Youth and military service: Exploring the effects of military socialisation, reintegration and employment

By

Neil Kramm

Thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sociology in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Stellenbosch University

Supervisor: Prof. Lindy Heinecken

March 2017

DECLARATION

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety, or in part, submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date: March 2017

_____

ABSTRACT

The Military Skills Development System (MSDS) was adopted to rejuvenate the ageing force of the South African National Defence Force (SANDF), and has an additional function to provide social upliftment to the youth by alleviating unemployment and providing the youth with skills to assist them in finding gainful employment in the civilian labour market. To date, little is known about the youth that enters the SANDF via the MSDS program and how military socialisation affects the young millennials recruited into the military. Similarly, research on youth reintegration after military service, especially for those that serve for shorter periods, is lacking in South Africa. Equally, how young veterans manage in the civilian work place is also largely neglected in the literature.

In this study, I aim to fill this void by exploring the experiences and perceptions of military socialisation, reintegration and employment status. Focus groups and interviews were conducted with MSDS instructors, current and former MSDS members and employment agencies. Discussions were framed around the three key themes this study sought to investigate, namely the effect of military socialisation has on young recruits and how this influences their ability to adapt in civilian life and find gainful employment.

The conclusion is reached that the values and aspirations of the millennial youth joining the military differs fundamentally from what the military requires. This is owing to this youth cohort being defined as more individualistic, lacking in discipline, selfish and opinionated. In terms of work preference, they prefer working in flexible work environments, flatter organizations, that are more participatory and less authoritarian, do not necessarily like team work unless it is collaborative and are typically risk adverse. The above character traits and work preferences stand in sharp contrast in terms of what the military desires in recruits and what the organisation can offer in terms of the work environment. The military therefore has to re-socialise young recruits in order to instil the values required by the military to transform these young civilians into soldiers.

This socialisation occurs via the total institution that changes recruits fundamentally with effects that are long-lasting as it creates a military habitus which reproduces their military identity in civilian life. The results of this study show that, initially, young recruits experience this as a culture shock, but as they assimilate the military culture that they become more authoritarian, aggressive and masculine. This they convey with them as they reintegrate back into civilian society when they leave the military. However, this is not the only affect that military socialisation has on them. Given that the military is a typical total institution, the loss of institutional support and command structure results in feelings of loss, anxiety, depression and alienation when they leave.

Their military habitus and dependency on the command structure in their work effects how and where they obtain employment. These effects are not similar for all military personnel. Combat branches experience finding employment more difficult as they have little skills to peddle on the labour market besides 'military skills'. Those in the technical and support musterings, find employment easier, but because it is not accredited often have to start their second careers right at the bottom of the ladder. However, irrespective of branch, their military habitus has an impact on how well they integrate into the workplace. These findings raise concerns in terms of the effect that militarization has on the youth, their ability to reintegrate back into society and whether the military should be used, or considered as a tool for social upliftment in a country like South Africa, which is beset with violence.

OPSOMMING

Die *Military Skills Development System (MSDS)* is geïmplementeer om die verouderende mag van die Suid-Afrikaanse Nasionale Weermag (SANW) te vernuwe met jonger lede, asook om sosiale opheffing te verskaf aan die jeug deur werkloosheid te verminder en om hulle met vaardighede toe te rus wat vir hulle van waarde sal wees om sinvolle werk in die privaatsektor te vind. Tans is min inligting beskikbaar oor die jeug wat deur die SANW in die MSDS program opgeneem word en hoe die leër se sosialisering hierdie jong millennials affekteer. Eweneens is daar 'n leemte in navorsing oor die jeug se herintegrasie na afhandeling van militêre diens, veral van diegene wat vir korter tydperke in Suid-Afrika diens gelewer het. Die vordering van jong veterane in die werksplek word ook nie deur die literatuur aangespreek nie.

Hierdie studie poog om die bogenoemde leemte te vul deur die ervarings en persepsies van militêre sosialisering, asook herintegrasie en werkstatus, te ondersoek. Fokusgroepe en individuele onderhoude is gevoer met   *MSDS*   instrukteurs, huidige en voormalige *MSDS* lede en werkagentskappe. Besprekings is gestruktureer rondom drie kerntemas sentraal tot hierdie ondersoek, naamlik; die effek wat militêre sosialisering op jong rekrute het, hoe dit hulle aanpassing in die burgerlike samelewing beïnvloed en die impak van militêre sosialisering op hul vermoë om betaalde werk te vind.

Die studie kom tot die gevolgtrekking dat die waardes en aspirasies van die *millennial* jeug wat by die leër aansluit, grootliks verskil van die leër se vereistes. Dit is danksy 'n jeugkohort wat beskryf word as meer individualisties, 'n tekort aan discipline het en selfsugtig en eiewys is.   In terme van werksvoorkeur, verkies hulle buigsame werksomgewings, meer gelyke organisasies wat deelnemend is en minder outoritêr, hulle hou nie noodwendig van spanwerk nie tensy dit samewerking vereis, en hulle vermy hoë risikos. Die bogenoemde karaktereienskappe en werksvoorkeure staan in skrille kontras met wat die leër van nuwe rekrute vereis en wat dié organisasie as werkgewer bied. Die leer moet dus jong rekrute her-sosialiseer om aan die vereistes van die leër te voldoen en om militêre waardes in hierdie jong burgerlikes in te boesem.

Die sosialisering vind   plaas via die totale instelling wat rekrute fundamenteel verander wat dan lewenslange gevolge inhou aangesien dit 'n habitus vorm wat hulle militêre identiteit in hul lewens her-produseer. Die bevindinge van hierdie studie toon dat jong rekrute aanvanklik 'n kultuurskok ervaar, maar soos hulle die militêre kultuur assimileer, raak   hulle meer outoritêr, aggressief en manlik. Na militêre diens word hierdie habitus tydens herintegrasie in die burgerlike samelewing voortgesit. Nietemin is dit nie die enigste invloed wat militêre sosialisering op hulle het nie. Gegewe dat die leër 'n totale instelling is, veroorsaak die verlies aan institusionele ondersteuning en bevelstruktuur 'n gevoel van verlies, angs, depressie en vervreemding wanneer hulle die militêre instelling verlaat.

