ADDRESSING DECEPTIVE DISTINCTIONS: A COMPARISON OF THE OCCUPATIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Todd A. Migliaccio, California State University, Sacramento

ABSTRACT

In the analysis of expected behaviors and personal attributes, emphasis has been on differences between men and women, often failing to address "deceptive distinctions" of occupational requirements. Based on mean comparisons of six variables from two gender ideology scales by equal numbers of men and women across different occupations (military personnel; elementary school teachers), a number of significant of differences were noted within gender, that follow occupational expectations. Ultimately, both men and women adhere to occupational expectations, while still continuing to "do gender" especially when the behaviors do not contradict requirements of the job.

Gender and behavioral expectations of males and females are socially constructed, making them fluid and dynamic across interactions and over time (West & Zimmerman 1986). In most, if not all Western societies, however, women and men are consistently defined in reference to one another (Connell 1995), or as Kimmel (1994) presents, women are identified as "other" and men are defined by what women are not, often establishing men's behaviors as the norm and women's behaviors as deviant. Women are assumed to be more expressive in their interactions, or emotional (Wright 1982). Hochschild (1983) claims women are expected to be emotion workers, focusing on the needs of others, both in the paid working world and the home (Garey 1995; Hertz 1997). Men, in contrast, are believed to be more instrumental, or activity-based in their interactions (Wright 1982), which often includes being more stoic (Harris 1995; Kaufman 1992), aggressive (Kaufman 1992; Kimmel 1996) and displaying higher self-efficacy (Whitley 1983; Wiley 1995). Simply, while expected roles of men and women have changed over time, assumptions about differences between men and women, and more important, contrasting the assumed differences persist in Western society. This study attempts to analyze how occupations dominated by one gender or the other contribute to the beliefs about gender differences.

OCCUPATIONS AS DECEPTIVE DISTINCTIONS

Assumed differences have been used to justify the "separation of spheres", as well as segregation in the workforce (Lorber 1994). While women have gained greater access to most occupations, both socially and legally, there still exists a social belief in gender differences that distinguish jobs and expectations about who should pursue specific careers. Many believe that men and women, as a result of certain behaviors, are more adept at specific jobs. For women, it tends to track them toward emotional and care giving careers (Epstein 1991) that have lower wages and less prestige (Williams 1995), such as teaching. In contrast, occupations that require more aggressive and even violent behaviors are male-dominated, such as the military, largely because men's behaviors and/or attributes are perceived to be better fitted to excel in such occupations (Kimmel 2000; Kirchmeyer & Bullin 1997).

Focusing on the differences between genders, however, overlooks the similarities that may exist between men and women, thus maintaining a segregated and ultimately hierarchical world (Epstein 1991). Emphasizing differences both marginalizes those who do not fit into this framework and maintains a separation of men and women (Sterk & Turner 1994). More importantly, highlighting differences fails to consider variation within each gender (Lorber 1994; Scott 1990). Connell (1987) presents that there exists an array of masculine and feminine displays in society, most of which are not fully discussed when the emphasis remains on differences between men and women. A number of studies have noted different masculine and feminine displays within interactions, and even occupations (Harris 1995; Messerschmidt 2004; Pyke 1996), concluding that variables associated with gender influence people's behav-

iors.

Cynthia Epstein (1988) labels those social factors, or variables that contribute to perceived differences between men and women but which are often overlooked in analyses as "deceptive distinctions." Deceptive distinctions are so closely associated with gender, the impact they have is hidden, leaving many to assume any changes are due to gender. For example, differences assumed to be related to gender are in fact a result of positions that men and women occupy. In this study, occupation is used as a "deceptive distinction," more specifically the male-dominated occupation of the military and the female-dominated occupation of grade school teachers. Seeking to expand on past research that has suggested that people who work in certain jobs are more likely to exhibit specific behaviors related to the jobs (Kohn & Schooler 1982; Martin 2003; Melzer 2002; Menaghan 1991), this study compares the behavioral expectations of both men and women across two different occupations in the United States: military personnel and elementary school teachers.

As Melzer states, "work is gender segregated...and this presumably leads women and men to establish different attitudes, skills, and behaviors" (2002 821). An outcome of this is to associate behaviors, traits and/or abilities with gender and not an occupation, making occupations "deceptive distinctions." In other words, segregating men and women into different jobs that have specific requirements, and then associating these behaviors and/or traits with the gender and not the job overlooks the influence occupational requirements have on individuals. At the same time, the segregation can result in an overemphasis in the impact of gender on behaviors, or what I term as behavioral expectations, which include beliefs about both the individual's own and other peoples' behaviors. Acknowledging that jobs influence the behaviors of individuals allows researchers to more fully understand differences, including the potential for differences among men or women who are in different occupations, rather than dichotomizing into differences between men and women. Failing to address occupation as a potential influence in behavior also disregards those individuals and their subsequent behaviors who crossover into occupations that are not associated with their gender.

