

The Air Force and Diversity

The Awkward Embrace

Col Suzanne M. Streeter, USAF*

We don't just celebrate diversity. . . . We embrace it!

—Gen Mark A. Welsh
Chief of Staff, US Air Force



The Air Force is pursuing diversity as a mission imperative, recognizing that individuals who think alike might not resolve future complex problem sets. These challenges range from unrav-

*The author profusely thanks Dr. Kimberly Hudson; Ms. Kimberly Streeter; Col Jill Singleton; COL Gene Kamena, USA, retired; Lt Col John Yourse; and Dr. Elizabeth Woodworth for their reviews, edits, and frank discussions on this topic. Thanks also to Ms. Kimberly Streeter for her inspiration on the title.

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed or implied in the *Journal* are those of the authors and should not be construed as carrying the official sanction of the Department of Defense, Air Force, Air Education and Training Command, Air University, or other agencies or departments of the US government. This article may be reproduced in whole or in part without permission. If it is reproduced, the *Air and Space Power Journal* requests a courtesy line.

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE JUN 2014		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2014 to 00-00-2014	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Air Force and Diversity: The Awkward Embrace				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Institute (AFRI),155 N. Twining St., Bldg 693,Maxwell AFB,AL,36112-6026				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

eling an intelligence problem at the tactical level, through developing a campaign plan against a near-peer competitor at the operational level, to creating policies at the strategic level. Recent efforts have attempted to integrate diversity measures into Air Force culture, including Air Force instructions to codify “diversity [as] a military necessity.”¹ Most Airmen, however, are more likely to view “diversity” as another top-down initiative accompanied by computer-based training, checklists, and rules-based compliance rather than recognizing it as a game changer for the Air Force. Even those who discern that diversity is important for the mission are often unable to articulate why this is so. The few who realize its importance or recognize groupthink in their inner circle often do so late in their careers.²

Discordance exists between Air Force intentions vis-à-vis diversity and any effective programs and policies to retain and develop a diverse cadre of senior leadership. Issues lie ahead for the service, from retaining key demographic populations to inculcating diversity’s importance to mission success. This article addresses such a key demographic—active duty women officers—as an exemplar of the Air Force’s retention challenges with diverse groups. Nevertheless, the data reflects that many of the conclusions are equally valid or comparable for other minority groups. Even though the service has initiated formal diversity efforts, recommended policy and development programs may help develop and retain competent officers across the board. Ultimately, building a diverse Air Force leadership team—including retention of its female officers—must be a persistent leadership effort.

The Air Force’s Diversity Challenge

Groupthink is the worst thing you can have when you have a problem. . . . If there are all male Caucasians sitting around the table, you have groupthink.

—Gen Philip M. Breedlove, USAF

The Air Force proudly touts its diversity numbers, including the fact that 18.9 percent of the overall active duty force consists of women and that about 27 percent of its members derive from minority populations.³ However, its long-term retention of minorities remains problematic; retaining female junior officers is emblematic of this systemic issue (see figs. 1–4). As of 2008, the Air Force's retention rate for women officers was about 50 percent around the seven-year mark, whereas the men met this milestone at about the 12-year mark; after 12 years of service, women's attrition rate was 70 percent (fig. 1).⁴ Male officers do not reach this level of attrition until the 21-year mark. Female line-officer O-6s are conspicuously small in number (figs. 2 and 3) (line officers are the backbone of the Air Force's cadre of senior leadership as group and wing commanders, center directors, and general officers). The numbers are not that much better when combined with the non-line-officers (fig. 4). Finally, as of 2008, 85 percent of all general officers were white males (fig. 2).⁵ These diversity imbalances in terms of gender and minorities at the senior leadership level have implications for the Air Force's long-term operational and overarching organizational success, as discussed later.




Figure 1. Attrition of Air Force officers. (Reprinted from Military Leadership Diversity Commission, *Officer Retention Rates across the Services by Gender and Race/Ethnicity*, Issue Paper no. 24 [Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission, March 2010], 4, <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=716147>.)




Figure 2. Gender and minority status distribution versus 85 percent of Air Force general officers as non-Hispanic white men. (Adapted from US Census Bureau, “Women and Men Population in the United States: 2006,” accessed 10 December 2012, http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/men_women_2006.html; and the author’s compilation of data from the Air Force Personnel Center [AFPC] Interactive Demographic Analysis System [IDEAS] application, November 2012.)




Figure 3. Line officers by gender (November 2012). (From the author’s compilation of data from the AFPC IDEAS application, November 2012, end-of-month data extracted 11 December 2012.)




Figure 4. Percentage of the entire officer population (line/nonline) by rank and gender (September 2011 data). (Adapted from “The Air Force in Facts and Figures: 2012 Almanac,” *Air Force Magazine* 95, no. 5 [May 2012]: 40, http://www.airforce-magazine.com/MagazineArchive/Magazine%20Documents/2012/May%202012/0512facts_figs.pdf.)

Diversity: Meaning and Importance

The Air Force has designated diversity as an institutional competency; in other words, it is “expected of all Airmen, throughout their careers, and will be . . . needed to operate successfully in the constantly changing environment in which they function.”⁶ This particular institutional competency is defined as “a composite of . . . personal life experiences, geographic background, socioeconomic background, cultural knowledge, educational background, work background, language abilities, physical abilities, philosophical/spiritual perspectives, age, race, ethnicity, and gender.”⁷ In July 2012, the Air Force acknowledged that “diversity is a leadership issue” and that leaders should develop “Airmen with different backgrounds and perspectives so [that] they continue to grow and thrive in the Air Force” because diversity “enhances mission readiness and is a national security imperative.”⁸ In July 2011, Gen Norton Schwartz, former chief of staff of the Air Force, asserted that “diversity should not be an end unto itself, but rather one of the means toward our broader desired state of enhanced effectiveness as an Air Force.”⁹ In spite of these strategic words, the service has not presented a clear case for how diversity improves mission readiness and national security, nor has it addressed how those at the operational and tactical levels should leverage diversity to enhance their mission success. Diversity is important to mission readiness and national security in terms of demographically representative leadership, enhanced civil-military relations with a diverse civil society, and the leveraging of diversity as a demographic mission necessity.

