2018

An Autoethnographic Examination of Personal and Organizational Transformation in the U.S. Military

Marjon K. John
Walden University

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Marjon K. John

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Joseph Barbeau, Committee Chairperson,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Barbara Turner, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Karla Phlypo, University Reviewer
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2018

Abstract

An Autoethnographic Examination of Personal and Organizational Transformation in the

U.S. Military

by

Marjon K. John

MS, American University, 1982

BS, American University, 1980

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Administration and Management Doctoral Studies

Walden University

November 2018

Abstract

Large-scale transformational change, such as the integration and acceptance of gays in the U.S. military, necessitates a long-term effort by management to mitigate unanticipated consequences. Suboptimal implementation may not account for damaging consequences among individuals expected to live the change. The purpose of this autoethnographic study was to examine the individual experiences of a closeted gay personnel member living through a transformational change in identity, which paralleled an organizational change in the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). The conceptual framework included elements of general systems theory, Kotter's theory of change management, Ostroff's change management for government, and Maslow's self-actualization theory. Data collection included logs, notes, journals, field notes, and recollections of experiences, conversations, and events connecting the autobiographical story to organizational change. Data were coded and analyzed to identify themes. Data analysis entailed triangularization using the largest DoD survey of that time, and public records of military personnel who participated in lawsuits against the DoD or opined about the policy. While the organization was transforming to allow openly gay individuals to remain in the military, findings showed that nearly half of those who offered opinions predicted that openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused. Findings showed the process of transformational change allowed those impacted to make their own sense of the change, and knowing whether someone was gay mattered. Findings may be used by sexual minorities and other subgroups to engage in sensemaking activities to promote transformational change initiatives.

An Autoethnographic Examination of Personal and Organizational Transformation in the

U.S. Military

by

Marjon K. John

MS, American University, 1982

BS, American University, 1980

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Administration and Management Doctoral Studies

Walden University

November 2018

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my partner [her name is withheld to protect her identity] whose support, love, care and encouragement gave me the space and time I needed to complete this work. This work could not have been possible without the transformational change brought about by the most important man in my life, my son [his name is withheld to protect his identity]. His existence revolutionized my life and I owe much of my maturity to the life-altering changes he ushered into my life by simply being the amazing child that he was, and the outstanding man he has become.

Acknowledgments

This long journey began with the care and guidance of my previous dissertation chair, Dr. John Nirenberg who left Walden University in 2016, but deserves my heartfelt appreciation and acknowledgement. The patience and dedication of my current dissertation chair Dr. Joseph Barbeau are gratefully acknowledged, and his support has led to the successful completion of this work. The heartwarming encouragements from my dissertation committee member Dr. Turner cannot go unacknowledged, nor the inspirational words of Dr. Phlypo. It is not possible to acknowledge all who helped me get through this journey, but I save a place of honor for each in my heart and mind.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

During the period 2008 to 2011, the Department of Defense (DoD) experienced

the beginning of a transformational change that was unexpected and difficult due to

competing moral sensitivities (Belkin, 2011; Belkin et al., 2012). Openly homosexual

men and women were not allowed to serve in the military in 2008, and were discharged if

discovered displaying behaviors that indicated their sexual orientation. After 2011, with

the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) policy, homosexuals serving in the

military were granted certain civil rights (Belkin, 2011). The DADT provision for

homosexuals' removal from the service ended. In 2015, the Supreme Court ruled that

gays have the right to marriage (Supreme Court of The U.S., 2015). These events led to

the ongoing transformation of the DoD to more fully reflect the diversity of U.S. culture

and to accept gays as equal members of the service (Bronski, 2011).

In that period, while being a contractor serving the DoD, I personally experienced

a similar transformation. My journey was from the steadfast disapproval of gays to

becoming an openly gay person myself. The timing enabled me to explore the

fundamental change at personal and organizational levels to shed light on the process of

adaptation. These dual transformations occurred contemporaneously and gave rise to an

urge to make sense of how this dramatic change was experienced on personal and

organizational level. This was an opportunity to understand and accommodate these

changes and gain insights that could be useful for organizational change makers. This

dissertation was an autoethnographic study to accomplish this purpose.

In the summer of 2008, I was disoriented because I could not figure out who or

what sort of person I could be sexually attracted to, even though I had once thought of

myself as heterosexual (straight). I had assumed for decades that I was straight, and my son's birth had confirmed that I was. When I fell in love with a woman, I was forced to confront my sexual identity. I had genuinely and deeply fallen in love, but when that relationship ended, I became even more disoriented. By the end of summer of 2008, as I was preparing to go to Europe on a job assignment, I had no idea that I would be observing a huge organization with over two million employees grapple with issues related to the standing of homosexuals within its ranks, and that I would answer some of my own personal questions in the process, while also addressing important lessons in management. This study is an account of a personal transformation that paralleled the organizational transformation of the military in a time of war.

Background of the Study

The National Opinion Research Center has been publishing a survey since 1972 called the General Social Survey (Rossi, Wright, & Anderson, 2010). Keleher and Smith (2012) examined the results of a question in the General Social Survey on individuals' attitude toward sexual relations between two adults of the same sex, and concluded that for nearly two decades from 1973 through 1991 (the period prior to enactment of DADT policy by the DoD), 70-78% of the U.S. public thought that sexual relations between same-sex adults was always wrong. By 2004, that number had declined to 57% (Keleher & Smith, 2012).

In 2008, as U.S. attitudes toward same-sex adults evolved, I was undergoing my own internal transformation to recognize my emerging gay nature, a period I called my chrysalis phase. Meanwhile presidential candidates Obama and Clinton were discussing the transformation of the DoD and the repeal of the DADT policy (*New York Times*,

2007). By the end of 2008, I was living overseas and working on military bases. This provided an opportunity to connect with a cross section of DoD personnel and observe insiders' reactions toward the transformation. It also seemed fortuitous that my internal questions related to being gay had some parallels to the larger DoD organization's internal reflections on gay issues, especially the controversial DADT policy.

As organizations attempt to transform and adapt to changing social circumstances, making sense of what is occurring and what the future will look like can be difficult at every level (Adler & Gundersen, 2008; Bersin, Geller, Wakefield & Walsh, 2016; Miner, 2015). Frustrations can ensue and impede the effectiveness of the change, even the will for the transformation (Alversson, 2011; French, Bell & Zawacki, 2004). Observing a major organizational change from the inside is uniquely informative, and was the challenge I focused on because I was motivated on a personal level.

I was an insider in the DoD before, during, and after the repeal of the DADT policy, which had been called homophobic (Herek, 2006, Schilts, 1987, 1993). As the organization attempted to transform and adapt to changing circumstances, sensemaking (Weick, 1995) of what was happening inside military services was difficult. Top-down organizations such as the Department of Defense often make decisions without input from the lower ranks, leaving insiders little else but to attend to rumors, guess about what will happen, and brace for what might stimulate resistance (Allsep, Levy & Parco, 2011; Alversson, 2011; Hartwood, 2015;). In this transformation, insiders were confused and could not see what the future looked like, or how to anticipate whether internal frictions would get resolved (Morton, 2009). From a change management perspective, change agents did not seem prepared for unanticipated reactions and provided little attention to

the needs of personnel during the period of transformation (Hartwood, 2015; Alversson, 2011; Belkin, 2011).

Previous DoD transformations, such as racial integration ordered by President Truman after WWII (Katz, 1992), or participation of women in the military, also initiated by presidential orders (Burrelli, 2012), had resulted in the choice of new military careers of many individuals previously denied the opportunity, but decades after these initial transformative orders, the organization still struggled with bias and mistreatment (Belkin, 2011). Evidence can be found in the sexual assaults of women in the ranks (Rock, Van Winkle, Mamrow & Hurley, 2014), or prejudicial barriers to African American and female promotion in military branches (Dinnen, 2015; Eager, 2016; Schaefer, A. G., et al., 2015). The problems in these previous DoD transformations had been that many of the circumstances went uncorrected, yielding resistance and pushback against change, and afterward friction and tensions ensued and persisted (Schaefer et al., 2015). Organizational transformations that seemed destined to effect the intended social changes in the DoD were inadequately managed, as evidenced by the widespread resistance to the transformations resulting in stalled or disappointing transformation (Dinnen, 2015; Dinnunzio, 2017; Evans, 2013; MacGregor, 1980). Prior to the repeal of DADT, it may have been expected that its elimination would usher positive change in the military, but in the military bases where I worked no active steps seemed underway to change circumstances for people who had to live the change. This study conducted a deeper examination of those circumstances at the time of the transformational changes.

Problem Statement

Large scale transformational change, such as the integration and acceptance of gays into the military, necessitates a long-term effort by management that is likely to stimulate unanticipated consequences, discomfort, or conflicts, which are predictable problems of large-scale transformational changes (Bersin, et al., 2016; Cameron & Green, 2015; Cummings & Worley, 2005; French, et al., 2004; Kotter, 1995; Miner, 2015). A more specific problem of integration of gays into the military is the magnitude of interpersonal reactions and unpredictability of people's willingness to cooperate in the change effort, as historical records of integrating African Americans and women into the military demonstrated (Belkin et al., 2012; Burk & Espinoza, 2012; Coll, Weiss, & Metal, 2013; Dinnen, 2015; Losey, 2014). The problem I wished to address was the suboptimal implementation of a formal transformational change driven by top management that did not account for the personal variation and potentially damaging unintended consequences among individuals expected to live the change.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this autoethnographic study was to illustrate insights learned through my experience of living through a transformational change in my identity, which paralleled an organizational change in the DoD, as a way of informing change makers about the nature of the dynamic personal circumstances, which they need to account for to increase the likelihood of success of their change efforts.

Research Questions

As personnel inside an organization try to make sense of changes at the same time the organization adapts to changing societal circumstances, there are lessons to be learned

about managing the change process from insights gleaned from personal experience as well as the historical record of previous responses to societal change (Hartwood, 2015; Minor, 2015; Weick, 2017). Given the significance of employee engagement and constructive employee reactions in implementating organizational change (Cameron & Green, 2015; Hart, 2016; Kotter, 1995), the general research question addressed considerations of the transformational change management process, focusing on how a large system adjusts to transformation while individuals are simultaneously experiencing personal transformations. Two research questions were used to guide the study:

1. How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change?

2. What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework grounding this study was fourfold. General systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968) was used to represent the DoD as a system of systems, and to explore the ramifications of transformation change in one corner of that organization. Kotter's (1995) theory of change management and Ostroff's (2015) change management for government were used to understand the dynamics of planned organizational transformation, while Maslow's (1970) concept of self actualization was used to address my personal transformation. As people inside an organization face change, the recounting of individual insights about the change, combined with understandings and observations about those external changes, shed light on the sensemaking that insiders undergo (Byrd,

2014; Cameron & Green, 2015; Weick, 2017). In this study, the conceptual framework provided the lens to view organizational change taking place contemporaneously with personal change, along with sensemaking in an autoethnographic qualitative study (Chang, 2008).

Central to the use of general systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968, 1981; Sayles & Chandler, 1971) was the conceptualization of the DoD as a a system of systems composed of subparts connected by a web of relationships and missions. U.S. European Command (EUCOM), where an important part of this study took place, was one of those subparts. Because the DoD was not a business enterprise like those addressed by Kotter's (1995) change management theory, I added Ostroff's (2015) framework to address the DoD's public service mission. Unlike for-profit private enterprises, the DoD has a public service mission to improve national defense (DoD, 2015). Safeguarding the public against varied external threats, the DoD has thousands of stakeholders and numerous bureaucratic controls on personnel pay, promotion, diversity, hiring, and firing (DoD, 2016). Therefore, I used the two change management frameworks against the backdrop of systems theory as my conceptual framework for the organizational change.

Because the autoethnographic methodology focuses on personal and internal factors integrated with external and environmental factors, Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs provided the psychological framework to understand my personal transformation inside the larger organizational change. I saw high risk of pain and loss in trying to understand my sexual identity, but I also experienced the genuine need to self-actualize and attain what Maslow described as *the most one could be*. Self-actualization provided

the framework for the autoethnographic study to tie my personal transformation to the larger organizational transformation, and integrate the internal with the external.

Nature of the Study

The rationale for the selection of the autoethnographic methodology (see Chang, 2008) was that it allowed my internal motivation for self-actualization to be a major data source for this study. The autoethnographic design would also allow me to introduce into the change management literature evidence from the impact that major change efforts have on the people within organizations also going through a transformation. There were no similar studies in the change management literature. The parallel transformations, namely the personal and internal paralleling the organizational transformation, were an opportunity to make a useful contribution to the literature.

Sensemaking required understanding biases and beliefs present in myself and others, which the autoethnographic framework allows. Researchers tasked with observing organizational change patterns are to be disinterested and impartial to obtain objective data and results (Chapman-Clarke, 2016; Custer, 2014; Voloder, 2008). In the current study, I was an insider and was conflicted about the outcome of the organizational change. I was also in a position to observe the change process and shed light on the personal impact of this dramatic change. Central to the autoethnography design is the acceptance of the researcher's perspective. My willingness to identify my biases and reveal my personal stake in the meaning of transformation made the autoethnographic design suitable for this study.

Autoethnographic studies are reflective narratives. They allow distillation of self-study and experiences as the background and context of change that is occurring

externally (Bochner & Ellis, 2016; Chang, 2008; Muncey, 2010). As my internal experiences were impacted by outside events, this approach provided an opportunity to examine my understanding of the sensemaking process (see Weick, 1995, 2017) that I and others went through during the DoD's transition, from excluding gays to including them in the organization. The autoethnographic design allowed me to examine the parallel transformations of personal and organizational change. Notes, recollections, and artifacts from multitudes of gatherings and discussions with military personnel on the repeal of DADT, most of which took place between 2008 and 2012 in the European environment, provided much of the data for this autoethnographic work.

Definitions

Autoethnography: A form of qualitative research in which an author uses self-reflection and exploration of personal experiences to connect the autobiographical story to wider cultural and social events (Anderson, 2006; Bochner & Ellis, 2016; Denzin, 2006; Ellis, 2004; Maréchal, 2010).

Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT): Section 654, Title 10, P.L. 103-160 of the U.S. Code, put forth by President Clinton's signing of the Military Personnel Eligibility Act of 1993 (Donnelly, 2008).

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered (LGBT): Any member of a sexual minority. The definition of lesbian is nearly identical to gay in that lesbian is a woman sexually attracted to women and a gay man is a man sexually attracted to other men (Pentagon Library, 2016). A bisexual person is attracted to both men and women; transgendered individuals' sexual identity does not match the gender assigned to them at birth, or traditionally accepted genders (Pentagon Library, 2016). The term LGBTQ is the same as

LGBT but includes a Q for questioning. Questioning in terms of sexual orientation includes people who are questioning their birth gender and/or sexual orientations (Pentagon Library, 2016). In this study, the word gay was used liberally and sometimes as a substitute for LGBT or LGBTQ.

Servicemember or *service member*: The generic term used in this study to refer to military personnel regardless of the service they may be in (Army, Navy, Air Force, etc.) (Military.com, 2017). Other terms, such as *sailor* and *airman*, are used to distinguish members of different services, but in this work they were referred to as servicemembers. Different spellings of this term have appeared in various publications pertaining to U.S. military personnel. The DoD archives (U.S. Department of Defense Knowledge Base, 2017) indicated the spelling as used in this study.

Assumptions

I assumed that I would have access to data about the organization, and that I would have sufficient information regarding the changes in my part of the organization. Autoethnography depends on the accuracy of memory, and I used personal journals and notes to capture the events and experiences reported in this study.

Another assumption related to my bias and background as a scientist. I assumed that proper research should be quantitative and traditional,. My early journaling and information-collection about the organizational transformation included personal notes on questionnaires and lists of military minutiae I had envisioned to be needed during my doctoral study. As my path of personal transformation turned out to be distressing and emotional, and as my evolution was impacted by my exposure to the ideas, viewpoints, and inputs from members of the organization about gays in the military, it became clear

that observations of organizational transformation and personal transformation could not be examined quantitatively. My initial assumption had to give way to a qualitative approach, and the autoethnographic design proved more suitable in examining personal and organizational change. The autoethnographic approach is used to describe and systematically analyze personal experience to understand cultural experience (Chang, 2008; Custer, 2016; Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011; Muncey, 2010).

Scope and Delimitations

The DoD Instruction pertinent to Directive 3216.20 (DoD Instruction, 2011) regarding research involving human subjects was not included in the scope of this study, although requirements such as anonymity of my personal observations of individuals, omission of identifying references to those with whom I spoke over the years, and personal observations were followed. I sometimes gathered data as personal reflections and other times as objective observations of events that took place in DoD bases. From the start of this study, I talked with DoD personnel about their attitudes toward gays and their opinions about DADT. This was strictly informal and their talking with me was voluntary. I also had conversations with people from other branches of the service and found their candor helpful in understanding what life of a gay servicemember might be like, and what my life as a gay contractor to the DoD might be like then or in the future. These conversations became an important part of this study. These conversations, in addition to my recollections and reflections of memorable events regarding gay servicemembers, provided the data for analyzing my personal transformation and seeing it in terms of the organizational transformation being managed by the DoD between the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. My understanding evolved as a result of these

conversations because reading official departmental policy on DADT merely informed personnel about what had been changed or endorsed. The new practices that would be instituted across the organization did not anticipate the challenges that would be encountered regarding policy conflicts between main and suborganizations processes, and interpersonal conflicts and emotional effects of policy changes. Implementing a policy was one thing, but addressing its downstream impact was another. Disambiguating the downstream effects that impacted personnel and their families, peoples' core beliefs, and religious principles was not addressed and could not be spoken about by organizational leaders.

Implementing a significant policy change that can impact personnel, such as policy changes that can impact various racial, religious, or other groups, is impacted by constructive personnel engagement and reaction within the organization (Cameron & Green, 2015; Hart, 2016; Kotter 1995;). Ensuring successful implementation of an organizational transformation such that harmony and acceptance might prevail among majorities, minorities, and ostracized minorities was important. The backdrop of prior DoD transformations enacted via presidential orders pertaining to inclusion of racial minorities and women in the military served as a framework for examining the key themes and major issues in this study.

Data collection for this work was conducted outside restricted DoD work sites and confined to the geographic regions around military bases in Germany, where I was working while DADT was enforced. After the repeal of DADT, my duty stations changed, and I was able to access military personnel including gay personnel in military posts in geographic areas near Washington D.C. and Baltimore. Special care had to be

taken to safeguard military sensitivities. Over the years I had provided some confidential or restricted works for the organization, and because autoethnographic methodology reveals substantial amounts of self-reflection and personal feelings, care had to be taken to prevent the insights about myself from this study from impacting my professional work.

Citizens and public policies of the DoD host nations overseas had sensitivities regarding U.S. military personnel stationed on their soil, and care had to be taken in this study to remain cognizant of those sensitivities. There were differences between European laws, which allowed greater freedoms for gay military personnel on European soil, and the rules of the U.S. military inside DoD bases in Europe. This further increased the need for care to be taken to ensure that base locations or times and dates of discussions did not inadvertently compromise those sensitivities, or that what people said in conversations with me about European laws or actions that took place on European soil did not upset Europeans.

The scope of this work did not include policies or implementation rules employed by different military services, combatant commands, or DoD suborganizations implementing the DADT policy. Specific cases pertaining to dismissals and legal challenges to the DoD policy were confined to publically available information. Criticisms, indictements, or disparagements of governments, political entities, governmental policies, military policies, and other governmental branches were beyond the scope of this study.

Limitations

Limitation of transferability and dependability of this work include limitations posed by my fallible memory. Because this study stretched over 8 years, my inability to access and articulate the realizations that I did not record was a limitation. According to Buchanan (2007), memories are influenced by the emotion experienced during its forming as well as by emotions experienced during its retrieval, and correct recall may be flawed.

The second limitation was that the journals I used for documentation and chronicling data for this study were created and gathered by me at various points in my transformation. The journals reflected snapshots of my personal learning at different moments, but the growth process was underway during the organizational transformation, and the realizations were not static. The data collected experientially I now know was initially thought to help me confirm my heterosexuality, but over time it instead helped me understand the opposite, and my personal transformation served to liberate my true nature and helped me understand that being gay was consistent with my becoming truly self-actualized. The limitation of dependability was that I did not sufficiently record my emotions or the emotions of the personnel I talked to because my scientific training did not value nonquantitative documentation. In retrospect, that was a weakness of the data. Too often in the beginning, I avoided emotional reflections. I attempted later in the reflection process to recall those feelings and to understand what had transpired more holistically.

Another limitation of dependability of this work was that at first I could not be honest with myself, and I was embedded in an organization that did not want to know its

personnel were anything other than heterosexual, per DADT policy. This negative attitude toward gays was an implicit bias that mirrored the environment of that part of the organization at that time. I mirrored the implicit bias around me, and it reflected the same back to me while I was inside that part of the organization. At the start of this study, my unconscious hope was to prove to myself that I was not gay. Therefore, a limitation of transferability and dependability was that I may have unconsciously weighed the antigay statements I heard from personnel more heavily in the early years of this study. I became more mindful when revisiting the early material for contrary clues and evidence. I was often mesmerized by what I did not clearly see back then.

Another limitation of this study was that the work started in the European environment, which was more gay friendly than the United States (see Azoulay, Chung, Simcovitch, Sukumar, & Supawong, 2010), and was perceived as such among the military (Westat, 2010). Being in that kind of environment was strange at first, but later became interesting, and eventually became liberating. Starting in an environment that did not look like the United States could also be considered a limitation of the transferability of the work.

A related limitation of embedded viewpoint and inherent bias was due to unchanging facts about my Iranian origin and antigay prejudices prevalent in my family and rooted in our Iranian culture. This embedded viewpoint for an investigator carrying a cultural hostility toward gays not only slowed down the process of letting go of the taboo about gays, but also slowed down the absorption of the shift that was underway inside the organization. Although I talked to as many servicemembers who were willing to talk to me as possible, my body language or expressions may have attracted personnel who

would confirm my biases. These unconscious biases and implicit favoritism toward

hearing what I wanted to hear must be acknowledged as a limitation of this study.

To overcome bias, I spent months talking to military personnel of various ages,

stages, ranks, races, and genders on several military bases in Germany. I did not want to

fail to discover the truth and was motivated to break my internal barriers, but I was also

somewhat afraid of the truth. The limitation to dependability caused by my sense of

shame was an inescapable part of this work.

Significance of the Study

Individuals are cultural agents, and cultures of large organizations are collectivist

(Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Soeters, Winslow & Weibull, 2006). Individuals

in organization exist in webs of self and others where shared understanding and repeated

patterns of interactions bind people together (Chang, 2008). Significant organizational

transformations impact shared understandings and patterns of interactions between

people (Miner, 2015). Changed individuals see their world differently, perceive their

culture and organization differently, and react in shifting patterns of interactions toward

their organization (Byrd, 2014). The significance of this study was to examine the

interrelatedness of these transformations.

One significance of this work pertinent to theory was the focus on the contrast

between Kotter's change management theory and Ostroff's change management theory

for government, and the difference in applicability of the two during data analysis. This

study was also pertinent to the practice of administration and management by

demonstrating that multiple transformations may occur among personnel during periods

of organizational transformations. In a very large organization, transformations may not

occur in a prescriptive, linear manner one at a time, but may occur with many different start times and with unknown or indeterminate finish times. For example, the transformation that began racial desegregation in the U.S. military occurred over six decades, and the transformation to integrate women into military is ongoing. Similarly, the transformation to allow open service for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered personnel in the U.S. military may occur over several decades. In addition, these transformations are occurring at the same time. The contemporaneous transformations that occur inside large organizations, and the proper practice to manage change, have not been fully explored (Cameron & Green, 2015). Findings from this study may be used to support the inclusion of sexual minorities and other subgroups who feel outside the mainstream. Exploring the dynamics of sensemaking in an organization coming to grips with open service for sexual minorities may effect positive social change.

Summary

At the beginning of this study, I wanted to examine organizational transformation and also explore personal transformation, not knowing what would transpire. My organization was reluctantly assessing (Belkin, 2011) the impact that repeal of DADT would have, fearing that massive numbers of its personnel would leave its ranks, or that military order and discipline would crumble as the country fought two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (Donnelly, 2009). My organization did not experience one departure as the result of the repeal of DADT, and the transformation was far smoother than predicted (Belkin, 2011; Belkin et al., 2012).

In Chapter 2, I review the literature on transformation and my organization's adaptation to changing social circumstances, as well as personal and collective

sensemaking during transformations. The standing of African Americans and other racial minorities in the military, as well as women in the military, continues to evolve. In Chapter 3, I explain the details of the autoethnographic methodology used in this study. I present my findings in Chapter 4 and analyze and interpreted those results in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The problem I sought to address was that the top management-driven implementation of a formal transformational change does not account for the personal variation among the individuals expected to live the change inside the organization. Given the significance of employee engagement in implementation of organizational change (Cameron & Green, 2015; Hart, 2016; Kotter, 1995), this research addressed important considerations of change management initiatives. As personnel inside an organization try to make sense of major changes while the organization adapts to changing societal circumstances, there are dual understandings about the change process and its perceived impacts (Bersin, et al., 2016; Cameron & Green, 2015). The purpose of this autoethnographic study was to explore my individual experience of living through a transformational change in my identity to inform change makers of the dynamic personal circumstances they need to account for to increase the likelihood of success of the change. I examined organizational change and my personal transformation impacted by that change to shed light on the dynamics of these changes and considerations needed for the change process.

Two related research questions were used to guide the study:

1. How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change?

2. What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization?

The primary question supported the rationale for the use of autoethnography (see Chang, 2008) as the principle methodology of this study addressing personal dynamics coinciding with organizational change. More details on autoethnography are provided in Chapter 3.

My literature search strategy focused on scholarly theories, concepts, case studies, and other research on organizational transformation, in addition to autoethnographic works on change and organizational transformation. Reviewing these works provided the most effective way of investigating connections between experiential works that include personal or testimonial approaches and traditional works rooted in theory, models, and quantitative analysis. This thorough literature search shed light on parameters linking the personal to the organizational during implementation of significant change by the organization.

Current literature establishing relevance of the problem addressed in this study included works on sensemaking in organizational studies (Brown, Colville, & Pye, 2015) and understanding organizational behavior (Weick, 2017). On organizational behavior, Weick (2017) pointed to scholars cycling from micro to macro levels of analysis, such as examinations of decision-making as micro analysis and investigations of organizational ecosystems as macro analysis. The micro and macro lenses provided perspectives from inside and outside of the organization (Weick, 2017).

Scholars of organizational behaviors have been drawn to the breadth and speed of changes in organization, from technological, informational, environmental, to social and interactive (Weick, 2017). Voloder (2008) described the time needed by field researchers to become insiders and develop trusting relationships with members of organizations.

Bochner and Ellis (2016) described a crisis of confidence in social science regarding presumptions about authority and objectivity of a humanly constructed doctrine of laws and theories. The supposition of silent, impartial researchers may have included researcher reflexivity or other bias, but may not have reflected the truth (Bochner & Ellis, 2016).

This study addressed the micro and macro perspectives through the lens of the insider undergoing a transformation impacted by a larger organizational transformation. The literature review addressed Bertalanffy's systems theory, which was narrowed using micro perspectives of organizational transformations championed by Kotter and Ostroff. I also addressed the works of Maslow regarding the insider's motivations and the final micro perspective. The literature on autoethnographic methodology, which incorporated researcher reflexivity and introspection, added to the current literature review.

Overview of Major Components of Chapter 2

This chapter begins with an overview of the DoD experience from the DADT policy, which sets the stage for the later discussion of the transformation of DoD in abiding by the Supreme Court decision legalizing gay marriage across the country (Supreme Court of the U.S., 2015). A review of literature related to significant DoD personnel transformations from the 20th century addresses transformations focused on racial desegregation, inclusion of women in the military ranks, and open service for gays in the U.S. military (Shilts, 1987, 1993; Supreme Court of the U.S., 2010). The literature review also includes references to the previous transformations and the issues that remain.

Being a person of color or female is observable, but being gay is not. This chapter's discussion includes explorations of the complexities of attitudes toward sexual minorities. In recent decades, these complexities have been compounded by the discrimination and animosity toward gays, resulting in gays hiding in plain sight to escape harm and persecution (Berube, 1990).

The focus of this study was limited to circumstances related to repeal of DADT. Wherever orientations to the four parts of the conceptual framework applied and were relevant, those references were made and discussed. The elements of the conceptual framework began with Bertalanffy (1968). Systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968) inspired the conceptual framework, while Kotter's (1995) theory of change management and Ostroff's (2015) change management for government were guiding pillars for analyzing the change management of the DoD's transformations. I used Maslow's (1970) concept of self-actualization and personal transformation to explore how individuals navigate their response to personal and organizational change.

Diversity and Organizational Transformation

Many administration and management studies have conflated inclusion of minorities, diversity of the workforce, and alterations of organizational cultures when addressing changes in the workforce (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Ghosh, 2012; Mundy, 2016; Shaban, 2016). Diversity in the workplace has been valued by organizations large and small (Byrd, 2014), where a diverse staff is considered beneficial and innovative (International Monetary Fund, 2017; Krill, 2016). Diversity in many large organizations comes after an alteration of the culture inside the organization (Adler & Gundersen,

2008; Bersin, et al., 2016; Miner, 2015) to encourage inclusion of minorities. Phillips (2014) stated

> it seems obvious that a group of people with diverse individual expertise would be better than a homogeneous group at solving complex, nonroutine problems. It is less obvious that social diversity should work in the same way—yet the science shows that it does. (para. 2)

The management of alterations of organizational culture should precede implementation of diversity changes by the change agents in a well-managed way (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Ghosh, 2012; Mundy, 2016). The current study did not the positive or negative effects of diversity and inclusion, but rather how people's experiences of change might inform change makers in an effort to increase chances of successful future change efforts.

Coneptual Framework

My background in science provided a thorough, albeit quantitative, introduction to systems theory, especially thermodynamics, a field focused on systems of interrelated and interacting systems, with the mathematical grounding required by the discipline of physics. I was excited to see the widespread application of concepts such as entropy to fields as divergent as biology, systems engineering, psychology, and organizational studies.

Systems Theory

Systems theory, more specifically general systems theory, is the study of systems to discern patterns or principles pertaining to them, and follows a worldview presupposing that factors related to systems are not wholly independent of one another but are interconnected and interdependent (Bertalanffy, 1981). General systems theory is

used to understand relationships among disparate factors, which contrasts with classic scientific analysis of looking at a set of independent variables and comparing them to dependent variables. General systems theory involves two things: (a) there is a web of interactions among elements under study and (b) patterns, often complex patterns in social sciences,result from these interactions (Bertalanffy, 1968). Change management from a systems perspective must account for the dynamic movements of organizational subsystems, especially those representing the interaction of people within them.

Department of Defense as a System of Systems

The DoD was created in 1947 from the War Department and was divided into three major departments: the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The DoD has a military staff of 1.3 million active duty military servicemembers, a civilian staff of 742 thousad, and a national guard and reserve force of 826 thousand (DoD, 2018). Uniformed and civilian DoD personnel work in 10 different unified combatant commands and 22 agencies across all continents and oceans under the authority of senior military leaders called the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which reports to the (civilian) Secretary of Defense appointed by the President of the United States. Each combat command must have personnel from at least two military services, such as Army, Navy, Air Force, and so forth (DoD, 2018). These personnel serve alongside civilians who can be from many different agencies in the DoD. In my experience, all these suborganizations operate as a complex system of interconnected and interdependent establishments. Effectively, the DoD operates as a vast system-of-systems, where the military personnel progress through their military careers by rotating through sequences of assignments that generally last two to three years at different bases and sites around the globe (DoD, 2018). The incessant kinetic flow of

personnel through the DoD's network of interdependent organizations was something I had not experienced working with different parts of our government. It aptly illustrates the applicability of the general systems theory.

Use of General Systems Theory in Analyses of DoD

Swanier (2016), applied systems theory in her analysis of DoD enterprises in which DoD's organizational business operations were analyzed through the framework of general systems theory. She stated: "The general systems theory implies that business operation is an integrated set of subsystems, and each department or unit functions within the entire system together to accomplish the organizational goals" (p. 17). Systems theory has been used across the DoD, in wide ranging works from exploring leadership in the military by the staff of the Joint Forces Colleges (Weis, Hamilton & Lenderman, 2016), to defense acquisition and related investigations of military acquisition programs (Clowney, Dever & Stuban, 2016), to family networks and the impact of deployments on military families (Paley, Lester & Mogil, 2013), and analysis of interactions and dynamics of large networks of interconnected individuals, a study conducted by Massachussetts Institute of Technology's Institute for Data, Systems and Society (MIT – IDSS) helping DoD with decision-making, socio-political change, and policies regarding the developing world (Koperniak, 2016).

Bertalanffy's (1968) systems view is broad and interdisciplinary. It is a paradigm with the goal of discovering patterns and principles related to systems (Alvesson, 2011). Scientific rigor in examining a system from outside, does allow deep understanding of its multifaceted complexities, and patterns. The realism for me living in Europe and completely dependent on my organization was that I sometimes felt *dwarfed* by it. In

Europe, my dependence on my organization pushed me to take actions I might not have

ordinarily taken here in the U.S. For example, on U.S. soil, my social life was not

composed of military personnel, and although my perfessional circles included military

personnel, it was primarily composed of engineers, scientists, and corporate

professionals. In Europe, my circles were limited to people in DoD bases, all of whom

were strangers to me, and most were in the military. There was no choice but to connect

with other strangers, with military personnel living in or out of various DoD bases. To

feel like I meant something to other people, I connected with folks who were in the same

circumstances. Longstanding friendship circles gave way to connecting with strangers in

my organization who worked in the same bases I did. As important as this life change

was for me at that time, in systems' theory, the viewpoint of members inside systems

does not play a central focus.

Satellites and Suborganizations in the General Systems Theory Framework

The Pentagon operates roughly 4800 *sites* from tiny shacks to military ranges, and

sites that are like large cities around the globe (DoD, 2018). The complexity of the DoD

system-of-systems brought focus on the *perception* of organizational environment that

personnel found themselves in. The general systems theory approach views the context –

namely the global environment in which the U.S. military operates in – by incorporating

external forces, populations or influences, as drivers that impact the environment. This

framework allows one to understand the atmosphere in which various sub-systems – for

example, the bases in Germany – operate in, as well as allowing for interdependence of

bases with one another, or with the larger bodies of U.S. base-systems, such as those in

England, Belgium or Italy. Further supporting the general systems theory framework,

DoD's *Unified Command Plan* which was a military plan approved by the Secretary of

Defense, U.S. Congress, and the President (DoD, 2016; Dufour, 2016; Military.com,

2018), effectively subdivided areas around the globe into areas of responsibilities (AOR)

of nine military combatant commands, ubiquitously known as COCOMs (DoD UCP,

2016). A tenth combatant command was added in 2017, namely U.S. Cyber Command,

which has a global area of responsibility (DoD, 2018). The web of interrelated networks,

bases, sites and personnel supports the use of systems theory, and suggests that system

wide change efforts may be unevenly accomplished at times, due to bureaucratic

complexities (Dufour, 2016; Military.com, 2018; Vine 2015).

The mission of the Department of Defense is "to provide the military forces

needed to deter war and to protect the security of our country" (DoD, 2015, para.9). The

output of the organization has been to provide security. Attempts to understand a

complex entity – such as one of the small sub-organizations of the Department of

Defense – required a methodology employing a system-of-systems approach that focused

on the system's structure instead of its functions. This focus on structure was

demonstrated by DoD's own information whereby it stated

> The national security depends on our defense installations and facilities being in
>
> the right place, at the right time, with the right qualities and capacities to protect
>
> our national resources. … Our military servicemembers and civilians operate in
>
> every time zone and in every climate. More than 450,000 employees are overseas,
>
> both afloat and ashore. (DoD, 2015, para.6).

Elements of any system were inputs, outputs, processes, subsystems and feedback

(Koperniak, 2016), and *open systems* theory referred to organizations strongly influenced

by their environment (Iwu, Twum-Darko, Kapondoro & Lose, 2015). General systems theory proposed that complex systems shared some basic organizing principles, many of which could be modeled mathematically (Bertalanffy, 1968, 1981). From this perspective, organizations acquired resources as inputs, and utilized the skills and abilities of their personnel who processed those resources or inputs of organization's operational or business processes, and produced services and outputs (Sayles & Chandler, 1971).

Content Literature

While the DoD operated under the DADT policy, U.S. personnel worked with European military and civilian personnel, who had an open policy for gays and other sexual minorities. What should not be neglected were important features of the space that personnel found themselves in. The gay-friendliness of Europe (Wilson, 2013) was an important factor. It was not a linear factor in that the environment of Europe did not impact all personnel the same, whether pertaining to issues related to gays, or other effects of that environment (Wilson, 2013).

Accounting for Environmental Influences

Many of our allies' militaries operated without a hint of a problem or controversy, yet our DADT policy's implicit message was that while they could be open-minded and gay-friendly, we were not (Allsep, Levy, & Parco, 2011). Their gay officers of our allies could lead and give orders to ours – in NATO exercises for example – but they knew that in our military we would have kicked them all out (Breslin, 2000). My own conversations with my German neighbors and friendly locals showed me how much Europeans ridiculed our politicians. They found our election year rhetoric and the antigay

pronoucements by American religious and military figures silly, bigoted, and extreme.

The environment impacted and evolved my thinking. Life inside the organization without

DADT might not have been as easily envisioned by me in 2008, 2009 or even 2010 if I

was on Texas or Alabama bases. Being in European cities, I could see for myself that the

sky would not fall if DADT was repealed. Were the magnitude and impact of these

realizations the same for other personnel, or would they have been the same if I was not

caught up in my own personal transformation? Capturing this effect was complicated and

nuanced enough for myself, and I was not sure how it could have been captured on a

large scale. I do not shy away from equations, mathematical constructs and scientific

approaches to vectors, forces, and systems, but accounting for variable environmental

influences, and crisscrossing impact of effects on open systems would have been ill-

advised as it would have not pertained to all parts of the organization, nor provided

generalization to other segments of the DoD system.

Our European allies had been happily operating with open service policies for gay

and straight military personnel for years or decades, and many of them had influential

relationships with their American counterparts. This environmental influence was unique,

and its influence on DoD insiders was not easy to determine precisely. The

autoethnographic methodology was better suited to exposing my internal actualities and

perceptions of individuals in different parts of the organization, and could have better

complemented the systems approach through a first person perspective for higher

granularity and depth than through other arrangements.

Unending transformations. With the events of 9-11, and the start of wars in

Afghanistan and then Iraq, the notions of continual change and transformation have been

ongoing in the U.S. DoD (McNaugher, 2007). He stated: "the related but ill-defined notion of a military transformation even found its way into candidate George W. Bush's campaign rhetoric in 2000. And transforming the U.S. military became Donald Rumsfeld's chief goal when he was named Bush's secretary of defense after the election." (McNaugher, 2007, para. 1). Across DoD, the needed to go from focusing on large-scale military adversaries to small guerrilla forces such as Al-Qaeda prompted many to welcome overhaul and transformation of the DoD. It was also common to despair (Galvin & Clark, 2015; McNaugher, 2007). As Nielsen (2010) put it: "It is common to hear the argument that military organizations are incapable of reforming themselves" (p. iii).

The use of systems theory in understanding change and transformation in the military was proven helpful in observing the frequent and un-ending changes and transformations constantly taking place. The problem was elegantly expressed by Dr. Thomas P. Galvin and Lieutenant Colonel Lance of the Department of Command of U.S. Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, which has long been a center of excellence for education and research, and producing future military leaders: "Every new weapon systems program, organizational realignment, headquarters consolidation, gain or drop in end strength, and other activity undertaken by the defense enterprise constitutes an organizational change effort. Even at the 4-star level, senior leaders are working to initiate transformational change amidst a turbulent sea of on-going change." (Galvin & Clark, 2015, p. 2).

Examining various theories on change, such as planned change, systems theory, learning theory, and others, the problem of change in the DoD during the ongoing wars

were described as follows: "A multitude of ideas on what that transformation is and how the military should accomplish it are widely published. Nevertheless, the question always arises, what is transformation? In addition, it is common to hear defense leaders state that transformation is ongoing and that it will never be complete. (Lira, 2004, p. 2). Successful transformation in the military hinged on many factors (Galvin & Clark, 2015; McNaugher, 2007), and as summarized by Nielsen (2010), the following components were essential: "First, leaders within military organizations are essential; Second, military reform is about more than changing doctrine. … Third, the implementation of comprehensive change requires an organizational entity with broad authority able to craft, evaluate, and execute an integrated program of reforms. … Finally, the process of developing, implementing and institutionalizing complementary reforms can take several decades" (p. vii).

Depending on how one looked at it, it could be argued that none of the *actions* specified above were enthusiastically implemented as related to racial and gender integrations, or that at best, the integration of sexual minorities may go on the same tortured path as the previous two transformations did several decades ago. What was important was to take a deeper look at all of these transformations, which this chapter will do in the sections to follow to try to determine whether one's experiences offered a way of understanding what change makers needed to do to successfully accommodate human variability.

Toward the repeal of DADT. As the 2008 presidential election put focus on the repeal of DADT, those of us who worked in U.S. bases in Germany heard and read about outsized cries from the political right in the homeland expressing outrage and citing

moral and religious objections. Many were forecasting doom for the military, and mass resignations if or when DADT was repealed (Belkin, 2011). From my own vantage point inside DoD's structures, those opposed to the repeal appeared to be quite loud before the repeal and afterward. For example, at a Senate Arms Services Committee Hearing on the repeal of DADT on November 30th, 2010, Secretary Gates said: "I believe this is a matter of some urgency because as we have seen in the past year, the federal courts are increasingly becoming involved in this issue. Just a few weeks ago, one lower court ruling forced the department into an abrupt series of changes that were no doubt confusing and distracting to men and women in the ranks." (DoD, 2010, para. 23).

Discussions and news reports among U.S. personnel in Germany reflected the same message that Secretary Gates was delivering to Congress in the U.S. The narrative we were hearing was that DoD was getting pushed into a corner and running out of time. Secretary Gates stated

> It is only a matter of time before the federal courts are drawn once more into the fray, with the very real possibility that this change would be imposed immediately by judicial fiat – by far the most disruptive and damaging scenario I can imagine, and one of the most hazardous to military morale, readiness and battlefield performance. (DoD, 2010, para. 23).

The Defense Department was telling its own military branches and personnel that the outside world was forcing it to transform itself. The organization could not be blamed for getting ahead of its conservative members who opposed the repeal, and it could not be blamed for marching toward a future its younger and more liberal members preferred. It was simply reacting to the legal forces and pressures, and trying to wrest control in its

own terms. The vocal unhappy personnel could therefore not blame their leaders, or the organization. This was to in effect neutralize resistance to the transformation, and was perceived as a brilliant strategy by some (Belkin, et. al., 2012). One of my office mates, a retired Army infantry officer I will call "Rob" (not his real name) said in August 2010 believed that President Obama was just *paying back* the gay lobby backfor helping elect him (Appendix F). Others came up with even stranger theories about the not-yet-announced repeal. It did not occur to me until later that I was observing the sensemaking of insiders.

Secretary of Defense Gates was quoted as saying: "I think it is very important for us to understand from our men and women in uniform the challenges that they see" (Garamone, 2010, para. 3). The DoD emailed or sent mailer surveys to 400,000 servicemembers, and the survey leaders who were General Carter Ham the head of European Command (EUCOM), and DoD General Counsel Jeh Johnson, spent months talking to thousands of troops in dozens of military facilities (Garamone, 2010; Carden, 2010). They received tens of thousands of email comments and responses about the repeal of the DADT policy (Westat, 2010).

I was observing the unspoken sleuthing that insiders conducted to deduce which way the organization was going to go. Meanwhile, the organization was trying to figure out what its people were really thinking. Even with the surveys and email feedback, the organization hadn't prepared for the actuality of the myriad ways the workforce and their family members responded (Johnson & Ham, 2010). The ramifications of the transformation were unknown, as were its implications for gays, the implications to gay

servicemembers' relationship to others in the DoD, and to the internal organizational environment.

Kotter's Change Theory

Kotter's change theory was quite popular in DoD, especially among officers and scholars in military services' higher education institutions (Galvin & Clark, 2015). Kotter's change theory and eight steps of implementing change had been prodigiously used in DoD papers (Hopkins, 2000; Smith, 2016). The following statement from U.S. Army War College staff captured this popularity

> As both an introduction to theories of organizational change and a tool in the students' leadership kit bag, Kotter's *Leading Change* (1995) suits the foundational needs of students entering their future roles as senior leaders. For this reason, the book is used widely across the senior service colleges. (Galvin & Clark, 2015, para. 1).

The core of Kotter's change model was his 8-step process for implementing transformational organizational change, which encompassed three phases, beginning with creating a climate for change that incorporated the first three of the eight steps, followed by engaging and enabling the organization, incorporating steps four through six, and finally, implementing and sustaining the change, which incorporated his last two steps (Kotter, 2012). The eight steps were as follows (Kotter, 1995; Kotter, 2012); (1) Establish a sense of urgency, (2) Form a powerful guiding coalition, (3) Create a vision for change, (4) Communicate the vision, (5) Empower others to act on the vision, (6) Plan and create quick wins, (7) Consolidate improvements and create still more change, and finally (8) Institutionalize the new approach (make the change stick!).

Popularity of Kotter's Framework Inside DoD

Kotter's eight rules have long been favored among military leaders as they fit well with the vigor and power officers liked to bring to change initiatives (Smith, 2016). Kotter's own words captured this sense of powerful leadership that many in the military desired: "First, useful change tends to be associated with a multistep process that creates power and motivation sufficient to overwhelm all the sources of inertia. Second, this process is never employed effectively unless it is driven by high-quality leadership, not just excellent management – an important distinction that will come up repeatedly as we talk about instituting significant organizational change." (Kotter, 2012, p. 22). Galvin & Allen (2016) as well as Lira (2004) and McNaugher (2007) questioned such semantics by asking whether whatever DoD liked to call *transformational* change was really all that transformational. Lira (2004) contended that changes in the military had either been organizational changes to make it a lighter and more deployable military force, or technological, giving it asymmetrical information or counter-adversary advantages. He contended that many so-called transformations were merely *reformations*, which did not cause any change to the organization's core. As popular as Kotter's change model may have been among officers and DoD change agents, there were questions about practicalities of applying them to the vast network of suborganizations which DoD truly is. Galvin & Clark (2015) eloquently stated "the bureaucracy pushes back and pushes back hard" (p.1).

Even after the events of 9-11 when DoD was pivoting toward battles with dispersed insurgencies, Kotter's approach which began with creating a sense of urgency to drive transformation into the DoD bureaucracy was critiqued: "The related but ill-

defined notion of a military transformation even found its way into candidate George W.

Bush's campaign rhetoric in 2000. And transforming the U.S. military became Donald

Rumsfeld's chief goal when he was named Bush's secretary of defense after the election"

(McNaugher, 2007, p.1). Despite the popularity of Kotter's framework among many in

DoD, governmental bureaucracies were simply more complex than many private sector

organizations that easily embraced Kotter's steps (Galvin & Clark, 2015).

Ostroff's Change Theory

Frank Ostroff (2015) argued that government bureaucracies are fundamentally

different from private sector organizations that can fully embrace Kotter's change model.

Principally, government agencies did not have a profit motive. Their mission was to serve

citizens and taxpayers, with no worries about market shares, shareholder revenues, and

other private sector concerns. The evaluation of success in serving the public was

different from those of the private sector, and government organizations were

incentivized or mandated to take steps in the public good. These included provisions to

open opportunities for disadvantaged workers or companies, utilizing American-made

products, showing preferences in awarding contracts to veterans, and much more.

Although Kotter's principles were exciting and highly popular across DoD (Galvin &

Clark, 2015), unsuccessful transformations or partially successful implementations

resulted in records of ineffectual changes, and a jaded workforce (Galvin & Clark, 2015;

Lira, 2004; McNaugher, 2007; Pellerin, 2014).

Ostroff's change management in government model offered five principles, which

were as follows (Ostroff, May 2006): (1) Improve performance against agency mission,

(2) Win over stakeholders, (3) Create a roadmap, (4) Take a comprehensive approach,

and (5) Be a leader not a bureaucrat. The change model was rooted in actual

transformations by DoD's Special Operations Forces (SOF) of U.S. Special Operations

Command (SOCOM), as well as other governmental organizations such as the General

Accountability Office (GAO) and Occupational Safety and Health Administration

(OSHA). These later organizations were subordinate to larger agencies, and this

highlighted an important factor in Ostroff's change theory, which was that it could work

for nested systems-of-systems organizational structures of government agencies, where

their executives might well be constrainted in ways that private sector executives often

were not. Ostroff (2015) argued that government agencies' leaders are chosen on the

basis of how intricately familiar they are with existing bureaucracies, and how well they

understand policies and stakeholders. He maintained that government agencies leaders

usually have a short time to implement change. This was intuitively familiar to

Americans, given the cycles of political elections, and rotations of government executive

slots opened to individuals favored by elected office holders.

      Quick and incremental changes instead of transformations. Kotter's ideas

have been enthusiastically embraced in DoD (Galvin & Clark, 2015) but the practicalities

of Ostroff's ideas on change and transformation in government provided a useful

framework that complemented Kotter's ideas (Boylan, 2015; Smith, 2016; Tilghman,

2016). Limited senior executives' tenures, and public scrutiny of government executives'

change attempts, were reasons for Ostroff to contend that organizational leaders in

government favored going for the quick, incremental changes instead of transformational

overhauls (Ostroff, 2015). Galvin & Clark (2015) observed: "When these leaders take

initiative and bring about changes, they tend to be evolutionary, small-scale, localized, or temporary." (p. 9).

DoD's implementation of racial desegregation, and integration of women into the military, which were seminal transformations of military personnel initiated by presidential executive orders (Berube, 1990; Burrelli, 2012; Frank, 2010), showed that the preparations and buy-in from across different layers of the DoD organizations and suborganizations did not exist prior to the implementation (Canaday, 2001; Carreiras, 2006; Morin, 2015; Mabus, 2016). Given the framework of Kotter's transformational change, this absence of buy-in is critical and its absence can damage or derail implementation of transformation (Kotter, 2012). As opportunities for various minorities in the military continued to lag those of the majority's (Nelson, 2015), it was unclear to what extent, these had actually been reformations and not core transformations (Galvin & Clark, 2015; Lira, 2004; McNaugher, 2007). It was unclear what the perception was regarding racial and gender inclusion in the Department of Defense. The government wide strategic diversity plan (Office of Personnel and Management, 2016), and the report on demographic diversity of the U.S. military on forces draw down, point to ongoing issues (Lytell et al., 2016) related to inclusion of minorities, their career progression, and many other concerns. These further support use of Ostroff's framework, although Kotter's ideas cannot be forsaken, especially given their great popularity among military personnel and leadership.

Tone on transformation contrary to theory's assumptions. In 2008, external pressures from some citizens and stakeholders against the repeal of DADT were expressed, forecasting doom and mass resignations from within DoD (Belkin, 2011).

From my own vantage point inside DoD's structures, opposition to the repeal appeared to be quite loud before the repeal, and afterward. On March 7, 2007, Marine General Pace, Pentagon's chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time, had said in an interview that homosexuality was immoral (Jelinek, 2007). Although General Pace retired a few months later, the frequency with which his comments appeared in print and in conversations in the various military bases I worked in made it clear to me that the core of the organization was not on board with implementation of a transformational change like the repeal of DADT. To calm internal and external criticisms against a possible repeal of DADT, the Defense Secretary Robert Gates repeatedly addressed critics by pointing to court cases, and the changing legal climate in the country that were placing greater urgency in favor of transformation of the military to allow open service for gays (Belkin, 2011).

From my vantage point, the buy-in from the organization to repeal DADT seemed absent. At a congressional hearing (DoD, 2010), Defense Secretary Gates spoke about the inevitability of the repeal of DADT

> It is only a matter of time before the federal courts are drawn once more into the fray, with the very real possibility that this change would be imposed immediately by judicial fiat – by far the most disruptive and damaging scenario I can imagine, and one of the most hazardous to military morale, readiness and battlefield performance. (para. 23).

From inside the organization what I was seeing was insufficient willingness or buy-in from the organization, only a reluctant surrendering to legal forces and environmental pressures. Scarborough (2010) reported in the *Washington Times*

"The four-star chiefs of the Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Army have said little on the topic in public and have not been pressed by Congress to provide their professional opinions. All four declined to answer when asked for their personal opinions on the ban by *The Washington Times*, except to say they will abide by the law." (para. 14).

Part of my personal motivation for meeting various military personnel, and engaging them in one-on-one conversations about the repeal of DADT was to get at the truth about the level of buy-in the personnel themselves perceived coming from the organization. I also wanted to get a feel for the kind of reaction there might be on the ground. I was concerned about whether the doom and gloom scenario would unfold, or whether the transition would be similar to the experiences of European forces whose countries had allowed open service for gays, but the change ultimately was smooth, organized and quiet.

Transformation not embraced. Both Kotter's and Ostroff's frameworks expressed the need for organizational leaders to strongly embrace the transformation they wish to implement (Kotter, 2012; Ostroff, 2006). Part of the popularity of Kotter's ideas in DoD was the eagerness with which military leaders embraced changes they championed, such as a new innovation, new weapon systems, or inclusion of special processes in countering insurgencies, and so forth (French, et al., 2004; Galvin & Clark, 2015; McNaugher, 2007). My perception was that insiders did not champion the repeal of DADT, nor a future that would include sexual minorities in the military. My office mate who was a retired Army infantry officer I will call "Rob" (not his real name) said in August 2010: "He [Obama] is just paying them [gays, and the gay lobby] back for

electing him. Now they're putting the squeeze on [DoD]." (Appendix F). No repeal had

even taken place, but in our offices there were rife guesses, rumors and strange theories

about a future to-be-announced repeal. There seemed no hopeful or welcoming

statements from DoD leadership saying that sexual minorities are already serving in the

DoD and should be recognized; my perception was that the narrative flowing down to us

from the top was that DoD may be hamstrung and legally unable to stop a repeal. There

really was no indication that the organization was *embracing* the transformation to allow

open service for gays. For those who did not embrace this transformation, the good news

was as Ostroff expressed it: "Over time, they see programs come and go without making

a dent." (Ostroff, 2006, p. 9).

The legal cases that made their way to the Supreme Court between 2008 and

2010, ultimately received the crucial vote of Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy

which ushered the transformation that gays in the military had been hoping for (Belkin,

2011). Without the required steps in the Kotter framework to make such a major

transformation successful the leadership had to scramble fast to deal with a big change it

had not prepared for (Cohen, 2010; Allsep, Levy & Parco, 2011; Belkin, 2011; Belkin, et.

al., 2012). In Europe, many partner nation personnel did not believe DoD would succeed

in making the transformation successfully (Wilson, 2013) and much of it had to do with

what Kotter and Ostroff championed in making changes become permanent.

Maslow's Theory

Maslow's theory of human motivation had been used in studies of organizational

behavior for decades, and could be categorized in three ways, micro, meso and macro

levels (Dopfer, Foster & Potts, 2004; Izard, 2009; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000; Miner,

2015). These allowed exploration of individuals' behaviors in organizations, and shed light on organizational culture and how organizations behaved overall. A large span of research in many fields of research such as counterproductive work behaviors, employee mistreatment, sexual harassment, bullying or incivility in the workplace, organizational citizenship behavior, work-family dynamics, and organizational culture have roots in various levels of organizational behavior – namely micro, meso or macro levels. Maslow's theory of motivation provided the academic framework for an impressive number of research focusing on individuals in organization, in peer work groups and as citizens of their larger organizations (Miner, 2015). Autoethnographic works that were reliant on self-observational and self-reflective data and focusing on similar topics, such as incivility in the workplace or work-family dynamics, investigated the impact of these on their author-reserachers (Chang, 2008; Denzin, 2014; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011; Hamdan, 2012;).

In this work, Maslow's theory provided touchpoints that brought together the theoretical backbones of individuals' behaviors in organizations with autoethnographical concepts from the perspective of the individual (Maslow, 1971). Maslow's work provided the link between the two. It provided the final piece that allowed moving from the terrestrial level of the individual to the stratospheric level of organizational leaders. It also linked the traditional research approach with that of the narrative autoethnographic voice approach.

Maslow's concept focused on how individuals evolved through life stages, where subsequent to their bodily needs being met, they progress onward, and move to higher stages of individual evolution and finally can reach the highest stage with is one of self-

actualization (Maslow, 1970; Izard, 2009). The transformational change of attaining

peace with my gay nature as the DoD organization came to repeal DADT and allow open

service for gays conveyed parallel evolutions that centered on self recognition, evolution

of individuals inside organizations that were evolving themselves, and progression

toward self-actualization. These made use of Maslow's concept very applicable to this

work.

Review of Autoethnography as a Research Methodology

Compared to other ethnological research methods, autoethnography appeared

relatively recently, and did not seek to rely on surveys or questionnaires from respondents

in order to arrive at the truth (Muncey, 2010). Autoethnography is a methodology by

which a researcher's self-reflection and personal experiences connect their

autobiographical story to larger social, cultural, political, or organizational

understandings or meanings (Ellis, 2000). Kelley (2014) compared and contrasted

autoethnography, ethnography, biography and autobiography by first reviewing how each

dealt with questions of who and what, for which Kelley (2014) stated that

autoethnographies focused on personal experience, culture and self, as ethnographies

focused on culture and others, biographies focused on story of others, and

autobiographies focused on story of self. Regarding the question of why, Kelley (2014)

stated that autoethnographies sought meaning and empathy, ethnographies sought

understanding, biographies sought historical events, and autobiographies sought interest.

While ethnographies were sometimes story driven, autoethnographies always were, as per

their distinctive approach which openly included the researcher alongside the subject

matter being researched (Custer, 2014).

As a methodology, autoethnography's potency came when the individuality of subjects were non-negligible components impacting the research attempted (Chang, 2008; Ellis, 2000; Raab, 2013). For example, in this work the sample size of *Middle Eastern* women working in DoD bases in Europe during the major transformation of the repeal of DADT taking place as they were undergoing their own personal self-discovery of sexual orientation was too small and unattainable to allow other research methodologies to be applicable. This was especially so when discovering parallels and impact between the organization and the individual. This methodology filled this gap. It allowed personal experience to fit into the larger story of the organizational transformation, and to shed light on puzzling phenomenon or consequences that the organization did not foresee.

