army requires women to undertake. These debates are currently on-going within the Ministry of Defence at a senior policy level. We can speculate about their content by looking both at recent military engagements where the deployment of women soldiers has been highlighted, and by looking at public portrayals of women soldiers through advertising. One such advertisement, 'Torchlight', denoted as 'ground-breaking' and 'hard-hitting' by one of our interviewees, placed emphasis on women's potential contribution to peace-keeping and associated roles, often denoted by the military abbreviation 'MOOTW' (Military Operations Other Than War'). This television advertisement uses point-of-view shots from the perspective of a soldier, entering a disorderly room to find a woman cowering over her crying baby. 'The last thing she wants to see is another soldier...' intones the voice-over, connoting that the woman has been raped. A female voice is heard, saying 'you're alright now', the voice-over interjects '...but not all soldiers are men', and the point-of-view occupied by the viewer/soldier is revealed to have been that of a female, rather than of a male soldier. This is an extremely clever advertisement, in that it includes women in the category of soldier by re-defining soldiering in terms of non-combat MOOTW roles, with the implied pre-requisite for inter-personal and empathetic skills.

There is also the argument, extending this logic, that the very nature of modern warfare, involving asymmetric or virtual engagement and a supposed 'revolution in military affairs'<sup>8</sup> as well as the extension of MOOTW, involves a re-think of women's military roles, not on the basis of their (supposed) aptitudes for emotional work, but on the basis of re-thinking more traditional or conservative notions about women's (non- or limited) military participation (Kennedy-Pipe, 2000). This re-thinking of women's traditional roles involves a quite fundamental reconceptualisation of the character of military organisations based on a shift from essentialist (biologically determinist) constructions of female difference, and moving instead towards a conceptualisation of gender understood as culturally constituted. That this is a contentious issue can be seen by the resistance of many senior military figures, on the record, to the idea of women as potential infantry personnel.<sup>9</sup> Such arguments are based not only on essentialist notions of women's

---

<sup>8</sup> The term 'Revolution in Military Affairs' is usually taken to mean the application of advanced information and communication technologies in the conduct of warfare. Kaldor (1999) argues against this, viewing the revolution in military affairs as that of a revolution in the social relations of warfare, not of technology. Either interpretation has implications for gender relations in the Armed Forces.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example the comments of General The Lord Guthrie, former Chief of Defence Staff, that 'the battlefield is no place for a woman', in public statements following his retirement.

(in)abilities in combat, but also, we would argue, because of the degree of symbolic violence caused by the figure of the woman soldier to the military concept of masculinity and the integrity of the idea of the soldier as male.<sup>10</sup> Ultimately, despite the policies and practices of equal opportunities and diversity management, the presence of women is fundamentally challenging at a cultural / symbolic level. The Army is historically and conventionally a masculinist organisation, wherein its main activity – soldiering and all that that entails – is defined in terms of its masculinities and in opposition to women and the feminine. The policy shifts at a practical or conceptual level which we describe are all limited, in that they are ultimately played out in the context of a wider culture resistant to the inclusion of women. As Dandeker and Mason (2001, 2003) point out, embracing difference, for the Armed Forces, ultimately requires a fundamental reconceptualisation of the very character of military organisations. They argue, with respect to the military participation of ethnic minorities, that responsibility for initiating such shifts does not lie solely with the Army, but is part of a wider requirement for changes within the contemporary imagination of British national identity and citizenship. We would argue that in the case of women's military participation, whilst British civil society may be more sympathetic to the idea of women's full equality of opportunity within the Armed Forces, this more progressive view has yet to be fully shared across the Armed Forces at present. Cultural resistance to change within the Armed Forces has and will limit women's military participation. Furthermore, we should be under no illusions as to how difficult it might be for the Armed Forces to induce cultural change within that organisation. The experiences of the Australian Defence Force (Cheeseman, 1998) and the US military (Bodnar, 1999) indicate the problems involved, and the time taken to change an organisational culture on the US military. Finally, and to return to the management of diversity for a moment, this would appear to confirm the arguments of critics of diversity strategies who see bound up in these discourses an implicit resistance to the idea of the workplace as a site for the production of social change (Prasad, 2001; see also Humphries and Grice, 1995).