Military Requirements

Male-dominated and physically engaging occupations, such as the military, require personnel to engage in more aggressive and even violent behaviors (Cohn 1993; Melzer 2002; Morgan 1994). Military personnel are expected to display higher levels of aggressiveness (Cohn 1993; Morgan 1994), to be more stoic, to avoid feminine behaviors, especially displays of emotional neediness (Bilton & Kosminsky 1990), and to be sure of their ability to produce specific changes, i.e. self-efficacy (Kimmel 2000). High self-efficacy is a necessity for the job, as research has shown that there is a relationship between lower levels of self-efficacy among military personnel and greater subsequent problems with PTSD (post traumatic stress disorder) after returning home from war (Weisenberg, Schwarzwald, & Solomon 1991).

While these are specific requirements of military jobs, the assumption is that these behavioral expectations are directly related to men and/or masculinity, in part because men encompass over 88 percent of military personnel (About.com 2007). The jobs and subsequent behaviors are associated with men as opposed to associating the behaviors with the jobs, but what of women in the military? Based on requirements of the military discussed above, female military personnel will likely portray behaviors that are better suited for a career in the military, such as being aggressive or displaying higher levels of self-efficacy. Boldry, Wood, and Kashy (2001) concluded in their study of men and women in the military that there was little difference between men and women in their motivation and in the leadership qualities needed to excel in the field. Women in the military displayed behaviors that assisted them in fulfilling the requirements in the military, which are likely different from those expected of females in more feminine-dominated occupations, such as primary school teachers.

Elementary School Requirements

The vast majority of elementary school teachers are women (93%) (Teachers.net 2007). This occupation requires different personal attributes and behaviors than those of military personnel, leading people to assume that it is women who choose to enter into fields because of their predilection toward certain behaviors (Epstein 1991) and if men

were to enter the field it would masculinize the primary school systems (Skelton 2003). Even self-efficacy, which can be construed as being necessary in both occupations, has been identified as an issue of major concern for primary schools because of the lower levels displayed by personnel (Cannon & Scharmann 1996; Morrell and Carroll 2003; Telljohann and Everett 1996).

Both Williams (1995) and Sargent (2001) identify certain expected behaviors of teachers, which include empathy as well as avoidance of competitive and aggressive behaviors. Teachers are expected to care for and support students. Even in dealing with colleagues, head teachers, regardless of gender, tend to elicit more feminine qualities and identify themselves as being more people-oriented (Coleman 2003). This emphasis on caring is historically based, as teachers have fought to keep militarism out of schools, choosing instead to emphasize connection in relationships between and with students in an attempt to avoid aggressive and competitive behaviors (Zeiger 2003). As Zeiger (2003) presented, educators concerned with a rise in aggressive behaviors, battled with administrators to stop the reinstatement of military training in physical education classes and public schools in general. Teacher activists based their arguments on professional identity, highlighting the negative effects militarism had on children and the learning environment. Additionally, in comparisons of different levels of teachers, elementary school educators tend to display higher levels of caring and people-orientation than other teachers (Skelton 2003).

Hypotheses and Research Questions

As outlined above, each of the attributes and behavioral expectations included in this study, with the exception of empathy, are related to occupational requirements for military personnel. On the other hand, only two of the attributes (i.e. aggressive and empathy) are specifically tied to requirements of the teaching profession. Self-efficacy, although considered a job requirement for teachers by many, has been found to customarily be low among teachers. Based on these parameters, hypotheses were developed for those two attributes that have some occupational expectation (low or high) for both jobs, while research questions were formulated for those factors that were expectations in only one field.

Given the expectation that military personnel will display aggression, while elementary school teachers will not, I pose the following hypothesis.

> H1: Male military personnel will report significantly higher levels of *aggression* than male elementary school teachers, and female military personnel will report significantly higher levels of *aggression* than female elementary school teachers.

Given the expectation that military personnel will be self-efficacious, while past research has shown elementary school teachers to report low levels of self-efficacy, I pose a second hypothesis.

> H2: Male military personnel will report significantly higher levels of *self-efficacy* than male elementary school teachers, and female military personnel will report significantly higher levels of *self-efficacy* than female elementary school teachers.

While empathy is an expected attribute for elementary school teachers, there is not necessarily an expectation that military personnel will exhibit a particularly high or low level of empathy. Hence, the following research question was developed to explore this relationship.

> RQ1: Will male and female elementary school teachers, by virtue of their occupational requirements, report higher levels of *empathy* than male and female military personnel, respectively?

Similarly, exhibiting low levels of emotion is an occupational expectation in the military, but teaching does not necessarily dictate a high or low level of emotion as a job requirement. Based on this, a similar second research question is posed.

> RQ2: Will male and female military personnel, by virtue of their occupational requirements, report lower levels of *emotion* than male and female elementary school teachers, respectively?

