10. WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT UNIT COHESION AND MILITARY PERFORMANCE

OVERVIEW

President Clinton's memorandum of January 29, 1993, directed the Secretary of Defense to draft an Executive order that would end discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in the military "in a manner that is practical, realistic, and consistent with the high standards of combat effectiveness and unit cohesion our Armed Forces must maintain." At present, there is no scientific evidence regarding the effects of acknowledged homosexuals on a unit's cohesion and combat effectiveness. Thus, any attempt to predict the consequences of allowing them to serve in the U.S. military is necessarily speculative.

During the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on the topic in March-June 1993, there was a division of opinion among military social scientists as to the likely effects of lifting the ban. Retired Colonel William Darryl Henderson, (former Commander of the Army Research Institute), Dr. David Marlowe (Chief of Military Psychiatry at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research), and Professor Charles Moskos (Department of Sociology, Northwestern University) predicted that the presence of acknowledged homosexuals would significantly disrupt unit cohesion. Others, including Dr. Lawrence Korb (Brookings Institution), Professor David Segal (Department of Sociology, University of Maryland), and Professor Judith Steihm (Department of Political Science, Florida International University), disagreed.

It is important to recognize at the outset that the military's concern about cohesion and unit functioning is not new. Cohesion is not now--and probably never has been--uniformly high (e.g., Griffith, 1989; Henderson, 1985, 1990; Manning and Ingraham, 1983; Scull, 1990; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a), and the military intervenes whenever a unit becomes

---

1This chapter was prepared by Robert MacCoun. John D. Winkler, Andrew Cornell, and Susan Adler assisted in the background research. Bryan Hallmark, Susan Hosek, and Bruce Orvis provided constructive reviews.

seriously dysfunctional for any reason. Because of this longstanding concern, there is a fairly sizeable research literature on unit cohesion--its nature and its correlates. This chapter provides a critical review of this research literature and its implications for the current policy debate.

Assumptions and Focus of the Chapter

To narrow the focus, the analysis in this chapter is premised upon three assumptions that appear to be widely shared by both sides of the current policy debate:

- There is no scientific evidence, and no compelling reason to believe, that homosexuals are inherently less capable of performing military tasks than are heterosexuals.
- There is considerable evidence that homosexuals already serve in the U.S. military, and always have, albeit most have not openly acknowledged their status, or have acknowledged it only to some colleagues. Thus, concerns about cohesion pertain to acknowledged homosexual status, not sexual orientation per se, and to how an individual’s acknowledged homosexuality would affect the group.
- If allowed to serve, homosexuals in the military would be held to standards of conduct, appearance, demeanor, and performance at least as stringent as the standards for heterosexuals.

Given these assumptions, the central question of the chapter is:

What effect will the presence of acknowledged homosexuals have on the cohesion and performance of a given military unit?

The Literature Review

The literature reviewed in this chapter was identified by an extensive search of the research base, including computerized literature searches in Psychological Abstracts and Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). The review covers almost 50 years of scientific research
published by military, academic, and industrial-organizational researchers, supplemented by conversations with a variety of experts. The research was conducted in a variety of settings and examines a variety of different types of groups: military units, sports teams, industrial work groups, and participants in laboratory experiments. It should be noted that military agencies have funded a large share of the academic laboratory research on small group performance; indeed, much of the academic literature was stimulated by military research questions.

Over 185 research articles and books were consulted, including studies by the Army Research Institute, the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, and other military sources; experimental studies of small group behavior; research on sports teams and industrial-organizational workgroups; and theoretical and empirical analyses of stereotyping, intergroup contact, and attitudes and their relationship to behavior. In addition, many of the nation’s leading experts on these topics were consulted. A complete list of references and interviewees is contained in the Bibliography at the end of this report.

A few caveats regarding relevant research are in order. First, anecdotes and impressionistic statements are a powerful source of hypotheses about unit cohesion, but by themselves they cannot provide scientific evidence as to the validity of those hypotheses (Garvey and DiIulio, 1993). Anecdotal information is difficult to verify, can be distorted by memory loss or other factors, cannot determine cause-and-effect relationships, and may provide an unrepresentative sample of the phenomenon in question (Nisbett and Ross, 1980). In this chapter, anecdotal or impressionistic information is cited only as a source of hypotheses, or as a means of illustrating certain phenomena established by more systematic empirical research.

Second, as in most social research, there tends to be a tradeoff in the cohesion literature between the scientific rigor of a study and its generalizability to combat and other “real-world” settings. Fortunately, there appears to be considerable convergence between the findings of laboratory and field studies on group cohesion and its effects, although known discrepancies are identified in the chapter. However, even the military field studies generally only simulate actual
combat conditions. Thus, existing research on the cohesion-performance relationship is most readily generalizable to noncombat conditions, which characterize the situation of most military units, most of the time. The likely effects of the stresses of combat on cohesion and performance are discussed later in the chapter.

Key Issues in the Review

To address the central question of how the presence of acknowledged homosexuals may affect unit cohesion, the chapter addresses the following concepts and issues:

- The cohesion concept: the ways in which cohesion has been defined and measured, the effects of cohesion on performance and coping under stress, and the factors that promote or hinder cohesion. A key finding from this review is that there are multiple types of cohesion, with different consequences for performance.
- What these principles of unit cohesion imply about the consequences of allowing acknowledged homosexuals to serve in the military. This examination indicates that some types of cohesion are more likely to be affected than others, and this has important implications for military performance.
- The likely prevalence of acknowledged homosexuals in military units. This has important implications for the scale of the phenomenon, the ways in which cohesion might be affected, and the likelihood of contact with acknowledged homosexuals.
- The conditions of intergroup contact that can bring about a reduction in hostility and stereotyping and the extent to which these conditions are likely to be met in the military.
- Factors that may enhance or deter behavioral expressions of negative attitudes.
- Concerns about whether heterosexuals will obey an acknowledged homosexual leader.
UNIT COHESION AND ITS EFFECTS ON PERFORMANCE

What Is Cohesion?³

Some military researchers (e.g., Marlowe, 1979; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a) draw a distinction between horizontal cohesion—the bonding among members of a unit—and vertical cohesion—the bonding between unit members and their leaders. While this distinction is useful, it can become somewhat cumbersome when each type of cohesion is further subdivided. Thus, this chapter will use the term “cohesion” to refer to horizontal cohesion, and the terms “leadership” and “followership” to refer to downward and upward vertical cohesion, respectively.

Defining Cohesion. The most popular definition of group cohesion was offered by Leon Festinger in 1950. Festinger defined cohesion quite broadly as “the resultant of all the forces acting on all the members to remain in the group” (p. 274). Festinger’s definition grew out of his study of the cohesion of voluntarily formed social groups. As a result, it seems overinclusive in the military context, since military personnel have only a limited role in choosing their unit memberships.

Others have defined cohesion more narrowly by emphasizing the quality of the relationships among group members: “…that group property which is inferred from the number and strength of mutual positive attitudes among the members of a group” (Lott and Lott, 1965, p. 259), “…members’ positive valuation of the group and their motivation to continue to belong to it” (Janis, 1983, p. 4), or “…a positive expressive relationship among two or more actors” (Etzioni, 1975, p. 280).

Understandably, military definitions tend to define cohesion in the context of the combat mission; for example:

- “…we define military cohesion as the bonding together of members of a unit or organization in such a way as to sustain

³The terms “cohesion” and “cohesiveness” are used interchangeably in the research literature. Since the former term is more common in military parlance we will use it except when directly quoting authors who use the latter term.
their will and commitment to each other, their unit, and the mission” (Johns et al., 1984, p. ix);

• “...cohesion exists in a unit when the primary day-to-day goals of the individual soldier, of the small group with which he identifies, and of unit leaders, are congruent—with each giving his primary loyalty to the group so that it trains and fights as a unit with all members willing to risk death and achieve a common objective” (Henderson, 1985, p. 4);

• “Unit cohesion [is the] result of controlled, interactive forces that lead to solidarity within military units, directing the soldiers toward common goals with an express commitment to one another and to the unit as a whole” (Dictionary of United States Army Terms, 1986, p. 174, quoted in Oliver, 1990a, p. 4);

• “...cohesion is a unit or group state varying in the extent to which the mechanisms of social control maintain a structured pattern of positive social relationships (bonds) between unit members, individually and collectively, necessary to achieve the unit or group’s purpose” (Siebold and Kelly, 1988a, p. 1).

**Measuring Cohesion.** Many authors have commented on the difficulties of translating definitions of cohesion into scientifically useful measurements (e.g., Beeber and Schmitt, 1986; Carron, 1982; Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley, 1985; Cartwright, 1968; Hogg, 1992; Mudrack, 1989a, 1989b; Oliver, 1990a; Stein, 1976). Although cohesion might seem inherently “intangible,” some investigators have been able to develop measures of cohesion that have adequate reliability—that is, consistency over time and across questionnaire items (e.g., Carron et al., 1985; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a; Yukelson, Weinberg, and Jackson, 1984). A more persistent problem involves the frequent failure to distinguish a variety of concepts that are often listed as aspects of cohesion,⁴ including:

---

⁴In the jargon of psychometrics, this is the problem of construct validity (Campbell and Fiske, 1959; Nunnally, 1978)—do the instruments actually measure the abstract construct we want to measure, no more and
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- morale
- esprit de corps
- motivation
- satisfaction
- mutual friendship, caring, interpersonal attraction
- shared goals, teamwork, coordination
- group pride, group prestige, group status

Some writers use the terms “morale” and “cohesion” interchangeably in the military literature, but others distinguish morale from cohesion in two ways. First, while cohesion is generally viewed as a characteristic of small groups (see Mullen and Copper, 1993; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a), some view morale as a characteristic of individuals as well as groups (e.g., Gal and Manning, 1987; Gross, 1954; Ingraham and Manning, 1981, cited in Bartone, 1989, p. 4). Second, morale is generally viewed as a more general, diffuse, and inclusive concept than cohesion; morale is thought to reflect the general level of motivation and satisfaction among members of a group or organization (Bartone, 1989; Motowidlo and Borman, 1978). Indeed, “morale” is sometimes used as a catch-all term: “Apparently any mental state which bears on a soldier’s performance reflects his morale, anything at all in his environment can affect his morale, and any aspect of his performance indicates quality of his morale” (Motowidlo et al., 1976, p. 49, cited in Gal and Manning, 1987). Although scientific measures of morale have been developed (e.g., Motowidlo and Borman, 1978), it is sometimes no less? It is particularly difficult to establish the construct validity of hypothetical attributes of groups, rather than individuals (see Longley and Pruitt, 1980; Park, 1990). For example, although cohesion is defined as a characteristic of groups, it is frequently measured by averaging together the relationships among individuals. As is shown below, this practice can obscure important differences in the pattern of cohesion, because it does not take into account the variability in ratings across members (Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley, 1985; Cartwright, 1969; Evans and Jarvis, 1980; Oliver, 1990a). On the other hand, some direct measures of the perceived cohesion of the group as a whole—e.g., how well does the group “work together to get the job done?”—inadvertently tap both cohesion and performance, thereby exaggerating their intercorrelation.
difficult to empirically distinguish morale from cohesion (e.g., Gal and Manning, 1987). Another term, “esprit de corps,” is sometimes used synonymously with either morale or cohesion, but cohesion is clearly the preferred term among most military and non-military researchers.