Die militêre *habitus* en afhanklikheid van die bevelstruktuur in hulle werk, beïnvloed hoe en waar hulle werk in die burgerlike samelewing kry. Hierdie uitwerkings word nie deur alle militêre personeel op dieselfde manier ervaar nie. Operasionale personeel vind dit moeiliker om werk in die burgerlike samelewing te kry, aangesien hulle oor min vaardighede beskik, behalwe hul militêre vaardighede. Diegene wat in die tegniese- en ondersteuningsvelde werk, vind dit makliker om werk in die burgerlike samelewing te kry, maar weens die feit dat nie alle kwalifikasies geakkrediteer is nie, begin hulle dikwels van voor af in hulle tweede loopbane. Ongeag hiervan beïnvloed hul militêre habitus hoe goed hulle in die werksplek integreer. Dié bevindinge wek kommer ten opsigte van die effek van die militarisering van die jeug, die vermoë van die jeug om te herintegreer in die samelewing en of die leër gebruik kan word as 'n instrument van sosiale opheffing in 'n land soos Suid-Afrika waar geweld 'n bedreiging vir die samelewing inhou.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank my supervisor, Professor Lindy Heinecken, who has been an inspiration with her wisdom, enthusiasm and passion for sociology and the development of students. Thank you for providing the opportunity to complete this research and all the support and guidance you gave without hesitation. I am grateful for the advice and discussions we had in this research journey. You have made a daunting task manageable and pushed me further than I thought I could go.

I would like to thank the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology and my peers. Research can be a lonely place and all the discussions and encouragement were inspiring. A special thank you to Jantjie Xaba for the many discussions and coffee breaks.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends. But a special thank you to my loving and supportive wife, Phelia, for your unconditional love, support and patience during the highs and lows. Phelia, you have been inspired me when I needed it the most. Thank you for the support. Without you, this would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

DOD   Department of Defence

MSDS   Military Skills Development System

PTSD   Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

SANDF   South African National Defence Force

SANW   Suid-Afrikaanse Nasionale Weermag

US   United States

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

With the end of conscription in 1993, the South African military became an all-volunteer force. A flexible service system was introduced where military personnel now came to be employed on a short, medium or long term contract. This meant that for many serving in the military, the prospect of having to return to civilian society and employment was imminent if their contracts were not renewed. To ensure a sufficient supply of young recruits to the newly formed South African National Defence Forces (SANDF), formed in 1994, a short term service contract was introduced to replace conscription. Later renamed the Military Skills Development System (MSDS) in 2003, the system operates on a contract basis over two years during which the recruits receive training in the various Arms of Service. All members receive basic military training followed by more specialized training within specific divisions of the SANDF (Department of Defence, 2003:28).

The MSDS was developed to achieve a number of broad objectives. First, the MSDS aims to rejuvenate the aging Core/Regular force of the SANDF by recruiting young able-bodied recruits between the ages of 18 and 22 years and up to 26 years for those who completed tertiary education. Secondly, the MSDS system forms part of the larger development plan of the South African Government to reduce unemployment and provide skills training to the youth of the country. Thirdly, the MSDS was meant to bolster the Reserve Force to enable the SANDF to achieve both numerical and functional flexibility to meet the strategic needs of the SANDF. Implicitly, the MSDS is orientated towards producing members that can serve in both military or civilian careers (Department of Defence, 2012:24).

Since the inception of the MSDS program in 2003, the exact number of recruits that have gone through the system is not easily discernible. The most reliable figure was reported in 2012, which placed the figure at 39 053, of which 24 586 (63%) have been taken into the regular force, 8 286 (21%) have left the service completely, and 6 861 (17%)[1] serve in the part-time forces. The remainder have withdrawn from the SANDF without completion of their contract

---

[1] The total number does not add up to 100%. This is because the reserves figure consists of members that have exited the SANDF, and includes members that have extended their contracts and exited the SANDF after the completion of their contracts.

for various reasons that include medical fitness or not fitting in with the organisational culture (Department of Defence, 2012:30; Parliamentary Committee of Defence, 2013). Since then, approximately 10 000 young people have entered the MSDS. The system is currently being used as a means for social upliftment of the youth and a means to introduce the youth to the SANDF. Whilst the military has no problem in recruiting sufficient numbers of youth to this programme, there is an issue regarding who volunteers as the military requires high calibre recruits with the desired profile and abilities. However, the young people that match the military's requirements are not willing to serve in the military as they do not see the military as the ideal employer (Smith & Heinecken, 2013).

1.2 Literature review

One of the challenges the SANDF faces is how to transform the so-called 'millennial generation' into soldiers. According to Howe and Strauss (2000), millennials refer to a historical period in which the cohort was born, irrespective of race, class and gender, they share characteristics associated with that specific historical era. In this, millennials are typically influenced by globalization, technological advance and broader social change which affects the values and behaviour of the youth. As result of the shared experience, they share certain characteristics that could make them more or less adapted to work in certain environments, including the military.

Based on an extensive literature review, it emerged that millennials have been defined in various ways that make them distinct from any other generation before them. According to Ogihara and Uchida (2014), millennials tend to be more individualistic, which has been associated with the growth in a rights-based culture, fuelled by information communication technology (Ogihara & Uchida, 2014). The rise of cheap accessible internet has made it easier to communicate individual rights, like freedom of speech and the right to protest and to make these universally accepted values (Wellman, 2008). At face value, the literature on the military requirements from recruits indicate that millennials are less than ideal for military service, as the military requires collectivist ideals that limit personal rights, whereas the youth today value these personal rights (Shi Hao, 2013).

Another characteristic that emerged is that millennials have specific motivations and ideals about work and providing service to others. Twenge, Campbell and Freeman (2012) argue that millennials as a generation differ from other generations as there is a marked decline in civic

engagements, marking a concurrent decline in selfless service. For Vézina and Crompton (2012), when millennials engage in civic duties it is generally for personal gain like income, or credits for completing coursework.

The millennial generation is said to prefer working for employers that provide flexible work environments with little routine (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). For Ozkana and Solmaz (2015), millennials are the least adapted of all generations to work in traditional office settings. The use of technology is central for millennials, as they believe it can set them free to not be bound by time and space in terms of their workplace (Moss, 2011). Thus as an organisation, the military does not fit these ideals as members are not only expected to live on a military base for their initial periods of training, but are highly regulated in terms of their daily lives (Strachan, 2006). Typically, military work is not very technological, and is often more physical as the majority of service members serve in the combat branches that do not deal with technology continuously. It is only later on that some may use more technologically-advanced equipment that may be computer based.