Table 1 - Male Role Norms Scale Factor Loadings

Survey Item	Anti-Feminine	Stoic
Not respect a man who worries	**0.50**	0.22
Hairdressers/cooks not masculine	**0.52**	0.26
Embarrassing to have a woman's job	**0.78**	0.27
Man who hobbies are cooking/sewing is not appealing	**0.75**	0.09
Man should not be a secretary	**0.72**	0.29
A feminine man bothers me	**0.60**	0.04
A man should not cry in a movie	-0.18	**0.72**
A man should not show pain	-0.20	**0.65**
A man showing weakness is disgusting	-0.26	**0.60**

Holding the views that men should be stoic, and that men should not exhibit feminine qualities, are occupational expectations for military personnel, however, it is unclear how they might relate to elementary school teaching. Hence, the final research question, in two parts, is related to these expectations.

> RQ3: Will male and female military personnel, by virtue of their occupational requirements, report that (a) men should be *stoic* and (b) that men should *not exhibit feminine qualities* at a significantly higher level than male and female elementary school teachers, respectively?

METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS

Sampling

This study relied on a quota non-probability sampling procedure (Salkind 1997) that drew males and females from two separate occupations: enlisted military personnel and grade school teachers. This study is part of a larger study that attempted to analyze the relationship between gendered expectations on friendships, controlling for gender and occupation. Beyond the behavioral questions used in this paper, respondents were asked about their attitudes concerning friendship and about their specific close friendships (for a complete discussion of this research, see Migliaccio 2002). The use of quota sampling works best when the groups under analysis have previously established statistics (Sheregi 1975), such as the two occupational groups in this study. While the sampling is nonrandom, the sample statistics are similar to those of the national averages of the same groups (discussed below). The use of enlisted military personnel (88% men) and grade school teachers (93% women) is based on the predominance of one gender in each occupation. Focusing on obtaining nearly equal numbers of males and females in both occupations, packets of surveys were sent to personal contacts (gatekeepers) who were either members of the military or grade school teachers, or who worked closely with one of the groups. Contact individuals lived in various regions of the United States (California, Washington, Montana, New York, and Maryland), thus limiting the regional bias (Weiss 1994). These "gatekeepers" distributed one survey to each member of the designated groups with which they worked, informing them of the project and the need for their responses. The respondents completed the survey independent of others and submitted them to the researcher via a self-addressed stamped envelope.

The response rates for both groups were 40 percent, showing a low response rate, as well as the potential for a non-representative sample. This low response I believe, however, is not due to normal social conditions related to volunteerism, but due to unforeseen social forces. The surveys were distributed less than one week prior to September 11. Adams, Buscarino and Galea (2006) identify that 9/11 had a profound impact on people throughout the United States, increasing stress levels for all people. People with higher levels of stress are less likely to respond to surveys (Miller & Salkind 2002) lowering the access and focus for completing surveys by all individuals following 9/11 and are not related to a specific group.

A common statistical response to addressing issues of non-responsiveness is to weight groups, but this is not often a tenable approach since it does not always generate the desired impact on the data (Schnell 1993). More so, as Schnell further reported, quota sampling follows a similar procedure as weighting, which is to derive a representa-

tive sample and that can be recognized if a comparison of statistics can be made between the population and the sample. Using two nationally recognized occupations, averages were found to be nearly the same between the sample and the population in terms of education, age and income (Sheregi 1975) (About.com 2007; Teacher.net 2007).

Survey

The survey was self-administered. This study utilized two separate gender ideology scales: Personality Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (for a detailed explanation of this survey, see Spence and Helmreich 1978) and the Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS) (for a detailed explanation of this survey, see Thompson and Pleck 1986). The PAQ asks respondents to rate their own attributes, while the MRNS measures people's general expectations for men's behaviors in society (for a detailed discussion of the measurement tool, see Migliaccio 2002). In other words, responses to the MRNS reflect both men's and women's reported expectations about how men should behave (e.g. a man should not show pain). To ascertain the dimensionality of the data, principle component factor analysis was performed. Gendered expectations and/or behaviors are complex concepts that are not easily defined by a single construct. Factor analysis allows us to separate items into coherent subsets that are relatively independent of one another (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996).

From the MRNS, nine items were used to determine the existence of two factors: *anti-feminine* and *stoic*. Thompson and Pleck (1986) identified these two factors in a previous study using the MRNS. Using a principal component factor analysis, eigenvalues were used to determine that the two factors existed (eigenvalues of 3.7 and 1.8 explained 61% of the variance). The *anti-feminine* factor utilized six indicators in its construction, which entails the avoidance of feminine behaviors by men. As one can see in Table 1, the six items load higher than .50 on the factor, while the remaining three indicators loaded below .30, identifying the six items as being associated with the first factor (To determine reliability both Cronbach's alpha (.81) and test-retest reliability (.9742) measures were run. The reliability measures were made for the six items, not all nine items).