Our second observation, which is entirely speculative, concerns the parallels or symmetries between the Army's arguments about male and female difference, and its arguments about its own difference and distinction from other public sector organisations. As we have already said, the Army's diversity management and equal opportunities policies are predicated on an argument which recognises difference in principle, but which in practice sees some differences as incompatible with the military role, hence the exclusion of women from direct combat positions. This line of argument is not unique to the Armed Forces; the negative valuation of diversity can

---

<sup>10</sup> This observation has long history in feminist and pro-feminist scholarship on gender, war and military forces; see e.g. Elshtain 1987, Enloe 1988, Stiehm 1989. This position is maintained both by liberal feminism and feminist anti-militarism, although these positions differ in the causal power they attribute to sex/gender in forging the gender/militarism nexus (see Feinman, 2000). The idea of women as a disorderly or disruptive force within an organisation is not confined to the military – see for example Thornton (1998) on women in the legal profession.

also be considered an economically rational strategy by private sector organisations (de los Reyes, 2000). What is unique to the Armed Forces, of course, is the fact that this exclusion rests ultimately on its justifications of its rights and needs to be different, on account of its role in the use of organised violence on behalf of the state; the Armed Forces' exemption from the UK's sex discrimination legislation is phrased in precisely these terms. The limits to diversity are there on account of the Armed Forces' military role:

[...] these policies are about getting the best out of our teams and about valuing difference, up to a certain point of course, because clearly we are about delivering operational capability and we can't allow everyone to ... indulge themselves to the detriment of the team. (Male Army officer, research interview, 2002)

These limits to diversity are fundamental, and in turn are part of a wider set of rights which are *necessarily* limited by the military (i.e. war-fighting) role. According to the 1999 Defence White Paper,

We must ... strike a balance between the requirements of the Armed Forces derived from the operational demands placed upon them, and the rights and freedoms to which Service personnel are entitled as members of society.' (MoD, 1999, p.35).

The use of the balance metaphor in such arguments is always interesting, as it implies the *possibility* of balance, of moderate course or compromise, even if the entities being balanced exist in fundamentally different moral spheres. The Commanders' guide to Values and Standards of the British Army (Army, 2002c) elaborates on this question of balance between military requirements and civilian values. It argues that the Army cannot remain immune from social changes, such as waning deference to authority, greater awareness of individual rights and what it sees as a reduction in the sharing of traditional values.

...its start point should be to reflect the values of the society it serves, varying from these only where it is necessary to do so by virtue of its function and responsibility.

Those functions and responsibilities are, of course, the state-sanctioned use of lethal force. The Army's responsibilities – its operational requirements – require the Army to place the emphasis that it does on values and standards. However, these may be at odds with wider civilian practice:

[...] the British Army is not a citizen army, and therefore it does not directly reflect national society like a citizen or conscript army. It concentrates rather on military effectiveness, but must understand the society on whose behalf it goes to war. (Army, 2002c).

This need to be different relative to civil society on account of the military's war-fighting role is quite fundamental to the Army's arguments on diversity and equality of opportunity. Our point here are not to question at this point the specificity of the military's war-fighting role, but to speculate on how its perception of its own difference shapes its perception of female difference.

**Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the representatives of the British Army who provided documentation and agreed to be interviewed for this research. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> international Gender, work and Organization conference, University of Keele, 25-27 June 2003; many helpful comments were made by participants.