According to Sigman (2009), millennials are perceived as a generation that lacks discipline, fails to obey orders and questions instructions. Shapira (2010) has described millennials as lazy, self-centred whiners that want their own way. Ender, Rohall and Matthews (2014) point to the differences between the millennials and the baby boomer generation that is now in the top echelon of business and command in the military, stating that in comparison, millennials lack commitment and loyalty. A study by Warner (2010) supports this, finding that the lack of commitment by millennials results in youth hopping between tasks and organisations far more frequently than previous generations. This can be critiqued because it may not be the millennials, but rather the implementation of flexible employment contracts that have led to this.

There is also evidence to support the claim that as a generation millennials prefer working for organisations that provide work-life balance, providing them with ample time with their family but also with a remuneration package that is large enough to support their family (Schweitzer, Lyons & Ng, 2012). For Twenge, *et al*. (2010), millennials believe that this can be achieved by using technology as it would provide them with the ability to achieve this balance. However, the literature on the military indicates that the military's needs are the opposite of the millennials'. The military operates as a 'greedy institution' that demands a high level of

institutional commitment from its members, and therefore subordinates the needs of the individual, which extends to their family as well (Segal, 1989).

Another characteristic of millennials is that they are more risk-averse than previous generations. A study by Eighmey (2006) found that young adults prefer work environments with low risks of physical danger, as well as those with flatter hierarchies (Stuart & Lyons, 2008). The organisations need to create a feeling of 'home away from home', where managers and supervisors provide support and help young people develop in the organisation (Puyabaraud & Pimm-Jones, 2010). At the same time, millennials value being taken seriously and making their voice heard. One can therefore see why millennials will typically struggle to adapt to the military, which is both hierarchical and autocratic and allows little room for questioning orders (Suleman & Nelson, 2011). Finally, some literature indicates that millennials are adapted to work in teams as they appreciate a diverse, collegial, and team-based work environment (Casner-Lotto & Barrington, 2006). However, others, such as Lipkin and Perrymore (2009), argue that millennials are in actual fact more suited to work as individuals instead of teams, as collaboration is frustrating. Therefore, it is not clear what millennials prefer.

What becomes apparent from the outline above is that millennials tend to have different values from those the military requires. Military work is completely different from any other institution in civilian life, as the essence of military work is the preparation of recruits to inflict lethal bodily harm on others. To kill another human being does not come naturally to most, and the military needs to mould civilians into soldiers (Rukavishnikov & Pugh, 2006; Christian, Stivers, & Sammons, 2009:28).

This process includes an intensive period of socialisation by the institution, where recruits are isolated from the rest of society for extended periods of time in order to inculcate an alternative 'military culture'. The effects are typical of what Goffman (1961) refers to as the total institution. According to Burk (1999), military culture consists of discipline, professional ethos, ceremonies and etiquette, *esprit de corps* and cohesion rooted in the 'warrior ethos' that constructs a hegemonic masculinity that subordinates femininity (Morgan, 1994). To understand the process by which the individual internalises military culture, culture shock theory is useful. Culture shock refers to the sudden immersion into a culture that is different from the individual's own. The transition generally results in a shock, often with long-lasting consequences on the physical, cognitive, psychological and social level (Culhane, Reid,

Crepeau & McDonald, 2012). Given that the effect of the process of military socialisation is long-lasting, this raises the question of how easily soldiers can readapt to civilian life.

The literature on reintegration of military veterans indicates that they generally experience certain challenges when they return to civilian life. This is because they have acquired a military habitus which shapes the way they think, behave and act. Bourdieu (1990) defines habitus as a set of dispositions that compel people to act, think and respond in certain ways in a variety of situations. These dispositions create practices on a conscious and an unconscious level that drive the actions, thoughts and responses of individuals. Therefore, their time in the military leaves a "behavioural residue" in former service men and women. Thus, using the concept of habitus is useful to understand and evaluate the lasting effects of the military socialisation on military veterans.

In general, the literature on reintegration shows that socialisation in the total institution of the military changes the individual in fundamental ways. For Ship (2001) and Haney (2001), recruits become more authoritarian and more disciplined as they come to internalise military culture. Given that the warrior ethos is embedded in hegemonic masculinities, Sun, Sung and Chu (2007) also claim that this is reflected in the individual's behaviour as they become more dominant and aggressive and demeaning of all things feminine. This is reflected in the behaviour of both men and women, who come to assume what is typically called a 'militarized masculinity' which values masculine traits, competition, and the carrying of weapons (Morgan, 1994).

Given that the military is a total institution that has regulated every aspect of their lives and influenced the way soldiers think and behave, it is not surprising that when they leave and the 'institution' is no longer there, they would experience a sense of loss. According to Haney (2001), this often results in them becoming lethargic and passive, and longing to return to the institution. DeVries and Wiegink (2011) explain that this sudden lack of command structure and hierarchy and the regulation of their daily lives leaves them with a crisis that feels like a fracture of their identity and results in feelings of alienation. This is especially true where they feel that they no longer get along with peers or fit into the family and community (Walker, 2013). When this is combined with a loss of status and income, as well as the ability to find gainful employment, these feelings of alienation are increased.

5

In this regard, research indicates that veterans are twice as likely to experience unemployment as their civilian peers (Humensky, Jordan, Stroupe & Hynes, 2013). In South Africa, Mashike (2004) examined veterans from the liberation movements and found that they experience high levels of unemployment, with little or no prospect of finding employment soon. Similarly, Kramm and Heinecken (2015) found that former MSDS military that served in the infantry had difficulty finding employment. While there have been many studies on military veterans and the challenges they face in reintegrating back into society, there is a dearth of literature on this topic in South Africa. This study attempts to fill this void by looking specifically at how military socialisation affects the youth and their ability to reintegrate back into society. This is especially important as the military is viewed as a tool for social upliftment (Krebs, 2004), but as Higate (2009) reminds us, military skills are only productive and functional in systems that use violence.

1.3 Rationale

An extensive literature search suggests that there is little research in South Africa on who the youth, joining the SANDF, is and on their experience when they leave the SANDF. No studies give prominence to young veterans who enter the military and stay for a limited period of time and then have to reintegrate back into civilian life when they are still in their early to mid-20's. Similarly, few studies focus on the reintegration of military veterans that entered the SANDF in the post-Apartheid context in South Africa (Kramm & Heinecken, 2015). This research therefore attempts to address this by providing some insights into how the former MSDS members manage in civilian life and how they deal with being socialised into the military.