Table 2 - Factor Loadings for Self-Efficacy, Aggressive, Empathy, and Emotional

Attribute		Factor Loadings
Self-efficacy		
	Makes decisions easily	0.54
	Does well under pressure	0.63
	Never gives up	0.68
	Feels superior	0.76
	Self-confident	0.86
Aggressive		
	Rough	0.38
	Active	0.44
	Competitive	0.65
	Aggressive	0.71
Empathy		
	Aware of other's feelings	0.66
	Very understanding of others	0.71
	Warm in relation to others	0.73
	Kind	0.75
Emotional		
	Always cries	0.51
	Needs other's approval	0.78
	Feelings easily hurt	0.88

The second behavior, *stoic,* refers to physical and emotional strength and inexpressiveness, and was comprised of three indicators (see Table 1). As shown in Table 1, the three indicators load high on the factor (.60 and above), while the other six indicators load below .30 (Cronbach's alpha (.70) and test-retest reliability (.9775) measures are for the three item factor and do not include the other six items; A full discussion of the factors and the subsequent loadings for both factors can be noted in Migliaccio 2002). Furthermore, the loadings identified in this study are higher than those identified by Thompson and Pleck (1996) in their original study.

In contrast to the MRNS, the PAQ is a personality-based measurement tool that attempts to assess self-ratings of both masculinity and femininity (Spence & Helmreich 1978). As opposed to focusing on masculine/feminine labels, used in previous studies of the PAQ, I chose to instead use variables that may be associated with a gender, but are not gendered by the label. Using principal components analysis, eigenvalues for four potential factors were identified (4.3, 3.1, 1.4, 1.2), which explained 63 percent of total variance. Indicators were sorted into coherent subsets. As displayed in Table 2, the first factor, *self-efficacy* was comprised of five items (±=.8073; test-retest reliability: .9535),

Table 3 - Demographic Characteristics of Military Personnel (N=90) and Elementary School Teachers (N=110), By Sex

	Military		Teachers	
	Females	**Males**	**Females**	**Males**
N	**40**	**50**	**62**	**48**
Race	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**
White	50.0	56.0	83.9	75.0
African-American	25.0	16.0	--	--
Latino/a	--	16.0	6.5	8.3
Asian-American	25.0	12.0	9.7	16.7
Education				
High school	--	16.0	--	--
Some college	25.0	56.0	--	--
Bachelor degree	50.0	24.0	71.0	64.6
Masters degree	25.0	4.0	29.0	35.4
Mean Age (years)	27.50	28.28	37.52	41.50
Median Income ($)	0,000-30,000	30,000-40,000	40,000-50,000	40,000-50,000

and measures a person's perceived belief in his or her own ability and/or usefulness in the social world (while I do not offer all of the loadings for each indicator on all of the other factors, I will note that the highest loading for the four indicators on any of the other factors was .21. This highlights that the indicators fit best on the *self-efficacy* factor than any other factor).

The second factor, *aggressive* (±=.601; test-retest reliability: .7576), combined four different items and focuses on physical competition (the highest loading of any indicator from the *aggressive* factor on another factor was .30. While not as low as those discussed in the *self-efficacy* factor above, this loading was for the indicator "aggressive," which had the highest loading (.71) of the four indicators on the *aggressive* factor. Furthermore, the highest loading for the "rough" indicator on another factor, which had the lowest loading on this factor (.51), was .22). The factor, *empathy* (±=.798; test-retest reliability: .954), which measures a person's connection and ability to care and feel towards others, was comprised of four indicators (the highest loading for an indicator on any of the other factors was .33. All of the indicators had much higher loadings on the *empathy* factor than any other factor). The final factor, *emotional* (±=.637; test-retest reliability: .9759), was comprised of three indicators, and measured how a person characterizes his or her own emotional state, with an emphasis on emotional sensitivity (the highest loading of an indicator on another factor was .32, which was "always cries." The loading for "always cries" (.51) was higher on the *emotional* factor, and it fit with the theoretical notion of being emotional.) *Empathy* and *emotional* measure two distinct behavioral expectations as *empathy* focuses on others' emotional experiences while *emotional* measures the individual's own emotional experiences.

Demographics

The 200 participants consisted of 90 military personnel and 110 grade school teachers. Demographic statistics, separated by occupation and sex are presented in Table 3. Within the sample for each occupation, the male-to-female ratio was comparable. The military group had 40 females (44% of total military personnel in the study; 39% of total females in the study) and 50 males (56% of total military; 51% of total males). The group of grade school teachers had 62 females (56% of total teachers; 61% of total females) and 48 males (44% of total teachers; 49% of total males). Such numbers allow for direct comparisons of the groups without weighting. It should be noted that these proportions are not representative of the actual ratios in the general populations of both military personnel and grade school teachers (as mentioned above), however the non-representative samples are not a concern in this study as it is not my intention to draw conclusions about the general populations

Table 4 - Means, Standard Errors, and Independent Sample T-Test Results for All 6 Factors, By Gender