## Bibliography

- Army (1997) *Guidance for the Employment of Women in the Army*. British Army document, D/DM(A)/76/04, dated 3 November 1997.
- Army (2002a) *Equality and Diversity: Newsletter for Equal Opportunities Advisors*. Winter 2002. Shrivenham: TSEOTC.
- Army (2002b) *The Values and Standards of the British Army: A Guide for Soldiers*. British Army document.
- Army (2002c) *Values and Standards: A Guide for Commanders*. British Army document.
- Army (2002d) *Soldiering: The Military Covenant: Army Doctrine Publication Volume 5*. British Army document.
- Bodnar, J. (1999) How long does it take to change a culture? Integration at the US Naval Academy. *Armed Forces and Society* 25,2, 289-306.
- Bracken, P. (2000) Women in the Army. In Strachan, H. (Ed.) *The British Army: Manpower and Society into the Twenty-First Century*. London: Frank Cass, 105-118.
- Brown, C. and Pechman, J. (Eds.) (1987) *Gender in the Workplace*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. London: Routledge.
- CGS: Chief of the General Staff (2000) *Equal Opportunities Directive for the Army 2000*. British Army document.
- Cheeseman, G. (1998) *Submission to an Inquiry into Sexual Harassment at the Australian Defence Force Academy*. Research paper, School of Politics, Australian Defence Force Academy.
- Cnossen, C. (1994) *Token or Full Member of the Team? An Examination of the Utilization and Status of Women in Combat Arms Positions in the Armed Forces of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America*. PhD thesis, University of Hull, UK.
- Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Crompton, R. (1997) *Women and Work in Modern Britain*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Crompton, R., Gallie, D. and Purcell, K. (Eds.) (1996) *Changing Forms of Employment: Organizations, Skills and Gender*. London: Routledge.
- Dandeker, C. and Mason, D. (1999) *Diversity in the British Armed Forces: The Debate over Ethnic Minority Representation*. Paper presented to the conference on 'Redefining Society-Military Relations: From Vancouver to Vladivostok', University of Birmingham, 16-18 April 1999.
- Dandeker, C. and Mason, D. (2001) The British armed services and the participation of minority ethnic communities: from equal opportunities to diversity? *The Sociological Review* 49, 2, 219-235.

- Dandeker, C. and Mason, D. (2003) Diversifying the Uniform: The participation of Minority Ethnic Personnel in the British Armed Services. *Armed Forces and Society* 29, 4, 481-507.
- Dandeker, C. and Segal, M. Wechsler (1996) Gender integration in the armed forces: recent policy developments in the United Kingdom. *Armed Forces and Society* 23, 1, 29-47.
- Dansby, M.R., Steward, J.B., and Webb, S.C. (2001) Introduction to Part 3: Gender Integration and Sexual Harassment. in *Managing Diversity in the Military*. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- DASA: Defence Analytical Services Agency (2004) *UK Defence Statistics Pocket Cards 2004*. London: The Stationery Office. Available on-line via <www.dasa.mod.uk>.
- Dickens, L. (1999) Beyond the business case: a three-pronged approach to equality action. *Human Resource Management Journal* 9, 1, 9-19.
- Elshtain, J.B. (1987) *Women and War*. New York: Basic Books.
- Enloe, C. (1988) *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives*. London: Pandora Press.
- Equal Opportunities Commission (1998) *Equality in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A New Sex Equality Law for Britain*. Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Feinman, I. (2000) *Citizenship Rites: Feminist Soldiers and Feminist Antimilitarists*. New York : New York University Press.
- Game, A. and Pringle, R. (1983) *Gender at Work*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Gutman, S. (2000) *A Kinder, Gentler Military: Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?* New York: Scriber.
- Halford, S. and Leonard, P. (2001) *Gender, Power and Organizations*. London: Macmillan.
- Halford, S., Savage, M. and Witz, A. (1997) *Gender, Careers and Organizations: Current Developments in Banking, Nursing and Local Government*. London: Macmillan.
- Herbert, M. (1998) *Camouflage isn't only for Combat*. New York: New York University Press.
- Higate, P. (2003) (ed.) *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State*. Westport CT: Praeger.
- Humphries, M. and Grice, S. (1995) Equal employment opportunity and the management of diversity: A global discourse of assimilation? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 8, 5, 17-32.
- Hussain, A. and Ishaq, M. (2002) British Pakistani Muslims' perceptions of the Armed Forces. *Armed Forces & Society* 28, 4, 601-618.
- Iskra, D., Trainor, S., Leithauser, M. and Segal, M. Wechsler (2002) Women's participation in Armed Forces Cross-Nationally: Expanding Segal's Model. *Current Sociology* 50, 5, 771-797.
- ITD(A) 10 *Individual Training Directive (Army) 10: Equal Opportunities*. Army training directive.
- Jackson, S.E. (ed.) (1992) *Diversity in the Workplace: Human Resources Initiatives*. New York: The Guildford Press.

