

the tremendous power that she was capable of wielding, were therefore undeniable; it was also undeniable that not every woman officer was so qualified.

Efforts To Determine Qualities of Leadership

After two years of experiment it was clear that the successful leader could not be determined entirely by age, or previous occupation, or education or the lack of it, or intelligence, or any other circumstance. This was in accord with Army experience with men.¹⁵ Later statistics revealed that some successful women leaders were married, some unmarried; many were college graduates; a few never went to high school; their ages ranged from 21 to 50. Many former teachers did well, but were almost equaled in number by former clerks and secretaries. Some former office managers succeeded, but so did former bookkeepers. Librarians were leaders as often as reporters, housewives as often as buyers, beauticians as often as lawyers.¹⁶

Neither did the ability to lead women automatically follow from instruction in voice and command, military manners, or Army Regulations. In fact, the only reliable method of discovery in the Corps' first years was that of trial and error, of sending commanders out with companies and advising Army stations to replace those who proved unsuccessful. This was costly, and involved the loss of real or potential leaders and damage to units.

The task of collecting and verifying available evidence on the nature of leadership was delegated to Dr. Hildegard Durfee, a psychologist employed as civilian consultant by the Office of the Director and, after the conversion, by the Army Service Forces. It was Dr. Durfee's opinion that the general principles of

leadership for men would apply equally to women, but that women would have certain special and additional problems. She added:

They are newcomers in a male setting; hence tend to feel on trial and under special pressure to make good. . . . They have volunteered their services, are apt to be more eager and more individualistic. . . . Their problem is not the overcoming of fear in combat, but more often the endurance of routine and monotony. . . . Women as a whole have had less experience in group discipline and leadership. Theirs has been at once an over privileged and an under privileged status in our society. They have been given more attention and consideration, but the price of this has been less opportunity and recognition.¹⁷

It was therefore anticipated, and later proved true, that certain established leadership principles would receive peculiar emphasis for women, and that new principles might emerge.

Sensitivity to Discipline

The first and most obvious difference to confront researchers was one of degree rather than intrinsic quality: that of responsiveness to leadership. All observers agreed that women were more dependent upon their company commander than were most men. A poor commander had

¹⁵ Lecture, Psychology of Leadership and Motivation, Lt. Col. T. Ernest Newland, USMA, 24 Mar 47, to seminar in advanced psychological principles of personnel administration, George Washington University, (D. C.), and on file there in mimeographed form.

¹⁶ Statistics concern 818 WAC officers who attended the School for WAC Personnel Administration in 1945. Routing Form, G-1, 26 Oct 45, sub: Final Rpt of Sch for WAC Pers Admin. SPTRP 352 WAC. Incl. Rpt of Comdt to G-1, 19 Oct 45. WDWAC 352.

¹⁷ References to Dr. Durfee's opinion are from her pamphlet, *The WAC Officer*.