Background of Use of Autoethnography

In the 1970s, autoethnography was used to describe studies in which members of a cultural subgroup provided insights into their own cultures (Muncey, 2010; Chang 2008). A number of researchers, notabley from fields of anthropology became interested in effects of researchers' own identities on their research data, which was an impact called researcher's bias, or contribution of bias in data collection (Miner, 2015; Klein & Kozlowsk, 2000). Autoethnography allowed the research to be expressed by the researcher-author laying bare the biases at the outset of the research. Aside from ample data on *inherent* biases in research, autoethnographers provided data on motivations, reasons, calculations and experiences pertinent to the topic being researched, without limitations of externalities (Ellis & Bochner, 2004). Over time, autoethnography was

expanded to explore the interplay of various perspectives that engaged selves with

cultural beliefs, practices, systems and experiences (Chang, 2008; Hamdan, 2012).

Complaints and Controversies About Autoethnography.

Autoethnography had been controversial in the past as it utilized storytelling, graphical,

oral and other traditions in the methodological process of self-observation and self-

reflection in provision of data on self. Criticisms about this methodology being non-

replicable and focused on the individual were made by traditionalists. Much like

qualitative researchers who faced significant criticisms from physical scientists – such as

physicists, chemists and the like – and responded with agreement that people were not

like atoms and molecules but still needed to be studied (Rossi, Wright & Anderson,

2010). Qualitative researchers held that people and their behaviors needed to be explored,

and similarly, autoethngraphers responded to criticisms by saying that survey methods in

qualitative research sometimes averaged-out too many important parameters, forces and

variables which should not have been reduced, and also that polls, questionnaires or the

mean-square-fit data were sometimes not as revealing or significant as an in depth

understanding of one data point (Chang, 2008; Hamdan, 2012; Muncey, 2010).

The subjectivity inherent in autoethnography was a useful parameter for

researchers in social media research who sought to understand human-computer

interactions, and ways by which personal perspectives link with community,

organizational and social perspectives (Cameron & Green, 2015; Paul & Reddy, 2010).

At the time, even if there were insufficient subjects to compose a needed sample size for

a survey, the complexities of a research question sometimes could not be neatly

encapsulated by available subject(s). In some circumstances, if answering a question with

one person or subject can benefit a larger field of research, then autoethnography can be the methodology through which the research can be successfully conducted (Chang, 2008; Muncey, 2010). This might have been quite controversial in the past, but then not many *Middle Eastern* women working in DoD bases in Europe during the major transformation of the repeal of DADT taking place, just as they were undergoing personal self-discovery of their sexual orientation. In this work, the contribution to the field of management in gaining an in-depth view of a minority member of an organization understanding the impact of organizational change on their personal transformation was one such case, undergirding the use of this methodology in this work.

Sensemaking and Autoethnography

The process by which people gave meaning to experience was defined as sensemaking (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Moore, 2011; Weick, 1995). Since the 1970s and the advent of personal computers, information scientists used sensemaking as a way of understanding human-computer interactions, and this was a rapidly growing field of research (Paul & Morris, 2009; Paul & Reddy, 2010; Chan, Dang & Dow; 2016). Centered within exploration of sensemaking was the need to utilize autoethnographic methodology to arrive at self-observation and reflexive investigation of experiences that connected individual behaviors to larger cultural or social meanings and experiences, or to organizational, communal, or public reactions or interpretations (Cameron & Green, 2015; Moore, 2011; Qu & Furnace, 2005).

In analyzing the applicability of the two frameworks selected to represent the organizational change regarding gays in the U.S. military (i.e. Kotter and Ostroff frameworks), it was important to review prior transformations – namely racial and gender

integration – so as to lay the groundwork to make the case for the usability and

applicability of the coneptual frameworks. The two frameworks had applicability over

different spheres of organizational transformations, but Kotter's framework had great

potency with members of the organization, while Ostroff's framework applied to

governmental processes and management of organizational change.

Integration of Minorities in Context

"Racism. We are not cured of it. And it's not just a matter of it not being polite to

say 'nigger' in public. That's not the measure of whether racism still exists or not. It's not

just a matter of overt discrimination. Societies don't overnight completely erase

everything that happened 200-300 years prior." (NPR, June 22nd 2015, para. 11). This

quote from President Obama's podcast interview with National Public Radio (NPR)'s

Marc Maron, pointed to the continuation of American people's prejudicial attitudes –

conscious or unconscious – that continued to persist. Putting various prejudices in context

(Salter, Adams & Perez, 2018), it should be added that an African-American military

leader such as General Colin Powell who might have railed about racism in the ranks, or

in his own career progression, could have been absolutely unaware of being sexist or

homophobic (Frank, 2012; Schilts, 1993). Many in gay communities had long accused

General Powell of homophobia (Frank, 2010, 2012) and blamed him for the

implementation of the DADT policy by President Bill Clinton (Belkin, 2011), primarily

by advocating that prejudice against blacks and other races was fundamentally different

from prejudice against gays and sexual minorities (Belkin, et al., 2012; Frank, 2012;

Golberg, 2011; Hollaran, 2013).

One nuance about prejudice was that being black or female were and are readily visible, making it impossible for non-whites or women to escape prejudices aimed at them or prejudicial behaviors directed against them, whereas being gay or bisexual could have been hidden, allowing people a mean for escape from others' prejudices (Salter, Adams & Perez, 2018). Many members of various sexual minorities disputed that (Allsep, Levy, & Parco, 2011) but in historic context of this review of military personnel, this notion of *passing* without detection had been part of military personnel's beliefs and experiences about gays in the military (Allsep, Levy & Parco, 2011).

A second nuance was that societal measures were in place to amend historic racial injustices, such as civil rights laws, or measures against gender bias, and furthermore, there had been a long history in the U.S. of hatred against immigrants, religious and cultural minorities, whereby those groups overcame prejudice to rise to prominence and attain societal support (Coll, Weiss & Metal, 2013). The answer to that type of nuance about gays, who were said to be complaining about mistreatments that other minorities overcame (Salter, Adams & Perez, 2018) were answered by saying that the level of hatred and vitriol against cultural roots did not compare with the malice, detestation and brutality faced by gays who were depicted in the bible and most holy books as sinful, and were shunned in nearly all cultures over the arc of uncounted number of centuries (Batalova, 2008; Berube, 1990). Consideration of this second nuances was like one battered group claiming that their suffering was worse some other battered group (Berube, 1990; Salter, Adams & Perez, 2018). In the end, there were no metrics for understanding the true amount of suffering ethnic minorities endured as compared to gays and sexual minorities among them, or among the larger white nativist populations in the

U.S. In the context of this work these nuances played a part in understanding the many discussions and interviews I had with military personnel to be discussed in Chapter 4.

Six Decades of Racial Minority Integration

President Obama said that America had not yet been *cured* of its racism (NPR, 2015). Another president, Jimmy Carter, had been fond of using the apartheid analogy for our country's racial problems (Carter, 2006). Indicating that the Emancipation Proclamation issued by President Lincoln on January 1st, 1863, was followed by an entire century of what the former president said was *apartheid* in the U.S., President Carter reminded us that racism and prejudice permeated our society and its institutions – including the military – but hoped that as older generations died off, and the white race lost its majority status in the U.S., that the younger and more racially diverse generations could put aside the longstanding legacy of prejudice (Carter, 2006).

President Truman issued Executive Order 9981 which directed the desegregation of U.S. Military (Truman Library, 2011). Through efforts of Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 was signed into law, authorizing regular and reserve military billets for women in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. Despite edicts and egalitarian policies, hundreds of thousands of job-roles in the military were completely closed for women for four to six decades (McCormack, 2015). The last couple of hundred combat positions were only opened to women in 2015 (Pellerin, 2015).

DoD's transformations after WWII allowing racial minorities and women into its ranks, was followed by reported issues of bias across its sub-organizations in the decades since (McCormack, 2015; Alt & Alt, 2002). Following the repeal of DADT, the open

service by gays had been an ongoing transformation with complexities that distorted the uniformity of treatment of sexual minorities in being equal or aligned with the heterosexual majority (Ramirez & Sterzing, 2017). Since gays could not be identified with the certainty that other minorities such as African Americans or women were identified, many gays escaped discovery and thus had the advantage of being integrated into the military without penalties faced by openly gays servicemembers, and accordingly faced some relative advantages in the integration process by escaping being lumped into that minority. The disadvantage of that was the pain of remaining careful about revealing their sexual identity for fear of not knowing what reactions might ensue (Ramirez & Sterzing, 2017).

Laws and executive orders did not end hardships faced by African Americans in the U.S. military, but they did remove the legality of the imposition of hardships, and paved the way for more equitable treatment (Cohen, 2010). Early in the Vietnam war in 1966 three out of four African Americans supported the draft, but within three years, in 1969, a 56% majority opposed the Vietnam war itself and the draft (Cortright, 1975). Jack Helms who was a member of Louisiana Draft Board was a Grand Wizard in the Ku Klux Klan, who famously lashed out at NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), stated that they were a communist-inspired, anti-Christ, sex-perverted group of tennis-short beatniks (Halstead, 1970). Many African Americans burned their draft cards, and as one was escaping to leave the country for Canada, he stated: "I'm not a draft evader, I'm a runaway slave" (Maycock, 2001, p.1, para. 10). Boxer Muhammad Ali openly opposed the government draft stating: "They

want me to go to Vietnam to shoot some black folks that never lynched me, never called me nigger, never assassinated my leaders." (Maycock, 2001, p. 1, para. 9).

Salter, Adams & Perez (2017) maintained that as a country, U.S. continued to have deep racial tensions embedded in the culture and everyday lives of its people, as illustrated by controversial cases of police mistreatment or deaths of African Americans (Associated Press, 2015). Race-neutral policies instituted by the U.S. military after the Vietnam era, were designed to protect racial minorities and seemed enlightened (Canaday, 2001). The U.S. military nurtured racial minorities by openly providing leadership and advancement opportunities for them throughout their military careers commensurate to those of whites (Salter, Adams & Perez, 2017). This has become a model for many American corporations (Canaday 2001), and continues to be a positive way for African Americans to attain higher ranges of opportunities even beyond their military careers (Han, 2017).

In 1948, Democratic Senator Richard B. Russel of Georgia delivered a bitter speech regarding President Truman's desegregation Executive Order, announcing that his perceived *mandatory intermingling of the races* throughout the services will be a blow to the efficiency and fighting power of the armed forces, will increase the number of men disabled through communicable diseases, and will increase crimes committed by servicemen (Belkin, 2011; Belkin et al., 2012; Salters, 2010). Although data on communicable diseases were sparse and murky, history proved that the intermingling of the races improved the services, and harmony among personnel resulted in wonderful efficiency and fighting power of the U.S. Armed Forces (Canaday, 2001; Han, 2017).

Working with the military personnel from different services since 2008, I could attest to the positive environment between races and its implication for the harmony that can exist between racial majorities and minorities. I was on the lower rungs of the DoD echelon and did not observe racial disharmony in environments I worked in. It was inspiring to me to observe how authentic servicemembers were with one another, and how genuinely close different races were with one another. Being in a highly technical and scientific work field, it seemed to me that my contracting company was not nearly as friendly in its work environment as the military was, and my company was not a showcase of racial integration the way the military seemed to be.

Four Decades of Women's Integration in the Military

Women served the military since the birth of the country, but were not allowed in as full military members (i.e. same as male servicemembers) until the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 was signed into law by President Harry Truman on June 12, 1948, gave women permanent status in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps (Borlik, 1998; Burelli, 2012). After that, no more special women's components were formed during military emergencies only for the duration of the emergencies. Women in all the services were made members of the Regular Armed Forces and the Reserves, subject to military authority and regulations and entitled to veterans benefits (Burrelli, 2012).

Laws and executive orders did not end hardships faced by women or the shutting of many military positions to women, but they did remove the legality of the imposition of overt bigotry; laws, orders and policies helped a sufficiently large number of women to serve and prove that women could do whatever jobs men could, and these factors

combined to smooth the way forward for more equitable treatment and implementation of envisioned changes (Carreiras, 2006; Burrelli, 2012).

Current status of integration of women in the military. The Pentagon indicated in January 2013 that it would lift its ban on allowing women to serve in combat roles, but all roles were not opened until Defense Secretary Ashton Carter declared in December 2015 that all military roles, including combat roles, were open to women (Pellerin, 2015). Up until then, the military had been taking gradual steps towards gender equality, with some notable steps taken in the early 1990s, when Congress lifted bans on women flying in combat and serving on combat ships (Burrelli, 2012). In 2010, the Navy changed its policy prohibiting women from serving on submarines, and by 2013, nearly 2 million servicemembers deployed during combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (Hovey, 2015; Pellerin, 2015). In the heaviest parts of the U.S. wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, over 280,000 of U.S. troops who served were women – 800 of whom were wounded in combat and over 130 died thereafter (Hovey, 2015; Pellerin, 2015).

Modern warfare's lack of clear front-line combat-zones has meant that any man or woman deployed at any hostile territory found him/herself in a combat zone. In traditional wars as in World War II, the formally denoted combat roles brought officially-recognized rewards and career promotions. These role designations – combat support as opposed to combat designations – had excluded women decades after President Truman's executive order formalizing the integration of women into the military (Carreiras, 2006; Burrelli, 2012). As *armed conflicts* such as the U.S. involvements in Korea and Vietnam demonstrated the ubiquitous absence of *frontline* in armed combat, the warfare in Iraq and Afghanistan put everyone including cooks, medics, doctors, nurses and many non-

combatants inside combat zones (Burrelli, 2012). Various U.S. campaigns in the Iraq and Afghanistan verified this fact of modern warfare. As male non-combatants were provided combat duty privileges, it became evident that combat duty ought not continue eluding women in their military careers (Burrelli, 2012; Pellerin, 2015).

With integration of women in the military, progress had been uneven; in some instances, the services opened positions to women only to have second thoughts and close those same positions within a few years (Borlik, 1998; Carreiras, 2006; Burrelli, 2012). For example, in 1978, Army women became eligible for assignment to the Old Guard Regiment performing ceremonial functions such as guarding the Tomb of the Unknowns; In 1982, the Army reversed itself, and excluded women from the Old Guard once again (Borlik, 1998; Carreiras, 2006). In 1979, the Marine Corps began assigning women to guard US embassies around the world; three years later, they decided to stop assigning women to those positions (Borlik, 1998; Carreiras, 2006). After years of indecision and revision about what jobs women could be assigned, more positions opened to women in the 1980s, but although many previously non-combatant jobs were allotted combat status for men, the designation was not extended to women, and women were still officially barred from direct combat positions (Borlik, 1998; Carreiras, 2006). The irrationality of this obviously differentiated treatment by the military was sarcastically expressed by a dissenting voice in the U.S. Marine Corps, Captain Eric Hovey who wrote: "Sorry America, it is just too hard; boys will be boys" (Hovey, February 2015, p. 1, para.1), which conveyed that military organizations had behaved prejudicially, and over many decades communicated their sexist contempt for women through unequal compensation and respect for jobs performed by women in the same roles their male counterparts did.

Historical context of the integration of women in the military. The initial

vision of women's service in the military was as nurses or secretaries taking on various

office administration personnel positions (Huntington, 1957). The Women's Armed

Services Integration Act placed a two percent ceiling on the number of women in each of

the services, restricting promotions to one full colonel (or Navy captain) as Chief of the

Nurse Corps and/or Service Director, and limited the number of female officers who

could serve as lieutenant colonels or Navy commanders. The law also granted the service

Secretaries' authority to discharge women without specified cause, and restricted women

from flying aircraft or ships engaged in combat (Borlik, 1998; Burrelli, 2012).

Female servicemembers' participation grew during the Korean War. Seventy

percent of the Army nurses in Korea served in the new and experimental Mobile Army

Surgical Hospital (MASH) units. These units followed the combat troops and moved

frequently. Large numbers of women, nurses and members of the Women's Army Corps

(WAC), were stationed in Japan during the Korean War, and more than 120,000

servicewomen served stateside (Borlik, 1998; Coll, Weiss, & Metal, 2013). Although the

military was reluctant to send women into the *Vietnam Theater*, many servicewomen

made it clear to their chains of command that they were very willing to deploy to

Vietnam if they could obtain permission to go and if positions were available for them to

fill (Azoulay, Chung, Simcovitch, Sukumar & Supawong, 2010; Burrelli, 2012). The

Army finally sent a detachment of WACs to Vietnam in 1966. These 100 women worked

at the US Army Vietnam Headquarters first in Tan Son Nhut and later at Long Binh as

clerk typists and administration workers (Azoulay, Chung, Simcovitch, Sukumar &

Supawong, 2010; Burrelli, 2012). Within a couple of years, the detachment had grown to

140, with women working in communications, personnel, finance, data processing, and intelligence; the numbers of enlisted women and women officers increased slowly through the 1970s, and by 1980, over 170,000 women were on active duty, making up 8.5 percent of the US Armed Forces (Azoulay, Chung, Simcovitch, Sukumar & Supawong, 2010; Burrelli, 2012; Coll, Weiss, & Metal, 2013). The proportion of military jobs open to women slowly increased as well, and women became eligible for Army and Navy ROTC programs (Burrelli, 2012). Servicewomen were trained for *nontraditional* positions becoming construction equipment operators, air and harbor traffic controllers, veterinary animal specialists, aerospace medical specialists, military police, chaplains, and helicopter pilots. The Coast Guard began assigning women as crew members on all its ships in 1978 (Carreiras, 2006).

As the 1990s military deployments soon demonstrated, having a non-combat MOS (Military Occupational Specialty) did not guarantee non-exposure to danger or to combat in the performance of duties. With widespread public support, 41,000 military women composed seven percent of the US Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf (Borch, 2010). Women served as aircraft pilots carrying troops and supplies, deployed on reconnaissance missions, served aboard hospital ships, in mobile medical units and in field hospitals, flew planes and helicopters, directed artillery, drove trucks, ran prisoner-of-war facilities, served in port security units, in military police units, as perimeter guards, and performed a myriad of communications, intelligence, supply and administrative jobs for military's success in the Persian Gulf (Carreiras, 2006; Borch, 2010; Burrelli, 2012). American military women did just about everything on land, at sea, and in the air except engage in the actual fighting, and even there the line was often

blurred; the Persian Gulf War demonstrated to the American public the capabilities of the

country's servicewomen (Carreiras, 2006; Borch, 2010). Several years after the war,

Congress lifted the ban on women serving as crew members on combat aircraft and

combat vessels (Carreiras, 2006). As the number of female personnel grew in the

military, so did sexual assaults and sexual harassment, a plague that continues (Eager,

2016; Schaefer, A. G., et al. 2015). Although women gained solid grounds in the military

in the last four decades as full and permanent components of the U.S. forces, the

nonlinear nature of their integration continued to illustrate sexism issues in military

organizations (Carreiras, 2006; Eager, 2016; Rock, et al., 2014; Schaefer, A. G., et al.,

2015).

Analysis of Change Implementation Frameworks

Kotter's steps regarding organizational transformation were to be initiated

following a look at a problem – or some problematic trend – that the organization was

facing (Kotter, 2012). According to Kotter (2012), the first step for organizational leaders

facing a challenging problem that required organizational transformation was to create a

sense of urgency, then to proceed with forming a guiding coalition for change, creating

and communicating a vision for the needed change, and empowering others to take action

on the vision (Kotter, 2012). Ostroff's advised that after checking to be sure the

transformation was well aligned with organization's priority mission, to initiate winning

over stakeholders, then creating a roadmap and taking a comprehensive approach

(Ostroff, 2015). To understand whether the DADT repeal transformation in DoD fit

within these frameworks, the timeline of activities by top leadership were reviewed.

Two years prior to the Senate Arms Services Committee Hearing on the repeal of DADT, President Obama was elected having expressed his willingness to consider such a repeal. In the interim a number of legal challenges had moved through the courts compelling Secretary of Defense Robert Gates to give many updates regarding the downstream ramification of the transformation to allow open service for gays in the U.S. military (Belkin, 2010). These steps are well aligned with what Kotter and Ostroff had advised.

Following a massive survey process that took half of a year to administer to nearly half a million military personnel and their spouses, and in my corner of military bases in Germany, many individuals had mentioned that fact to me personally. As per Kotter's transformation steps, Secretary Gates had not followed his urgent call to action with forming a guiding coalition for change, creating and communicating a vision for change, and empowering others to take action on the change, but instead he had declared that DoD was studying how to repeal the policy and that the vision for what would need to happen regarding open service for gays would be worked out after the President made the final decision (Belkin et al., 2012).

Following the massive survey of the organization's servicemembers, Secretary Gates was still trying to convince senators and their constituents about the actions that had to come: "I believe this is a matter of some urgency because as we have seen in the past year, the federal courts are increasingly becoming involved in this issue." (DoD, 2010, para. 23). President Obama signed the repeal of DADT into law three weeks after Secretary Gates made that statement on the urgent need for that transformation, on December 22, 2010 (Belkin et al., 2012). The Department of Defense website was rapidly

changed to show that a review was underway to determine processes, procedures and training that required the change the President had authorized (Department of Defense, December 28, 2010), and a month later, on January 28, 2011, training processes to prepare the troops for the impending change was set to begin in February (Halloran, 2011; Lee, 2013).

Reviewing these events followed by DoD and its leadership, and contrasting whether the change plan fit with Kotter's steps vis-à-vis Ostroff's principles, it appeared that DoD was following Ostroff's transformation framework more closely. When the transformation was enacted right before Christmas 2010, the organization was still engaged in winning over the stakeholders who were disagreeing with its sense of urgency. The Ostroff framework fit the government organization transformation steps more closely as opposed to Kotter's model which fits private sector entities more closely. In the case of DoD, the transformation was put in place as the language to create urgency, energy, and organizational buy-in were replaced by a language of compliance – and the ordered adherence – to the new laws sent down by the courts. The Kotter (2012) and Ostroff (2015) frameworks stipulated that without willing implementors of change truly embracing needed modifications, it was difficult to successfully implement desired transformations. Triangulation of the information from different sources concurred that organizational change agents were not *embracing* the repeal transformation, but treating it as declared laws that could not be avoided (Belkin, 2010; Halloran, 2011; Belkin et al, 2012; Lee, 2013).

Incomplete transformations. "It is common to hear the argument that military organizations are incapable of reforming themselves." (Nielsen, 2010, p. iii, para. 1). The

problem of numerous yet incomplete changes and military transformations was elegantly

expressed in a report by the Department of Command, Leadership and Management of

the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, which stated: "Even at the 4-star

level, senior leaders are working to initiate transformational change amidst a turbulent

sea of on-going change." (Galvin & Clark, July 16, 2015, p. 2. para.3). Exasperated by

endless organizational transformations that either do not end or succeed, a scholar from

United States Military Academy at West Point framed the problem as follows: "The U.S.

military is going through a change process that its leadership characterizes as

Transformation [italicized by author]. … Nevertheless, the question always arises, what

is *transformation*? In addition, it is common to hear defense leaders state that

transformation is ongoing and that it will never be complete."

The overall issue of endless and incomplete organizational transformation in the

DoD and military services was summarized as: "This lack of consensus in the literature

and inability to identify an end state to the change in the military leads me to believe that

the U.S. Defense establishment may still be groping in the dark for an understanding of

the basic problem." (Lira, L. 2004, p. 2). This phenomenon was touched upon by Ostroff

(2015), and the repeal transformation which began to adapt to both Kotter and Ostroff's

frameworks, seemed to follow the roadmap methodology of Ostroff as time progressed

(Galvin & Clark, 2015; McNaugher, 2007). Political controversies related to sexual

minorities, such as the Trump administration's attempts in July 2017 to reverse DoD

policies on transgendered troops – which were blocked in October 2017 by the District

Court in Washington D.C. – did not alter organizational tendencies for incomplete or

partial transformations exacerbated by backlash, mixed signals, midstream switches and half-hearted executions of organizational change (Dannunzio, 2017).

Cultural and historical context: Attitudes toward gays in the military. The Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus said: "When we faced racial integration, when we integrated women into the service, when we repealed 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,' every time those changes were proposed—every time—there were naysayers saying the force would be weakened and unit morale would decrease. And yet, the Navy, the Marines, the Army, the Air Force, the Coast Guard are the most powerful forces in the world today and it shows that a more diverse force is a stronger force." (Mabus, June 8, 2016, para. 8). Cultural and organizational views and context about minorities were not be considered only from the lens of today's evolved viewpoints (Azoulay, et. al., 2010; Moten, 2011). They were to be viewed in context of their time, although it could have been said that current Republican administration's reversal of President Obama's DoD policy on transgenered troops perhaps showed that longstanding sexual misconduct, racial tensions in society, as well as problems with gays and other sexual minorities had not evolved too much (Dannunzio, 2017).

The examples of convoluted and nonlinear integration of women in the military, and racial desegregation detailed in this chapter served as models that showed that significant transformations which impacted personnel broadly did not follow smooth linear paths. Decades passed after executive orders were signed which mandating racial desegregation and integration of women, during which different military services blocked the opportunities and upward careers of many minorities through bureaucratic steps, and internal protocols that resisted the intents of the executive orders (Cohen, 2010; Cohen,

2018). The literature review showed that the *context* of attitudes toward gays in 2011 vastly differed from those of previous decades as related to different minorities simply through societal changes and evolution, but paths of change set against the tapestry of their times seemed to be repeated stories of resistance or slowed change against each minority.

Viewpoints on the History of DADT

Department of Defense Instruction 1304.26 issued on December 21, 1993 differed from that same directive instruction more recently in effect (Executive Office of the President, 2010; U.S. Department of Defense Instruction, 2015). The older version instituted President Clinton's policy on service by gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered personnel in the military, which came to be known as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) (Belkin, 2011). This directive lasted until September 20, 2011, because the legislation to repeal DADT established in December 2010. It specified that the policy would remain in place until the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff certified that the repeal would not harm military readiness, followed by a 60-day waiting period (Belkin, et. al., 2012).

According to Frank (2012) General Colin Powell was instrumental in convincing President Bill Clinton – who was determined to have open service for gays in the military – to install the DADT policy instead. General Powell, the first African-American chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1989 to 1993, defended his stance as he addressed a U.S. Naval Academy audience in January 1993: "Homosexuality is not a benign characteristic, such as skin color or whether you're Hispanic or Oriental;…It goes to one of the most fundamental aspects of human behavior." (Lancaster, 1993, para. 14).

For years, he questioned the validity of comparison between racism and homophobia (Frank, 2012; Moradi & Miller 2009). Despite a pivotal role in establishing DADT as the military's policy, in an interview with CNN's Wolf Blitzer two decades later, General Powell had apparently changed his mind and said he had no problems with same-sex marriage (Frank, 2012). If it took four decades from when President Truman issued Executive Order 9981 directing the 'Desegregation of US Military' for General Powell, the first African-American to reach the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Frank, 2010, 2012), then it might take another four decades after President Obama's executive order repealing DADT for an LGBT officer to reach that pinnacle. To better understand why an African American general who experienced prejudice and bigotry firsthand not feel similarities with another hated minority, Ayers and Brown (2004) convey that although some minorities might have struggled for inclusion into the body of a majority population, but then other norms stay intact, and once integrated, former minorities might join the rest to push against the next minority seeking inclusion into the body. Ayers and Brown's (2004) concepts did clarify for me that the contradictory behavior might make sense.

On July 6, 2011, the 9th circuit Court of Appeals ordered the military to halt enforcement of the ban against open service for gays, which halted discharges under the policy (Barnes, 2011). This prompted the Pentagon military leadership to notify congress, and for President Obama, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen to forward their certification to Congress on July 22, 2011, which then set the end of DADT to September 20th, 2011. On that date,

President Obama held a ceremony at the White House officially ending DADT (Belkin, 2010; Belkin et al., 2012).

In military bases around the globe, the news of the repeal of DADT splashed in the media with the same energy it did around the country, and reactions were mixed (Barnes, 2011; Belkin et al., 2012). Along with stories of jubilation of those whose lawsuits had been victorious, there were military personnel who expressed dismay and disagreement, but emotions appeared to subside quickly (Barnes, 2011; Allsep, Levy & Parco, 2011). For me that was a watershed moment. One that seemed to speak to me about accepting my own gay nature. My self-acceptance of my gay nature had been a faltering muddle that spanned many years, and was a work in progress. It had many parallels to the military's shift in understanding and envisioning new realities about itself. Did a major organizational transformation live up to the true meaning of the word, and did it actually transform the tapestry of the organization? The U.S. military's history with racial desegregation and integration of women forewarned that such shifts were hard, long and complex, which stretched over many decades.

Organization's Preparation: Training and Stepped-Down Enforcement

In 2009, more than one year prior to the repeal, I witnessed that in military bases I worked in, DoD required most military personnel to undergo training on DADT policy. The training was not required for contractors, but was widely available. These training videos were not preachy regarding homosexuality, and in my eyes were done with kindness and sensitivity. I did not understand why servicemembers were required to attend such training, but several thought that it was as a result of lawsuits that DoD had lost. To me, the training was a good thing.

Secretary of Defense Gates tightened the standards regarding the enforcement of discharges, after having curtailed the acceptance of what he referred to as hearsay, or the *revealing* of a servicemember's sexual identity by a third party, in response to criticisms about 'witch hunts' against gays in some military organizations, and masses of lawsuits by discharged personnel in different courts around the country (Belkin, 2010; Frank, 2010). The training explained that the discovery (i.e. determination of a servicemember being gay) had to be a first-hand determination, and the suspected military member had to *tell* without being asked. This had dismayed many politicians outside the organization and disgruntled many military personnel inside it (Brooks, 2016; Cahill, 2008). A number of military personnel I spoke to indicated they were fearful that non-enforcement or non-existence of DADT, as to their minds, the U.S. military might lose its masculine toughness and hardcore image, or become effeminate.

I believed that although being a person of color or female, cannot be escaped, being gay can be hidden, even to oneself. Acknowledging my own baseline view a decade ago – that being heterosexual was normal, and being homosexual was abnormal – aligned me with views inside the U.S. military while DADT was in effect. Like the majority of personnel at the bases I worked in Germany, I did not want to know whether people were gay. My own starting point belief was that I could close my eyes and not be told that there were gays all around me, or that I myself was actually gay. That was an arrangement I found acceptable until, little by little, the arrangement stopped being reasonable. The notion that I was really straight but enjoyed being in a relationship with a woman became the obvious farce that it was. The dissonance in my own thinking became obvious. Investigating other colleagues' views about gays emanated out of sheer

bewilderment about not knowing how to think about gays, or whether my assumption that homophobia was universal was really true or not. I realized I was not happy or true to myself, nor self-actualizing, as Abraham Maslow (1970) had detailed regarding internal evolution, self-esteem and self-acceptance along the path of his hierarchy (Maslow, 1970). It was the realization that my own self-actualization was being harmed by not facing my true nature that I became motivated to undertake this exploration. I blamed or credited it to Maslow depending on the day.

Arriving at a Conceptual Framework for Personal Transformation

Reviewing theories on human relations that included the Hawthorne experiments in Chicago, Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, as well as Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory of motivation (Adler & Gundersen, 2008) led me to select Maslow's theory as the most suitable framework that incorporated the evolution I was on. In his attempt to describe human motivation, Maslow's five levels of needs, starting with physiological, security, esteem and finally self-actualization seemed to capture the journey I was on. Certainly, I had attained a level of physical, personal and social circumstances that were compartmented but met my needs. I was searching for my true authentic self, which was oscillating between psychological needs of belonging, and self-fulfillment needs of self-actualization.

Standing on the fence about my own transformation. For a long time, whenever I researched histories of gays, the endeavor became depressing and hard to bear. My many internal back-and-forths and indecision about wanting to come out was greatly impacted by the very high price that gays paid when they came out in the open, and afterward, throughout the remainder of their lives. For a very long time, my

hesitation at looking very deeply at myself centered on the very high cost of changing my self-identity. Standing on the cusp of taking ownership of my gay nature, the many books and documented painful histories of gays gave me pause. Many nights I would ask myself 'Why on earth would I not want to stay safely tucked 'in the closet' if being 'out of the closet' brought such sorrow'? The answer of course was that being in the closet was sometimes more painful.

Another aspect of being on the fence about my transformation was that coming 'out' was irreversible. Once a person 'announced' their non-heterosexual identity, it was irreversable. In my own head, in many self-talks, I could get quite depressed about being part of three different minorities, namely women, Middle Easterners and gays; not that there were no cross-pollination of these, but as per my biases, they accounted for three groups of people oppressed in different ways.

Evolution invoked Maslow. A key difficulty in studying organizational change in the timeframe of the repeal of DADT had been the inability to directly observe internal dynamics (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007), to get at the sensemaking that insiders went through before, during and after a major change (Bridges, 2009). In today's organizational environments around the globe where sensors, cameras and monitoring devices permeate workspaces openly, and communications exchanged among the workforce are autostored and can easily be analyzed with automated tools, many employers around the globe have new capabilities to observe internal dynamics of their personnel in real time. A few short years ago in DoD bases, this was not a possibility. Many years have passed since official passage of the repeal, and given prior transformations that attempted to abolish racial and gender disparities that were not fully

resolved, it stood to reason that even though gays were now technically allowed to be open, a long period of adjustment was likely needed before open service may be considered settled issue (Bridges, 2009; Bronski, 2011). Problems such as sexual harassment and racial animosities remained in DoD sub-organizations (Eager, 2016; Rock, et al., 2014), and as this study was being conceived as a topic of scholarly work, military services faced adjustment issues surrounding the integration of gays (Eager, 2016). This chapter's historical review of prior transformations illuminated the evolutionary track of various transformations that were supposed to eliminate obstacles facing other groups such as women and racial minorities.

This inquiry began in 2008 as my evolution and path of self-actualization was prompting me to understand how the organization dealt with minorities, and I was trying to figure out how my evolution might be boltstered or stymied inside that environment. In 2008 presidential elections had been underway, and candidates Barak Obama, Hillary Clinton, and John Edwards had all stated they would repeal DADT, as conditions regarding gay personnel inside DoD had become a growing issue (Washington Post, November 10, 2010). I tried to find gay individuals inside military bases where I worked, but the environment was such that no one dared to ask, nor would anyone ever openly admit to it. The construct of DADT was that I was not allowed to '*ask*', and no one dared '*tell*'. As I began my journey of investigation in 2008, about how military personnel felt about open services for gays in the military, my casual conversations conveyed to me that people around me did not actually believe that DADT would be repealed, and the statements of presidential candidates were like hot air coming out of politicians back home in an election climate. My own curiosity emanated from evolutionary steps that

Maslow had described in his theory (Maslow, 1970), given the disruptive internal changes I was going through. I was getting used to the military and its DADT policy, but the DoD workforce had already been living under that policy for decades. I wanted to see and hear what my colleagues felt about gay people, and how the behavior of the larger organization differed from what I was observing on the ground. I also wanted time to reflect and contemplate how I felt about it all.

Five years after the repeal of DADT, gay military personnel were still not 'outing' themselves in large numbers, illustrating continuing negative or prejudicial attitudes (Brooks, 2016; Mabus, 2016; Pentagon Library, 2016; Ramirez & Sterzing, 2017). In 2016, an active duty gay Army officer explained why military personnel did not come out in the open: "A great number of civilians do not dare coming out of the closet for fear of what their loved ones will think about them -- of bullying, of being abandoned, etc. Can you imagine what it would be like for a *soldier*?" (Ethan Davis, 2016, February 01, blog p.1, para.2). The ongoing negative opinion of gay military personnel and the continuing environment of rejection and repulsion of sexual minorities was illustrated in a military chat blog posting by an Army veteran with the online moniker 'Don't fear the reaper': "I'm not saying YOU can't be gay and in the military. What I'm saying is gays are just not actually good soldier material." (Don't_Fear_the_Reaper, 2015, para.3)

Despite continuing prejudice toward gays, and although there might have been a dozen reasons every morning not to continue on the journey that began in 2008, there was always one good reason to go forward, and often that one reason was that I simply did not want to be afraid to discover the true *me* or be ashamed of my true nature any more. And that was where Maslow's need framework came in. I was motivated to discover my true

self and be an actualized human being. There were no better theories or frameworks that resonated with me, or could explain the journey of transformation that I took. The thought was to self-actualize even though I was not sure I was on the right tier in the hierarchy.

Autoethnography as Methodology

My review of autoethnographic works revealed disenchantment with traditional research and the language of traditional research methodologies. In my readings, this dissatsfaction was rooted in the ways individuals' experience were subordinated to aggregate data that averaged data values from many individuals. Systematic reliance on repeatable experiments and data was criticized by autoethnographers for assuming individuals are akin to particles in scientific experiementation, or that real life circumstances were controllable like they are in Physics experiments, whereas real life situations in truth are non-similar and quite disparate (Denzin, 2014; Ellis, Adams & Bochner , 2011; Muncey, 2010; Chang 2008).

Differences between diverse methodologies were explored extensively and from ethnographic qualitative research to grounded theory, from ethical to critical social study methods, most qualitative research did employ survey instruments and tabulation of data gathered from numerous sources, and forwarded the role of researcher as one of impartial, independent observer eschewing nearly all bias, or at least accounting for their sources in order to eliminate them (Ghosh, 2012; Mundy, 2016; Morin, 2015; Raab, 2013; Rossi, Wright & Anderson, 2010; Senge, 1999). This was precisely the core criticism of autoethnographers who held that traditional research favored experiences of multitudes of individuals, and *commonalities* between their experiences as meriting more

attention than the in-depth look at one individual or one experience (Raab, 2013; Bannick & Coghlan, 2007). Methodologies reliant on surveys rendered the individual experience an aspect or a variant among the multitude or data points when the unbiased researcher focused on the larger trend and the overarching picture that emerged from the research; the value of individual experience tended to get averaged in the *process* of research (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2012; Muncey, 2010; Chang, 2008).

Autoethnographic Traditions of Qualitative Research

The autoethnographic research methodology of this work will be discussed at length in the chapter on methodology, but autoethnographic tradition and the variations and contexts of its different lenses are introduced here. Autoethnographic works were traditionally put into two broad categories: analytic and evocative (Anderson, 2006; Denzin, 2006; Ellis & Bochner, 2006). Compared to traditional ethnography, autoethnography was a relatively new field (Anderson, 2006; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011), and this field's scholars still debate with one another about its categorizations (Anderson, 2006; Chang, 2008; Denzin, 2014; Ellis & Bochner, 2006; Hamdan, 2012, Voloder, 2008). Anderson (2006) recognized the differences between the two traditions, and wrote: "The dominance of evocative autoethnography has obscured recognition of the compatibility of autoethnographic research with more traditional ethnographic practices." (p. 373). He proposed that analytic autoethnography was not only clearly distinguished from evocative autoethnography, but was a distinct subgenre within the broader practice of analytic ethnography (Anderson, 2006).

Emotive or evocative autoethnographies tended to focus on highlighting emotional presentations, often through evocative storytelling, while analytic

autoethnographies focused on developing explanation of broader social phenomena (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). Evocative or emotive autoethnographies had gained popularity for many reasons, some of which pertained to the de-humanization of social science fields by process of conducting scientific inquiries (Anderson, 2006). This was expressed by Margaret Chapman-Clark (2016) as follows:

> I naively thought becoming a psychologist was supposed to be about people, yet to be part of this scientific discipline, to become chartered and registered (so validated) I needed to learn how to 'write out' the person and, in order to be accepted, to represent lived experience in numerical form rather than in artistic ways through art and poetry and to avoid any possible contamination from my own biases. (p. 11)

Voloder (2017) called authoethnography *insider research*. Literature review of different scholarly works showed there was some interest in incorporating both analytic and emotive autoethnographic traditions into one; Egeli (2017) stated: "I hope I can do both; to be analytical and emotional." (p. 10). This work used the investigative perspective of an organizational insider at a time of significant change to understand organizational transformation that was underway, and according to Voloder (2017) this categorized it as an analytic autoethnography conducted by an *insider*-researcher.

Ellis, Adams & Bochner (2011) encapsulated criticism of autoethnography by citing that some of its critics wanted to hold autoethnography accountable to criteria applied to traditional ethnography. They expressed the issue this way: "autoethnography is criticized for either being too artful and not scientific, or too scientific and not sufficiently artful." (p. 283). Hokkanen (2017) expressed that "in contrast to conventional

ethnography, autoethnography places more emphasis on using the personal experiences of researcher-participant to understand facets of the social world within which s/he [*sic*] is embedded." (p. 26). Furthermore, Voloder (2017) responded to critics of autoethnography by expressing that "it provides a strategy for negotiating the challenge of incorporating personal reflection into ethnography and utilizing self to understand the experience of others." (p. 28).

A review of literature on autoethnography revealed internal criticisms that echoed scholarly concerns (Ellis, 2004; Denzin, 2006; Marechal, 2011). Emotive autoethnographers accused the analytical ones of not being original, artful or self-revealing enough, and too preoccupied with traditional methods of ethnography (Denzin, 2006, 2014; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). Analytical autoethnographers criticized the emotive ones of being unnecessarily evocative and self-preoccupied (Anderson, 2006). Anderson (2006) maintained that evocative autoethnographers remained marginalized in mainstream social science venues due to the "rejection of traditional social science values and styles of writing" (p.377). As an analytical autoethnographer, my intentions were to provide insights from my quest and research in customary and familiar formats that could have been consumable to other researchers. I did not find value in emotive evocation about feeling like one was a stranger to oneself, or other self-pitying soliloquy. My scientific and technical path of life led me to analytic autoethnography.

Evocative Autoethnographic Research Tradition

Anderson (2006) reviewed the history of scholarly works after WWI that provided biographic backgrounds, or drew heavily from personal experiences to explain the eventual rise of the autoethnographic traditions. Self-reflection and self-observation

were central key components of these traditions (Anderson, 2006). Ellis & Bochner (2006) stated that *evocative* appeared as a separate term associated with the tradition because readers of authoethnography recognized the evocative quality of the work, which was a characteristic that made "a distinctive genre of ethnographic writing" (p. 436). Ellis, Adams & Bochner (2011) described evocative autoethnographic traditions as commonly including personal narratives and storytelling, with many having different forms of interviews, including reflexive, dyadic, indigenous or native layered, and interactive. "Autoethnography, as method, attempts to disrupt the binary of science and art." (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011, p. 283). The role of researcher in emotive traditions was centrally dependent on various elements, such as memory, self-questioning, narration, emotions, and their correlations to reactions and events, and also, interactions in ethnographical explorations.

Analytic Autoethnographic Research Tradition

Within the analytic autoethnographic tradition, theorists such as Chang (2008) favored methodical approaches to data collection, as well as systematic self-questioning, and narration. Anderson (2006) argued in favor of analytic reflexivity and commitment to theoretical analysis, while Ellis & Bochner (2006) argued against overemphasis of analytical, and favored allowing artistic aspects of an autoethnography to be brought forth into the analytical. Central tenets of analytic autoethnographic methodology were to allow flexibility, analytic reflexivity, and wide latitude to an investigation in disclosing the sensemaking involved in understanding the phenomenon being studied (Anderson, 2006). Chang (2008) listed analytic reflexivity, narrative visibility of the researcher's self, dialogues beyond the self, and commitment to theoretical analysis as crucial

components of analytic autoethnography. Ellis, Adams & Bochner (2011) stated that narrative and reflexive ethnographies incorporated the ethnographers' experiences into the ethnographic descriptions and analyses of others. This flexibility in analytic autoethnographies methodology allowed inclusion of narratives on particulars of organizational norms and culture, and circumstances from the perspective of an insider.

Comparative Perspectives on Different Approaches

My background in science and quantitative inquiries provided the necessary lens for me to undertake the conceptual framework that grounded this study, which was composed of the four theories discussed in this chapter beginning with general systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968) used to represent the Department of Defense as a system of systems, Kotter's theory of change management (Kotter, 1995) and Ostroff's change management for government (Ostroff, 2015) as frameworks for understanding dynamics of planned organizational transformations, and Maslow's theory that highlighted actualization (Maslow, 1970). The qualitative research methodology that tied the observer-participant nature of this inquiry centered on an insider's reflexive analyses of internal and external transformations using analytic autoethnography as methodology (Chang, 2008; Izard, 2009) . My own absorption of the differences between autoethnography and other methodologies referenced my own scientific background in Physics and engineering.

In studies of complex systems of interchangeable particles – namely molecules, atoms, electrons, etc. – within controlled environments, scientists look at first order changes, followed by second, third, fourth and lower order perturbations that might have impacted that original change (Iwu, et al, 2015; Koperniak, 2016). Social sciences do not

deal with interchangeable particles and research environments are hardly ever controllable (Iwu, et al., 2015). Understanding second, third, fourth or higher order variations the way physicists analyze them are nearly impossible in social sciences due to immensities of variability between participants and uncontrollable environmental circumstances (Chapman-Clarke, 2016; Custer, 2014). Human beings are not interchangeable particles like atoms or electrons, and human environments are not reproduceable from one moment to the next (Izard, 2009). With qualitative research's survey methodologies, if first order changes could be identified, the *causes* underneath variabilities and data perturbations below that initial change might well remain indetermined, even through a separate survey (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007).

The personnel DoD organizations in Germany seemed to me to be comprised of mostly straight white men and women, along with various racial minorities and a small minority of servicemembers who were gay. As a contractor serving the needs of the DoD overseas in Europe, the proper subgrouping of data elements to survey other individuals experiencing what I was experiencing would be the totality of females coming out to themselves in this same organization, in the gay-friendly environment of Europe, being from a Middle Eastern Background like mine. Even if there were 1 or 2 individuals with such rare identical backgrounds working in Germany, there would still have been higher-order perturbation differences between them that would have hampered trending (Iwu, et al., 2015), in the research endeavor to understand the impact of organizational change on individual behaviors (Koperniak, 2016).

Autoethnography considered the in-depth study of each case from the perspective of the one who lived through the experiences, as opposed to a researcher studying the

case from a distance, unaware of the internal dynamics that gave rise to the individuals'

behavior(s) under observation. Given that this work focused on parallel transformations

of an individual undergoing a personal transformation, the keenest way to understand

behavior inside the organization was to utilize the autoethnographic methodology and

look at events inside-out, and by juxtaposing actual events for views from the outside in.

Finally, it must be added that many autoethnographers considered autoethnography their

only conceptual frameworks (Ellis, 2000; Ellis & Bochner, 2004), and still others rejected

labels that distinguished different approaches and disciplines in the social sciences

(Denzin, 2014). When immersed in autoethnographic works, I found this to be sometimes

disorienting, and sometimes liberating.

Summary

The conceptual framework of this research was fourfold, beginning with general

systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968) which represented the Department of Defense as a

system of systems, Kotter's theory of change management (Kotter, 1995) which provided

a large platform for understanding transformations, combined with Ostroff's change

management for government (Ostroff, 2015), whereby the two served as the frameworks

for undersanding organizational transformation. Maslow's theory (1970) that originated

in 1954, provided the linkage needed to apply the conceptual frameworks on

organizational transformation with transformation of self. Literature search in this chapter

focused on the three most recent organizational transformations in the DoD, related to

racial desegregation, integration of women into the armed forces, and open service for

gays and sexual minorities. The search of scholarly works interconnected the individual

and personal to the social and cultural spheres. This chapter laid the groundwork for the methodology, detailed in chapter 3.

The research methodology detailed in chapter 3 of this study was the analytic autoethnographic methodology (Chang, 2008) that rested on self-reflection and self-observation, and resonated with Maslow's concepts (Maslow, 1970), which addressed the quest for self-discovery and self-actualization in personal transformation. The conceptual framework explored in depth the parallel cases of the organizational transformation to allow gays in the military to come out in the open, with personal transformation to allow quest for self-actualization pave the way for coming out in the open as a gay person. Analytic autoethnography was specifically suited to an organization insider's lens, which allowed exploration, dissection and interplay of internal and external transformations.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this autoethnographic study was to illustrate insights learned through my individual experience of living through a transformational change in my identity, which paralleled an organizational change in the DoD, as a way of informing change makers about the nature of the dynamic personal circumstances, which they need to account for to increase the likelihood of success of their change efforts. This chapter includes a description of the autoethnographic research design, the rationale for its use in this study, the role of the researcher, the cataloging of data from observations and personal journals pertaining to opinions of personnel impacted by organizational transformation, and the trustworthiness of the autoethnographic data.

Research Design and Rationale

This study addressed experiences of members of an organization during transformational change, an important area of inquiry due to the need for supportive instead of resistive responses to change inside organizations. The problem I addressed was the suboptimal implementation of a formal transformational change driven by top management that did not account for the personal variation and potentially damaging unintended consequences among the individuals expected to live the change. Two research questions guided the study:

1. How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change?

2. What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization?

Because the willingness of people to fully cooperate in organizations' change efforts is important (Cameron & Green, 2015; Hart, 2016; Kotter, 1995), I sought to improve chances of success of transformational change by developing an in-depth understanding of experiences during such transformational change. Change makers may benefit from insights regarding the unpredictable nature of people's reactions and their willingness to cooperate in the change effort. Because autoethnography is a form of qualitative research in which the researcher uses self-reflection to explore personal experiences and connect the autobiographical story to the cultural issue being addressed (Chang, 2008; Muncey, 2010), this methodology was appropriate for this study. The use of a first-person account from an observer-participant inside the organization was appropriate to answer the primary question of this study. To answer the second research question, I examined the details of personal circumstances of living through the transformational change. My self-reflections and explorations of living through transformations pertinent to the second research question were augmented by research on historical and scholarly works on the repeal of DADT to provide insights for improving the likelihood of success of organizational change for individuals expected to live the change.

<div align="center">**Role of Researcher**</div>

The primary research question was the following: How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change? The second research question was the following: What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization? As the

researcher who lived through the organizational change of the repeal of DADT, and as a participant contractor for the Department of Defense who worked in DoD military bases before, during, and after the repeal of DADT policy, my role in this study was that of an observer-participant. The autoethnographic methodology supported my observer-participant role in the study. The benefit of the observer-participant role was that it provided in-depth insights into the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change, a view from the inside that illuminated disconnects related to implementation and success of the transformational change. My role also provided insights regarding the unpredictable personal dynamics related to the transformation for members who had to live the change.

Researcher Subjectivity in Analytic Autoethnography

Autoethnographies do not include empirical measures to limit researcher subjectivity (Ellis, 2004). In the analytic autoethnographic methodology, researchers as observer-participants experience, observe, interact, discuss, and produce data and artifacts through the filters of their own lens and understanding. The role of the researcher in an analytic autoethnography includes disclosing the subjectivities and biases that influence data analysis and outcomes. Researchers are to fully acknowledge the lenses, filters, and biases they use when conducting the study (Mundy, 2016; Rossi et al., 2010).

What Weick (2017) described as "believing is seeing" (p. 5-9), captured the tendencies of human researchers to extract cues from contexts that seem relevant as opposed to all cues that seeming implausible. The benefit of using autoethnographic methodology includes disclosures by observer-participant researchers regarding their

lenses, biases, and affiliations. These disclosures impact the way autoethnographers

ensure reliability, transferability and validity in their works.

In autoethnographies, whatever people think they are in the context of their lives

and experiences shapes how they see and interpret events (Brown et al., 2015; Denzin,

2014; Ellis, 2004; Moore, 2011). As observer-participants, researchers' observations

hinge on who they are and ways they make sense out of the environment they are

observing. Cues and parameters in researchers' observations that are discarded or

selected as well as interpretations made about events or observations, all depend on what

researchers find plausible and what sense they make of what they observe (Denzin, 2014;

Ellis, 2004).

Despite assumptions of impartiality, neutrality, scientific objectivity, and fairness

of observations about people, events, or activities, researchers can still unknowingly

inject many sources of bias in their observations by being who they are and believing

what they believe (Brown et al., 2015; Denzin, 2014; Ellis, 2004; Moore, 2011). To

manage this risk, researchers provide full disclosure of biases. Other forms of research

include statistical or numerical strategies to mitigate the risks of researcher subjectivities,

but with analytic autoethnography, statistical methods can not fully account for the risks

posed by researcher bias (Denzin, 2014; Ellis, 2004). Furthermore, mathematical means

can not fully mitigate predispositions of researchers during data collection, analysis, and

interpretation (Mundy, 2016; Rossi et al., 2010).

Autoethnographers fully disclose their biases to clarify how data may have been

viewed, understood, and analyzed. Without full acknowledgement of this source of error,

even the best researchers may be deluded into thinking their results are impeccable when

they may not be (Ellis, 2004). In the current study, I disclosed subjectivities in my role as observer-participant to mitigate the risks of bias that could have influenced the findings.

Hidden Insider: Observer-Participant

While I was a contractor in a DoD military base, no one could tell whether I was gay or straight. My colleagues and coworkers assumed I was straight. My evolving sexual orientation was not visible to outsiders the way my being female was. Not only was I an insider in the organization, but the other organizational members around me could not tell that I was changing. My colleagues could express their religious fears about God's wrath toward gays, or fears of unmanly gay soldiers bringing shame to the organization, or superstitions about gay soldiers not being as courageous as straight soldiers, without considering that I might be gay.

This presumption of straightness and the invisibility of my gay nature allowed me to think of myself as a straight person one minute, but then feel like I could never see myself in another heterosexual relationship, and that I was gay; I felt lucky that I was hearing my colleagues' unfiltered opinion about gays, yet also felt liberated to discover I might be lesbian or bisexual despite rampant bigotry I had heard.

During this journey, the invisibility of my gayness allowed me to understand what servicemembers must have experienced as they realized they could not escape their true nature, but were under a policy that required them to keep their nature hidden. An African American researcher investigating racial integration in the military might not have been able to obtain honest insights about White soldiers' biases against racial minorities because the African American researcher could not hide his or her skin color. However, I could easily pass as a straight person, so in my role as researcher I felt

assured that the invisiblity of my gayness provided a way to hear honest opinions inside the organization. Years after the discovery that began in Germany was fully realized, the continuing invisibility of my gayness allowed me to connect with several gay servicemembers who had to come face to face with their gay nature in the secrecy of their hearts and minds, knowing it was illegal and undesirable under DADT. I did not have black skin, nor was my regional accent strong to allow people to place me as a foreigner or outsider. I was not a servicemember, so I did not wear a uniform. In addition, I did not have any rank or perceived importance. These circumstances helped me blend in and be perceived as a regular person curious about peoples' opinions.

In the DoD bases, the workers I engaged with learned that I worked for and supported the DoD and had obtained special authorization, which meant my work was focused on unique missions requiring dedicated employees who led clean and upstanding lifestyles. I was part of a web of trusted people inside the DoD bases. This situation allowed me to gain exposure to heartfelt opinions of insiders who loved and cared about the DoD and the United States as much as I did. I believed what people told me as the organizational transformation was underway. I will never know how much the thoughts and sentiments people expressed impacted my own transformation, but I can attest that the impact was not negligible.

The benefit of autoethnography methodology was to lay out the interconnectivity of the web of self and others, and require that insider observers pay attention to the impact of the outside organization on its members. No matter how unquantifiable, this methodology offered that insider observers were impacted by the phenomenon being observed, and conversely might well have impacted the community or phenomenon.

Given the homophobia I was embedded in throughout my life, a lot of fears expressed by the DoD workforce resonated with me, but I do not know if the effect of these conversations was to solidify the load of antigay sentiment I inherited in childhood, or to lessen the load. Exposure to the information I sought may well have impacted my observations, the measure of which remained unknown.

Methodology

Central Concepts

The central phenomenon in this work was the cross-relation of coincident transformations, both personal with organizational, and the dissection of lived experiences related to the linkages between the two. Given that employee engagements have strong consequences for outcomes of organizational change (Hart, 2016; Cameron & Green, 2015; Kotter, 1995), a key notion of this work was that personnel inside my organization tried to make sense of changes being conceived, contemplated or introduced, and the sensemaking played an important part in the degree of success leaders were hoping for (Hart, 2016; Cameron & Green, 2015). Personnel's sensemaking about a transformation was critical to the their reactions, which in turn impacted the outcome that leaders had wanted to attain (Hart, 2016). Sensemaking not just by me, but by the rest of the DoD personnel, was the invisible, internal process that impacted the connectedness of people during the transformation process, and the outcome of the change.

Sensemaking

Karl Weick (1995) defined sensemaking as "literally, it means the making of sense" (p. 4). In the field of intelligence and information gathering, David Moore (2011) said sensemaking referred to "a set of philosophical assumptions, substantive

propositions, methodological framings, and methods" (p. xxxvi), which laid out how intelligence professionals gained a necessary understanding of relevant parts of their world. In cyberspace and search for meaning inside big data, sensemaking models were used to understand how people and organizations interacted with their societies, groups, sub-organizations, other websites and their members. In that field sensemaking was used to understand how people faced new problems or unfamiliar situations, and that "Sensemaking is the process through which people work to understand issues or events that are novel, ambiguous, confusing, or in some other way violate expectations" (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014, p. 57).

Sensemaking became an important part of forward progress toward artificial intelligence as it focused on how humans made sense out of circumstances they did not understand. Whether trying to pull significance out of vast stores of data about computer users' behaviors, or tyring to understand organizational behavior, Karl Weick (1995) observed that sensemaking was something that came quite naturally to all of us, although the process can be complex. He contended that people recognize, act upon, create, recall, and apply patterns from the material of their lived experiences within their world, so as to impose understanding and order on those experiences. He identified seven key properties of sensemaking "Identity, retrospect, enactment, social contact, ongoing events, cues and plausibility" (Weick, 1995, p. 3) which he applied in different ways throughout his work. He advised to think of sensemaking as a frame of mind about other frames of mind.

Whether synthesizing big data and arriving at an understanding of collaborative sensemaking (Paul & Morris, 2009), group interactions in cyberspace, and large *ideation* (Chan, Dang & Dow, 2016), sensemaking – both numerically derived from massive data,

and descriptively derived via paths defined by individuals who navigated clues they found in their lived circumstances – evolved into an important part of understanding individuals' experiences within larger contexts, such as organizations, societies and cultures (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). As time and contexts changed, experiences looped back, or were revisited to provide new understanding for individuals themselves (Weick, 1995).

Although self-reflective insights and data form vital components in employing autoethnographic methodology, no specific sensemaking protocol was *prescribed* by theorists (Chang, 2008). Within the web of self and others in DoD bases in Germany, sensemaking in this work was the process of my making sense out of my circumstances which were very confusing and quite stressful, as the organization's personnel were trying to make sense of the transformation that was occurring around them. The research questions in this study aimed to illuminate important considerations of transformational change management processes, focusing on how the large DoD organizations adjusted to transformation, while individuals were simultaneously experiencing their own personal transformations and adjustments. Techniques that resonated with Weick's (1995) work were utilized in what was called or referred to in this work as sensemaking, given the inherent flexibility of the process, and adherence to the seven properties that Weick had identified as 'Identity, retrospect, enactment, social contact, ongoing events, cues and plausibility' (Weick, 1995, p. 3). The sensemaking in this work squarely resonated with techniques recommended by Chang (2008), Muncey (2010) and many others, which were simply to revisit or recreate memories of experiences.