1.4 Research Question and Objectives

Accordingly, the research question is: "What effect does military socialisation have on MSDS members, and how does this influence their ability to adapt to civilian life and find gainful employment?"

To answer these question, the following research objectives have been set:
   a) To establish how millennials are defined and the extent to which their values are in line with those of the military.
   b) To determine how military socialisation affects recruits and their ability to adapt to military discipline and military culture.

6

c) To establish what difficulties MSDS veterans face upon having to reintegrate back in to society.

d) To determine the extent to which military skills are transferable to the civilian sector, as well as where these young military veterans typically find employment.

1.5 Research Methodology

This is an exploratory research study using qualitative methods to attain a deeper understanding of what the youth entering the military typically look like, how military socialisation affects them and to what extent they are able to reintegrate back into civilian society. Data collection was done by means of semi-structured interviews and focus groups with MSDS instructors, serving MSDS members, veteran MSDS members and employment agencies. This might seem ambitious, but it was felt that triangulation was necessary to obtain a holistic view of the effect of military socialisation on the youth.

1.6 Value of the study

Research on military veterans have focussed predominantly on the experiences of older veterans that have reintegrated after a period of combat, or have been discharged from the service. What the majority of these studies tend to neglect is the experiences of young military veterans and where these do exist, they have focused mainly on post-traumatic stress, which is not the focus of this study. Similarly, studies conducted in the South African context have focussed on the experiences of veterans during the formation of the SANDF and the reintegration of former liberation fighters into civilian life in the context of the newly-formed democracy. These studies have focused mainly on benefits that former liberation fighters should receive (Ferreira, Liebenberg & Roefs, 2002).

However, a substantial gap exists in that no study has focussed on the experiences of young military veterans in South Africa. Little is known about the challenges they experience when they reintegrate into civilian society. This poses a challenge as the military and the MSDS programme specifically is used as a means for social upliftment to provide the youth with skills to alleviate unemployment. However, the impact of this programme is not monitored and no one knows what the effects are on these young people and to what extent they become militarized. This study therefore endeavours to highlight the experiences of young veterans.

1.7 Chapter Outline

Chapter Two provides the literature review and theoretical framework in which the findings of the research are analysed and interpreted. Chapter Three describes the qualitative research strategy employed in the study, covering the reasons for the methods selected as well as the strengths and weaknesses of these methods. Chapter Four presents the findings and discussion of the research according to the conceptual and theoretical framework outlined in Chapter Two. This includes presenting a discussion of the findings in relation to the literature. Finally, in Chapter Five I present the conclusions and recommendations that can be drawn from the research.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To be able to understand and analyse the effect that military service may have on an individual, it is important to first grasp how the youth of today act and think. The first part of this chapter describes the typical characteristics associated with the millennials, or generation Y as many call them. Secondly, working for the military is not your usual job as the armed forces typically have to socialise and train the millennial 'civilians' into becoming soldiers, and this process needs to be understood in order to determine the effect of this process on millennials' lives. Of particular relevance for this study is how this socialisation affects the youth after they have experienced the culture shock of joining the military, but then have to reintegrate back into civilian society upon leaving the military. As such, the last part of this chapter reviews the literature on the reintegration of military veterans into civilian life and some of the challenges they face in terms of adaptation and finding gainful employment.

2.1 Generational theory: millennials and the military

Selfless service and absolute commitment to the goals of the organisation are what the armed forces look for in those choosing to join the military (Heinecken, 1997b). This is owing to the nature of military work which may require the ultimate sacrifice, one's own life, in the course of duty. Therefore, the armed forces need to socialise civilians to be willing to accept and conform to the goals of the organisation and to put self-interest aside for the greater good. One of the greatest challenges that an all-volunteer military force faces is how to get those who enlist to conform to its norms, values and goals, especially where the recruit's own value systems and ideals vary from those of the military. To achieve this socialisation, it is important to understand how the current generation is typically defined. It is useful to draw on the literature on generational theory in order to comprehend why the military is not typically an employer of choice for the current generation and some of the difficulties the military experiences in socialising the current youth into accepting its value system.

2.1.1 The millennial generation

Various authors have posited that generational theory is useful to understand an age cohort. This is owing to the rationale that cohorts of a similar age have related experiences that create wide-spread commonalities in their behaviours and values and this makes them different from other age groups (Massey, 1979; Howe & Straus, 2000; Rainer & Rainer, 2011; Taylor, 2014). While this might be the case, it is important to note from the onset that such generalisations, or stereotypical depictions of a specific generation, has limitations (Castells, 2005; McCrindle,

9

2011). The characteristics that define a particular generation are not static or uncontested but are in a constant state of flux as peer group changes recreate their image and adapt, and are influenced by how the media, authors and academics portray them (Castells, 2005; Stafford & Griffis, 2008; Rainer & Rainer, 2011). As Agati (2012) argues, generations are not a monolithic group and within the specific cohort, important influences like socio-economic status, family characteristics and location can account for differences among the youth. Along with this, significant events like the end of the Cold War, the economic recession and the end of Apartheid and advent of democracy in South Africa, have an important effect on a particular cohort (Massey, 1979). Differences in terms of race, class and gender should not be ignored and these are often excluded from studies that draw on generational theory (Adams, 1997). Regardless of these limitations, generational theory provides a way to comprehend some of the general challenges armed forces face in transforming these civilians into soldiers.

As a generation, millennials have been labelled in a variety of ways, which include Generation Y, the Spoilt generation, and the Me generation, to name but a few. Regardless of the label, 'millennials' describes the cohort of young people most aptly as it is more reflective of the historical period in which these young people were born (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Goldgehn, 2004, Ender *et al.*, 2014). Various studies on millennials use specific dates to define the cohort, each using slightly different criteria. However, Ender, Rohall and Matthews (2014) argue that regardless of the variation in the use of dates, generally millennials are those that have been born between the 1980's and 1990's.

Millennials are the largest generational cohort since the baby boomer's generation from the post-World War Two era, and millennials vary from other generations in that they are more heterogeneous, globally connected, technologically interconnected, racially and ethnically diverse and androgynous (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Goldgehn, 2004). This is largely owing to the influences of globalization, technological advancement and broader social change, which affects the values and behaviour of the youth. Information communication technology is one of the most notable influences on this youth. Inexpensive internet access and the use of cell phones, instant messaging and social networking have exposed millennials to a greater variety of political, economic, cultural and social values (Elder, 1999; Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000; Loveless & Holman, 2006; Rainer & Rainer, 2011).