Representative Leadership

The Military Leadership Diversity Commission found that “officers were generally less demographically diverse than both the enlisted troops they led and the civilian population they served.”¹⁰ This situation could lead to “invisible privilege”—a condition in which a dominant group cannot comprehend those who do not fit the “norm” of that culture. A relatively homogeneous senior leadership cadre can

become prone to “blind spots” in their dealings with the diverse enlisted corps and relatively diverse junior officer corps—not fully understanding what will resonate with these populations.¹¹ For example, current efforts to develop retention policies for women that emphasize monetary carrots do not necessarily reflect measures that will entice them to stay. In fact, in a 2002 survey, “only 4 percent of the women said pay and allowances were a critical factor in their decision to separate from the active duty Air Force”; other reasons honed in on family and leadership issues.¹² The military is one of the few US workplaces where women receive the same compensation as their male counterparts for doing identical jobs.¹³ This equal-pay factor might not cross the minds of senior leaders who focus primarily on fiscally oriented retention efforts.¹⁴

Civil-Military Relations

Relative homogeneity in the senior officer corps also has implications for civil-military relations with respect to political leadership and the broader civilian society. As former House Armed Services Committee chairman Ike Skelton (D-MO) warned, “Those who protect us are psychologically divorced from those who are being protected.”¹⁵ Throughout history, tension has existed between military and civilian leadership. Increasing divergence in the attitudes of the Air Force and political leadership is foreseeable if the service’s senior leadership cadre stays mostly homogeneous (given the continuation of a reduced presence of lawmakers who are military veterans). This trend has ramifications not only for garnering support for Air Force program requirements within Congress but also for resonating with the general public when the Air Force articulates its *raison d’être*.

Diversity and Military Necessity

Diverse teams are better than homogeneous ones at solving complex problem sets and thus can lead to mission success.¹⁶ Indeed, cognitive diversity—thinking differently—has enabled “diverse groups of prob-

lem solvers . . . [to have] consistently outperformed groups of the best and brightest.”¹⁷ Several studies of the civilian workforce suggest that gender diversity at the senior levels helps companies during a recession. One 2012 report that studied 2,360 worldwide companies from 2005 to 2011 demonstrated that “large-cap stock” companies (those making \$10 billion annually) with at least one woman on their boards “outperformed those without women board members by 26%.” It attributed this success to wide-ranging characteristics from “better mix of leadership skills” to “risk aversion,” especially in a volatile market.¹⁸ The benefits or success of gender diversity can be undermined by institutional biases or poorly implemented diversity programs.¹⁹

The military has no wide-range studies that examine whether diverse teams resolve complex problem sets better than nondiverse teams.²⁰ However, by concentrating on one segment of diversity—gender—one could make the case that women are increasingly necessary to conduct military missions. For example, male military personnel could not interact with Afghan women without violating cultural taboos. Marine Corps female engagement teams and special forces cultural support teams established in response to this matter produced unexpected benefits and valuable intelligence, including expanded impact since women “have considerable influence on their husbands, children and their community as a whole.”²¹ Gen Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recognized this fact in January 2013 when he pushed for the lifting of the women’s combat ban, assessing that “ultimately, we’re acting to strengthen the joint force.”²² Not only have women been increasingly integrated in operations downrange but also a need exists for them to fill positions since fewer young people are available to meet military requirements. Specifically, only 15 percent of the US “youth population . . . is [eligible and] available to serve in the military.”²³

Moving toward Leadership Diversity

In her book *The Loudest Duck*, Laura Liswood asserts that “we need to get beyond the bricks and mortar of diversity as we know it—the committees, the employee networks, and the trainings. . . . These are all necessary, but not sufficient.” She astutely observes that “diverse organizations require more sophisticated leadership . . . to reap the benefits of what true diversity can provide” and describes most corporations’ approach to diversity as one of “Noah’s Ark,” whereby accession is the principal means of measuring diversity’s success. However, there are often no effective programs to retain these minorities; even designed training can become counterproductive and the “unconscious handling of diversity can lead to diverse groups leaving.”²⁴ As demonstrated below, this is the case for the Air Force as well.

The Air Force has directed much of its effort on gaining diversity via accession. In the case of gender diversity, female officer accession rates have averaged 24 percent (fiscal years 1997–2011).²⁵ However, the average percentage of females in the overall officer corps over the same time frame remained at 17.83 percent.²⁶ Disparities between accession and overall officer corps percentages for other minorities also exist. Given these facts, the article examines the Air Force’s diversity efforts beyond accession, including three of the five priorities of the 2013 *United States Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* that address the development and retention of a diverse force: “institutionalize diversity as necessary to mission success”; “develop a high-quality, talented and diverse total force (active duty, Guard, Reserve, and civilians)”; and “retain a high-quality, talented and diverse total force.”²⁷ The planned actions to execute these goals have not gone far enough to ensure that Airmen understand how and why diversity is a critical part of solving complex problem sets.

The first priority is to “institutionalize diversity as necessary to mission success”—a multiyear and complex effort requiring persistent leadership efforts to communicate basic awareness (fig. 5). The next steps of influencing attitudes and changing beliefs—thereby evolving

Air Force culture—will call for even more dedicated attention and time. Efforts should include reviewing and changing policies to ensure the Air Force does not run “the risk of perpetuating the idea that organization members must always adjust to the organization, rather than the organization at non-mission-essential times adjusting to the diverse needs of its members.”²⁸




Figure 5. Desired effects of strategic communication. (Reprinted from USAF Public Affairs Center of Excellence, 2012.)

Current goals and actions mostly deal with Airmen feeling included instead of institutionalizing why and how diversity is necessary to mission success.²⁹ These actions include creating the Air Force Diversity Committee, major command-level diversity focus groups, and Air Force-wide guidance via the latest Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-7001, *Diversity*, 20 July 2012.³⁰ Inclusion is important because “without an awareness of the cultural diversity of one’s organization and the needs of different cultural groups, it is difficult to achieve an inclusive culture where members feel like they belong and believe they can succeed” (and stay).³¹ Nevertheless, a backlash might emerge from the

dominant population if the Air Force overemphasizes inclusion rather than diversity's importance since "framing social inequalities only in the context of the disadvantaged outgroup encourages prejudicial attitudes by privileged group members."³² Several examples of this kind of reaction within the Air Force fall under the realm of the Equal Opportunity (EO) Office.³³ If diversity is to succeed, it must "complement, but remain separate and distinct from, Air Force Equal Opportunity compliance programs and activities," as noted by AFI 36-7001.³⁴ Most people regard the EO office as a resource to use when inclusion (or one might say, "tolerance") fails; therefore, relating diversity to an office associated with social ills would inhibit its evolution into a value completely embraced by the Air Force.³⁵