Analytic Autoethnographic Lens

This work utilized narrative as part of the analytical autoethnography methodology. Analytical autoethnography was more grounded in methodical analysis than emotive autoethnography, which focused primarily on emotions and personal story (Anderson, 2006). As fascinating as some of these emotive autoethnographic traditions were, and as useful as they may have been in detailing personal stories of people caught up in difficult situations, emotive autoethnographic methodology in my view fell short of going beyond one person's journey, or allowing a larger exploration of implication to other organizations, or society. This work followed the analytic autoethnographic tradition, which was better suited to the systematic self-questioning and explorations to be focused in this inquiry.

Analytic autoethnography and the seven aspects of sensemaking. Personnel in organizations were affected by their perceptions, as well as their own *interpretations* of communications (Denzin, 2014; Lewin, 1997) – messages from leaders, communications with colleagues, with subordinates, from top levels of the organization, within communities and so on are all interpreted differently through different lenses. Given the criticality of these interactions in times of change (Cameron & Green, 2015; Hart, 2016; Kahn, 1990; Ngima & Kyongo, 2013; Rhon & Sutrich, 2014), *meanings* given by inidividuals to various communications and interactions can take significant importance. Meanings given by insiders to organizational communications, or understandings that were arrived at by members of the organization during interactions with others, took on some importance in this autoethnographic methodology, given that this pursuit for meaning employed techniques such as retrospection, interpretive, shared, social or

transpersonal narratives (Chang, 2008; Muncey, 2010). Moore (2011) believed that *sense* was in the eye of the beholder, and sensemaking an individual trek. This resonated with Chang (2008). Garner (2012) and Denzin (2014) forwarded that understanding how personnel made sense of organizational transformation was critical to the way they reacted to change. Although personal and individual, the *process* of sensemaking was commonly engaged by all (Lewin, 1997; Weick, 1995), and was performed repeatedly in the reference frameworks of peoples' past experiences and understandings. In my circumstances, my personal experiences were unique, although detailing the sensemaking process through autoethnographic methodology was to provide the commonality applicable to other minorities' social experiences inside other organizations.

Weick (1995) identified seven properties or aspects to sensemaking, and in various disciplines from organization studies, to intelligence, big-data analysis, and others, these have been called properties, parameters, features, lenses, variables, concepts and many other terms (Chan, Dang, & Dow, 2016; Moore, 2011; Paul & Reddy, 2010; Weick, 1995). In organizational studies, the first aspect of sensemaking was the identity of the person trying to make sense of the organization, since the person's identity in their organizational position shaped how the individual interpreted events (Weick, 1995; Moore, 2011). The second was retrospection, or opportunities to look back at occurances – even communications about occurances – in the organization, and interpreted or tried to make sense of them (Chang, 2008; Weick, 1995).

The third aspect of sensemaking was the enacting of the environments that people in organizations faced and lived, since people impacted and were impacted by the organizational environment (Brown, Colville & Pye, 2015). The enactment of the

environment also referred to human tendencies to build narrative accounts which helped reduce complexity of their lived experiences in the organization, and put in context their dealings with changes in the environment. The fourth was social activities and storytelling shared and distributed by members of the organization (Brown, Colville & Pye, 2015). Of course, in these days of social media, and shared storytelling, this aspect has taken on proportions not envisioned by Weick (1995), but these shared social activities of exchanging stories about the job events with insiders in the organization, were found to help evolve our conversations with ourselves and others (Brown, Colville & Pye, 2015).

The fifth aspect of sensemaking was the incessant, ongoing nature of its evolution, and the ways that changes in the organizational environments caused even previously-shared narratives to evolve or adjust to the changed enviornments (Weick, 1995). Cameron and Green (2015) provided overviews of classical approaches to change management by looking at psychological theories about individual change, such as the four approaches to understanding individual change, which included cognitive, behavioral, psychodynamic and humanistic approaches. After these, they expressed the importance of managing change in self and others, before delving into team changes, and finally, organizational change (Cameron & Green, 2015). It was Weick (1995) and this fifth aspect of the sensemaking process that illuminated ways memories and narratives changed over time. It was not that the passage of time made them duller or less accurate albeit common – but that an incessant process of reframing and re-understanding past events as environments revised previously exchanged narratives.

The sixth aspect of sensemaking pertained to clues extraction, which meant that decisions on what or which information was significant depended on contexts of lived experiences in the organization (Weick, 1995, 2017). This facet was one where many thinkers like Chang (2008), Muncie (2010), Moore (2011) and others agreed with. The seventh and last aspect was about people favoring plausibility over accuracy; This said that people needed to select contexts that helped them see what made sense, instead of hearing factual and accurate descriptions of events that may not have offered a plausible explanation of occurances (Brown, Colville & Pye, 2015; Moore, 2011; Weick, 1995, 2017). According to weick (1995) People prefered what made sense to them over an accurate description of events, even though the later could be more detailed. Many researchers (Chan, Dang, & Dow, 2016; Brown, Colville & Pye, 2015; Moore, 2011; Paul & Reddy, 2010) agreed with this aspect of sensemaking. Weick (1995) expressed it as plausibility over accuracy. This last aspect was one of the factors that compelled the use of autoethnographic methodology for this work, given that there were no ways of reinserting impartial accuracy into data and information collected at a time of shifting plausibility, perspective, and radical change.

Illustration of fifth and sixth aspects of sensemaking. Weick's (1995) sixth aspect pertained to the incessant ways that people reframe previous understandings, even when previously-shared narratives contrast or seem at odds with their newly reframed or evolved perspective as their minds responded to changes in the organizational environments. What I observed in the period since the repeal of DADT was when some colleagues who opposed the repeal of DADT bristled at comparisons of policies related to racial or gender segregation with DADT policy. They articulated what General Colin

Powell had articulated many times in the 1990s and 2000s. General Powell who was

pivotal in establishing the DADT policy, believed that gender and skin color were

unchangeable features of a person, unlike – to his mind – being gay (Cummings &

Rudnicki, 1995; Frank, 2012). Over the years, as my colleagues reframed and changed

their minds about their opposition to the repeal of DADT, they also changed the

narratives of stories or of events that reflected their reframed beliefs; they would say that

they did not really oppose that policy when I was a witness that they had. It was

documented that General Powell had done the same (Frank, 2012). This fifth aspect

allowed people to feel aligned with the transformed DoD as an organization that allowed

its members to love whomever they liked no matter the gender or sexual preference. As

my colleagues' sensemaking evolved following the repeal of DADT, the memory of their

prior oppositions gave way to a reframed understanding that they had always been

freedom loving, and as such they *always* favored servicemembers to have the feedom to

choose their love interests (Weick, 1995, 2017).

      The sixth aspect of sensemaking pertained to peoples' mental decisions on what

or which information was significant in accordance to the contexts of their lived

experiences in the organization (Weick, 1995, 2017). This was not perceived by me to be

some scheming attempt for my colleagues to rewrite history, or refuse ownership of their

own prejudices. on my former colleagues' parts to lie or dupe other people, it was some

personal reframing or changed-remembering of the past that had now convinced each

man or woman that they were not as really as hostile or fearful of the repeal of DADT as

they actually were at the time. For a couple of my colleagues, nothing short of a

videotape documentation of their words would have convinced them they had said

radically different words at prior times. Weick (1995, 2017) held that alterations in the environment allowed reframing and narrative tweaks in our own memories over time regarding events that took place in the past. Reality according to Weick (1995) was an ongoing manifestation that emerged from individuals' efforts to create order and make retrospective sense out what had occurred to them in their evolving environments.

Commonalities and differences of analytic autoethnography and sensemaking. Brown, Colville & Pye (2015) held that for organizational studies, the seven aspects of sensemaking were important elements, and this study certainly used many of them. Following analytic autoethnographic methodology prescribed by Chang (2008) self-narrations, retrospection, interpretations of conversations, interpretations of textual artifacts such as personal notes or items from DoD suborganizations were extensively used in this work. While analytic autoethnography was the research methodology in this work, sensemaking was a process that proved useful during the usage of the methodology. Practicioners of sensemaking in fields of intelligence, internet usage research, social media engineering and other sub-specialities, may have been engaged in elevating the practice to the level of research methodology, but in the scope of this work, it was a useful process employed during the methodological application of analytic autoethnography. It was noteworthy that terminologies ubiquitously used by autoethnographers overlapped with those used by sensemakers. Both autoethnography and sensemaking focused on letting meanings emerge out of data of experiences, and both traditions, in their focus on the web of self and others, used similar terms in analyses of interpretations, in collective narratives and retrospection. Many correlations between these were employed in this work.

Data Collection

Commonly, autoethnographic inquiries included personal memory, self-observational and self-reflective insights, as well as external data (Chang, 2008; Ellis & Bochner, 2004). The corpus of *data* included notes from conversations, journal entries about discussions, reflections about individuals, self-observational and self-reflective information, journals of discussions with military personnel, personal memory, and records of interpretations and meanings about various conversations, communications sent from the organization or its leaders.

Throughout my worklife in sciences and technology, the term data held great reverence. I fully understood the objections that traditional science had against social sciences. The *word* data had pertained to numerical quanta that some researchers objected to its use in autoethnographic works, mostly because of non-numeric and non-quantitative nature of ethnographic explorations. The perspective of those researchers for whom the usage of the *word* appeared objectionable, was understandable. The perspective of those for whom the usage was not objectionable was also understandable. My own habit of thinking of all information – numeric and nonnumerica – as *data* was just a personal routine. It was the best word to convey the totality of information this methodology used to answer the research questions.

Time span of information collection for this study began in 2008 when DADT was in full force, and DoD's organizational policies required immediate termination of personnel discovered to be gay. The work spanned through the repeal of DADT when DoD organizational policies allowed not only open service for gays, but began consideration to extend that to transgendered personnel. The time span matched my own

personal transformation, so what was parallel was the struggle of the organization to come to accept sexual minorities despite its history. My coming to accept of my gay nature had precisely been my own heart's struggle during this same period.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Conducting quantitative research during my undergraduate and graduate years of studying Physics involved presenting strong evidence of data validity, proof of reliability of measurements, and demonstration of objectivity throughout data acquisition processes ranging from planning, collection and execution. Qualitative research methodologies differed from quantitative ones, and the former allowed for field-data acquisition to include real life events that might not be duplicated (Saldana, 2003; Anderson, 2006; Custer, 2014). Analysis of traditional qualitative data required systematic identification of themes and parameters in the data content, and identification of variables, with values embedded in data sources that were then used to devise data matrices or visualizations (Weitzman, 2000; Saldana, 2003). In the last half century, some qualitative researchers eschewed validity and reliability as gold standards for engendering legitimacy of their works, which gave rise to use of alternative criteria such as fidelity, accuracy, consistency, authenticity, plausibility and other norms (Taylor, 2014).

Demonstrating trustworthiness of this work was very important, given that many researchers such as Taylor (2014), Anderson (2006) and Holt (2003) agreed that trustworthiness confirmed high quality of qualitative research. According to Taylor (2014) establishing trusthworthiness in qualitative research required satisfying four criteria, which were credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These

corresponded to quantitative research's internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity.

Credibility and Transferability

Credibility pertained to establishing that the results of the qualitative research were credible or believable from the perspective of the participants – in this case, the personnel working at DoD bases in Germany – and that the phenomenon of interest was understood and found credible from their perspective (Saldana, 2003; Taylor, 2014). Transferability referred to the degree to which the results could be transferred to other contexts and settings (Taylor, 2014). While a person wishing to transfer results of an autoethnography to a different context was responsible for making the judgement of how sensible the transfer might be, it was incumbent on the autoethnographer to provide as much detail about the context of the research, as well as the assumptions and constraints that were central to the execution of the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Taylor, 2014).

An autoethnographic methodology was suited to providing the context needed by other qualitative researchers, given that autoethnographers were observer-participant researchers who were to go into some detail about the context, circumstances, biases and viewpoints of their own, as well as other participants. This was presumed to be done in a detailed and transparent fashion to establish credibility, but also for purposes of informing future researchers the limitations and applicability parameters of the autoethnography establishing boundaries of transferability into future works.

Dependability

I understood the third criteria of dependibilty from the perspective of my experiences as a Physics graduate student. I used to be immersed in physics experiments

where particles under observation were in closed or strongly controlled environments. The dependability of the quantitative measurements I took pertained to the replicability and repeatability of the experiments. In my current graduate works in the social sciences, no two events or activities were ever exactly identical or indistinguishably repeatable; additionaly, people were not particles trapped in closed environments. In my experiences with qualitative research no two event or activity were ever exactly the same parametrically, the way Physics experiments were.

Researchers such as Borders & Giordano (2016), Taylor (2016) and Saldana (2003) advised that in qualitative studies, dependability of the research emphasized the need for the researcher to account for the ever-changing context within which the research occurs. Thus, the changes that occured in the setting and descriptions needed to be described, most especially in an autoethnography. Dependability was the third criteria of trustworthiness and gave this autoethnographic study an advantage, since the narrative of the events and discussions with DoD personnel provided details of the context and setting pertaining to circumstances under research, alongside the lens of the observer-participant recording the events.

Confirmability

Confirmability was the fourth criteria of the trustworthiness of qualitative research, and echoed the criteria of objectivity in quantitative research. While in my days of conducing physics experiments, I had to be completely objective regarding the forces and particles I was doing experiments on, as a qualitative researcher, I admitted to being part of the organization I was observing, and admitted to being biased in favor of my organization, namely the DoD. In qualitative research, it was understood that each

researcher brought a unique – albeit not always impartial – perspective to the study, and

confirmability as a criteria of trustworthiness referred to the degree to which results could

be confirmed or corroborated by others (Saldana, 2003; Chang, 2008; Taylor, 2014).

Autoethnographers related this criteria to another set of interpretive research standards,

which was authenticity (Ellis, 2004). Authenticity as an autoethnographic research

standard intended to create ethically sound, empowering and beneficial relationships

between researchers and their participants. Satisfying this criteria required seeking a full

range of perspectives across participating groups including conflicting and contradictory

views (Taylor 2014). For example. in the case of this work, authencity required collecting

views no matter whether in favor or opposed to the repeal of DADT, and to represent this

pluralism in the research report. This was precisely how this autoethnographic work

conducted the regime.

In implementing the four criteria of trustworthiness, which were credibility,

transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Taylor, 2014), researchers were to

construct deep understandings of the *meaning perspectives* of their participants. In the

case of this work, the participants were DoD's military servicemembers, and the deep

understandings about them emerged from prolonged immersion in the DoD's social

worlds. These understandings were verified through *member checking*, which meant that

the understandings checked or were verified by members of the group (Taylor, 2014;

Borders & Giordana, 2016; Chang, 2008), nor did they appear out of the norm of the

spectrum of views belonging to the members of the group. As a member of the

organization, member checking was enmeshed and embedded in the data, although these

understandings were repeatedly challenged through evidence searches to disconfirm

them. These were done through inferences rising from grounded theorizing cited in the second chapter's literature review, such as disconfirmation of generational presumptions, disconfirmation of the invisibilty of sexual or gender identity, disconfirmation of presumptions about racial identity and so forth.

Optimization of Trustworthiness: Context and Narrative Writing

According to Taylor (2014), trustworthiness was optimized by researchers making visible the context of participants' social worlds. In this work, that was my own and other DoD servicemembers' social worlds when they were stationed or posted in Germany. The context of participants' social worlds were made visible by means of thick descriptions, which were the ideas, beliefs, values, and worldviews of the participants. Secondly, trustworthiness was optimized by the process of fieldwork inquiries through narrative writings in which their unfolding subjectivities were expressed in the first person (i.e., '*I*' and '*We*' voice) alongside probabilistic reasoning – namely '*it seems that…*', '*it appears that…*', or '*it is likely that…*' – conveying the implied uncertainty of interpretations. These two optimization techniques were liberally used in the journal writings, reflective narrations and across the breadth of data collection in this work.

Progressive Subjectivity

According to Guba & Lincoln (1994) researchers' self-understanding, and the need to make trustworthiness transparent in the research reporting, was a process they termed progressive subjectivity. Progressive instead of immediate subjectivity of researchers intended to enhance the trustworthiness of the work perceived by disparate reviewers. As the term implied progressive subjectivity provided the advantage of appearing trustworthy to individuals who might not have had the same starting point,

viewpoint, lens, or perspective as the researcher. The advent of the researcher as reflective practitioner, was to result in giving confidence to diverse communities of scholars in institutions of higher education interested in improving their own professional practices. Another advantage of using autoethnographic methodology in this work was that it allowed the usage of progressive subjectivity in research reporting.

Triangulation

Triangulation, drawn from the field of engineering in which surveyors used two or sometimes several observation points to baseline a straightline distance to a faraway object, triangulation in social science research had been a way of ensuring validity of data through the use of more than one method of data collection in order to answer a research question (Barbour, 2001; Taylor, 2014). According to Taylor (2014), triangulation in multi-method or mixed-method quantitative experiments might well have increased the validity of the data set, but for qualitative research it did not serve the epistemological interests of the interpretive or autoethnographic researchers.

The idea behind triangulation was that *multiplicity* of verifications helped achieve empirical objectivity and inferential certainty (Taylor, 2014). Barbour (2001) held that triangulation was hard to perform properly, because unlike surveying in engineering, data collected in discussions or surveys with participants came in different forms and defied direct comparisons. Finding similar results from multiple methods in triangulation from different qualitative methods provided corroboration, and some reassurances about the validity of the data, but its absence did not imply refutation or absence of data reliability (Taylor, 2014; Barbour, 2001).

Necessity of triangulation. In this work I was on a personal journey of discovery to find out the truth about my own nature, and beginning in 2008, I sought to discover whether my organization's personnel genuinely agreed or disagreed with policy changes to allow open service for gays before it was a '*Fait Accompli*'. To satisfy my curiosity, I found targets of opportunity to engage with, and did not cherry-pick military servicemembers who would give me positive or negative opinions about gay people. Even though I spoke to people from all services and ranks around my primary DoD bases in Germany, and bases far from my own, it was only possible for me to utilize targets of opportunity covering the widest range of diversity available at that time.

Autoethnographic personal journey on its own did not constitute an academic endeavor that could propel the discipline of organizational management forward unless the veracity of the information in my personal journals and notes could be verified against documented and verified scholarly works. That made triangulation necessary. As displayed in Chapter four, despite the constraints I contended with during information acquisition, widely dissimilar sets of opinions emerged showing widely different reasons for favoring or disfavoring the DADT policy. This concurred with public records of the controversies surrounding the repeal of that policy.

Data sets used in triangulation. Triangulation was attained through use of two different data sets. The first was the largest survey that DoD had conducted (up until 2010), which was a study of nearly four hundred thousand active duty and retired military personnel responding to a broad and far reaching examination on the ramification of the repeal of DADT. The results of that survey was published as the 'Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"'

(DoD, November 30, 2010). Due to this report's very long title, references to this report

will be abbreviated to DoD's 'comprehensive review', or DoD's 'report of the

comprehensive review'. The second data set included public records of military personnel

who either participated in lawsuits against the DoD, opined publically – in favor , in

opposition or something in between – about the policy and its impact, or the pulished

records of first person experience related to the DADT policy. These two data sets were

used as triangulization references. Although these data sources were to triangulate the

data in this study, they were not designated to provide insights on how this particular

organizational transformation change could have been improved. Data from this study

can be a source to provide such insight.

The credibility of evidence in this work regarding attitude toward gays was

bolstered over the recent years by continuing published accounts of sexual violence in the

military, misbehaviors toward minorities, and unfair treatment of various personnel in the

ranks, even though many years and decades have passed since various presidents signed

orders related to equality and protection of various minorities in the U.S. military. The

larger body of published evidence related to the repeal of DADT provided added

credibility to the researcher's presentation of experiences inside the complexities of

internal DoD organizational machinations.

Divergence from autoethnographic conventions was related to triangulation.
Autoethnographers have long valued the narrative truth in the understood experience

(Muncey, 2010; Chang, 2008), and questions of reliability referred back to the narrator's

credibility (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). Factual evidence in any autoethnographic

work had to render it unambiguous that the narrator had the experience(s) described, and

believed that what was described was actually what happened. In this autoethnographic data collection, a systematic identification of themes and parameters was executed along with distillation of variables. Many autoethnographic works skipped valuation or enumerations that in many typical qualitative analyses displayed raw data in charts or tables (Chang, 2008). In this work, this part was done mostly due to my own comfort level and automatic preference for such ordered displays of information. The need for triangulization was a part of the reason that numeralization of the raw data of this work made sense even though most autoethnographies omitted such quantizations. My choice of showcasing numerical data and tables of information was a departure from the conventional norms of autoethnography.

Expanded data set for triangulation and credibility. In this autoethnographic work centered on personal journal and notes used as data a balance point had to be found regarding textual artifacts and how much of the logs pertained to academic endeavor as opposed to private diary. Additionaly the demands of establishing observer-participant credibility as well as progressive subjectivity required disclosure of more data than simply what might be necessary and sufficient for triangulation of my results. To that end, two sets of data seemingly unrelated to the logs used in establishing triangulation were added in Appendix F. These were to stand alongside my other notes, personal journals, logs and diaries of conversations, and were to enhance the credibility of this work so that this academic inquiry might advance knowledge of this field, untangle complexities pertinent to the research questions, and establish the standing of the work so that future researchers might utilize it to increase understanding by conducting their own inquiries. Triangulizations that depended on DoD surveys had to be such that

comparisons and contrasts with data on military servicemembers might have provided

necessary verification of my autoethnographic findings. The coding strategy explained in

detail later in this chapter, was to distill and tease out themes and parameters as ways that

satisfied triangulization.

Data Integrity

Custer (2014) stated that a good qualitative study can help us understand a

concept or situation that would otherwise be mysterious or confusing, and this connected

to the idea that reliability helped to evaluate quality, whether it was in quantitative studies

that had a purpose of *explaining*, or qualitative studies with a purpose of *generating*

understanding. For this work, it was unambiguous that the repeal of DADT had occurred,

that there were public records of discord and dissonance inside and outside the

organization, and that the presidential decision provided a freedom to a long disliked

minority to serve openly in the U.S. military. What required data quality verification was

that the data I collected within with the span of openly available and already accepted

data or was outside it. Data quality and integrity hinged on the triangulization of the data.

Although news stories may have revealed unpleasant facts about life in the military for

gays or other minorities, an eyewitness accounting such as this researcher's observer-

participant view over the arc ot the transformation timeline had been rare.

Data Validity and Reliability

In autoethnographic works, validity had long been closely related to reliability in

that validity sought verisimilitude, and the giving of the sense that events or experiences

described by autoethnographers were lifelike, believable and possible (Ellis, Adams &

Bochner, 2011). This work did not try to resemble other realities in order to be lifelike, or

in order to be considered valid. This work involved and immersed the reader in the angles and aspects of life as a unique contractor supporting the DoD in a unique setting and time. The validity and understanding of the undergoing transformations at that time were to be understood by the reader through the in-depth sensemaking that the researcher revealed through the display of logs, notes and journals (appendices A thru F) during the process of this research. The straightforward telling of the path of transformation and the experience of an insider of an organization undergoing transformation was the path selected to provide verisimilitude and validity. This exposure of private thoughts and examinations revealed to the readers quandries and ambiguities that belonged to experiences and perspectives of one particular insider. It opened up the lived realities of the narrator to the readers, and in bridging the divide, it helped the reader feel the verisimilitude of those experiences.

Validity of findings had been the bedrock of our collective search for truth, and reliability was the bedrock of the truth being verifiable by most everyone. Generalizability pertained to applicability of findings to larger social realms. Events and experiences that could never be replicated by other people or for the readers of this work, could become reliable and valid if readers of the work were able to feel the verisimilitude of those events and experiences. Ellis, Adams & Bochner (2011) maintained that "Autoethnographers believe research can be rigorous, theoretical, and analytical *and* emotional, therapeutic, and inclusive of personal and social phenomena" (p. 1). Credibility of the data in this work was accomplished via the triangulation of journaled record of conversations with military personnel, public records of the historical facts of the repeal of DADT, organization surveys that provided factual data and referencial

evidences, as well as publicized controversies, lawsuits and grievances surrounding the DoD transformation and repeal of DADT.

Generalizability

Generalizability in autoethnographic works had never been like in the traditional scientific research where random samples of data or respondents' answers were generalized to represent the realities of all (Chang, 2008). In autoethnography, the degree to which the narrator brought readers into events, and when lived realities of the narrator along with the degree to which truths being explored felt applicable to reader's own personal circumstances, then the autoethnography was considered generalizable to the larger body of readers (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). The more effectively the autoethnography immersed readers into the realities of the narrator, the more successfully the ethnographer's experiences were generalized to larger numbers of readers (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011).

As the observer-participant narrator of this work, which was focused on parallel transformations – personal and organizational – at the time of the DoD's repeal of DADT, the validity of the truth presented in this work hinged on the spectrum of information detailing that reality, while also describing its meaning as it was perceived or understood by the observer-participant-narrator. That was where sensemaking had to be utilized. The truthfulness of the journals, notes, logs or data had to correspond to the way that data made sense to the narrator, and the readers of that internal dialog had to be given that sensemaking.

The reliability of the work hinged on the presentation of data from other people, gathered methodically, and consistent in providing voices to personnel who lived in the

same environment under the same organizational transformation but lived dissimilar experiences. Leveraging the time elapsed after the transformation and utilizing more recent narratives of personnel after the transformation brought additional data on the commonality of frame-shifts in sensemaking and other ways people make sense of events of the past, as the environment gives way to a new atmosphere.

Data Collection from Targets of Opportunity

During the data collection period starting in 2008, the country was still engaged in two wars, and in Germany's DoD bases personnel complained that it was far longer than most previous wars. Warfighters were exhausted by deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan, and we read accounts of a vocal controversial public opposition to any attempts to repeal DADT. As an information collector I was gathering all the tidbits I could inside the organization. My training as a physicist and my years of engineering work had hard-wired the scientific research method into my unconsciousness. I wanted to discover the truth about how people in the organization felt about gays, and about the repeal of DADT. I worried about data validity and reliability because I wanted to get to the real truth about peoples' feelings. I tried to talk to anybody who wanted to talk about the repeal.

Looking back, some of these discussions began like ritualized interviews, and for years I simply called them interviews of targets of opportunity, or simply respondents of my questions. These were not sanctioned interviews by university scholars, but was a way of taking advantage of the opportunities available to me under the circumstances to tap into truths that I believed were quite delicate, and vanishable. I could not let the opportunity slip by waiting for approval from the DoD, knowing they were routinely

declining such research, given the wartime security restrictions of the DoD, nor could I wait for scholarly review boards who most likely would have wanted randomly selected subjects or selections based on statistical approaches which could not have been possible without access to personnel data, which surely would not have been granted. Additionally, DoD had engaged in conducting its own study, the largest study and opinion survey DoD conducted of its own personnel – throughout the organization.

Seeing these impediments, I persisted with my own personal inquiry path toward understanding the truth inside my little corner of the DoD in Germany. My my data collection methodology was holding long conversations with military personnel one-on-one, gathering their answers, letting them pontificate over their reasons, getting responses and feelings they expressed to me, which helped me in answering my questions about what they thought about the repeal of DADT. Through those conversations, I trusted that the information I sought and received helped me light my way forward. As I progressed in my own sensemaking process, and as I evolved over the years, I continued to collect information and data about the ongoing transformations, although that insight might not pertain to the research topic of this work.

Subjectivities and Biases

Autoethnography utilized subjectivity to lay bare the perspective of the researcher, and had the added benefit of revealing the biases of the researcher-author (Denzin, 2014; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011; Chang, 2008). Bias was discussed the previous chapter as part of the structure of autoethnographies. Aside from *inherent* biases in research, autoethnographers provided data on motivations, reasons, calculations and

experiences pertinent to the topic being researched, without limitations of externalities
(Ellis & Bochner, 2004).

Pro-DoD lens bias. DoD that I had known seemed wedded to data-collection and
systematic methods of discovery, and fully immersed its members in its own ways of
looking at the world. I called that bias my pro-DoD lens. Whether it was due to the
responsibilities that come with defending the nation, or the utter devotion
servicemembers have to giving their all for their country, the loyalty and devotion of the
the pro-DoD lens was a bias in this work. Having to go through processes to establish
good moral character and behavior in order to be allowed onto special access workspaces
also increased the bias in favor of the DoD organization. The pattern of life inside of the
organization looked to me to be such that insiders were either aligned with the
organization, and felt at home in its culture and mission or felt somewhat disconnected or
alienated and subsequently, many of those would depart. My bias was that I was in the
earlier category even though at the time, the DADT policy did not favor gays inside DoD.

Organizational socialization bias. Katz (1964) in his seminal work held that
organizational participation rested with three essentials, namely that (a) people were to be
induced to enter and remain with an organization, (b) that they had to carry out assigned
roles in dependable fashion, and that (c) there were quick and innovative ways by which
they could go beyond their specified roles. As an all volunteer force, people were to be
willingly to freely enter our military system as warfighters. Well defined roles in the
military progressed them upward in the organization, which provided opportunities that
allowed them to go beyond their assigned roles. Various benefits, training, health and

retirement programs provided incentives to stay in the military and stay loyal to the organization.

Ethnographers looking into military culture inside the Department of Defense, had found the aforementioned components bonded personnel with their DoD services and suborganizations in strong and meaningful ways (Lytell et al., 2015; Manigart, 2006; Soeters, et al., 2006). Organizational socialization was a term denoting the process by which employees learned and adapted to their roles, jobs and workplace organizational culture (Ozdemir & Ergun, 2015). This was what Weick (1995) called the *identity* of the individual inside the organization as related to sensemaking. Ethongraphic frameworks that originated the concept of organizational socialization looked at the individual members of the organization from the outsider perspective while Weick looked at it from the individual's insider view.

The military was a type of organization that could impact how individuals saw themselves (Fallows, 2014). It left a strong stamp on its members, as military culture became embedded in members' self understanding (Caforio, 2006). For example, personnel defined themselves as marines, airmen, soldiers or sailors for decades, or their lifetime (Fallows, 2014). This contrasted sharply with members of large organizations such as Walmart or Boeing who did not come to see themselves as Walmart-ers or Boeing-ers the way military personnel proudly self-defined as sailors or soldiers throughout life (Fine & Kleiman, 1979; Frank, 2010; French, et al., 2004). The strong emotional bonds to military organizations pointed to unique organizational socializations not easily found outside DoD. This was a strong a source of bias for each servicemember whose viewpoint was requested in the course of this inquiry, and the level of bias was

indeterminable. The observer-participant narrator was also bias due to the pro-DoD lens bias.

Culture of trusting only insiders bias. In studying sexual assaults in the military, researchers found the organizational culture such that complaining to outsiders might bring retaliation to members of the organization: "Some participants report seeing retaliatory behaviors first-hand or could easily imagine it occurring within the force" (Dippold, Van Winkle & Hurley, March 2015, p. vii, para. 6). A revulsion toward disclosing negative information to people outside the DoD organization was documented and reported (Meredith, et al., 2018; Rhodes, 2010). This illustrated another bias whereby DoD personnel trusted insiders. It was also another confirmation of limitations that a strictly ethnographic approach may have had inside DoD, where members did not wish to involve outsiders, or did not trust outsiders with the whole truth (Dippold, Van Winkle & Hurley, 2015)

On one hand, being an insider allowed trusted access to insights about the organization, its people and its culture, but on the other, it predisposed its member with a sense of socialization, belonging and allegiance that possibly blinded them to problems. As subjectivity went, I freely admitted to suffering from both edges of this double-edged sword.

Data Analysis Plan

The coding strategy of the data – namely, logs, notes, journals, field notes and recollections of experiences, conversations and events – followed the process recommended by Chang (2008), Muncey (2010), Hokkanen (2017), and Egeli (2017). The coding strategy in autoethnographic methodologies was for the researcher to code the

themes, concepts, impressions, and other significant markers that emerged from experiences, collected data, artifacts, memories and all other sources of data. This work accomplished that, but also, in order to properly triangulate with the DoD surveys and data sources, as well as open and public accounts of the repeal of DADT, more mundane coding such as demographic information had to occur as well. What was considered relevant was to be coded, and in the data I gathered, some traditional and non-traditional parameters were coded.

Traditional parameters I coded included parameters like gender, approximate age, and service – namely, Air Force, Army, Navy, etc. To provide full security protection for individuals I engaged in Germany, specifics such as unit, duty and mission were completely omitted. General rank, and years of service were included. Other Personal parameters such as religious or political affiliation, and ethnicity were coded systematically, and were used in analysis and cross referenced with other themes from conversations. A significant part of the data rested with reflexive data that paralleled exchanges with other personnel, and interchanges of thoughts, opinions, perceptions, impressions, biases, reactions and reflections of other insiders during their own sensemaking of the transformation.

The coding strategy was to identify themes and concepts that reveal insights on the primary and secondary research questions in this work, which were: (1) How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change? And, (2) What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization? Answering the two related questions necessitated coding

personal notes, journals and logs regarding interactions, conversations, insights and feedbacks with other insiders related to the organizational transformation, which shed light on insiders' circumstances of living through organizational change. These expressed the impact of these circumstances on my own personal transformation, and illuminated understandings about insiders' perceptions which could have helped the organization better execute the intended transformation.

Data Sources and Data Acquisition Process

From the end of 2008 through 2009 and the presidential election season that resulted in the Barak Obama becoming the president, there were only rumors at the U.S. bases in Germany where I worked that DADT might be repealed. From the minute the idea occurred to me that I really wanted to find out how people around me *really* felt about gays, I found my desire for discovery irresistible. I wanted to talk to people at sites I worked in across Germany, about what they felt – not just about the rumors of repeal, but about what they thought about gays, and about our beloved military allowing open service for gays. In my mind's eyes I saw people around me that I could engage with in conversations, people whose faces I could look into, and people who were openly, freely and willingly interested in speaking their truths, speaking their hearts and talking to me about their points of view. I wanted to find out whether I was like them, or really different from them. I wanted to understand whether they would consider me a freak if they realized I was gay. I wanted to know if they could read my mind, or figure out that I was realizing I was gay. I thought the idea of talking to people near my military bases would work. I thought it would be powerful and transformative for me. I thought it would provide insights I had not thought of before.

At the outset, I had many more questions I wanted answered than the work that eventually resulted in the inquiry displayed here in this work. Although I admired journalists and celebrated interviewers who made a career out of interviewing people, I was not that accomplished, skilled or adept at talking to people. Nonetheless I cultivated the ideas in my mind and was motivated and determined. Over time, my scholarly advisors compelled me to investigate ways of acquiring permissions and DoD approval to conduct a sanctioned study, but at a time of war, the organization made it impossible to do so. I thought academic inquiry was about finding the truth, and that if I was curious enough to listen to people, allowing them to express themselves willingly and openly, their words would reveal their truths, and I would be able to document those words not just for my own benefit in that moment but maybe in the future when I could look back on them, and find some other truth or revelation down the line. My journey of conversation collection began, and that compilation of truths became the data sources in this work. Twenty nine conversations were compiled for this work, although there were many more individuals who engaged me over the period starting before DADT was repealed through the finalization of the repeal, and afterward. Not all of my compilations were pertinent to the academic inquiry which became the focus of this work, but they were all significant to me.

Process of Data Acquisition

My practice of taking fieldnotes evolved through the many years of my education. In my undergraduate and graduate Physics works, I immersed myself in technical fields, practiced making detailed observations during experiments, tests, and trial activities documenting all that transpired as data – some useful, and some not so much – and as

facts. As an older researcher in the social sciences and engaged in listening to people speak about DADT, my former practice of documenting facts and events now included keeping track of important insights such as gestures, expressed perceptions, temperament, sentiments and other significant reflexivity or emotions. It was overwhelming and I did not think I succeeded too well.

I did not ever get a positive response from people inside any DoD base in Germany when I asked whether I could tape record our conversation. Actually one man became highly agitated and unpleasant. That early lesson was to stop asking. The problem remained that to engage speakers in coversations I needed to help people feel they were safe to speak their truth, I needed to keep my eyes on them, and give them a sense that I was really listening to them. This interfered with my documenting their words. The process of data acquisition that I settled on allowed me to engage dozens of people in conversation, document important segments of what they spoke about, and keep a record of the conversation electronically. The details of the process I followed were enumerated in the sections to follow.

In this work, I wanted to answer two related research questions: 1) How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change? And, 2) What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization? The process of data acquisition entailed coding my logs, notes, journals and artifacts on electronic media that were then analyzed, compared, cross-referenced, categorized, re-categorized and compiled to provide the themes, concepts, narratives, and distilled ideas that revealed the evidence to back up personal

circumstances of living through the organizational change. These revealed some disconnects between insiders and suborganizations, or larger DoD organization, the important central pain points that fed the dissonance between personnel and their organizations, and the ways the experiences by the personnel and the organizational processes could be improved. The analysis of the notes, logs and journal documentation entailed making several passes at the data tagging, rearrangement, collating or juxtaposing before integration, in order to pull out threads previously unseen. This process entailed remembering and recalling, which required going through the information at a later time, making additional notes, coding, and sometimes using different colors on the electronic files that were copies of the original to highlight, underline, make bold or distinguish portions of the texts.

Early failures. My first few attempts at conversing with my colleagues about gays in the military went so badly and were so awkard that each miserable failure jolted me to avoid the mistakes that derailed my previous attempts. In 2009, for each new attempt, I travelled to a distant site in order to be completely unknown. I would observe personnel that I thought were American military to try and engage them in conversation. I was nervous and unsure of myself. It can be easy to imagine what someone's reaction – let alone a military man stationed overseas – might be if some total stranger stopped them on their tracks, and asked if they could have a conversation about gays in the military! It was disastrous. Time after time, emphatic *NO* answers dashed my hopes. The disaster were my own fault, born out of my own incompetence. My failures taught me something that professional interviewers know all too well, which was that in order to engage people in conversation there had to be some rapport, some trust and some connection. Would I

call this first phase of my data acquisition a sort of pilot? I think not. I think it was just a miserable and amateurish attempt that hindered instead of help my self-discovery. No significant data resulted from this phase. The usefulness of this period was to help me decide on a process that could result in data acquisition.

Deciding what to ask. I had so many questions to ask. I was so hungry to discover whether the hate and homophobia I had absorbed in my life truly reflected the way people thought inside their own minds, assuming they felt free to say what they truly felt. Most especially, I wanted to know if people would assist or oppose the organization's decision to repeal DADT, or behave with disdain toward gays. It was important whether I could be free to tell the truth about myself in the organizational environment, or would have to continue hiding my true self.

Given that DoD's transformations after WWII, allowing racial minorities and women into its ranks, was followed by issues of bias and reluctance toward the minorities (McCormack, 2015), I wanted to find out if something similar would be transpiring regarding gays. Of course, the difference in this case was that the heterosexual majority *could* visually tell who was black, Asian, Hispanic or female, but *could not* readily tell who was homosexual. Scientific education trained me to prepare well in advance of observation and inquiry, and launching into my personal discovery process to get at truths about my organization's personnel was no different.

In my inquiry, I wanted to establish rapport with the servicemembers, adjust to the tempo and pace of the individual, ask familiar questions – which meant adhering to Likert-like structure so familiary to military personnel – but also convey an open willingness to listen. I devised blocks of questions that were of interest to me, and

congruent with the types of questions DoD people were accustomed to hearing or seeing. These questions were supported by data as per my understanding at the time. After my failures at holding conversation with open ended questions, I was motivated to construct *normal-sounding* questions that sounded familiar to people working in various bases. I came up with four blocks of questions that were as follows:

1. Identity – the category included specifics that military personnel did not think twice about since they answered them numerous times in the many forms the military demands. These included age, rank, branch, years of service, unit-type, duty status, race, and religion. Name, duty station and other personnel or job identifiers were omitted throughout.

2. Position and bond with the organization – I tried to probe the degree to which the person felt aligned with the organization using *military-ese* substitution for bonding with their cohorts, which included readiness, cohesion, teamwork, leadership, satisfaction with work, mission, training, and accomodations.

3. Receptivity to change of DADT policy – I wanted to know about the person's exposure, beliefs and comfort level toward gays. Aside from asking directly if DADT ought to be repealed, and whether the person was personally comfortable with gays, a listing of beliefs covered by training videos and publications that military personnel were given – much like sexual assault prevention training and publication – that would have allowed the person talking to me to react to those beliefs that resonated with them.

4. Impact of environment – I wanted to know the impact of the environment, because the liberal and tolerant environment of Europe might have had some

impact on the receptivity of individuals toward open service for gays.
Exposure of our soldiers to those of our partner nations – such as NATO
partners that almost all had open service for gays – was a way for our troops
to directly see that militaries that allowed open service for gays were no
different than our own. I wanted to understand if the possible exposure to gay
European troops or gay friendly environment had an impact on our troops.

Offering reflexive analysis after presentation of data was a marker of analytical
autoethnography (Borders & Giordano, 2016), and this work included these reflections,
most especially since they impacted the observer-participant works of the researcher.

Types of Data

The bulk of data in this work was textual or enumerated text. Qualifiers had to be
given that with military people it was nearly impossible to avoid Likert scale
psychometric numbers, which was ubiquitously used in regular military banter. To
illustrate, jokes about military people ranking their experiences with numbers were
commonplace. For example, when asked how somebody liked a base eatery, a typical
response might well be '6', and nothing more, meaning that on a scale of one to ten, the
rating of the eatery was a six. Dates, partners, spouses might be ranked from one to ten in
regular conversation, as were jobs, cars, movies, television shows, bosses, subordinates,
and so on. In response to questions such as 'How comfortable are you in the presence of
gays or lesbians', the answer I might have gotten may well have been given as 5, which
was supposed to be translated to the middle of Likert scale from 1 – to – 10, meaning not
too comfortable but not uncomfortable either.

Most people I engaged with told me they were action oriented and hated writing a lot. Many proudly expressed they were very straight forward and linear and hated people who gave complex, nuanced or convoluted answers to questions. I quickly learned that I better come up with some Likert scales, or anticipate that many answers were going to be coming in numbers defined haphazardly. Very early in my inquiries, the unavoidability of receiving psychometric answers to questions became evident. I solved the problem by providing one consistent scale from one to five – commonly used in many military questionnaires I had filled out in Germany – to provide people a comfortable scale to express the *grade* or *value* of their feelings or opinions. Embedded in the gradations, abbreviations, jargon and numerical specificities of the military, my own reflexive analysis of discussions, statements heard, perceptions and all other data, was included in the presentation of the data since this was part of analytical autoethnography (Borders & Giordano, 2016), and this work needed to include these reflections as they impacted what was being observed by the observer-participant researcher.

Locations of Sources of Data

The German cities where my outreach to DoD personnel took place between 2008 and 2011 were (in alphabetical order): Darmstadt, Frankfurt, Griesheim, Heidelberg, Kaiserslautern, Mannheim, Ramstein, Stuttgart, and Wiesbaden. These cities had different posts or building sites that served different purposes. One site might have had an Army base, and also an Air Base, along with one or several diplomatic or State Department establishments. German cities might also have had offices related to NATO or other European Union military or governmental purposes. Over the past years or

decades, some of these sites were multi-purposed, or sometimes used for reasons other than the one(s) that the host country or host state understood they were built for.

Early in the course of this work I came to realize that if I divulged information that might have seem harmless – for example, military Equipment Teams, or Technical, Medical or Special teams such as a *Task Force*, which were used for various purposes during wartime years under special circumstances, at locations that I specified – it might have revealed something that could have caused unhappiness for the government or the military, or might have invited questions, and could have gotten me in trouble. For that reason, all references about where I connected with whom were omitted during data collection. Specification of the city and the rank of the persons I spoke to could have told people who knew about DoD activities and suborganizations whether the person was in a combat unit or not, was involved in military operations or intelligence gathering, etc. Military personnel were smart enough not to divulge mission-information, but my fear was that revealing specifics openly in a report that ended up on the internet might cause inadverdent spillage of information that should have been for official use only. The point of my inquiry was not to worry about buildings, bases, structures, security or sensitivities of locals, but to focus on people inside the organization and their narratives. I therefore omitted all such information from my data collection.

The point of this exercise was not to cause problems with DoD. This was an autoethnographic study focused on qualities of experiences not sample representation of personnel I spoke to. Early in information acquisition, it became evident that what mattered were themes related to human experience inside a large organization, and not minutiae of military environments. Thus, for the presentation of the data, I designated the

sites by alphabetic letters, M, D, A, C, B, etc, to anonymize them. These letters did not

correspond to the name of the cities or names of bases. Most letters were skipped. If

conversations were had with a particular person who was in multiple locations, for

example, in sites M, B, C and G, they were often associated with the first location,

namely M. Therefore #M1 referred to the first person with whom I had a conversation in

a site in Germany I had assigned with the letter M. I may have had several more

conversations with this same person, and they may have taken place at sites B, C, and G,

but the person's designation stayed #M1.

The U.S. cities where my outreach to DoD personnel took place since 2008 – no

matter whether they ended up as part of this work or not, or were just engagements

impactful to my own understanding about DoD culture or activities – were in alphabetic

order: Aberdeen, MD., Annapolis Junction, MD., Alexandria, VA., Arlington, VA.,

Baltimore, MD., Dayton, OH., Eatontown, NJ., Elkridge, MD., Fort Belvoir, VA.,

Gaithersburg, MD., Jessup, MD., McLean, VA., Rockville, MD., Washington, D.C., and

Woodbridge, VA.

Autoethnographic Features in Data Presentation

Although autoethnographies can be highly evocative, given how analytically I

went about understanding silent agreement or opposition inside my organization about

open service for gays, it was evident that my methodology was analytic autoethnography.

As such, my presentation of information collected about the research questions were

intertwined with the journey taken in attaining the data, and the insights on how

organizational insiders saw the repeal of DADT. This had an impact on my own

transformation at various steps. The resonance and mutuality of impacts of

transformations was another confirmation that an autoethnographic methodology, whereby the observer-participant was being impacted by voices of other insiders during the period of observation, was an appropriate methodology. An elegant summary of the phenomenon of observer-participant being impacted by observations was expressed by Weick (2017), who stated 'believing is seeing' (p. 5-9), which meant that cues and insights that human researchers extracted during observation potentially changed when their own sensemaking changed.

Retrospection as Lens

Reflections about meanings of experiences at the time they took place, while paralleling dynamics of the large system change implementations, or other external factors, might not have had the same meaning some later time, given the feedback loop between personnel's transformations as the organization's transformation was unfolding. These were included in autoethnographic analysis and sensemaking. In the years of trying to understand the dual transformations, namely my personal one and the organizational, the processes of sensemaking were embedded in the acquisition of data and information because I was changing while the organization was changing too. It was not appropriate to show one without the other. This elongated the reporting of the results of this work, but it was part of analytical autoethnography.

Autoethnographic technique of probing retrospection, and analyses of the many strands of emotional linkages or dissonance between insider members and organizations (Keval, 2012; Muncey, 2010, Chang, 2008), revealed complexities that might well be useful to organizational leaders during transformational changes (Keval, 2012; Muncey, 2010, Chang, 2008). Juxtaposition of frames from autoethnographic data of lived

experiences was a frequently used technique I favored, since it shoeds various perspectives or perceptions of the organizational transformation. Juxtaposition of frames of mind revealed in discussions with insiders from different parts of the suborganization added to my self-questioning, and became part of my sensemaking.

Being an insider in an organization like the DoD provided advantages such as understanding cultural habits of servicemembers avoiding written answers in favor of oral ones, shunning long sentences and paragraphs in favor of short directives, and personnel's preference of avoiding outsiders such as reporters or social science researchers. An observer-participant such as this researcher was not as surprised as other Walden Univeristy academicians by the organizational culture of deep disdain for talk instead of achievement, suspicions of social science academicians, high valuation of action, and low valuation of academic introspection. It might have been naïve to think that oral responses may have been the same whether the individuals were male or female, straight, gay or transgendered especially if pertained to a topic like the repeal of DADT, so no insights existed during data collection about whether the methodology of data collection was impacted by the process of data collection.

Impediments, Constraints, and Limitations

Journals of conversations with various military personnel were like snapshots of people's opinions. The constraint was that I could not follow people and see whether their opinions changed later on. When in discussion, people shared their thoughts which might have been changing, but there was no way to know for sure. Conversations about a controversial topic revealed a lot about that person and what they shared at that one time. This provided an analytical mean of understanding an aspect of sense making which

pertained to sharing narratives that seemed plausible. There was no way I know if what they said was tuned to me, and they would have tuned their words differently if I had been a man, or someone in uniform. Journaling conversations between organizational insiders was like preserving the commonly-shared viewpoint congruent with organizational practices filtered through my own understanding of each conversation.

Respecting Confidences

To respect the confidentialities of colleagues, and individuals I engaged in conversation, my coding strategy was to never use individuals' names in any way. Some considerations needed to be mentioned regarding discussions involving members of the military. If the person I was speaking with was wearing a military uniform – given that soldiers' last names are always sewn on them – the name was not recorded anywhere, for any reason, at any time, on any page of my sheets, and this was stated upfront to the individual at the beginning of each conversation – and sometimes, repeated several times in the course of discussion – in order to assure the bond of trust, the comfort level of the participants, and my desire to ensure their truthful telling of thoughts, opinions and perceptions during our interaction. There were two instances where the dialogist checked my journals and notes to make sure the name did not appear anywhere on the notes. Appreciation of respondents involved in this self-imposed limitation appeared universal.

Environmental Constraints

Instructions ubiquitously given by security officers to contractors and other personnel stationed across Europe contained a number of security, safety and situational awareness tips. These revealed that across Europe and around locations near U.S. bases, the population may not have been highly approving of U.S. military activities. I was told

by security personnel to be mindful that many Europeans opposed the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and were opposed to many activities that U.S had engaged in during those wars. In conversations I had during my travels, a number of people made a point of telling me that they opposed what the U.S. government and what my organization, the DoD was doing in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

American soldiers were often reminded about spies, and enemies hiding in Europe who aimed to gain information from anybody, especially about disgruntled servicemembers, in order to target them and '*turn*' them into sources of information for adversary governments. These information sheets may have been remants of the cold war, but were nonetheless drilled into people. The hostility of the outside environment was a constraint in that people watched what they said if it sounded critical of the DoD policy or behavior of Americans.

A second outcome of this mindset of worry was a constraint I had understood at that time, which proved to be overblown which was that I was not allowed to engage military personnel in conversation inside the base. This may sound odd, but that was how I understood the rules and privilege-differences between various categories of contractors to government civilians and military personnel. This faulty understanding cost me a lot of wasted time, and caused me to undergo a lot of unnecessary steps to meet people in eateries right outside the bases. I had been given some initial misinformation that if I was not doing DoD-sanctioned, or official DoD research, I could not have conversations with military personnel inside the base on topics I was doing interested in. I was not trying to publish a book or article about military actions, only my own understanding of how

people felt about the changes that they either liked or did not like. Looking back, I can laugh about it, but it was a big impediment.

Outside the base, a lot of military personnel did not really want to talk about controversial topics, or about issues regarding their organization. This mindset was that it was safer to blend in with Europeans, since they might be disapproving or suspicious of American warfighters. Fruitless weeks and months were wasted trying to hold conversations with personnel before it was discovered by happenstance that the most successful locations to have open chats with willing participants were eateries, given that many such places in Germany sold beer, and patrons could linger and talk long after finishing meals. Game places such as soccer games, and bowling alleys, which were favorites across Germany were also good places to engage people. Easy hours were spent relaxing and talking, without worrying about security risks or uncertainties about hostile citizenry.

Access Limitations

Military bases in Germany in the years I was there were not final destinations for many of the personnel that came through. Reasons for not staying and quickly passing through were plentiful. I learned early on that the tempo of personnel rotations through Germany was fast. Personnel in Germany were there for training, for collaboration or joint-exercises with U.S. partner nations, for work with NATO forces, for reassignment prior to going back to war-fronts, for 'Re-Gearing' or other equipment matters, for check-ups or medical attention, or for some other military re-engagement purposes. The period of time military people spent in Germany varied but was often just a few months. This fast tempo of frequent rotations was a fact of life in the military, and a well-understood

limitation in engaging with people who might say they would return next week to an eatery and might be shipped out in short notice.

Summary

This inquiry aimed to use the autoethnographic methodology in answering two related research questions, which were: 1) How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change? And, 2) What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization? To this end, personal notes, journals, logs and artifacts were used with data pertinent to my personal experiences, and conversations with DoD insiders, colleagues and military personnel regarding the organizational transformation of repealing DADT and allowing open service for gays in the military. The parallels between my self-reflective personal account of grappling to come to peace with being gay were resonant with reflective accounts of other insiders in the organization struggling with fears of open service for gays. The methodology entailed coding the data, discovering themes, concepts, perceptions, reflections and other insights, collating well-aligned concepts and themes, realizing and connecting relationships between different pieces of the data, distilling the essence of the common themes in the distillations, and analyzing the findings. These steps were repeated in different passes of the data to insure accuracy of analysis. The autoethnographic methodology allowed open discolosure of researcher assumptions, presumptions and biases.

Unearthing of views from within my corner of DoD, at a time the organization considered repealing DADT reflected on broader internal parameters DoD had to

confront alongside formidable societal ambivalence and controversy about open military service for gays (Belkin et al., 2012). As the organization grappled with coming to terms with the fact that gay people were already inside, and were serving in the military (Borch, 2010; Breslin, 2000), I interacted with others while grappling with how we all felt about the open-ness of being gay. Military servicemembers struggled with coming to terms with gay personnel, be they civilians or contractors, working together openly. These were contemplated consequences of a transformation to allow open service for sexual minorities at a time of war.

Some organizations can impact how individuals see themselves, leaving a strong stamp on their members, as organizational cultures can become a girding substructure for members' self understanding (Caforio, 2006). U.S. Military can impart such stamps (Caforio, 2006). For example, members saw themselves as marines, airmen, soldiers or sailors for decades, over their lifetime (Fallows, 2014). This contrasted sharply with private citizens who may never see themselves in terms of organizations (Fine & Kleiman, 1979; Frank, 2010; French, et al., 2004). Special care was needed in understanding strong emotional bonds to DoD and military services. In-depth first person perspectives helped further the understanding of personnel's views from inside military organizations, to fill a knowledge gap.

Transformation in organizations can often be messy, emotional and uncertain, but especially one with such a strong and unique stamp on its personnel. Characteristics of autoethnographic tradition, such as incorporating first person perspectives that can address knowledge gaps pertinent to views, reactions, feelings and internal perspectives on organizational transformation, allowed this observer-participant researcher to shed

light on individual decisions to resist or assist change that precipitated from organizational transformation. In that, autoethnography was uniquely able to fill knowledge gaps about experiences and beliefs inside the culture of the organization, especially at a time when it was about to undertake a controversial change. The next chapter provided data from sources outlined in this chapter, according to the data presentation strategy already detailed.

Chapter 4: Results

Background

In the summer of 2008, I was disoriented because I could not figure out who I was or what sort of person I could be sexually attracted to, even though I had thought of myself as heterosexual most of my life. I had assumed for decades that I was straight and that my son's birth had confirmed that, yet I had fallen in love with a woman. That summer, I had to confront my homophobia without excusing it or ignoring it. I knew that challenging it would transform my life, even though I did not know how to do it. Looking back, I realize was still running away from it, as I had done for over a decade.

My life was divided into compartments; when I was in the company of other parents whose children were my child's friends and classmates, I was straight like them. I cannot count the number of times some well-meaning mother or father tried to pair me up with some eligible man they thought I might like to date or marry. To my family, I was unlucky in love, single and raising a terrific child. To them, I never could be accepted as gay because the Farsi word for a gay person translated to *defective* in English. Many of my friends, some of whom were gay or lesbian, were sure I was like them. I accepted them as they were, but they did not know that I could not overcome my homophobia. My friends did not know I could not accept the truth about myself. I could not accept my gay nature as a biological certainty that rendered me incapable of living straight. I did not want to define myself in terms of my sexuality. My inability to see my inner reality paralleled the dissonance I lived in my workspaces in the DoD, where DADT policy was in effect.

Many DoD insiders I interacted with admitted that gays were serving inside DoD, just as scholars had documented (Belkin, 2011). I also observed that openly stating this reality was difficult. In 2009, presidential elections brought the issue of open service for gays to the forefront, and in 2010 President Obama was compelled to undertake the repeal of DADT policy (Belkin et al., 2012). I worked in DoD bases in Germany where we discussed the organizational change he proposed to allow open service for gays in DoD. It seemed revolutionary at that time.

My own transformation to come out as a gay person paralleled DoD's transformation to allow open service for gays in the U.S. military. My background in science and engineering compelled me to investigate these parallel transformations in a systematic and methodical way without being prompting by friends or mentors. My instinct was to learn about the world of openly living as a gay person before I launched into it. To my mind, I needed to systematically research and uncover opinions and heartfelt beliefs of my colleagues at my DoD work sites in Germany. I wanted to understand how my colleagues felt about gays. I did not want to invite hostility or avoidance of me. My perception was that if people were not going to respect organizational policies of nondiscrimination toward gays, then this suboptimal implementation of change would be challenging. I also wondered how the DoD change implementation would account for variation in ways people could avoid the change. I considered the potentially damaging consequences for gay individuals expected to live the change when they came out.

I realized while I was in Gemany that most of the DoD were neutral or unopposed to the repeal, yet they saw problems coming from some upset insiders who were strongly

opposed to it. I engaged dozens of people in one-on-one conversations between 2008 and 2011 when DADT policy was officially repealed. In Europe, where open service for gays was practiced extensively by European Union allies and NATO partner militaries and where DoD personnel frequently worked with military personnel who were gay, my journal entries indicated feelings of aversion and distaste toward gays.

My conversations with close colleagues and other personnel about their feelings toward gays impacted my own feelings about my own transformation. Fears and discomfort of my colleagues in Germany about what would happen to the military if gays served openly resonated with fears I had started to dispel. These fears compelled me to look deeply into my own development, my various prejudices, and whether I was looking at that world through the lens of a disfavored gay person in hiding from the world. The transformation of the organization was impacting my own transformation.

Roots and Consequences of Delimitation

I did not use any recording devices to capture conversations I had with military personnel. One reason had to do with constraints of being in high-security buildings inside military compounds with stringent security rules. After the events of 9-11, security protocols at many bases were tightened and many types of photographic, audio, or video recording devices were disallowed. Personnel had to lock their devices inside their cars before entering buildings. Furthermore, to ensure security of personnel and operations in and around military bases overseas, everyone was discouraged from souvenir videotaping, even at celebratory events, for fear of exposing people or backgrounds that might show members of the intelligence community or special U.S. government properties or personnel. Even if such documentation was to be posted or shared years

after the recording, the rules said that the possibility of adversaries connecting people with locations and events made the activities too risky. Use of recording devices was something that many Americans in or around military bases had a strongly negative reaction to. In my work settings, there were security spot-checks, and the threat of losing accesses or privileges I needed to do my job if some electronic gadget was detected in my bag or my clothes was not worth the risk. The mere thought of bringing audio or video recording devices to a conversation seemed counterintuitive to me and to many people I interacted with.