Although there is no absolute consensus in terms of how millennials can be defined or described, Howe and Straus (1991; 2000; 2007) have identified seven characteristics of millennials. These include that they view themselves as 'special', that they tend to be sheltered

by their parents, are generally confident, are more team orientated, are competitive and like achieving, feel pressured and tend to be somewhat conventional. They consequently tend to display a strong sense of confidence and believe they can achieve anything with their abilities. Failure does not factor into their lives and they are comfortable with limited rules and structure, which is an outcome of their over-protective (but often absent) parents (Howe and Straus, 2000). Others studies have concluded that in comparison to previous generations, millennials are sociable, collaborative, more educated and achievement orientated (Raines, 2003). They are inclined to be more open-minded, optimistic and happy and believe that the current era is the pinnacle of civilisation (Ender, Rohall & Matthews, 2014: 13). Lipkin and Perrymore (2009) add that millennials have high levels of self-esteem, sometimes to the point of narcissism. While it is accepted this generation cannot be defined in a stereotypical way, it is useful to engage with generational theory to comprehend the extent to which this may affect the ability of the youth to adapt to military life, which in many respects is an antithesis to the values depicted above.

If there is one general trend that seems to depict the millennial generation, it is the rise of 'individualism', which has been associated with the growth of a rights-based culture, fuelled by information communication technology (Triandis, 1995; Elliott & Lemert, 2009; Ogihara & Uchida, 2014). Technology has made people aware of their rights because it became easier to communicate freedom of speech, the right to protest and so forth as universally accepted values (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008; Smith, 2011; Walker & Mullins, 2011). The awareness has been accelerated by a rapid growth in the influence of social media, blog sites and other online media which has enabled millennials to be 'plugged in'. This assists millennials to be part of the global world and even think globally, but has also created to some extent the social individual in the real world that lives in isolation or disconnected from those around them (Wellman, 2008). The fact that this generation inclines to be more educated has also contributed to the higher levels of knowledge about the rights of individuals among millennials (Smith, 2011). Different arguments include that changes in parenting styles have resulted in the rise of individualism in millennials. Parents are overly involved in the lives of children, but at the same time absent in instances where both parents have to work. Children are either cared for by a third party or need to take care of themselves. To compensate for the lack of parenting, parents will be over protective when time allows them. (Triandis, 1995; Howe & Strauss, 2000).

Ultimately, what generational theory inclines to highlight is that millennials are more conscious of their human rights and employment rights than previous generations. They struggle to accept top-down authority and demand the right to be heard. Consequently, they have been described as a generation who believes in social justice and is willing to defend these rights through channels such as social media (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Raines 2003; Wellman, 2008; Martin & Tulgan, 2006). While this appears to be contradictory to the individualism ascribed to millennials in abundance of the literature, social media has created both individual voices and collectivism, by means of these virtual networks. Individualism and a demand for rights, as well as a lack of respect for authority, can create hindrances for the military (Twenge, 2006; Ender, Rohall & Matthews, 2014).

The millennial generation have been branded as a generation that lacks discipline, fails to obey orders and questions instructions (Sigman, 2009). Authors have labelled this generation as lazy, always wanting their own way, having no real drive to plan or succeed, having a 'don't care' attitude towards their personal responsibilities and generally lacking in commitment to their actions (Shapira, 2010; Warner, 2010). The so-called lack of discipline is ascribed to a number of factors. Some claim that it is owing to the parents taking control of the lives of their children, sheltering them from risks and even long term commitments (Warner, 2010). Others, like Sigman (2009), state that parents are not solely to blame, as changes in parenting styles and transformation of the family structure also contribute. Along with this, a transference to a more outcomes-based education system has resulted in millennials receiving grades easily for minimal effort (Warner, 2010). At the same time, the obligation of moral education has been transferred to schools or carers as in many instances both parents have to work. However, this responsibility has been associated with limited disciplinary power for educators and in some instances, less support for disciplinary interventions by the parents. Many consider that as a consequence millennials are more entitled and undisciplined and lack balance and moral values (Shapira, 2010). Owing to the changes in the way that children are viewed in society, they are encouraged to engage in a variety of activities, never having to commit to any one specifically.

The lack of discipline for millennials manifests in a variety of forms. For Ender *et al*. (2014), the lack of commitment is more apparent when looking at millennials in comparison to previous generations like the baby boomers, who placed a high value on loyalty and commitment. For Shapira (2010), the lack of commitment of millennials has implications for organisations in terms of labour turnover. Warner (2010) claims that this lack of commitment results in the youth hopping between tasks and organisations, meaning that millennials would

jump to an organisation that offered them a better remuneration package, the possibility of training and mentoring, more flexible working hours or the promise of work that engages more intensely with technology (Deloitte, 2016). Twenge *et al*. (2012) argue that the lack of commitment can be seen in the decline of civic engagement, while Vézina and Crompton (2012) added that millennials tend to engage more in civic duties if there is some personal gain for them. As such, the millennial generation has different expectations from employers than previous generations.

Research on millennials shows that they are inclined to preference an employer that provides flexible work conditions in an environment that is technologically forthcoming. This signifies that millennials want to work in spaces that are fluid and constantly changing with little routine, while engaging and working with technology (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Schweitzer, et el., 2012). Ozkana and Solmaz (2015) conducted a study among university students and found that millennials prefer not to work in the traditional office environment. For Meister & Willyerd (2010), millennials believe that technology sets them free and that they are not bound by time and space in terms of their workplace. They prefer a more fluid arrangement in terms of their work-life balance. Moss (2011) found that millennials perceive access to the internet as enabling them to shift the boundaries between leisure and work time.

Some authors portray millennials to prioritise their personal life higher than their work life. Work should not dominate their lives and should only be one component of their lives, leaving them with ample time to spend with their family (Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman & Lance, 2010; Schweitzer, Lyons & Ng, 2012). Others have problematized this view, arguing that incorporating technology in their work has shifted the work-life balance with millennials willing to work in their personal time as long as they have the freedom to take time away from work for personal issues (Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). However, as millennials are generally better educated, they expect to receive large remuneration packages with benefits; to have opportunities for career advancement, but to work in an environment that is relatively safe (Schweitzer, *et al*., 2012).