	Females				Males			
Aggression[c]	**Mean**	**S.E.**	**t**	**p-value**	**Mean**	**S.E.**	**t**	**p-value**
Teachers[a]	1.55	0.107	-5.50	p<.001	2.03	0.141	-2.43	p<.05
Military[b]	2.25	0.069			2.52	0.146		
Anti-Feminine[d]								
Teachers	2.72	0.153	-2.33	p<.05	3.43	0.193	-1.68	n.s.
Military	3.25	0.158			3.84	0.153		
Emotional[c]								
Teachers	2.97	0.110	2.65	p<.01	2.05	0.107	-0.311	n.s.
Military	2.50	0.139			2.10	0.012		
Empathy[c]								
Teachers	3.24	0.058	0.96	n.s.	2.59	0.049	-2.24	p<.05
Military	3.15	0.073			2.81	0.89		
Self-Efficacy[c]								
Teachers	2.34	0.067	-5.17	p<.001	2.35	0.071	-3.89	p<.001
Military	2.86	0.076			2.82	0.099		
Stoic[d]								
Teachers	2.77	0.169	-2.90	p<.01	3.80	0.185	-0.40	n.s.
Military	3.42	0.143			3.90	0.153		

[a] N for female teachers on all variables = 62; N for male teachers = 48.
[b] N for female military on all variables = 40; N for male military = 50.
[c] Measured on a 5-point semantic differential scale, with 5 representing a high level of the attribute.
[d] Measured on a 7-point scale, 1 representing the lowest score, and 7 the highest.

of military personnel and elementary school teachers. Still, the national averages (identified in parentheses for 2005-2006; see About.com; Teacher.net) of education (military: 74% some college; teachers: 35% earned masters degrees), income (military: $37,000; teachers: $47,000), race (military: 70% white; teachers: 87% white) and age (military: 33; teachers: 44) of both occupations are similar to the averages of the sample of this study (see Table 3 below).

Data Analysis

To test the hypotheses and explore the research questions, independent sample t-tests were conducted to test mean differences for each of the six factors: *anti-feminine, stoic, self-efficacy, aggressive, empathy*, and *emotional.* As noted on Table 4, four of the variables (self-efficacy, aggressive, empathy and emotional) were measured on 5-point semantic differential scales. For these variables the means can be interpreted that a larger mean indicates a higher level of the attribute. Two of the variables (anti-feminine and stoic) were measured on 7-point scales, and larger means indicate higher levels of these expectations for males' behavior. Mean scores for military personnel and teachers were compared separately for males and females. The means, t-values, standard errors and significance are reported in Table 4. All significant and non-significant t-values are reported, as lack of significant mean differences across job types are notable findings in this study.

For females, means for military personnel and teachers were significantly different for five of the six factors. The only factor that was not significantly different for these two groups was *empathy* – the person's ability to care for and feel toward others. Means for military personnel were higher on *aggressive*, *anti-feminine*, *self-efficacy*, and *stoic*. The only factor for which female teachers had significantly higher mean scores was *emotional,* which measured how a person characterized their own emotional state, with an emphasis on emotional connections to others.

For males, there were significant mean differences between military personnel and teachers for three factors: *aggressive, empathy*, and *self-efficacy*. On each of these measures, military personnel had higher mean scores than teachers (at least p<.05).

The mean scores for males on *anti-feminine, stoic,* and *emotional*, were not signifi-

cantly different for military personnel and teachers.

DISCUSSION

Occupational Requirements

The results outlined above highlight the value of viewing attributes and behavioral expectations expressed by men and women in the context of their occupational requirements. My findings support my first hypothesis, with male and female military personnel reporting higher levels of aggression. Excelling in the military requires individuals to display higher levels of aggressiveness than in other occupations. Interacting with students, a teacher is expected to connect with students and not be too aggressive or competitive, regardless of gender.

Excelling in the military also requires high levels of self-efficacy. Although there is nothing inherent in their profession that would suggest lower self-efficacy among teachers, my second hypothesis was based on past studies that have revealed lower levels of self-efficacy among teachers. The present findings further support this, as both male and female teachers reported significantly lower self-efficacy than their same-sex military counterparts. This issue continues to be of concern to educators and administrators in public schools.

Beginning with the first research question posed, I have a mixed finding that addresses both occupational and gendered expectations. The question was whether male and female elementary school teachers would report higher levels of *empathy* than male and female military personnel, respectively. And in fact, this was not the case. Military men were significantly more empathetic than male grade school teachers. This was counter to expected behaviors, as military men are generally presented as being hypermasculine, and even violent (Cohn 1993; Melzer 2002), but this oversimplifies the experiences of men in such occupations (Morgan 1994). And, at least in part, the masculine expectations learned through the military are related to issues of violence, aggression and even misogyny that solidify social hierarchies; this, however, does not fully articulate the complexity of their experience, for men in the armed forces undergo incidents that only their military "brothers" can understand. They become dependent on and require assistance from others in their group, a lesson that is literally "drilled" into them from the first days of boot camp. In other words, interdependence develops among the men. While individual sacrifices are rewarded, survival is insured through reliance on and caring for the others in their military unit. In effect, empathy is an unexpected occupational requirement of the military, even though such behaviors are often not associated with masculinity and thus not assumed to be a requisite of a masculine-focused occupation such as the military (Morgan 1994).