Regarding the 2013 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap's* second priority of "develop[ing] a high-quality, talented and diverse total force (active duty, Guard, Reserve, and civilians)," that plan has the right view of assuring the infusion of diversity and inclusion into many avenues of training and education. As mentioned previously, diversity cannot be reduced to computer-based ancillary training that involves individuals quickly clicking through to obtain their annual certificate. Headquarters Air Force Global Diversity Division is researching ways to implement a new learning framework following the 70-20-10 model created by the Center for Creative Leadership and adapted by Princeton University.³⁶ This model proposes that only 10 percent of students learn from "formal training," that 70 percent learn "from real life and on-the-job experiences, tasks and problem solving," and that about 20 percent learn "from feedback and from observing and working with role models."³⁷ Squadron Officer College's Leadership Department is implementing a 70-20-10 approach via a leadership elective that leverages Second Life, an online avatar-based program that virtually immerses students in historical leadership situations, allowing them to better grasp leadership styles.³⁸ Avatar-based scenarios like this one should be expanded to realistic diversity education and training insofar as no Air Force professional education offerings for officers have fully developed diversity education programs based on the 70-20-10 model.³⁹

The 2013 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* advocates mentoring as a path to “effectively operate in a global environment.”⁴⁰ The online mentoring program that the service has had since 2009 could be a significant complementary tool because it allows mentors to see their protégés’ official personnel records but presupposes that mentors have access to the Air Force Portal and that protégés are comfortable asking a senior officer to serve as a mentor.⁴¹ A 2011 report by Women in International Security observes a “direct correlation between mentorship and professional advancement” but indicates that most government agencies “do not devote enough resources toward ensuring that existing programs are effective.”⁴² Instead, the Air Force could consider something like the OfficerWomen eMentor Program, which develops female officers and veterans.⁴³ In this program, a female officer can seek out a specific mentor or join a forum to discuss such issues as dual-military couples, efficiently regaining flight qualifications after giving birth, lactation in the workplace, or general career advice.⁴⁴ OfficerWomen eMentor has produced measurable results with a sister service. The Navy contracted with AcademyWomen, the program’s sponsor, for a three-year pilot eMentor program for all uniformed female Sailors (officers and enlisted). Eighty-two percent of survey participants who reached a retention decision while in the program elected to remain in uniform, and 67 percent of these retained members reported that program participation “positively impacted their decision” to stay in the service.⁴⁵ This latter group represented 45 enlisted and 15 female officers in the program who elected to stay, translating to an estimated savings of \$4.35 million to the Navy.⁴⁶

Informal mentoring is the more traditional route, whether at work or at events like the “Women in the Air Force” Symposium mentioned in the *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* of 2010.⁴⁷ Low-cost mentoring opportunities include women-specific quarterly lunches or webinars with senior Air Force women leaders; webinars are already an avenue for certain development teams to convey data to their career fields, so the foundation is already in place. Finally, the Air Force could include training for senior officers who mentor junior officers of different

racess and genders. This training would not only address various approaches for interacting with and developing different personalities, genders, orientations, and cultures but also examine concerns that “those in the dominant group often fear that they will have to be politically correct, avoid giving critical feedback . . . [and] accept compromised performance.”⁴⁸

Regarding the third relevant priority of “retain[ing] a high-quality, talented and diverse total force,” the service has taken concrete steps since the inaugural 2010 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* to realize this goal.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, efforts to “achieve an inclusive environment that provides the total force with the opportunity to realize their full potential” should extend beyond surveys and tracking of quantitative performance measures.⁵⁰ It should also expand the Air Force culture to guarantee a well-rounded, mission-competent, diverse force, including a diverse senior leader cadre. The road map still contains too few measurable goals to indicate whether the Air Force is succeeding in this endeavor.⁵¹ Indeed, as Steven Samuels and Dena Samuels point out,

Even with the best of intentions, it is common to make surface-level, often cosmetic, changes in the hope of alleviating the problem. . . . Since leaders do not believe there is any underlying problem in situations like these, they see no need to make any underlying changes. Thus, they may release public statements pointing to successes they have accomplished in these domains, add a statement about being an equal-opportunity employer in their recruitment advertisements, or put women and people of color into their training films.⁵²

The Air Force will stagnate in its diversity efforts without an in-depth review and overhaul of personnel policies and systems. Both the following recommendations and those mentioned above in the *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* indicate ways of making this document’s aspirations a reality: policy transformation and program development leading to a stronger force.

Recommendations

Change Policy

Previous policy recommendations to mitigate issues concerning the retention of female officers include home basing, sabbatical programs, and a more flexible continuum of service (see the table below).⁵³ These recommendations, which remain valid, can be applied to a range of demographics, including men and women from the millennial generation, who tend to follow less linear career paths. However, the Air Force has not fully implemented these recommendations; they require action by the chief of staff of the Air Force and Congress. These programs would not only retain women but also promote key skill sets and cognitive diversity across the force.

Table. Reasons for leaving the Air Force (2002 data)

<i>Reasons for Leaving the Air Force</i>	<i>% Critical/Significant Factor</i>	<i>% Not a Factor</i>
Start a family	24	60
Stay home with children	27	61
Spend more time with family	41	40
Child care	8	80
Civilian jobs (more money)	12	67
Civilian jobs (more fulfilling work)	20	61
Civilian jobs (move ahead)	12	72
Civilian jobs (better cultural climate)	11	70
Geographic stability	41	42
Dissatisfied with Air Force leadership	27	42

Reprinted from Lt Col Laura A. H. DiSilverio, Winning the Retention Wars: The Air Force, Women Officers, and the Need for Transformation, Fairchild Paper (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, August 2003), 30.

The first proposed solution instituted home basing as an option, defined as “assigning a military member to the same base or location for an extended period of time.”⁵⁴ In August 2001, the Government Accounting Office pointed out that more time between moves led to more likelihood of retention across the board—60–64 percent for three-plus-year tours as opposed to 46 percent for two-to-three-year tours (the average was two-year tours).⁵⁵ The Air Force slashed the number of moves in 2006 to conserve funds by keeping individuals on station for an average of four years (saving about \$134 million annually).⁵⁶ An unimplemented proposal included more extensive home basing for officers—up to eight to 10 years. This initiative allowed junior officers “to develop roots in a community and a support network,” minimizing the disruption of frequent moves.⁵⁷ Today a viable option entails expanding the current policy regarding permanent change of station, which allows selected enlisted members to volunteer for hard-to-fill spots via the Voluntary Stabilized Base Assignment Program for five years at a time.⁵⁸ For officers, a home-basing program is easier to implement in locations like Colorado Springs, San Antonio, or Washington, DC, because of the greater number of lateral and vertical openings. This initiative could retain individuals who otherwise would separate for reasons of geographic stability as well as reduce moving costs in this era of austerity. The AFPC would have to gauge the size of the program, but it could be lottery-based to keep the numbers at a manageable level and account for mission needs.