**Social Cohesion vs. Task Cohesion.** As we shall see, using the same term—cohesion—to refer to concepts like “mutual friendship,” “caring,” and “interpersonal attraction,” on the one hand, and “shared goals,” “teamwork,” and “coordination,” on the other, accounts for a great deal of confusion about the effects of cohesion on group performance. In the early years of cohesion research, Festinger (1950), Back (1951) and Gross and Martin (1952) each noted the possibility that there are different types of group cohesion. Although some authors acknowledged this idea throughout the 1960s and 1970s (Davis, 1969; Mikalachki, 1969; Shaw, 1976; Steiner, 1972), most research either focused exclusively on personal attraction (e.g., Lott and Lott, 1965), or else haphazardly mixed measures of different types of cohesion, leaving the literature in a fairly chaotic state (see Cartwright, 1968; Hogg, 1992; Mudrack, 1989a; Shaw, 1976).

This situation began to change in the 1980s, with a renewed recognition of the need to distinguish different types of cohesion. The most common distinction is between two types of cohesion that can be labeled “social cohesion” and “task cohesion” (see Carron, 1982; Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley, 1985; Davis, 1969; Griffith, 1988; Mikalachki, 1969; Mudrack, 1989; Mullen and Copper, 1993; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a, 1988b; Tziner, 1982a, 1982b; Yoest and Tremble, 1985; Yukelson, Weinberg, and Jackson, 1984; Zaccaro and Lowe, 1988; Zaccaro and McCoy, 1988):\(^5\)

\(^5\)Mullen and Copper (1993) use the terms “interpersonal attraction” and “commitment to task.” Siebold and Kelly (1988a) use the terms “affective bonding” and “instrumental bonding.” Tziner (1982) uses the terms “socio-emotional cohesiveness” and “task-oriented (instrumental) cohesiveness.” Yoest and Tremble (1985) use the terms “interpersonal closeness” and “quality of work relationships.” Yukelson, Weinberg, and Jackson (1984) distinguish “attraction to the group” from two aspects of task cohesion: “quality of teamwork” and “unity of purpose.” Zaccaro and Lowe (1988) use the terms “interpersonal cohesiveness” and “task-based cohesiveness.” This proliferation of terms has added to the confusion in the literature; on the other hand, it indicates that
• Social cohesion refers to the nature and quality of the emotional bonds of friendship, liking, caring, and closeness among group members. A group is socially cohesive to the extent that its members like each other, prefer to spend their social time together, enjoy each other’s company, and feel emotionally close to one another.

• Task cohesion refers to the shared commitment among members to achieving a goal that requires the collective efforts of the group. A group with high task cohesion is composed of members who share a common goal and who are motivated to coordinate their efforts as a team to achieve that goal.

This general distinction is supported by both experimental and correlation evidence (Anthony et al., 1993; Back, 1951; Carron et al., 1985; Griffith, 1988; David Marlowe, personal communication, April 6, 1993; Mullen and Copper, 1993; Mullen et al., in press; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a; Yoest and Tremble, 1985; Yukelson, Weinberg, and Jackson, 1984; Zaccaro and Lowe, 1988, Zaccaro and McCoy, 1988). Note that the military definitions listed above tend to emphasize task cohesion.

A number of researchers have distinguished a third type of cohesion, variously called “group pride,” “group prestige,” or “group status” (e.g., Back, 1951; Festinger, 1950; Mullen and Copper, 1993). However, there is relatively little research on this factor, and it appears to involve aspects of both social and task cohesion. For example, Tziner (1982a) suggested that group pride appears to be another manifestation of task cohesion, while Yukelson, Weinberg, and Jackson (1984) found considerable overlap between group pride and social cohesion.

6 In Siebold and Kelly’s (1988b) Platoon Cohesion Index (PCI), affective and instrumental social cohesion loaded on a single factor, but the PCI includes only two items to assess each construct, providing very low resolution. Siebold and Kelly’s (1988a) analysis of their more complete 79-item Combat Platoon Cohesion Questionnaire (CPCQ) found a clear distinction between the affective and instrumental dimensions of horizontal cohesion.

7 Another possibility, suggested by social identity theory, is that group pride is an antecedent of social and task cohesion, rather than a several different research teams have more or less independently recognized the need for this distinction.
What Effect Does Cohesion Have on Unit Performance?

Over the years, many reviewers struggled to make sense of the conflicting results across studies of the cohesion-performance relationship, in part because the relevance of the social-task distinction was not fully appreciated (Carron and Chelladurai, 1981; Greene, 1989; Lott and Lott, 1965; Mudrack, 1989b; Shaw, 1976; Stogdill, 1972). While many studies reported a positive association, others were unable to detect a relationship, and cohesion and performance were even negatively correlated in some studies. Some clarity has been provided by recent applications of meta-analytic methods for statistically aggregating results across independent studies.

Meta-analyses by Oliver (1988, 1990b), Evans and Dion (1991), and Mullen and Copper (1993), using overlapping collections of studies, all indicate that, overall, there appears to be a modest positive relationship between cohesion and performance, although as we shall see, the effect varies with different types of cohesion. Oliver’s (1990b) meta-analysis at the Army Research Institute included 14 field studies of existing working groups; she reported an average correlation\(^8\) of \(0.32\). Evans and Dion’s (1991) meta-analysis included 16 studies, with an average correlation of \(0.36\). The most complete meta-analysis was conducted by Brian Mullen and Carolyn Copper (1993) of Syracuse University, under contract to the Army Research Institute. Mullen and Copper identified 49 studies containing 66 separate estimates of the cohesion-performance link, with an average correlation of \(0.25\).

**Moderating Factors.** The Mullen and Copper meta-analysis provides a detailed examination of a number of variables that appear to moderate the cohesion-performance relationship--that is, the conditions under

---

\(^8\) The most common measure of correlation is the Pearson correlation coefficient, \(r\). A correlation of \(r = +1.00\) indicates a perfect positive relationship between two variables, a correlation of \(r = -1.00\) indicates a perfect negative relationship (i.e., one variable decreases with an increase in the other variable), and a correlation of \(r = 0.00\) indicates the complete absence of a relationship between the two variables. In the behavioral sciences, \(r = 0.10\) is generally considered a “small” correlation, \(r = 0.30\) is considered a “medium” correlation, and \(r = 0.50\) is considered a “large” correlation (Cohen, 1988, pp. 79-80).
which it is stronger or weaker. For example, the association is strongest for sports teams ($r = .54, n = 8$ tests), significantly weaker for military units ($r = .23, n = 10$ tests) and other real work groups ($r = .20, n = 13$ tests), and weakest for artificial groups ($r = .16, n = 12$ tests). The cohesion-performance relationship was not associated with the degree to which the task required high levels of interaction among members; according to the authors, “this argues against the notion that cohesiveness impacts upon performance by enhancing coordination and ‘lubricating’ the group as a social system” (p. 28).

Janis (1983, p. 248) suggested that “the duality of cohesiveness may explain some of the inconsistencies in research results on group effectiveness.” This argument is supported by the Mullen and Copper (1993) meta-analysis. For each correlational study, they coded (with perfect interrater reliability) the proportion of questionnaire items tapping social cohesion (“interpersonal attraction”), task cohesion (“commitment to task”), and group pride. For experimental studies, four judges each rated the manipulations of cohesion with respect to the three types of cohesion. Because these three dimensions of cohesion were correlated, Mullen and Copper (1993) computed residual measures of social cohesion, task cohesion, and group pride, partialling out their shared variance. These analyses indicated that only task cohesion was independently associated with performance; social cohesion and group pride were not correlated with performance after statistically controlling for task cohesion.

Thus, Mullen and Copper’s analysis suggests that it is task cohesion, not social cohesion or group pride, that drives group performance. The association of task cohesion with performance is entirely consistent with the results of hundreds of studies in the industrial-organizational psychology literature on the crucial role of goal setting for productivity (see Locke and Latham, 1990).

**Reciprocal Effects.** Of course, finding a correlation between cohesion and performance need not imply that cohesion causes
performance: It could simply reflect the causal influence of performance on cohesion (Oliver, 1990a). In fact, there is considerable evidence that successful performance is a powerful factor in promoting group cohesion. Military training experts have long utilized this phenomenon by providing opportunities for group success experiences during training exercises. According to Davis (1969, p. 79), “it is often said about real-life groups that there is nothing like success to increase morale or group spirit. A near universal finding is that cohesiveness generally increases with success.”

Using adjusted cross-lagged panel analysis techniques, Mullen and Copper (1993) meta-analyzed data from seven different correlational studies that assessed both cohesion and performance at multiple time periods. The results suggest that “while cohesiveness may indeed lead the group to perform better, the tendency for the group to experience greater cohesiveness after successful performance may be even stronger” (p. 32). This conclusion is bolstered by experimental studies that have increased group cohesion by providing groups with success feedback (see Lott and Lott, 1965, pp. 277-278). Unfortunately, the existing literature does not examine reciprocal effects separately by social vs. task cohesion.