The heightened masculinized context of the military, however, allows for feelings to be expressed that may be contradictory to hegemonic notions of masculinity. As Bilton and Kosminsky (1990) suggest, it is not generally acceptable for men to be aware of others' feelings and be warm toward others, but in times of war it is. Having already validated their masculinity by being a member of the military, men have the opportunity to display "other characteristics more conventionally associated with the feminine than the masculine," which "include open and physical displays of concern and care" for other men (Morgan 1994 177). Military men are expected, and need to be more concerned with the safety of others in order to survive. The expression of these concerns and feelings, even though normatively characterized as feminine behaviors, are less of a concern for military men because their masculinity has already been validated through their occupation. Occupation, as a performance of gender, therefore, may allow for behaviors that are required of an occupation but may be counter to gender performances.

The same cannot be said of male grade school teachers. Lower levels of empathy are consistent with past research (Hilgenkamp & Livingston 2002) that suggests that male grade school teachers avoid behaviors that can be construed as feminine (Sargent 2001; Williams 1995), for, as Connell (1995) argues, a fear of being emasculated. While men in the military are able to follow requirements of their gender and occupation simultaneously, men in public schools may be prescribing to behaviors associated more with their gender than with their occupation, suggesting that men may be more inclined, regardless of job, to "do masculinity" appropriately by being less empathetic. In a similar vein, women in both the military and the public schools are able to simultaneously

meet the expectations of their gender and their occupations when exhibiting empathy, and subsequently do not differ significantly on this measure.

In reference to research questions two and three, both reveal strikingly consistent findings. Would military personnel report lower levels of emotion? And the two part question: Would military personnel also report higher expectations that men should be stoic, and higher expectations that men should not be feminine? For female military personnel, the answer was "yes," on all counts. For males, there were no significant differences between military personnel or teachers in any case.

To begin with male's emotional levels, an argument related to gender may be made to explain the lack of a significant difference across occupations between males' reported emotion levels. High levels of emotion do not appear to be a requirement of the teaching profession, and are typically associated with femininity. Therefore male teachers are free to exhibit lower levels of emotion, without detriment to their occupation, and can in essence reaffirm their masculine identities, a common behavior of male grade school teachers (Sargent 2001; Williams 1995). In effect, in an effort to appear masculine while being associated with a feminine occupation, male teachers "do gender" by avoiding appearing emotional. "Doing gender" (West & Zimmerman 1986) is an ongoing process through which people perform gender in society, which determines access to social resources.

One's position in the job market not only is related to gendered expectations but also can be a part of the overall gender performance, or a way of "doing gender." As past research has shown, an occupation can be so strongly gendered that it affects other behaviors (Hilgenkamp & Livingston 2002; Williams 1995). In relation to this study, the gender performance of male teachers, who are interacting in a female-identified occupation, results in reported levels of emotion comparable to men in the military, where low levels of emotion are expected. While the behavior fits for only one of the occupations, it is expected of all of the men.

On the other hand, female military personnel, in alignment with job expectations, do report lower levels of emotion, compared to female teachers. It has been proposed that women are not as concerned with gender boundaries as men (Bem 1993; Connell 1987) and are able to adhere more to the job requirements so as to excel in the field of their choosing. Herbert's interviews revealed the perception among women in the military that "it was more important to be perceived as heterosexual than feminine," (1998 175) which further suggests a flexibility to exhibit less emotion, even though it might be at odds with the typical expectations of femininity.

Across occupations, male respondents also reported similar behavioral expectations regarding (a) men being stoic and (b) not exhibiting feminine traits. In this case high levels were expected for military men based on job requirements, while the comparably high responses of male teachers may be based on their own attempts to define masculinity in contrast to their role in a predominantly female occupation. Past research has shown that men in female-dominated occupations often will attempt to exhibit characteristics of a job that are defined as masculine (Sargent 2001; Williams 1995) in an attempt to appropriately perform their masculinity.

In contrast to male teachers who expect to be stoic and avoid femininity as a response to their occupation, military personnel, and men in particular are projected to be stoic and to avoid that which is perceived as feminine as a requisite of their occupation. Those individuals who are members of the occupation are more likely to subscribe to such beliefs about men's behaviors, including women. More so than women in public schools, women in the military were more inclined to believe men should be stoic and to not be associated with femininity or display feminine behaviors. This suggests that occupation is related to expectations of behaviors of not only oneself but also of others. Herbert's conclusion that women in the military "walk a fine line" (1998 170) between being "too feminine" to excel at their jobs, and "too masculine" to appropriately perform their role as a woman provides an important insight into this particular finding. By idealizing the typical male's behavior as more masculine and more stoic, military women are in essence giving themselves a wider masculine-feminine continuum in which to navigate. In other words, by expecting men to operate at a more extreme end of the spectrum, women in the military allow themselves more

flexibility to exhibit the masculine traits so often equated with competence in their work, while still being less stoic and more feminine than their male co-workers. In contrast, in an occupation that does not pose these same challenges, female teachers' expectations of males' behaviors are not as closely linked to their own gender performances.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the analysis of occupation as a deceptive distinction shows how gender associated attributes and behavioral expectations can just as likely be job-related expectations. In this study, I focused on specific fields of work, i.e. enlisted military and grade schools, showing that the required expectations within each occupation impact both men and women, allowing me to question the impact that expectations about gender, and gender in general have on the behaviors of those in the occupations. I also presented that for those behavioral expectations that are not directly necessary for the occupation, gendered expectations take precedence. Simply, after satisfying occupational expectations, people engage in gendered behaviors. People "do work" then they "do gender."