Nonrandomized Sampling

This was not a quantitative study, and there was no way of attaining a random sampling of personnel and no way of controlling variables. Further, my bias contained inherent sources of error that would have readily ruined the validity of a quantitative study. In executing this study, I relied on my technical training as I collected data to understand what was going on around me. In my scientific life, understanding truths often involved numbers, spreadsheets, graphs, and visualization charts. In determining how my organization felt about open service for gays, I had to rely on people's spoken words. The individuals who entered into conversations with me were not selected through a scientifically calculated method of sampling. These were connections of chance based on people's willingness to engage about the topic. I did not have recording devices to capture conversations, and I wrote as little as possible in order to follow what the speakers were trying to say. The usie of numbers as shorthand for ranges of emotions, ranges of agreement, and other types of sentiments seemed flawed.

Gross Error Minimization

My notes written at home following conversation with #C4 (subsequent to the comment in the spreadsheet) had an extra sentence at the end of the quote, which was "They gay guys are fine!! [*sic*]". This was my recollection of the conversation not written at the time of the conversation. I treated these data entries as inconsistencies and considered them sources of gross error in my data. Having spent a lifetime working in technical and scientific fields that eschewed gross errors, I reasoned that use of numbers instead of sentences might minimize these types of errors. My reasoning for not using recording devices related to creating a private, intimate conversation space. Also, recording devices had long been prohibited in secure sites where classified events and conversations took place. Secure interaction had long been a standard of operational security. Military people generally recoiled at recording devices in secure military facilities. The benefit of obtaining honest opinions was worth the inability to use audio or video recorders.

Error minimization without use of recording devices. Had this been research sanctioned by the DoD, I would have been expected to record answers respondents gave to each question asked; however, this was not a government study. This was a personal and unofficial inquiry, which I thought was going to be valuable only to me. The decision not use recording devices was something I considered appropriate given the controversial nature of the topic, my strong desire to get at undisguised sentiments and views of insiders, and the prohibition on recording devices. To minimize gross errors of misremembered comments, typing errors, and transposition errors, my decision to use spreadsheets and numbers instead of statements and phrases seemed prudent. Years later,

that decision appeared inconsistent with what most autoethnographers do. However, at the time, the decision was motivated by the desire to minimize error and personal bias.

Inherent error in autoethnographic methodology data collection.

Scientifically speaking, it could be argued that autoethnographic methodology is filled with sources of gross and systematic error given that biases of an insider-researcher cannot be fully accounted for or eliminated. It could also be argued that assigning numbers to sentiments expressed by participants was a source of systematic compared to the practice of recording responses verbatium. In my scientific training, I had often been told that emotions are sources of bias or error, and a researcher ought not be in an emotional state to conduct her work. Despite my training, there might have been some inherent biases or errors due to my own emotions surrounding the endeavor. Maslow (1970) explored emotions and motivation, while Buchanan (2007) and Izard (2009) looked at relationships between emotions and thought and how people disguised or obfuscated negative emotions. It was possible that servicemembers may have been more negative toward the subject of gays in the military, but calibrated their emotions and gave measured responses. Giving answers in dispassionate military fashion might have been part of servicemembers' biases. Piryani, Madhavi and Singh (2016) analyzed disguised emotions through obfuscated expressions by conducting sentiment analysis of opinions, and concluded that people hide their negative emotions more frequently and deliberately.

The understanding I sought regarding people's opinions about open service for gays was emotional for many insiders, and I did not want people to filter those raw or negative emotions. Despite wanting to document their responses in full, I was not allowed to use recording devices.

Flaw caused by my use of disfavored words. Use of words like *subject*, *respondent*, *interviewee*, and *interviewer* was routine for me throughout my schooling as a scientist and engineer and during my work life. However, these words do not often make their way into autoethnographies. Given that my quest for understanding dual transformations, one organizational and the other personal, prior to making the choice of autoethnographic methodology, these words found their way into my notes and journals as they had for most of my life. I used numbers to indicate a *yes* or *no*. Numeric references and terms such as respondent and interviewee may not be typical for autoethnographies, but that was how I captured the data I documented in Germany.

My raw data were full of numbers and included words most often associated with quantitative studies. This might be disconcerting to some who like clean separation between quantitative and qualitative verbiage, but in my case the use of quantitative verbiage began early in the data collection process. From what I understood years later, the existence of numbers and quantitative terms in my raw data was a methodological flaw. At the time, this approach felt logical and systematic in my quest to uncover the truth. My instincts to collect information and record my findings systematically followed a path familiar to me. That path included words, notes, numbers, averages, percentages, tables, and spreadsheets. This would eventually be recognized as a weakness or methodological flaw, but at the time I thought all serious research had to be approached that way. I used words and numbers to represent the range of feelings, agreements, disagreements, and opinions expressed by individuals I spoke to. My notes were recorded inside cells of spreadsheets and data tables.

At that time, my inquiry was to bring me to a rational understanding at a point in my life, where I was driven by an emotional calling. My rational understanding was to come through a systematic discovery approach. I did not eliminate numbers and words from my original notes, although they did not reflect any sort of quantitative or scientific methodology sanctioned by the research boards of this university for this work. I hoped this warning might ameliorate the shock of finding numbers, tables and unexpected verbiage in Appendices B, C and D.

Reliability of Data Collection and Retention

My data collection did not begin as a way of doing a dissertation study. It began as a way of understanding changes in the organization, in the personnel and in myself. The tables and spreadsheets of data collected from 2008 through 2016 have not been altered. The content have remained intact over the course of these many years. If something was said during a conversation and put in quotes inside a table or a spreadsheet, then that was exactly what was said, heard, documented and maintained during that interchange. My background instilled in me the value of raw data as manifestations of truth. My notes and data will continue to be treated as such, not only because of the university requirements pertinent to data used in a study, but also because they reflect my own history and evolution.

Ease of search capability. The data organization reflected my personal preferences for the ways I wanted to see and relate to the data. I came to understand the harm done to ethnographers and citizen researchers whose notes, diaries and papers were discounted as insufficiently modern, and somewhat deficient tools of rigorous data collection. My preference for electronic journal-writing had not been based on anything

other than my own desire to use means that felt comfortable to me. The electronic form made searches very easy, which would not have been possible with stacks of papers, folders of notes or pads. The added benefit of electronic documentation was the ease of finding phrases and answers that allowed me to reflect on my data – either in pieces or in aggregate – and to look for patterns. This capability promoted sensemaking of the experiences. Having had the ability to figure out why someone might have been opposed to the repeal of DADT, or what peoples' feelings were about gays, through the use of my personal computer and via a few mouse clicks was a blessing. It allowed deep introspection and reflection during uncounted hours when I was alone and staring at my information.

   Alignment of data collection methodology with autoethnographic approach. Unlike structured data approaches in quantitative, and some qualitative research, autoethnographies do not constraint researchers with form, means or approved methods of data collection methods. Many forms of data are acceptable in autoethnographies. In my case, my data collection methodology was organically developed as I formulated how I wanted to proceed in uncovering the truth. From the start my preferences included tables, spreadsheets, and representation of emotions with numbers. This is allowed and well-aligned with autoethnographies. For me, the benefit of this lack of constraints has always been that in autoethnographic approaches to data collection, concerns about *form over substance* did not generally pertain. Common forms of autoethnographic data included personal memory data, self-observational and self-reflective data, and external data (Chang, 2008; Ellis & Bochner, 2004), all of which were used in this work.

Time span of data collection for this study began in 2008 at a time when DoD's policies required immediate termination of military personnel whose behaviors were discovered to gay, and most of the data acquisition ended by 2011, but some of information collection continued through 2016, years after DoD policies had changed, to not only allow open service for gays, but also had initiated extension of policies for transgendered military personnel. This time span matched my own personal transformation, so what was parallel was the struggle of the organization to come to an acceptance of sexual minorities despite its history. My coming to acceptance of my gay nature had precisely been my own heart's struggle during this same period.

The corpus of data included collected literature, self-observational and self-reflective data, journals of discussions with military personnel, personal memory data, and records of interpretations and meanings about various communications from the organization and its leaders. Discussions with military personnel journaled prior to repeal of DADT or afterwards, pertained to gays in the military but were not limited to it. These were used in sensemaking, comparisons and contrasts, and understanding the spectrum of interpretations made by insiders about information, announcements or rumors in the organization.

Withheld data. Vast volumes of data journals during the journey of self discovery were withheld from this work, even if some parts of such data pertained to coming to peace with some hard truths uncovered during conversations with military personnel. In the course of conversations with military personnel, I asked questions that pertain to military duties and military teams, such as "Are the NCOs in your unit good leaders?" which meant are Non-Commissioned Officers in your unit good leaders? Such

a question may mean a great deal to a military personnel who has to contend with such unit leaders on a day-to-day basis. The value of this question during the conversation was to engage the person, and to try to see the world from his/her vantage point, but this question has no bearing on the main concept of this research. A number of such questions that were systematically and routinely asked during the interview – whether as ice-breakers, conversation-fillers or other dialog tools were not included.

During documentation of my conversations, I was not aware that I was removing curse words, or gratuitous cussing that peppered the language of a number of military personnel. Some time later I would realize that I had withheld such phrases somewhat instinctively. After some consideration about putting them back in, I realized I could not remember where they fit, and my decision was to not reinsert anything after the original documentation in order to keep the raw information pristine. I withheld personal data related to my own private sensemaking and emotive expressions, as I wrestled with my internal homophobia. I wrestled with admitting to myself I was gay, and I wrote some harsh words about myself, my origins, the people in my life, and about my culture. This trove of data was simply not related to the main point of this study which was the transformation of the organization in parallel to the transformation of the self, and it was withheld.

<div align="center">

Exemplification Selection

</div>

Finding a Voice Typical of Voices of Organizational Insiders

A coworker labeled #M1 was an early source of data and insights. The information pertaining to this person was included in Appendix B. Conversations with #M1 were critical to my evolution, given that #M1 was gay. Years before I met her, she

was in uniform in the U.S. Army. During her service, an incident in a movie theater in a base near Berlin resulted in her discharge from the Army under DADT. As #M1 recalled it, she had put her head on the other woman's shoulder during a movie at their base's theater. This prompted a complaint from someone in the theater to the movie usher. A follow-up investigation of the complaint conducted by the Army base security and legal offices caused both women to be discharged from the military under DADT. The bitterness of the experience remained very strong and prominent for #M1.

Conversations with #M1 helped me understand and adjust to the world of my organization, and to antigay perceptions of some organizational insiders. I came to better understand the travails of gay military personnel under the DADT policy. As #M1 explained, she was no different than many young people who join the Army right after high school. She wanted to get away from her homelife. Years later she confided in me that her father abused her, and this was a very strong reason why she was so eager to get away from home as soon as she could. She joined the Army and while there, she discovered she was gay, which was an unwelcome discovery given the prevailing DADT policy.

At the time I met #M1 she was a coworker, she was gay, she was bitter about her treatment by the Army, and I decided my conversations with her ought to stand apart from other conversations I sought with more neutral military personnel. I was trying to understand how my organization felt about gays, so, I did not want to have an outlier perspective serve as my exemplar. #M1's impact on insights I attained about treatment of gays inside the military was seminal, even though I decided early on that her viewpoint would not be representative of many other DoD personnel. I believed that #M1 was

unique, but not representative. I knew that generally, four out of five U.S. military persons were male (Morin, 2015; Lytell et al., 2016), which made her a minority simply because she was a female in this masculine organization. She was gay, and no longer a member of the military, making her a minority in a minority, and she could not properly represent the organization. #M1's experience in the Army, and her viewpoints about the DoD policy change represented a minority viewpoint, not the majority or representative viewpoint. I was more interested in the later.

The table shown is an ordered subset of information derived from conversations in Germany. Such a tabular display of information is atypical for many autoethnographic works; documentation of conversation using numbers was a simple necessity of the unusual circumstances of the times.

Table 1

Some Central Parameters

Questions	Service Branch	Age Group	Gender	Race / Ethnicity	Personally, how comfortable are you in the presence of gays and lesbians?	Do you know for certain that someone is gay or lesbian in your unit?	Is the presence of gays and lesbians in the unit well-known by others?	Do you agree or disagree with allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military?	Open gays and lesbians would get beat up or abused
Keys → #Number Assignments (to safeguard servicemembers) ↓	1 = Air Force, 2 = Army, 3 = Marines, 4 = Navy	1 = 18-29, 2 = 30-49, 3 = 50-64, 4 = 65+	1 = Male 2 = Female	1 = White, 2 = Non-White	1 = Very Comfortable, 2 = Somewhat Comfortable, 3 = Uncomfortable, 4 = Very Uncomfortable, 5= Not Sure	1 = Yes, 2 = No, 3 = Not Sure	1 = Yes, 2 = No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply	1 = Strongly Agree --- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree	1 = Yes
#D1	1	4	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
#D2	1	3	1	2	2	2	4	3	1
#D8	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	1
#D12	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	5	1
#D13	2	1	1	1	2	3	3	5	1
#D14	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
#A2	4	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	-
#A3	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	3	1
#A4	4	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	-
#A5	4	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	-
#A11	3	1	2	8	1	3	4	2	-
#C3	1	3	1	1	2	2	4	3	-
#C4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	-
#C7	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	4	1
#C8	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	-
#C9	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	-
#C10	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	3	-
#C11	1	1	1	2	2	2	4	3	-
#C12	2	3	1	1	2	3	3	5	1
#C13	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	-
#C14	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	4	-
#C15	1	1	2	1	2	2	4	3	-
#C16	2	3	1	1	2	2	4	1	-
#B30	4	3	2	1	2	1	1	5	1
#B31	2	2	1	2	1	3	4	-	-
#B32	2	2	1	1	-	2	4	4	1
#B33	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1
#B35	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	1
#B37	2	3	1	1	2	2	4	5	1
Summary findings	Army = 45%, Navy = 14%, Air Force = 34%, Marines = 7%	20s= 45%, 30s&40s= 28%, 50s-65= 24%, 65+ = 3%	83% Male	69% White (Error on #A11; Value was omitted)	93% said they were somewhat or very comfortable w/ gays	24% knew a gay unit-member	24% believed gay-person was known by all in unit	34% disagreed w/ repealing DADT (i.e. they were against open service for gays); Rest agreed or were neutral	48% believed open gays would get beat up or abused

Using data on #C4 to detail depiction of data exemplar. Data displayed in

Appendix C for a Sergeant I engaged in conversation, were labeled #C4. The journal

entry has been captured below in words and sentences. What I did after my conversations

with people, was to convert their sentences into numbers. This was what I learned to do

before I began my university studies in Physics, and my undergraduate and graduate

works simply enforced that habit. I had realized I could not maintain eye contact with

people I was conversing, and people would get unnerved if I was writing too long. Plus, I

was not such a good note taker. This was not a formal interview situation, and we were

often conversing in open setting of a coffee shop, snack bar, or restaurant. I did not want

to come off as a formal person conducting an interview, so I fell back on my comfort

zone of jotting down numbers.

The sample selected below was a reflection on a conversation with #C4 in 2010,

which I wrote after the interview as the information was transposed into my spreadsheet.

The transposition process is also explained below:

> The 42 year old active duty Army Seargant [*sic*] had 24 years of service and had
>
> served in a Combat Support unit. He had 4 kids and and [*sic*] considered himself
>
> 'White Hispanic'. I was not sure what White Hispanic meant … He said he was a
>
> real family man, and a strong Catholic. (Appendix C)

This passage provided nine insights. Each was reflected numerically into my

spreadsheet. These numbers were written down during the interview, *not* because I was

conducting a survey but because of my own personal comfort and preference for

numbers. I had a habit of using numbers as descriptors – such as describing how happy I

was on a scale of 1 – 5, or how much my arthritic toe hurts on a scale of 1 – 10. During morning conversations with personnel in Germany, we gave each other numbers as descriptors – such as 10, meaning a very happy state and a good morning – or 7, meaning a groggy or sleepy state.

In coversations with people, given that I was not a professional interviewer, I discovered that I preferred to use numbers instead of sentences, mostly because I needed to look at people when they talked to me. I did not want to be bogged down with writing notes. Also, I wanted to have numbers because I wanted to compare different peoples' answers to one another, and I wanted to look for patterns. It was easier for me to do that with numbers than with sentences. During my information acquisition, numbers were my default preference.

The ten pieces of information I gleaned from the passage above were as follows:

1. Race / Ethnicity;
2. Years of Service
3. Service Branch
4. Duty Status
5. Gender
6. Religious Affiliation
7. Unit Type
8. Age Group
9. Rank, Grade

A follow on passage provided a tenth piece of information, which was a cell in my spreadsheet dedicated to comments captured from the conversation. The passage was:

He jumped the topic and said that his attitude about Gays was that he liked them: [*sic*] "Gays in my unit are fine & cause no problems. There are other gays however, in other units that cause problems. But not in our unit. They gay guys are fine"!! [*sic*]

10. Comment captured in the journal entry as a direct quote.

In conversations, I decided I could write the reaction of someone based on a scale of 1 – to – 5 much easier than writing words like, laughing hysterically, looking indifferent, emotionally neutral, and other descriptions. Furthermore, if I was busy writing down peoples' spoken words, I would lose my own concentration and miss the rest of what they said. I certainly did not dare to use a tape or video recorder since it would make all participants self-conscious and detract from the authenticity and truthfulness I was after. I decided I would be less stressed if I devised a simple system to make the capture of commonly discussed information, such as duty status, unit type, agreement or disagreement with the repeal of DADT easier to jot down so that I might only have a sentence or two of quotes to capture carefully.

I had read many common reasons for soldiers' opposition to open gay service that I thought I could have a list prepared ahead of time, and just mark whichever of these common reasons they expressed. I thought this would be far more helpful than having my head down in my notes the whole time. That initial list grew as conversations took place and people gave new reasons for their agreements or disagreements. These are displayed in Appendix D.

For the ten items from the aforementioned conversation with #C4, given the scale choices I had picked (Appendix D), the number representations were as follows:

1. Race / Ethnicity; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = White, 2 = Non-White] the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

2. Years of Service; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = 4yrs or fewer, 2 = 5-10 yrs, 3 = 11-20 yrs, 4 = 21-30 yrs] the number I recorded for #C4 was 4.

3. Service Branch; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = Air Force, 2 = Army, 3 = Marines, 4 = Navy] the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

4. Duty Status; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = Veteran, 2 = Active Duty, 3 = Reserve / Guard] the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

5. Gender; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = Male, 2 = Female] the number I recorded for #C4 was 1.

6. Religious Affiliation; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = Atheist / Realist / Humanist, 2 = Catholic, 3 = Protestant, 4 = Jewish, 5 = Latter-Day Saints, 6 = Muslim, 7 = Other No Affliation, 8 = See Religion Under Comments] the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

7. Unit Type; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = Combat, 2 = Combat Support, 3 = Combat Service Support, 4 = Other] the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

8. Age Group; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = 18-29, 2 = 30-49, 3 = 50-64, 4 = 65+] the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

9. Rank, Grade; [Choices I had assigned were: 1 = E1-E4 (Junior Enlisted) , 2 = E5-E6 (Junior NCOs), 3 = E7-E9 (Senior NCOs), 4 =

W1-W5 (Warrant Officers, 5 = O1-O4 (Junior Officers), 6 = O5-O9

(Senior Officers)] and the number I recorded for #C4 was 2.

10. Comment for #C4; I wrote "[Respodent [*sic*] had the following

feeling:] Gays in my unit are fine & cause no problems. There are

other gays however, in other units that cause problems. But not in our

unit."

Demography and Demographic Breakdowns

Aside from my coworker #M1 with whom I began conversing in Germany in

2008, and who turned out to be a gay woman dismissed from the Army under DADT

(Appendix B), I have displayed my personal journal data of 29 conversations with

various individuals (Appendix D). The spreadsheet captured these individuals' opinions

about open service for gays and sexual minorities in the military. #M1 was a white

American female from the state of Washington. I conversed extensively with a

multigenerational Afro-German family – with members in the U.S. military – to better

understand racial, cultural and organizational cross-connections (Appendix B). This

family endured being racial minorities in the U.S. military and in the European

environment. Understanding their experiences vis-à-vis another minority status such as

gender or sexual minority was significant to me. The military man I initiated

conversations with was married to an Afro-German daughter of a retired Army

servicemember living with his German wife near the Army base his son-in-law worked in

– I had labeled him Sergeant D [*sic*]. This man was not in favor of repealing DADT but

my conversations with him did not focus on the repeal of the DADT. He was

instrumental in teaching me about the magnitude of race as a factor in day-to-day lives of military personnel.

Gender and Racial Demographics

The 29 individuals I randomly engaged with were 83% male versus 17% female. This compared very closely to the DoD's archival data for 2010 that showed averages of 85% male and 15% female populations (DoD DMDC, 2018 [archive of 2009 – 2010 DoD demographics]). The 29 individuals I interacted with were 69% white to 31% non-white. Using the same DoD resource for the same period, DoD's archival data showed a 75% white to 25% non-white population ratio (DoD DMDC, 2018 [archive of 2009 – 2010 DoD demographics]).

Triangulation of Demographic Breakdown of Gender

To triangulate my data, and verify the deviation of demographic information between my numbers and DoD's archival reference data, I chose another government report. I selected one of the largest DoD studies issued. The report was titled: "Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"" (Johnson & Ham, 2010). DoD had solicited views of nearly 400,000 active duty and reserve component servicemembers, which prompted 115,052 responses, as well as 44,266 views received from over 150,000 spouses, making it one of the largest surveys in history (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 2).

In 2010, the U.S. military in that period was about 85% male (Lytell, et al., 2015; DoD DMDC, 2018), and at the time of DoD's survey reviewing DADT, the expectation was that the majority of survey respondents, which was eventually tabulated to be 115,052 individuals, were to be male. The adjacent expectation was that the bulk of the

spouses that responded to the survey, which were tabulated to be 44 thousand individuals, were to be female. This was indeed the case. Respondents of the survey were over 85% male, and respondent spouses were 93% female (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 231, p. 252). This data was also consistent with prior DoD survey data analyzed over that time (Lytell et al., 2015).

Breaking down the pool of 29 people I conversed with in Germany for my study, 24 were male and 5 were female, yielding an 83% to 17% male to female ratio. Compared to DoD's internal personnel data, or the massive survey DoD had undertaken, my survey was infinitesimally small, but yet my male to female ratio was close and consistent with those data sets. Triangulation of the basics of data demography, such as male to female ratio added to the trustworthiness of the information.

Triangulation of Demographic Breakdown of Race

The 29 individuals I interacted with were 69% white to 31% non-white. Surveying the archival DoD data for the years of 2009 & 2010, the DoD data showed that its population was 75% white to 25% non-white (DoD DMDC, 2018 [archive of 2009 – 2010 DoD demographics]). Triangulating this information with DoD's large survey on the repeal of DADT, the racial composition of the 115,052 responders from the 400,000 active duty and reserve component servicemembers who were asked to take the survey, showed the racial breakdown being 78% white to 22% non-white (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 233), while the racial breakdown of the 44,266 military spouses out of 150,000 asked to complete the survey, was 81.9% white to 18.1% non-white (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 256).

Assuming that the DoD archival data for the entirety of the workforce of the organization was the correct reference number, then the racial representation in Johnson & Ham (2010) was off by +3%. The racial breakdown of the spouses which ought to match that of the workforce was off by +6.9% from the DoD reference number. Johnson & Ham (2010) stated the margin of error for their data to be $\pm$1% (p. 3).

My data for white servicemembers was 69% which differed from the DoD's reference by 6%. My dataset was miniscule compared to the massive study undertaken by the DoD, nonetheless, this deviation was smaller than the deviation of the Johnson & Ham's (2010) data on racial composition of the survey's participating military spouses. Given the constraints and delimitations in the discovery I had embarked on, it seemed reasonable not to have had an expectation of exact matches between my data and DoD's official data. The relative closeness of racial composition breakdown of my study vis-à-vis actual organizational data, and a much larger DoD study adds to the credibility of my dataset, especially when considered alongside the constraints and delimitations that were necessary during its conduct.

Understanding the Demographic Breakdown of Religion

My discussions with military servicemembers did not convince me that religious denomination breakdowns could be deterministic in whether someone would want – or not want – the repeal of DADT. Of the 29 people I spoke with, 11 said they were Catholic, 6 Protestant, 4 Baptist or Evangelical, 1 Mormon, 7 who declined to say, or had no religious affiliations, and none who identified as Atheist, Jewish or Muslim.

I often got confused about which religious branches were harder or easier about acceptance of gays. A few individuals said they were deeply religious, stated their

denomination without being asked, and talked about the significance and impact of their religious faiths on their views regarding homosexuality. Many of the people I spoke with stated their religious denomination in a simple straightforward way, but some gave a muffled answer, or shrugged their shoulder, or just waved their hand. These peoples' reactions did not appear to convey high religiosity, but I had to accept the fact that peoples' body language or apparent reluctance to speak to a total stranger about religions might be problematic for some people. Religion is not a topic people dive into with mere strangers (Heaton & Jacobson, 2015).

I did think a long while about a clever way of calibrating peoples' religiousity in a simple astute way, but did not succeed. I was not well-informed about Christian denominations, and was ambivalent about delving deeply into questions of faith and religion. For my part, engaging in conversation about a religion I was not familiar with was very uncomfortable. I was afraid I might inadverdently say something erroneous, inappropriate, or insulting about someone's faith. I felt the topic might upset people if not done right, and detract from the focus I had in mind, which was organizational policy on DADT. As my conversations and interactions with the 29 individuals were taking place, I tried hard to analyze and tease out something profound about some antigay or anti-repeal comment and religiosity in my journal entries. I had heard about religious objections to homosexuality and wanted to see something in my data about the relationship between religiosity and antigay sentiments. I did not find conclusive or convincing dependencies. This might be an area for further research.

Error Breakdown

This work being an autoethnography has no intention of undertaking computations of error margins or error propagation. Given that subsequent sections of this chapter provide numbers of people with various viewpoints, percentages of people who were for or against the policy repeal, and other such analyses of people's heartfelt beliefs, it was fair to look at errors of this study. This work was a qualitative autoethnography and not a scientific quantitative inquiry. Furthermore, this work has constraints and delimitations that bounded the approach to discovery. The fluidity, non-linearity and complexity of servicemembers' feelings about sexual minorities serving openly in the military required the presumptions of large and possibly overstated error margins instead of small or minimized errors.

In Germany, I conversed with 29 individuals. Even one erroneous mal-recording of information from one of the individuals among the 29 meant an error margin of 3.4%. That was my smallest error margin. The large DoD study in 2010 had reported an error margin of less than $\pm$ 1% (Johnson & Ham, 2010. P. 3). Given that DoD administered the study to over 400,000 servicemembers, a $\pm$ 1% error entailed an error pertaining over 4,000 servicemembers. The DoD study was very costly and massive, it covered the entirety of DoD across all continents, was attended to by a massive team of experts, and the expectation was that its results were to be numerically accurate.

My work was to uncover truth for myself. It did not involve massive budgets, was not attended by a large staff of subject matter experts, and was not quantitative. My work was autoethnographic and simply designed to help me uncover the truth from inside my corner of the organization. I was not competing with the DoD study for aggregated truth

across all of DoD. Despite these vast differences, it was actually remarkable that my findings echoed what DoD had uncovered, and it was doubly remarkable that the error in my findings was as tenable as it was.

<div align="center">**Findings**</div>

Conversations with veterans, reserve or active duty military personnel stationed in Germany prior to the repeal of DADT revealed heartfelt concerns the personnel had about transformations taking place in the organization, and about gays serving openly in the military. These revelations were impactful to me personally, and convinced me that coming out in the open as a gay person might not be the smartest strategy. These conversations not only informed me about what my organization's members believed would happen, but highlighted insiders' concerns related to shifts in policy.

Similarities in Personal and Organizational Dissonance

By the end of summer of 2008, as I was preparing to go to Europe on a job assignment for DoD, Moradi (2006) had already documented that a DoD-requested study by the Office of Inspector General in 2000, surveyed and assessed military personnel's perceptions of sexual harassment in the military as per "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" (DADT) policy. According to the government's findings, there was widespread knowledge among DoD personnel about the presence of gays in military ranks, as well as their mistreatment and abuse going on inside the organization (Moradi, 2006; Bronski, 2011; Burks, 2011). My organization and its personnel could disengage from the reality of gays serving in the military, just as I disengaged for years from the reality of my own gay nature.

The parallel between the two sets of behaviors – my own and my organization's – was a motivation to dig deeper to further my understanding. The paradox of being a gay person but not accepting my gay nature seemed similar to the paradox of my organizations' personnel working side by side with gay servicemembers and knowing they were gay, but not accepting open service for them.

Understanding the Interpretive Lens of #D2

In 2009, I talked to an Air Force veteran, who had retired as a senior non-commissioned officer, and whose wife was an Air Force servicemember deployed to Afghanistan. The husband was in Germany, along with other friends and spouses of deployed servicemembers, and he happened to be near a base where I was working. Our relationship was one of co-countrymen and members of our DoD suborganizations in Germany. I gave him identification number #D2 (Table 1 or Appendix D).

He said his wife was more open to the repeal of DADT, and to gays serving openly in the military, but he summarized his feelings by saying: "Keep DADT. It depends: If I don't know [that a servicemember is gay], I don't care. It would be hard for me to work side by side with gays. To me it's just not right" (Appendix E). He spoke about being a Hispanic, and a Catholic, and having served almost 3 decades in the Air Force without ever working with gays – to the best of his knowledge – but when he worked with members of partner nations, he had come across some servicemember from United Arab Emirates (UAE) who routinely wore make up. He said: "I was *not* uncomfortable, but it was new to me. .. I was not influenced" (Appendix E).

It was fascinating to me that he would recount an experience that seemed seminal, but would quickly say he was not influenced. The contradiction was that on one hand,

#D2's facial expressions and verbiage would clearly indicate shock, distaste or revulsion, but then he would say the experience did not mean he was antigay. I was not sure whether this was because gays were in hiding in the Air Force, and he – or he and his wife – had learned to moderate their language, and withhold saying what might be grossly homophobic statements, but I could tell from his facial expression that the notion of men wearning make-up was highly displeasing.

#D2 elaborated further: "They [i.e. military personnel from UAE] had eye shadow. Male soldiers had eye make-up. … I thought they were funny [interpreted to mean weird, abnormal]." (Appendix E). In conversing with #D2, my finding was that he correlated the repeal of DADT and open service for gays in U.S. military with his own outrage and revulsion of seeing military men wearing eye make-up. He was not thinking that UAE military did not allow open service for gays at that time. He also had not considered that the UAE soldiers might have been cross-dressers – namely men gravitated to women's outerwear and appearance – without actually being gay in their sexual identities. #D2's shock and disgust at seeing UAE military men wearing make-up was sufficient to convince him that any DoD policy change to repeal DADT might mean that someday in the future, U.S. military men might also decide to wear make-up. To him, that was unacceptable, and he did not want DADT to be repealed.

#D2 talked about his Catholic faith, but he did not seem super conservative about it. Although Catholicism was intertwined with his Hispanic background, he also stated that he was neutral – namely, neither uncomfortable nor comfortable – toward gays. What he said was that if he didn't know [that someone was gay], then he didn't care. His concerns regarding open service for gays was that their open service would undermine

military unit cohesion, encourage other gays and lesbians to join the military and pursue

other gays. #D2 said that if DADT was repealed, then open service for gays would end up

causing them to get beat up by straight servicemembers (Table 1 or Appendix D).

#D2 stated that there was no strong argument in favor of allowing open service

for gays, especially given that homosexuality was contrary to his moral and religious

beliefs. On the other hand he expressed that gays were already serving in the military,

that government should not pry into servicemembers' private lives, that sexual orientation

had nothing to do with job performance, that people should not be forced to lie about who

they truly are, that discharging all the gays from the military would undermine military

readiness, and that it was fundamentally wrong to discriminate on the basis of sexual

orientation.

Understanding the Interpretive Lens of #D8

Coming to understand #D8 who was an African-American active duty Army

servicemember, with less than ten years of service, was very enlightening. #D8 said that

there was someone in his unit who was gay, although the person had not actually told

anyone, but nonetheless, many members of the unit *knew* he was gay (Table 1 or

Appendix D). #D8 explained that the DADT policy required that military personnel not

Ask, and the person not *Tell* if he/she was gay or not. He was emphatic toward

circumstances gays found themselves while DADT remained DoD policy, and he

explained that he himself was neither uncomfortable nor comfortable with gays in

general.

#D8 did not want DADT to be repealed. He did not know about policies of other

militaries toward gays, and didn't think many U.S. soldiers knew or cared whether our

EU allies or other partners allowed open service for their gay servicemembers. He acknowledged that there were no real good arguments for keeping gays from serving openly in the U.S. military other than the facts that gays – in his opinion – would get beat up or abused more if DADT was repealed. Under open service for gays, he believed gays would not be respected by straight soldiers, be more likely to pursue other gays than they did under DADT, and open service for gays would open up the door to more gays joining and staying in the military.

#D8 acknowledged it was wrong to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, and that the government had no business prying into its members' private lives. He agreed that gays were already serving in the military, and all personnel – straight or gay – were needed at that crucial time – namely 2010 – as wars in Iraq and Afghanistan continued. He concurred that sexual orientation had nothing to do with a servicemember's job performance. The nuance or caveat that #D8 wanted to express was: "Keep DADT, with the clause that you can't be investigated and, it should not be an element of punishment, but it should stay as the general protocol." (Appendix D). He added: "If repealed, they have to train and inform [servicemembers] on how "Hate Crimes" should be addressed." (Appendix E).

My own interpretation of what #D8 conveyed was that he did not want U.S. servicemembers to act differently, or to be *out* and *open* if they were gay. That said, he did not want gays in the military to be afraid of being discovered, and punished for being gay. He was against open service for gays mostly because he was fearful the straight soldiers would harm gays, and perform hate crimes against openly gay servicemembers.

He was against policy change in DoD, but he was more willing to consider a post-repeal U.S. military.

The gentler disdain of #D8 for open service of gay servicemembers, his worry that policy change in the organization might open floodgates of hatred and violence toward gays deepened the confirmation in my own mind that contempt for gays in the military was more universal than I had realized. #D8 worked with a gay servicemember in his unit, cared and worried about safety and welfare of gays, but even this man disapproved of the repeal of DADT. I came to wonder whether all servicemembers had a preference for not knowing who was gay among them. My conversation with #D8 was powerful because the engagement left me presuming that the whole organization was against the repeal of DADT.

Understanding the Interpretive Lens of #D12

Another powerful voice that impacted my thinking about the universality of disapproval about the repeal of DADT was a young active duty Air Force servicemember with less than four years of military time. He was in a combat support unit that had a gay person in the leadership of the unit. #D12 stated that the person had not told anyone about being gay, but he and others in the unit *knew* he was gay, although no one could *ask* him, and of course he could not *tell*. Apparently, this gay person was not well-liked (Appendix E). #D12 was in his late twenties and was not religious. He identified politically as a liberatarian. He said he had undergone some change of opinion regarding gays in the military without going into detail about this dislike of his gay leader. He was highly dissatisfied with the work he was doing in the military, did not think there was a lot of teamwork and cooperation in his unit, or that officers in his unit were particularly good

leaders. Although #D12 agreed that the government should not pry into servicemembers' private lives, he believed there was no strong argument for allowing open service for gays. He believed that open service for gays in U.S. military would undermine unit cohesion, make it more likely for gays to join and stay in the military and pursue other gays, would likely increase the spread of HIV/AIDS, and many of them would ultimately be abused and beaten up by other servicemembers. His opinion about gays being subjected to violence or abuse inside the military was expressed this way: "There are too many beliefs, and religious beliefs; And too much that can cause friction" (Appendix E). It was his opinion that the Air Force, which was his military service was better than the U.S. Army for gays because: "Army gets away with a lot more than Air Force does. If they have someone gay in their unit, that they'd get hurt [i.e. the gay person would receive serious injuries]" (Appendix E). What he was conveying was that the Army being the largest – in terms of number of soldiers – than other services is less accountable thatn his service, the Air Force, so gays in the Army were more likely to be brutalized without as much accountability.

#D12 had a list of concerns if the DoD wanted to repeal DADT, which he expressed as follows: "In all DoD, there will be a leadership issue; Respect will be impacted – [his specific concern was:] Homosexual bias against straights." (Appendix E). My opinion at the time was that he was talking about his own situation. I speculated that he was under a gay leader he disliked a fair amount, whom he believed was unfair to him.

Another issue #D12 expressed had to do with: "[U.S. military's] Image. Look at others [i.e. other partner nations' militaries that allow open service for gays]. We have a strict standard. If we're gay [i.e. allow open service for gays], that's not going to make us

Elite." (Appendix E). #D12 had raised a new concern I had not encountered previously, which was the sullying of the country's image, if U.S. allowed open service for gays in its military. To put it differently, since gays in the military had to conceal themselves, the image of the military as a strict and elite warfighting force was intact, but if gays could serve openly, then that top tier designation would get tarnished.

Triangulation of Initial Findings on Anti-Repeal Views Among DoD Personnel in Germany

The views expressed during conversations with three servicemembers in Germany, and recorded in my journals prior to the repeal of DADT, were negative and unfavorable toward open service for gays in U.S. military. In addition to these, dozens of other conversations and views were also recorded in my journals. To confirm the reliability and trustworthiness of this autoethnographic data, triangulations were undertaken via use of published first person accounts of gay military members under DADT, as well as DoD survey and other government reports. Triangulation of findings provides confirmability and credibility of the results detailed in this chapter.

Data Comparisons With Government Reports and First-Person Accounts

Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) Robert Gates' appeared before congress on April 1st, 2010, stating that he fully supported President Obama's decision to repeal the DADT law (Congressional Digest, 2010). This placed a question before DoD and its various organizations, which was not *whether* the law had to be repealed but *how best to prepare for it* (Belkin, 2011). Secretary Gates stated that he was mindful of the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and had assembled a high-level working group within the DoD to methodically and objectively review all aspects pertinent to the repeal of DADT, so as to

minimize disruption and polarization within the ranks or the front lines (Congressional Digest, 2010).

A nine months large scale study ensued from March 2nd , 2010 until November 30th, 2010, headed by Honorable Jeh Johnson and U.S. Army General Carter Ham, during which views of nearly 400,000 active duty and reserve servicemembers were sought, as well as 150,000 of their spouses, with 95 face to face forums interfacing directly with 24,000 servicemembers at 51 bases worldwide, 140 focus group sessions worldwide, alongside solicited views from military service academy superintendents, faculties, chaplains, service surgeon generals, and various members of congress, not to mention the views of foreign allies, veterans groups, chiefs of all military services, current and former servicemembers who were gay or lesbian (Johnson & Ham, 2010). The conclusion of this comprehensive review by DoD was that although "a repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell will likely, in the short term, bring about some limited and isolated disruption to unit cohesion and retention, we do not believe this disruption will be widespread or long-lasting" (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 3).

As this review was undertaken by the DoD across the globe, my own personal investigation in Germany was underway, buoyed by the publicity and internal conversations that had started inside many corners of the organization about the massive DoD comprehensive review, and the well-publicized statements made by Secretary Gates about DoD leader's desire to strike down DADT. According to Johnson & Ham (2010) "69% of the [U.S. military] force recognizes that they have at some point served in a unit with a co-worker they believed to be gay or lesbian" (p. 4). Johnson & Ham (2010) reported "a frequent response among servicemembers at information exchange forums,

when asked about the widespread recognition that gay men and lesbians are already in the military, were words to the effect of: '*yes, but I don't know they are gay*.' Put another way, the concern with repeal among many is with "open" service." (p. 4). This was precisely what I had heard from #D2. He had said "If I don't know [that a servicemember is gay], I don't care." (Appendix E). This common refrain from the personnel I spoke to was a finding identical to the government's finding. In terms of triangulation, my finding was verified by the finding of DoD's massive comprehensive study, and vice versa.

I triangulated the concurrence of my findings with a third data set, namely the openly available published first person accounts of gays who served in the military under DADT. There are numerous first person accounts of hardships and travails of gay military servicemembers documented in books, magazines as well as television and documentary narratives. Nearly all of these media documents illustrate traumatic prejudice, rejection and violence against gays when their sexual identities were uncovered when they served inside their DoD organizations. One such first person account was the story of former Army Sergeant Darren Manzella, a gay combat medic discharged from the Army in June 2008 (Heath, 2011; Meredith, 2011). Sergeant Manzella had joined the Army right after 9-11, and during his service he came to the realization that he was gay. He struggled a great deal with accepting his gay nature throughout dramatic experiences of his wartime deployment in Iraq in 2004. Following his service in Iraq and Kuwait, he returned to Fort Hood, Texas, and began a relationship with a man in Austin, Texas (Heath, 2011; Meredith, 2011; Sarvis, 2013). He began receiving harassing emails, and calls at work, and in an exchange with his supervisor, came out to him: "Finally my supervisor said he could tell something was wrong, and I

told him: 'I'm getting these e-mails, I have a boyfriend in Austin, and I don't know what

to do anymore—I need some guidance here.' He was very understanding at first. He said,

'Okay, take the rest of the afternoon off, go home, and we'll see you tomorrow morning.'

After I left, he went to the legal department and turned me in." (Heath, 2011, para. 39).

The first person account of Sergeant Manzella detailed that personnel inside the

military did not want to know that someone was gay, and if their suspicions were

confirmed, then they had to make decisions about taking actions against the person. Such

documented first person accounts confirmed what military personnel inside the

organization were also telling me during my own explorations. The finding was the same

as what was documented in the government report, and in first person accounts. The

published and documented first person accounts verified and triangulated findings of this

autoethnographic work.

Focus on Data Related to Violence Toward Gays

My interactions with #D2, #D8 and #D12 confirmed that they were aware of the

potential of abuse and significant violence toward gays in the military (Appendix E).

Exploring this finding further, DoD's comprehensive survey (Johnson & Ham, 2010) was

reviewed, and its data indicated a minuscule potential for violence. The report's segment

titled "Service Members Likely Actions if Assigned to Share Living Quarters With a Gay

or Lesbian servicemember" displayed in a table which was delineated as Table 6 (p. 67;

Appendix A). This table included questions #88 and #90, which respectively asked: "If

Don't Ask, Don't Tell is repealed and you are assigned to share a room, berth, or field

tent with someone you believe to be a gay or lesbian servicemember, which are you most

likely to do?", and "If Don't Ask, Don't Tell is repealed and you are assigned to

bathroom facilities with an open bay shower that someone you believe to be a gay or lesbian servicemember also used, which are you most likely to do?" (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 67). The report stated that "less than 0.1% of servicemembers indicated that violence of any kind might occur" (Johnson & Ham, p.67). This result did not match my finding.

In further exploring the harassment and violence that were hinted at by the servicemembers I spoke to inside the U.S. military organizations, Burks (2011) referenced a study conducted in 2000 by the DoD Office of the Inspector General, to assess antigay harassment via witness accounts. This other government report had found that 37% of the 71,570 respondents had either witnessed or experienced harassment and violence based on suspicions that the victim was gay, whereby 5.3% of respondents reported physical assaults (Burks, 2011, p. 607). Additionally, Burks (2011) held that data from the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN) had documented 4600 incidents of antigay harassment that included verbal and physical abuse, violence and death threats toward personnel in the period from 1994 – 2002 (p. 606). Significant under-reporting or undercounting of instances of violence, harassment and verbal abuse experienced by persons suspected of being gay in the U.S. military has been documented (Azoulay, et al., 2010; Belkin, 2011; Herek, 1996), and corresponds to the silence or non-expression of true intent of hurling verbal abuse, harassment let alone violence in official documentation such as DoD survey. Researchers and scholars have treated discharges and forced separations of military personnel by their DoD organizations as punishment, which gave credence to the charge that the mere threat of discharge itself caused fear among personnel (Barnes, 2011; Belkin, 2011; Mabus, 2016; Moradi & Miller, 2009).

My findings triangulated and concurred with reports and results documented by Burks (2011) and other researchers, who showed that the smaller estimations of *violent intentions* reported by Johnson & Ham (2010) stood apart from documented *instances of violence* inside the organization.

Dissonance Between the Organization and the Lived Experiences of Its Personnel

Bertalanffy (1968) underscored the distance between organization's leaders and its personnel. This distance often rendered some dissonance between views and perspectives of organization's leaders, and realities of lived experiences by the personnel inside the organization. This dissonance might well be an everyday experience for working members in most organizations across many societies.

Viewpoint on prejudice and violence underscored dissonance. Rand report in 1993 (Rostker, et al., 2010) cited numerous instances of antigay violence and harassment. The 2010 Rand update (Rostker, et al., 2010) maintained that verbal, physical and psychological abuse had not ended, and much went unreported. My understanding and sensemaking of this perpetual threat of violence by members of my organization was that it was not okay to be gay, it was not safe, it was loathsome and it ran antithetical to the culture of the organization. Media news reports showcasing first-person accounts by servicemembers (2000; Heath, 2010; Losey, 2014; NPR, 2009) concurred data and reports of mistreatment and victimization of military personnel, most of which went unreported. These documents confirmed continued strong reluctance of victimized servicemember to formally report mistreatment, harassment and violence against them. Victimization of gays in the military was showcased through data collected by Servicemembers Legal Defense Fund (SLDN), an organization that was dedicated to

assisting gay and lesbian servicemembers (Burks, 2011; Frank, 2010). The data showed widespread non-reporting of many types of mistreatment, abuse and victimization of servicemembers in the military, which were verified, published or broadcasted by different media outlets (Burk & Espinoza, 2012; Gate, 2010; Keleher & Smith, 2012; University of California at Davis, 2011). First person interviews and media documentation reported by National Public Radio and interviews posted online (NPR, September 23, 2009) identified threats against gays such as: "God help anyone who airs our dirty laundry" (para. 15), "And when you get into it [the new unit], I mean, the enemy's not outside the line, the enemy's within. …Your enemy is your chain of command." (para. 10). Nine years earliers SLDN reported the same circumstances about the abuse of gay military personnel by going publically to various broadcasting media. CBS broadcasting news was one of firsts to broadcast SLDN findings (Burks, 2011). The online archived reporting included first person accounts documenting antigay abuse and violence showed that gays were hounded, harassed, and chased out of the service (Burks, 2011).

        Impact of external, contact, and environmental factors. Harwood (2015) sought the data from DoD's comprehensive review (Johnson & Ham, 2010) through a 'Freedom of Information Act' request in 2010, immediately following the publication of the DoD report on November 30th 2010. In January 2014, a file was sent from DoD to the researcher with redacted data, and significant gaps pertinent to participants of the survey (Harwood, 2015). This data was used to analyse relationships between attitudes of servicemembers toward gays as related to the extent of contact they had before, during or after their service with gay individuals (Harwood, 2015). The theory undergirding that

research was 'contact theory' which maintained that the quality and quantity of contact between people of different groups impacts perceptions and additional contacts with one another (Harwood, 2015; Pettigrew, 1998). Despite redactions of source data by DoD, as well as other limitations of disclosed data such as gaps and non-identification of respondents who were gay, transgender, bisexual, etc, given that DADT policy was still in effect at the time of data collection. The study concluded that quality of contacts between gay and straight servicemembers was more important than frequent low quality contacts in altering negative attitudes toward gays inside the military (Harwood, 2015), which was consistent with contact theory construct (Pettigrew, 1998).

This had great significance in my own inquiry because many servicemembers in bases I worked in Germany interacted with their European Union (EU) and NATO military counterparts, and all those nations allowed open service for gays back in 2010. Additionally, Germany and the rest of EU allowed significant social liberties and equalities of rights for their sexual minorities. Even our *Five Eyes* English-speaking partners, which are Australia, Canada, New Zealand and United Kingdom – all allowed open service for gays when the transformation to repeal DADT was underway. It seemed to me significant to understand what impact repeated contact with our partners – many of whom may presumably involved contact between our military personnel with openly gay military persons from those nations – to alter antigay sentiments or perceptions inside DoD.

Understanding the Interpretive Lenses of #C12 and #C16

I connected with two different servicemembers #C12 and #C16. These two were not related to one another, but were just selections I made while reviewing my diaries. I

was interested in understand the widely divergent arcs people take in real life when on the surface, they seem very similar, and could well have been of the same mind about what I was talking to them about. Instead, they were quite different.

Both had been in the Army for decades, both were in their 50s, and both were Catholic. #C12 was an officer (Colonel) and #C16 was not, and both had stated they were only somewhat comfortable with gays in general. Neither had ever known for sure if a member of their unit was gay or not, and neither was sure they had ever worked with gays in their past units. Since they each had worked with European partner militaries in EU and NATO forces, they had known of gay personnel in those militaries. The officer, #C12, had worked with Netherland troops at a time that nation was one of the first countries to allow open service for gay personnel. #C16 had several deployments with EU and NATO partners at times they allowed open service for gays, so the experience #C16 had had working with gays in different militaries was quite extensive.

In talking about the impact of allowing gays to serve openly, Colonel #C12 stated that his experience was very instructive because " In my observations, it [i.e. Open Service for Gays and Lesbians in Netherland's Military] was detrimental to their military." (Appendix E). He disagreed with repealing DADT, but his views regarding gays in the military were nuanced: "We discriminate based on sex all the time. If a soldier commits adultery -- It's a kiss of death for officers. We discriminate now. So, I think [if] it's Adultery [it] is not right. And I served with hundreds of soldiers who committed adultery; … There are some soldiers who are gay & are excellent. But at a Ball, they should not bring their girlfriend or boyfriend [with them, i.e. as their spouse]. It's not good for [the military] service." (Appendix E).

I initially thought there was a contradiction in what Colonel #C12 said about never having known anyone gay in the U.S. Army, and then minutes later saying there were some gays in the Army who were excellent. Then I realized he was talking his own experience of not having worked with someone gay directly in his units, but being aware that there were thousands of gays in the U.S. military and about understanding that some were excellent. This explained his comment that there are some soldiers who are gay and are excellent.

Colonel #C12 felt that openly serving gays and lesbians would undermine cohesion in their units, would get beat up or abused, would be more likely to pursue one another, and would cause other gays and lesbians to join the military. He said that acceptance of homosexuality was against his Catholic faith, and straight Army personnel should not have to share foxholes, showers and other such combat zone facilities with gays. He did not think that anyone who wanted to get out of the military while DADT applied could do so by claiming to be gay, but he also agreed that sexual orientation had nothing to do with how someone performed their missions. Colonel #C12 thought that the government should not pry into personal lives of soldiers, that discharging military personnel undermined military readiness, and that there were a number of gays in the military who were making valuable contributions to the military. Despite all this, he felt that as an officer, he had to think of what was good for the Army as a whole, and that repealing DADT was not good for the Army.

Master Sergeant #C16 had very different perspectives on gays serving openly in the military. He said he was only somewhat comfortable with gays in general, but he had been greatly influenced by his interactions with NATO and EU militaries that allowed

open service for gays, and said that his opinions about gays serving in the military had changed over time. He thought there were no strong arguments for keeping gays from serving openly, even though he felt that with open service, gays were more likely to pursue other gays, and the openness would encourage even more gays to join the U.S. military. He felt that the government should not pry into the personal lives of military personnel and no one should be forced to lie about their true selves in order to serve in the military. Like Colonel #12 He also did not want people to easily leave the Army by claiming to be gay. He felt that during the times of war, the Army needed every qualified servicemember that wanted to serve, and that discharging military personnel was a waste of education and training, and unfavorable to military readiness. He felt that sexual orientation had nothing to do with job performance and it was fundemantally wrong to discriminate based on sexual orientation.

Master Sergeant #C16 talked about some of the experiences that had shaped his views. He had been in active duty since 1978 [at the time of this conversation, he had served 31 year in the U.S. Army]. He said he had served with NATO on two deployments, and these tours of duty were very impactful for him. He said: "It influenced me in that it showed me that gays can coexist [with straight soldiers]. [They] do and can work very openly and well with straights. … I saw for myself, and living in Europe, [I realized] they [gay & straight soldiers] could co-exist" (Table 1; Appendix D).

In addressing the resistance inside the DoD to the repeal of DADT, #C16 said: "We [Americans] tend to hide behind our phobias. It's own own homophobic views. [It is important to pay attention to] Stories about Netherlanders military where gays and straights worked and lived together" (Appendix E). "The gay-est strangest situation [I]

encountered were American Officers in a Spanish airport's Departure Lounge being very

flirtatious and openly suggestive until these [Netherlander gay] soldiers, [who then] told

them they weren't interested." (Appendix E). Clearly, the experiences that Master

Sergeant #C16 had with the gay military personnel of Netherland military was the

opposite of those experienced by Colonel #C12. While Colonel #C12 had said the openly

gay Army soldiers would get hurt or beat up if DADT was repealed, Master Sergeant

#C16 did not say that. Given the difference in rank, I thought that there might be greater

dissonance between the Colonel and the everyman who was serving under him, than the

Master Sergeant. Since neither had ever directly known about any gay persons in their

units, what could account for this divergent prediction of violence and abuse? Could it be

that the prediction of violence was a confluence of their own feelings in the context of the

separate communities of similar-ranked personnel they served with? This was a very

interesting topic for future research, but I did not know at that time that DADT would get

repealed by President Obama, and the opportunity for additional research into such

divergent viewpoints about DADT would be lost.

Inconsistencies in Views Expressed by Personnel About Gays

Out of the 29 people I conversed with at a time that DADT was still in effect,

93% said they were either *very* comfortable or *somewhat* comfortable with gays. One

person did not answer the question since he did not know any gays, one said he was

uncomfortable and another person said he was *very* uncomfortable. Given this high level

of comfort for the majority of people I conversed with, I did not understand why 41%

believed homosexuality violates their religious or moral beliefs, 38% believed open gays

would undermine unit cohesion, 28% believed gays would increase the spread of

HIV/AIDS, and 38% believed straight servicemembers should not be forced to share foxholes, showers and other quarters with gays. This inconsistency seemed similar to saying one is not racist or sexist, but then finding nothing wrong with racist or sexist behavior.

Results of my conversations showed that approximately 2 out of 5 servicembers did not want to share accomodations with gays, and believed homosexuality violated their religious or moral beliefs. Given that 93% of servicemembers said they were either somewhat comfortable or very comfortable with gays, the concept of being *comfortable* apparently had vastly different nuances from one person to the next. This inconsistency regarding a person's comfort with another person might be a way of exploring peoples' implicit biases against one another.

A review of comments that military personnel made in conversations with me about the repeal of DaDT revealed their fears and concerns about changes that would follow inside the organization. Looking at comments from 7 of 29 responsdents who *strongly* opposed the transformational change of allowing open service for gays, the strongest flashpoints seemed to be related to *flaunting* gayness openly. Other flashpoints centered on unwelcome advances by gays, straights and openly serving gays sharing close quarters on the front lines, fears of loss of prestige or image of the U.S. military and other homophobic fears.

Data Supporting Assertions on Servicemembers Opposition to Gay Behavior

Of the 29 servicemembers I conversed with in Germany, many expressed complex emotions, thoughts and beliefs about the future if open service for gays became DoD policy; 76% believed that open service for gays would mean that more gays and

lesbians would join or remain in the military, 69% believed that sexual orientation had nothing to do with job performance, and 62% believed that no one should be forced to lie about who they are as a condition of serving the military (Appendix E). This exposed the fairness of many who opposed the repeal of DADT, and yet, 38% believed openly gays and lesbians would undermine military cohesion (Appendix E). Not all of those who vehemently opposed the repeal shared this fear about loss of unit cohesion, and yet, three people from among those who favored the repeal or were neutral shared this fear. Another confusing discovery was that three people, one who strongly favored the repeal, one who strongly opposed it, and one who was neutral to it, feared that openly serving gays would be more likely to pursue straight servicemembers, while none of the rest of those who opposed the repeal believed this. Another reflection of fear of gays was the belief of 28% of the servicemembers, all of whom opposed the repeal, with one who was neutral, said that openly serving gays and lesbians would increase the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Some of the comments servicemembers made during conversations with me revealed some of their fears centered on gay behaviors, flaunting of homosexuality, unwelcome advances and erosion of morality and military standards. Army Senior Warrant officer #B37 who was in his late fifties quietly said that DoD should keep DADT and "No one needs to be announcing that they are gay. They should be keeping that to themselves" (Appendix E). Similarly, #B32 simply advised gays not to be too outlandish. He said: "No Flaunting [*sic*]", and "[It] Depends on how open they are; [and] if they don't bug me about it [*sic*]" (Appendix E). Senior noncommissioned Army officer #B32 stated his opposition to the repeal of DADT: "If they take DADT [i.e. if they repeal

DADT and take it away as a DoD policy, then], they [gays] can't flaunt it." (Appendix

E). The theme of *flaunting* – with its many variations such as boasting, flaming, and so

forth – was one of the white hot centers of negative emotions for those opposed to the

repeal of DADT and organizational change. What was underneath that contempt was

aptly summarized by Navy nurse #B30 who said: "I will not call one man another man's

husband, and one woman another woman's wife. This will deteriorate everything in the

military." (Appendix E).

Other themes related to loss of privacy and unwanted advances in shared private

spaces. A young female Army officer in her late twenties opposed to the repeal of DADT

stated her discomfort this way: "In the Shower - It's uncomfortable - Otherwise [I'm]

comfortable… I don't shower with guys so why should I shower with girls who are

attracted to other women?" (Appendix E). Another Air Force junior noncommissioned

officer in his twenties said to me: "Out in the field, gays and straights -- [being / working]

Together -- can become a problem. So, it's an issue in the air." (Appendix E). Others

worried about erosion of military standards, unit cohesion and common morality across

the military. The Army officer #C12 who was *strongly* against open service for gays

spoke of his experiences working with European partners whose militaries all allowed

open service for gays. Speaking about his extensive work with the Netherland military

personnel, he critiqued Dutch military's longstanding policies of allowing open service

for sexual minorities, and said: "In my observations, it [i.e. Open Service for Gays and

Lesbians in Partner Nation's Military] was detrimental to their military." (Appendix E).

His observation was that in general: "Soldiers [when I served] did not want to be with

gays." (Appendix E). #D13 who was a young noncommissioned officer in his early

twenties with less than 4 years in the Army worried about two things that seemed like *militaryspeak* or shorthand for something more specific. Those two concerns were about: (1) "People's safety", and (2) "Overall military bearing" (Appendix E). What he meant was that a soldier had to act like a soldier on or off duty, so therefore, gay soldiers were not to be engaged in being too open in their gayness, or behave in a manner unbecoming a soldier. His concerns about people's safety bespoke of hostility against gays inside the organization.

First-person accounts published in magazines, newspapers, and tabloids.