**Deleterious Effects of Cohesion.** Intuition suggests that people who like each other should be able to work together more effectively than people who do not. Thus, the lack of an independent effect of social cohesion in experimental studies, and the negative effect of social cohesion among correlational studies, may seem somewhat counterintuitive. Actually, it has long been recognized that social cohesion has complex and sometimes deleterious effects on various aspects of group performance. Both military (Driskell, Hogan, and Salas, 1987; Kahan et al., 1985; Manning, 1985; Tziner and Vardi, 1982; Wesbrook, 1980) and non-military (Davis, 1969; Janis, 1983; Lott and Lott, 1965; Stogdill, 1972) research reviews have noted this phenomenon. For example, in the military context, Adams (1953; also Roby, cited in Mudrack, 1989b) found no association between a measure of group harmony and performance by bomber crews; Tziner and Vardi (1982) found no association between a measure of social cohesion and the performance
effectiveness of Israeli tank crews;\textsuperscript{10} and McGrath (1962) found zero to negative correlations between measures of the quality of social relationships and the quality of performance in experimentally composed 3-person ROTC rifle teams.

Janis (1983) argued that under some conditions, high social cohesion actually undermines the effectiveness of group decision-making processes, promoting a state of 'groupthink'. According to Janis, the probability of groupthink is stronger "when high cohesiveness is based primarily on the rewards of being in a pleasant 'clubby' atmosphere or of gaining prestige from being a member of an elite group than when it is based primarily on the opportunity to function competently on work tasks with effective co-workers" (p. 247). A recent meta-analysis of nine studies of groupthink (Mullen et al., in press) supported the prediction that social cohesion promotes groupthink; interestingly, task cohesion appeared to prevent it from occurring.

High social cohesion can also result in excessive socializing that interferes with task performance (see review by Lott and Lott, 1965; Zaccaro and Lowe, 1988). Davis (1969, p. 79) noted that the "pleasure from interaction itself, in cohesive groups, sometimes exceeds the task-specific motivation, and greater energy is devoted to interpersonal relations than to overcoming the task obstacles. Hence performance suffers." According to Steiner (1972, p. 126), "people who flock together because they find one another attractive may or may not be inclined to work hard on a joint task. Perhaps they will be content merely to savor the joys of intimate companionship, or be reluctant to mix business with pleasure. Sociability does not necessarily breed productivity."

To argue that high social cohesion sometimes undermines performance should not be taken to imply that low social cohesion is actually desirable; it isn’t. Janis (1983, p. 248) proposes that "for most groups, optimal functioning in decision-making tasks may prove to be at

\textsuperscript{10}Tziner and Vardi (1982) did find an interaction of social cohesion and leadership style on performance, such that relations-oriented leadership enhanced performance in low cohesion groups. See discussion of leadership, below.
a moderate level of cohesiveness” [emphasis added]. The same principle seems likely to be true for other types of tasks.

Several authors have argued that the relationship between cohesion and productivity is moderated by the goal adopted by the group (Bass, 1981; Berkowitz, 1954; Davis, 1969; Greene, 1989; Mudrack, 1989b; Schachter et al., 1951; Shaw, 1976; Stogdill, 1972). According to Shaw (1976, p. 205), “the problem often is that groups do not set the same goals for themselves that outside agencies...set for them. Hence a cohesive group may achieve its own goals, but be relatively unproductive with regard to the goals of the researcher.” Describing one such example, Shaw (1976) noted that “the more cohesive groups set social activity as their goal, and they apparently achieved this goal!” Davis (1969, p. 79) argued that “… [an] increase in cohesiveness results in an increase in pressures to uniformity. If uniformity of response can be achieved more easily on a wrong or low-quality response, overall performance will decline while satisfactory interpersonal relations may be preserved.” According to Bion (quoted in Beeber and Schmitt, 1986), “a highly cohesive group will successfully complete whatever goals are inherent to its culture without regard for the desirability of the goals to the superstructure surrounding the group.” Two early cohesion experiments (Berkowitz, 1954; Schachter et al., 1951) demonstrated this process by experimentally varying groups’ cohesion levels and performance standards; they found a positive cohesion-performance effect when groups operated under high performance standards, but a negative effect when groups operated under low performance standards.

In the field of organizational behavior, a common example of this phenomenon is rate-busting--an agreement among workers, either tacitly or explicitly, to maintain low levels of performance (see Bass, 1981; Janis, 1983; Seashore, 1954; Stogdill, 1972). In the military context, there are many more serious examples involving drug use, insubordination, or mutiny (Ingraham, 1984; Marlowe, personal communication, April 6, 1993; Savage and Gabriel, 1976; Wesbrook, 1980). Ingraham (1984) describes the “anti-Army norm” that was prevalent in barracks life during his research in the 1970s. He suggests that a shared disdain for the organization might have actually bound units
together socially. High cohesion can even create some problems in elite, high-performance units. Manning (1985, p. 15) notes that among the “minuses of unit cohesion” in the U.S. Army’s Special Forces “A-team” is the fact that “the ability of the teams to operate as independent units leads to strong resentment of attempts at control by higher headquarters as well as other failures to recognize them as special.”

Effects of Cohesion on Psychological Coping

According to Marlowe (1979, p. 47), “while cohesion and morale do not correlate with technical performance...they do correlate with military performance in the sense of affectively maintaining the organized group at its tasks even in the face of the severe stresses of battle.” Marlowe’s conclusion about technical performance was perhaps too pessimistic; as we have seen, task cohesion does indeed appear to promote technical performance, although the effect is modest. Marlowe’s assertion of a cohesion-coping association is echoed by many other military scholars (Henderson, 1985; Marshall, 1947; Shils and Janowitz, 1948), although it is often based on battlefield recollections and anecdotes.11

A number of empirical studies (see Griffith, 1989; Manning and Fullerton, 1988; Marlowe, 1979, 1993 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee) report a positive correlation between unit cohesion and psychological coping, although the different types of cohesion have not been distinguished. This correlation has been interpreted as a causal influence of cohesion on coping. Clinical and social psychologists have hypothesized that supportive social relations provide a “buffer” for those coping with traumatic life events (see Marlowe, 1979), although recent research suggests that such effects might be attributable to aspects of social networks other than social support, per se (Coyne and Downey, 1991; House et al., 1988). At present, the

11An anecdote by Kirkland (1987, p. 14) suggests one way in which high cohesion might impair coping; he reports that members of highly cohesive units have asked, “We are so close, if one of us is killed in combat, will the unit fall apart?”
correlation between unit cohesion and coping is open to plausible alternative explanations. Researchers have not established the extent to which the correlation reflects the influence of psychological coping skills on cohesion, or the joint effect on both coping and cohesion of other factors, such as superior logistical support, ideological commitment, or strong unit leadership. One such factor might be stress itself; as we shall see, there is evidence that under some conditions, shared threats promote cohesion. Thus, while it seems quite plausible that cohesion might enhance coping under stress, further research is needed to establish a causal relationship, and to assess which type of cohesion is most relevant.

Other Determinants of Military Performance

Whatever the beneficial effects of cohesion, it is important to bear in mind that even task cohesion generally accounts for only a small portion of the total variance in performance. Moreover, there is only limited empirical research on cohesion and military performance under actual combat conditions (see Garvey and DiIulio, 1993; Sarkesian, 1980). Even if the results of combat exercises generalize to actual combat, it is clear that a variety of non-psychological factors are crucial to battlefield performance, and can be decisive: supplies and logistical support, the quality and quantity of information, the weather, geographical constraints, and pure dumb luck (see Sarkesian, 1980). As Moskos (in Henderson, 1985, p. xv) puts it:

In assessing who wins wars and why, it is easy to overweigh any one factor and neglect others. Broad factors such as objectives and strategies, weapons and materials, technology, numbers of soldiers, and the human element must all be considered in determining who wins and why. ...Single-cause explanations must be avoided: they claim too much for one factor at the expense of others.

Henderson (1985, 1990) and others have spoken eloquently of the crucial role of “the human element” in combat effectiveness, but they clearly recognize that cohesion, while important, is only one aspect of that element. A group’s likelihood of success also hinges on the characteristics of its members--their individual ability levels (e.g.,
Henderson, 1990; Kahan et al., 1985; Shaw, 1976; Steiner, 1972) and individual motivation levels (e.g., Kerr, 1983; Kerr and MacCoun, 1984, 1985b; Locke and Latham, 1990; Sheppard, 1993). And of course, the human element also includes the cohesion, abilities, and motivation of the opponent (Henderson, 1985).

An example of the importance of individual motivation is provided by a recent Army Research Institute study of 22 platoons in two light infantry battalions undergoing training at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) at Fort Chaffee, Arizona (ARI Newsletter, June 1992, Vol. 9, pp. 1-4). Prior to training, the soldiers completed a detailed questionnaire that assessed group factors, including platoon cohesion and pride in the platoon, but also a number of individual factors, including motivation to do well at JRTC, job satisfaction, job motivation, and bonding with leaders. The strongest predictors of JRTC performance, which was assessed by trained observers, were the quality of leadership and three individual-level factors: JRTC motivation, job motivation, and job satisfaction.

WHAT FACTORS INFLUENCE SOCIAL AND TASK COHESION?

Before introducing the issue of homosexuality, it is useful to summarize what is and is not known about the antecedents of cohesion. There is a sizeable research literature on the factors that promote cohesion (see reviews by Berscheid, 1985; Hogg, 1992; Lott and Lott, 1965; Summers et al., 1988). Unfortunately, many of the studies focus exclusively on social cohesion, or else fail to distinguish social from task cohesion, so the antecedents of social cohesion are somewhat better understood than those of task cohesion.

Propinquity and Group Membership

Based on his ethnographic research on Army barracks life, Ingraham (1984, p. 58) argued that “by far the most potent determinant of social choice [of friends] was the company of assignment.” This conclusion is amply supported by the research literature on social relationships. The role of propinquity—the simple fact of spatial and temporal proximity—in forming relationships seems so obvious that it is easy to overlook. In the electronic age, being in the same place at the same time may no
longer be a necessary condition for a relationship to evolve, but it
greatly enhances that probability (Berscheid, 1985; Lott and Lott,
1965). Despite the adage that “familiarity breeds contempt,” controlled
experiments indicate that, everything else being equal, mere exposure to
a person or an object increases liking for that object upon subsequent
contact (Zajonc, 1968; Berscheid, 1985). Of course, in social
encounters, everything else is rarely equal, particularly when the
person in question has disliked attributes. This point will be
discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

Moreover, there is a pervasive tendency to evaluate and treat one’s
own group members more favorably than members of other groups, which
social scientists call the ingroup bias. Many different explanations
for this bias have been offered, invoking historical, economic,
political, and even biological factors (see Austen and Worcher, 1979).
However, even in the absence of these factors, research indicates that
mere group membership—e.g., randomly assigning individuals to ad-hoc
groups—is sufficient to create an ingroup bias (see Brewer, 1979;
Gaertner et al., 1993; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Wilder, 1986).