A second recommendation included a “non-punitive break in service option as a retention tool.”⁵⁹ Earlier proposed, unimplemented solutions were a “one-year paid sabbatical” and a one-to-five-year unpaid break in service; each option would allow personnel to return as valued assets to the Air Force, saving training funds in the long run.⁶⁰ The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of 2009 authorized each service to “carry out pilot programs under which officers and enlisted members of the regular components of the Armed Forces . . . may be inactivated from active duty in order to meet personal or professional needs and returned to active duty.”⁶¹ Congress authorized “20 officers

and 20 enlisted members of each Armed Force” per year, for a maximum of three years.⁶² In the 2012 NDAA, Congress extended the program to the end of calendar year 2015.⁶³ However, the Navy has been the only Department of Defense service to take advantage of the Career Intermission Pilot Program, a once-in-a-career initiative that includes full health care and a small stipend for participants.⁶⁴ The Air Force should follow the Navy’s lead in establishing a career-intermission pilot program of its own. It is within the secretary of the Air Force’s power to establish this program; in the long run, it would not be overly expensive to implement. The Air Force could also examine the Coast Guard’s temporary separation program, activated since fiscal year 2001.⁶⁵ That service rededicated support to the program in September 2012 as a “retention tool” and an option for personnel making life-changing decisions.⁶⁶ Although the Coast Guard falls under Title 14 and as such is not bound by NDAA restrictions, the Air Force could still benchmark from some practices. If well integrated, a break in service would not prove punitive to an individual’s career. There is no reason why a program participant should not attain senior officer status since his or her “outside” experience could inject even more cognitive diversity.⁶⁷

A third recommendation includes increasing the “permeability of [the] active-reserve barrier.”⁶⁸ This kind of policy change is needed more than ever. The Air Force designed the 3-1 Integration Plan to allow the three components of the Air Force to combine their personnel systems, thus allowing for a true continuum of service, but it was shelved for reasons unknown to the author.⁶⁹ The fact that the Army initiated its continuum of service program in 2012, though, shows great promise. According to the *Army Reserve 2012 Posture Statement*, the goal is to “inspire Soldiers to a lifetime of military service, which includes seamless transitions between active and Reserve statuses.”⁷⁰ If the plan unfolds as intended, a Soldier could take several paths, including a mix of reserve status and active-reserve.⁷¹ It behooves the Air Force to track the outcome of the Army program and reconsider the shelved 3-1 Integration Plan.

Develop a Diverse Force

The Air Force should create solid development programs to inculcate diversity as a force multiplier; pursuing surface-level diversity can be counterproductive. If women and minorities are put into key positions based solely on gender or their minority status rather than on training or competence, they may be more likely to fail and either create or reinforce negative perceptions. Furthermore, these individuals would not receive the critical feedback they need to grow as leaders. Action plans should be sensitive to these factors and prepare leaders to develop their entire officer corps's core competencies so that, when chosen, everyone can step up confidently to leadership positions.

Intervention to inculcate diversity into the Air Force culture should be implemented incrementally. One approach to the 2013 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap's* institutionalization priority involves linking diversity to mission effectiveness at every turn in the field. This reinforcement could be woven into opportunities found in mentoring, professional development sessions for officers, and wingman days. An initial focus, for example, would call for Airmen to uncover their own misperceptions or implicit biases about women officers (or minorities).⁷² Free surveys are available, such as the Harvard Implicit Association Test, which measures subconscious biases via a simple online test.⁷³ Other activities could leverage case studies from free websites like the Stanford Graduate School of Business's "Leadership in Focus."⁷⁴ These programs could include a concerted effort to develop technical and leadership competencies in all Airmen.⁷⁵

Conduct Surveys

The Air Force is on the right track with future survey topics, such as an upcoming one concerning women's reasons for leaving active duty.⁷⁶ However, this effort could expand to include crowdsourcing techniques. That is, instead of obtaining a snapshot of quantitative data, the Air Force could opt for a living source in which members provide reasons that women officers leave as well as possible solutions.

Not all reasons would be actionable, but the information would widen the aperture for senior leadership to develop better retention policies.

Additional data snapshots would also prove useful, such as expanding the 2013 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap's* performance measurement of “track[ing] the number/percentage of supervisory total force personnel who indicate . . . they are serving as a mentor” to include questions about who they are mentoring and why.⁷⁷ The survey could include a hyperlink to mentoring resources. Another method for capturing the incorporation of diversity into the culture might entail using questions on diversity as it relates to mission effectiveness in unit climate-assessment surveys since current questions dealing with interrelationships tend to emphasize EO-related issues. The Air Force should also consider publicly tracking attrition rates of stressed career fields such as intelligence or cyber. At this time, the service publishes a thorough analysis of the attrition rates of pilots, navigators, and air battle managers only in its annual analysis of rated officer retention; it is difficult to understand why individuals are leaving if the numbers are not analyzed and published.

Use Avatars

The work started by the Squadron Officer College's use of avatars could grow to introduce diversity in a way that reaches the younger generation. Imagine a simulation in which an officer role-plays a minority or a woman via an online avatar, encountering some of the implicit biases or challenges. This will not necessarily change attitudes immediately but could plant some seeds of empathy. Another option with this technology would involve developing scenarios in which players encounter realistic, complex problems that can be solved only by a diverse virtual team.⁷⁸

Conclusions and Areas for Future Research

This article has addressed the Air Force's recognition of diversity as a critical mission element and has expanded upon why and how divergence exists between policy and reality when it comes to the retention of women officers. First, many Air Force people do not consider diversity as a factor when they create operational teams or solve complex problems, no matter the findings of surveys regarding how Airmen recognize the importance of diversity.⁷⁹ Second, current personnel policies are not necessarily conducive to retention. The 2013 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* recognizes this fact and has outlined actions to accommodate these values. Third, although the service has created groups to discuss diversity, programs that develop a diverse force are limited, especially in the education and mentoring fields. The Air Force should consider strategic-level tracks to close this gap in the retention of women officers—first, by pursuing policy changes at the Headquarters Air Force and congressional levels and second (and probably more time consuming and leadership intensive), by moving beyond rhetoric and a culture in which women-officer leaders are a normative part of achieving mission success.