Identifying how occupations influence the behaviors of individuals, potentially in lieu of gender begins to break down normative assumptions about gender differences of males and females. Behaviors that have traditionally been associated with a specific gender may be deceptive distinctions in that the behaviors are as likely a result of occupational requirements of the jobs they choose (or are tracked into) as they are gender.

While these findings can be utilized to further study gender across a range of occupations, they can also be used in the analysis of the segregation within work environments. For example, within the military, recent discussions about military designations by gender have become more pronounced, as women are still denied access to "combat" positions; positions that offer increased pay and greater access to promotions. Regardless of this designation, in present military conflicts, women often find themselves in combat situations, necessitating comparisons of men and women who encounter similar "battle" experiences, regardless of designation. Analyzing factors beyond gender would begin to uncover this social inequality, as well as the potential "deceptive distinction" about women's ability to be aggressive in physical altercations.

Moving beyond the gender dichotomy, combat experiences of both men and women should be compared to enlisted men and women who are not in combat situations, for each job designation carries with it different occupational expectations, and ultimately reactions, regardless of gender. Acknowledging the relationship between occupations and behaviors will begin to assist in breaking down the stereotypes and social labeling of occupations as "male" and "female", and begin to portray these jobs as non-gendered arenas with different requirements for the individuals.

Furthermore, studies should address why people choose different occupations, and the similarities and/or differences that may exist between genders, and more important, how gendered expectations impact this process. For example, for enlisted military personnel, if both men and women choose to enter into the military for financial reasons, then self-selection is less likely due to gender and behavioral expectations. Similarly for teachers, having greater access to career choices because of the college degree, the career choice for both males and females will help to comprehend the relationship between gender, occupation and behavioral expectations.

Ultimately, studying the relationship between gender and occupations continues the discussion surrounding "deceptive distinctions" and how perceptions about men and women can be limited by a gender lens. Discussions should extend beyond occupations, as deceptive distinctions may exist in a range of social situations that have been overlooked in the past. By examining these variables and their relationship to gender, one can begin to more fully understand the differences that exist between men and women, and more important, the similarities, as well as engage the debate surrounding the inequality between men and women.

REFERENCES

About.com. 2007. *About US Military*. NY: New York Times Company. Retrieved March 27, 2007. (http://usmilitary.about.com)

Adams R.E., J.A. Boscarino & S. Galea. 2006. Social and psychological resources and health outcomes after the World Trade Center Disas-