Thus, the simple fact that individuals are assigned to a unit
together predisposes them to social cohesion, although not necessarily
to task cohesion. The military has long recognized the effect of
salient group membership on bonding among members:

Symbols that indicate common membership in an organization
reinforce shared experiences. Shoulder patches, unit colors,
campaign streamers, review ceremonies, and even informal
symbols such as scarves serve this important function and
should be supported as long as they are used in an appropriate
manner. (Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, Department
of the Army, 1987, p. 64)

Whether members sustain a sense of cohesion will depend on what
happens to them during their time together, as discussed below.

Turnover and Turbulence

In the 1970s, the Army grew increasingly concerned that its
individual replacement system created too much “turbulence” in combat
units, undermining their cohesion (see Henderson, 1985, 1990; Manning,
in Ingraham, 1984; Scull, 1990). In essence, the argument was that unit cohesion was continually disrupted when individuals joined or left the unit in a constant, haphazard fashion. As a response, in 1981 the Army adopted a new Unit Manning System; its key component was called COHORT (Cohesion, Operational Readiness, and Training). In COHORT divisions, first-term soldiers were trained together as a group, and then assigned as a group to infantry, armor, and artillery companies; they were kept together for three-year cycles. Although COHORT stabilized first-termer turbulence, it did not stabilize NCO or officer turbulence, so units often saw several changes in leadership during a 3-year cycle.

Although the COHORT intervention was thought to hold great promise, by 1990 it had largely been abandoned as a failure. There are a number of published analyses of the COHORT experience (Griffith, 1989; Henderson, 1990; Kirkland et al., 1987; Scull, 1990). While there is some evidence that unit-replacement units were indeed more cohesive than individual-replacement units (Griffith, 1989), WRAIR field evaluations conducted in 1985 and 1986 documented a significant drop in both horizontal and vertical cohesion for some COHORT units relative to non-COHORT units (see Henderson, 1990; Scull, 1990). However, COHORT’s unit-replacement system was implemented in tandem with the creation of a new light infantry concept for the 7th Infantry Division, which became a rapid deployment force expected to achieve high combat effectiveness standards with minimal support in terms of equipment and personnel. The decline in vertical and horizontal cohesion in COHORT units was much steeper for light infantry units than for other COHORT units (Henderson, 1990; Scull, 1990). Thus, some of the problems attributed to COHORT may be at least in part attributable to the light infantry program. However, the effect of turbulence on performance in non-COHORT military units may be somewhat weaker than was originally believed (see Dropp, 1989; Eaton and Neff, 1978; Kahan et al., 1985). If so, the expectations for COHORT might have been unrealistically high.

\[\text{12} \] Recall that vertical cohesion refers to the bonding between leaders and their subordinates.
Some believe that COHORT was poorly implemented, plagued by serious leadership problems, and a unit replacement process that proved difficult to administrate. According to Henderson (1990):

A concluding one-sentence summation of the preceding eight chapters could read “The mediocre to average unit performance and the discouragingly low numbers of combat troops that characterize today’s Army are a direct result of deeply rooted organizational inefficiencies that are apparent in the Army’s manpower, personnel, and training (MPT) organization and policies.” (p. 145)

Scull (1990) concludes that:

The idea that stability is the single most important factor in creating a well-bonded unit is suspect. In light of the above discussion, the traditional view persists that cohesion among soldiers remains primarily the by-product of good leadership combined with important, fulfilling work.

**Leadership**

As seen in Scull’s (1990) quote, military analysts have identified the quality of leadership as a key factor in determining whether units are cohesive (e.g., Henderson, 1985, 1990; Kirkland et al., 1987; Manning and Ingraham, 1983; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a, 1988b). This hypothesis is supported by research in non-military organizations as well (e.g., Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1985; Locke and Latham, 1990). Researchers have identified two key dimensions of leadership (see Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1985): Relations-oriented leadership involves active attempts to provide a warm, supportive, caring environment for workers; task-oriented leadership emphasizes the importance of goal achievement and the steps needed to accomplish it. These styles are not mutually exclusive, and good leaders can exhibit either style depending on the circumstances. Both styles of leadership have been shown to promote group cohesion in military and other settings (see Bass, 1981, pp. 379, 433). One might expect relations-oriented leadership to promote social cohesion, and task-oriented leadership to promote task cohesion, but unfortunately, most studies of the leadership-cohesion relationship have
not distinguished the two forms of cohesion, so this hypothesis has not been tested systematically. There is some evidence that leadership styles moderate the effects of cohesion on performance, such that highly relations-oriented leadership promotes high performance in low cohesion groups (Schriesheim, 1980; Tziner and Vardi, 1982; but see Yoest and Tremble, 1985).

Group Size

Group cohesion is inversely related to group size (see reviews by Hogg, 1992; Mullen and Copper, 1993; Siebold and Kelly, 1988a; Steiner, 1972). According to Marlowe, "only 40 to 50 people are in a soldier's universe," roughly his or her platoon, and perhaps a few others from the same company (personal communication, April 6, 1993). Thus, "only teams, squads, platoons, and companies possess cohesion" (Marlowe, 1979, p. 50). Siebold and Kelly (1988a) suggested that the platoon is the optimal size for measuring cohesion. Savage and Gabriel (1976, p. 364) argue that "in conflict, the unit of cohesion tends to be the squad."\(^\text{13}\)

The fact that cohesion declines with group size suggests that larger groups should have weaker cohesion-performance correlations. Mullen and Copper (1993) report that the relationship between cohesion and performance grows weaker as a group's size increases, although the effect was only statistically significant in correlational studies, which have examined a larger range of group sizes.

Success Experiences

In addition to the importance of leadership, what happens to groups during their time together obviously matters a great deal. As reviewed above, there is considerable evidence that successful performance experiences promote cohesion; indeed, the effect of performance on cohesion appears to be stronger than the effect of cohesion on performance (e.g., Bakeman and Helmreich, 1975; Mullen and Copper, 1993; __________ 13 Unit sizes and labels vary within and across the military services. In the U.S. Army, companies vary from 50 to 200 members, platoons range from 15 to 40 members, squads generally have about 10 members, and teams and crews can range from 4 to 9 members. The exact size of a unit will depend on its function (armored, mechanized, airborne, etc.) and whether it is fully manned.
There is direct evidence that success can promote social cohesion (see Lott and Lott, 1965), but there is little direct evidence regarding the effect of performance on task cohesion. Given that the cohesion-performance correlation is largely attributable to task cohesion, it seems likely that success also promotes task cohesion. Success experiences reward the group for teamwork and the coordination of effort.

**Shared Threat**

Dating back at least to the turn of the century (Sumner, 1906), many have hypothesized that external threat promotes group cohesion. Henderson (1990, p. 124) is skeptical of this notion: “It is a great American myth that cohesion will occur the moment we go into battle.” But many studies suggest that indeed, external threats can enhance cohesion, although the effect is by no means universal (see Dion, 1979; Hogg, 1992; Schachter, 1959; Sherif et al., 1961; Stein, 1976).

Figure 10-1 is an attempt to make sense of the conflicting findings regarding threat and cohesion, adapted from a discussion by Stein (1976) with some modifications. The figure depicts a series of moderating conditions that determine what effect threat will have on cohesion. If individuals anticipate a threat, their response will depend on a number of conditions. First, are the individuals mutually threatened? If not, there will be no enhancement of cohesion. If individuals are mutally threatened, their response will depend on whether they perceive the possibility of a collective response that will eliminate the danger. Given a shared threat and an interdependent task with a feasible solution, research demonstrates that both social and task cohesion will be enhanced (see Johnson et al., 1981; Johnson, Johnson, and Maruyama, 1984; Miller and Davidson-Podgorny, 1987; Sherif et al., 1961; Slavin, 1985; Stephan, 1985). However, psychological research demonstrates that

---

14 Under special conditions, groups actually become more cohesive after a failure experience (Davis, 1969; Lott and Lott, 1965; Turner et al., 1984). This only appears to occur when the failure signals an external threat (see below), or when the blame for the failure is shared equally, resulting in cognitive dissonance reduction (Festinger et al., 1956).
anxiety promotes affiliation or social cohesion even when no collective instrumental response is available—a “misery loves company” effect (Schachter, 1959; Berscheid, 1985). But this affiliative effect seems unlikely when threat or scarcity encourages intragroup competition or a conflict between personal and group interests (Hamblin, cited in Stein, 1976).

Figure 10-1—Effects of External Threats on Social and Task Cohesion

Stein argues that threat will promote cohesion only where some cohesion (task or social) already exists—in pre-existing groups. But while the pre-existence of a group undoubtedly enhances the promotion of cohesion, Stein’s own review and other sources (e.g., Miller and Brewer, 1984; Miller and Davidson-Podgorny, 1987; Stephan, 1985; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Wesbrook, 1980) indicate that it is not a necessary condition, everything else being equal, it appears that strangers can develop social and task cohesion amidst conflict when the conditions in Figure 10-1 are met. Moreover, Sherif’s classic studies (Sherif et al., 1961) demonstrated that in the face of a superordinate threat and goal, even hostile groups can merge together to form a cohesive whole.
This social cohesion may sometimes be temporary. Moskos (quoted in Marlowe, 1979; cf. Williams, 1989) has suggested that earlier scholars failed to appreciate the extent to which the bonding in combat situations is "instrumental and self-serving," a temporary and situational adaptation to danger. He writes that "in most cases, nothing more is heard from a soldier after he leaves the unit. Once a soldier’s personal situation undergoes a dramatic change—going home—he makes little or no effort to keep in contact with his old squad. Perhaps even more revealing, those still in the combat area seldom attempt to initiate mail contact with a former squad member. The rupture of communication is mutual despite protestations of lifelong friendship during the shared combat period." Thus much of what appears to be social cohesion on the battlefield may have more to do with task cohesion and/or tacit psychological contracts—"I’ll cover you if you’ll cover me—than with the intrinsic likeability of one’s comrades. This point will be addressed in more detail later in the chapter.