Headquarters Air Force Global Diversity Division, charged with developing diversity policy and programs, is committed to resolving the aforementioned challenges. However, a small office of five permanent-party members is not enough to turn the tide of Air Force culture. Its personnel need assistance both from the service's senior leadership and from the field to create excitement about diversity.

Developing effective programs needs the most research and work. The objective is to move the Air Force beyond the guidance, talking points, and static websites, all of which operate via a pull versus a push methodology. Furthermore, it is not clear how the numerous speeches by senior leaders to niche audiences like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or Congress are translated to action. These programs should not only focus on those in the field but also reiterate the lessons at every educational opportunity,

from accession programs to professional military education. Another area for further research, the introduction of leadership from the middle, would train a specific cadre of individuals on diversity to develop a peer cadre—much like the Air Force does now for resiliency.⁸⁰ Finally, as Samuels and Samuels recommend, “a framework is needed to help leaders become more culturally aware of other organizational members’ experiences and needs . . . to highlight the manner in which the statuses of leaders might serve as blinders and even inhibitors to creating a diverse and inclusive workplace.”⁸¹

Transforming culture is a difficult endeavor. Although the Air Force has taken great strides to initiate this change, it will require at least a generation of consistent involvement on the part of senior leadership as well as purposeful policies and programs to make diversity a true Air Force competency. The steps that the service takes in the next few years will make all the difference for the retention and development of diverse individuals. More important, however, is the goal of changing the attitude of the entire force to truly embrace diversity as a force multiplier in dealing with increasingly complex problems. ✪

Notes

1. Air Force Instruction (AFI) 1-1, *Air Force Culture*, 7 August 2012, 11, http://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_cc/publication/afi1-1/afi1-1.pdf.
2. The 2011 report of the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) stated that “there are potential perceptual barriers that prevent racial/ethnic minorities and women from obtaining key assignments, such as command. In particular, . . . [they] may lack sufficient knowledge about key assignment opportunities, perhaps because . . . [they] do not receive the same counseling or mentoring about key assignments as their white male counterparts.” MLDC, *From Representation to Inclusion: Diversity Leadership for the 21st-Century; Final Report* (Arlington, VA: MLDC, March 2011), 68, http://diversity.defense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/Special%20Feature/MLDC_Final_Report.pdf.
3. “Air Force Personnel Demographics,” Air Force Personnel Center, accessed 28 October 2012, <http://www.afpc.af.mil/library/airforcepersonnel demographics.asp>.
4. MLDC, *Officer Retention Rates across the Services by Gender and Race/Ethnicity*, Issue Paper no. 24 (Arlington, VA: MLDC, March 2010), 4, <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=716147>.

5. The MLDC's report makes this particular point via its charts. Military Leadership Diversity Commission, *From Representation to Inclusion*, 43.

6. Air Force Policy Directive 36-26, *Total Force Development*, 27 September 2011, 9, http://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_a1/publication/afpd36-26/afpd_36-26.pdf; and Col Harry Lane, chief, Headquarters Air Force Global Diversity Division, Pentagon, to the author, e-mail, 10 October 2012.

7. "Air Force Diversity," US Air Force, accessed 25 September 2012, <http://www.af.mil/Diversity.aspx>.

8. Air Force Document (AFD) 120716-024, "US Air Force Key Talking Points, June 2012 Special Edition: Diversity," 16 July 2012, <http://www.af.mil/Portals/1/documents/diversity/2012-diversity-talking-points.pdf>.

9. Gen Norton Schwartz (remarks, 102nd NAACP Annual Convention Military Awards Dinner, 26 July 2011).

10. MLDC, *From Representation to Inclusion*, 44.

11. Within the Air Force Academy, for example, the normative population is comprised of white Christian males. Anybody who does not fit into that category is not necessarily viewed as inherently belonging to that institution and often has to go above and beyond simply to justify his or her membership. Without conscious effort or education, dominant groups simply do not realize that others have a different experience or outlook than their own. As Steven Samuels and Dena Samuels remark, "When privilege is normalized, those in dominant positions tend not to see themselves as privileged and thus run the risk of ignoring their own role in perpetuating inequalities" or inadvertently "distance themselves from their goals." Steven M. Samuels and Dena R. Samuels, "Incorporating the Concept of Privilege into Policy and Practice," in *Attitudes Aren't Free: Thinking Deeply about Diversity in the US Armed Forces*, ed. James E. Parco and David Levy (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, February 2010), 326.

12. Lt Col Laura A. H. DiSilverio, *Winning the Retention Wars: The Air Force, Women Officers, and the Need for Transformation*, Fairchild Paper (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, August 2003), 36. In 2002 Lieutenant Colonel DiSilverio conducted a survey for her Air War College research paper that included this data. She observed that "the Air Force can focus its retention efforts on decreasing the conflict between having/caring for families and fulfilling military duties rather than on making the military look attractive in comparison to civilian opportunities. The Air Force has historically been focused on the latter" (*ibid.*).

13. This is not to say that women are promoted at the same rate. The MLDC made clear the existence of a gap, especially in the Coast Guard and Navy, due to any number of potential reasons. The latter include performance reports that are not competitively written and assignment matching. Promotion boards are not necessarily one of the reasons because they work under very clear direction regarding what is expected. MLDC, *From Representation to Inclusion*, 76–78.

14. With the millennial generation forming the junior officer ranks, monetary reasons are not necessarily incentives to stay. A 2011 survey of 250 junior officers (mostly Marines and Army and 86 percent male) noted that 75 percent of those surveyed claimed "personnel management issues" and that 57 percent cited "the limited ability to control their own careers" as reasons for leaving the military. Though only 4 percent of them were in the Air Force, the generational tendencies are probably similar. Sayce Falk and Sasha Rogers, "Ju-

nior Military Officer Retention: Challenges & Opportunities" (master's thesis, John F. Kennedy School of Government, March 2011), 11, 53.

15. Philip Ewing, "Defense Leaders Fear Military-Civilian 'Disconnect,'" Politico.com, 20 February 2011, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0211/49838.html>.

16. Several examples exist in the civilian world, such as computer gamers who mapped the complex molecular structure of a retrovirus enzyme that perplexed trained scientists for years. University of Washington, "Gamers Succeed Where Scientists Fail: Molecular Structure of Retrovirus Enzyme Solved, Doors Open to New AIDS Drug Design," *ScienceDaily*, 19 September 2011, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/09/110918144955.htm>.