While DADT was in place first person accounts of gay servicemembers' experiences often involved publication in television news magazine, print media publications, and tabloids. Scholarly works from Palm Center in University of California in Santa Barbara not only produced academic works related to DADT, but sometimes provided publications that provided snipets of first person accounts, although most of the rest of academic and scholarly works on the plight of gay servicemember inside DoD organizations rested on aggregate data. Many researchers interested in sound sampling and statistical methodologies stayed away from first person accounts and autoethnographic stories. For these reasons, triangularization of my own data required use of multimedia publications of first person stories of servicemembers' accounting inside their DoD organizations.

For this work, publications from the University of California at Santa Barbara, and at Davis' Palm Center (Frank, 2012) were used as well as published first person accounts from Harvard Business Gazette (Mitchell, 2017), Southern Poverty Law Center (Cohen, 2010), Associated Press (Associated Press, 2010, 2013), National Public Radio,

namely NPR (Holloran, 2011), Cable News Network, namely CNN (CNN, 2010), Wall Street Journal (Barnes, 2011), and other print media publications not typically used in scholarly social research. These resources provided firsthand stories that fully corroborated my findings on harsh and violent circumstances that gays found themselves inside DoD prior to the repeal of DADT.

Examples of first person account by Eric Alva, the Hispanic marine designated as the first American injured in the U.S. invasion of Iraq to depose Saddam Hussein in 2003, centered around Alva's hero status given that he had been in Iraq only 3 hours when he triggered an IED and lost his leg (Barnes, 2011; Gate, 2011; Heath, 2011; Mitchell, 2017). Following vast media attention to honor his sacrifice, he was interviewed by all major television networks, went on Oprah Winfrey show, talked about his Hispanic roots in Texas, and achieved notoriety as a model Marine, even though all the while, he feared coming out as gay, even though he was discharged from the Marines in 2004 while DADT persisted as DoD policy (Barnes, 2011; Gate, 2011; Heath, 2011; Mitchell, 2017). Another first person account centered on Darren Manzella who enlisted in the Army after 9-11 and became a medic who won a Combat Medical Badge during the war. Being closeted because of DADT was so harsh and untenable that he chose to come out and make his story fully public by televising his story on television network CBS's 60 Minutes news magazine show in December of 2007, after which he was discharged under DADT in 2008 (Associated Press, 2013; Barnes, 2011; University of California at Davis, 2011). After the repeal of DADT, Manzella was allowed to reenlist as a medic, which he happily did, and followed that happy event by marrying his partner at the time, although a terrible car accident took Darren's life only two months after his marriage (Associated

Press, 2013). The first person accounts by these servicemembers detailed hostile work and life environments inside DoD's military services, which hampered their ability to attain high cohesion inside their units, and decreased their high morale as their served their duties.

Triangulation of findings about opposition to gay behavior. Studies, surveys and data that documented repulsion of gays and opposition to gay behavior in the U.S. military were plentiful prior to reconsiderations of the DoD's policies on gay servicemembers by President Clinton (Rostker, et al., 1993). Donnelly (2009) articulated that allowing gays in the military would be unfair and would hurt troop morale. Senator John McCain mounted fierce opposition to open service for gays throughout his decades of service in the senate, as did military leaders such as General Colin Powell, and prominent leaders in the DoD, military services, DoD Agencies and suborganizations (Belkin, 2011; Frank, 2010).

The report of one of DoD's largest surveys ever done (Johnson & Ham, 2010) stated that "Repeatedly, we heard servicemembers express the view that "open" homosexuality would lead to widespread and overt displays of effeminacy among men, homosexual promiscuity, harassment and unwelcome advances within units, invasions of personal privacy, and an overall erosion of standards of conduct, unit cohesion, and morality" (p.5). Triangulation of my findings on U.S. servicemembers' fears and opposition to gay behavior may not have been necessary given the decades of documented studies. Despite persistent repulsion toward gays over the decades, the slow gradual decrease of these negative perceptions of gays in the U.S. military, coupled with

the slow incremental acceptance of gays in the general society resulted in the reconsideration of the DADT policy followed by its repeal.

Research Questions and Outcomes

The problem I wished to address was the sub-optimal implementation of a formal transformational change driven by top management, that does not account for the personal variation and potentially damaging unintended consequences among the many individuals expected to live the change. The purpose of this autoethnographic study was to illustrate insights learned through my individual experience of living through a transformational change in my identity, which paralleled an organizational change in the DoD, as a way of informing change makers about the nature of the dynamic personal circumstances, which they need to account for in order to increase the likelihood of success of their change efforts. There were two research questions, the first being the primary inquiry, and the second being subordinate to the first:

1. How can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change?

2. What are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization?

From the start, I understood that some bias would seep into my observations as an insider-observer, which might not be eliminated, or accounted for. An autoethnographic methodology allowed for such bias, and this was admitted right upfront. My perspective of insider-observer researcher was that of a person struggling to accept her gay nature, inside a suborganization of a larger organization that had struggled to accept open service

for gays. The parallel between these two types of struggles with acceptance of openness reflected dual impacts of attitudes inside the organization and its personnel.

Findings Pertinent to Research Question 1

In conversations with 29 DoD personnel in U.S. military bases located in Germany, from 2008 through 2010 – just prior to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates asking President Obama to repeal DADT, I uncovered that 10 out of the 29 individuals, who were white and 80% male of different ages, with different military ranks and service branches, disagreed with the repeal of DADT (Table 1 or Appendix D). Seven out of these ten *strongly* disagreed with the repeal of DADT. Another 10 individuals neither agreed nor disagreed with the repeal. Of the remaining 9 individuals, 2 agreed with the repeal and 7 *strongly* favored the repeal (Table 1 or Appendix D). One fifth of the 34% who opposed the repeal were officers. Roughly one sixth of the remaining 66% that either supported or were neutral toward the repeal were also officers (Table 1 or Appendix D). These findings showed that opposition or support for repeal of DADT cut across rank, as it did across service branches.

In U.S. bases in Germany, on the threshold of DoD's decision making about the organizational transformation to repeal DADT, I had uncovered that 24% of servicemembers *strongly* favored the repeal, but an equal number, namely 24%, *strongly* disagreed with such repeal (Table 1 or Appendix D). The rest – namely the majority 52% — fell somewhere in between these polar opposites. What I also uncovered was that 14 out of the 29, namely 48% of the all individuals – no matter whether they were pro-repeal, anti-repeal, or somewhere in between – predicted that openly serving gays would get beat up or abused (Table 1 or Appendix D). I found this discovery very sad, but very

valuable as it reflected sincere beliefs and understandings of organization's personnel about the transformation that was about to be executed.

A year after the repeal of DADT, some gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and other sexual minorities among military personnel came out in the open, but most did not (Belkin et al., 2012). Walden University scholar Marin Nikolov (2017) showed that even five years after the repeal of DADT, assaults, violence and discrimination against gay, lesbian and bisexual servicemembers inside the DoD persisted, as did sexual harassment of women in the military. Despite years of policy changes, mandates, rules, and other DoD directives that established rights of racial, gender and sexual minorities in the workforce, lack of enforcement of many of these regulations appeared to have continued the environment of hostility, violence and even fear these minorities experienced in the military. These negatives in the organizational environment retarded the diversity of the workforce (Belkin et al., 2012), as well as the full contribution of many minorities in the DoD, including the sexual minorities (Nikolov, 2017).

The primary question of this inquiry asked how can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change? The answer I uncovered pointed to the lessening of hostility in the work environment. I uncovered that the transformational change was resisted by a fraction of the workforce and insiders had predicted they would resist the change through hostility and violence in the work environment. My findings were that this minority was predominately male and was dispersed across different military ranks and services. The success of transformational change could have been improved by an understanding of the personal dynamics of fear, violence and stigma in

the work environment coinciding with the organizational change. In the U.S. bases in Germany where I worked there were no plans to mitigate *antigay violence or intimidation* which insiders anticipated and spoke about, rendering the implementation of change sub-optimal.

Findings Pertinent to Research Question 2

The second research question asked what are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization? As this study began prior to the repeal of DADT and ensuing transformational change, there was no way of knowing if the outcome of the transformation would succeed. In the years following military's repeal of DADT, researchers uncovered that hostility and antigay violence in the workforce continued (Nikolov, 2017).

In answering this second research question, the critical data from my work came from the discovery of internal polarization of the workforce over the repeal of DADT and the ensuing realization that the workplace environment will not be fully receptive of change or fully open service for gays. The resultant self reflections regarding my gay nature caused me to keep my emerging gay nature hidden, which was contrary to the spirit of the intended transformation. My discovery showed that almost one quarter of the servicemembers were in favor of the transformation – namely the repeal of DADT – and an equal number were against it (Table 1 or Appendix D). The rest fell somewhere between these polar opposites. As an insider living with such a polarized workforce, the work environment felt hostile and unwelcoming to a person who was coming out to herself as I was. This hostility compelled me to keep my journey of self-actualization

hidden. Nikolov (2017) described similar findings, but the dissonance of the organization took on a different dimension in my work.

My military suborganization was in the middle of Europe, where countries were known for their openmindedness and acceptance of sexual minorities. Although the welcoming and accepting environment of Europe might have had some impact on DoD personnel, the internal workspaces inside the organizational seemed unable to protect the safety of gays from hostile insiders. If the organizational leaders wanted to remove fears of antigay hatred and hostility via repealing DADT, the work environment I was exposed to did not display that intended transformation. Although I was not a uniform-wearing member of U.S. military services, I completely understood how unwelcoming the work environment could feel to a gay or sexual minority servicemember since I was embedded in that environment. Without a positively receptive work environment, I could see that sexual minorities serving in the military might not feel comfortable being out to their colleagues. The absence of safe space would not encourage people to expose themselves to rejection, abuse or violence inside U.S. military installations as the organizational transformation was being implemented.

My journals reflected that as the DoD leadership were repealing DADT to effectively end overt official actions against gays, the covert environment of fear and hostility toward openly gay personnel was still in place. The data from this study could have helped the DoD leadership better understand this and improve implementation of the transformation.

Summary

The information I had uncovered as an insider in the organization showed that nearly half of the servicembers I talked to (Table 1 or Appendix D) predicted that in the absence of DADT, openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused. Cross comparing my information with public data of first person accounts by gay servicemembers across different services (CNN, 2010; Heath, 2011; Holloran, 2011; Losey, 2014), and triangulating these with DoD's own survey (Johnson & Ham, 2010), the triangulation confirmation that dislike or disapproval of openly gay individuals in the military persisted over time prior to the repeal of DADT. My notes and journal entries showed that servicemembers just prior to the repeal of DADT believed it would still persist if DADT was repealed, causing violence and abuse against gays inside their DoD organizations. The outcome of my findings conveyed to me that the organizational environment was not too safe for gay servicemembers to come out of hiding until they knew that disapproval, dislike or violence would not be perpetrated against them. Following the repeal of DADT, circumstances for gays and sexual minorities did not change significantly, in that hiding one's sexual minority status was still more advantageous and preferred that self-revelation (Castro, 2017). Gains made by transgendered DoD personnel prior to 2016 were altered after tweets by President Trump on disallowing transgendered individuals from joining the military (Edelman, 2017), all of which indicated continued disfavor of sexual minorities. The next chapter provides deeper reflections on the findings of this study, interpretations, implication and conclusions reached, as well as internal sensemaking analysis of this work.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

After decades of claims that inclusion of racial minorities and women would degrade U.S. fighting forces or damage the prowess of warrior institutions, the U.S. government decided that it ought not prevent people from serving in the military based on their gender, ethnicity, or skin color (Belkin et al., 2012). In the 21st century, the U.S. government decided it ought not prevent people from serving in the military based on their sexual orientation (Belkin, 2011). Maslow (1970) theorized that individuals evolve through life phases to progress to higher stages of individual evolution in attaining self-actualization. The transformational change of embracing my gay nature was contemporaneous with DoD's initiative to repeal DADT and allow open service for gays. These were parallel evolutions that went far beyond my journey of self-actualization. Several years have passed since the repeal of DADT, but issues related to open service of sexual and other minorities persist (Cohen, 2018; Pawlyk, 2018; Salter, Adams, & Perez, 2018). The current study provided an insider's view of organizational transformation and detailed dual tracks of change, one personal and the other organizational, that may be used to facilitate future transformations, evolutions, and self-actualizations.

Interpretation of Findings

My conversations with military personnel in Germany prior to the repeal of DADT indicated that 34% of servicemembers disagreed with repealing DADT, and the rest agreed or were neutral toward the repeal. This finding was consistent with the largest DoD study (Johnson & Ham, 2010) conducted immediately prior to the repeal of DADT, as well as academic findings in published studies (Belkin, 2011; Belkin et al., 2012)

before and after the repeal. These provided triangulation of my autoethnographic information.

Nearly half of the servicembers I talked to predicted that in the absence of DADT, openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused (Table 1 or Appendix D). I compared my findings with documented first-person accounts of gay servicemembers across different services (Associated Press, 2013; Cohen, 2010; Heath, 2011; Holloran, 2011) and DoD's survey results (Johnson & Ham, 2010) to triangulate the findings. My findings indicated that most servicemembers did not disfavor the repeal of DADT, but were aware of some personnel's violent aversions toward gays inside their organization. Despite the longstanding dislike, disapproval, and victimization of gays across different military services (Belkin, 2011; Belkin et al., 2012), the formal organizational change implementation to repeal DADT did not fully account for personal variations and damaging unintended consequences of its enactment for the personnel expected to live the change (Burks, 2011). Insights derived through autoethnographic qualitative research executed as an insider-researcher allowed me to examine the complexities, intricacies, and inconsistencies inherent in a transformation within a large organization.

Analysis of Personnel's Reasons for Agreeing or Disagreeing with Repeal of DADT

Two of the reasons DoD personnel who opposed the repeal of DADT gave for their opposition were that 80% believed open service for gays in the military would undermine military unit cohesion, and 90% thought that more gays would join the military (Appendix E). Many personnel reported that it would open the floodgates to people with lifestyles that were not good for the military. Of this group, 80% believed that straight servicemembers should not be required to share showers, foxholes, combat

tents, or close quarter facilities with gays, and 80% believed the repeal would inevitably result in having gays get beat up and abused in their units. Out of the 29 servicemembers I spoke to, 10 disagreed with the repeal of DADT, and six of these 10 said they were opposed to homosexuality based on their religious or moral beliefs. However, none of the 29 people I spoke to believed that gays could not perform their military jobs as well as heterosexuals (Appendix E). What this told me as an insider-researcher was that DoD personnel opposed to the DoD transformation to repeal DADT did not want gays to serve openly but thought they were as competent as anyone in performing their military missions. Such complexities in peoples' viewpoints indicated the conflicted nature of viewpoints that insiders held about gay personnel in the military.

Inconsistencies in the Views Expressed About Gays in the Military

Out of the 29 people I spoke with at a time when DADT was still in effect, 93% said they were either very comfortable or somewhat comfortable with gays (Table 1 or Appendix D). One person did not answer the question because he did not know any gays, one said he was uncomfortable, and another person said he was very uncomfortable (Appendix E). Given this high level of comfort, I did not understand at that time why 41% believed homosexuality violated their religious or moral beliefs, or why 38% believed open gays would undermine unit cohesion, or why 28% believed gays would increase the spread of HIV/AIDS (Appendix E). These data seemed counterintuitive unless people were not genuinely comfortable with gays when they said they were comfortable with gays. Out of the 29 people I spoke with, 38% believed straight servicemembers should not be forced to share foxholes, showers, or other quarters with gays. This group represented almost 2 of 5 servicemembers (Appendix E). This

irregularity was similar to military personnel who said they were not racist or sexist, but turned around and made sexist or racist jokes without realizing there was anything wrong with that.

Given that 93% of servicemembers said they were either somewhat comfortable or very comfortable with gays, the complexities regarding a person's comfort with another person provide an opportunity for further research addressing peoples' preferences for certain types of people.

Hidden Status of Researcher Allowed Truth to Emerge

Throughout my life, I could not escape the visible fact of being female. When I held work assignments in science-related positions where it was known that men were receiving higher pay, better assignments, and faster promotions than women, there was no way to hide my femaleness to speak to people and get at the truth behind what people felt, thought, and believed about female coworkers. My being gay, or more precisely my emergence as a gay person, was not visible; it was a minority status that I could hide to hear the truth from other insiders in Germany. Had my gay nature been revealed to me or to individuals I conversed with in Germany, my suspicion is that those honest and revealing conversations would not have been possible. It was significant in the conversations that servicemembers assumed I was straight. Had my gay nature been revealed, these individuals might not have revealed their beliefs that significant violence would be perpetrated against gays inside their military units.

Of the 10 individuals I spoke with who opposed the repeal of DADT, two were officers (Appendix E). Both were in the Army, one was in her late 20s, and the other was in his 50s. The female officer said she believed it was wrong to discriminate based on

sexual orientation, while the older male officer stated that although homosexuality violated his religious and moral beliefs, he believed that discharging servicembers for being gay undermined overall military readiness (Appendix E). They were officers who had many servicemembers serve under them, and I believe that if my gay nature was not hidden, these truths would not have been readily admitted during the conversations. Both officers believed gays were already in the DoD, were serving in the U.S. military, and were making valuable contributions to the military. The officers did not believe the government had any right to pry into people's private lives, and the officers were firm that being gay had nothing to do with job performance in the military. In yet another manifestation of the complex and conflicted nature of people's opinions about gays, both officers felt servicemembers should not avoid or shorten their military duties by claiming to be gay or by using the DoD policy to get out of their obligations. Both officers believed that open gays and lesbians would get beat up or abused inside their service units if DADT were repealed, which I thought was a stunning revelation from Army officers (Appendix E).

Analysis of Connections Between Demographics and Views on Repeal of DADT

The large survey by DoD (Johnson & Ham, 2010) included 103 questions but did not include the simple question I asked, which was "do you agree or disagree with allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military?" The survey was criticized at the time for not including this question (Belkin, 2011; Lee, 2013), but the premise of the DoD study was a review of issues associated with a repeal of DADT, not whether there ought to be a repeal of DADT. My findings in Germnay indicated that of the roughly one third of servicembers who disagreed with the repeal of DADT, all of them were White,

80% were male, and they were at varying ages and life stages (Table 1 or Appendix D), which was consistent with the breakdown of genders in the military. I attempted to connect the demographic profiles of the people I engaged with to their views regarding gays or the repeal of DADT. For a time, I suspected that anti-repeal sentiments were generational, but the data indicated that I was wrong (Table 1 or Appendix D); opposition to open service for gays included all age groups.

Another theory I had for a time was that some services were harder on gays than others. Bolstered by academic research that showed that the Navy and Air Force were discharging many more gays than the Army was, and many more African Americans than Whites (Evans, 2001; Sinclair, 2009), I anticipated higher negativity toward gays from Navy and Air Force personnel than from Army, but that was not borne out. The military personnel I interacted with were 45% Army, 14% Navy, 34% Air Force, and 3% Marines. I did not have a large enough number of service personnel for a statistically representative breakdown, and I was never concerned with that at the time. If had conducted a quantitative study, a representative sample would have had to reflect the service breakdown reported by DoD Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) data for FY 2009 and 2010 for the different services, which showed 39.5% Army, 22.5% Navy, 22% Air Force, and 15% Marines (DoD DMDC, 2018). My work was qualitative autoethnographic, and my results indicated that one out of 10 who disagreed with repealing DADT belonged to the Navy and was in his late 50s, while three were in the Air Force and were in their late 20s. The remaining six were Army personnel who ranged in age from 20s to 60s. There was no discernable connection between age and negativity toward gays and service.

In my anecdotal discovery in Germany, age, life stage, and service type were not reliable predictors of negative attitude toward gays under DADT. None of the individuals I spoke with told me their colleagues disliked gays more or less than they did (Table 1 or Appendix D), although some told me that in combat zones hostility toward gays was higher due to lack of private living quarters and minimal personal privacy. In Germany, roughly one third of people I spoke with opposed open service for gays, and age, gender, service, and rank were not predictors of that opposition. There was no way for me to tell which insider was going to be negative toward someone like me. This made me reluctant to be open at all.

Comparisons, Triangulation, and Interpretations of Findings

To understand whether my results were consistent with views of the rest of DoD, I began the triangularization of my results using the 2010 DoD study commissioned by Defense Secretary Robert Gates on the repeal of DADT (Johnson & Ham, 2010). The DoD study had 115,000+ respondents out of 400,000+ servicemembers polled globally. The DoD study found 30% of all servicemembers thought the transformation to allow open service for gays would have negative effects. Scholars from Galvin & Clark (2015), to McNaugher (2007) and French, et al. (2004), believed that change leaders have to be concerned with insiders who are either opposed to the change, view it negatively, or anticipate negative ramifications. The DoD study summarized that: "Consistently, the survey results revealed a large group of around 50–55% of servicemembers who thought that repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell would have mixed or no effect; another 15–20% who said repeal would have a positive effect; and about 30% who said it would have a

negative effect" (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p. 4). The study had a reported error margin of $\pm$ 1% (Johnson & Ham, 2010. P. 3).

My findings showed that 34% of servicemembers I spoke to in Germany disagreed with the repeal, 31% agreed and the rest were neutral or had no opinion one way or the other (Table 1 or Appendix D). Even one mistaken answer out of the 29 answers in my conversations would have meant at least a $\pm$ 3.4% error (i.e. $[1 \div 29] \times 100\%$). It was a happy surprise that the DoD result of 30% and my result of 34% were within combined allowances of their error margins of $\pm$ 1% and my own *at least* $\pm$ 3.4%.

Qualitative autoethnographic works do not conduct rigorous error computations. It is my own background in science that compelled me to worry whether my results matched numerically to those of the larger DoD; this is just my personal gravitation. My interpretation of this simple analysis was that my results were close and consistent with those of the massive DoD study administered to 400,000+ servicemembers globally. My interpretation was that the voices I had listened to in my conversations in Germany somehow spoke the way the rest of DoD spoke regarding organizational transformation to repeal DADT. I reasoned that one out of every three servicemember in DoD was in some way negative toward open service for gays, and although the other two out of three were indifferent or somewhat receptive to open service for gays, it did not make military workplaces particularly gay friendly. My interpretation was that repeal of DADT might end overt rejection of gay servicemembers or their expulsion from DoD, but it will not readily make work environments welcoming to gays or sexual minorities, or end covert opposition to them if one of out every three servicemembers has a stated opposition toward transformation to allow open service for gays.

Another set of comparison markers in triangulating my results with the larger DoD organization were the male to female ratios and the white to non-white breakdowns. My reasoning was that if the 29 servicemember I spoke to in Germany fell within reasonable proximity of DoD's breakdown of those categories, I could be comforted into thinking that the voices I had randomly engaged in conversation compared well with the voices of the larger parent organization.

DoD's archival data for 2010 had separate racial, gender and ethnic breakdowns for Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and other military organizations, but their overall averages were 85% male to 15% female, and 75% white to 25% non-white population ratios (DoD DMDC, 2018 [archive of 2009 – 2010 DoD demographics]; Lytell, et al., 2015). The 29 individuals I had randomly engaged with in Germany were 83% male versus 17% female, and 69% white to 31% non-white, where my smallest error margin was *at least* $\pm$ 3.4%. Qualitative autoethnographies are not studies that engage in numeric error analyses, so the fact that male to female and white to non-white ratios of my study's results were in the ballpark of DoD's global averages for those markers conveyed to me that the voices I engaged with in Germany were maybe not that different from voices of DoD's global personnel.

Analyzing Impact of Environmental Factor on Opinions About Repeal of DADT

Did the environment of Europe where servicemembers found themselves impact their views on their organizational transformation to allow open service for gays? Did European openmindedness toward gays and sexual minorities change any servicemembers's mind about DoD's transformation to allow open service for gays? This analysis attempted to understand the impact of the environment on servicemembers.

As conversations with 29 servicemembers I had randomly engaged with in Germany were transpiring, I began to consider whether working in the European Union (EU) with its longstanding tradition of open service for gays and sexual minorities might inspire viewpoints that might be more gay friendly. I was conducting this personal investigation to inform myself about the truth that was all around me. My thinking was that maybe I was uncovering some anomaly associated with the location of Germany, or the effects of exposure many servicemembers had with partner nation militaries in Europe. I was not sure whether exposure to gays working in partner nation militaries or collaborating with U.S. military servicemembers – say, during joint exercises, or in NATO related activities – could change servicemembers' opinions about the repeal of DADT. If there was a peculiar effect due to the EU environment and European attitudes, then I would know things might not be the same in military bases in Texas, Florida, Virginia and other location in the continental United States.

I investigated this *Europe effect* after a few conversations had already transpired, which is another benefit of conducting an autoethnography, whereby the discovery of truth can allow flexibility, and adjustment to the organic accounting of findings in the inquiry are sanctioned. I was on a quest to discover the truth for myself, and I could add to the series of questions I would discuss with the personnel I talked to. I asked directly whether they worked with "troops of Partner Nations who allow gays and lesbians to serve openly in their military", and also, I asked whether their "opinions about gays serving in the military have changed over time" (Appendix E).

The outcome was that 16 out of 24 individuals I spoke with in Germany had worked in European Union (EU) with partner nations that allowed open service to gays

and sexual minorities (Appendix E). The real point I was after was whether exposure and interactions with these European military personnel had caused our own servicemembers to change their minds about open service for gays in the military. This would tell me whether exposure to the European environment and EU military had some measureable impact on their views about DoD transformation and repeal of DADT.

Of these 24 individuals I spoke to 16 had worked with EU militaries and two out of the 16 said that over time they had changed their opinions about gays serving in the military (Appendix E). One additional person out of the 24 individuals was not among the 16 who had worked with EU military. He said that he had changed his opinion about gays serving in the military, but had never worked with EU military personnel (Appendix E). If all three men who said they had changed their minds about gays serving in the military did so due to the effect of living in Europe and working with European partner militaries – who may well have included gay personnel – then I might have stumbled on a real *cause and effect* vector, but as it was, I could not be sure. The three people did not attribute the *cause* of their changed opinion to the European environment or its militaries, even though they did acknowledge the beneficial aspect of living in Europe. These three people did not specify that a single event or several experiences in Germany had caused them to change their minds. They said it evolved over a long period, and one pointed to experiences of working with gays. I did not have sufficient data to draw a conclusion about whether there was a *Europe effect*.

It should be noted that Bertalanffy's systems theory did not focus on specific effects of environmental changes on the system. The effects of EU environment would be additive to the body of research literature. My own work was inconclusive as far as the

effects of the Europeaan environment on servicemembers' opinion change was concerned but perhaps several factors were significant in changing individuals' viewpoints about gays above and beyond being stationed in Europe or working with partner militaries with open service policies. The benefit would be that if an organizational transformation could be aided by a more suitable environment, then implementation of the transformation can be started in this more favorable place instead of in environments inhospitable to the desired change. If there was a Europe effect, my results did not verify it, and a systematic larger study with a larger pool of individuals will be needed for proper understanding of that impact.

Complex Reasons Behind Servicemembers' Anticipation of Violence Against Gays

One stunning revelation from all the conversations I had in Germany was that 40% of the segment of personnel who were neutral toward repeal of DADT, and believed that government should not pry into peoples' private lives, also believed open gays in the military would get beat up or abused (Appendix E). These same individuals – one Marine, one Air Force, and two Army servicemembers, with names #A3, #B33, #D2 and #D8 – stated that openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused if DADT was repealed (Appendix E). Even though these servicemembers had stated their neutrality toward the repeal of DADT, they were either aware of the depth of negativity toward gays, or felt some of this negativity themselves even though they did not verbalize it. It could also be both, and through their answer, they were acknowledging or hinting at it. The confirmation of the probability of violence toward gays by military personnel who had expressed neutrality also conveyed to me that some people might verbally say they were not opposed to repeal of DADT but in their hearts still harbored disenchantment

about the organizational transformation that would allow open service for gays

(Appendix E).

This revelation was another instance of deep appreciation and relief for being an insider and getting a chance to see the hidden feelings of my organization's personnel, as well as not having my own status as a person questioning my sexuality being visible to the people I conversed with. My data showed me that althought the organizational policy might change, disfavor toward gays might well continue, and overt disfavor might well give way to covert disfavor. To tease out the different reasons these servicemembers anticipated violence against gays, I looked deeper into their statements in each conversation through my journals and logs.

In conversation with the Army servicemember #D8, he revealed that he was a mixed-race servicemember in his forties, who did not like questions about race, but considered himself African-American (Appendix E). Although he stated his neutrality about the repeal of DADT, he added: "Keep DADT, with the clause that you can't be investigated and , but [*sic*] it should not be an element of punishment, but [*sic*] it should stay as the general protocol" (Appendix E). Later on, he also said: "No one should be asked about their sexual orientation." When I pressed him about the violence against gays, he did not cite anything specific but was so certain about the reality of additional violence against openly gay military personnel that he said: "If repealed, they have to train and inform [servicemembers] on how "Hate Crimes" should be addressed." (Appendix E). In trying to understand whether his exposure to the European environment, or troops from partner nations had impacted his thinking about open service for gays, he

said that he did not interact much with members of partner nation militaries and flatly

stated: "Most soldiers don't know about the other nations' policies" (Appendix E).

Air Force servicemember #D2 was in his fifties, and my in-depth conversation

with him revealed much about the complexities of the group that said they were neutral

toward the repeal of DADT. Regarding his exposure to gay servicemembers he said he

had "Never heard of anyone in the unit being gay" (Appendix E). He said "I would have

less problem working with a lesbian than a gay guy." #D2 opened up about his first

experience working with a partner nation military – United Arab Emirates (UAE) – and

being exposed to gay servicemembers. He said that the UAE servicemembers wore eye

make-up. He said: "They had eye shadow. Male soldiers had eye make-up". "I thought

the gays in UAE Military were funny", but he said that his first experience with gays in

partner military was *not* uncomfortable, and that he "Was not uncomfortable, but it was

new to me". (Appendix E).

In projecting whether #D2 was comfortable in the presence of gays he said: "It

depends: If I don't know, I don't care." (Appendix E). Reviewing the DoD survey of

several hundreds of thousands of servicemembers regarding implications of the repeal of

DADT, Johnson & Ham concluded that servicemembers' discomfort was with *knowing*

that a servicemember was gay, and if they did not *know*, they did not care (Johnson &

Ham, 2010). Much like the response that #D2 gave me face to face, the main problem

many military personnel across DoD organization had was with the *open* part of having

gay servicemembers in the military. The answer that #D2 had given me that open gays

would get beat up or abused centered on the *open* part of being gay. My conversations

with a few servicemembers had again verified results found by the massive DoD study.

Air Force servicemember #D2 had said at the beginning of the conversation that he did not agree nor disagree with the repeal of DADT (Table 1 or Appendices D or E). After some time passed, and he talked about how his wife – who was a servicemember deployed to the war zone at the time of that conversation – was more openminded than he was (Appendix E). He agreed that sexual orientation had nothing to do with job performance, that it was wrong to discriminate based on sexual orientation, that gays were already in the military, that the government should not pry into people's private lives. Finally, he agreed that no one should be forced to lie about who they are as a condition of military service. But in the end, #D2 revealed his true wish, which was "Keep DADT" (Appendix E). What this conveyed to me was that although he was in the cadre of servicemembers conveying neutrality about the repeal of DADT, he too was against the repeal.

The remaining two servicemembers were a young white Army soldier in his twenties who identified as a strong Baptist, and a white Marine in his fifties without stated religious affiliations (Appendix E). Both said they neither agreed nor disagreed with the repeal of DADT, conveying their neutrality with the organizational transformation that seemed underway (Appendix E). Both men told me that sexual orientation had nothing to do with job performance, that it was wrong to discriminate based on sexual orientation, that no one should avoid service obligations by claiming to be gay, and during wartime, armed forces needed every qualified servicemember regardless of sexual orientation (Appendix E). Aside from all that they thought, gays were already in the military and made valuable contributions (Appendix E). The Marine servicemember also stated that government should not pry into people's private lives, that

no one should be forced to lie about who they are as a condition of military service, that

discharging servicemembers for being gay undermined military readiness, and

discharging them was a waste of recruiting, education and training dollars (Appendix E).

Both believed that openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused (Appendix

E). This simply was a reality that both recognized about the feelings and reaction of their

colleagues toward openly gay military personnel. Echoing the feelings of #D2, this

reinforced the finding that if DoD servicemembers did not *know* someone was gay, they

had no problems, but if the gay individuals were open or somehow displayed their gay

nature, the evidence and warning was there that the openness would not be welcomed

(Appendix E).

Triangulation of Data on Aversion Toward Gay Servicemembers

Surveying sentiments of DoD servicemembers about open service for gays,

DoD's researchers and investigators found: "Repeatedly, we heard servicemembers

express the view that "open" homosexuality would lead to widespread and overt displays

of effeminacy among men, homosexual promiscuity, harassment and unwelcome

advances within units, invasions of personal privacy, and an overall erosion of standards

of conduct, unit cohesion, and morality." (Johnson & Ham, 2010; p. 5). This finding was

consistent with the results I uncovered in my conversations with those servicembembers

who opposed the repeal of DADT, and also with some of those who neither opposed nor

favored the repeal. First person accounts of gay servicemembers, in wartime or in peace,

from WWII to the present, published individually online, collectively in mass and print

media, reported in television newscasts, or analyzed in academic studies, revealed the

same sense of aversion toward gay behavior, and open service for gays (Berube, 1990;

Herek, 1996; Moradi & Miller, 2009; Heath, 2011; University of California at Davis, 2011).

Gates (2011) stated that an estimated 48,500 lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals were serving on active duty or in the ready reserve in the U.S. military, and an additional 22,000 were in the standby and retired reserve forces, approximately comprising 2.2% of military personnel. He predicted that lifting of DADT restrictions could attract an estimated 36,700 men and women to active duty service along with 8,700 more individuals to the ready reserve, allowing the military to save an estimated $22,000 to $43,000 per person it spends to replace those discharged under DADT (Gates, 2011). Given that the DoD had therefore spent between $290 million and more than a half a billion dollars to discharge thousands of servicemembers since the inception of DADT (Gates, 2011), it was understandable that the organization wanted to be rid of the cost and burden of the policy, although the controversial nature of the policy made any change or transformation contentious.

Burks (2011) explored victimization of gay military personnel under DADT, while violence toward gays in other periods were reviewed by Berube (1996), Cahill (2008) and many others. As time passed, tolerance for gays in society at large had been gradually growing (Keleher & Smith, 2012). Donnelly (2009) said that disapproval of gay behavior had been constant during DADT , and my own findings were consistent with military's own study (Johnson & Ham, 2010) regarding disapproval of gay behavior by military personnel. The data I had uncovered was that 48% of servicemembers I spoke to in Germany told me that open gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused (Appendix D), even though only a smaller subset, namely 34% overtly stated that they –

themselves – disagreed with the repeal of DADT, and admitted their opposition. The difference – namely 14% of the total – had actually declared their neutrality toward that policy. In conversation some of those in the neutral segment confessed they did not want the repeal to go through. Mixed messages, conflicting answers and complex feelings about the transformation of the organization and open service for gays was part of the findings of this autoethnographic work. My own sensemaking of these insights I had captured in my journals, notes and logs was that people do not like to admit to themselves they have biases such as racism, sexism, or homophobia, even though they might in reality possess any, some or even all of those prejudices to some extent.

Of the 29 servicemembers I conversed with, 8 declared they agreed or strongly agreed with the repeal of DADT (Appendix E). Two of these included a mid-career Hispanic servicemember in the Army, and an African-American servicemember in the Air Force, who was nearing the end of his military career (Appendix E). Both agreed that openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused. This indicated that even servicemembers who favored what the organization was trying to do in transforming, and repealing an outdated policy, understood the reality of personnel's aversion to gay behavior, and understood that it would still result in violence toward gays inside their suborganizations.

Cross comparing my data, the public data of first person accounts by gay servicemembers across different services (Heath, 2011; Losey, 2014), and DoD's own survey (Johnson & Ham, 2010), triangulated the confirmation that dislike and disapproval of openly gay individuals in the military persisted over time. My data showed that servicemembers just prior to the repeal of DADT believed it would still persist if

DADT was repealed, causing violence and abuse against gays inside their DoD

organizations. Therefore, the organizational environment was not too safe for gay

servicemembers to come out of hiding until they knew that disapproval, dislike or

violence would not be perpetrated against them. The data I had uncovered as an insider in

the organization showed that nearly half of the servicembers I talked to (Appendix E)

predicted that in the absence of DADT, openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or

abused. This pointed to a consistent pattern of stigma, violence, and abuse of gays inside

the military (burks, 2011). This work confirmed other works that showed there was

strong evidence it was not safe for a gay person in the DoD to be too open or reveal their

gay nature.

Limitations

Limitations in this work included access to resources and organizational

permissions that could have allowed wide selection of servicemembers from across

military services and DoD suborganizations. Other limitations included open execution of

the study whereby research could have been conducted with approval of the organization,

and as researcher, open methods of data acquistions such as use of tape recording or

video recording of participants could have been possible. Other limitations were related

to geographical confinement of U.S. military bases in Germany as the locations for the

research, which might have benefitted from a larger geographical scope, or from

comparison to bases inside national boundaries. Getting at heartfelt truths about

individuals' feelings toward an ostracized minority such as sexual minorities who have

been disliked over the centuries was limited by the inability of research process to allow

greater familiarity and trust to be developed on a person to person basis prior to engagement of research and initiation of conversations.

I could not use recording devices during informal chats with organization insiders. Not only was this a limitation because what I was after heartfelt and deepest truths about peoples' feelings about gays, and their organization's DADT policy, but because such instruments are mood killers for servicemembers who got very tense around recording devices. With use of data acquisition tools, I had to recognize that this constraint would be the source of multiple types of error.

Summarizing heartfelt feelings expressed by people into numbers to avert having to write too much during informal in-depth conversations was another source of error, but it eliminated the gross or random errors of mis-writing, mis-reporting and mis-transposing sentences and paragraphs expressed during conversations. I told myself I can use my training gained from years of scientific research, and my wisdom gained during my work history of technical analysis and discovery to find the answers to questions about transformation. Even though paragraphs and descriptions in diaries capture the context, feeling, and texture of a conversation or interaction, I found that numbers on my spreadsheet were perhaps more pristine than diary descriptions.

The use of qualitative autoethnographic methodology is not a venue for precisions that can only come through the use of quantitative studies. This limitation is part of all autoethnographic studies, which are considered biased since insider-researchers bring their own viewpoints and biases into the research, and do not account for them quantitatively. These limitations of autoethnographic works impact the applicability of the results and findings.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Further Study

Violence against gays and sexual minorities inside military environments. My work illuminated the surprisingly large potential for violence and abuse of openly gay personnel and likely other sexual minorities inside military environments. Since safety of servicemembers is of utmost importance it is significant that this recommendation for further study be undertaken as soon as possible. My work was conducted in Germany but there was no indication that the problem was limited to bases in Germany. Further study is needed to understand the extend and nature of violence and abuse of gays and sexual minorities. Without the DADT policy to simply report someone and then have the military kick them out will no longer be possible. Those who disapprove of sexual minorities can only resort to hidden violence, and biased behavior toward them. This will have some risks, and will exact some costs against perpetrators of disapproval and violence, since without DADT, violence and misbehavior toward sexual minorities will not be excused by official policy.

The recommended study can take many forms and structures, and can extend geographically as well as temporally. This does not need to be an autoethnography that takes a significant amount of time to complete. It can be structured to be qualitative or quantitative, and might well simply collect existing data. The study can even review medical records, complaints, referrals and other documentations from nurses, physicians or mental health practitioners inside the military systems or associated with military services to uncover data regarding internal violences against servicemembers.

Understanding beneficial aspects of external environment. In exploring whether there was a *Europe effect* which pertained to beneficial effects of exposure to the environment of Europe in calming servicemembers' fears about open service for gays, or other worries about softening of U.S. military warrior culture, it was discovered that there were insufficient data sources to conclusively determine the impact of the environment on military servicembers. Further study is recommended to attain greater insights regarding this type of effect.

If large enough changes do result from immersion of a sector of a workforce in a hospitable environment so that they can be prepared and better-aligned with the transformation that the organization is palnning on executing, then the practice of embedding groups of personnel into this environment will assist the organization in making preparations for transformational change that can have a larger chance of longterm success. The recommendation for further study can have beneficial impacts not just for government and military organizations but for many organizations and enterprises.

Factors that impact participation of minorities in the military. Further study is recommended to better understand the factors behind the levels of participations of minorities in the U.S. military. Aggregates of data from all the military services show that roughly one out of every seven DoD servicemember is female, and three out of four of the personnel identify as white (DoD DMDC, 2018 [archival data]). This data shows that U.S. military is predominately white and male. The androcentric male-dominated internal culture might be uniquely suited to the DoD or not, but the low participation of women and minorities in have significant downstream implications, and needs to be better

understood. which compels its members to defend the country at the expense of their own lives if necessary. The androcentric environment of the military might also provide some clarification about use of violence to solve uncomfortable matters, such as open service for gays and sexual minorities. If the fighting forces that defend the nation are to be a representation of the population of the nation, then the DoD has a long ways to go in attracting sufficient minority participation into its ranks. Further study can unlock the mystery of minorities' low participation..

Recommendations for Practice

  Self-actualization of gay personnel in military workplaces. Servicemembers spend large parts of their lives working at their jobs, and if it proves unsafe for warfighters or other Department of Defense personnel who are sexual minorities to be their true honest selves at work in DoD, it would be unlikely they be able to attain highest possible levels of self-actualization in their life stages, such as that described by Maslow (Maslow, 1970). Attainment of highest actualization of true selves might then not be achievable by gays and other sexual minorities in the inhospitable environment (Maslow, 1970). This requires further study, which ought to be be done delicately.

  Explorations of self-actualization are typically quite unique and tailored to each individual making such evolutions. Such work might well need the investigation to follow a qualitative autoethnographic approach. By the time I decided to undertake my autoethnographic inquiry, I had progressed along Maslow's life phases beyond having met my social needs, then elevating my self-esteem by recognizing my gay nature, and finally, embracing that aspect of my existence to self-actualize and seek to be the best person I could be. My excitement in conducting the current study about how

servicemembers actually felt about gays was my way of going beyond the limitations of my own singular individual experience. I was fortunate enough to be a contractor, so I did not have to face the dire choice of having to give up my uniform or my career under DADT in order to leave a hostile work environment that proved intolerant of gays.

The qualitative autoethnographic practice is recommended as it allows for a fuller and more in-depth investigation of all aspects of self-actualization journey faced by servicemembers. Through practice, understandings can be attained about how one's journey of self-actualization gets impacted positively or negatively in military work environment. This can also have ramifications for the experience stretched across dispersed military work environments far beyond continental U.S. sites.

Rethinking long series of half-completed organizational transformations. Scholars of organizational change in the government or the military have long understood that theories of organizational change constructed for the private sector – where the profit motive propels enterprises to attain completion of organizational transformations – do not work as well in the constraint-filled environments of public service organizations (Glavin & Clark, 2015; Ostroff, 2006). Kotter's change theory (Kotter, 1995; Kotter, 2012) was popular in the DoD, and many of its various suborganizations longed to apply Kotter's 8-step process to transform their processes, but despite this popularity, leaders and change agents almost never got to see the final – or even the middle steps – and full transformation results of their initiatives (Glavin & Clark, 2015). Recommendation for practice of organizational transformation to investigate, review, revise, modify and improve organizational transformation models that can be applied to public organizations

such as the military and go beyond the current state of half-completed transformation that do not attain their intended results, at great expense to taxpayers and other stakeholders.

This recommendation not only involves further study but also engages practitioners of many different specialties of organizational transformation, since this issue is of significant proportions. Additional research and investigation in application of different theories in the context of DoD suborganizations might provide better bridging of the gap between theories that can address the public sector organizations versus the private sector, to provide enlightenment about improved motivations and management of public organizations.

Innovative method of improving success of organizational transformations. The success of the transformational change to allow open service for gays was improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change that was addressed through a vast communication and outreach campaign by DoD in 2010 through at 10-month study. This entailed the execution of a massive survey study that allowed all servicemembers and their spouses, as well as other associated suborganization members to have their voices heard, and their opinions known during the study. Allowing all members of the organization to reveal issues pertinent to the organizational change prior to its implementation not only revealed the strength of support for the change that the organization had intended, but also revealed the areas that needed to be addressed by organizational leadership.

Understanding the successful practice of using a survey methodology to entice the engagement, participation and buy-in of the workforce prior to the implementation of significant change might be an exciting methodology or change factor that can improve

success of organizational transformation. It is recommended that this approach be studied further so that other organizations contemplating implementations of a significant change follow the model of the DoD change in 2010, and allow for the buy-in from insiders through the communication process. This survey will be expensive, but will have significant and longstanding beneficial dividends in ensuring successful organizational transformation.

Sensemaking inside organizations. When I first began to work as a contractor in the DoD, I was struck with how different DoD was as compared to other government agencies I had been involved with. The military chain of command and the relationship that each member of the organization had to its own suborganization's leader and to the Secretary of Defense was quite significant. I only understood these differences and their many nuances when I was actually inside the DoD organization. In my view, grasping the concept of chain of command and military rank and order from outside the organization does not come close to what it is in the lived experiences of the organization's members. This understanding informed me how closely the personnel inside the organization keep track what the organization's leadership says and does in order to intuit what changes were being contemplated or might soon be coming down the pike. After being inside the organization for some time, I began to understand that my colleagues seemed to assume they understood the will of the organization's leaders but leaders did not always care to understand the needs and desires of their organization's members. The joke was that the military is not a democracy, but a dictatorship.

There is a significant need for researchers to be immersed in organizations in order to understand the paths of least resistance available to insiders and the ways

organizations can be brilliantly effective or too complex to be effective at all. Sensemaking inside an organization can be a significant boon to the leadership of the organization, or conversely a significant impediment. This is to recommend that qualitative studies such as autoethnographic work be conducted by insider-researchers to understand the sensemaking of the attempts that organizational leaders make during the processes of implementing organizational change. This can help the success of the change initiative, and can significantly reduce anxieties and disruptions experienced by the workforce if the implementation is sub-optimal.

Implications

Preference for Prevailing Norms

The words of servicember #D8 who was African-American about a gay unit-mate echoed previous findings in research literature about overarching preference for whiteness, maleness and heterosexuality as prevailing norms – even by people who might not be white, male, or heterosexual (Berube, 1990; Borlik, 1998; Meredith, et al., 2018; Schein, 1992;). My findings showed that *knowing* someone was gay in one's military unit was significant to servicemembers I spoke to. The DoD study (Johnson & Ham, 2010) that looked at thousands of servicemembers worldwide stated that although there was widespread recognition among servicemembers that gays were already in the military, most did not actually want to *know* who was gay. The study reported that servicemembers disliked the *open* part of open service for gays (Johnson & Ham, 2010, p.4), and preferred to continue the anonymity of personnel's sexual orientation. Remembering the African-American military leader General Colin Powell who sometimes railed about racism in the military, and was angered by military services'

preference for *whiteness* in promotions and rank elevations, it was he who was reported to be most influencial in President Clinton's decision to establish the DADT policy at the DoD (Frank, 2010, 2012). Prior to the repeal of DADT, some women leaders who strongly supported inclusion of women in combat forces, opposed open service for gays and sexual minorities (Donnelly, 2009).

The contradictions inherent in various minorities disliking gays and sexual minorities, or not wanting to *know* who is gay among the workforce, continues the documented trend for maintenance of prevailing norms (Meredith, et al., 2018). In this work, when #D2 conveyed his story of encountering UAE military males who were wearing make-up, I came face to face with my own prejudice against military males who behave in unmanly fashion just as servicemember #D2 did. Admitting this bias conveys that even an insider-researcher who was undergoing a personal transformation of accepting her own gay nature carried normative bias against effeminacy in male military personnel. Although I continue to fight against my inherited normative assumptions, this contradiction is but one example of inconsistencies in reactions to various minorities disliking some aspects about gay and sexual minority personnel.

Were there biases that might have impacted the organizational transformation and might have had implications regarding the repeal of DADT? Over the years, many researchers pointed to the maleness of the Department of Defense – namely that unlike the population of the U.S. that has a slight female majority, almost 3 out of every four DoD servicemember is male – and its warfighting culture as indicator of bias. This never satisfactorily established an organizational bias given that the U.S. has an all-volunteer military force, and many more men sign up for such warfighting work than women.

Racial Perceptions and Implications Inside the Organization

While in Germany I began to observe differences in comments and reactions toward our African American four star general who led the U.S. Africa Command in Stuttgart since 2007, General William E. Ward, vis-à-vis the white four star general who led the U.S. European Command in Stuttgart, General Bantz J. Craddock. Both men had offices in buildings that were geographically close although organizationally and bureaucratically were miles apart.

Personnel's attitudes toward General William Ward who was heading DoD's newest Combatant Command, the U.S. Africa Command (military abbreviation: AFRICOM), were vastly different from those of General Bantz Craddock, head of the long established U.S. European Command (military abbreviation: EUCOM). General Ward's efforts to establish closer linkages with African leaders, African militaries, and tribal groups in Africa, in order to be seen as a friend and ally of African nations (McFate, 2008; Macheng, 2010) were widely questioned by insiders and the rank and file. General Ward wanted to leverage his African American heritage but also bring along the heft of American military might as he tried to establish his new command (Phillips & Corcoran, 2011; Walsh, 2012). His intent was to gain a reputation for AFRICOM as giver of aid and supporter of all Africans, instead of a military command bringing threats of confrontations. He did not want to lecture Africans about absence of democracy in their countries, graft, poverty, corruption, and the many ills of that vast continent (Putman, 2008).

General Ward's publication of a book on the grandeur of the AFRICOM Headquarters, and the supposed lavish support his command was receiving was said to

have been a signal to the military personnel across the African continent whom he wanted to impress (Putman, 2008; Walsh, 2012; Evans, 2012). In the spaces I worked in, these same moves were widely questioned by some rank and file personnel, who simply assumed that our African American General just wanted luxuries that were paid for by the taxpayers (Evans, 2012).

The differences I observed inside the organizations in Germany toward the two four star generals who led AFRICOM and the other EUCOM, one being an African American man, and the other a white man, conveyed to me that the personnel were not blind to the race of the two leaders, and different perceptions differentiated the two. Surprisingly, after some years, both men were found to have violated a number of rules and were punished by the Secretary of Defense, although General Ward received the strongest punishment. These experiences in Germany conveyed to me that once a minority status is made visible, it will be a constant factor in the way others see and judge a servicemember's actions – no matter the rank.

Conversations with "Sergeant D" were not highlighted in the previous chapter since he was a colleagues and a superior; he was not part of the 29 servicemembers I conversed with about DADT. He was an African-American Army servicemember married to a biracial German citizen. His wife was the daughter of a former Army servicemember, himself an African-American from South Carolina who decided to marry his German sweetheart after satisfying the terms of his draft by the Army, after which he simply remained and lived in Germany. Sergeant D's family were part of a large diaspora of biracial *'Afro-Germans'*, offsprings of American or European personnel of African descent.

Conversations with this mixed race multi-national family pointed to some implications regarding perceptions of the organization. My journal entries had the following statement from him: "He talked at length about our allies – especially Europeans – who laugh *[sic]* at the hypocracy of our feverish embrace of individual liberty, while historic and overt intolerance of minorities such as blacks and hipanics *[sic]* had been common knowledge by their troops and populations, not to mention the current bias against gays or transgendered minorities who also wish to exercise their liberties." (Appendix B).

These observations are skewed as per my autoethnographic recounting, which includes my own biases as the insider-researcher. It does not establish any organizational bias pertaining to race. I did not encounter servicemembers who gave me sad stories of racial prejudice perpetrated against them. Nonetheless, in the interest of fairness, it must be noted that across the organization, identification of people according to their race and ethnicities was rampant – and continues to be so, across bases I have worked in – not just in Germany but across the U.S. bases as well.

This only anecdotally highlights ways people identify themselves and others: by gender, race, ethnicity and physical features. Therefore, in safe spaces, and in conversations conducted in quiet tones, people talked about General Ward as the African American General, making his race the prime parameter of the man. When President Obama was elected as the first African American President in the United States, people inside bases in Germany began fist-bumping one another instead of shaking hands. It was not always done with high reverence for the fun ways President and Mrs Obama fist-bumped one another on campaign appearances. My observations were that in Germany

people who did fist-bumps instead of handshakes were mocking some aspect of African-American pop-culture, or black ways of doing a greeting; perhaps were simply mocking President Obama, their Commander in Chief for embracing that culture.

The implication of findings, observations and additional notes regarding nuances about race and racial identity in the organizational culture (Meredith, et al., 2018) has research implication for future researchers who have to account for these factors in research. Racial sensitivities of the regular civilian American culture might seem out of step for such a large organization that has dual perceptions of race as a biometric identity vector, and also as a parameter of maintaining prevailing norms (Meredith, et al., 2018).

Connection of Religiosity with Antigay Viewpoint

My findings showed that every third servicemember I spoke to in Germany disagreed with open service for gays. This group was a minority of the DoD personnel in U.S. bases where I worked, but the striking findings about them was that 80% of them believed that allowing open service for gays would result in gays getting beat up and abused in their units, while 60% fundamentally believed that homosexuality was incompatible with their deeply held religious beliefs (Appendix D and E). I presumed that the prediction by 80% of this group that gays would get beat up and abused came from the natural tendency of military warriors to perpetrate violence against those they don't like. Military warriors who are ready at any instance to apply anger or violence against internal or external sources of threat might reasonably think that if gays bother people in the military services then gays would get beat up or abused. Secondly regarding the 60% of anti-repeal servicemembers who had found homosexuality violated their religious beliefs, I wondered whether there was an implication of connection between religiosity

and antigay sentiments? My conversations with servicemembers in Germany did not find a strong and connection between the two.

In studies reviewing the influence of religion on prejudice as related to racial and sexual attitudes, Canaday (2001), Heaton & Jacobson (2015) and Herek (1987, 2006), conveyed that prejudice toward a group depended on the group, and on how explicity that religion had condemned such a group. These investigators held that the religion's highly conservative adherents were more likely to be hostile to that group than its non-conservative adherents (Canaday, 2001; Heaton & Jacobson, 2015). In my interaction with DoD insiders in Germany, my measure of a person's religiosity or conservatism was the person's own self declarations about their piety or conservatism. What I discovered was that adherence to religion did not necessarity imply an antigay viewpoint.

A good example of this was servicemember #D2 who provided deep insights about his Catholic faith. #D2 talked about his religion, and Catholicism seemed intertwined with his Hispanic identity and background. Despite his religiosity he was neutral – namely, neither uncomfortable nor comfortable – toward gays. He stated that if he didn't know that someone was gay, then he didn't care. What was revealed during our conversation was that he correlated his experience seeing men wearing make-up with his opinion that DADT ought not be repealed. His religiosity did not seem to be at the core of his opposition to the repeal of DADT.

#D2 stated that gays serving openly would get beat up or abused in the military. Given that #D2 was not admitting to being prejudiced, my analysis was that the core of his certainty that insiders would beat up or abuse gays stemmed not from his Catholic religiosity or from religious adherence, but from his knowledge of the organizational

culture was such that he was certain insiders in the organization would not tolerate males not behaving according to manly norms. He was struck by UAE male soldiers wearing eye make-up. His Catholicism was not at the core of his revulsion toward them. Through my sensemaking, I deduced that deviation from manly norms was at the core of his disdain, and men wearking make-up, or being attracted to other men, were clear deviations from manly norms. #D2 was aware that organization's insiders probably felt the same, which prompted his prediction that openly serving gays in the military would be beat up or abused.

The implication of the findings, observations and additional notes regarding nuances about religiosity of servicemembers point to the need for in-depth inquiries instead of polls or simple surveys to fully discern what might be religious views and what might have other reasons and compulsions for the servicemembers. It was not known whether servicemembers are more or less religious than the general U.S. populations, but the nature of military service and the repeated relocation of servicemembers entail differences in religious participation and adherence that can have implications in the future for the organization.

Prejudice Against Unmanliness and Effeminacy

In conversations with #D2 who was faced with make-up wearing UAE soldiers when he was on a mission, I saw a parallel between his discomfort with effeminacy and discomforts that other American soldiers encountered historically when they were in a foreign country with a different culture. However, I also saw that his disdain for effeminacy was not just his lens but was DoD's lens, and it was my own lens too. I asked myself: Did I want male soldiers to wear makeup? My answer at the time was no, I did

not. In conversation with Army officer #C4, he said: "There are some soldiers who are gay, & *[sic]* are excellent. But at a Ball, they should not bring their girlfriend or boyfriend [with them, i.e. as their spouse] *[sic]*. It's not good for service *[sic]*" (Appendix C). That meant that at that stage of my evolution, I did not have tolerance for ways some sexual minorities might need to express themselves – be that through wearing make-up, panty hose, or other cross-gender accessories. This was the paradox of my life, and my internal conflict: I wanted to be proud of my gay nature, but I carried the disdain of my organization's straight people for non-normative behavior.

As #D2 spoke expressing his disdain for unmanly behavior, I found myself nodding in agreement. He spoke from his heart, and I felt I understood him. My later analysis and sensemaking made me realize that I carried homophobia inside me. I came to believe that like me, my organization's personnel also carried many prejudices. At that time it seemed to me that being shocked at men wearing make-up was a good thing. Being in a DoD where both males and females felt free to wear make-up was something I could not envision in that moment.Such a future was not only unfathomable but something I did not think was good or positive.

The implication of the findings, observations and additional notes regarding prejudices of the servicemember apart from the prejudices of the researchers will entail deeper explorations into perceptions of manliness and effimanacy in the organization. These might be similar or different from those perceptions in the general U.S. population (Meredith, et al., 2018). Bias is not easy to admit but when prevailing social norms about men and women might be questioned (Meredith, et al., 2018), the implications for

researchers are to admit their suppositions and assumptions openly in order to ensure the integrity of data collection and the research results.

Personal Relections

In 2008, I worked as part of a subcontracting team supporting the DoD and military servicemembers in their war efforts. This final year of President George W. Bush's presidency began against the backdrop of seven years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan. The public seemed exhausted with DoD's failures to either attain military victories in those warfronts, or bring the two wars to an end. A rapidly deepening financial crisis that President Bush struggled to contain seemed to have ushered unprecedented numbers of foreclosures, bankruptcies and economic suffering around the military sites where I worked. Economic woes seemed to have swept the country and were engulfing financial industries and many of my colleagues were worried about their banks and their ability to get loans. Widespread anger and frustration with the unending costs of war made it clear to us that the proverbial axes were about to fall, and big changes were in store for the DoD. What we did not know was what kinds of changes were about to hit us. It turned out that the newly elected President Obama who had his hands full with the financial crisis, also wanted to bring massive changes to DoD by bringing the two wars to an end – without the appearance of cutting-and-running, or military defeat – and by ushering sweeping changes to government contracting, VA (the Department of Veterans' Affairs), Guantanamo Bay detention facilities, and by putting an end to "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT).