Another attribute associated with millennials is that they are risk-averse, which is possibly owing to the way they have been raised and protected by their parents. For example, Eighmey (2006) conducted a number of youth surveys and established that for young adults an environment free from physical harm or danger is an imperative consideration when choosing an employer or a career. Typically, an employer of choice is one that provides an environment that is supportive and nurturing of their development, offers opportunity for career

advancement and self-actualisation (Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman & Lance, 2010). In this regard Ehlert, Senn, Kling and Beers (2013) established that millennials assign significant value on incentives like training and development opportunities.

The finding also demonstrated that millennials prefer to work for organisations with values similar to their own. Therefore, they would select to work for organisations that operate along sustainable business practices; these firms need to be socially responsible with a firm belief in corporate responsibility and social upliftment in the community and the country at large (Puyabaraud & Pimm-Jones, 2010). In Deloitte's (2016) study of South African millennials in the workplace, they observed that a primary motivator for millennials selecting an organisation is how closely the millennials identify with the organisation. Ng and Gosset (2013) studied the motivations of millennials in Canada to determine whether public or private institutions were preferred as employers. They established that millennials in Canada preferred the public sector as they believed it would have higher ethical standards, more inclusive workplaces and greater social responsibility than private sector organisations. What is interesting in this case is that public sectors are more restrictive, allow limited creativity, and operate in a highly bureaucratised setting. This is somewhat unexpected, given that most millennials prefer to work in a space that has a less rigid atmosphere and that feels like a "home away from home", which the public sector as a rule is not (Puyabaraud & Pimm-Jones, 2010).

In this regard, most of the research on millennials indicate that they dislike organisations that are bureaucratic and have a pyramid-like corporate structure, preferring a more "flat" environment (Stuart & Lyons, 2008). Millennials disapprove of hierarchical organisations, as such organisations limit their movements, behaviour, initiative and creativity (Okros, Verdon & Chouinard, 2011). While millennials like flexibility and the ability to be creative, they are highly dependent on mentors and leaders in the work place. However, they do not like to be told what to do and are critical of authority (Stafford & Griffis, 2008). Loyalty is influenced by the style of the manager or leader rather than the organisation or its corporate vision (Alexander & Sysko, 2012).

Millennials as a generation favour team work, a product of outcomes-based education. They appreciate a diverse, collegial, and team-based work environment, although Casner-Lotto & Barrington (2006) argue that millennials are not true team workers, but rather collaborators, and tend to work well in self-forming teams that consist of individuals that voluntarily come together to address a specific issue or to perform a task. However, there is also counter evidence that millennials are not necessarily team workers, with Lipkin and Perrymore (2009) arguing

that they tend to work better as individuals as many find collaborative team work frustrating, especially where the rest of the team lacks motivation.

2.1.2. Millennials and the military

The generation described above is the one currently entering the armed forces and accompanying them some of the character traits and values previously described (Ender *et al*., 2014). This poses a number of challenges for the military, who have to mould these 'civilians' into 'soldiers' within the bounds of an institution which is highly bureaucratic, rigid, and authoritarian, and which requires unwavering obedience and selfless service. Many have argued that military work is not just a job, but should be seen as a calling, or a service to the country and society (Brett & Specht, 2004; Well-Greenberg, 2006; Baker, 2008).

This has been a subject of much debate, as the military demands a high level of institutional commitment, whereas many who join the armed forces have come to view it as a job, like any other (Dandeker, 2006). Charles Moskos put forward the Institutional/Occupational thesis to explain the tension between institutional and occupational motivations for joining the military. He claims that many people currently join the military purely for tangible benefits like remuneration, danger pay, leave, traveling, education, medical care and housing, while the military prefers to recruit those who want to join based on honour, self-sacrifice and service to their country. In reality, many join the military for both institutional and occupational reasons. Segal (1989) refers to these as pragmatic professionals, where a combination of institutional and organisational elements is used as a means to attract people to the armed forces. A space is provided where a specific combination of professional tasks are used in conjunction with other elements that are valued in the civilian labour market (Nuciari, 2006).

In this regard, Drago (2006) found that young people serving in the US military are motivated to join for self-centred reasons, like income and access to training, instead of patriotic or altruistic reasons. Similarly, Heinecken (1997a & 1997b) found that junior officers join the military for job security, benefits, discipline and interest in the military tasks, rather than for selfless service ideals, marking a decline in selfless service among junior officers (Franke & Heinecken, 2001).

This is problematic for the military as the organisation requires a sense of duty and selfless service in order to achieve its objectives. To achieve the above, the military operates under a collectivist value system, whereby individual needs are subjugated to the unit and the military (Strachan, 2006; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010; Shi Hao, 2013). For Shi Hao (2013),

collectivism in the military is achieved, enforced and codified though military law. Military law varies from the laws that govern society and applies strict punishments for those that commit insubordination. Punitive sanctions can range from corrective measures like punishment, rejection from the unit or even incarceration. Implied within the collectivist value system and military law is unquestioning obedience to the chain of command and a need to comply with orders. There is limited space in the military to challenge orders from superiors (Strachan, 2006; Shi Hao, 2013). As highlighted above, millennials are more demanding of their rights and the rights of others and more likely to strive for social justice, all of which is not ideally suited to the collectivist values system required by the military. It implies that millennials are not suited for military service, as the military limits the rights of individuals in contrast with millennials demanding their rights.

Along with the military culture of obedience, traditions and routine (Burk, 1999), high levels of discipline from recruits is required which is policed and maintained through military law. Millennials have been labelled a generation that lacks discipline, fails to obey orders and questions instructions, suggesting that millennials are the opposite of what is required by the military. The military operates on given orders and the maintenance of tradition and routine to prepare for deployment. As a generation, millennials appear not to be the ideal recruits. However, it has been argued that millennials lack discipline owing to their parents being overly involved in their lives, meaning that millennials allow others to control their lives, and this might make them adapt more easily to the military taking control of their lives.

As a workplace, the military is significantly different from what millennials expect from an employer. Firstly, military work is based on rigid routine and training. For Strachan (2006), military work is epitomised by training for combat with rationally planned routines to ensure that if the unit needs to engage in warfare, every action is easily executable. Military work is often very physical, especially in the combat branches, but may also involve the use of technology, which can be very advanced; it has been argued that this is what millennials prefer. However, those who engage with technology in the military are generally more skilled or specialised, or enter the military with acquired skills to work with specific technology (Grint & Woolgar, 1997).