17. Scott E. Page, *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), xxv. For this article, cognitive diversity includes identity diversity. That is, the socialization of US society (especially the military) fits firmly into the masculine quadrant of any chart made by Geert Hofstede, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov. In a masculine society, male and female "emotional gender roles are clearly distinct"; masculine values such as work earnings and recognition are more esteemed than values found in feminine society, such as the importance of "relationships and quality of life." Due to this typical socialization in American society, women also tend to be cognitively diverse (they think differently) due to their identity diversity. Geert Hofstede, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2010), 140–41, 151–52, 155. Alluding to organizational theorist I. D. Steiner, Dr. Scott Page notes that diversity is necessary for "conjunctive tasks, those in which everyone's contribution is critical" (emphasis in original). He also remarks that although identity diversity does not automatically translate to success, when it is linked to cognitive diversity and issues that require diverse thought, "identity diversity produces better outcomes indirectly." One could argue that this holds especially true in the case of the military since its leaders and many junior officers are tasked to resolve complex problems that need innovative solutions. Page, *Difference*, xv, xxv–xxvi, 13.

18. Credit Suisse Research, *Gender Diversity and Corporate Performance* (Zurich: Credit Suisse, August 2012), 12, 18, 19.

19. According to Frank Dobbin and Jiwook Jung, "The fact that board diversity has no effect on profits, but a negative effect on stock price, lends support to our thesis that institutional investors may sell the stock of firms that appoint women to their boards—not because profits suffer, but because they are biased against women." Frank Dobbin and Jiwook Jung, "Corporate Board Gender Diversity and Stock Performance: The Competence Gap or Institutional Investor Bias?," *North Carolina Law Review* 89, no. 3 (March 2011): 828, http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~dobbin/cv/articles/2011_NCLR_Dobbin_Jung.pdf. The MLDC notes that "if it is not managed effectively, diversity . . . can actually reduce capability, most frequently through the decreased communication and/or increased conflict that result when some people are (or feel) excluded." MLDC, *Decision Paper no. 6: Diversity Leadership* (Arlington, VA: MLDC, February 2011), 6.

20. This topic should be considered for future research.

21. Sgt Christopher McCullough, "Female Engagement Teams: Who They Are and Why They Do It," *Defense Video & Imagery Distribution System*, 1 August 2012, <http://www.dvidshub.net/news/92477/female-engagement-teams-who-they-and-why-they-do#.UI3rBYbuhTw#ixzz2AeSqGXsr>. See also "About the Cultural Support Program," US

Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, accessed 4 February 2013, <http://www.soc.mil/swcs/cst/about.html>.

22. Cheryl Pellerin, "Dempsey: Allowing Women in Combat Strengthens Joint Force," US Department of Defense, 24 January 2013, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=119100>.

23. US Department of Defense, *Population Representation in the Military Services: Fiscal Year 2011* (Washington, DC: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense [Personnel and Readiness], 2011), 2.

24. Laura Liswood, *The Loudest Duck: Moving beyond Diversity While Embracing Differences to Achieve Success at Work* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2010), xix–xx, xxvii, 1–2, 4, 82.

25. This 15-year average raises the question as to why overall female accession rates have hovered at 24 percent (with many ups and downs). We need further research on expanding the Air Force message to attract more women for the health of the force.

26. Department of Defense, *Population Representation*, D-20, 23.

27. Air Force Global Diversity Division, *United States Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* (Washington, DC: Air Force Global Diversity Division, AF/A1DV, 12 March 2013), 9, 14, 15, <http://www.af.mil/Portals/1/documents/diversity/diversity-strategic-roadmap.pdf>.

28. Samuels and Samuels, "Incorporating the Concept of Privilege," 322.

29. Air Force Global Diversity Division, *Diversity Strategic Roadmap*, 9–10.

30. Air Force Diversity Operations, *United States Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap: A Journey to Excellence* (Washington, DC: Air Force Diversity Operations, AF/A1DV, 19 October 2010), 5, 7, <http://www.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-101117-010.pdf>; Lane to the author, e-mail; and Lt Col John Yourse, Headquarters Air Force Global Diversity Division, Pentagon, to the author, e-mail, 5 November 2012.

31. Samuels and Samuels, "Incorporating the Concept of Privilege," 322.

32. *Ibid.*, 327.

33. The most recent example occurred when General Welsh, the chief of staff of the Air Force, issued an edict to conduct "health and welfare" checks in December 2012 to ensure that workspaces were professional. These checks were depicted as a "witch hunt" against the fighter pilot culture. General Welsh countered vehemently, stating that certain traditions had no place in today's Air Force. Nevertheless, discussions regarding witch hunts are still alive in the blogosphere and workspaces. Gen Mark A. Welsh III, "CSAF January Letter to Airmen—Happy New Year," 2 January 2013, <http://www.301fw.afrc.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123331351>.

34. AFI 36-7001, *Diversity*, 20 July 2012, 4.

35. Regarding the repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, Steven Samuels and Col Gary Packard declared in February 2012 that "our Oath of Office demands that we support our nation's laws; thus, under repeal, toleration is the minimum behavioral expectation of every service member. However, military strength is not built on toleration. Strength requires acceptance and, ultimately, respect and inclusiveness for all who volunteer to serve. We must value our colleagues for who they are and not who we want them to be." Steven M. Samuels and Col Gary A. Packard, "Repeal of DADT Makes the Military Stronger," *Air Force Times*, 6 February 2012, 24; and Dr. Steven Samuels (USFA professor, Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership), interview by the author, 17 November 2012.

36. Yourse to the author, e-mail.

37. "Learning Philosophy," Princeton University Office of Human Resources, 21 June 2011, <http://www.princeton.edu/hr/learning/philosophy/>. From the Center for Creative Leadership, this model is "a research-based, time-tested guideline for developing managers [that] proposes engaging them with three clusters of experience, using a 70-20-10 ratio: challenging assignments (70%), developmental relationships (20%), and coursework and training (10%). Despite the popularity of the 70-20-10 rule, most organizations are still not systematic or intentional about using a synergistic combination of assignments-relationships-coursework to groom future leaders." Meena Surie Wilson et al., *Grooming Top Leaders: Cultural Perspectives from China, India, Singapore and the United States* (Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, September 2011), 4, <http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/GroomingTopLeaders.pdf>.

38. Dr. Fil J. Arenas (associate professor, Organizational Leadership Studies, Squadron Officer College), interviews by the author, 11 October 2012 and 14 December 2012.