Slowly, I began to understand that if the rumors were true and DADT policy was to be repealed, it would usher a transformation for the DoD as far reaching as the

desegregation order signed by President Truman in the 20th century. I knew full well that gays and sexual minorities had long been despised as sinful people who were hated subclasses in most parts of the world. My family was quite homophobic and I had grown up with taboos against gays that were far more intense than racial or ethnic taboos. My problem was that in this late stage of my life, I was beginning to understand that I might be gay. It was something I was dreading to face, but it was a realization I was trying to come to grips with.

In 2008 I began working in Germany and supporting our military servicemembers in the U.S. bases across that country. As the reality took shape that DoD leadership was undertaking steps to prepare for the repeal of DADT, I realized I had a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to see, experience and understand the transformation of DoD from the ground floor. Additionally, since I was raised to loath gays, yet was realizing that maybe I was gay myself, I wanted to know how people really felt about living, working and going to war with gays. I decided to talk to servicemembers and methodically explore their opinions and viewpoints about the repeal of DADT, and open service for gays. I wanted to hear, see and learn as much as I could because an opportunity like this would only happen once. It was a chance of a lifetime, and I realized I was in the right place at the right time. I wanted to seize the chance and go with it. This work is not just an inquiry that I took part in; this was the way I explored, and ultimately made sense of what was happening to me and to my organization. It was transformative.

Reflections on What I Learned

In 2010 when I heard that President Obama had authorized Secretary of Defense Gates to conduct the largest survey DoD had undertaken (up until that time) to

understand viewpoints and issues military personnel had with the repeal of DADT, I thought the exercise was just one more DoD survey that was meant to satisfy political squabbles. I was surprised to discover that servicemembers who took the survey, or participated in the open forums felt better about saying their piece and getting things out in the open. The guarantee of anonymity gave participants the chance to answer the questions and feel like they were heard without reprecussions.

The survey work undertaken by the DoD did not dissuade me from doing my own inquiry and conducting conversations with servicemember to understand for myself how they felt about open service for gays and the repeal of DADT. I despaired they were going to tell me was some version of what I grew up with, which was that gays are bad ungodly sinners and should be killed. What I found out was that 2/3rd of the 29 people I had spoke to regarding repeal of the DADT policy either favored it or were neutral toward it (Table 1, also Appendices D or E).

I discovered that servicemembers did not want to *know* who was gay. The umbrella term I gave to what people said they disliked was *gay behavior*, which I understood to refer to males not behaving in a manly fashion, or behaving differently than the norms of male behavior in the military. Had I not been an insider, I would not have been able to hear soldiers, sailors, airmen and marine speak about their fear and disgust of having a unit mate who acted gay (namely had *gay behavior*). Servicemembers wanted to uphold military norms and customs. Even though I was on a journey to accept my own gay nature, at that time I was completely sure I was not comfortable with male servicemembers wearing make-up just the same as female servicemembers, so I understood what insiders' disdain was for *gay behavior*.

I also learned that whether people agreed or disagreed with the repeal of DADT, the majority of people I spoke to predicted that more gays would join the military if DADT was repealed, and worried about the cohesion of their units. Most forecasted that openly gay servicemembers would get beat up or abused in their units. The detested *gay behavior* was the umbrella term that best fit the reasons. My take away was that it was okay to be gay as long as nobody knew about it, and one behaved according to norms. The warrior psychology cannot be forgotten. Servicemembers are warriors; they understand violence, are constantly trained and ready to settle conflicts with violence, and work everday to deal with violence from our adversaries. Beating people up who break rules and norms is consistent with warriors are trained to do (Meredith, et al., 2018).

Decision to stay in the closet. Following my conversations and findings with servicemembers across Germany, and the realizations that it was important for personnel inside the DoD to *not* be made aware of someone's homosexuality, I resolved to stay in the closet, and keep the whole matter to myself. It came to pass that DoD was transformed through the repeal of DADT, and the transformation of personnel policies, spousal and family benefits, and so forth continued. I did not believe much would change in Germany or other DoD bases around the globe. I reasoned that the human environment inside DoD was going to stay the same, and the disfavor toward gay behavior would also continue. After the repeal, there would be no justification to discharge military personnel just because they were gay. It also did not mean they would be embraced, or would be on equal footing with heterosexual majority personnel when came time to give out promotions, evaluations of rank, and other benefits. Additionally, since it was not possible to see an outwardly sign of someone's internal intensity of dislike for gays, it

would be prudent to avoid raising peoples' ire by displays of same sex husbands or wives, or by gay behaviors. So my decision was to stay quiet about my personal transformation in my work environment.

Continuing evolution. My journey continued beyond self acceptance. As I embraced my gay nature, I began to think about transgendered servicemembers, and other sexual minorities who wanted to find their place as defenders of the nation. My previous prejudice to confine males to the norms of heterosexual male behavior began to fray. Surely if male entertainers, politicians and even men on social media sites became accustomed and expert at wearing make-up to appear on television, online, and in public forums, then anybody could get used to men wearing make-up, and women not wearing make-up.

I decided that if it is okay for President Trump to wear make-up then it should be okay for servicemembers – male or female – to wear make-up. My evolution is continuing and I do not know where it will lead, but the wellspring of it all was the transformation that began with the inquiry a decade ago in Germany. On many occastions throughout this self-actualization process, I found myself convinced that Abraham Maslow would be proud of my journeyand evolution, which seems to be continuing.

Continued aversion toward sexual minority servicemembers. On July 26th, 2017, President Trump sent out a series of 3 tweets, which stated: "After consultation with my Generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow...8:55 AM - Jul 26, 2017 ....Transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. Military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming....9:04 AM - Jul 26, 2017.....victory and cannot be burdened

with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would

entail. Thank you 9:08 AM - Jul 26, 2017" (Edelman, 2017). In a report to the DoD

regarding acceptance, integration and health of LGBT personnel in the military,

University of Southern California researchers headed by Carl Castro (2017) concluded:

"Approximately 3% of military personnel across all service branches identify as lesbian,

gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT). Despite some restrictions on LGBT individuals

serving openly in the military having been lifted in recent years, it has not become

significantly easier for most of these individuals to serve openly. A culture of non-

acceptance – established prior to the easing of restrictions – remains alive and well, with

some LGBT servicemembers experiencing interpersonal and institutional discrimination,

marginalization, and rejection." (Castro, 2017, p.5). This document was published three

months after the initiation of President Trump's tweets, as controversy regarding

transgender troops continued. DoD's policy on transgender troops is still under review by

the Pentagon, and by different courts, but Castro (2017) acknowledged the ambivalence

and rejection of heterosexual military personnel pertinent to openly serving sexual

minorities and especially those whose sexual minority status are visible – which many

transgender individuals can be.

Reflections About Visible and Invisible Minority Status

To me it seemed that when minority status is visible – such as having dark skin, a

different ethnicity or being female in an organization full of males – the timeline of

inclusion and acceptance is significantly longer than for minority status that is invisible –

such as atypical religious affiliation, or in many cases, being gay. Considering minority

religions adherents such as Mormon or Jewish adherents who have succeeded despite

opposition to their faiths by Protestant or Catholic faithfuls (Heaton & Jacobson, 2015). It has been evident to me that if the minority status can be hidden from one's organization or community, then significant opposition and painful experiences can be averted. Without constant hostility, members of such minorities can flourish. I am convinced that gays in the military who keep their sexual identities private, focusing instead on their missions' work will succeed far more rapidly than those who choose to flaunt or showcase it, although I am fully dedicated to safeguarding personnel's right and opportunity to choose whichever of these paths they wish.

Conclusions

Large scale transformational change can result in unanticipated consequences, discomfort or internal struggle. The adoption of the DADT as a DoD policy, and the arc of its controversial use in the removal of thousands of servicemembers resulted in financial losses to DoD (Belkin 2011) as well as immeasurable human costs. Following multitudes of legal actions and controversial lawsuits, the formal transformational change of repealing DADT was driven by some top military leaders, and applied across the board inside the DoD (Belkin, 2011). Being embedded in Germany in 2010 just as Secretary of Defense Robert Gates announced his intentions to repeal DADT, my colleagues and I resembled most of the DoD workforce in that we did not know how to make sense of what was occurring. Many servicemembers such as Darren Manzella who entered the military as youngsters, discovered they were gay while serving in battle zones of Iraq and Afghanistan, and then faced excrutiating choices under DADT (Associated Press, 2013; Meredith, 2011; Sarvis, 2013) did not know that following the repeal decision, they would be allowed back into the military. Many did not know whether housing,

healthcare, food allowances and benefits for servicemembers and families would now have to be dispersed to girlfriends and boyfriends of openly gay servicemembers, which became an emotional matter for a number of my colleagues. Ambiguities increased organization members' resistance to the change. There was much confusion about the transformation, and this work highlighted the dissonance between the divergent perspectives of organizational change among the workforce.

Formal transformational change driven by top management in the organization sought uniform application across military services. It did not account for the personal variations and potentially damaging unintended consequences among the many individuals expected to live the change. The opposition to the transformation which was overtly acknowledged by DoD to be about a third of combat military worforce but smaller in other pockets (Johnson & Ham, 2010), was discovered to be larger albeit partially obscured, through the findings of this research.

The purpose of this autoethnographic study was to illustrate insights learned through my individual experience of living through a transformational change in my identity, which paralleled an organizational change in the DoD. Just as DoD had to come face to face with the reality that thousands of gay people were already serving in the organization, I was coming face to face with my own gay nature. In implementing the transformation by simply repealing the DADT policy, I used the invisibility of being gay the same way thousands of gay people in DoD used it everyday. I came to uncover that I needed to remain closeted, which was the opposite of what top military leaders might have had in mind.

Insights learned through my individual experience were meant to provide a way of informing change makers about the nature of the dynamic personal circumstances, which they need to account for in order to increase the likelihood of success of their change efforts. In discovering that over ninety percent of the personnel stated their comfort with gays, even though about a third opposed the repeal of DADT, and almost half predicted that openly serving gays in the military would get beat up or abused, the clarity brought on by the incongruities in the information compelled me to stay closeted. Following the repeal there was no stampede by gays in the military to announce themselves and come out in the open (Allsep, Levy & Parco, 2011; Belkin et. al., 2012; McCormack, 2015), which to my mind meant that many gays in the military reached the same conclusions I did.

The primary research question was how can the success of transformational change be improved with an understanding of the personal dynamics coinciding with the organizational change? Contrasting this transformation to other significant transformations such as racial desegregation and inclusion of women into the military, I compared the relative invisibility of being a sexual minority to the relative invisibility of being a religious minority. The success of transformational change can be improved with an understanding that perspectives of change makers might well have little resemblance to the lived realities of the workforce. Without deep understanding of the on the ground realities of the organizational environment, the implementation of transformational change can take an unpredictable course. The repeal transformation benefitted from the large and widespread outreach across the organization prior to the implementation of the change. This impacted the insiders and helped the workforce voice their opinion, talk

amongs themselves and ultimately, take part in the transformation of the organization. This was one of the largest surveys DoD had undertaken, and it helped drive the point that the organization did not disregard its members. Addressing the problem of sub-optimal implementation of a formal transformational change driven by top management was partially addressed by the outreach that took ten months, included in person and online surveys, listening-tours and open forums conducted by the organization. The repeal of DADT occurred without massive resignations, separations, or departures of personnel from the organization, which attested to the smoothness of the execution process.

The second research question asked what are the dynamic personal circumstances of living through a transformational change that might inform or influence the organization? This work showed that change agents must understand that transformations related to minorities who look like the majority can have important unintended consequences. I discovered that some who said they were neutral about the transformation were not really neutral. Some had religious, moral or other objections to homosexuality, and did want to reveal that at the outset. Policies can get reformed or eliminated, but peoples' feelings and preferences are not so easy to change, and organizational change cannot rapidly create changed circumstances on the ground.

This was a very small undertaking conducted in a small corner of Europe in a very vast and everchanging organization. The larger significance of this work might be that a majority population has to understand that sexual minority status can be as invisible as someone's religious affiliation. People in an organization might not be able to visually pick out gays any more than they can pick out Mormons, Catholics, Jews or Muslims. If

the member of a minority looks like the majority of the worforce, then how will the majority be able to exclude them the way they might have excluded racial minorities or women in the past? This can require additional research. Understanding the ways different minorities get integrated into organizational societies might provide great dividends. Dissecting mechanisms by which hatred and animus toward minorities can be reduced will require additional investigation.

References

Adler, N., & Gundersen, A. (2008). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (5th edition). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western, Thomson Publishing.

Allsep, M., Levy, D., & Parco, J. (2011). The culture war within: Reconciling policy change and military culture after DADT. *Armed Forces Journal. 2011*(1), 28-31. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/400605/The_Culture_War_Within_Reconciling_Policy _Change_and_Military_Culture_After_DADT

Alt, W., & Alt, B. (2002). *Black soldiers, white wars: Black warriors from antiquity to the present.* Westport, CT.: Praeger Publishers.

Alvesson, M. (2011). Leadership and organizational culture. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Sage handbook of leadership.* 151-162. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage publications, Inc.

Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*(4), 373-395. doi:10.1177/0891241605280449

Associated Press. (2010). In reversal, federal court orders immediate end to "'don't ask, don't tell" policy. Retrieved from http://www.algbtical.org/2A%20MILITARY.htm

Associated Press. (2013). Pioneering gay veteran combat medic who first opposed DADT dies in a car wreck just a month after getting married. Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2407711/Famous-Dont-Ask-Dont-Tell-activist-dies-car-wreck-Darren-Manzella.html#ixzz52r0zbtIo

Associated Press. (2015). More U.S. police charged with murder or manslaughter in

2015. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/more-u-s-police-charged-with-murder-or-manslaughter-in-2015/

Ayres, I., & Brown, J. G. (2004). The inclusive command: Voluntary integration of sexual minorities into the U.S. Military. *Michigan Law Review, 103*(1) 150-188. Retrieved from https://jsou.libguides.com/womencombat

Azoulay, D., Chung, J., Simcovitch, J. Sukumar, S., & Supawong, J. (2010). Open service and our allies: A report on the inclusion of openly gay and lesbian servicemembers in U.S. Allies' Armed Forces. *Columbia Law School Sexuality & Gender Law Clinic*. Retrieved from http://web.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/microsites/clinics/sexuality-gender/files/antidiscrimination3.pdf

Banusiewicz, J. D. (2011). Gates expects smooth 'Don't Ask' repeal transition. *Armed Forces Press Service; DoD News (archives).* Retrieved from http://archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=63465

Barbour, R. S. (2001). Checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research: A case of the tail wagging the dog? *British Medical Journal*, *322*(7294), 1115-1117. doi:10.1136/bmj.322.7294.1115

Barnes, J. E. (2011). Military gay ban to end in 60 days. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424053111903554904576460463874043414

Batalova, J. (2008). Immigrants in U.S. armed forces. *Migration Information Source*. Retrieved from http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=683

Belkin, A. (2011). *How we won: Progressive lessons from the repeal of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'.* Hpmg ebooks, Huffington Post Media Group Publication. Retrieved from https://www.amazon.com/How-We-Won-Progressive-Lessons-ebook/dp/B005NDLMVK/ref=sr_1_fkmr0_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1541137 750&sr=1-1-fkmr0&keywords=How+we+won%3A+Progressive+lessons+from+the+repeal+o f+%E2%80%98Don%E2%80%99t+Ask%2C+Don%E2%80%99t+Tell%E2%80 %99+++Belkin%2C+A.+%282011%29.

Belkin, A., Ender, M., Frank, N., Furia, S., Lucas, G. R., Packard Jr., G., Schultz, T. S., Samuels, S. M. & Segal, D. R. (2012). One year out: An assessment of DADT's repeal's impact on military readiness. *Palm Center*. University of California. Santa Barbara, Ca. Retrieved from https://www.palmcenter.org/?s=One+year+out%3A+An+assessment+of+DADT %E2%80%99s+repeal%E2%80%99s+impact+on+military+readiness

Bersin, J., Geller, J., Wakefield, N. & Walsh, B. (2016). The new organization: Different by design. *Global human capital trends 2016*. Deloitte University Press. Retrieved from https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/HumanCapita l/gx-dup-global-human-capital-trends-2016.pdf

Bertalanffy, L. V. (1968) *General Systems Theory.* New York, NY: George Braziller Inc.

Bertalanffy, L. V. (1981). *A Systems View of Man.* LaViolette, P. (Ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Berube, A. R. (1990). *Coming out under fire: the history of gay men and women in world*

war two. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bochner, A. P. & Ellis, C. (2016). The ICQI and the rise of autoethnography. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 9*(2), 208 – 217. doi: 10.1525/irqr.2016.9.2.208 Retrieved from http://irqr.ucpress.edu/content/9/2/208.full.pdf+html

Borders, D. L. & Giordano, A. L. (2016). Confronting confrontation in clinical supervision: An analytical autoethnography. *Journal of counseling & development, 94*, 454-463. doi:/10.1002/jcad.12104. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jcad.12104

Borlik, A. K. (1998). DoD marks 50th year of military women's integration. *DoD News.* U.S. Department of Defense online news. Retrieved from http://archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=41380

Boylan, S. (2015). Public opinion: A center of gravity leaders forget. *Military Review 2015*(September-October), 93-105. Retrieved from http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview_20151031_art015.pdf

Brannick, T. & Coghlan, D. (2007). In defense of being "native". The case for insider academic research. *Organizational Research Methods, 10* (1), p. 59-74. *doi:* 10.1177/1094428106289253.

Breslin, C.B. (2000). *Organizational Culture and the Military.* Carlisle Barracks, PA.: U.S. Army College. Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a378263.pdf

Bridges, W. (2009). *Managing transitions (3ʳᵈEd).* Philadelphia, PA. Da Capo Press

Books – Perseus Book Group.

Britton, D. M. & Williams, C. L. (2010). "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue": Military policy and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30*(1), p. 1-21. doi: 10.1300/J082v30n01_01

Bronski, M. (2011). *A queer history of the United States*. Boston, MA.: Beacon Press.

Brown, A. D., Colville, I, & Pye, A. (2015). Making sense of sensemaking in organization studies. *Organization Studies, 36*(2), 265-277. doi: 10.1177/0170840614559259

Brooks, R. (2016). *How everything became war and the military became everything: Tales from the Pentagon*. NewYork, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Buchanan, T. W. (2007). Retrieval of emotional memories. *Psychological Bulletin, 133*(5), 761-779. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.133.5.761

Burk, J. & Espinoza, E. (2012). Race relations within the U.S. military. *Annual Review of Sociology 38*, 401-422. Retrieved from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145501

Burks, D. J. (2011). Lesbian, gay and bisexual victimization in the military. *American Psychologist, 66*(7), p. 604-613. doi: 10.1037/a0024609.

Burns, S. M. & Mahalik, J. R. (2011). Suicide and dominant masculinity norms among current and former United States military servicemen. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 42(5), 347-353. doi: 10.1037/a0025163.

Burrelli, D. F. (2012). Women in Combat: Issues for Congress. *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress.* Issue 7-5700-R42075. Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a584292.pdf

Byrd, M. Y. (2014). Exploring the relationship between the organizational culture and

    diversity in the workforce. In M. Y. Byrd & C. L. Scott (Eds.), *Diversity in the*

    workforce: Current issues and emerging trends. NewYork, NY: Taylor & Francis

    Group, Routledge.

Caforio, G. (2006). Military officer education. In Caforio, G. (Ed.) *Handbook of the*

    sociology of the military. (p. 255 – 277). NewYork, NY: Springer Science and

    Business Media. Retrieved from

    https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780387324562#otherversion=978030647295

    4

Caforio, G. (2006). Unionization of the military: Representation of the interests of

    military personnel. In Caforio, G. (Ed.) *Handbook of the sociology of the military.*

    (p. 311 – 323). NewYork, NY: Springer Science and Business Media.

    https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780387324562#otherversion=978030647295

    4

Cahill, S. (2008). The disproportionate impact of antigay family policies on black and

    latino same-sex couple households. *Journal of African American Studies, 13*(3),

    (p. 219-250). doi: 10.1007/s12111-008-9060-7.

Cameron, E. & Green, M. (2015). *Making sense of change management 4th Ed*. London,

    UK. Kogan Page Ltd.

Canaday, M. (2001). *U.S. military integration of religious, ethnic, and racial minorities*

    in the twentieth century. Santa Barbara, CA.: University of California Center of

    Sexual Minorities in the Military – Palm Center. Retrieved from

    https://www.palmcenter.org/publication/u-s-military-integration-religious-ethnic-

racial-minorities-twentieth-century/

Carreiras, H. (2006). *Gender and the military: Women in the armed forces of western democracies.* NewYork, NY: Routledge Publishers – Taylor & Francis Group.

Carter, J. (2006). *Palestine peace not apartheid*. NewYork, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Castro, C. (2017). Improving acceptance, integration, and health among LGBT servicemembers. *University of Southern California*, for U.S. Army medical research and material command, Ft. Detrick, MD. Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1043420.pdf

Chan, J., Dang, S. & Dow, S. P. (2016). Comparing different sensemaking approaches for large-scale ideation. *CHI'16: Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems.* 2717-2728. San Jose, CA.:ACM. Retrieved from https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2858178

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method.* Walnut Creek, CA. Left Coast Press.

Chapman-Clarke, M. (2016). 'Discovering' autoethnography as a research genre, methodology and method 'The Yin and Yang of Life'. *Transpersonal Psychology Review, 18*(2), 10-18.

Clowney, P., Dever, J. & Stuban, S. (2016). Department of Defense acquisition program terminations: Analysis of 11 program management factors. *Defense Acquisition Research Journal, ARJ*(July 2016). Retrieved from http://dau.dodlive.mil/2016/06/20/department-of-defense-acquisition-program-terminations-analysis-of-11-program-management-factors/

Cloud, D. S. (2010). Pentagon study finds few drawbacks to dropping 'don't ask, don't tell'. *Los Angeles Times.* Retrieved from

http://articles.latimes.com/2010/dec/01/nation/la-na-dadt-survey-20101201

Cohen, R. (2010). DADT comments by FRC's Perkins echo old racist fears. *Southern Poverty Law Center*. Retrieved from https://www.splcenter.org/news/2010/12/20/dadt-comments-frc%E2%80%99s-perkins-echo-old-racist-fears

Cohen, Z. (2018). From fellow soldier to 'monster' in uniform: #MeToo in the military. *CNN Wire*. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2018/02/07/politics/us-military-sexual-assault-investigations/

Coll, J.E., Weiss, E.L., & Metal, M. (2013). Military culture and diversity. In A. Rubin, E.L. Weiss & J.E. Coll (Eds.), *Handbook of military social work.* 21-26. Hoboken, NJ., John Wiley & Sons publishers.

Congressional Digest. (2010). Should the U.S. military's Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy be repealed. *Congressional Digest, April 2010.* 116-118. Retrieved from https://eds-b-ebscohost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=dfdfee4f-438f-441d-8823-3bf3b2f44007%40pdc-v-sessmgr01

Cortright, D. (1975). *Soldiers in revolt: GI resistance during the Vietnam War.* Chicago, Il., Haymarket Books.

Cummings, J. & Rudnicki, S. (1995). *Colin Powell and the American dream: the reluctant hero.* Los Angeles, CA: Dove Books.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C.G. (2005). *Organization Development and Change.* Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Custer, D. (2014). Autoethnography as a transformative research method. *The Qualitative*

Report, 19(37), 1 – 13. Retrieved from

https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss37/3/

Dannunzio, P. J. (2017). DC Federal Court Blocks Most of Trump's Transgender

Military Ban. *National Law Journal*. Retrieved from

https://www.law.com/nationallawjournal/sites/nationallawjournal/2017/10/30/d-c-

federal-court-blocks-most-of-trumps-transgender-military-

ban/?slreturn=20180111121452

Deming, W. E. (1994). *The new economics for industry, government, education*. 2nd Ed.

Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Denzin, N. K. (2014). *Interpretive autoethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications Inc.

Denzin, N. K. (2006). Analytic autoethnography, or Déjà vu all over again. *Journal of*

Contemporary Ethnography, 35(4), 419-428. doi:10.1177/089124606286985.

Dinnen, C. M. (2015). Curent challenges being faced by female survivors of military

sexual assaults: suggestion for policy change. *St. Cloud University Department of*

Social Work. Retrieved from

http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=msw

_etds

Dippold, K. E., Van Winkle, E. P. & Hurley, M. M. (2016). 2015 focus groups on sexual

assault prevention and response among active duty members. *DoD Defense*

Manpower Data Center. Retrieved from

http://sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/FY15_Annual/Annex_2_2015_FGSAPR_Repo

rt.pdf

DoD. (1994). Mission Statement. *Government Information Library*. Retrieved from:

    https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/status/mission/mdod.htm

DoD. (2010). Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal

    of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell". *DoD Support Plan for Implementation*. Retrieved

    from http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/DADTReport-

    SPI_FINAL_20101130(secure-hires).pdf

DoD News. (2010). DoD News Briefing with Secretary Gates and Adm. Mullen from the

    Pentagon. *DoD Press Operations*. Retrieved from

    http://archive.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4728

DoD. (2011). Repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT): Quick Reference Guide. *DoD*

    USD(P&R) Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments. Retrieved

    from

    http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/Quick_Reference_Guid

    e_Repeal_of_DADT_APPROVED.pdf

DoD Instruction. (2011). Protection of human subjects and adherence to ethical standards

    in DoD-supported research (No. 3216.20.) *DoD Directives Division*. Retrieved

    from http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/321602p.pdf

DoD National Defense University. (2011). Strategic Leadership and Decision Making –

    Organizational Culture. *National Defense University*. Retrieved from

    http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ndu/strat-ldr-dm/pt4ch16.html

DoD. (2015). About DoD. *Department of Defense*. Retrieved from

    http://www.defense.gov/About-DoD

DoD Instruction. (2015). *Qualification standards for enlistment, appointment and*

induction (No. 1304.26). Retrieved from

http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/130426p.pdf

DoD. (2016). Commanders' areas of responsibilities. *DoD Unified Command Plan*.

Retrieved https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dod/unified-com.htm

DoD. (2018). FAQs. *DoD Defense Knowledge Base.* Retrieved from

https://kb.defense.gov/

DoD. (2018). Know your military. *Department of Defense*. Retrieved from:

https://www.defense.gov/

DoD DMDC Archive. (2018). Active Duty Military Strength by Service; Historical

reports - FY 1994-2012. *DoD personnel, workforce reports & publications*.

Archive of 2009 – 2010 Demographics. Retrieved from

https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/dwp_reports.jsp

Donnelly, E. (2008). Legislative history of the law regarding homosexuals in the military.

Center for Military Readiness. Retrieved from:

https://www.cmrlink.org/issues/gays-in-the-military

Donnelly, E. (2009). Allowing Gays in the Military Would Be Unfair and Hurt Troop

Morale. *U.S. News & World Report*. Retrieved from

http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2009/06/29/allowing-gays-in-the-

military-would-be-unfair-and-hurt-troop-morale

Dopfer, K., Foster, J. & Potts, J. (2004). Micro-Meso-Macro. *Journal of evolutionary

economics* 14(3) p. 263-279. doi:10.1007/s00191-004-0193-0.

Dufour, J. (2016). The worldwide network of U.S. military bases; the global deployment

of US military personnel. *Center for research on globalization.* Retrieved from

http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-worldwide-network-of-us-military-bases/5564

Eager, P. W. (2016). *Waging gendered wars: U.S. military women in Afghanistan and Iraq*. New York, NY: Routledge; Taylor and Francis Group.

Edelman, A. (2017). Trump bans transgender people serving in the military. *NBC News*. Retrieved from https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/donald-trump/trump-announces-ban-transgender-people-serving-military-n786621

Egeli, C. (2017). Autoethnography: A methodological chat with self. *Counselling Psychological Review, 32*(1), 5-15. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/publications/journals-and-periodicals/counselling-psychology-review-vol-32-no-1-march-2017.html

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative social research, 12*(1); Article 10. Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095

Ellis, C. & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & A. P. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, (2nd edition). p. 733-768. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ellis, C. & Bochner, A. P. (2006). Analyzing analytic autoethnography; an autopsy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*(4), 429-449. doi:10.1177/0891241606286979

Evans, C. P. (2013). Leadership challenges in a culture of entitlement. *U.S. Marine Corps*

Combatant Development Command. Retrieved from

http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a601749.pdf

Evans, R. (2001). U.S. Military policies concerning homosexuals: Development,

implementation and outcomes. *Palm Center – University of California at Santa*

Barbara. Retrieved from https://www.palmcenter.org/wp-

content/uploads/2017/12/evans1.pdf

Executive Office of the President. (2010). Statement of Administration Policy: House

Amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 2965 – Don't Ask, Don't Tell

Repeal Act of 2010. *Office of Management of Budget*. Retrieved from

https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/omb/legislative/sap/111/s

aphr2965h_20101215.pdf

Fallows, J. (2014). The tragedy of the American Military. *The Atlantic* (January/February

2015). Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/features/archive/2014/12/the-

tragedy-of-the-american-military/383516/

Fine, G.A., & Kleinman, S. (1979). Rethinking subculture: An interactionist analysis.

American Journal of Sociology, 85(1), 1-20. Retrieved from

http://www.jstor.org/pss/2778065

Frank, N. (2010). Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Detailing the damage. *Palm Center – University*

of California at Santa Barbara. Retrieved from https://www.palmcenter.org/wp-

content/uploads/2017/12/DetailingCostofDADT.pdf

Frank, N. (2012). The cowardice of Colin Powell. *Slate.com*. Retrieved from

http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2012/05/colin_powell_e

ndorsed_same_sex_marriage_once_it_was_safe_more_evidence_he_s_hardly_a_

great_leader_.html

French, W., Bell, C. & Zawacki, R. (2004). *Organization development and transformation: Managing effective change (6th Ed.)* Boston, Mass., McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Galvin, T. P. & Allen, C. D. (2016). *The challenge of the paradoxical vision: Innovating where no solution seems possible.* U.S. Army Press at Ft. Leavenworth. Retrieved from

https://ssl.armywarcollege.edu/dclm/pubs/Challenge%20of%20the%20Paradoxical%20Vision%20(Galvin-and-Allen,%20APOJ%2016-6,%204Feb16).pdf

Galvin, T. P. & Clark, L. D. (2015). Beyond Kotter's leading change: A broad perspective on organizational change for senior U.S. military leaders. *U.S. Army War College, Department of Command, Leadership and Management Strategic Studies Institute*. Retrieved from

https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/PDFfiles/PCorner/LeadingChangePrimer4.pdf

Garamone, J. (2010). Gates, Mullen urge participation in survey. *American Forces Press Service*. Retrieved from

http://archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=59956

Garamone, J. (2010). Gates, Mullen endorse working group report. *American Armed Forces Press Service; DoD News (Archives)*. Retrieved from

http://archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=61895

Garner, J. T. (2012). Making waves at work: perceived effectiveness and appropriateness of organizational dissent messages. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26(*2; May 2012), 224-240. doi: 10.1177/0893318911431803.

Gate, G. J. (2010). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual men and women in the US military: Updated estimates. *Williams Institute of Law, UCLA*. Los Angeles, CA. Retrieved from https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-GLBmilitaryUpdate-May-20101.pdf

Ghosh, A. (2012). Leveraging sexual orientation workforce diversity through identity deployment. In C. L. Scott, & M. Y. Byrd (Eds.), *Handbook of research on workforce diversity in a global society: Technologies and concepts*. Retrieved from http://sites.uci.edu/ghosh/files/2015/09/pdf3.pdf

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, 105–117. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Halloran, L. (2011). With repeal of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,' an era ends. *National Public Radio.* Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/2011/09/20/140605121/with-repeal-of-dont-ask-dont-tell-an-era-ends

Halstead, F. (1970). *G.I.s speak out against the war.* N.Y., N.Y.: Pathfinder Press Inc.

Hamdan, A. (2012). Autoethnography as a genre of qualitative research: a journey inside out. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 11*(5), p. 585-606. Retrieved from http://ijq.sagepub.com/content/11/5/585.full

Han, J. (2017). African-Americans in the US Military. In. D. E. Rohall, M. G. Ender, & M. D. Matthews (Eds.), *Inclusion in the American Military; A force for diversity.* 19 – 36. Lanham, MD., Lexington Books of Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

Hart, A. J. (2016). Exploring the influence of management communication behaviors on

employee engagement. *Walden University*. Retrieved from

http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3255&context=disse

rtations

Harwood, J. (2015). Intergroup contact, prejudicial attitudes, and policy preferences: The

case of the U.S. military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. The Journal of Social

Psychology, 155, 57-69. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2014.959886

Heath, C. (2011). Tell: An intimate history of gay men in the military. *GQ*. Retrieved

from https://www.gq.com/story/dont-ask-dont-tell-gay-soldiers-military

Heaton, T. B & Jacobson, C. K. (2015). The social composition of Mormonism. In T. L.

Givens & P. L. Barlow (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of Mormonism*, (p. 309 – 333).

Oxford, U.K.; Oxford University Press.

Humes, K. R., Jones, N. A. & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic

origin: 2010. *U.S. Department of Commerce Economic and Statistics*

Administration. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from

https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf

Herek, G. M. (1987). Religious Orientation and Prejudice: A Comparison of Racial and

Sexual Attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Yale University,*

13(1), 34-44. Retrieved from

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.494.4197&rep=rep1&t

ype=pdf

Herek, G.M. (1996). Why tell if you're not asked? Self disclosure, intergroup contact,

and heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In G.M. Herek, J.J.

Jobe, & R. Carney (Eds.), *Out in force: Sexual orientation and the military*. 197-

225. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herek, G. M. (2006). Psychology 101 for the DoD. *Beyond Homophobia.* Retrieved from

http://www.beyondhomophobia.com/blog/2006/11/

Herek, G.M., & Jobe, J.B. (1996). Social science, sexual orientation, and military

personnel policy. In G.M. Herek, J.J. Jobe, & R. Carney (Eds.), *Out in force:*

Sexual orientation and the military. 3-14. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Culture and organizations: Software*

of the mind, 3rd Ed. N.Y., N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.H

Hokkanen, S. (2017). Analyzing personal embodied experiences: Autoethnography,

feelings and fieldwork. *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting*

Research; Translation & Interpreting, 9(1), 24 - 35.

doi:10.12807/ti.109201.2017.a03

Hopkins, Y. C. (2000). Out of the closet: Addressing policy options. *U.S. Army*

Command and General Staff College; Monograph for School of Advanced

Military Studies. Retrieved from http://dtic.mil/get-tr-doc/pdf?AD=ADA393883

Hovey, E. (2015). Why women DO belong in the U.S. infantry. *Marine Corps Gazette,*

99(2), 2015. Retrieved from https://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/2015/02/why-

women-do-belong-us-infantry

Huntington, S. P. (1957). *The soldier and the state: The theory and politics of civil-*

military relations. Cambridge, MA.: Belknap Press.

International Monetary Fund. (2017). *IMF diversity and inclusion annual report 2015.*

Retrieved from https://www.imf.org/external/np/div/2017/index.pdf

Iwu, C. G., Twum-Darko, M., Kapondoro, L. & Lose, T. (2015). Strategic human

resource metrics: A perspective of General Systems Theory. *Business Administration and Business Economics*; *Economica 12(2) 2016;* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303702476_Strategic_Human_Resource _Metrics_A_Perspective_of_the_General_Systems_Theory

Izard, C. E. (2009) Emotion theory and research: Highlights, unanswered questions, and emerging issues. *Annual Review of Psychology 2009*(60), 1-25. Retrieved from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.16353 9.

Jelinek, P. (2007). Pace expresses regret over gay remark. *Associated Press*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/13/AR2007031300185.html

Johnson, J. C. & Ham, C. F. (2010). *Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"*. Retrieved from http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/DADTReport-SPI_FINAL_20101130(secure-hires).pdf

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *The Academy of Management Journal, 33(*4), 692-724. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/256287?uid=2&uid=4&sid=47698871047 227

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 131-146. doi:10.1002/bs.3830090206

Katz, J. (1992). *Gay American history: lesbians and gay men in the U.S.A.* New York,

NY: Meridian books; Plume Publishing.

Keleher, A. & Smith, E. (2012). Growing support for gay and lesbian equality since 1990. *Journal of Homosexuality, 59*(9), 1307-1326. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2012.720540.

Kelley, A. (2014). Layers of consciousness: An autoethnographic study of the comprehensive exam process. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 9,* 347-360. Retrieved from http://www.ijds.org/Volume9/IJDSv9p347-360Kelley0588.pdf

Keval, F. (2012). Moral imperative as a strategy for transformational leadership and sustainability: An autoethnography. *California State University.* Sacramento, CA: California State University.

Klein, K. & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). From Micro to Meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Academy of Management, 3*(3). doi:10.1177/109442810033001

Koperniak, S. (2016). Using data from social networks to understand and improve systems. *Massachussetts Institute of Technology – Institute for data, systems and society (IDSS).* Retrieved from http://news.mit.edu/2016/idss-researchers-use-data-social-networks-understand-and-improve-variety-systems-0407

Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2007/01/leading-change-why-transformation-efforts-fail

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard business review press.

Krill, J. A. (2016). Developing and implementing a framework for innovation. In M. A.

Garrison Darrin, & J. A. Krill (Eds.), *Infusing Innovation into organizations: A systems engineering approach.* 62 – 80. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.

Lee, J. L. (2013). The comprehensive review working group and Don't Ask, Don't Tell repeal at the Department of Defense. *Journal of Homosexuality, 60*(2-3) 282-311. Doi:10.1080/00918369.2013.744673

Lewin, K. (1997). Resolving social conflicts and Field theory in social science. *American Psychological Association, 422*. doi: 10.1037/10269-000

Lira, L. L. (2004). To change an army: understanding defense transformation. *United States Military Academy; Proceeding of the 2004 ISSS/ISAC Conference*. Retrieved from http://www.usma.edu/sosh/SiteAssets/SitePages/Faculty%20Scholarship/Lira-To%20change%20an%20Army.pdf

Losey, S. (2014). America's military: A conservative institution's uneasy cultural evolution. *Military Times*. Retrieved from http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2014/12/21/americas-military-a-conservative-militarys-cultural-evolution/18959975/

Lowy, A. (2015). The six dilemmas of strategy execution. *Strategy & Leadership 43*(6), p. 18-24. doi: 10.1108/SL-07-2015-0062

Lytell, M. C., Kuhn, K. Haddad, A. Marquis, J. P., Lim, N., Hall, K. C., Stewart, R. & Wenger, J. W. (2015). Force drawdowns and demographic diversity. *Rand Corporation*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1000/RR1008/R

AND_RR1008.pdf

Mabus, R. (2016). Remarks by the Honorable Ray Mabus Secretary of the Navy;

Pentagon lesbian, gay bisexual and transgender Pride month ceremony. *U.S.*

Navy. Retrieved from Navy.com portal at

http://www.navy.mil/navydata/people/secnav/Mabus/Speech/DoD%20Pride%20

Month.pdf

MacGregor, M. J. (1980). Integration of the armed forces (1940 – 1965). *U.S.*

Department of the Army; Center for military history of the U.S. Army. Retrieved

from http://www.history.army.mil/html/books/050/50-1-1/cmhPub_50-1-1.pdf

Macheng, S. T. (2010). Is the United States Africa Command on track? *U.S. Army War*

College, Strategic Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA. Retrieved from

http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a520014.pdf

Maitlis, S. & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and

moving forward. Academy of Management Annals 2014, 8(1) 57-125. doi:

10.1080/19416520.2014.873177 Retrieved from

https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c5ef/1af1d6b68ed0d97b7aa19de748550a379fa7.

pdf

Manigart, P. (2006). Restructuring of the armed forces. In Caforio, G. (Ed.) *Handbook of*

the sociology of the military. (pp. 255 – 277). Retrieved from

https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780387324562#otherversion=978030647295

4

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Maréchal, G. (2010). Autoethnography. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos & E. Wiebe (Eds.),

*Encyclopedia of case study research, 2. doi:*10.4135/9781412957397.n19

Maycock, J. (2001). War within war. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from

http://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2001/sep/15/weekend7.weekend3

McCormack, M. (2015). The after-effects of decreasing homophobia. *Sociology 50*(2),

416 - 421. *doi:* 10.1177/0038038515584529.

McFate, S. (2008). U.S. Africa Command: A new strategic paradigm?, *Military Review,*

88(1). Retrieved from

https://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview

_20080228_art002.pdf

McNaugher, T. L. (2007). The real meaning of military transformation: Rethinking the

revolution. *Foreign Affairs* (Jan/Feb 2007). Retrieved from

https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/review-essay/2007-01-01/real-meaning-

military-transformation-rethinking-revolution

Meredith, A. P. (2011). Interview with former Army Sergeant Darren Manzella. *Harvard*

University Library Audiovisual collection "Angels-DC-March 2011." March 16-

23, 2011; Inclusive collection of Ann P. Meredith, 1976-2011. Retrieved from

https://hollisarchives.lib.harvard.edu/search?utf8=%E2%9C%93&op%5B%5D=

&q%5B%5D=%22Darren+Manzella%22&commit=Search++&limit=&field%5B

%5D=&from_year%5B%5D=&to_year%5B%5D=

Meredith, L. S., Sims, C. S., Bartosrsky, B. S., Okunogbe, A., Bannon, B. L. & Myatt, C.

A. (2018). Identifying promising approaches to U.S. Army institutional change: A

review of the literature on organizational culture and climate. *Rand Corporation.*

Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1054034.pdf

Military.com. (2017). SCRA: Servicemembers Civil Relief Act Overview. *Military.com*.

Retrieved from http://www.military.com/benefits/military-legal-

matters/scra/servicemembers-civil-relief-act-overview.html

Military.com. (2018). Military Base Guide by Base Name. *Military.com*. Retrieved from

https://www.military.com/base-guide/browse-by-name

Miner, J. B. (2015). *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and

leadership*. New York, NY: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group publishers.

Mitchell, R. (2017). Gay marine helps change history. *Harvard Business Gazette*.

Retrieved from https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2017/04/eric-alva-shares-

story-of-being-gay-a-marine-and-changing-history/

Moore, D. T. (2011). Sensemaking: A structure for an intelligence revolution. *U.S.

Department of Defense, National Defense Intelligence College Clift Series on the

Intelligence Profession.* Retrieved from http://ni-

u.edu/ni_press/pdf/Sensemaking.pdf

Moradi, B. (2006). Perceived sexual-orientation-based harassment in military and civilian

contexts. *Military Psychology, 18*(1), p. 39-60. doi:10.1207/s15327876mp1801_3

Moradi, B., & Miller, L. (2009). Attitudes of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans toward

gay and lesbian servicemembers. *Armed forces & society 36*(3), 397-419.

doi:10.1177/0095327x09352960

Morin, R. (2015). Exploring racial bias among biracial and single-race adults: The IAT.

Pew Research Center; Social & Demographic Trends. Retrieved from

http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/08/19/exploring-racial-bias-among-biracial-

and-single-race-adults-the-iat/

Morton, L. B. (2009). "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy: Is it time to talk? *U.S. Army War College*. Retrieved from handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA494822

Moskos, C. C. (1966). Racial Integration in the Armed Forces. *American Journal of Sociology, 72*(2), 132-148. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2775465.pdf

Moten, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Between war and peace: How America ends its wars.* New York, N.Y: Simon & Schuster's Free Press.

Muncey, T. (2010). *Creating autoethnographies*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage publications.

Mundy, D. E. (2016). Bridging the divide: A multidisciplinary analysis of diversity research and the implications for public relations. *Research journal of the institute for public relations, 3*(1), 1-28. Retrieved from http://www.instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/Dean-Mundy-1.pdf

National Defense University (2012). Strategic Leadership and Decision Making. *NDU*. Retrieved from http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ndu/strat-ldr-dm/pt4ch16.html

Nelson, A. M. (2015). Exploring the lack of African Americans in the Department of Defense Senior Executive Service Corps. *Walden University*. Minneapolis, MN.: Walden University. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2900&context=dissertations

New York Times. (2007). The democrats' second presidential debate. *New York Times*. Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/03/us/politics/03demsdebate_transcript.html?_r
=0

Ngima, W. M. & Kyongo, J. (2013). Contribution of motivational management to
employee performance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science,
3*(14), 219 – 239. Retrieved from
http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_14_Special_Issue_July_2013/26.pdf

Nielsen, S. C. (2010). An army transformed: the U.S. Army's post-Vietnam recovery and
the dynamics of change in military. *U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies
Institute (SSI), The Letort Papers.* Retrieved from
http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil

Nikolov, M. (2017). U.S. Army drill sergeants' response to sexual harrassment and
sexual assault of gay, lesbian and bisexual recruits. *Walden University*. Retrieved
from
https://search.proquest.com/openview/de2eebe28006e2833accf70fe0e91328/1?pq
-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

NPR. (2015). 'We are not cured': Obama discusses racism in America. *National Public
Radio*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-
way/2015/06/22/416476377/we-are-not-cured-obama-discusses-racism-in-
america-with-marc-maron

Office of Naval Research. (2016). Human subject research documentation requirement.
*Department of the Navy; Office of Naval Intelligence Science and Technology –
DoD ONI – S&T* . Retrieved from http://www.onr.navy.mil/About-
ONR/compliance-protections/Research-Protections/Human-Subject-

Research.aspx

Office of Personnel and Management (OPM). (2016). Governmentwide inclusive

diversity strategic plan. *U.S. Office of Personnel and Management*. Retrieved

from https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/diversity-and-

inclusion/reports/governmentwide-inclusive-diversity-strategic-plan-2016.pdf

Ostroff, F. (2006). Change management in government. *Harvard Business Review*.

Boston, MA: HBR OnPoint. Retrieved from

http://www.harvardbusiness.org/change-management-government

Osur, A. M. (1977) Blacks in the Army Air Forces during WWII: The problem of race

relations. *Office of Air Force History, Washington, DC*. Retrieved from

http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a036585.pdf

Ozdemir, Y. & Ergun, S. (2015). The relationship between organizational socialization

and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of person-environment

fit. *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 207(2015), 432-443. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284559507_The_Relationship_between

_Organizational_Socialization_and_Organizational_Citizenship_Behavior_The_

Mediating_Role_of_Person-

Environment_Fit00000aacb360&acdnat=1469978929_d168f5ca95abb32f1ba4abc

9f266849f

Paley, B., Lester, P. & Mogil, C. (2013). Family systems and ecological perspectives on

the impact of deployment on military families. *Clinical Child and Family

Psychology Review, 16*(3) 245–265. Retrieved from

https://rd.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10567-013-0138-y#page-2

Paul, S. A. & Morris, M. R. (2009). CoSense: Enhancing sensemaking for collaborative

web search. *CHI'09: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on human factors in*

computing systems. 1771-1780. Retrieved from

http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~pszmw/G53CCT/cosense.pdf

Paul, S. A. & Reddy, M. C. (2010) Understanding together: sensemaking in collaborative

information seeking. *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on computer*

supported cooperative work; CSCW'10. 321 – 330. Retrieved from

http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/1720000/1718976/p321-

paul.pdf?ip=128.29.43.2&id=1718976&acc=ACTIVE%20SERVICE&key=A9E

D11D7A520B19D%2E4D4702B0C3E38B35%2E4D4702B0C3E38B35%2E4D4

702B0C3E38B35&CFID=894632939&CFTOKEN=36346168&__acm__=14857

04302_8c286d6adcf282fbf16803fd33114b85#URLTOKEN

Pawlyk, O. (2018). Air Force Secretary: 'Our Doors Have to Be Open to All'.

Military.Com. Retrieved from https://www.military.com/daily-

news/2018/01/21/air-force-secretary-our-doors-have-be-open-all.html

Pellerin, C. (2014). Work: DoD transforms global posture for future needs. *DoD News*.

Retrieved from http://archive.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=123304

Pellerin, C. (2015). Carter Opens All Military Occupations, Positions to Women. *DoD*

News; Defense Media Activity. Retrieved from

https://www.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/632536/carter-opens-all-military-

occupations-positions-to-women

Pentagon Library. (2016). General Information – DADT. *DoD History and Library*

Directorate, Pentagon Library. Retrieved from

http://whs.mil.campusguides.com/content.php?pid=339252&sid=4130284

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology,*

1998(49), 65-85. Retrieved from

https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f86a/3dbf4639cda042f4bd6de79f236e87616a0a.

pdf

Phillips, K.W. (2014). How diversity makes us smarter. *Scientific American; Politics &*

Ethics. Retrieved from http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-diversity-

makes-us-smarter/

Phillips, P. C. & Corcoran, C. S. (2011). Harnessing America's power: A U.S. national

security structure for the 21st century. *Joint Forces Quarterly, 63*(4), 38 – 46.

Retrieved from http://ndupress.ndu.edu/portals/68/Documents/jfq/jfq-63.pdf

Piryani, R., Madhavi, D. & Singh, V.K. (2016). Analytical mapping of opinion mining

and sentiment analysis research during 2000-2015. *Information Processing and*

Management 53(2017), 122-150. Retrieved from https://ac.els-

cdn.com/S030645731630245X/1-s2.0-S030645731630245X-

main.pdf?_tid=b0d6f10c-45d7-416f-b9ed-

9250487308e4&acdnat=1528827338_4a4e2fe62a22be5e207d66b14564dacd

Putman, D. B. (2008). Combating African questions about the legitimacy of AFRICOM.

U.S. Army War College, Strategic Research Project. Retrieved from

http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a479332.pdf

Raab, D. (2013). Transpersonal approaches to autoethnographic research and writing. *The*

Qualitative Report, 18(42) 1-18. Retrieved from

http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/raab42.pdf

Ramirez, M. H. & Sterzing, P. R. (2017). Coming out in camouflage: A queer theory perspective on the strength, resilience and resistance of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender servicemembers and veterans. *Journal of gays and lesbian social services 29*(1) 68 - 86. doi: 10.1080/10538720.2016.1263983.

Rhodes, S. (2010). *Changing the military culture of silence*. Bloomington, In.: AuthorHouse Publishing.

Rhon, C. C. & Sutrich, U. (2014). Dialog as shared social space in management and organizations. In K. Scala, R. Grossman, M. Lenglachner & K. Mayer (Eds.), *Leadership learning for the future, 11,* 145-162. Retrieved from http://www.sutrich.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/DIALOGUE-AS-SHARED-SOCIAL-SPACE-IN-MANAGEMENT-AND-ORGANIZATIONS_2014.pdf

Rock, L., Van Winkle, E., Mamrow, N. & Hurley, M. (2014). 2014 Department of Defense report of focus groups on sexual assault prevention and response (Report No. 2014-041). *DoD DMDC.* Retrieved from https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/searchResults.jsp?search=sexual+assault

Rossi, P. H., Wright, J. D. & Anderson, A. B. (2010). *Handbook of Survey Research* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Rostker, B. D., Harris, S. A., Adler, S., Peterson, J. Kahan, J. P., Koegel, P. ... Turner, S. F. (1993). Sexual orientation and U.S. military personnel policy: Options and assessment. *Rand Corporation*. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2009/RAND_MR323.pdf

Rostker, B. D., Hosek, S. Winkler, J. D., Vaiana, M. E., Leuschner, K., Zakaras, L. ...

Haddad, A. (2010). Sexual orientation and U.S. Military personnel policy. *Rand Corporation*. Retrieved from

https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG1056.pdf

Saldana, J. (2003). *Longitudinal qualitative research*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Salter, P. S., Adams, G. & Perez, M. J. (2018). Racism in the structure of everyday worlds: A cultural-psychological perspective. *Association of psychological science, 27*(3), p. 150 - 155. doi: 10.1177/0963721417724239. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0963721417724239

Sarvis, A. (2013) A Soldier Who Changed His Country. *Huffpost*. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/aubrey-sarvis/a-soldier-who-changed-his_b_3855982.html

Sayles, L. R. & Chandler, M. K. (1971). *Managing large systems: Organizations for the future.* New York, New York: Harper & Row.

Scarborough, R. (2009). Exclusive: Marine leads 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' fight. *Washington Times.* Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/nov/02/marine-leads-dont-ask-dont-tell-fight/?page=all

Schaefer, A. G., Wenger, J. W., Kavanagh, J., Wong, J. P. Oak, G. S., Trail, T. E. & Nichols, T. (2015). Implication of integrating women into the marine corps infantry. *Rand corporation*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1100/RR1103/RAND_RR1103.pdf

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view.* San

Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass publisher.

Senge, P. M. (1999). *The dance of change: The challenge to sustaining momentum in a*

learning organizations. New York, NY: Doubleday publishing at Random House,

Inc..

Shaban, A. (2016). Managing and leading a diverse workforce: One of the main

challenges in management. ScienceDirect Procedia - Social and behavioral

sciences 230(2016) 76-84. Retrieved from https://ac.els-

cdn.com/S1877042816311119/1-s2.0-S1877042816311119-

main.pdf?_tid=2721bc27-38b7-46a7-bce8-

36d8c5ca348f&acdnat=1541369143_50ff78f03be313e5ba0395825a297a64

Shilts, R. (1987). *And the band played on: Politics, people and the AIDS epidemic.* New

York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Shilts, R. (1993). *Conduct unbecoming: Gays and lesbians in the U.S. Military.* New

York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Siebold. G. L. (2001). Core issues and theory in military sociology. *Journal of political*

*and military sociology, 29(*summer), p. 140-159. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290076848_Core_issues_and_theory_in

_military_sociology

Sinclair, G. D. (2009). Homosexuality and the military: A review of the literature.

Journal of Homosexuality, 56, 701-718. doi: 10.1080/00918360903054137.

Retrieved from

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00918360903054137

Smith, K. (2016). A narrative inquiry into an army school leadership experience. *University of Oklahoma; Department of educational leadership and policy studies*. Retrieved from https://shareok.org/bitstream/handle/11244/34734/2016_Smith_Kyle_Dissertation%20Narrative%20Inquiry.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

Soeters, J. L., Winslow, D. J., & Weibull, A. (2006). Military culture. In Caforio, G. (Ed.) *Handbook of the sociology of the military.* (pp. 255 – 277). N.Y., N.Y.: Springer Science and Business Media. Retrieved from https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780387324562#otherversion=9780306472954

Supreme Court of the U.S. (2015). *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges, Director, Ohio Department of Health, et. al*. Supreme Court of the United States, Docket No. 14-556. Retrieved from https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf

Supreme Court of the U.S. (2010). *Dennis Hollingsworth et al. v. Kristin M. Perry et al.* Supreme Court of the United States, Docket No. 09A648. Retrieved from https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/09pdf/09a648.pdf

Swanier, W. A. (2016). Strategies for implementing a successful enterprise resource planning system. *Walden University*. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3377&context=dissertations

Taylor, P. C. (2014). Contemporary qualitative research. In N.G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education, 2*, 38 – 54. doi:

10.4324/9780203097267.ch3 Retrieved from

https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9780203097267.ch3

Tilghman, A. (2016). Inside the Pentagon personnel feud that's roiled the military's most

senior leaders. *Military Times.* Retrieved from

http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/careers/2016/05/15/inside-pentagon-

personnel-feud-s-roiled-militarys-most-senior-leaders/84150066/

Truman Library. (2011) Executive Order 9981. Retrieved from

http://www.trumanlibrary.org/9981a.htm

University of California at Davis. (2011). Lesbian and gay men in the U.S. military:

historical background. *Department of Psychology, Military History.* Retrieved

from http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/military_history.html

Vine, D. (2015). How U.S. military bases abroad undermine national security and harm

us all. *The Huffington Post.* Online U.S. Edition. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-vine/us-military-bases-

abroad_b_8131402.html

Voloder, L. (2008). Autoethnographic challenges: Confronting self, field and home.

Australian Journal of Anthropology, 19(1), 27-40. doi: 10.1111/j.1835-

9310.2008.tb00104.x Retrieved from:

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1835-9310.2008.tb00104.x

Walsh, R. M. (2012). Security Cooperation: A new functional command. *Joint Forces*

Quarterly, 64 (1) 52 – 59. Retrieved from

http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a575520.pdf

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

Weick, K. E. (2017). Perspective construction in organizational behavior. *Annual Review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior, 4*, 1-17. Retrieved from http://www.annualreviews.org/journal/orgpsych

Weis, E. J., Hamilton, P. & Lenderman, L. (2016). Building the joint "Bench"; Borrowing best corporate practices to enhance talent management. *Campaigning: the Journal of the Joint Forces Staff College* (Spring 2016). Retrieved from http://jfsc.ndu.edu/Portals/72/Documents/JCWS/campaigning/Campaigning%20S pring%202016.pdf

Weitzman, E. A. (2000). Software and qualitative research. In M. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd edition), 803-820. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Westat. (2010). Support to the DoD comprehensive review working group analyzing the impact of repealing "Don't Ask, Don't Tell". *DoD Comprehensive Review Working Group.* Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/Vol%202%20Final%20 11-26-10.pdf

Wilson, A. R. (2013). *Why Europe Is Lesbian and Gay Friendly (and Why America Never Will Be).* Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.

Appendix A

The DoD study in 2010 was one of the largest that DoD had undertaken to that point. It was the largest ever in terms of the number of servicemembers who were solicited for their input and opinions not just in automated questionnaire format, but also in terms of in-person interviews in bases across the globe. The screenshot below is the output of the data culled from answers by over 152 thousand servicemembers.

Figure 1. Sample image showing data from DoD report (Johnson & Ham, 2010; p. 67).

Table 5. Service Members' Likely Actions if Assigned to Share Open Bay Shower Facilities With a Gay or Lesbian Service Member

Question 90. If Don't Ask, Don't Tell is repealed and you are assigned to bathroom facilities with an open bay shower that someone you believe to be a gay or lesbian Service member also used, which are you most likely to do?

	Overall
Take no action	29.4%
Use the shower at a different time than the Service member I thought to be gay or lesbian	25.8%
Discuss how we expect each other to behave and conduct ourselves	11.0%
Talk to a chaplain, mentor, or leader about how to handle the situation	1.3%
Talk to a leader to see if I had other options	17.7%
Something Else	7.0%
Don't Know	7.9%

Table 6. Service Members' Likely Actions if Assigned to Share Living Quarters With a Gay or Lesbian Service Member

Question 88. If Don't Ask, Don't Tell is repealed and you are assigned to share a room, berth, or field tent with someone you believe to be a gay or lesbian Service member, which are you most likely to do?