- Kaldor, M. (1999) *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Policy Press.
- Kandola, R. and Fullerton, J. (1998) *Diversity in Action: Managing the Mosaic*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development, Second Edition.
- Kennedy-Pipe, C. (2000) Women and the Military. *Journal of Strategic Studies* 23, 4, 32-50.
- Kimmel, M., Hearn, J. and Connell, R.W. (2004) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Liff, S. (1999) Diversity and equal opportunities: room for constructive compromise. *Human Resource Management Journal* 9, 1, 65-74.
- Liff, S. and Dale, K. (1994) Formal opportunity, informal barriers: black women managers within a local authority. *Work, Employment and Society* 8, 2, 177-198.
- McDowell, L. (1997) *Capital Culture: Gender at Work in the City*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MoD: Ministry of Defence (1998a) *The Strategic Defence Review: Modern Forces for the Modern World*. Cm 3999. London: The Stationery Office.
- MoD: Ministry of Defence (1998b) *The Strategic Defence Review: Supporting Essays: Essay 9*. London: The Stationery Office.
- MoD: Ministry of Defence (1999) *The Defence White Paper 1999* Cm 4446. London: The Stationery Office.
- MoD: Ministry of Defence (2000) *The Armed Forces Overarching Personnel Strategy*. London: The Stationery Office.
- MoD: Ministry of Defence (no date) *The Wider Employment of Women in Ground Combat*. Unpublished MoD document, c.2001.
- MoD: Ministry of Defence (2002) *Women in the Armed Forces: A Report by the Employment of Women in the Armed Forces Steering Group*. London: Ministry of Defence.
- Muir, K. (1993) *Arms and the Woman*. London: Coronet.
- Myers, S.L. (1997) Why diversity is a smokescreen for affirmative action. *Change* 29, July/August, 24-32.
- Prasad, A. (2001) Understanding workplace empowerment as inclusion: A historical investigation of the discourse of difference in the United States. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* 37, 1, 51-69.
- Prasad, P., Mills, A., Elmes, M. and Prasad, A. (Eds.) (1997) *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*. Sage, London.
- de los Reyes, P. (2000) Diversity at work: paradoxes, possibilities and problems in the Swedish discourse on diversity. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 21, 253-266.
- Sanglin-Grant, S. (2003) *Divided by the Same Language? Equal Opportunities and Diversity Translated*. London: Runnymede Trust.

- Segal, M. Wechsler (1995) Women's military roles cross-nationally: past, present and future. *Gender and Society* 9, 6, 757-775.
- Sinclair, A. (2000) Women within diversity: risks and possibilities. *Women in Management Review* 15, 5/6, 237-245.
- Soeters, J. and van der Meulen, J. (1999) (eds) *Managing Diversity in the Armed Forces: Experiences from Nine Countries*. Tilberg: Tilberg University Press.
- Stiehm, J. Hicks (1989) *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Thornton, M. (1998) Authority and corporeality: the conundrum for women in law. *Feminist Legal Studies* 6, 2, 147-170.
- Walby, S. (1986) *Patriarchy at Work: Patriarchal and Capitalist Relations in Employment*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Weedon, C. (1987) *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Witz, A. (1992) *Professions and Patriarchy*. London: Routledge.
- Woodward, R. and Winter, P. (2004) Discourses of gender in the contemporary British Army. *Armed Forces and Society*. 30, 2, 279-302.
- Zugbach, R. von, and Ishaq, M. (2000) Managing race relations in the British Army. *Defence Analysis* 16, 2, 185-203.