39. Training and education are included as key parts of the development priority mentioned in the 2013 *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap*. Work remains, despite the progress made in introducing diversity at various levels of accession and professional military education (PME) programs. Training and education should go beyond these efforts and should be emphasized at every opportunity to link with mission needs. Increasing awareness and influencing attitudes vis-à-vis diversity starts with officer accession programs. Solid efforts have begun at the Jeanne M. Holm Center for Officer Accessions and Citizen Development, which oversees all officer accession programs with the exception of those at the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA). The Holm Center introduces the diversity concept to its cadets and officer trainees, specifically via a two-hour lesson entitled "Managing Diversity," which utilizes team-building exercises to cover the elements and challenges of leading a diverse force. The USAFA has been most holistic and dedicated in its approach to diversity. Though the academy's focus remains on accessing a more diverse force, it has recognized the need to develop solid action plans not only to diversify its teaching cadre but also to train it, expand opportunities for retention, and put resources behind its efforts. Of the three main Air Force officer PME programs, the one geared toward junior officers (Squadron Officer School) has the most developed program to comply with the Air Staff's direction. A 50-minute in-class course introduces the Air Force's emphasis on diversity, and a 90-minute team-building exercise touches on diversity as a consideration for building a team. The Air Command and Staff College, geared toward majors, has some diversity elements in its curricula, including an elective historical survey of women in the military; however, only 12 of 485 students were enrolled in this particular course. At this time, the Air War College does not have any topics on diversity in its curricula. Nevertheless, the Leadership Department is looking into ways to interweave diversity into its Joint Strategic Leadership course as well as its 360 leadership survey for Annual Year 2014's class; this effort would include administering the Harvard Implicit Bias test. See Air Force Global Diversity Division, *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* (2013), 14; Dr. Charles Nath III (director of curriculum, Holm Center), interview by the author, 19 October 2012; *USAFA Diversity Plan* (Colorado Springs, CO: USAFA Diversity Office, June 2009), 2-3, 14, <http://www.usafa.edu/superintendent/diversity/office/links/AFD-110316-012.pdf>; Arenas, interview, 11 October 2012; Dr. Mary N. Hampton (associate dean for academics, Air Command and Staff College / DEA), interview by the author, 1 November 2012; and COL Gene Kamena, USAF, retired (former deputy department

chair, Air War College Department of Leadership and Warfighting), interview by the author, 5 November 2012.

40. Air Force Global Diversity Division, *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* (2013), 14.

41. The mentoring programs can be found on the MyEDP, MyODP, or MyCDP, via the Air Force Portal. AFI 36-3401, *Air Force Mentoring*, 1 June 2000, took 13 years to replace; Air Force Manual 36-2643, *Air Force Mentoring Program*, was issued on 1 May 2013.

42. Jolynn Shoemaker and Jennifer Park, *Progress Report on Women in Peace & Security Careers: US Executive Branch*, WIIS Leadership Series (Washington, DC: Women in International Security, [2011]), 4, http://csis.org/files/publication/110726_WIIS_ProgressReport_ExecBranch_fnl.pdf.

43. In the interest of full disclosure, note that the author is a board member of AcademyWomen, the sponsoring vehicle. AcademyWomen also sponsors e-Mentoring leadership programs for female cadets and midshipmen, male and female veterans, and military spouses.

44. These individuals meet virtually, via telephone/e-mail/Skype or in person. At this time, the program is mostly restricted to women mentoring women with some inclusion of senior male mentors (O-4 commanders and above). "Our eMentor Programs," E-Mentor, accessed 12 November 2012, <http://www.ementorprogram.org/pages/programs>; and Stefanie Goebel, eMentor Leadership Program director, to the author, e-mail, 27 November 2012.

45. *NavyWomen eMentor Leadership Program: Year 3; Year End Assessment Report, 2010–2011* (Washington, DC: Department of the Navy, n.d.), 8. Data prepared by Magnolia, Inc., as a third-party evaluation of AcademyWomen services, AcademyWomen Archives.

46. When extrapolated to the entire population of program participants, the 12 individuals who stated in the survey that the program "positively impacted their decision to remain in uniform" represent 60 program participants. Retaining these 60 members would translate to a total \$4.35 million return on investment (the program costs approximately \$200,000) when one considers replacement costs such as recruitment and training. *NavyWomen eMentor Leadership Program*, 22, 27; and Stefanie Goebel, eMentor Leadership Program director, to the author, e-mail, 29 January 2013.

47. Air Force Diversity Operations, *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* (2010), 14.

48. Liswood, *Loudest Duck*, 27.

49. The Air Force Diversity Committee formed in December 2010. A quarterly session is cochaired by the secretary of the Air Force and the chief of the Air Force's human resources staffs to "offer advice on major diversity policy issues and long-term strategic oversight and perspectives." Lane to the author, e-mail. Further, a chief diversity officer was hired at the US Air Force Academy in early 2011, and several surveys have been conducted or planned, including an Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC) Career Decision Survey in November 2011 to better understand why individuals leave/remain in the Air Force (results are pending) and a planned joint Air Force Public Affairs and AFPC survey to examine the specific issue of retaining women. Finally, in 2012 official guidance in the form of AFI 36-7001, *Diversity*, and AFI 1-1, *Air Force Culture*, was issued in summer 2012. Lane to the author, e-mail.

50. Air Force Global Diversity Division, *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* (2013), 15.

51. Air Force leaders should remain vigilant to the problem set of increasing diversity because resting on one's laurels could trigger inadvertent backsliding. Yourse, interview.

52. Samuels and Samuels, "Incorporating the Concept of Privilege," 323.

53. Lieutenant Colonel DiSilverio addressed three policy recommendations, including values identified by women, in her Fairchild Paper *Winning the Retention Wars*.