	Overall
Take no action	26.7%
Discuss how we expect each other to behave and conduct ourselves which sharing a room, berth, or field tent	24.2%
Talk to a chaplain, mentor, or leader about how to handle the situation	2.4%
Talk to leader to see if I have other options	28.1%
Something Else	8.7%
Don't Know	9.9%

Appendix B

Data on #M1 is displayed below. I started fully intending to have her be part of the study,

but I was dissuaded from including her among the 29 servicemembers whose answers

formed the bulk of the findings of this study. The significance of #M1 was that she was a

coworker, and a gay servicemember discharged from the military under DADT, and her

story, viewpoint, and narrations were significant. The life story of #M1 drew me into the

the internal frictions among personnel inside the bases in Germany. In a lot of ways, it

was #M1 who provided insights about the forces that segregated the personnel inside the

organization. Midway in my conversations with #M1, I realized she was quite radical in

some of what she was saying to me, most especially when she began showing her

opinions about the Moral Majority, the conspiracy of the insiders who are religious, and

so forth. I decided she was not a good representative of opinions of *most* servicemembers.

There are many pages of journal notes, logs and reflections related to #M1. Due to their

volume, I organized them chronologically and according to themes. Some rows that

provide clarity on the themes have been added. Identifiers have been added on the left of

the journal entries to provide additional clarity.

Table 2. Recollections and diary notes on conversations with #M1

#M1	Case of Colleague #M1	Case of Colleague #M1
		It took 16 months to speaking openly…
		It took about 16 months for #M1 to feel completely comfortable, and open up about her life's details. In the end, she was very open.
		The case study of #M1 was compelling and illustrative. She agreed to be part of the mosaic of this research. Aside from face to face conversations with

#M1, there were follow-up phone calls from 2009 to 2011 (after DADT was repealed by President Obama), and a number of email. She has recently sent me wedding photos (marriage to her longtime German partner) on a lovely beach, that took place in the summer of 2014.

[Photos deleted from file]

I gave this colleague of mine the label of #M1. This is because M was my shorthand for an American base-location in the Baden-Württemberg state of Germany where I first saw this coworker, and she was the 1st person I connected-with near this location. Hence the label #M1.

Background

#M1's Terrible Story…

2009;

The next several entries pertain to the cause of #M1's discharge from the U.S. Army via DADT

#M1's story was that in October 1995, a movie-goer at the base theater (i.e. a movie theater located at #M1's military base in Germany) complained about her to Military Police. This led to the Army's investigation into inappropriate conduct against #M1. The basis of the complaint was that while watching the movie in that theater, #M1 put her head on the shoulder of another female Army enlisted as they watched the movie side by side.

The base was near Berlin, Germany, a mecca of liberal attitudes toward gays. If these women had been in any public theater in Berlin, other moviegoers might not have been bothered in any way. However, that night, these women forgot that the European attitudes did not necessarily follow them into the on-base theater. Polar-opposite views between attitudes toward gays inside the base and outside the base led to problems for both of these women.

The complaint about the women's inappropriate behavior in the theater charged that they were "displaying" inappropriate gay behavior. Under DADT, you cannot show or demonstrate gay behavior. Subsequently, an official investigation was launched.

The two women's 'relationship' had not gone on long enough for them to have considered each other a full-fledged 'significant other', or for them to have been "perceived" by others around them as a couple. Additionally, what they were doing was apparently nothing that was overtly sexual.

#M1

The Army's investigation of the two women in the movie theater was conducted, and the women had at first assumed it would be a quick punishment or an investigation that would conclude quickly. After all, how could investigators come up with movie attendees in that auditorium from across disparate bases to validate the assumption or charge of the complaining patron? It turned out that the investigation went on for quite some time. This period was filled with torment and anguish for the two women. Subsequently, both women were found guilty, and were thrown out of the military. However, due to lack of aggrevating evidence – such as being caught in an overt display of homosexual behavior, they were 'discharged' but not dishonorably.

#M1

At subsequent conversation sessions, it was uncovered that #M1 had suffered such trauma and upheaval after the discharge, that she had boxed-up and stored away all paperwork related to her dismissal. Additionally, for a number of years, she moved repeatedly and needed to be unencumbered from having too much belongings. She had subsequently sent those boxes away to a family member near Seattle (where she was from). Unhappily, that person had a falling out with #M1, and she guesses that her boxes (hence her records) had been gotten rid of – probably out of anger. It was fortunate that I had not asked #M1 about the paperwork pertaining to her military service and discharge, because the whole subject was such a sore topic. #M1 estimated she might probably never find out how or when her boxes were destroyed, but in her words, "there was so much water under the bridge that it didn't even matter by then".

The happenings after the discharge under DADT

#M1

As this unhappy discharge had occurred in Germany, the other woman that #M1 had been with at the movie theater went back home to the U.S., to put the whole matter behind her, while #M1 stayed on in Germany but moved south to network with former soldiers who worked as contractors at various military bases.

#M1

The other woman who went state-side wanted nothing more to do with #M1. She wanted to start fresh with a new life, and be freed from the shadows of Army's investigations.

#M1

Meanwhile, #M1 discovered she could become a military contractor, and remain in Germany. She stayed mum about the details of her discharge, and began working wherever she could in support of the DoD missions. She had to have some therapy, and life had some serious ups and downs for her. Two former Army captains who knew her after the discharge gave her recommendations to gain employement with a liberal and fair-minded military contractor that she was very happy with. To this day she does not feel comfortable revealing or trusting too much information about those days or

that DADT event, unless she knows the person well. Initially, she did not say much to her family other than she had been unhappy with the Army, and had left it. She told them that she liked Europe and was staying on to work as a contractor. At the time of the discussions with me, she lived near Landenberg, Germany with her German wife, who was unrecognized by the US government.

Some who knew about her discharge thought it was right and appropriate. Others thought it was over-the-top, and so they helped her re-established herself in the civilian world. What she has noticed over the years was that as time went on, more and more soldiers seemed to think that her treatment was over-the-top. And that's the change she noticed, most especially in Germany.

#M1 noticed that being among Europeans, seeing how they are not bothered by gays as Americans were – at least to the best of her recollection – seemed to propel soldiers and officers to re-examine their attitudes. Many were warned about 'going native', a metaphor for becoming tolerant about taboos in American culture. To the best of her abilities, she continued to educate people about the many costs of hunting gays in the military, discharging them, as well the human toll that gay people pay in shutting out their identities from themselves and hiding their truths from the world.

It was #M1's case that foretold me that the process of transformation has direct implications to organizational management. Certainly, it provided possibilities that could help managers and leaders get their workforce to deal with despised and loathsome minorities.

#M1 and the 'Moral Majority'

2009;

#M1 thought that the 'Moral Majority' was the real cause behind her discharge…

The Moral Majority was founded in 1979 as an American political organization which had an agenda of evangelical Christian-oriented political lobbying. Jerry Falwell, whose founding of the Moral Majority was a key step in the formation of the New Christian Right, had embarked in the bicentennial year of 1976, on a series of "I Love America" rallies across the country to raise awareness of social issues important to Falwell. These rallies were an extension of Falwell's decision to go against the traditional Baptist principle of separating religion and politics, a change of heart Falwell said he had when he felt alarmed by the decay of the nation's morality. Through hosting these rallies, Falwell was able to gauge national support for a formal organization and also raise his profile as a leader. Having already been a part of a well-

established network of ministers and ministries, within a few years Falwell was favorably positioned to launch the Moral Majority.

#M1

According to #M1, many Army personnel were enamored of the Moral Majority.

#M1

#M1 had not realized it at the time, but she later came to understand that many soldiers and officers at that time (early 1990s) were disenchanted by changes that came in the aftermath of the breakup of the former Soviet Union (USSR), with the 'peace dividend', and with the diminished importance of the military in the eyes of Americans. Their anger and resentment seemed to resonate with what the Moral Majority complained about, and they felt a belonging with what they perceived as mainstream American values. Furthermore, President Clinton's perceived compromise that resulted in DADT as the official Department of Defense policy on gay personnel, further alarmed many religiously-inclined officers.

#M1 believed that practicing-religious personnel came to fear that decadence and amorality had tried to creep into the military, with the military's inability to directly ask and confront soldiers about whether they were gay. A number of senior officers reacted by clamping down on gays. It was in this environment that #M1 was seen in the movie theater with her head on the shoulder of a girlfriend she was attracted to. Someone in the audience didn't like what he was seeing and reported her to the authorities. And just like that, her Army career was over.

#M1 believed (*and continues to believe*) that if the Moral Majority hadn't fomented bigotry against gays, what happened to her would not have occurred. Furthermore, she believed that her punishment was actually made softer because the environment of Europe softened (and continued to soften) people's antigay hatred. Longterm contact with European forces – in #M1's opinion – had allowed U.S. military servicemembers to learn that nothing horrible occurred in our partners' militaries with policies that allowed gays to serve openly.

#M1

"Europe Effect" as an antidote to "Moral Majority"

#M1 believed that the experience of our European Allies positively influenced the more-relaxed attitudes of the U.S. Military leadership in Europe. This in turn had helped allow our military personnel to behave with more civility toward minorities who were hated by average Americans back in the U.S.

She called it the *"Europe Effect"*.

| #M 1 | Morphing and updating the concept of a large majority |

Morphing and updating the concept of a large majority

Two years after DADT was instituted as the policy for the military by President Clinton's administration, these two women (#M1 and her friend) were being investigated for inappropriate behavior. Since they were in a U.S. military base in Germany, it was as if they were on U.S. soil. At that time, the Moral Majority had been greatly favored for many years by military personnel.

#M1 believed that when military people said things like the 'American mainstream', 'main America', or our 'great people' they actually were saying 'Moral Majority'. She believed it was just the updated or morphed terminology for the same concept of "us, excluding them".

A brief discussion in 2009 with an Army military chaplain, who had the rank of Colonel, in Wiesbaden Germany revealed a verification of this. Army Colonel Chaplain's statements verifying #M1's opinions;

 "[They are] doing the good work demanded by the [American] public and the Secretary of Defense; fighting two wars [In Iraq and Afghanistan] against Islamic terrorism and fanatical enemies of our country; loving our enemies – as Jesus instructed – despite our enemies' fanatical beliefs; setting good examples of honorable living in daily interactions with many other peoples [i.e. people around the globe]; and living no worse or better than the great majority of Americans when upholding the great principles of our founding fathers; these warfighters are the backbone of the great people that we are."

#M1 hated all of this hidden, covert bigotry that she perceived was prevalent in the military. She believed that it was the absorption of Moral Majority preachings, and the fear of moral decay in the military that directly precipitated in what happened to her. She had deep disgust for many supporters of the Moral Majority, and repeated this sentiment a number of times as if the movement was still a vibrant – albeit quieter – theme of military personnel's beliefs.

She said that her discharge was but one example of the tide of intolerance that the Moral Majority brought to the branches of the military – although she thought the Air Force had it even worse than the Army. She saw herself as an exemplar of how intolerant the Moral Majority was, and how pervasive its influence could be.

One officer (in a later discussion with me) said, "the military is a young man's game". Although it was observed that many young soldiers are children of parents and even grandparents who served in the military, and followed the

dictates of the Moral Majority, a large number of young people enlisted did not even remember the Moral Majority, or the military in the era of President Reagan.

When #M1 was confronted with this observation, she was dismissive. She said: "No, they're all there. They might not say anything now, but you'll see, they'll all come out when they want to." #M1's perceptions about the harms of the Moral Majority were locked in the time capsule of her sensitivities. She still feared and battled the Moral Majority long after their supporters had moved on or retired.

Varieties of reactions to gays in an organization within the larger organization

In observing #M1 at a holiday celebration event in Germany hosted by her company, I found out that she worked with many former-military individuals. Nearly all liked her – although one said jokingly that she was a "pain in the A_s when she wanted to be!"

Shock & horror at a lesbian colleague & her wife…

At this gathering, the employees were present with their spouses. #M1 was there with her German wife. One military retiree who had recently joined this company, and wasn't aware of #M1's openness about her partner, had come with his wife. Both were apparently quite religious.

This man found #M1 to be shocking in the casual way she displayed no shame about being out-and-about with her "wife" at a company gathering, but he did not dare say anything for fear that others would react negatively to him. He did express his shock. When this researcher approached him about whether he wanted to have a separate conversation, he said 'No', although he had by then looked loathingly at the two women, and had expressed his feelings by shaking his head, and saying: "Oh my Lord, I just … I just don't know... This is just crazy!" His wife who was deeply catholic, and from South America said "I just cannot believe they are two women married to each other… as if it's nothing. I'm Catholic. In my religion this is sin. No matter what, this is sin."

Several military persons with whom she worked were completely non-plused by the fact that she was a lesbian.

Observing the interactions, statements and physical expressions among the coworkers, everyone else who knew and worked with #M1 was very affectionate and kind to her as well as her wife. Once the event got going, the most heated conversation of the evening had to do with the contract that they

were competing for against a larger competitor.

The 'Europe Effect'

2010;

Queries from principles among these coworkers uncovered that they worked with her, and over time had been transformed by seeing her live her life, do her work, serve her employer and country, and live happily.

Two of these men were asked to elaborate further. When asked about the repeal of DADT, they said, 'Yes', it should be repealed, and 'No' they did not want to have a conversation [i.e. an in-depth one], since to them, it was just a dumb policy – one of many dumb policies that the Department of Defense had come up with over the years. They thought that the time was long past for it to be repealed. When asked if their opinions had been transformed by the day-to-day work with #M1, they said 'No', because they had arrived at the conclusions on their own. One said: "I mean just look at the Europeans… They think we're religious nuts! Not just about gays, but about everything. … I mean, it's sometimes really embarrassing."

They said they could not tease-out which influence was the biggest: Europe's ridicule of Americans' silly proventiality toward sex, the openness and acceptance of gays in German society (which convinced them that DADT was a faulty policy), the presence of gays among their European Partner Nations' militaries, or the impact of #M1 (which had subconsciously shown them that the military's behavior toward gays was wrong.) It was noteworthy that they then circled back and agreed that there was nothing better to drive the point home than to actually work with gay persons and observe that they are normal people like anybody else.

Impact of #M1

Considering the longterm transformation and impact of what happened to #M1, it appeared that her path had yielded many evolutions and transformations in others. Whether our other colleagues agreed or disagreed with open service for gays, or equal rights for sexual minorities, their fears and worries about gays subsided after working closely with #M1 and seeing for themselves that she did not have some sinister agenda, that she was like them, was not trying to destroy their religious lives, or the image of strong U.S. warfighters, or anything else #M1 was just an exemplar that she just wanted to do her job, earn a living and live a normal life.

Subsequent to the repeal of DADT, I contacted her via phone call, and invited her to offer her thoughts on the matter. She was genuinely happy to have lived long enough to see DADT repealed, although she was still cynical that it wouldn't be overturned somehow. Her concern was that the religious right would somehow undermine it.

#M1

She advised me – through this research and beyond – against assuming that the old generation of anti-gay folks would cease to cause problems for gay soldiers. She said that even at overseas sites, where the environment may have been lax or more relaxed, hard-nosed military personnel would simply not turn into secular Europeans overnight. She said that she continued to advise gay folks to watch their backs and be careful to hide their orientation for fear of back-stabbing colleagues who might deny them promotions and career opportunities simply because they are gay.

#M1

She said: "They [i.e. the antigay or homophobic military personnel] may not be so revolted with women [i.e. lesbians], as [much as] with men [who want to kiss other men], but believe-you-me they'll find a way to shut down [their] careers… I just think that this amount of bigotry just doesn't evaporate overnight. … I hope I'm wrong… but I don't think so. Anyway, I tell everybody to just be careful.

#M1

In March 2010 discussion in Germany, #M1 remembered her own case – leading to her discharge from the Army, subsequent breakdown, and psychological therapy.

#M1's recollections about the persecution she endured in the U.S. Army were as follows:

#M1

"What really took the heaviest toll were the weeks and months of investigation, the constant looking-over-your-shoulder… [and] we thought they did it non-stop [the collecting of evidence about their lives], especially talking to other soldiers [i.e. conducting discussions with their units' soldiers regarding their behavior, personal conduct, comments, statements, demeanor and other items] that could give them [i.e. the military] some smidgen of evidence [of homosexual 'acts']. … We weren't doing anything… Nothing. But boy… they came after us. … And it just destroyed us.… Everybody [in our units] was exhausted [by the process of investigation].… Everyone [contact to help with the investigation] got scared… and so, everybody got hurt. Everyone just stuck to just doing their jobs, … and looking over their shoulders…"

"They showed that if they wanted you [to make an example out of you], they just didn't stop. … It was scary. And it's still scary.… It's still just the same…

I've got friends inside [military service branches] and they say it's not like that anymore. But, still they're not 'coming out' even if it [i.e. the repeal of DADT] comes through."

#M1

Disclosures between colleagues

I never came out to #M1 as straight, gay, or bisexual person. I hid my issues about my sexuality, but I think she knew….

I never discussed my own sexuality. When I asked her for a conversation, I had already known her for many months, had observed her in a work setting and had already interacted with her for purely professional reasons that had nothing to do with my dissertation work.

Years after our first meeting, I informed her that I was working with a doctoral mentor, was engaged in a discovery process, and was interested in conversing with her about her life, she readily agreed to talk and connect. We easily morphed from a work-related professional interaction to an academic investigation modality, where I found her to be very forthcoming about her life. Despite the academic nature of our interaction, the discussions felt very organic and comfortable. She talked about childhood abuse.

She never said to me whether she assumed I must be gay, and she never treated me as if I was straight, or gay or whatever. What she did say was that she had made it her life's mantra that gay people were the same as straight people, and that she was going to treat everyone the same.

#M1

Disclosure of childhood abuse

#M1 had been repeatedly abused by her father.

Therapy following her discharge from the Army allowed her to delve deeply into this aspect of her childhood, but she did not site it as the cause of her being a lesbian. She did not disclose the details of her father's abuses, but described the origins of her desire to stay away from the U.S. being rooted in those negative experiences.

She wanted to be away; away from the mainland, away from her father, and away from the havoc of her early life. She found such warmth and acceptance

in Germany that she never wanted to leave. After her discharge, and much therapy, she said that she came to peace with a lot of those internal struggles.

With the passing of her father, and the dwindling of her family's older generation, she now has a stronger desire to stay in contact with her siblings and their families.

#M1

The many Impact of #M1's case and the Repeal on all of them

#M1

#M1 said that her treatment changed the minds of her unit-mates, as well as her superiors. The sympathies for her would not have existed if people did not get transformed by the changes caused by this event. Other military personnel (working with her new employer) benefited from her professional know-how, insights, ready-to-go ability to jump into their missions. The Department of Defense lost a great soldier.

#M1

Impact of #M1's Case

After a decade, not only had she outstayed the men who were her nemeses, but she managed to be a lighting rod for other soldiers (male and female) who could approach and confide in her about their own situations, and be guided by her, as they – in turn – provided her with valuable insights to excel in her private sector job. Before I ever came to connect with her (professionally, long before this research came about), she was known as the 'Go-To' person in accomplishing certain tasks. Many of these people – no matter whether veteran, active duty or reserve – in turn provided opinions and votes on the DoD Study in 2010 headed by General Carter Ham, head of the U.S. European Command (also called US EUCOM, or simply EUCOM), assessing the impact of the repeal of DADT.

#M1

The impact of DADT-related discharged cannot be calculated, however, my own observations in Germany was that their effects were substantial.

2010;

#M1

the DoD study related to the repeal of DADT had found that most military personnel supported the repeal. This was shocking to many among the older generation military.

With that determination alone, #M1 realized that the entire organization – especially in her view, the Army – had indeed changed irreversibly. The transformation she thought would never come had indeed come to pass. She was elated. But she continued to advise gays in the military to stay covert (because the descendants of the 'Moral Majority' are still out there).

2012;
It was clear to her that those who wanted to stay in the military (until retirement) were still laying low in order to keep their chances of promotion & elevation high.

Most people who confided in her that they were gay, bisexual, transgender, etc., apparently were continuing to be very quiet about their sexuality.

What she said to me in phone conversations and emails was that gays inside the DoD had realized it would be career suicide to be open about their gay nature. Although the threat of immediate expulsion from military service had been eliminated, there was widespread fear that covert disapproval of gays might cause downstream problems with various personnel, and grumblings that might result in confrontations, entrapment affecting their permanent record, claims of wrong-doing that could not be disproved, etc…

2014;

#M1 decided to marry her German partner. They married in a ceremony in the United States, and she began contemplating retiring altogether.

She continued to believe that the Moral Majority still gripped the military, and gays in the military were well-advised to stay clear of them, as well as trying to serve openly.

It is unclear whether her impression that gays were being quiet and covert about their sexual identities were her impression, or factual information widely practiced across DoD bases in Germany.

Sergeant D was a servicemember who was a direct supervisor, and also one who was not going to take part in the study due to work circumstances. This is why the indexing of Sergeant D was not set as Sergeant #D since he was not going to count. For a time, #M1 was going to be included in my dataset but I decided against it to her being an outlier among the rest of the personnel. The multiracial nature of Sergeant D's family

was a very interesting and unique explicator of several undercurrents that existed in

Germany. One of those were the multiracial Afro-Germans, the other were the

multigenerational dual citizenship offsprings of military personnel. Understanding

subtleties or race and culture, race and rank, religion and culture and other seldom spoken

topics were reasons I collected information on Sergeant D and his family. Journal entries

of the data are organized according to themes, and are also ordered chronologically.

The case of Sergeant D clarified the legacy of the racial friction that permeated

the military during the Vietnam war. "Sergeant D's father in law" told his daughter that

one of factors that brought black soldiers closer to German women in the 50s and 60s was

the agreement of German people with African Americans regarding the

'wrongheadedness' of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. This commonality provided a

foundation of support for lower-rank soldiers who were drafted to serve in the war, but

were becoming increasingly hostile toward their military superiors. The story of Sergeant

D was part of the greater story of his African American father-in-law finding and

marrying his German soulmate and staying in Germany after completion of his draft

obligations. Their Afro-German children ended up feeling more European than

American, but still, one daughter married an African American Army officer. The

multigenerational viewpoint on the slow pace of parity between Whites and non-whites

informed this study in a significant way.

Table 3. Diary of conversations with Sergeant D and his family.

Multi-cultural, Multi-racial, Multi-generational Military Family

2010;

| Sergeant D | Black and Married to a German | One multi-racial German-American family in Darmstadt had 2 daughters born and raised in the west section of Darmstadt's 3 bases (West of the Kelley Barracks), in the "Griesheim" area, where the Air Field for the military's planes was located. Griesheim (pronounced Gries – Heim) was not only where military flights came in, but it was also home to the military's "Stars & Stripes" newspaper which was distributed to U.S. service personnel across Europe.

This African-American G.I. – I shall call him "Sergeant D's father in law" for reasons that will soon become obvious – had married his German wife in 1966. He left the Army in 1971, and decided to stay in Germany, and make his living providing various services for the bases' personnel. For a time he worked for the "Stars & Stripes". His kids grew up knowing – and being – with other American kids from the base, but also going to school with German kids and being considered regular neighborhood kids. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sergeant D | Racism & Sergeant D's In-Laws | Later on, as they grew up, they could explain Germans' views to the Americans, and the Americans' views to the Germans. "Sergeant D's father in law" raised his kids and after the fall of the Soviet Union, the base began to go through a multi-phased shrinking and closing process that stretched into a dozen years. By then, he had retired.

… This is how things used to be in 1964, in the U.S. bases in Germany… Photo found from open source stock photos

"Sergeant D's father in law" told his daughter that one of factors that brought black soldiers closer to German women was their agreement about the 'wrongheadedness' of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. This commonality |

provided a foundation of support for lower-rank soldiers who were drafted to serve in the war, but were becoming increasingly hostile toward their military superiors.

… Old photos of German women with American soldiers; and blacks asked to pose shorter than whites

After Germany's experiences in WWII many Germans understood & were empathetic toward U.S. African Americans, while some continued to believe the superior race ideas of the past…

Sergeant D's wife talked about this 'Paternalistic' attitude of the U.S., and the differences that her mother's generation saw between white American soldiers and black American soldiers. In this family, the relationship between the German woman who ultimately decided to marry her black American lover was an act of revulsion toward the paternalism of the white American military.

Mrs. Sergeant "D" stated it in a German expression, which Sergeant "D" translated it (approximately) to a kind of "America knows best" attitude, which was perceived as belonging to the older WWII generation of white senior American officers, who seemed to be out of touch with the times, with their own troops, with the German public tired of its 'overseer' Americans. Besides, they ridiculed the student movements and other protest activities like the German 'Red Army' and other internal terrorism groups.

According to long-time retirees who knew about the old Darmstadt bases before the base-closures, even the Darmstadt eating establishments were somewhat divided; some served the 'everyman' military personnel, and others catered to the senior officers and their families. These establishments knew that high ranking officers did not want to eat with black soldiers, so they had to deal with the minutiae of American prejudices too.

Sergeant D Darmstadt History

... U.S. kept nuclear missiles in Germany without telling the citizens...

Citizens of Darmstadt had to learn the ins-and-outs of the U.S. military if they wanted to cultivate their customer base. This cavalier attitude of senior American military personnel Germans bred resentment.

When the citizens discovered that the Darmstadt was quietly storing many "Hawk" missiles and various other warheads, fear and anger ran rampant that Americans were causing them to become soviet targets in a game of East-versus-West that could once again bring war and annihilations on them. Protests ensued.

One of the daughters of "Sergeant D's father in law" met a black Army Sergeant from North Carolina. In this research, I gave him the name Sergeant "D". I met Sergeant "D" many times, conversed with him, and on one occasion, I met his wife and conversed with her as well for this research.

As these s took place in 2009, he was one of the very early subjects of this inquiry, and the questions posed to him and his wife were synthesized to yield the questions that were subsequently asked of other military personnel. His guidance about what to ask military personnel and how to ask it (so that they would be responsive) were invaluable.

Sergeant "D" was liberal and open-minded regarding gays in the military. He was not in favor of the DADT policy, and quite diplomatically, he said that if the President wished to repeal DADT, he would follow the wishes of the Commander and Chief, but if not, he would understand and continue to uphold the current policy. He did also emphasize that DADT was "hard" on all personnel to follow in the German environment of openness and acceptance toward gays and bisexuals. Sergeant "D" mentioned Leonard Matlovich.

Sergeant Matlovich had served in Vietnam, and had won the "Purple Heart". He was one of the firsts to disagree with the Department of Defense policy. Sergeant "D" – as well as his father in law (according to the sergeant) – thought that DADT was an exercise in futility, and that letting go of gays in the military was "self-defeating".

Sergeant "D" repeated Sgt Matlovich had been to Germany numerous times. He talked at length about our allies – especially Europeans – who laugh at the hypocracy of our feverish embrace of individual liberty, while historic and overt intolerance of minorities such as blacks and hipanics had been common knowledge by their troops and populations, not to mention the current bias against gays or transgendered minorities who also wish to exercise their liberties.

Sergeant "D" admitted that his wife's family – i.e. his father in law's – provided a glimpse of how much America as well as the Department of Defense and the U.S. Military had evolved since the 60s. However, they also thought that in some ways – regarding race and "minorities" issues such as gays in the military – they still had to evolve more, and become more open-minded. The Sergeant believed that America had a lot to learn from the Europeans, especially the Germans.

I met the Sergeant's wife. She was very smart and well-spoken. She embraced her German side and said that she preferred to work and live in Germany, and be close to her parents. She remembered that as a child, there were controversies surrounding missiles at the U.S. base that had brought out protesters and antiwar marches. Germans were upset.

She remembered asking her father about this because her school friends' families, who were in uproars over U.S. putting their friends (German) in danger of being targets of Soviet attacks. She remembered her Mom, cousins and relatives were all against it. This was not limited to Griesheim or Darmstadt, but permeated across the Hessen region.

Peace activism in Hessen – and indeed across all of Germany – was strongly supported by the population. Being critical of the policies of the Department of Defense was very popular, and non-white military service personnel who had their own issues with the U.S. military found ready-to-listen audiences among the regions' residents.

Sergeant D

[Research: There were conflicts, and racial riots in U.S. bases in Germany in the late 60s & early 70s]

Her father did not want to go back to the U.S. as his siblings in Florida had dispersed long ago, and all but one had died. Her mother's family all lived in Germany, and she and her children wanted to be close to their German families. So there was no point to uprooting her children and moving back to the U.S.

She acknowledged that her husband's family lived in North Carolina and they missed seeing the children, however, when some years ago, she had quit her job and moved to the U.S. on one of his 3 year assignments, she found the African American community to be too church-centered, claustrophobic and hard to relate to. Plus, she had not found a job environment that she liked.

Compared to her husband's family members she had been a sort of aetheist. Her husband's family did not enjoy that. So, the multi-year stay had not been to her liking. If at the end of her husband's current tour in Germany, they were again assigned to the U.S., she said that she would just keep her job, and stay in Germany, and just have long vacations for her and the children to stay with her husband until the two-year tour was completed. Afterward he could put-in for another Germany assignment so that he could come back to the same general area. If not, he considered retiring early from the military, and working for a German or an American company.

She said she was more like her father, and therefore more liberal than her husband. Her husband disagreed. He thought that he was pretty much on par with his father in law. Since – according to German law – a person cannot be a citizen of Germany unless they are biologically (mother's bloodline) proven to be of German blood, in this family both African-American husbands were married to full German citizens.

Sergeant D

Mrs. Sergeant "D" thought that the U.S. Army was wrong about DADT as it had been wrong about the "War on Terror". She indicated that her parents were living testimony that U.S. had been wrong about "Vietnam".
She disliked the warmongering attitudes of many U.S. military personnel and did not think they should espouse bigoted views to German people who were more liberal and open-minded, nor should they walk around as if they 'owned the world'.

In the book "Changing the world, changing oneself" (2010), editor Wilfried Mausback who included a chapter titled "America's Vietnam in Germany – Germany in America's Vietnam: On the Relocation of Spaces and the Appropriation of History" the significance of German protests on American policy in Germany and its "adjustment" to the German 'environment' was

detailed. This was verified by the descriptions given by Sergeant D's wife in the microcosm of the discussion about the American troops in Darmstadt and their neighborhood in Griesheim. The fact that the hostility of the German environment would lead to unnecessary 'trouble' between the lower-rank troops compelled the base commanders to have an laissez-faire easy going attitude, which allowed troops to find the space to become 'transformed' by the energy and zeal of the student movements against the policies of the Department of Defense.

Sergeant D's wife talked about the time of her parents and the influence of Germany's "Red Army" and public protests against U.S. policies. The anti-American violent protests and bombings compelled many military personnel and contractors (which included Sergeant D's father in law) to keep a low profile, to withhold overt displays of patriotism, and to blend in with the populas.

Germany had become a microcosm of the cold war battles between the left and right wings, and the student protests organized in Berlin culminating in the killing of student Benno Ohnesorg had the same effects as the student killings in Ohio State had had for student protests in the U.S. This in turn caused a cultural shifts inside Germany, which impacted the personnel in the military bases in Germany and across Europe.

The cultural shift actually favored African American servicemen in that their struggles against their superiors and their "establishment" were applauded by the citizens across Germany. This played out in the neighborhood of Sergeant D's wife. And she talked about it by saying that being a mixed-race child was something that her friends' parents commended her about. Although no one directly told her to be aware of white Americans, she got the sense that she was safer with European whites than with American whites. She grew up with the sense that has

[Realization: Multiple generations of mixed race Germans live across EU, which was yet another legacy of U.S. presence in Germany for many decades]

Mrs. Sergeant "D" loved her American roots and the black American heritage of her father, however, her many years of life in the U.S. had demonstrated to her that she was more European than American, and that she just did not fit with the people of her father's family, nor her husband's family. She was a mixed-race German who did not want to move to the U.S. For her, as it was for

Sergeant D   *Cultural Shifts in Europe and U.S.*

her children, sister, father & mother who mattered the most – her husband's job was not as important as their happiness. he preferred to live in Germany.

She had told this to her husband, and he said that he was trying to extend his assignment in Germany instead of being assigned to somewhere back in the homeland, because if he had to be apart from his wife and children who preferred to stay in Germany, he would have to retire from the Army.

The Sergeant and his wife considered Germany to be more humane, less prejudiced and more liberal than America. She said that in Germany, she was treated like a German, but in the U.S., "It was a different story". It should also be remembered that a mixed-race black German is a clear legacy of Americans having been in Germany for decades. But in the U.S., a light-skinned black person is still treated like a black person.

What attracted the Sergeant's father in law in the 60's to stay in Germany, was the liberal environment of the country, its stance against American efforts in Vietnam, and the citizenry's support for military personnel who showed dissent toward their military organization's policies.

A direct link and parallel was found in this family between the supportive influence of the Darmstadt environment on the dissent of 2 generations of

Army persons against policies of their military organization.
Darmstadt and the other large and small German towns' anti-war, pro-gay and liberal attitudes attracted the Sergeant's father in law and inspired him to leave the Army and stay in Germany to raise a family. This same environment supported the Sergeant's own liberal attitudes toward gays in 2010, and inspire him to envision a happy future no matter what the military said or did. The common threat was the supportive environment.

Sergeant D

German Versus American Attitudes

Griesheim Army Airfield

Co-worker's recollections – Many of the U.S. bases in Germany have been closed and returned to Germany as part of large military-base realignment that has been ongoing since the collapse of the former Soviet Union, to shrink

---

the footprint of the U.S. military across Europe.

Personal recollection – I used to drive by some of these bases, and it was sad that some were abandoned and left unused. It was lovely that some bases & buildings have been re-purposed by German cities & provinces as housing, shopping or other types of civilian mixed-use facilities.

Appendix C

The case of Army Sergeant #C4 was significant and highlighted in the body of the study. The experience that made #C4 stand out was the sheer openness of the secret inside the military base regarding gays serving the U.S. military. As #C4 expressed it: "EVERYBODY already knows! [The] whole unit [i.e. the large over-arching unit] knows." This individual provided a seminal experience in shining light on the paradox that permeated inside military bases regarding gays. The truth telling by #C4 showed the servicemembers' internal conflicts regarding the open secret that gays are honorably serving their country inside DoD, but are forced to hide their true selves. As with other appendices, the journal notes and diary entries below are organized according to themes, and are chronologically arranged.

Table 4. Sample detailing conversion of conversations into numbers.

	Army Sergeant #C4
	Three Hispanic soldiers were chatting, but soon, two of them left (either on an errand, or went back into their training session) and the other was sitting by himself, when I asked whether he wanted to be interviewed regarding DADT. He welcomed it.
#C4	The 42 year old active duty Army Seargant # C4 had 24 years of service and had served in a Combat Support unit. He had 4 kids and and considered himself 'White Hispanic'. I was not sure what White Hispanic meant, but I did not ask for an explanation, as I did not want to say something insensitive or ignorant just as the conversation was getting started.
	He was – as he called himself – a true 'Grunt' of the Army. He said he was a real family man, and a strong Catholic. He jumped the topic and said that his attitude about Gays was that he liked them: "Gays in my unit are fine & cause no problems. There are other guys –straight guys – however, in other units that cause problems. But not in our unit. They gay guys are fine"!!!

He had to spent some time dealing with my confusion regarding his references to his unit and the other units. It appeared he was part of a large unit, which had a number of sub-units. So, when he talked about his unit, he actually meant the 'sub-unit' for which he was responsible, and when the talked about the other units, he was actually talking about the other sub-units that were under another officer, but yet part of the larger units. Seeing my confusion and what may have been a "So What?" look on my face, he finally said: "We [are] good, but they kind-a.. little bit stink"!

He said he was very comfortable with gays and lesbians, and fully agreed that DADT had to be repealed. He thought gays should be able to serve openly. He had a strong Spanish accent. He repeatedly said "No Question" for emphasis. And he also repeated some words for even more emphasis. So, for example, when I asked 'how comfortable are you in the presence of gays and lesbians', he answered "Very comfortable; no question; Very comfortable.". When I asked do you know for certain that someone in your unit is gay or lesbian? He answered: "Yes, sure. No question". But when I asked 'did the person tell you directly?' He answered "No. No No." When I asked how come? He said "Don't Ask. Yes, No question. Don't Ask, Don't Tell".

C4	Random Label #Number Assignment	SCALE
1	Personally, how comfortable are you in the presence of gays and lesbians?	1 = Very Comfortable, 2 = Somewhat Comfortable, 3 = Uncomfortable, 4 = Very Uncomfortable, 5= Not Sure
1	Do you know for certain that someone is gay or lesbian in your unit?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure
1	Is the presence of gays and lesbians in the unit well-known by others?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply
2	Lesbian or gay person told you	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply

#C4

It was that deliberate silence again. The need for plausible deniability. No one wanted to know for sure, even when they were sure that somebody was living a gay lifestyle. Conversely, people who disliked someone for whatever reason could easily start a rumor that they were gay. Which would put that person in a position of proving a negative – seemingly to the entire world.

For Army Sergeant #C4, the Army was the only life he knew. He had spent more years in the army than outside of it. For his whole adult life, the Army was part of his identity. The Army was the only profession he knew. So, if the Army told him "Don't Ask" he did not ask. However as a policy, he thought DADT was a stupid policy. And furthermore, he wanted the Army to get rid of it. At one point, he seemed flustered, and said:

"EVERYBODY already knows! [The] whole unit [i.e. the large over-arching unit] knows [that the gays in his sub-unit are gay]. [All] the other units [i.e sub-units] know! Let them serve [in the] open. It's better. No question."

It took some time for me to fully understand him, because as he got more animated, the language barrier between us impeded my understanding.

The way DADT worked in their units was that one of his gay subordinates could talk all day about his boyfriend, about his boyfriend's style, clothes, furniture, etc, but unless and until he said flat out something like I am gay and I am living in a gay sexual relationship with a man, the team-mates were safe from DADT. As they understood it, technically, he had not "Told" them that he was gay, and of course – technically and literally – they had not "Asked". Hence, DADT did not apply. And so, it was not problematic. But, the fact that everyone had to play this game, was something that the Sergeant #C4 wanted quickly to be rid of.

The Sergeant had to leave.
So, we postponed the rest of my questions until he finished his tasks, and reconnected with his other two friends. I wanted to interview the others as well, so I had no choice but wait and hope I could continue the energizing research later.

My Reactions to respondent #C4

I was mesmerized by this Army Sergeant! I could listen to him speak for hours, even though he was a man of few words who struggled with expressing his thoughts. After the homophobic attitudes of previous respondents, he was like a healing balm. I also wanted to ask him about his religious beliefs and how his open attitude towards gays squared with Catholic practice.

Up until the time I began speaking directly about gays, DADT and peoples' thoughts about it, I had thought I had come a long way in getting comfortable with my own sexual identity. But I was wrong. As vast as I thought my gay experiences were up to that point, I realized I needed to know much more about what was in peoples' hearts. I had thought I had done so much self-discovery and self-acknowlegement up to that point, but I had to face having to admit ignorance, and confess that I did not know much.

DADT seemed like such an awfully messy situation for the military. How was DoD ever going to handle the stark polarity between its members' wishes regarding the repeal? In relatively short order, an insider such as myself could see that "Asking" and "Telling" had turned into riddles for straight and gay soldiers, who had to deal with a confounding, convoluted non-speak. Something had to be done. Would the Department of Defense actually repeal DADT? How could it deal with this division?

#C4

#C4

The interview with respondent #C4 resumed. But, of course, as with many time-availabilities from volunteers, there were complications and logistical issues to be dealt with, some of which I could not even begin to recall, and all completely irrelevant to the interview. To me, the important thing was soaking up the information.

#C4 I was very happy to see #C4 and to get a chance to ask more questions, but I worried about looking too happy, too eager, too agreeable, and not like a detached, serious and independent researcher. I had to continue my "split-life-ness" and not be vowed by these soldiers' utterances. But, I could feel something special was happening to me. Here was this warrior telling me gays should be out in the open. To him, gays were fine. Certainly no worse than some other people. That was not a message I was used to hearing. I was enthralled. A transformation was underway for me, but I did not know what form it would take.

Resumption of conversation with respondent #C4

When we started again, he asked me again who and what I was doing the research for. I repeated my previous answers. Then he started to ask me about whether the school was affiliated with the Department of Defense, or the Internal Securities, Clearances or other Investigative offices. It may have felt to him that I might expose him, or that he should be wary of me, and more careful. It appeared he worried something bad might happen because of his openness.

#C4 I had to calmly and slowly re-explain the information. I had to let him decide whether he wanted to continue. He had to trust that this was not a security trap, or internal audit to expose who knows what – maybe lapses, non-enforcement or wrongdoings – regarding Army's policies and DADT. I had to re-explain that nothing could be traced back to him, that no name or identifying information was recorded. He had to be assured that all information was completely confidential and

I was not spying on him, his unit or worse, and not interested in any security, mission, technical or military related information. He had to be assured that all I wanted was his anonymous opinions about one topic.
He listened. And stayed seated. I took that as a positive sign.

I launched into a philosophical question. I asked him how he squared his religious beliefs and Catholic principles with the DADT policy.

#C4 He said: "For me, it's no problem. I am Catholic. My wife is more [i.e. has more religiosity]. And, my whole family is. My friends are. Everybody. No question. God said Love Everybody. Love [your] enemies and friends. Everybody. But with Catholics, you're not supposed to do many things. You know? But you have to. So, you'll die by the sword [reference to Jesus' statement that 'whosoever shall live by the sword, shall perish by the sword']. But we need the sword [i.e. presumably, the

Army]. Without it, crazies come out. True."

Another interruption occurred.
Afterward, he continued.

It appeared he had a pragmatic approach toward his religion. His religious beliefs did not compel him to have the same negatives about gays that some others had. If all gays in the military did not "Tell", he would never "Ask". It was a 'détente'. A 'live and let live' approach did not violate his religious beliefs.

I asked him: On a scale of '1 to 5', with '1' being "Strongly Agree" and '5' "Strongly Disagree", what do you choose when asked if you agree or disagree with allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the U.S. Military? The Army Sergeant #C4 answered: '1'.

I asked him whether his opinion about gays serving in the military had changed over time? He answered "500". He meant it as "Strongly Disagree", since on a scale of '1 to 5', '1' represented "Strongly Agree", surely a number like 500 must have meant "Super-Strongly Disagree"!

#C4   I wanted to dig further and understand whether he grew up with gay friends, or had gay family members. But there was another interruption. He got paged. After dealing with that, he said his time was now more limited.

I asked him to tell me if his opinion regarding gays serving in the military had been impacted by the environment, namely the open service environment of European militaries he worked with, the gay friendly settings across Europe, the general tolerance, openness and inclusive nature of people in Europe. I wanted him to include impact from the other nations' militaries that might have impacted his viewpoint. He said:
"Germany, Europe it's great. No question. But I have to say No. I was open before [i.e. my opinion was already set on "Open Service", before any impact from Germany / Europe]".

<center>Hell for gays and girls</center>

#C4   Unhappily, as he expanded on his work with partner nations, he said the following – which continued into a very sad and unfortunate discovery.

"I've worked with NATO, across EU, in Iraq, in AFPAK [the war zones associated with the Afghanistan-Pakistan regions] and none impacted my opinion [regarding the need for repeal of DADT]." … "Actually overseas is sometimes hell for gays. But girls too. No question. Girls get it bad too. [It's the]Same thing: Don't Ask. Nobody asks. I saw it [was] bad in Iraq. Very bad over there."
His facial expressions, the ominous way he spoke about this, and the way he said "Very bad over there", all conveyed that there was more – much more – to this than he could say. It was a bit frightening to hear.

I asked whether Army Sergeant #C4 believed open service for gays and lesbians would undermine unit cohesion. He said "Yes". He believed cohesion resulted when people similar and equal to one another served together in a unit. As an example, he mentioned himself with the other two Hispanic friends who were very close and tightly bonded. That kind of cohesion, he thought, came from having similar backgrounds and experiences. In their case, their Hispanic heritage, as well as similar life stages. So, according to him, girls and gays did not gel well with regular Army guys. He answered the next dozen questions as follows:

- He was "Neutral" when asked whether there was a lot of teamwork and cooperation in his [larger] unit. He was also "Neutral" that the officers and NCOs (Non-Commissioned Officers) in his [larger] unit were good leaders. He eventually hinted – but would not factually confirm, nor repeat with additional details to allow independent fact-checks – that a leader (officer) of the [larger] unit was known for sexual exploits and intimidation of female subordinates, and another NCO with similar habits assisted or 'covered' for that leader as well. The leadership problem in the unit was by far the most visceral and devisive issue.

o Note and data pertinent to this interview in 2010: As early as 2005 reports of rampant rapes and sexual assaults of female soldiers by their male superiors and counterparts generated much outcry, and congressional inquiries and widespread coverage brought additional funding to assist victims, and set up a special office ("SAPRO" Sexual Assaults Prevention and Reporting Office). In 2007 Inquiry-panels showed that military's chain of command dismissed incidents-reports, targeted and harassed victims, overlooked or blocked repeated complaints, and exhonorated serial-rapists (Corbett, 2007). When this interview was conducted in 2010, 'Ladies Rooms' in U.S. Bases in Europe displayed posters with websites and 'Urgent Hotline' phone numbers to report assaults. However, most female soldiers dismissed these, considering the whole process inconsequential. By October 2012, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta called the military's record on the handling of sexual assaults an "Outrage" (O'Toole, 2012). After over 20 years of "Zero Tolerance" directives and official policies, 10 years of official record keeping – the last 7 years by "SAPRO" (Sexual Assaults Prevention and Response Office) – negligible decrease in sexual assaults had resulted with continued abysmally-low convictions of rapists and perpetrators.

o At the start of this research, the number of gays in the military were estimated at 66,000, and there were an estimated 495,000 women in the Armed Forces (O'Keefe, 2010), making sexual assaults a bigger and more vexing problem. One participant in this research remarked, 'Gender Identity can be hidden but Gender cannot.'

- He vehemently and "Strongly Disagreed" that the [larger] unit was well equipped, well trained and ready for its wartime mission. The shabby state of the unit was a fallout of the sorry state of leadership and cohesiveness in the unit.

#C4

- He said his [larger] unit never had access to private shower facilities. All of their showers were always group showers. Gay or straight, everyone showered together and there were no choices in that.

- He "Strongly Agreed" that in his [larger] unit there were many more pressing issues than the keeping or elimination of DADT. Also, he "Strongly Agreed" that most individuals in his [small] unit [i.e. the sub-unit of the larger unit] had views and work habits similar to himself. Regarding the overall big picture of his Army career and his own part in the Army, he "Strongly Agreed" that he was satisfied with the work his small unit was doing – or trying to do – in the U.S. Military to carry out the mission they were given.

The figure below provides a screenshot of the Excel spreadsheet file that held the comments, notes and diary entries on various servicemembers. Each column was dedicated to a different person showing how journal entries were organized in the original electronic diaries. Use of colors were to highlight important comments. The figure shows the data for #D2 one of the servicemembers showcased in Chapter 4. It provides the linkage between the data in the files and the data as it was streamlined in the chapter of this study. The data in the spreadsheet file was disparate and compartmentalized. The threading of the various comments and compartments brought out the story that servicemembers told me.

The figure below illustrates variations in number and volume of comments by different servicemembers.

Figure 2. Screenshot of spreadsheet of comments captured from military personnel.

D1	D12	D13	D14	D2	D8
On the question about whether there were many more pressing issues than keeping DADT, the respondent answered: "[Was] Not a big deal [was back in the 70's]"	Regarding privacy of showers, respondent said "Almost always private showers" but that: "Downranges [there were always] group showers."	Regarding DADT: "Keep DADT"	Regarding knowing someone gay in the unit, respondent said: "Quite a few."	Regarding the question on knowing anyone in the unit to be gay, respondent said: [I]"Never heard of anyone in the unit being gay".	Regarding privacy of showers, respondent said (half and half): "[It] Depends on the situation".
Regarding the question on most individuals having views and work habits similar to mine, the respondent answered: "[We] Accomodated the lesbian in the unit"; What the respondent meant was that the lesbian wanted to be treated the same as the men and they complied with her desires	Regarding Political affiliations, the respondent said he is a Liberatarian.	Respondent's list of concerns: "(1) People's Safety."	Regarding whether the presence of gays or lesbians in the unit is well-known by others, the respondent says YES, however added: "But [when speaking openly with gays known to others in the unit, I am] careful about who the others [are, i.e. whether I know for sure the other unit members are 'supportive' not harmful to the gay person]."	Regarding the question of shower privacy the respondent said:"At first they were semi private, then moved to private showers". Also, regarding the question of straights sharing foxholes and showers w/ gays, Respondent said: "Foxholes ok. Showers Not ok. I don't want them in [the] showers".	Regarding whether respondent is white or non-white, he said he doesn't like this structure, as he considers himself African-American.
Regarding the question about whether the gay/lesbian person persnnally told the respnodent [that s/he was gay] the respondent said: "I could just tell]	Regarding DADT, Respondent said: "Keep DADT"	Respondent's list of concerns: "(2) Overall Military Beariing (Acting like a soldier on or off duty [i.e. Gay soldiers have to not be engaging in lude conduct or conduct unbecoming a soldier]."	Regarding shower privacy, respondent added: "@ field [sites, the shower facilities] were group, [but] in garrison they were private."	Regarding working with troops of partner nations who are gay, respondent said: "First experience w/ gays [in partner military] were not uncomfortable".	Regarding Political Affilltation, respondent said he will vote his issue.
The respondent said there was a gay man in his unit in the 60s, and there was a lesbian in his unit in the 70s.	Respondent comments: " There are too many beleifs, and religious beliefs; And too much that can cause friction."	Respondent's list of concerns: "(3) Overall perception of military by American Civilians [i.e. American public would not respect a military that allows Gays to serve openly when the public itself does not have such liberal work policies]."	Regarding unit type, respondent added: "Health"	Regarding whether their opinions have changed over time, respondent said: "I still feel the same way."	Regarding DADT, respondent said: "Keep DADT, with the clause that you can't be investigated and , but it should not be an element of punishment, but it should stay as the general protocol.
The respondent said that he served in 2 tours of duty in Vietnam	Respondent List of Concerns: "(1) Army gets away with a lot more than AF does. If they have someone gay in their unit, that they'd get hurt [i.e. in the Army, gay people would get physically hurt by members of the unit.]"	Respondent's list of concerns: "(1) My family living next to a gay family - If you accept gays in the military, then they can move wherever the military goes [Respondent was unaccepting of the fact that a gay family is a family just the same as his family]."	Regarding religious affiliation, respondent added that he was: "Baptist".	Regarding opinion on DADT is similar /consistent w/ family, respondent said: "My wife is more open. She's deployed [now]".	Respondent said: " No one should be asked about their sexual orientation."
Respondent Comments: "Steel Mills in Chicago were gone. Had to go to the Military."	Respondent List of Concerns: "(2) In all DoD, there will be a leadership issue; Respect is going to be impacted; [the issues will be centered on] Homosexual bias against straights."	Regarding Impact of work with PN, respondent said: "No work with PN. No Impact from PN"	Regarding work with PN, respondent said he worked with PN and added they were "Not impative"	Respondent Comments: "[I] Was not influenced by gays [in UAE military]. They had eye shadow. Male soldiers had eye make-up.	Respondent comment: " If repealed, they have to train and inform [service members] on how "Hate Crimes" should be addressed.
Respondent Comments: "2 Guys in Grammar School were gay." "[I was] Open-minded from the beginning."	Respondent List of Concerns: "(3) Image. Look at others [i.e. other nations' militaries] we have a strict standard [i.e. the US military has a higher standard than other militaries]. If we're gay, that's not going to makes us Elite. [i.e. Being known as having gays will make us look less Elite than we are now]."	Regarding Impact of Environment [on opinion regarding DADT], respondent said: "No Influence by the Environment after work here in Germany for 1.5 year"	Regarding opinion about gays/lesbians changing over time, respondent said: "[No] I always thought they should serve"	Respondent worked with partner nation UAE which [respondent thought] has open-service policy. He experienced working with UAE gay service members. "I thought the gays in UAE Military were funny. "	Respondent said he was not impacted by the environment or PN
[Regarding gays, I say] "If they want to join, let them join." "DADT is not good for the military. Let gays be open. It won't hurt the military."			Regarding DADT being high or low on respondent's list of concerns, the respondent said: "[No; Other concerns were more important such as:] Economy, Katrina".	Respondent comments: "[I] Did not work under the gay service members. [I] Was not uncomfortable, but it was new to me."	Respondent comments: "Most soldiers don't know about the other nations' policies."
[Regarding other religions] if you want to build a mosque, don't build it in NY. In other muslim lands, they won't let churches get built." "If they won't allow the saying of Jesus, then I say go to muslim country."			Regarding DADT being a pressing issue for the unit, respondent said: "[He] Served 1982 - 1993; DADT was not an issue."	Comment on DADT, "Keep DADT." "It depends: If I don't know, I don't care." ... "I would be hard for me to work side by side w/ gays. To me, it's just not right.	
Respondent Comments: [What hurts the military is that] only poor people join the military now. Bring the DRAFT back. The rich get away without serving in the military."			Regarding most individuals in unit having views and work habits similar to respondent's, the respondent said: "[I] Don't know. [My Unit was a] Hospital, [and] Unit was [working in] Shifts [Therefore, it's unknown how the others in the unit felt or thought]."	Respondent concerns: (1) I don't want it to happen, then we have to roll with the punches. It the gov't agrees to let them in, then we have to do [it so they'd have to do] your everyday duties [i.e. they have to be mission oriented and not about accomodating their uniqueness]"	
Respondent Comment: "[To me] If you don't bother me, I won't bother you".			Regarding DADT, respondent wanted REPEAL of DADT, and added: " NO punishment; Let thtem serve openly."	Respondent concerns: (2) "I would have less problem working with a lesbian than a gay guy."	
Respondent Comment: "I know how it feels to be discriminated against. I] was discriminated against as being non-white. "I had to sit in the back [of bus, during] service"			Respondent Comment: "You do what you do, and I won't press mine on you." ... "Regarding allowing gays/lesbians to be the in same foxholes and showers as straights, [and that being objectionable to some straights], the respondent said: "The same [gay] guy [who] was in the foxhole [was] protecting your ass."		
			Respondent Comments: "We partied and chilled w/ Lesbians - No problems." ... "Gays have been serving for years. They should be accepted." ... Respondent said: "[Back in previous decades during service] Gays were rat-ed out. The [gay] person kept it to themselves."		
			Regarding work with PN, the respondent said: "[Gays encountered in the miilitary were not w/ PN, instead the] Gays were encountered were from Ft Hood Texas." ... Regarding PN, respondent said: "[In PN militaries] Sexuality [Listing] is their preference."		
Respondent Comment: "I know how it feels to be discriminated against. I] was discriminated against as being non-white. "I had to sit in the back [of bus, during] service"			Respondent lives in European environment and added: "Europeans were more open [than Americans]. Sex is nothing to them. They are like me. Sexual preference is your own [business]. Culture [of Europe] impacted me, but not in my viewpoint on DADT."		

Each cell of the spreadsheet contained a different piece of information. The yellow highlight was to distinguish officers' comments. Other colors such as green were used as markers during comparison and contrasts between different peoples' answers.

Figure 3. Use of yellow highlights indicated individuals who were military officers.

C3	C4	C7	C8
[Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Respondent answered:	[Regarding wrok with Partner Nations] Respondent answered: NATO,	[Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Responded answered: "[I'm	[Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Respondent said: "All of NATO.
[Regarding question on opinion being similar to family's] Respondent answered: "I don't know"	[Regarding question on opinion being similar to family's] Respondent answered: "I don't know"	[Regarding the first question on Comfort Level with Gays / Lesbians] Respondent Said: "It depends on the situation".	[Respondent 's Opinions / Comments]: In my job, it wouldn't be a problem. In combat, it'll be an issue. In a combat, it
[Respondent had the following feeling:]"I think good order and discipline requires people	[Respodent had the following feeling:] "Gays in my unit are fine & cause no problems. There	[Respondent's Opinions / Comments]: "In the Shower - It's uncomfortable - Otherwise [I'm]	[Respondent's Additional Opinions / Comments]: "Shower is the pertinent
		[Respondent's Additional Opinions / Comments]: "I don't shower with guys so why should I shower with girls who are attracted to	

Some people gave a lot of comments and some did not. Sometimes circumstances were such that I could write down the comments, and sometimes it was not as easy. The distance view of the table shows that open comments by servicemembers differed wildly.

Figure 4. Different individuals provided several or only a few comments.