**Similarity/Homogeneity**

The conventional wisdom tells us that "birds of a feather flock together," but also that "opposites attract." Which is more accurate? The evidence clearly supports the former over the latter; there is well-established positive association between interpersonal liking and similarity with respect to attitudes, interests, and values (Lott and Lott, 1965; Berscheid, 1985). A meta-analysis of 17 studies comprising 25 separate estimates (Anthony et al., 1993) yielded an average similarity-cohesion correlation of .24. However, the effect appears to be significantly weaker in enduring groups—e.g., military units, sports teams, work groups—than in temporary, artificially-created laboratory groups. The size of the similarity-cohesion correlation decreases with group size, and with the percentage of males to females in the group. The similarity-cohesion effect is largely due to social cohesion in artificial groups, but similarity was actually inversely related to social cohesion—albeit weakly—in the studies of real groups in the Alexander et al. analysis, for reasons that are not clear. In an important observation, Alexander et al. report that similarity of
attitudes and values appears unrelated to task cohesion in either type of group.\textsuperscript{15}

Thus, similarity does not appear to influence task cohesion, the type of cohesion that influences group performance. This is consistent with the research on the effects of group homogeneity on productivity (Kahan et al., 1985; Steiner, 1972; Shaw, 1976). On one hand, heterogeneity can breed social tension, and due to its effects on social cohesion, homogeneity “sometimes has adverse effects on task motivation, particularly when work activities are extended over long periods of time” (Steiner, 1972, p. 127). On the other hand, heterogeneity can enhance the quality of group problem-solving and decision-making (Hoffman and Maier, 1967; Janis, 1983), and it broadens the group’s collective array of skills and knowledge. Because of these conflicting tendencies, heterogeneity has no net effect on performance.

HOW WOULD ALLOWING ACKNOWLEDGED HOMOSEXUALS TO SERVE AFFECT COHESION AND PERFORMANCE?

As we have documented in the chapter on military opinion, negative attitudes toward homosexuality and homosexuals are quite prevalent among current military personnel, particularly among males. This understandably raises concerns about how the presence of acknowledged homosexuals would affect unit cohesion and performance. However, it should be reiterated that no systematic empirical research has been conducted on the effect of acknowledged homosexuals on unit cohesion or unit performance. Thus, the analysis in this section is necessarily speculative. Five questions are addressed:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Will many units have acknowledged homosexuals as members?
  \item How might the presence of an acknowledged homosexual influence task and social cohesion?
  \item Will contact with acknowledged homosexuals influence attitudes toward homosexuality?
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{15}Of course, task cohesion is directly determined by similarity of a different sort: sharing a commitment to the group’s goals and objectives.
Will negative attitudes toward homosexuality be expressed behaviorally?
Will heterosexuals obey an acknowledged homosexual leader?

Will Many Units Have Acknowledged Homosexuals as Members?
In evaluating concerns about unit cohesion, it would be useful to know what percentage of units of a given size will actually have an acknowledged homosexual. This question cannot be answered with scientific precision. Relevant data are scarce and there are many unknowns. For example, the prevalence of homosexuality in the population at large is still very much in dispute. There is little reliable information on whether the prevalence of homosexuality in the military differs appreciably—in either direction—from the population at large.

The scientific literature on prevalence estimation for homosexuality in the general population is reviewed in “Sexual Orientation, Sexual Behavior, and the Epidemiology of Sexually Transmitted Diseases” (to be published). Suffice it to say here that almost all experts agree that the prevalence of homosexual behavior in the adult population falls somewhere in the 1 percent to 10 percent range (Rogers and Turner, 1991). However, it appears that many of those who engage in homosexual behavior also engage in heterosexual behavior, and may not consider themselves to be homosexual; if so, the prevalence of individuals with a homosexual self-identity—whether overt or covert—is probably nearer to the low end than the high end of that range. Little is known about the prevalence of homosexual self-identity among military personnel (see Harry, 1984).

How might ending discrimination based on sexual orientation affect the prevalence of homosexuality in the military? It is conceivable that this prevalence might increase somewhat, but it seems implausible that it would significantly exceed the prevalence of homosexuality in the general population, particularly given the current level of hostility
toward homosexuality expressed by many military personnel.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, the prevalence of a homosexual orientation among U.S. military personnel seems likely to fall somewhere in the 1 percent to 5 percent range. Homosexuals are and will probably remain a much smaller statistical minority than most ethnic and racial minorities in the military.

However, as noted in the chapter opening, many of the concerns raised in the policy debate involve not the prevalence of homosexuality in the U.S. military, but the prevalence of individuals who openly acknowledge a homosexual orientation. In reality, the “openness” of one’s sexual orientation is not a dichotomous variable but a continuous variable. Thus, some homosexuals might be open only to close friends. Such situations are less germane to the concerns raised by supporters of the ban. For them, an operational definition of “openness” would seem to be “acknowledged by the individual, known by a majority of the individual’s colleagues and by supervisors.”

Given this definition, it is useful to examine the experiences of domestic paramilitary institutions that have adopted non-discrimination policies, reviewed in the chapter on U.S. police and fire departments. As stated in that chapter, these institutions differ from the military in many ways, and are by no means completely analogous. As seen in Table 10-1, the institutions we visited report that between 0 percent and 0.51 percent of their total membership consist of acknowledged homosexuals, with a mean prevalence of 0.12 percent, a median prevalence of 0.03 percent, and an upper quartile of 0.19 percent.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, the experiences of these institutions suggest that acknowledged homosexuals are likely to be quite rare in the military, at least in the foreseeable future. This has several implications. First, recall that group

\textsuperscript{16}This is an aggregate statement; even if lesbians are overrepresented (Harry, 1984), males constitute about 90 percent of the active forces.

\textsuperscript{17}With the exception of the Houston Police Department and the Los Angeles Fire Department, these statistics were obtained in interviews with representatives of the institutions and were verified when possible by homosexual members of the institutions (some of whom were unacknowledged). The numbers were sufficiently small that respondents could often list the individuals by name.
Table 10-1
Estimated Prevalence of Acknowledged Homosexuals in Domestic Paramilitary Institutions Visited by RAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy Changed</th>
<th>Total Force Size</th>
<th>Number of Acknowledged Homosexuals</th>
<th>Prevalence of Acknowledged Homosexuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,000 approx. 100</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>975</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 0.12%
Median 0.03%

See the chapter on racial integration for the history of relevant policies in Houston.

Acknowledged homosexual officers are actively recruited for community policing in heavily homosexual neighborhoods.

We were unable to get a precise count of acknowledged homosexuals.

We were told there was an acknowledged homosexual in the Seattle Police Department, but after our visit, the Seattle Times reported his resignation ("Gay Officer Quits, Cites Harassment," Kate Shatzkin, May 30, 1993, p. A1).

The only acknowledged homosexual firefighters in the cities we visited were lesbians.

Cohesion is mostly relevant at the level of platoons (16-40 members) and smaller units, like five-person teams or crews. It appears that relatively few of these units will actually have one or more acknowledged homosexuals, and units with two or more acknowledged homosexuals will be quite rare, at least in the foreseeable future.18

18For example, if the prevalence of open homosexuals in the military were to match the mean prevalence in the domestic institutions we studied, then given random distribution across units, fewer than 5 percent of 40-person platoons and fewer than 1 percent of 5-person crews and teams would be expected to have an open homosexual; just a small fraction of a percent of platoons would have two or more open homosexuals. If homosexuals are clustered rather than randomly
This will limit the aggregate effects on unit cohesion, although the potential impact on any given unit must be taken seriously. A second implication is that acknowledged homosexuals may be somewhat isolated, creating a potential for ostracism. A third implication is that most heterosexuals in the military will have relatively little contact with acknowledged homosexuals. These implications are addressed in more detail in subsequent sections.

Why have paramilitary institutions encountered so few acknowledged homosexuals among their ranks, despite the adoption of explicit non-discrimination policies? As in the military, many individuals in these organizations hold negative attitudes toward homosexuality. “Coming out,” even in an officially non-discriminatory atmosphere, is a risky choice; homosexuals can face hostility from some colleagues, unequal treatment from some supervisors, and even the possibility of physical violence.\(^{19}\) In the military focus groups discussed in the chapter on military opinion, both homosexual and heterosexual military personnel predicted that few homosexuals would come out; two comments from heterosexuals were:

Those that are gay and have served have accepted [military] values. They know that if they come out it would cause problems.

It’s not going to be a mass of people coming out of the closet. It’s not going to happen.

There was also general agreement on this point at the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearings (March 31, 1993).

It would appear that homosexuals are generally unwilling to acknowledge their sexual orientation unless the local climate appears to be tolerant. As an environment becomes more tolerant, homosexuals may become more willing to disclose their orientation, but that same level distributed, for any given aggregate prevalence rate, even fewer units will have an open homosexual.

\(^{19}\)One might argue that a homosexual individual is more likely to come out in an environment where there is already an open homosexual individual. However, this possibility is constrained by the facts that (1) the prevalence of homosexuals is already low, and (2) the high frequency of turnover and transfers mean that homosexuals cannot count on locally favorable conditions to last.
of tolerance suggests that their openness will pose less of a threat to the quality of working relationships.

How Might the Presence of Acknowledged Homosexuals Influence Cohesion?

Although there is no direct scientific evidence about the effects of acknowledged homosexuals on unit cohesion the established principles of cohesion suggest that if there is an effect, it is most likely to involve social cohesion rather than task cohesion. As explained above, similarity of social attitudes and beliefs is not associated with task cohesion, although it is sometimes associated with social cohesion. Task cohesion involves similarity, but of a different sort; it is found when individuals share a commitment to the group’s purpose and objectives. There seems little reason to expect acknowledged homosexuality to influence this commitment, at least not directly. The values of homosexuals in the military have not been systematically compared to those of heterosexual personnel. However, historical anecdotes and RAND’s interviews suggest that homosexuals who serve in the military are committed to the military’s core values, which Henderson (1990, p. 108) lists as “fighting skill, professional teamwork, physical stamina, self-discipline, duty (selfless service), and loyalty to unit.” This notion was accepted by most witnesses during the recent Senate hearings, and it seems likely, since homosexuals in the military are a self-selected group who enter despite numerous obstacles and personal and professional risks.