54. *Ibid.*, 42.
55. US General Accounting Office, *Military Personnel: Longer Time between Moves Related to Higher Satisfaction and Retention*, GAO 01-841 (Washington, DC: US General Accounting Office, August 2001), 2, 17, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d01841.pdf>.
56. Erik Holmes, "Slowing PCS—Fewer Moves Will Save Millions, Boost Unit Efficiency, Leaders Say," *Air Force Times*, 23 October 2006.
57. DiSilverio, *Winning the Retention Wars*, 43. According to DiSilverio, "Of 3,795 officers completing a 1999 AFPC survey about home basing, 83 percent overwhelmingly liked the concept. The majority of personnel (76 percent of officers) would want to remain at a home-base location for 5–12 years" (*ibid.*).
58. AFI 36-2110, *Assignments*, 22 September 2009, 343.
59. DiSilverio, *Winning the Retention Wars*, 45.
60. *Ibid.*, 46.
61. *Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009*, Public Law 110-417, 110th Cong., 2nd sess., 14 October 2008, sec. 533(a)(1).
62. *Ibid.*, sec. 533(c).
63. *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012*, Public Law 112-81, 112th Cong., 1st sess., 31 December 2011, sec. 531.
64. Specifically, the Navy indicated that "during the period of inactive duty in the IRR [Individual Ready Reserve], the member is provided full active duty TRICARE health benefits for themselves [*sic*] and their dependents, a monthly stipend of 2 times 1/30th of their basic pay, and a one-time move to a CONUS [continental United States] location of their choice for the duration of their participation in the pilot program. All program participants will return to active duty at the end of the period prescribed and will incur a two-month for every one-month of program participation obligated service (OBLISERVE) in addition to any existing OBLISERVE owed to the Navy." NAVADMIN 089/12, "Career Intermission Pilot Program Extension," 16 March 2012, <http://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/reference/messages/Documents/NAVADMINS/NAV2012/NAV12089.txt>.
65. The Coast Guard program is open to men and women, officers and enlisted. Individuals can leave twice during their career for 24 months at a time without pay. These individuals choose either to affiliate with the Reserve or not affiliate, and returning to duty is a rather straightforward process. Initially a once-in-a-career opportunity, it was modified in 2009 to become available twice in a career. ALCOAST 299/09, "Update to Temporary Separation and Care of Newborn Children Policy," 19 May 2009, <http://www.uscg.mil/announcements/ALCOAST/alcoast299-09.txt>; and US Coast Guard, Commandant Instruction M1000.4, *Military Separations*, September 2011, 1-177–1-179.
66. About 407 Coast Guard officers (7.4 percent of the force) separate each year. Of these, about 125 are eligible for temporary separation (30.7 percent), and 59 of them (47.2 percent) took part. Neither the return rates for this program (about 17 percent of approximately 44 officer participants) nor the promotion rates have been high thus far, but the Coast Guard remains dedicated since even a small return rate offers a way to retain quality individuals. TempSepStats Excel Spreadsheet, LCDR Micah Acree, US Coast Guard Workforce Forecasting and Analysis (CG-12A) Officer Team, Washington, DC, to the author, e-mails, 23 and 25 October 2012.
67. Yourse, interview.
68. DiSilverio, *Winning the Retention Wars*, 49.

69. Michael Donley, secretary of the Air Force, "Rebalancing the Total Force: Leveraging Reserve Strengths for Changing Global Realities" (remarks at the 2011 AFRC Senior Leaders Conference, Washington, DC, 16 May 2011), http://european-security.com/n_index.php?id=6082.

70. US House and Senate, *The United States Army Reserve 2012 Posture Statement: An Enduring Operational Army Reserve; Providing Indispensable Capabilities to the Total Force*, 112th Cong., 2nd sess., March 2012, ii.

71. *Ibid.*, 13.

72. Unconscious bias or "mind bugs" may influence the judgment of even the most well-intentioned officers. As psychologist Roger Shepard observes, "The intellect is completely powerless" when it comes to the fact that "unconscious judgments, may often be in error" in dealing with diversity. Corydon Ireland, "Mahzarin Banaji Looks at Biology of Bias," *Harvard Gazette*, 11 October 2007, <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2007/10/mahzarin-banaji-looks-at-biology-of-bias/>.

73. "Project Implicit," Harvard University, accessed 6 October 2012, <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/>.

74. "Bringing Leadership Lessons to the Classroom . . . and the Boardroom," Stanford Graduate School of Business, accessed 6 October 2012, <http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/cldr/teaching/leadershipinfocus.html>.

75. Part of developing competency is ensuring that leaders are gender-neutral when it comes to selecting individuals for certain positions. One finds a powerful example of this principle enjoying success in the civilian world. For several decades now, orchestra audition panels have gone to great lengths to overcome gender bias. Panels considering future players will do so without initially seeing the candidates. They will go to such lengths as having men escort women candidates so that the candidate sounds like a man walking. Having leveled the playing field, the panel focuses solely on the quality of the music. According to the study, "Estimates based on the roster sample indicate that blind auditions may account for 25 percent of the increase in the percentage of orchestra musicians who are female." Claudia Goldin and Cecilia Rouse, "Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of 'Blind' Auditions on Female Musicians," *American Economic Review* 90, no. 4 (September 2000): 715–41.

76. Lane to author, e-mail.

77. Air Force Global Diversity Division, *Air Force Diversity Strategic Roadmap* (2013), 14.

78. Arenas, interview, 11 October 2012.

79. The "January 2012 Internal Communication Assessment Group Diversity Survey of Airmen [revealed that]: 86% believe the Air Force is doing a good/excellent job creating diversity throughout the Total Force; 75% agree that it is important for the Air Force to attract, recruit, develop and retain a diverse workforce; 61% think Air Force senior leaders are committed to improving diversity." The surveys do not demonstrate how the questions were framed, but more telling of the author's personal experience are the following statistics: "[Sixty-one percent] have not read or heard diversity initiatives discussed by senior leaders; 40% understand the Air Force definition of diversity." AFD 120716-024, "US Air Force Key Talking Points."

80. Many thanks to Kimberly Streeter for this idea.

81. Samuels and Samuels, "Incorporating the Concept of Privilege," 323.



Col Suzanne M. Streeter, USAF

Colonel Streeter (USAFA; MA, Middlebury College; MA, Naval Postgraduate School; MA, Air University) is currently assigned to the US Cyber Command Joint Intelligence Operations Center as the division chief of Intelligence Plans and Exercises. This division serves as the driving force behind intelligence planning support to deliberate and real-world contingency planning of cyber operations. Colonel Streeter is a master intelligence officer with 18 years of operational intelligence experience at all levels of the Air Force, including staff experience at Headquarters Air Force. She was most recently a student at the Air War College. Previously, she was deputy commander of the 548th Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Group, Beale AFB, California, which included 1,200 Airmen and civilian personnel engaged in the rapid processing, analysis, fusion, and reporting of intelligence information collected by U-2, RQ-4, MC-12, MQ-1, and MQ-9 reconnaissance aircraft supporting tactical military forces, regional commanders, and national priorities worldwide. She has also been a director of operations and squadron commander. Deployments include translator for Operation Decisive Endeavor, officer in charge of the Cryptologic Services Group at the combined air and space operations center, and officer in charge of setting up the Air Force's first in-country expeditionary intelligence-exploitation squadron in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Let us know what you think! [Leave a comment!](#)

Distribution A: Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

<http://www.airpower.au.af.mil>