A11	A2	B30	B31	B32	B33	B35	B37	C10	C11	C12
Christian	Do Not Flaunt Lifestyle. Do Your Job	[Question Regarding DADT being high / low on own's list of concerns] Respondent Comment = "Keeping the DADT Policy"	Protestant = Baptist	Christian, Baptist	Protestant = Baptist	Evangelical	(1) Responded added comment to question [On my own list of concerns regarding the military, the keeping / elimination of the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy is high on the list] - Respondent added: "Keep it [DADT] intact".	[Regarding work other Partner Nations] Respondent replied that all deployed service members do. Respondent said:" [Yes, I worked with] NATO. [Afghanistan because of being] Deployed to Afghanistan. But NO Influence [resulted] due to wrok with P.N."	[Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Responded noted he worked with: "NATO & EU. [But I have] NOT been influenced by [having had to] work with P.N."	[Regarding work w/ Partner Nations]: Respondent said: "EU / NATO"
		[Question Regarding Own Opinion being consistent / similar to family's] Respondent did not respond.	[Question Regarding Agree / Disagree with allowing gays / lesbians to serve openly in the military] Respondent Answer = "No Opininon"	[Question Regarding Personally, how comfortable one is in the presence of gays and lesbians] Respondent Answer = "Depends on how open they are; If they don't bug me about it; No Flaunting"	(1) People who don't agree so they're going to have leadership	[Question Regarding Own Opinion being consistent / similar to family's] Respondent Answer = "Don't Know"	(1) Current Policy that's in place works fine.	[Additional Comments]: " I grew up with friends who were gays."	[Respondent's Opinions / Comments]: "Even though I have my own religious views, the military can allow every[one] as long as it does not violate the comraderie or cohesion of the unit. Otherwise it becomes a problem.	[Regarding being influenced on DADT opinion by work with P.N.] Responded said: " In my observations, it [i.e. Open Service for Gays and Lesbians in Partner Nation's Military] was detrimental to their military." Respondent referred to the NETHERLANDS, which at the time this veteran served was one of the few nations to allow open service to Gays & Lesbians.
		[Question Statement that "There is a lot of teamwork and cooperation in my unit."] Respondent Comment = "Lesbians should be eliminated from the Military".	[Question Regarding Own Opinion about gays serving in the military having changed over time] Respondent Answer: "Don't Think About it [at all]",	[Question Regarding shower privacy-levels] Respondent Answer = "In the field, it's always open". [Respondent did not answer question in writing]	(2) In a combat unit, openly serving gays and lesbians would be disruptive.	(1) As long as they're professional and don't come on to you. It's true otherwise; It'll distract from the mission.	(2) No one needs to be announcing that they are gay. They should be keeping that to themselves.	[Additional Comments]: "I work in the Legal Dept / Office".	[Resondent's additional opinion / comment]: "Out in the field, gays and straights - [being / working] Together - can become a problem. So, it's an issue in the air."	[Comments / Opinions] by respondent: " Soldiers [when I served] did not want to be with gays."
		(1) My present supervisor is a lesbian and is trying to adopt -- illegally -- 2 children from a Muslim country.		(1) If they don't flaunt	(3) They have to adjust leadership roles to make them more compassionate toward the new morales and values or religious beliefs.			[Respondent's Additional Opinions / Comments]: "I don't know if gays should be in the military, because of the image [it conveys]."		[Additional Comments / Opinions] by respondent: " We discriminate based on sex all the time. If a soldier commits adultery -- [regarding officers] It's a kiss of death for officers. We discriminate now. So, I think [if] it's Adultery [and it] is not right [then there should be consequences]."
		(2) I will not call one man another man's husband, and one woman another woman's wife". This will deteriorate everything in the military.		(2) Benefits and Housing as a regular couple?				[Respondent additional Opinion / Comments]: "The Legal Dept is Concerned [about service members being processed / prosecuted under DADT]. [If DADT policy issues / repeal] will go through, the legal office [and I will work [with it] ".		[Additional Comments / Opinions by respondent]: "[Regarding Adultery and discrimination based on adultery, and officers' career end due to adultery], And I served with hundreds of soldiers who committed adultery."
				(3) If they take DADT, they [gays] can't flaunt it.				[Respondent's additional Opinion / Comments]: "[In the legal office itself as a unit] There are some issues that we could work on in the unit. There are some interpersonal issues."		[Additional Comments / Opinions by respondent]: "There are some soldiers who are gay, & are excellent. But at a Ball, they should not bring their girlfriend or boyfriend [with them, i.e. as their spouse]. It's not gogod for service."
				(4) There are more important issues than DADT. Right now, the WAR is PRIORITY. This should be the most important priority of the Administration.				[Respondent's additional Opinion / Comment]: [Regarding DADT] Keep things the way they are. If you're gay, the military lifestyle would not work for gays."		
				(5) [Gays coming to the military] This is not the same as women and blacks coming into the military; But no-one can PROVE that being gay is innate [Versus being female or black which are innate and cannot be changed] and we have a choice.				[Regarding question on congruence of opinion with family's]: Respondent said: "I don't know"		
				(6) No on has proved that being gay is natural. People can choose. You cannot compare it to discrimination against women and blacks.				[Regarding question on the unit having other pressing issues aside from DADT], Responding Disagreed [Since she worked in legal office] and commented: "[My office works directly with] What to do w/ their discharge.		

The journal entries below pertain to my captured logs and notes about #D1. They include reflections of answers that he gave and my own reactions to those answers. The entries and notes were separated according to themes, and have also been organized chronologically.

Table 5. 2014 Reflections on conversations from 2010.

Reflections
#D1; On the question about whether there were many more pressing issues than keeping DADT, the respondent answered: "[Was] Not a big deal [was back in the 70's]" Regarding the question about whether the gay/lesbian person personnally told the respnodent [that s/he was gay] the respondent said: "I could just tell]. The respondent said there was a gay man in his unit in the 60s, and there was a lesbian in his unit in the 70s. The respondent said that he served in 2 tours of duty in Vietnam. Regarding the question on most individuals having views and work habits similar to mine, the respondent answered: "[We] Accomodated the lesbian in the unit"; What the respondent meant was that the lesbian wanted to be treated the same as the men and they complied with her desires. "Steel Mills in Chicago were gone. Had to go to the Military." "2 Guys in Grammar School were gay." "[I was] Open-minded from the beginning." [Regarding gays, I say] "If they want to join, let them join." "DADT is not good for the military. Let gays be open. It won't hurt the military." [Regarding other religions] if you want to build a mosque, don't build it in NY. In other muslim lands, they won't let churches get built."   2014; To me, the subjects of these national debates – namely gays in the military – were hiding right under my nose, in the workplaces that I was in. I wanted to know what their lives were like, and whether they were prized members of their organizations like I was in mine. I wanted to know if their teams and units were happy or caustic. Although many soldiers might feel there was palpable dissonance between the military organizations and their own personal situations within it, I wanted to understand whether gays hidden inside the military felt additional dissonance where they were. The gap in knowledge seemed to be whether most of these gay individuals felt

#D1

wholely embraced and woven into their teams and units.
If there were gays in the units, did everyone know or quietly assume they were gay – albeit they just didn't talk about this (due to restrictions of DADT)?

Or was it like my situation, which was that they lived hidden splited-up lives, and hid their romantic natures not only from others but perhaps also from themselves?

How was it?

And how different was their work environment out in the far flung bases outside the country?

What was it like for soldiers in Europe where the population has long had a much more liberal attitude towards gays?

This country seems to have forgotten what a controversy the repeal of DADT had been. During the first Obama-Biden Presidential run, as I watched and read about the public discourse from my assignment posts overseas, candidates McCain and Palin sometimes came across as if the Obama-Biden support for the repeal of DADT would cost them the 2008 election.

Many republicans railed about allowing gays to serve in the military. Radio hosts and conservative Television broadcasters argued about "Unit Cohesion" in the absence of DADT.

There were threats of mass departures of officers and soldiers – in the middle of two wars – if the repeal was enacted.

There were heated debates about gay soldiers 'flaming like peacocks' and embarrassing our country in front of our enemies if DADT was repealed.

Inside the Department of Defense bases in Germany, the perception, atmospherics and assumptions about the country's support for DADT was a cacophony of contradictory voices. I was there. Neither my colleagues nor I, had any clear clue that DADT would get repealed.

#D1 "If they won't allow the saying of Jesus, then I say go to muslim country." [What hurts the military is that] only poor people join the military now. Bring the DRAFT back. The rich get away without serving in the military." "[To me] If you don't bother me, I won't bother you". "[I know how it feels to be discriminated against. I] was discriminated against as being non-white. "I had to sit in the back [of bus, during] service".

Appendix D

Thirty core questions asked of the 29 servicemembers were common to all. All servicemembers gave answers to a set of 30 questions shown on the screenshot figure 5. below. The other 21 questions are on the next screenshot, which is figure 6. All 24 out of the 29 servicemembers answered 51 questions while the remaining 5 answered 45 questions. The 7 questions they did not answer had to do with their NCOs and other unit-related matters, which does not have much to do with DADT. The reason I included those questions were due to their importance on the day to day lives of servicemembers themselves. Since it was important to them, they wanted to talk about it. When I realized this, I asked about it, and people were only too happy to inform me – sometime at great length – what the unit NCO does well or not so well.

An important discovery I made in listening to people was that it was important to have people get engaged and the best way to do that was to let them talk about what they wanted to talk about. The key was to figure out what that key was.

Figure 5. First 30 pieces of information gathered from each conversation.

Raw Data from 29 conversations with military personnel in Germany during 2009 - 2010

Yellow Highlight indicates a military officer

Question shown in **RED** was critical to organizational transformation. Questions in **BLUE** were significant

B37	B35	B33	B32	B31	B30	C16	C15	C14	C13	C12	C11	C10	C9	C8	C7	C4	C3	A11	A5	A4	A3	A2	D14	D13	D12	D8	D2	D1	Label #Number Assignments (for privacy & security)	SCALE
2	2	2		1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	4	3	2	2	Personally, how comfortable are you in the presence of gays and lesbians?	1 = Very Comfortable, 2 = Somewhat Comfortable, 3 = Uncomfortable, 4 = Very Uncomfortable, 5 = Not Sure
2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	Do you know for certain that someone is gay or lesbian in your unit?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure
4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	3	1	1	4	1	Is the presence of gays and lesbians in the unit well-known by others?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply
4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	1	4	2	2	4	2	Lesbian or gay person told you	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply
5	5	3	4		5	1	3	4	5	5	3	3	2	1	4	1	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	5	5	3	3	1	**Do you agree or disagree with allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military?**	**1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree**
2	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3	4	2	2	1	2	1	1	Service Branch	1 = AF, 2 = Army, 3 = Marines, 4 = Navy
3	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	3	4	Age Group	1 = 18-29, 2 = 30-49, 3 = 50-64, 4 = 65+
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Gender	1 = Male, 2 = Female
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	Race / Ethnicity	1 = White, 2 = Non-White
1	1		1		1								1			1	1	1						1	1		1		Open gays and lesbians would undermine unit cohesion	1 = Yes
1	1	1	1		1								1			1					1		1	1	1	1	1	1	**Open gays and lesbians would get beat up or abused**	**1 = Yes**
1	1		1		1						1	1	1	1			1				1			1				1	Homosexuality violates religious / moral beliefs	1 = Yes
		1												1		1	1			1						1			Straights would not respect gay or lesbian leaders	1 = Yes
1		1			1		1	1	1	1			1			1	1							1					straights should not have to share foxholes, showers, etc with open gays and lesbians	1 = Yes
1					1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1						1	1	1	1	1		Open gays and lesbians would be more likely to pursue one another than they do now	1 = Yes
1	1				1			1					1	1			1							1	1				Gays and lesbians would increase the spread of HIV/AIDS	1 = Yes
					1									1	1														Open gays and lesbians would be more likely to pursue straights	1 = Yes
1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1					1		1	1	1	1	1	1	More open gays and lesbians would join or remain in the military	1 = Yes
																													Gays and lesbians cannot perform their military jobs as well as heterosexuals	1 = Yes
							1						1			1			1							1		1	There are no strong arguments for keeping gays from serving openly	1 = Yes
1			1			1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1			1	1		1	1	Sexual Orientation has nothing to do with job performance	1 = Yes
	1		1			1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1			1			1	1	It is wrong to discriminate based on sexual orientation	1 = Yes
	1	1			1		1	1	1	1			1	1			1	1		1		1		1				1	During wartime, the armed forces need every qualified service member regardless of sexual orientation	1 = Yes
		1				1	1	1	1			1	1			1	1		1		1			1				1	Discharging service members for being gay is a waste of recruiting, education and training dollars	1 = Yes
1	1		1			1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		1			1	1		1	1	No one should be able to avoid a service obligation by claiming to be gay	1 = Yes
	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1		1		1			1		1	1	**Gays are already in the military and make valuable contribution to the military**	**1 = Yes**
1		1			1				1			1	1	1	1			1		1		1		1	1	1	1	1	The government should not pry into people's private lives	1 = Yes
1		1			1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1			1	1		1		1		1		1	1	1	No one should be forced to lie about who they are as a condition of military service	1 = Yes
		1			1	1	1	1	1			1					1			1		1			1	1	1	1	Discharging service members for being gay undermines military readiness	1 = Yes
			1		1												1		1			1	1		1		1		There is no strong argument for allowing gays and lesbians to serve in the military	1 = Yes

Figure 6. Final 21 pieces of information gathered from each conversation.

Raw Data from 29 conversations with military personnel in Germany during 2009 - 2010

Yellow Highlight indicates a military officer — Question that had less significance to the study

B37	B35	B33	B32	B31	B30	C16	C15	C14	C13	C12	C11	C10	C9	C8	C7	C4	C3	A11	A5	A4	A3	A2	D14	D13	D12	D8	D2	D1	Label #Number Assignments (for privacy & security)	SCALE
3	8	3	8	3	2	2	7	3	2	2	8	2	2	2	3	2	5	2	3	3	7	7	7	2	7	8	2	2	Religious Affiliation	1 = Atheist / Realist / Humanist, 2 = Catholic, 3 = Protestant, 4 = Jewish, 5 = Latter-Day Saints, 6 = Muslim, 7 = Other No Affliation ;; 8 = See Religion
4	3	3		1		3	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	2	3	5		2	1	1	3	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	Shower Privacy-Level in your unit	1 = Almost Always Private, 2= Usually Private, 3= About Half and Half, 4 = Usually Group Shower, 5 = Almost Always Group Shower
1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	Duty Status	1 = Veteran, 2 = Active Duty, 3 = Reserve / Guard
4	2	2	4	3	1	4	1	1	1	4	2	2	3	3	1	4	4	2	2	2	1	4	3	1	1	2	4	4	Years of Service	1 = 4yrs or fewer, 2 = 5-10 yrs, 3 = 11-20 yrs, 4 = 21-30 yrs
4	2	2	3	5	2	3	1	1	1	5	2	1	5	2	5	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	Rank, Grade	1 = E1-E4 (Junior Enlisted), 2 = E5-E6 (Junior NCOs), 3 = E7-E9 (Senior NCOs), 4 = W1-W5 (Warrant Officers, 5 = O1-O4 (Junior Officers), 6 = O5-O9 (Senior Officers)
3	2	1	1	1	4	3	2	1	1	3	4	3	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	1	Unit Type	1 = Combat, 2 = Combat Support, 3 = Combat Service Support, 4 = Other
2	1	2	1	1		1	3	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	Has your unit had Antigay Harrassment Prevention Training?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure
4	3	3		1		3	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	2	3	5		2	1	1	3	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	Shower Privacy-Level in your unit	1 = Almost Always Private, 2= Usually Private, 3= About Half and Half, 4 = Usually Group Shower, 5 = Almost Always Group Shower
1	1	1	1	1		5	1	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1						1	5	5	5	1	5	I work with troops of Partner Nations who allow gays and lesbians to serve openly in	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
4	5	5	2			5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5						5	5	2	3	5	5	My opinions about gays serving in the military have changed over time.	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	2	2	5	1	2	5	5	5	2	5	4	5	1	3	5	5						5	2	3	5	4	5	On my own list of concerns regarding the military, the keeping / elimination of the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" Policy is high on the	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1		1	1	1		5	1	1		1	4			1	1								1	1	5		5	1	My opinions about "Don't Ask Don't Tell" are quite similar / consistent with those of my family (parents / siblings / step-parents).	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	1	3	1	5	1	5	5	5	2	1	5	5	1	2	1	1						1	3	1	1	5	5	In my units, there are many more pressing issues than the keeping / elimination of the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" Policy.	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1							3	3	2	1	1	In my unit, most individuals have views and work habits similar to mine.	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1						1	2	5	5	1	1	I am satisfied with the work my unit is doing in the US Military. (For Veterans, reference last phase of military worklife).	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	5	1	3	4	3	1	1	There is a lot of teamwork and cooperation in my unit.	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	3	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	5	3	3	1	1	4	5	4	1	The officers in my unit are good leaders.	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	5	1	3	1	2	2	3	1	3	The NCOs in my unit are good leaders.	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	5	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	5	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	How would you rate the readiness of your unit for its wartime mission?	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	5	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	5	1	1	How would you rate your unit's level of training for its wartime mission?	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
1	1	5	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	5	4	3	1	3	2	2	1	2	1	5	1	1	How would you rate the equipment your unit has for its wartime mission?	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree

Appendix E

Of the 52 questions asked and mostly answered by the 29 servicemembers, a few were critical to the understanding of how servicemembers felt about the organizational transformation to repeal DADT and allow open service for gay servicemembers. These questions are shown in different ink colors (red or blue). The final figure repeats the information on the important 30 questions of the study as well as showcasing the important findings of this study.

Figure 7. First information page accompanied with averages and comparisons.

Analysis																														Raw Data from 29 conversations with military personnel in Germany during 2009 - 2010	
																														Yellow Highlight indicates a military officer	Question shown in RED was critical to organizational transformation. Questions in BLUE were significant
Percentages	B37	B35	B33	B32	B31	B30	C16	C15	C14	C13	C12	C11	C10	C9	C8	C7	C4	C3	A11	A5	A4	A3	A2	D14	D13	D12	D8	D2	D1	Label #Number Assignments (for privacy & security)	SCALE
93% somewhat or very comfortable w/ gays	2	2	2		1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	4	3	2	2	Personally, how comfortable are you in the presence of gays and lesbians?	1 = Very Comfortable, 2 = Somewhat Comfortable, 3 = Uncomfortable, 4 = Very Uncomfortable,
24% knew a gay unit-member	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	Do you know for certain that someone is gay or lesbian in your unit?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure
24% believe gay person is known by all in unit	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	3	1	1	4	1	Is the presence of gays and lesbians in the unit well-known by others?	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply
Only 10% were told directly by the gay person	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	1	4	2	2	4	2	Lesbian or gay person told you	1 = Yes, 2= No, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Does Not Apply
34% disagreed w/ repealing DADT; Rest agreed or were neutral	5	5	3	4		5	1	3	4	5	5	3	3	2	1	4	1	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	5	5	3	3	1	Do you agree or disagree with allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military?	1 = Strongly Agree -- to -- 5 = Strongly Disagree
Army = 45%, Navy = 14%, Air Force = 34%, Marines = 7%	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3	4	2	2	1	2	1	1	Service Branch	1 = AF, 2 = Army, 3 = Marines, 4 = Navy
20s = 45%, 30s&40s = 28%, 50s-65 = 24%, 65+= 3%	3	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	3	4	Age Group	1 = 18-29, 2 = 30-49, 3 = 50-64, 4 = 65+
83% Male	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Gender	1 = Male, 2 = Female
69% White	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	Race / Ethnicity	1 = White, 2 = Non-
38% believed this	1	1		1		1					1					1	1	1						1	1			1		Open gays and lesbians would undermine unit cohesion	1 = Yes
48% believed this	1	1	1	1		1					1				1						1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Open gays and lesbians would get beat up or abused	1 = Yes
41% believed this	1	1		1		1					1	1	1	1			1					1		1				1		Homosexuality violates religious / moral beliefs	1 = Yes
21% believed this			1											1		1	1				1						1			Straights would not respect gay or lesbian leaders	1 = Yes
38% believed this	1			1		1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1					1						1			straights should not have to share foxholes, showers, etc with open gays and lesbians	1 = Yes
55% believed this	1					1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1					1	1	1	1	1	1		Open gays and lesbians would be more likely to pursue one another than they do now	1 = Yes
28% believed this	1	1				1		1					1			1						1	1							Gays and lesbians would increase the spread of HIV/AIDS	1 = Yes
10% believed this						1						1		1																Open gays and lesbians would be more likely to pursue straights	1 = Yes
76% believed this	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	More open gays and lesbians would join or remain in the military	1 = Yes
0% believed this																														Gays and lesbians cannot perform their military jobs as well as heterosexuals	1 = Yes
21% believed this						1							1			1		1							1				1	There are no strong arguments for keeping gays from serving openly	1 = Yes
69% believed this	1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1	1		1	1	1	Sexual Orientation has nothing to do with job performance	1 = Yes
59% believed this		1		1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1			1	1			It is wrong to discriminate based on sexual orientation	1 = Yes
55% believed this		1	1	1		1	1	1	1				1	1		1	1		1		1		1			1		1		During wartime, the armed forces need every qualified service member regardless of sexual	1 = Yes
48% believed this		1				1	1	1	1				1	1		1	1		1		1		1			1		1		Discharging service members for being gay is a waste of recruiting, education and training dollars	1 = Yes
62% believed this	1	1		1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1	1		1	1	1	1	No one should be able to avoid a service obligation by claiming to be gay	1 = Yes
62% believed this	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1		1		1			1	1	1	Gays are already in the military and make valuable contribution to the military	1 = Yes
52% believed this	1		1			1				1		1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1	1	1	1	The government should not pry into people's private lives	1 = Yes
62% believed this	1		1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1		1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1	No one should be forced to lie about who they are as a condition of	1 = Yes
41% believed this		1			1	1	1	1						1		1		1		1		1	1	1	Discharging service members for being gay undermines military readiness	1 = Yes
24% believed this		1		1											1		1			1	1		1	There is no strong argument for allowing gays and lesbians to serve in the military	1 = Yes

The table below contains the aggregates notes, journal entries, logs and other information pertinent to all servicemembers who participated in this study. There are many misspellings and errors in the content below.

Table 6. Notes, journal entries and records of conversations

Notes, journal entries, and records of conversations with military personnel in Germany from 2008 – 2010. Note: There are many errors and misspellings; the texts were copied verbatium from original journals.

#D1   On the question about whether there were many more pressing issues than keeping DADT, the respondent answered: "[Was] Not a big deal [was back in the 70's]" Regarding the question on most individuals having views and work habits similar to mine, the respondent answered: "[We] Accomodated the lesbian in the unit"; What the respondent meant was that the lesbian wanted to be treated the same as the men and they complied with her desires   Regarding the question about whether the gay/lesbian person personnally told the respnodent [that s/he was gay] the respondent said: "I could just tell]   The respondent said there was a gay man in his unit in the 60s, and there was a lesbian in his unit in the 70s.   The respondent said that he served in 2 tours of duty in Vietnam Respondent Comments: "Steel Mills in Chicago were gone. Had to go to the Military."   Respondent Comments: "2 Guys in Grammar School were gay." "[I was] Open-minded from the beginning."   [Regarding gays, I say] "If they want to join, let them join." "DADT is not good for the military. Let gays be open. It won't hurt the military."
        [Regarding other religions] if you want to build a mosque, don't build it in NY. In other muslim lands, they won't let churches get built." "If they won't allow the saying of Jesus, then I say go to muslim country."   Respondent Comments: [What hurts the military is that] only poor people join the military now. Bring the DRAFT back. The rich get away without serving in the military."   Respondent Comment: "[To me] If you don't bother me, I won't bother you".   Respondent Comment: "[I know how it feels to be discriminated against. I] was discriminated against as being non-white. "I had to sit in the back [of bus, during] service"
                Respondent Comment: "[I know how it feels to be discriminated against. I] was discriminated against as being non-white. "I had to sit in the back [of bus, during] service"

D2   Regarding the question on knowing anyone in the unit to be gay, respondent said: [I]"Never heard of anyone in the unit being gay".   Regarding the question of shower privacy the respondent said:"At first they were semi private, then moved to private showers". Also, regarding the question of straights sharing foxholes and showers w/ gays, Respondent said: "Foxholes ok. Showers Not ok. I don't want them in [the] showers".   Regarding working with troops of partner nations who were gay, respondent said: "First experience w/ gays [in partner military] were not uncomfortable".   Regarding whether their opinions have changed over time, respondent said: "I still feel the same way." Regarding opinion on DADT is similar /consistent w/ family, respondent said: "My wife is more open. She's deployed [now]".   Respondent Comments: "[I] Was not influenced by gays [in UAE military]. They had eye shadow. Male soldiers had eye make-up.   Respondent worked with partner nation UAE which [respondent thought] has open-service policy. He experienced working with UAE gay servicemembers. "I thought the gays in UAE Military were funny. "   Respondent comments: "[I] Did not work under the gay servicemembers. [I] Was not uncomfortable, but it was new to me."
        Comment on DADT, "Keep DADT." "It depends: If I don't know, I don't care." … " I would be hard for me to work side by side w/ gays. To me, it's just not right.   Respondent concerns: (1) I don't want it to happen, then we have to roll with the punches. It the gov't agrees to let them in, then we have to do [it so they'd have to do] your everyday duties [i.e. they have to be mission oriented and not about accomodating their uniqueness]"   Respondent concerns: (2) "I would have less problem working with a lesbian than a gay guy."

#D8   Regarding privacy of showers, respondent said (half and half): "[It] Depends on the situtation".   Regarding whether respondent is white or non-white, he said he doesn't like this structure, as he considers himself African-American.   Regarding Political Affilitation, respondent said he will vote his issue. Regarding DADT, respondent said: "Keep DADT, with the clause that you can't be investigated and , but it should not be an element of punishment, but it should stay as the general protocol.   Respondent said: " No one should be asked about their sexual orientation."   Respondent comment: " If repealed, they have to train and inform [service members] on how "Hate Crimes" should be addressed.   Respondent said he was not impacted by the environment or PN   Respondent comments: "Most soldiers don't know about the other nations' policies."

#D12 Regarding privacy of showers, respondent said "Almost always private showers" but that: "Downranges [there were always] group showers."
Regarding Political affiliations, the respondent said he is a Liberatarian.
Regarding DADT, Respondent said: "Keep DADT"
Respondent comments: " There are too many beleifs, and religious beliefs; And too much that can cause friction."
Respondent List of Concerns: "(1) Army gets away with a lot more than AF does. If

they have someone gay in their unit, that they'd get hurt [i.e. in the Army, gay people would get physically hurt by members of the unit.]"
Respondent List of Concerns: "(2) In all DoD, there will be a leadership issue; Respect is going to be impacted; [the issues will be centered on] Homosexual bias against straights."
Respondent List of Concerns: "(3) Image. Look at others [i.e. other nations' militaries] we have a strict standard [i.e. the US military has a higher standard than other militaries]. If we're gay, that's not going to makes us Elite. [i.e. Being known as having gays will make us look less Elite than we are now]."

D14 Regarding knowing someone gay in the unit, respondent said: "Quite a few."
Regarding whether the presence of gays or lesbians in the unit is well-known by others, the respondent says YES, however added: "But [when speaking openly with gays known to others in the unit, I am] careful about who the others [are, i.e. whether I know for sure the other unit-members are 'supportive' not harmful to the gay person]." Regarding shower privacy, respondent added: "@ field [sites, the shower facilities] were group, [but] in garrison they were private." Regarding unit type, respondent added: "Health"   Regarding religious affiliation, respondent added that he was: "Baptist". Regarding work with PN, respondent said he worked with PN and added they were "Not impative"   Regarding opinion about gays/lesbians changing over time, respondent said: "[No] I always thought they should serve" Regarding DADT being high or low on respondent's list of concerns, the respondent said: "[No; Other concerns were more important such as:] Economy, Katrina".   Regarding DADT being a pressing issue for the unit, respondent said: "[He] Served 1982 - 1993; DADT was not an issue."   Regarding most individuals in unit having views and work habits similar to respondent's, the respondent said: "[I] Don't know. [My Unit was a] Hospital, [and] Unit was [working in] Shifts [Therefore, it's unknown how the others in the unit felt or thought]."   Regarding DADT, respondent wanted REPEAL of DADT, and added: " NO punishment; Let thtem serve openly." Respondent Comment: "You do what you do, and I won't press mine on you." … "Regarding allowing gays/lesbians to be the in same foxholes and showers as straights, [and that being objectionable to some straights], the respondent said: "The same [gay] guy [who] was in the foxhole [was] protecting your ass."   Respondent Comments: "We partied and chilled w/ Lesbians - No problems." … "Gays have been serving for years. They should be accepted." … Respondent said: "[Back in previous decades during service] Gays were rat-ed out. The [gay] person kept it to themselves."   Regarding work with PN, the respondent said: "[Gays encountered in the miilitary were not w/ PN, instead the] Gays were encountered were from Ft Hood Texas." … Regarding PN, respondent said: "[In PN militaries] Sexuality [Listing] is their preference."
Respondent lives in European environment and added: "Europeans were more open [than Americans]. Sex is nothing to them. They are like me. Sexual preference is your own [business]. Culture [of Europe] impacted me, but not in my viewpoint on DADT."

D13 Regarding DADT: "Keep DADT"   Respondent's list of concerns: "(1) People's Safety."   Respondent's list of concerns: "(2) Overall Military Beariing (Acting like a soldier on or off duty [i.e. Gay soldiers have to not be engaging in lude conduct or conduct unbecoming a soldier]." Respondent's list of concerns: "(3) Overall perception of military by American Civilians [i.e. American public would not respect a military that allows Gays to serve openly when the public itself does not have such liberal work policies]."Respondent's list of concerns: "(1) My family living next to a gay family - If you accept gays in the military, then they can move wherever the military goes [Respondent was unaccepting of the fact that a gay family is a family just the same as his family]."   Regarding Impact of work with PN, respondent said: "No work with PN. No Impact from PN"   Regarding Impact of Environment [on opinion regarding DADT], respondent said: "No Influence by the Environment after work here in Germany for 1.5 year"

#C4   [Regarding wrok with Partner Nations] Respondent answered: NATO, EU (Across EU), Iraq & AFPAK; No impact on opinion as per Partner Nation policy on Gays. [Regarding question on opinion being similar to family's] Respondent answered: "I don't know" [Respodent had the following feeling:] "Gays in my unit are fine & cause no problems. There are other gays however, in other units that cause problems. But not in our unit.

ARMY OFFICER
#C9   [Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Respondent said: "NATO. [But it has been] NOT influencial on [my opinion of] DADT."   [Regarding opinion of congruence of opinion with family's] Responded said: "[He] Didn't Know [his family's opinion on DADT policy]". [Respondent's Explanation Regarding answers was]: "[My] Unit is very senior. Lowest Member is an E7. Gay-ness is not an issue."
        [Opinion / Comment]: "Keep DADT - Don't Remove. [I / Unit] Have not encountered [issues / problems] for being Gay."

#C8   [Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Respondent said: "All of NATO. [Was] NOT influenced by work with partner nations. Not in any way. Not Positively or Negatively. They're different countries & different [situations]."
        [Respondent 's Opinions / Comments]: In my job, it wouldn't be a problem. In combat, it'll be an issue. In a combat, it wouldn't work. It would cause problems in combat."   [Respondent's Additional Opinions / Comments]: "Shower is the pertinent [issue/matter]. Are they going to have different lockers? [What are they going to do? I mean,] I wouldn't get naked in front of a woman. [So what are they going to do]?"

AIR FORCE OFFICER
#C3   [Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Respondent answered: "NATO - 1989; But Never has exposure to partner nations a factor on own opinion"

[Regarding question on opinion being similar to family's] Respondent answered: "I don't know"   [Respondent had the following feeling:]"I think good order and discipline requires people to be of like mind. It's important they all work for the common good of the mission. If they cannot do that, then discipline and order is going to be undermined."

#C16   [Regarding question on whether opinion on DADT has changed over time], respondent said: "[Yes] Since active duty in 1978."   [Regarding work with other partner nations]: "NATO. On Two Deployments.   [Regarding whether service with partner nations influenced opinion on DADT], Respondent said: "It influenced me in that it showed me that gays can coexist. [They] do and can work very openly and well with straights." [Additional comments on opinions]: "[Regarding partner nations influencing view] I saw for myself, and living in Europe, [I realized] they [gay & straight soldiers] could co-exist.   [Additional Opinions / Comments]: "It's time to repeal DADT. Join the rest of the world."[Additional Comments]: "We [American / People] tend to hide behind our phobias. It's own own homophobic views."   [Additional Comments]: "Stories about Netherlanders military where gays and straights worked and lived together". Also "The gay-est strangest situation encountered were American Officers in a Spanish airport departure lounge being very flirtatious and openly suggestive until these soldiers told them they weren't interested."

#C15   [Respondent Explanation regarding responses overall]: " We're only a month out of training. We're brand new."   [Respondent Explanation regarding responses overall]: " We haven't done anything yet."   [Respondent overall comment RE/ DADT]: "DADT should stay the same."

#C14   [Respondent Explanation regarding responses overall]: " We're only a month out of training. We're brand new."   [Respondent Explanation regarding responses overall]: " We haven't done anything yet."   [Respondent Opinion / Comment overall:] "DADT has been working so far. So, don't bother it."

#C13   [Respondent Explanation regarding responses overall]: " We're only a month out of training. We're brand new."   [Respondent Explanation regarding responses overall]: " We haven't done anything yet."   [Respondent overall comment RE/ DADT]: "DADT should stay the same."

ARMY OFFICER
#C12   [Regarding work w/ Partner Nations]: Respondent said: "EU / NATO"
        [Regarding being influenced on DADT opinion by work with P.N.]
Responded said: " In my observations, it [i.e. Open Service for Gays and Lesbians in Partner Nation's Military] was detrimental to their military." Respondent refered to the NETHERLANDS, which at the time this veteran served was one of the few nations to allow open service to Gays & Lesbians.   [Comments / Opinions] by

respondent: " Soldiers [when I served] did not want to be with gays."

[Additional Comments / Opinions] by respondent: " We discriminate based on sex all the time. If a soldier commits adultery -- [regarding officers] It's a kiss of death for officers. We discriminate now. So, I think [if] it's Adultery [and it] is not right [then there should be consequences]." [Additional Comments / Opinions by respondent]: "[Regarding Adultery and discrimination based on adultery, and officers' career end due to adultery], And I served with hundreds of soldiers who committed adultery." [Additional Comments / Opinions by respondent]: "There are some soldiers who are gay, & are excellent. But at a Ball, they should not bring their girlfriend or boyfriend [with them, i.e. as their spouse]. It's not gogod for service."

#C11   [Regarding work with other Partner Nations] Responded noted he worked with: "NATO & EU. [But I have] NOT been influenced by [having had to] work with P.N."   [Respondent's Opinions / Comments}: "Even though I have my own religious views, the military can allow every[one] as long as it does not violate the comraderie or cohesion of the unit. Otherwise it becomes a problem.

[Resondent's additional opinion / comment]: "Out in the field, gays and straights -- [being / working] Together -- can become a problem. So, it's an issue in the air."

#C10   [Regarding work other Partner Nations] Respondent replied that all deployed servicemembers do. Respondent said:" [Yes, I worked with] NATO. [Afghanistan because of being] Deployed to Afghanistan. But NO Influence [resulted] due to wrok with P.N."   [Additional Comments]: " I grew up with friends who were gays."

[Additional Comments]: "I work in the Legal Dept / Office".

[Respondent's Additional Opinions / Comments]: "I don't know if gays should be in the military, because of the image [it conveys]."   [Respondent additional Opinion / Comments]: "The Legal Dept is Concerned [about servicemembers being processed / prosecuted under DADT]. [If DADT policy issues / repeal] will go through, the legal office [and I] will work [with it] ".

[Respondent's additional Opinion / Comments]: "[In the legal office itself as a unit] There are some issues that we could work on in the unit. There are some interpersonal issues." [Respondent's additional Opinion / Comment]: [Regarding DADT] Keep things the way they are. If you're gay, the military lifestyle would not work for gays."   [Regarding question on congruence of opinion with family's]: Respondent said: "I don't know"   [Regarding question on the unit having other pressing issues aside from DADT], Responding Disagreed [Since she worked in legal office] and commented: "[My office works directly with] What to do w/ their discharge.

#B37   (1) Responded added comment to question [On my own list of concerns regarding the military, the keeping / elimination of the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy is high on the list] - Respondent added: "Keep it [DADT] intact".   (1) Current Policy that's in place works fine.   (2) No one needs to be announcing that they are

gay. They should be keeping that to themselves.

#B35   Evangelical   [Question Regarding Own Opinion being consistent / similar to family's] Respondent Answer = "Don't Know"   (1) As long as they're professional and don't come on to you. It's true otherwise; It'll distract from the mission.

#B33   Protestant = Baptist   (1) People who don't agree so they're going to have leadership   (2) In a combat unit, openly serving gays and lesbians would be disruptive.   (3) They have to adjust leadership roles to make them more compassionate toward the new morales and values or religious beliefs.

#B32   Christian, Baptist   [Question Regarding Personally, how comfortable one is in the presence of gays and lesbians] Respondent Answer = "Depends on how open they are; If they don't bug me about it; No Flaunting" [Question Regarding shower privacy-levels] Respondent Answer = "In the field, it's always open". [Respondent did not answer question in writing]   (1) If they don't flaunt(2) Benefits and Housing as a regular couple?   (3) If they take DADT, they [gays] can't flaunt it. (4) There are more important issues than DADT. Right now, the WAR is PRIORITY. This should be the most important priority of the Administration.   (5) [Gays coming to the military] This is not the same as women and blacks coming into the military; But no-one can PROVE that being gay is innate [Versus being female or black which are innate and cannot be changed] and we have a choice.   (6) No on has proved that being gay is natural. People can choose. You cannot compare it to discrimination against women and blacks.

ARMY OFFICER

#B31   Protestant = Baptist   [Question Regarding Agree / Disagree with allowing gays / lesbians to serve openly in the military] Respondent Answer = "No Opininon"
       [Question Regarding Own Opinion about gays serving in the military having changed over time] Respondent Answer: "Don't Think About It [at all]".

#B30   [Question Regarding DADT being high / low on own's list of concerns] Respondent Comment = "Keeping the DADT Policy"   [Question Regarding Own Opinion being consistent / similar to family's] Respondent did not respond.
       [Question Statement that "There is a lot of teamwork and cooperation in my unit."] Respondent Comment = "Lesbians should be eliminated from the Military".
       (1) My present supervisor is a lesbian and is trying to adopt -- illegally -- 2 children from a Muslim country.   (2) I will not call one man another man's husband, and one woman another woman's wife". This will deteriorate everything in the military.

#A2   Do Not Flaunt Lifestyle. Do Your Job

#A11   Christian

Journal Entries on #M1
Information also captured in Appendix B, Table 2.

#M1's story was that in October 1995, a movie-goer at the base theater (i.e. a movie theater located at #M1's military base in Germany) complained about her to Military Police. This led to the Army's investigation into inappropriate conduct against #M1. The basis of the complaint was that while watching the movie in that theater, #M1 put her head on the shoulder of another female Army enlisted as they watched the movie side by side. The base was near Berlin, Germany, a mecca of liberal attitudes toward gays. If these women had been in any public theater in Berlin, other moviegoers might not have been bothered in any way. However, that night, these women forgot that the European attitudes did not necessarily follow them into the on-base theater. Polar-opposite views between attitudes toward gays inside the base and outside the base led to problems for both of these women.

The complaint about the women's inappropriate behavior in the theater charged that they were "displaying" inappropriate gay behavior. Under DADT, you cannot show or demonstrate gay behavior. Subsequently, an official investigation was launched. The two women's 'relationship' had not gone on long enough for them to have considered each other a full-fledged 'significant other', or for them to have been "perceived" by others around them as a couple. Additionally, what they were doing was apparently nothing that was overtly sexual.

The Army's investigation of the two women in the movie theater was conducted, and the women had at first assumed it would be a quick punishment or an investigation that would conclude quickly. After all, how could investigators come up with movie attendees in that auditorium from across disparate bases to validate the assumption or charge of the complaining patron? It turned out that the investigation went on for quite some time. This period was filled with torment and anguish for the two women. Subsequently, both women were found guilty, and were thrown out of the military. However, due to lack of aggravating evidence – such as being caught in an overt display of homosexual behavior, they were 'discharged' but not dishonorably.

At subsequent sessions it was uncovered that #M1 had suffered such trauma and upheaval after the discharge, that she had boxed-up and stored away all paperwork related to her dismissal. Additionally, for a number of years, she moved repeatedly and needed to be unencumbered from having too much belongings. She had subsequently sent them away to a family member near Seattle (where she was from). Unhappily, that person had a falling out with #M1, and she guesses that her boxes (hence her records) had been gotten rid of – probably out of anger. It was fortunate that this researcher had not asked #M1 about the paperwork pertaining to her military service and discharge, because the whole subject was such a sore topic. #M1 estimated she might probably never find out how or when her boxes were destroyed, but in her words, "there was so much water under the bridge that it didn't even

matter by then".

As this unhappy discharge had occurred in Germany, one woman went back home to the U.S., to put the whole matter behind her, while the other one, namely #M1, stayed on in Germany but moved southward to network with former soldiers who worked as contractors at various military bases.

The other woman who went state-side wanted nothing more to do with #M1. She wanted to start fresh with a new life, and be freed from the shadows of Army's investigations.

Meanwhile, #M1 discovered she could become a military contractor, and remain in Germany. She stayed mum about the details of her discharge, and began working wherever she could in support of the DoD missions. She had to have some therapy, and life had some serious ups and downs for her. Two former Army captains who knew her after the discharge gave her recommendations to gain employement with a liberal and fair-minded military contractor that she was very happy with. To this day she does not feel comfortable revealing or trusting too much information about those days or that DADT event, unless she knows the person well. Initially, she did not say much to her family other than she had been unhappy with the Army, and had left it. She told them that she liked Europe and was staying on to work as a contractor. At the time of the interviews with this researcher, she lived near Landenberg, Germany with her German wife, which was unrecognized by the US government.

Some who knew about her discharge thought it was right and appropriate. Others thought it was over-the-top, and so they helped her re-established herself in the civilian world. What she has noticed over the years was that as time went on, more and more soldiers seemed to think that her treatment was over-the-top. And that's the change she noticed, most especially in Germany.

#M1 noticed that being among Europeans, seeing how they are not bothered by gays as Americans were – at least to the best of her recollection – seemed to propel soldiers and officers to re-examine their attitudes. Many were warned about 'going native', a metaphor for becoming tolerant about taboos in American culture. To the best of her abilities, she continued to educate people about the many costs of hunting gays in the military, discharging them, as well the human toll that gay people pay in shutting out their identities from themselves and hiding their truths from the world.

#M1 and the 'Moral Majority'

#M1 thought that the 'Moral Majority' was the real cause behind her discharge. The Moral Majority was founded in 1979 as an American political organization which had an agenda of evangelical Christian-oriented political lobbying. Jerry Falwell, whose founding of the Moral Majority was a key step in the formation of the New Christian Right, had embarked in the bicentennial year of 1976, on a series of "I Love America" rallies across the country to raise awareness of social issues important to Falwell. These rallies were an extension of Falwell's decision to go against the traditional Baptist principle of separating religion and politics, a change of heart Falwell said he had when he felt alarmed by the decay of the nation's morality. Through hosting these rallies, Falwell was able to gauge national support for a formal organization and also raise his profile as a leader. Having already been a part of a well-established network of ministers and ministries, within a few years

Falwell was favorably positioned to launch the Moral Majority.

According to #M1, many Army personnel were enamored of the Moral Majority. #M1 had not realized it at the time, but she later came to understand that many soldiers and officers at that time (early 1990s) were disenchanted by changes that came in the aftermath of the breakup of the former Soviet Union (USSR), with the 'peace dividend', and with the diminished importance of the military in the eyes of Americans. Their anger and resentment seemed to resonate with what the Moral Majority complained about, and they felt a belonging with what they perceived as mainstream American values. Furthermore, President Clinton's perceived compromise that resulted in DADT as the official Department of Defense policy on gay personnel, further alarmed many religiously-inclined officers. #M1 believed that they came to fear that decadence and amorality had tried to creep into the military, with the military's inability to directly ask and confront soldiers about whether they were gay. A number of senior officers reacted by clamping down on gays. It was in this environment that #M1 was seen in the movie theater with her head on the shoulder of a girlfriend she was attracted to. Someone in the audience didn't like what he was seeing and reported her to the authorities. And just like that, her Army career was over.

#M1 believed (and continues to believe) that if the Moral Majority hadn't fomented bigotry against gays, what happened to her would not have occurred. Furthermore, she believed that her punishment was actually made softer because the environment of Europe softened (and continued to soften) people's antigay hatred. Longterm contact with European forces – in #M1's opinion – had allowed U.S. military servicemembers to learn that nothing horrible occurred in our partners' militaries with policies that allowed gays to serve openly. #M1 believed that the experience of our European Allies positively influenced the more-relaxed attitudes of the U.S. Military leadership in Europe. This in turn had helped allow our military personnel to behave with more civility toward minorities who were hated by average Americans back in the U.S. She called it the "Europe Effect".

Morphing and updating the concept of a large majority

Two years after DADT was instituted as the policy for the military by President Clinton's administration, these two women (#M1 and her friend) were being investigated for inappropriate behavior. Since they were in a U.S. military base in Germany, it was as if they were on U.S. soil. At that time, the Moral Majority had been greatly favored for many years by military personnel. #M1 believed that when military people said things like the 'American mainstream', 'main America', or our 'great people' they actually were saying 'Moral Majority'. She believed it was just the updated or morphed terminology for the same concept of "us, excluding them".

A brief discussion in 2009 with an Army military chaplain, who had the rank of Colonel, in Wiesbaden Germany revealed a verification of this:

 "[They are] doing the good work demanded by the [American] public and the Secretary of Defense; fighting two wars [In Iraq and Afghanistan] against Islamic terrorism and fanatical enemies of our country; loving our enemies – as Jesus instructed – despite our enemies' fanatical beliefs; setting good examples of

honorable living in daily interactions with many other peoples [i.e. people around the globe]; and living no worse or better than the great majority of Americans when upholding the great principles of our founding fathers; these warfighters are the backbone of the great people that we are."

#M1 hated all of this hidden, covert bigotry that she perceived was prevalent in the military. She believed that it was the absorption of Moral Majority preachings, and the fear of moral decay in the military that directly precipitated in what happened to her. She had deep disgust for many supporters of the Moral Majority, and repeated this sentiment a number of times as if the movement was still a vibrant – albeit quieter – theme of military personnel's beliefs. She said that her discharge was but one example of the tide of intolerance that the Moral Majority brought to the branches of the military – although she thought the Air Force had it even worse than the Army. She saw herself as an exemplar of how intolerant the Moral Majority was, and how pervasive its influence could be.

One officer (in a later interview with me) said, "the military is a young man's game". Although it was observed that many young soldiers are children of parents and even grandparents who served in the military, and followed the dictates of the Moral Majority, a large number of young people enlisted did not even remember the Moral Majority, or the military in the era of President Reagan. When #M1 was confronted with this observation, she was dismissive. She said: "No, they're all there. They might not say anything now, but you'll see, they'll all come out when they want to."

#M1's perceptions about the harms of the Moral Majority were locked in the time capsule of her sensitivities. She still feared and battled the Moral Majority long after their supporters had moved on or retired.

Varieties of reactions to gays in an organization within the larger organization

In observing #M1 at a holiday celebration event in Germany hosted by her company, I found out that she worked with many former-military individuals. Nearly all liked her – although one said jokingly that she was a "pain in the A_s when she wanted to be!"

At this gathering, the employees were present with their spouses. #M1 was there with her German wife. One military retiree who had recently joined this company, and wasn't aware of #M1's openness about her partner, had come with his wife. Both were apparently quite religious. This man found #M1 to be shocking in the casual way she displayed no shame about being out-and-about with her "wife" at a company gathering, but he did not dare say anything for fear that others would react negatively to him. He did express his shock. When the researcher approached him about whether he wanted to be interviewed, he said 'No', although he had by then looked loathingly at the two women, and had expressed his feelings by shaking his head, and saying: "Oh my Lord, I just … I just don't know... This is just crazy!" His wife who was deeply catholic, and from South America said "I just cannot believe they are two women married to each other… as if it's nothing. I'm Catholic. In my religion this is sin. No matter what, this is sin."

Several military persons with whom she worked were completely non-plused by the fact that she was a lesbian. Observing the interactions, statements and physical expressions among the coworkers, everyone else who knew and worked with #M1

was very affectionate and kind to her as well as her wife. Once the event got going, the most heated conversation of the evening had to do with the contract that they were competing for against a larger competitor.

The 'Europe Effect'

Queries from principles among these coworkers uncovered that they worked with her, and over time had been transformed by seeing her live her life, do her work, serve her employer and country, and live happily. Two of these men were asked to elaborate further. When asked about the repeal of DADT, they said, 'Yes', it should be repealed, and 'No' they did not want to be interviewed [by this researcher], since to them, it was just a dumb policy – one of many dumb policies that the Department of Defense had come up with over the years. They thought that the time was long past for it to be repealed. When asked if their opinions had been transformed by the day-to-day work with #M1, they said 'No', because they had arrived at the conclusions on their own. One said: "I mean just look at the Europeans… They think we're religious nuts! Not just about gays, but about everything. … I mean, it's sometimes really embarrassing." They said they could not tease-out which influence was the biggest: Europe's ridicule of Americans' silly provientiality toward sex, the openness and acceptance of gays in German society (which convinced them that DADT was a faulty policy), the presence of gays among their European Partner Nations' militaries, or the impact of #M1 (which had subconsciously shown them that the military's behavior toward gays was wrong.) It was noteworthy that they then circled back and agreed that there was nothing better to drive the point home than to actually work with gay persons and observe that they are normal people like anybody else.

Considering the longterm transformation and impact of what happened to #M1, it appeared that her path had yielded many evolutions and transformations in others. Subsequent to the repeal of DADT, I contacted her via phone call, and invited her to offer her thoughts on the matter. She was genuinely happy to have lived long enough to see DADT repealed, although she was still cynical that it wouldn't be overturned somehow. Her concern was that the religious right would somehow undermine it. She advised me – through this research and beyond – against assuming that the old generation of anti-gay folks would cease to cause problems for gay soldiers. She said that even at overseas sites, where the environment may have been lax or more relaxed, hard-nosed military personnel would simply not turn into secular Europeans overnight. She said that she continued to advise gay folks to watch their backs and be careful to hide their orientation for fear of back-stabbing colleagues who might deny them promotions and career opportunities simply because they are gay. She said: "They [i.e. the antigay or homophobic military personnel] may not be so revolted with women, as [much as] with men [who want to kiss other men], but believe-you-me they'll find a way to shut down [their] careers… I just think that this amount of bigotry just doesn't evaporate overnight. … I hope I'm wrong… but I don't think so. Anyway, I tell everybody to just be careful. Best thing is to just lay low, and don't talk about your personal life. … If you flaunt it, they'll find a way to crush you."

In March 2010 interview in Germany, #M1 remembered her own case – leading to her discharge from the Army, subsequent breakdown, and psychological therapy – as

follows:

"What really took the heaviest toll were the weeks and months of investigation, the constant looking-over-your-shoulder,… [and] we thought they did it non-stop [the collecting of evidence about their lives], especially talking to other soldiers [i.e. conducting interviews with their units' soldiers regarding their behavior, personal conduct, comments, statements, demeanor and other items] that could give them [i.e. the military] some smidgen of evidence [of homosexual 'acts']. … We weren't doing anything… Nothing. But boy… they came after us. … And it just destroyed us.… Everybody [in our units] was exhausted [by the process of investigation].… Everyone [contact to help with the investigation] got scared… and so, everybody got hurt. Everyone just stuck to just doing their jobs, … and looking over their shoulders… They showed that if they wanted you [to make an example out of you], they just didn't stop. … It was scary. And it's still scary.… It's still just the same… I've got friends inside [military service branches] and they say it's not like that anymore. But, still they're not 'coming out' even if it [i.e. the repeal of DADT] comes through."

Disclosures between interviewee and interviewer

I never came out to #M1 as straight, gay, or bisexual. I never discussed my own sexuality. When I asked her for her interview, I had already known her for many months, had observed her in a work setting and had already interacted with her for purely professional reasons that had nothing to do with my dissertation work.

When I informed her that I was working with a doctoral mentor, was engaged in a discovery process, and was interested in interviewing her about her life, she readily agreed to talk and be interviewed. We easily morphed from a work-related professional interaction to an academic investigation modality, where I found her to be very forthcoming about her life. Despite the academic nature of our interaction, the interviews felt very organic and comfortable.

She never said to me whether she assumed I must be gay, and she never treated me as if I was straight, or gay or whatever. What she did say was that she had made it her life's mantra that gay people were the same as straight people, and that she was going to treat everyone the same.

Disclosure of childhood abuse

#M1 had been repeatedly abused by her father. Therapy following her discharge from the Army allowed her to delve deeply into this aspect of her childhood, but she did not site it as the cause of her being a lesbian. She did not disclose the details of her father's abuses, but described the origins of her desire to stay away from the U.S. being rooted in those negative experiences.

She wanted to be away; away from the mainland, away from her father, and away from the havoc of her early life. She found such warmth and acceptance in Germany that she never wanted to leave. After her discharge, and much therapy, she said that she came to peace with a lot of those internal struggles. With the passing of her father, and the dwindling of her family's older generation, she now has a stronger desire to stay in contact with her siblings and their families.

Appendix F

Other journal entries and conversations from diary compilations between 2010 – through 2014

2010; Interviewee #A1 was an incomplete conversation since he was called away. Respondent #A1 (interviewee in location #A) interviewed in July 2010 was a 31 year old active duty Air Force junior NCO (Non Commissioned Officer) with 8 years of service, who was in Germany following a tour of duty in Afghanistan.

He said he was strongly opposed to the repeal of DADT, and he emphasized 'strongly'. There was a gay person in his unit and although the man had not told him he was gay, he stated this as a fact, and said that this 'fact' was well-known to others in the unit. I inquired further to make sure the respondent was not in error, or that this was not just gossip about a disliked person, but the soldier assured me that 'down-range' – this term is used to mean battle field, 'Forward Operating Base' (FOB), a site on the front line of confrontation with an enemy – there isn't much privacy, and sooner or later, such secrets are overheard, observed, or somehow discovered, which is what happened in this case in his unit. When asked point blank "Do you know for certain that this someone in your unit is gay", the interviewee said "Yes". When asked directly "Is the status of this person in your unit as being gay well-known to others in your unit?", his answer again was "Yes". When asked "Did this person tell you directly he was gay?", the answer was "No". Respondent #A1 assumed that I understood – as did everyone around him apparently – "Don't Ask" meant do not ask, so they did not ask.

I sat face-to-face listening to the interviewee, and said that I understood the nuance he was talking about, but apparently everyone in the unit "sort'a knew" the man was gay. I asked: 'Did he agree or disagree with allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military'? He answered "I STRONGLY disagree". When asked whether he was personnally comfortable in the presence of this gay person or any gay person? He answered with a long pause, followed by: "I guess.. I'd say, I'm 'Somewhat comfortable'".

Proceeding with the question-set I had prepared, I asked "Are the officers and NCOs in your unit good leaders?" The answer he chose was "Agreed". It suddenly slipped out that the gay person was an officer, and a superior to the respondent. This subordination appeared to be part of the reason he was grudging in agreeing that overall, the officers in his unit were good leaders, just not great ones.

Unhappily, this soldier was called away and the interview was interrupted. The value of this conversation was in shedding light on the repulsion that comes to officers who are presumed to be gay.

My emotional reaction to this interview was that acceptance of gays was a long way off.

2014 notes from entry made in 2011 - Interviewee #G1 – Illustration of the retardation of 'coming out' to oneself

On a trip to the U.S. (a visit to see friends, family, attend some meetings for work and tend to some personal business), I came across a gay former Air Force Major (interviewee #G1) living with his longtime partner near Baltimore. He had been in many of the bases in Germany that I had been in. Additionally, he had been all over Italy and bases in other parts of Europe as well.

In Baltimore, he worked as a contractor for the military, and his partner worked at a university. He had been married (while he was in the military), had an ex-wife, and three grown children, one of whom was in the military herself. I interviewed him 3 times, whenever I was in Baltimore.

He recalled that it took him many years – nearly 16 years – to admit to himself that he was gay.

He thought his 'coming out' to himself took such a very long time because he was in the military, and after all, he could not allow himself to "Find Out" for sure (because of DADT). Besides, he had a wife and three kids. It would not work for him to make the discovery that he was actually gay. It would make his life a farce. He could not face that. He cited that the "Knowing" was so negative for his survival in the Air Force, and the repercussions were so severe that the 'hiding from himself' became both second nature to him, and later one reason he felt suffocated and compelled to leave the Air Force (instead of serving the remaining years until retirement) after his divorce. It wasn't until he was leaving the military that he allowed himself to jump-in and discover the truth about himself.

He talked about being stationed in different towns in Germany and Italy with short stays in other European sites . He mentioned that the European environment was helpful to him to open up to himself. Even though his family lived on base (at whatever home base he was assigned to be), his work would take him away from the home sites. He explained that the distance, the atmosphere, the accepting environment of Europe had been very helpful to him. He felt that in Europe, the shame and stigma that was associated with being gay was so much less, that it emboldened him to take the steps he needed to, in order to face the truth about himself.

"It was scary. I mean, it was really bad back home [i.e. to become cognizant that one was gay]. It still took [me] a couple of decades, but over there [i.e. in Europe], it wasn't so bad. You were a million miles away [from your family], and you could take chances… you could go places [i.e. gay bars, gay establishments you'd otherwise never go to]."

An Air Force Culture Issue?

I asked #G1 whether there was an issue of the culture of the Air Force, since I had come across Air Force people recently in my interviews who were religious and non-accepting of gays. He said "No". It was the same for other services. He actually thought it was worse in the Army. The Army was the most populous service, so it probably had the most number of gays serving, he guessed.

Impromptu conversation #H1 – 2014 (Baltimore-Washington Airport site) – years after the repeal of DADT.

#H1 was a retired Army Colonel. This is what he started with – the repeal of DADT;

"It's lying to the family. When they come in [to the military] they know they're not supposed to [be gay, or bisexual, etc.] They sign the documents. They swear [it is] God's honest truth. Then [presumably, after a while], they want to be gay. They know they're not supposed to. They say 'Oh well [facial grimace; expression indicating guilt, embarrassment, shame], I always felt different.. oh, deep down [expressed with emphasis, as in 'deeeeeeep dowwwwwnnn' with hand gesture embellishment] , I just can't help how I feel [hands with wrists held at right-angles gesturing feelings or emotions mocking sissy gestures].. oh gosh [expressed with emphasis as in 'oooohhhh gawwwsh' with facial grimace indicating mockery or disgust], oh golly..[expressed with emphasis 'oooohhh gawwwwllly']. But they know if they wanna be gay, they have to get out. But they don't [expressed loud as in 'They DON'T']. Why? 'Cause they want benefits [expressed slowly and stretched to convey B-E-N-E-F-I-T-S]. So… They're breaking their oath [i.e. breaking their military oath by not exiting the military]. They're lying to their [military] family. Simple as that."

Self-Observation: duality about the respondent's comments – The grimaces on the man's face broadly expressed his contempt. His expressions when he said 'oooohhhh gawwwsh… oooohhh gawwwwllly' emphasized his disdain for the sissy manners associated with some gays. What I could not know on that morning was whether this angry posture was the broad opinion of his unit, the larger organization, or just him. Sitting in front of this man and listening to him, I felt the same odd sense of dyad, contrast and opposition. This person probably did not feel empathetic to the long process of evolution, maturity and painful self-discovery that gays often went through. He might even be disgusted by that. For example, Air Force Major respondent #G1 had slowly realized he was gay, and when he was sure, he had gotten out. By then he had served his country in full eligibility of military retirement. What did #H1 expect him to do: forgo his benefits? Kill himself so he would not get benefits? Pretend he did not enjoy his military career when he genuinely did? The process of self-discovery is notoriously non-linear and complex. It wasn't as if the memo reached #G1's brain in one instant in time that he was for sure gay and not bisexual. For many in the military, it might indeed have been a long arduous process.

 Also, the outrage about 'lying to the family' used a familiar phrase often heard on the "Pentagon Channel" – TV station in Germany broadcasting Department of Defense television programming to their personnel. In advertisements, and on many announcement on the Pentagon TV Channel, as well as other military venues, there were a lot of mention about the 'military family', the 'warrior family' and other such terminologies. So, when #H1 mentioned this, it seemed that if soldiers were 'straight' they could be part of the 'family', otherwise they somehow betrayed their family. My take-away from this experience was that research needed to determine many more nuances around the organization and its soldiers' perceptions and issues about gays.

Office mate Rob; August 2010;
Quote from office mate "Rob", a retired Army infantry officer (not his real name) in August 2010: "He [Obama] is just paying them [gays, and the gay lobby] back for electing him. Now they're putting the squeeze on [DoD]."