Thus, if the presence of acknowledged homosexuals has an effect, it is most likely to be on social cohesion. Recall that social cohesion involves the emotional bonds of friendship, liking, caring, and closeness among group members. As documented in the chapter on military opinion, many military members express negative attitudes toward homosexuality, and it is likely that many will continue to do so, at least in the immediate future. Thus, if a unit had one or more acknowledged homosexuals, and one or more heterosexuals who disliked homosexuality, a reduction in social cohesion would be likely.

As we have seen, it is task cohesion rather than social cohesion that has a direct influence on performance. This suggests that it is
not always necessary for co-workers to like each other, or desire to socialize together, to perform effectively as a team; indeed Steiner (1972) notes that "...it is apparent that people sometimes prefer to work with nonfriends" (p. 127). According to Steiner (1972, p. 161):

Work groups sometimes persist in the face of adversity even though members have little affection for one another, and industrial psychologists often obtain low or even zero correlations between inter-member esteem and measures of the success with which groups cope with their environments.

There are many examples of this phenomenon in the sports literature; notorious examples include the 1973-1975 Oakland A’s and the 1977-1978 New York Yankees. Aronson (1976, p. 193) describes how black and white coal miners in West Virginia "developed a pattern of living that consisted of total and complete integration while they were under the ground, and total and complete segregation while they were above the ground." Many military observers (e.g., Ingraham, 1984) have noted a similar tendency of black and white soldiers to socialize separately, despite working together effectively. In one of our focus groups, we were told:

It’s all about respect. When you develop a team, they develop a respect that transcends race. Team members look beyond race. Utopia is team work. Once you get out of that, it breaks down back at the garrison when they’re not at work.

However, there may be conditions under which a reduction in social cohesion brings about a reduction in task cohesion. There appear to be few invariants in the research literature on small group performance; factors that have one effect under certain task conditions can have a very different effect under others (McGrath, 1984). For certain types of tasks, some minimal level of social cohesion might be necessary for the group to accomplish its task (Driskell et al., 1987; Janis, 1983; Zaccaro and McCoy, 1988). One might expect this to be less of a concern in additive tasks—where the group’s performance is the sum of individual performances, and more of a concern in disjunctive and conjunctive tasks—where the group’s performance is determined by the
most able member or the “weakest link,” respectively (Kerr, 1983; Kerr and MacCoun, 1985b; Steiner, 1972; Zaccaro and Lowe, 1988; Zaccaro and McCoy, 1988). However, Mullen and Copper’s (1993) meta-analysis did not support this prediction; they found no differences in the strength of the cohesion-performance effect for tasks with high vs. low interactive requirements. But one can imagine circumstances in which a group has so little social cohesion that task performance becomes impossible, with potentially disastrous consequences for the group.

Thus, much may depend on how social cohesion is affected. Figure 10-2 presents four qualitative types of social cohesion in a five-person crew or team, where individual E has revealed his or her homosexual orientation. Social cohesion involves the pairwise bonds among these individuals. Strictly speaking, there should be two directional bonds for each pair of individuals, but the figure depicts only one, for simplicity. Similarly, in reality, these bonds vary continuously in strength, but Figure 10-2 treats them dichotomously for simplicity. It assumes that if either individual rejects the other, the pairwise bond is broken; this is a pessimistic assumption that provides an upper bound on the loss of cohesion. Under these assumptions, Figure 10-2a depicts a group in which social cohesion has not been disrupted. Figure 10-2b depicts the “complete breakdown” of social cohesion—a state of anarchy. A less extreme version would depict a significant weakening in each bond. In either case, this would imply that E’s acknowledgment of homosexuality would actually affect the bonds of friendship among heterosexuals in the unit; e.g., A would like C less because E is a homosexual. Again, we have no direct evidence, but this scenario seems unlikely in most instances.

Figure 10-2c seems somewhat more plausible. In this scenario, the crew is split into factions; members A, B, and C are hostile to the homosexual, while D befriends the homosexual. This is conceivable,

---

20 Task cohesion and group pride would be depicted differently, with group members bonded to each other indirectly through a common node depicting “group goals” or “group identity,” respectively.

21 This is the situation discussed by General H. Norman Schwarzkopf during his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 11, 1993. General Schwarzkopf noted that, “the introduction of an open
but only if D is willing to sacrifice his relationships with the others in the process. D may be more likely to weaken his bonds with everyone rather than take sides with E alone. Of course, D may also be a homosexual; statistically this will be quite rare in five-person crews, but it may happen.

homosexual into a small unit immediately polarizes that unit and destroys the very bond that is so important for the unit’s survival in time of war. For what ever reason, the organization is divided into a majority who oppose, a small minority who approve, and other groups who either do not care or just wish the problem would go away.”
If there is any breakdown in social cohesion, Figure 10-2d would appear to be more likely than 2b or 2c. This is the case of complete or partial ostracism. Social psychological research (Levine, 1989; Schachter, 1951) indicates that opinion deviates in small groups initially receive intense attention as the group attempts to pressure the individual to conform to the group. That research may not be directly applicable; it involved individuals expressing views directly in opposition to the majority view on a group-judgment task, whereas homosexuals deviate from the majority’s sexual orientation rather than the group’s views regarding task accomplishment. Nevertheless, the individual’s sexual orientation may create fears of “stigma by association”—a concern that the group’s reputation will be tarnished (Mackie and Goethals, 1987; Sigelman et al., 1991). Thus, the group is likely to put intense pressure on the homosexual individual to conform to other group norms—conduct, appearance, performance, values, opinions, and attitudes. Statistically small minorities—in particular, lone minorities—have disproportionately little ability to resist social influence (e.g., Kerr and MacCoun, 1985a; Latané and Wolf, 1981; Mullen, 1983; Tanford and Penrod, 1984). When the relevant unit shifts from the five-person crew to the 40-person platoon or 200-plus company, the majority pressures may be even greater.

If the group fails, they may react by partially or completely ostracizing the individual. Because ostracism provides the others with a common enemy, the strengths of the bonds among the heterosexuals might

---

22 David Marlowe also predicted that ostracism was the most likely scenario during his conversation with us on April 6, 1993. Similarly, in our discussions with the Head of the Department of Mental Health of the Israel Defense Forces (May 4, 1993) this point was also noted: "Homosexuals can become scapegoats if their manifestations of homosexual behavior cause them to be rejected or ostracized from the group. This is not just because of homosexuality, but for any social adjustment problem or personality problem which do not allow him to adapt to the group. ... (However), if there were no disfunctionality in the unit, he (the homosexual) would not currently be removed from the unit."

23 As discussed earlier, these same conformity pressures are likely to keep most homosexuals "in the closet," at least within the group.

24 However, majority influence will reach an asymptote due to diminishing marginal social influence, and possibly, social or physical distance (Latané and Wolf, 1981; Tanford and Penrod, 1984).
actually increase; in a large enough group, the result might be a net increase in social cohesion for the group as a whole.\textsuperscript{25} That is not to suggest that ostracism is in any way an acceptable state of affairs. Ostracism has a cruel and potentially dangerous effect on the ostracized individual, and it can seriously hinder the unit’s performance if ostracism is maintained at the expense of the unit’s mission. Thus, ostracism cannot be tolerated. When cases do occur—as sometimes happens today for reasons other than sexual orientation—the military actively intervenes through informal conflict resolution, or if necessary, reassignment or disciplinary action.

The likelihood of complete ostracism will depend on what actually happens during contact between heterosexuals and acknowledged homosexuals. The effect on performance will depend on whether the individuals refuse to cooperate with each other to accomplish the group’s mission. These issues are addressed in the next two sections.

**Will Contact with Acknowledged Homosexuals Influence Attitudes?**

As discussed earlier, everything else being equal, the mere fact of propinquity and group membership predisposes members to social cohesion. However, everything else is not equal if one member is an acknowledged homosexual and the others have hostile attitudes toward homosexuality. This creates the possibility of divisiveness in the group—an “Us vs. Them” phenomenon.

Research on social categorization processes (e.g., Brewer, 1979; Gaertner et al., 1993; Messick and Mackie, 1989; Ostrom and Sedikides, 1992; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Wilder, 1986) suggests that whenever there are salient boundaries between social groups, three effects generally occur. First, there is the in
group bias described above: people evaluate their own group members more favorably, simply because they are ingroup members. Second, there is a between-group contrast effect, such that individuals exaggerate the extent to which members of the ingroup differ from members of the outgroup. Third, there is an

\textsuperscript{25}This underscores the point made in footnote 4 that averaging across individual ratings of other members can obscure important qualitative differences in patterns of cohesion.
outgroup homogeneity effect, such that individuals exaggerate the extent to which members of the outgroup “are all alike.”

The ingroup bias effect is a pro-ingroup effect, but not necessarily an anti-outgroup effect (Brewer, 1979); in other words, it reflects special favorability toward fellow ingroup members, not special hostility toward the outgroup. Thus, the mere fact that group boundaries exist appears to be necessary, but not sufficient, for hostility toward outgroups (Struch and Schwartz, 1989). Other factors account for the level of hostility in attitudes toward homosexuality. As reviewed in the chapter on public opinion, and elsewhere (e.g., Britton, 1990; Herek, 1991, 1992), attitudes toward homosexuality are complex. They can have several different origins, including one’s socialization, religious beliefs, conformity to a peer group, and media influences. And they can serve several different psychological functions: the evaluative function of summarizing one’s experiences and expectations, the conformist function of emphasizing one’s unity with other heterosexuals, the value-expressive function of broadcasting one’s own values or identity, or the defensive function of reducing anxiety about one’s own sexuality.

The salience of group boundaries is very fluid. Each of us belongs to many different social categories—our gender, our race, our age group, our nationality and region, our religion, our profession, our political party, and so on. Psychologists have demonstrated at least three ways to disrupt the potentially divisive influence of salient intergroup boundaries (see Fiske and Neuberg, 1990; Gaertner et al., 1989, 1990, 1993; Hewstone, Islam, and Judd, 1993; Miller and Brewer, 1984; Wilder, 1986). The first approach is decategorization: break down the ingroup-outgroup boundary by emphasizing the many features that differentiate members of the same groups; e.g., the fact that all homosexuals are not alike. The second approach is cross-categorization: emphasize the many ways in which individuals who differ on one dimension—e.g., sexual orientation—share memberships on other dimensions—e.g., you and I like sports but he doesn’t, but he and I like rock music and you don’t. The third approach is recategorization:
emphasize a common superordinate identity that unites all the individuals--e.g., we are all Rangers.