ter. *Social Science Medicine* 62 1 176-188.
Bem S.L. 1993. *The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate on Sexual Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale U Press.
Bilton M. & P. Kosminsky. 1990. *Speaking Out: Untold Stories From The Falkland War*. London: Grafton.
Boldry J., W. Wood & D.A. Kashy. 2001. Gender stereotypes and the evaluation of men and women in military training. *J Social Issues* 57 4 689-705.
Cannon J. & L. Scharmann. 1996. Influence of a cooperative early field experience on preservice elementary teachers' science. *Science Edu* 80 419-437.
Cohn C. 1993. Wars, wimps, and women: talking gender and thinking war. Pp. 227-248 in *Gendering War Talk*, M. Cooke & A. Woollacott, eds. Princeton, NJ: Princeton U Press.
Coleman M. 2003. Gender and the orthodoxies of leadership. *School Leadership & Management* 23 325-340.
Connell R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford U Press.
_____. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: U California Press.
Epstein C. 1991. On the non-work aspects of work. *Antioch Rev* 49 46-57.
_____. 1988. *Deceptive Distinctions: Sex, Gender, and the Social Order*. New Haven, NY: Yale U Press & Russell Sage Foundation.
Garey A.I. 1995. Constructing motherhood on the night shift: 'working mothers' as 'stay-at-home moms'. *Qualitative Sociology* 18 415-437.
Harris I.M. 1995. *Messages Men Hear: Constructing Masculinities*. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.
Herbert M.S. 1998. Fredrick the Great or Fredrick's of Hollywood?: The accomplishment of gender among women in the military. Pp. 157-187 in *Everyday Inequalities: Critical Inquiries*, J. O'Brien & J.A. Howard, eds. Ames, IA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
Hertz R. 1997. A typology of approaches to childcare: the centerpiece of organizing the family life for dual-earner couples. *J Family Issues* 18 355-85.
Hilgenkamp K.D. & M.M. Livingston. 2002. Tomboys, masculine characteristics, and self-relatings of confidence in career success. *Psychological Rep* 90 743-749.
Hochschild A. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: U California Press.
Kaufman M. 1992. The construction of masculinity and the triad of men's violence. Pp. 28-49 in *Men's Lives*, M. Kimmel & M. Messner, eds. NY: Macmillan Publishing Co.
Kimmel M. 1994. Masculinity as homophobia. Pp. 119-141 in *Theorizing Masculinites*, H. Brod & M. Kaufman, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
_____. 1996. *Manhood in America*. NY: The Free Press.
_____. 2000. Saving the males: the sociological implications of the Virginia Military Institute and the Citadel. *Gender & Society* 14 494-517.
Kirchmeyer C. & C. Bullin. 1997. Gender roles in a traditional female occupation: a study of emergency, operating, intensive care, and psychiatric nurses. *J Vocational Behavior* 50 78-95.
Kohn M. & C. Schooler. 1982. Job conditions and personality: a longitudinal assessment of their reciprocal effects. *Amer J Sociol* 87 1257-1286.
Lorber J. 1994. *Paradoxes of Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale U Press.
Martin P. 2003. 'Said and done' versus 'saying and doing': gendering practices, practicing gender at work. *Gender & Society* 17 342-366.
Melzer S. 2002. Gender, work, and intimate violence: men's occupational violence spillover and compensatory violence. *J Marriage Family* 64 820-832.
Menaghan E. 1991. Work experiences and family interaction processes: the long reach of the job? *Ann Rev Sociol* 17 419-444.
Messerschmidt J. 2004. Varieties of 'real men'. Pp. 126-149 in *The Gendered Society Reader*, M. Kimmel & A. Aronson, eds. NY: Oxford U Press.
Migliaccio T. 2002. *"Doing gender", "doing friendship": How gendered expectations influence friendships*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside, University of California, Riverside.
Miller D. & N. Salkind. 2002. *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Morgan D. 1994. Theater of war: combat, the military, and masculinities. Pp. 165-182 in *Theorizing Masculinities*, H. Brod & M. Kaufman, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Morrell P. & J. Carroll. 2003. An extended examination of preservice elementary teachers' science teaching self-efficacy. *School of Science and Mathematics* 103 246-251.
Pyke K. 1996. Class-based masculinities: the interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power. *Gender & Society* 10 527-549.
Schnell R. 1993. Homogeneity of social categories as a precondition of "representativity" and weighting procedures. *Zeitschrift for Sociologie* 22 16-32.
Salkind N.J. 1997. *Exploring Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Sargent P. 2001. *Real Men or Real Teachers?: Contradictions in the Lives of Men Elementary School Teachers*. Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.
Scott J. 1990. Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. Pp. 134-148 in *Conflicts in Feminism*, M. Hirsch & E. Keller, eds. NY: Routledge.
Sheregi F.E. 1975. The application of the method of quotas in sampled sociological research. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya* 2 74-84.

Skelton C. 2003. Male primary teachers and perceptions of masculinity. *Educational Rev* 55 195-210.
Spence J.T. & R. Helmreich. 1978. *Masculinity & Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents*. Austin, TX: U Texas Press.
Sterk H. & L. Turner. 1994. Introduction: examining 'differences'. Pp. 1-15 in *Differences That Make a Difference: Examining the Assumptions in Gender Research*, L. Turner & H. Sterk, eds. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
Tabachnick B. & L. Fidell. 1996. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. NY: Harper Collins.
Teachers.net. 2007. Teacher.net Marketing and Demographics. La Jolla, CA: Teachers.net. (http://teachers.net/advertising/demo graphics.html)
Telljohann S. & S. Everett. 1996. Effects of an inservice workshop on the health teaching self-efficacy of elementary school teachers. *J School Health* 66 261-266.
Thompson E. & J. Pleck. 1986. The structure of male role norms. *Amer Behavioral Scientist* 29 531-543.
Weisenberg M., J. Schwarzwald, & Z. Solomon. 1991. Effects of combat stress reaction and posttraumatic stress disorder on perceived self-efficacy in battle. *Military Psychology* 3 61-72.
Weiss R. 1994. *Learning From Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. NY: Free Press.
West C. & D. Zimmerman. 1986. Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1 125-151.
Whitley B. 1983. Sex role orientation and self-esteem: a critical meta-analytic review. *J Personality Social Psych* 44 765-778.
Wiley M.G. 1995. Sex category and gender in social psychology. Pp. 362-394 in *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, K. Cook, G.A. Fine, & J. House, eds. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
Williams C.L. 1995. *Still a Man's World: Men Who Do "Women's Work"*. Berkeley, CA: U California Press.
Wright P. 1982. Men's friendships, women's friendships and the inferiority of the latter. *Sex Roles* 8 1-20.
Zeiger S. 2003. The schoolhouse vs. the armory: US teachers and the campaign against militarism in the schools, 1914-1918. *J Women's History* 15 150-179.