When comparing the military with the stated desires of millennials, it becomes apparent that the military might not be the ideal employer for millennials. This is owing to millennials' preference to work for organisations that are flatter and more flexible in terms of working hours and routine. They question authority and want to "understand" the rationale of orders, instead

of blindly following orders from those in superior ranks. Sigman (2009) argues that millennials prefer not to work in organisations that are rigid or Authoritative, while Suleman and Nelson (2011) claim that millennials have difficulty in following and respecting authority if they are not able to question it. In fact, a study by Wong (2000) has found that millennials despise the rigid rank structure of the military. They are positive about the service and are loyal to the armed forces, but would prefer an organisation that provides openness, transparency, equity and balance, characteristics that are typically in contrast to the nature of the armed forces. Similarly, Cole (1999) found that the youth experience the military as too authoritarian with too much risk and demanding too much time away from their families. Essentially, joining the military entails being on call 24 hours, spending significant periods of time away from the family and ultimately the possibility of sacrificing one's life for their country (Segal, 1988; Caforio & Nuciari, 1994).

For most millennials, this is not an attractive start to a career in the armed forces. Drago (2006) found that millennials are risk-averse, individualistic and favour being close to their families. Similarly, Smith and Heinecken (2014) found that young people do not see the military as a great employer owing to the perceived mortal risk when working for the military. This means that the armed forces in its inherent organisational structure and task is not the ideal employer for most millennials. In his study on millennials' perception of a career in the US Navy, Hyler (2013) discovered a marked decline in the willingness of this cohort to take risks, or to enter risky positions in the navy and a greater desire to be deployed in the highly technical spaces of support branches, rather than in the combat.

Based on the literature outlined above, we can make a few tentative conclusions about millennials and military work. Firstly, owing to its organisational culture, structure and task, the military is typically not an employer of choice for millennials. Secondly, the selfless requirement that military service necessitates is opposed to the needs of millennials, who wish to be close to their family while maintaining a work-life balance. Thirdly, millennials are risk-averse, which is often a product of their protective upbringing. Fourthly, millennials display a lack of discipline, commitment, and disrespect for authority, which do not make them ideal recruits. Lastly, the values of millennials are not aligned with what the military requires from new recruits, as the military is not a democratic institution, and often denies members their individual rights and freedoms. Given this, the military faces an enormous challenge in having to re-socialise members into accepting the organisational culture.

2.2 From citizens to soldiers: socialisation, military culture and habitus

So how does the military transfer these citizens into soldiers? The previous section highlights that the nature of military work is completely different from any other institution in civilian life, as the essence of military work is the preparation of recruits to inflict lethal bodily harm on others. Killing another human being does not come naturally to most and the military needs to mould civilians into soldiers, but also requires certain values from recruits to ensure that the mission is completed (Higate, 2001; Rukavishnikov & Pugh, 2006; Christian, Stivers, & Sammons, 2009:28). Therefore, the military as an institution needs to mould civilians into soldiers to create a person that is willing and able to fight within a cohesive unit, to follow orders, and ultimately to be able to fight under conditions that may entail the ultimate sacrifice – their own lives (Rukavishnikov & Pugh, 2006:134; Christian, Stivers, & Sammons, 2009:28). Even when faced with a mortal enemy, sacrificing one's life does not come naturally to most people.

2.2.1 Military socialisation

There are various theoretical approaches to understand how the military creates soldiers from civilians. For many, the study of the military institution and how it creates soldiers is synonymous with the concept of total institutions, as espoused by Irvin Goffman (See: Dyer, 1985; Morris, 1996; Haney, 2001; Siebold, 2001; Krebs, 2004; Caforio, 2006; Reger, Etherage, Reger, & Gahm, 2008; Scott, 2010:214). Goffman defined a total institution as:

> *"A place of residence and work, where a large number of like-situation individuals, [are] cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time together [leading] an enclosed round life … of which they do not control…" (1961:xiii).*

For Davies (1989:84), the isolation from the rest of society is central for an institution to be classified as a total institution. In the armed forces, individuals are taken into the military and isolated from the rest of society for lengthy periods of time during which they do not have control over what happens to them and their daily routines. Here they are expected to conform and behave in certain ways. The aim of this isolation within the total institution is to re-socialise the new recruit from their previous identity to ensure that they comply with the new required identity (Goffman, 1961).

In the total institution, the daily life of the recruit is rationally and methodically planned and administered according to a tightly controlled 24-hour schedule. Recruits' activities are rigidly controlled and administered by an impersonal bureaucracy that affords little recognition to

individuals' needs or wants (Goffman, 1961). The goal of the planned program is to ensure that the recruit complies and identifies with military values. The process of de-individuation augments the group and unit, which become more important than the individual. Working in teams, the goal is to maximise the group cohesion that is central in combat, where soldiers rely on each other for mission success and survival, while complying with orders (Morris, 1996:728-729; Scott, 2010:216).

An important element of the total institution is subordination and subservience to bureaucratic control and the activities in the institution are managed and executed by a small group of authority figures. The strict rank and file system places each person in a specific position in the hierarchy in relation to their superiors and their peers. This enables a relatively small group of officers in powerful positions in the hierarchy to exercise coercive control over the recruits (Goffman, 1961:8; Sun, Sung & Chu, 2007:602). Unquestioning obedience to the chain of command is considered a key element of the total institution, as it ensures that the individual relies completely on the command structure for orders and decision-making (Siebold, 2001; Soeters, Winslow & Weibull, 2006). Socialisation in the total institution affects individuals differently than socialisation in other institutions in society, as the rank and file system serves a double function within the military. As young recruits enter and experience the decorum and efficiency of officers, they are inspired to move up the hierarchy, but this depends on their subservience and compliance with the institutional culture and goals. Thus, control ensures not only compliance, but can produce aspiration, which enhances identification with the organisation's goals and values (Davies, 1989:81).

To achieve this, total institutions limit the amount of information recruits have about their own situation. This is done to ensure compliance by the recruits. For Dyer (1985:95), recruits need to be a "little bit scared and they should be unsure, but adjusting" to the realities of the military and the institutional culture that is fostered in the military. Keeping the recruits in the dark about their situation and future actions fosters dependence on the unit, which includes the recruits seeking support-from their peers and guidance from their superiors in the hierarchy. Krebs (2004) highlights that it is important to consider that those who join the military are young recruits, at an impressionable age and at a point in their lives where the effect of such socialisation can be long lasting, extending into their adult lives. This is reinforced by social group bonding that emerges among members of the same team and unit.