Decategorization can be effective because between-group contrast and outgroup homogeneity are generally sustained by a lack of information about the diversity of characteristics in the outgroup (Fiske and Neuberg, 1990; Miller and Brewer, 1984; Stephan, 1985). In the case of homosexuality, this is enhanced by stereotyped media portrayals that give the impression that all homosexuals are flamboyant, effeminate, promiscuous, or abrasive. Thus, actual contact with homosexuals--or any outgroup--holds the potential for weakening stereotypes and thereby reducing intergroup hostilities.

Does contact with homosexuals enhance the favorability of attitudes toward homosexuality? Sometimes, but not always. There is fairly limited research on this question. There is evidence (see the chapters on public and military opinion; Whitley, 1990) that those who know homosexuals have less negative attitudes towards homosexuals. This may be an indication that positive interactions with homosexuals break down stereotypes. But it also seems likely that homosexuals are more likely to acknowledge their sexual orientation to those with more favorable attitudes.

Research on the effects of intergroup contact indicates that mere contact, per se, is often insufficient to improve intergroup relations. According to Allport (1954, p. 281):

"Prejudice...may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports...and if it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups."

There is now a large body of research supporting Allport’s analysis of the conditions under which intergroup contact brings about a reduction in hostilities (e.g., Miller and Brewer, 1984; Stephan, 1985, 1987). For example, there is considerable evidence that cooperative learning interventions can bring about a reduction in interracial hostilities; these interventions assign students to mixed-racial or
ethnic groups that must pursue common goals which can only be achieved through cooperative efforts (Johnson and Johnson, 1989; Miller and Davidson-Podgorny, 1987; Slavin, 1985).

Some of the conditions that promote harmonious intergroup contact may be difficult to achieve. Research indicates that contact is more likely to be effective when interaction takes place among a mix of equal numbers of members of each social group (e.g., Miller and Davidson-Podgorny, 1987). In initial encounters with members of an outgroup, our tendency is to assimilate them into our stereotype unless their behavior is greatly discrepant from our expectations (see Fiske and Neuberg, 1990). It generally takes extensive exposure to a diversity of members of the outgroup before assimilation becomes impossible and our stereotypes begin to break down (see Jones et al., 1984, pp. 315-318). But the very low prevalence of acknowledged homosexuality will limit this possibility. Because open homosexuals will be relatively rare, it may be difficult for many heterosexuals to achieve a “critical mass” of intergroup contact. Moreover, minority solo status in a group tends to heighten the salience of the intergroup boundary (Taylor and Fiske, 1978). Thus, some conditions may promote a perpetuation of stereotypes.

But other conditions for effective intergroup contact are naturally met in the military context. Although decategorization might be difficult to achieve, the military actively encourages recategorization. The military naturally strives to diminish the salience of individuating characteristics and enhance the salience of the superordinate group identity. As David Marlowe put it in his testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee (March 31, 1993):

If the individual insists upon being treated first and foremost in terms of a different primary identity, as happened in Vietnam in terms of drug-using, as has happened in any number of cases, then I think we have a problem.

The military goes to great lengths to remind unit members of their superordinate identities: American, Service Member, Unit Member. This is emphasized and reemphasized throughout the military socialization process, and it is reinforced by the use of uniforms and insignia. The
superordinate identity is even more salient when units are stationed abroad. The military also strives to decouple social status—based on race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic factors—from military status; e.g., through the use of standardized aptitude testing and rigorous performance criteria.

According to Hollander (1958, 1985), group members must first earn idiosyncracy credits in the eyes of their colleagues before the group will tolerate innovations or deviations from group norms or culture. To earn these credits, members must first (1) demonstrate their competence in pursuing the group’s tasks, and (2) demonstrate their loyalty to the group and its culture—i.e., their allegiance to the group’s superordinate identity. Interestingly, research on social stigmas (Goffman, 1963; Jones et al., 1984; Luhtanen, 1993) indicates that many stigmatized individuals intuitively understand these principles. In order to normalize their relations with non-stigmatized others, they often feel compelled to go to great lengths to establish competence and loyalty “above and beyond.” “Invisible” stigmas like homosexuality provide an advantage in this regard; invisibly stigmatized individuals can establish their competence and loyalty before revealing the stigma.

The sense of superordinate identity is particulary salient in combat settings, where there is a bright psychological line dividing the unit from the enemy. As discussed earlier, the presence of a shared threat and a common enemy enhances task and social cohesion. Thus, when members of a military group belong to different social groups, combat conditions can reduce intragroup tensions.26 Brophy (1945-1946) provided early evidence for this hypothesis in his study of white seamen during the Second World War. He found that prejudice against blacks was inversely associated with the number of voyages taken with blacks, and that “...those who have not been under enemy fire are significantly more prejudiced than those who have been subjected to enemy action” (p. 461). He concluded that “it would appear that many of our respondents could not afford the luxury of an anti-Negro prejudice while at sea” (p. 466).

26As depicted in Figure 10-1, the exception is when individual and group interests conflict, as when group members compete with each other for scarce resources.
A key factor in effective intergroup contact is institutional support, communicated by leaders at all levels (Allport, 1954; Stephan, 1985). This is within the military’s control, and is promoted by the military’s clear chains of command. Allport’s analysis of desegregation experiences suggests that military leadership must demonstrate through their words and their actions that intolerant behaviors are categorically unacceptable (also see the chapter on organizational change). Chapter 4 suggests that the integration of blacks into the military was greatly facilitated once military leaders aggressively implemented the policy change.

**Will Negative Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Be Expressed Behaviorally?**

The widespread expression of negative attitudes toward homosexuality among heterosexual military personnel has raised concerns about how they will behave if they find themselves working with an acknowledged homosexual. Thus, there are predictions of soldiers refusing to work, bunk, or shower with homosexuals, and of widespread outbreaks of violence against homosexuals. But there is little reason to believe that negative attitudes toward homosexuality are automatically translated into destructive behaviors (see the chapters on domestic police and fire departments and on foreign military experiences). The effect of attitudes toward social groups on behavior is known to be indirect, complex, and for most people, fairly weak (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Campbell, 1963; Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; LaPiere, 1934; Stephan, 1985; Wicker, 1969).27

For many years, researchers simply assumed that social attitudes were a major determinant of behavior. An early indication that this might not be the case was provided by LaPiere (1934). LaPiere traveled across the United States with a Chinese couple, and found that of approximately 250 hotels and restaurants, only one refused to serve the couple. LaPiere then informally surveyed the proprietors of these institutions to ask if their establishments accepted members of the

---

27 This also implies that people who express positive attitudes toward a social group might behave more negatively; see Devine et al. (1991).
Chinese race; out of the 128 replies he received, over 90 percent said that they did not. Stephan (1985, p. 627) cites several replications of this finding involving discrepancies between anti-black prejudice and behaviors toward blacks. In light of these and other findings, Wicker (1969) argued that attitudes have little or no association with behavior; across his review of over 40 studies, the attitude-behavior correlation was generally in the 0.10-0.20 range, and rarely greater than 0.30.

Since Wicker’s study (1969), there has been considerable research on ways in which attitudes actually do influence behavior (see Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Figure 10-3 summarizes some of the key findings of this literature; it is adapted from Ajzen and Fishbein’s (1980) theory of reasoned action and Ajzen’s (1991) theory of planned behavior, with modifications suggested by others (e.g., Cialdini et al., 1991; Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Triandis, 1977). According to a recent chapter in The Annual Review of Psychology (Olson and Zanna, 1993, p. 131), this general approach “remains the dominant theoretical framework in the attitude-behavior literature”; it has received enormous empirical support (see Eagley and Chaiken, 1993), and it plays a central role in applied psychology, consumer research, and organizational behavior.

Figure 10-3 illustrates a number of important points about the relationship between attitudes toward subjects—in this case, attitudes toward homosexuals—and behavior. First, the relationship between attitudes toward subjects or objects and actual behaviors is quite indirect. A negative attitude toward homosexuality will only influence behavior via its influence on attitudes toward acts; i.e., the attitude toward working with this homosexual, the attitude toward sleeping in the same barracks or tent as this homosexual, the attitude toward showering in the same room as this homosexual, and the attitudes toward verbally or physically harassing this homosexual. Moreover, attitudes toward homosexuality are only partial determinants of attitudes toward these acts; the latter are also determined by their perceived consequences. For example, the attitude toward refusing to work with a homosexual is likely to be influenced by the perceived benefits of that action (I’ll
avoid having to be around someone I don’t like; others will know that I’m not homosexual; etc.), but also the perceived costs (we won’t get the job done; I’ll interfere with the unit’s mission; I may end up in an unpleasant confrontation with the homosexual person; I may have to endure disciplinary actions by my superiors). As one soldier said in a focus group, “if you can’t get your job done, you’ll be in trouble. If you can’t work with people, you’ll be in trouble.”

Moreover, the attitude toward the act is itself only indirectly related to behavior through its influence on the intention to engage in the act. Intentions are influenced by attitudes, but intentions have other important determinants. For example, our intentions to engage in a behavior are heavily influenced by our perceptions of the social norms of the people around us. There are two types of social norms, injunctive norms and descriptive norms (Cialdini et al., 1991). Injunctive norms refer to our beliefs about what we think others want us to do—whether they will approve or disapprove of our behavior. For
example, in deciding whether to refuse to work with a homosexual, I may anticipate the approval of my heterosexual buddies, but the disapproval of my supervisor. Descriptive norms refer to what we actually see others doing in similar situations. Thus, if I see my heterosexual peers working with the homosexual soldier, I will be more inclined to work with him too; alternatively, if I see a plurality of them refusing to work with him, I may be more inclined to join them.

Intentions are also influenced by self-efficacy (Ajzen, 1991; Bandura, 1982), the perceived capability of performing the act. Self-efficacy is partly a personal disposition, but it also reflects immediate environmental constraints—e.g., limited resources or opportunities. In many situations, it may be quite difficult to refuse contact with a homosexual: If I don’t ride with this guy, how am I going to get there? If I refuse to sleep next to him, where am I going to sleep?

Finally, behavior itself is only partly intentional. Like intentions, behaviors are also constrained by the resources and opportunities afforded by the immediate environment. And our behaviors in many situations reflect well-learned habits that we engage in with little or no conscious reflection. Norms and habits often combine to provide us with familiar “scripts” for how to behave in a given situation, and it can be very difficult to force ourselves to deviate from those scripts (Abelson, 1981). Thus it is often the case that the best predictor of behavior is the behavior of the actor in similar situations in the past (see Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Triandis, 1977). For example, in work situations, most of us have a well-learned and rehearsed script which inclines us to cooperate with co-workers; it is “the path of least resistance.” Organizational role theorists have shown that occupational roles and norms largely constrain both work-related and social behaviors in organizational settings (Pfeffer, 1985). In this sense, the military is a heavily scripted environment.

The principles depicted in Figure 10-3 help to explain why the effect of diffuse attitudes toward objects or social groups often has only weak effects on behavior. This is not to say that negative attitudes toward homosexuality will never be expressed behaviorally;
history clearly suggests otherwise. But Figure 10-3 indicates that there are many factors that mitigate against serious behavioral expressions of anti-homosexual attitudes. It is important to reflect that the military has considerable influence over many of those mitigating factors—the consequences of the action, the injunctive and descriptive norms, the environmental constraints, habits and scripts—through its leadership, its regulations, its standard operating procedures, and its training and socialization process. If military leaders set and enforce clear standards for acceptable and unacceptable conduct, compliance is likely to be high. It will not be universal, however, and some individuals will test their leaders’ resolve to enforce compliance. Leaders who display ambivalence about enforcement can probably anticipate further problems.

Because of their compliance, many individuals may find themselves in a state of “cognitive dissonance”—a conflict between their attitudes and their conduct. According to Festinger’s (1957) well-supported theory of cognitive dissonance (see Eagly and Chaiken’s 1993 review), this state of dissonance is unpleasant, and people generally resolve it by either changing their attitudes or changing their behavior. When an individual with negative attitudes toward homosexuality finds himself cooperating with acknowledged homosexuals, there are a number of ways to resolve the sense of dissonance he may feel:

1. Verbally harass the homosexual co-worker.
2. Do his job poorly (“passive aggression”).
3. Ostenatiously broadcast his own values (e.g., heterosexuality, machismo, religiousity, conservatism).
4. Justify his behavior by invoking the costs of refusal (my sergeant would kill me).
5. Justify his behavior by invoking descriptive norms (everybody else is working with him, too).
6. Justify his behavior by invoking his sense of duty, professionalism, and the need for task cohesion.
7. Change his attitude by adjusting his attitude toward working with homosexuals.
The unit leader can help the reluctant heterosexual resolve this sense of dissonance in a manner that is in keeping with unit discipline and unit performance. It must be clearly communicated that route 1 (harassment) and route 2 (passive aggression) are unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Route 3 (symbolic displays of identity) can be tolerated within the limits outlined in personal conduct regulations (see the chapter on legal issues and the chapter on change in large organizations). Route 4 (punishment avoidance) may be expedient, but in the long run, route 5 (conformity) and route 6 (duty and professionalism) seem more desirable. The research evidence (reviewed by Eagly and Chaiken, 1993) suggests that route 7 (attitude change) may frequently occur, but it should be emphasized that the goal of compliance is to establish unit discipline, cohesion, and effectiveness. Tolerance of homosexuality will promote those goals, but tolerance need not require moral or religious acceptance.

**Will Heterosexuals Obey an Openly Homosexual Leader?**

Earlier, it was suggested that if social cohesion is adversely affected, it is most likely to be through a process of partial or complete ostracism. What if the ostracized individual is the group’s leader? Will heterosexual soldiers respect an acknowledged homosexual, and comply with his or her orders? This is the question of “followership,” or upward vertical cohesion. In one of the focus groups, one person said “I worked with a homosexual and not one man would do what he said.” On the other hand, there is anecdotal evidence that known homosexuals have served in leadership positions in the military with no deleterious effects. The organizational literature on leadership provides some hints as to when known homosexuals are likely to be effective leaders.

French and Raven (cited in French, 1959) distinguish several different forms of social power: **Reward power**, **coercive power**, **expert power**, **information power**, **legitimate power** (the leader’s right to a position of authority), and **referent power** (influence through subordinates’ identification with the leader). Although military leaders generally have more reward, coercive, information, legitimate, and expert
power than their subordinates, it is costly and difficult for the leader to rely solely on these forms of power; ideally, the leader should rely heavily on referent power to motivate the team (see Henderson, 1985). One path to referent power is through expert power. Bass (1981) cites evidence that the esteem with which leaders are held is reliably associated with the group’s performance. Of course, to some extent this correlation may reflect the common influence of leader ability on both esteem and group performance. According to Bass (1981, pp. 161-163):

A leader’s influence is more strongly associated with one’s sociometrically rated value or ability than one’s sociometrically determined popularity or visibility.  ...Whereas being liked, being visible, and being popular may still be of some importance to one’s influence in play situations, competence and value are of most importance to influence in task situations.

This is consistent with Hollander’s (1958, 1985) idiosyncracy credit model of acceptable deviance in organizations, reviewed earlier. Recall that Hollander has demonstrated that group members must demonstrate their competence and their loyalty to the group before it will accept deviations from group norms. Homosexuals in leadership roles may have an advantage over other homosexuals in this regard because subordinates will tend to assume that a leader is competent and loyal until proven otherwise (Bass, 1981). But a homosexual leader is likely to be held to higher informal standards of conduct and competence than other leaders, at least in the current attitudinal climate.

Military leaders obviously benefit from being liked, but it may not be necessary to get the job done. According to Bass (1981, p. 209):

Lyndon Johnson wanted every American to love him, but Harry Truman opined that “if you can’t stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen!” National leaders must settle for less than universal affection. They must be willing to be unloved...No leader can be successful if not prepared to be rejected.

Military leaders also get considerable mileage out of pure legitimate power; many subordinates will obey a homosexual leader simply because of a strong sense of duty and allegiance to the military role,
regardless of their attitude toward the leader’s personal traits. Ultimately, then, much may depend on the behavior of the next leader up the chain of command; if the homosexual leader is treated with respect from above, he is more likely to be treated with respect from below.

If the relationship between a leader and a unit becomes completely dysfunctional, it may be necessary to replace the leader. According to a 1988 Army Research Institute report (Siebold and Kelly, 1988a, p. 27):

Very high or very low [vertical] cohesion seldom lasts for long periods because the leaders causing either get reassigned, perhaps more quickly than their peers. Replacement leaders are, on the average, average. Therefore, while there are differences in cohesion among a set of platoons at any given time, they tend to be within a band set by the general command climate and post procedures and conditions.

In addition to reassigning leaders, there are many other interventions that can be used to restore unit functioning to an acceptable level, including informal conflict resolution; additional training; the reassignment of members to new units, new tasks, or new bunks; or even disciplinary action. To reinforce this intervention process, if homosexuals were allowed to serve, formal steps should be taken to systematically monitor the cohesion and functioning of those units with acknowledged homosexuals to ensure that any problems can be identified and managed in a prompt and constructive fashion. This monitoring should be conducted in an unobtrusive manner to avoid calling undue attention to the homosexual’s presence or implying special treatment.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis in this chapter suggests that concerns about the potential effect of permitting homosexuals to serve in the military are not groundless, but the problems do not appear insurmountable, and there is ample reason to believe that heterosexual and homosexual military

28See Kelman and Hamilton’s (1989) analysis of rule, role, and value orientations toward compliance with authority.
personnel can work together effectively. This review of the literature suggests the following conclusions:

- There is no direct scientific evidence regarding the effects of the presence of acknowledged homosexuals on unit cohesion or unit performance.
- There are at least two types of cohesion. Task cohesion has a modest but reliable influence on performance; social cohesion does not have an independent effect after controlling for task cohesion. Under some conditions, high social cohesion is actually detrimental to unit performance; moderate social cohesion appears most beneficial. Research indicates that it is not necessary to like someone to work with them, so long as members share a commitment to the group’s objectives.
- The presence of acknowledged homosexuals may bring about a reduction in social cohesion, although it seems less likely to undermine task cohesion. If there is a reduction in social cohesion, it will probably involve some degree of ostracism of the homosexual, rather than a complete breakdown of the unit. Whether this occurs will depend in part on the conduct, competence, and loyalty of the homosexual individual in question. If ostracism does occur, it can have potentially dangerous consequences for the individual and the group, and must be dealt with promptly by leaders.
- It is possible that some heterosexuals will refuse to cooperate with known homosexuals. However, many factors will help to promote cohesion and performance even in the face of hostility toward homosexuals. First, research suggests that leaders play an important role in promoting and maintaining unit cohesion. Second, military norms, roles, regulations, and disciplinary options each enhance the likelihood that heterosexuals will work cooperatively with homosexuals. Third, external threats enhance both social and task cohesion, provided that the group members are mutually threatened and there is the possibility that cooperative group action can eliminate the danger.
• Homosexual leaders will need to earn the respect of their subordinates by proving their competence and their loyalty to traditional military values. In the absence of that respect, homosexuals will need to rely on other forms of power, which will hinder but not prevent effective leadership. The behavior of the next leader up the chain of command will be critical; if the homosexual is supported from above, he or she is more likely to be respected from below.

• Open homosexual military personnel are likely to be rare, at least in the foreseeable future. Homosexuals in the military will be under enormous informal pressure to "stay in the closet," even without any explicit requirement to do so. As a result, only a small minority of units platoon-sized or smaller are likely to have acknowledged homosexuals as members. This low prevalence will help to limit the potential frequency of conflicts, although it will also limit the opportunities for the kind of positive social interaction that overcomes stereotypes and improves intergroup relations.

• The military should not, and does not, tolerate seriously dysfunctional units. Military leaders can and always have intervened whenever a unit has been identified as dysfunctional. Careful monitoring of units with acknowledged homosexuals will ensure that any problems can be identified and managed in a prompt and constructive fashion. It should be clearly communicated at all levels that disruptive behavior by anyone, whether heterosexual or homosexual, will not be tolerated.