This bonding is a result of the intimate associations provided by the total institution, where close psychological bonds are formed amongst like-minded individuals. It further results in the

view that everyone who is not part of the primary group becomes part of the out-group (Goffman, 1961; Morris, 1996; Ship, 2001; McNown Johnson & Rhodes, 2007). Within the military, this group cohesion and bonding is fostered through training and competition at various levels between different sections, platoons and companies.

The military uses training as a tool to reinforce many of the required traits in recruits. Strachan explains it as follows:

> "*Training...has five fundamental functions over and above that of imparting the basic grammar of military service. Firstly, it counters boredom. Secondly, it distinguishes the soldier from the civilian and so generates professional pride. Thirdly, it can create unit cohesion. Fourthly, training is a means by which soldiers can assimilate new tactical thinking to the point where it becomes instinctive in its application. Fifthly, and finally, training teaches men to kill. It sets out to overcome the civilising effects of peacetime norms and to defy the most obvious commandment of all*" (2006: 216-217).

Part of the socialisation process is the need to inculcate a military culture that makes the soldier different from a civilian. This culture is associated not only with the training soldiers receive, but through various rituals, language, practices and behaviour, such as "wearing uniforms, saluting, military discipline, military ranks, hierarchical management structures, use of acronyms and technical terminology, learning to use a weapon and a communal life style…" (Bergman *et al.*, 2014:62). The culture encompasses courage, loyalty, integrity, determination and commitment to duty. These traditions are all alien to the new soldier, even those who enter the service from military families (Bergman *et al.*, 2014). This is as a result of the military culture being different from the civilian culture in many ways.

2.2.2 Military culture

Various authors have argued for different understandings of what military culture is, how it operates and the effect it has on people (Dunivin, 1994; Morris, 1996; Burk, 1999; Williamson, 1999; Vreÿ, Esterhuyse & Mandrup, 2013). For Burk (1999), most agree that military culture simply consists of four distinct elements: discipline, professional ethos, ceremonies and etiquette, *esprit de corps* and cohesion. Each element interplays with the others in creating a specific culture in each of the different branches of the armed forces. For Sun, Sung & Chu (2007), military culture constitutes a form of subculture that is:

> *"characterized by authoritarianism (discipline and subordination), hyper-masculinity (profession of arms and military ethos), formalism (ceremonial display and etiquette), and the siege mentality".*

Military culture is very practical and is considered to be a requirement to operate as an effective fighting force and progresses to the core of the institution (Vreÿ *et al.*, 2013:iii). The importance of military culture is emphasised by Weber (2009) when he explains that:

> *"military culture is nothing but the consistently rationalized, methodologically trained and exact execution of the received order, in which all personal criticisms are unconditionally suspended and the actor is unswervingly and exclusively set for carrying out the command…".*

The above quote illustrates the centrality of what military culture is, but also how it shapes the culture of the military by highlighting the requirements and importance of discipline. Discipline is the most central concept for military culture, relating not only to the individual, but to unit discipline as well. The military expects "blind obedience of subjects" that is enforced through the military disciplinary code. (Buckingham, 1999; Burk, 1999; Weber, 2009:253). Where members do not comply, swift punishment is carried out to show that no insubordination will be tolerated (Dyer, 1985; Heinecken, 2013). This means that the individual and the unit must submit themselves to the chain of command to follow orders, or be corrected swiftly.

Teamwork and cohesion form two important elements of military culture. Military culture is focussed on the group and therefore requires a strong group identity and obedience. The collectivist nature of military culture requires that individual identities become secondary to the unit identity and the needs of the individual subordinate to the unit and the military (Buckingham, 1999). This is important to instil from the onset of the military career:

> *"During basic training, because marching in formation, with every man moving his body in the same way at the same moment, is a direct physical way of learning two things a soldier must believe: that orders have to be obeyed automatically and instantly, and that you are no longer an individual, but part of a group." (Dyer, 1985:96)*

For the unit, cohesion is very important. To be able to work as a cohesive unit is central for the military (Winslow, 1994; Sasson-Levy, 2002; Ben-Ari & Sion, 2006; Nesbit & Reingold, 2011). For King (2007:643), the cohesion of the group arises not from social relations, but from members being a part of the process and shared practice of training and communal living. The importance of cohesion is that it creates the:

> *"…foundations for the instinctive, selfless reactions and the fierce group loyalty that is what the recruits will need if they ever see combat."* (Dyer, 1985: 96).

Therefore, military culture requires cohesion and loyalty to the group to ensure that the goals of the military are achieved.

Military culture entails commitment and self-sacrifice to the institutional goals. It requires the execution of military tasks by service members that are qualified and professional (Burk 1999). Through socialisation into military culture, the professional ethos needs to be developed to achieve the goals of the institution and to place selfless service above self-interest. This is one of the base arguments for viewing the military as a calling and not a job. However, today many join the military for 'selfish service' rather than 'selfless service'. Heinecken (2013) argues that for many, employment in the military is a job and is used as a stepping stone for later civilian employment especially in the instance where members are employed on a short-term contract and where military service is merely a transitional phase.

Lastly, the military is a masculine environment imbued with a 'warrior ethos' that is central to military culture, and can be observed in every aspect of military life (Enloe, 1993; Barrett, 1996; Buckingham, 1999; Carreiras, 2006; Shefer & Mankayi, 2007). Morgan (1994) argues that the military is a space where masculinity is constructed, reconstructed and reproduced in the most direct way through war and the 'warrior' image. Hegemonic masculinity is developed in the military in a specific form that subordinates other masculinities with a misogynistic practice that is grounded in the warrior ideal (Barret, 1996; Higate, 2003; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). The 'warrior ethos' constructs hegemonic masculinity which endorses a specific set of ideals. These include a capacity for violence and aggression with strong parallels with the image of the warrior. The ideals include emotional control, adventurous risk-taking, stoicism in the face of hardships, self-reliance, and the recognition that one is part of a larger group of interdependent individuals (Morgan, 1994). The masculinity of the military is resolutely heterosexual with the only space to let out emotions being the bar and the field of battle (Woodward, 2000; Higate, 2003; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Hinojosa, 2010). The significance of this ideology transcends the diversity in the armed forces between branches and creates standards for service men and women from support branches through to combat operators (Higate, 2001). Hegemonic masculinity therefore favours masculine values and actions more than other forms of masculinity or femininity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). It resulted in many to classify the form of masculinity in the military as a militarized masculinity.

2.2.3 Culture shock

If one compares the characteristics of the millennials and the expectations of the military as an institution, it is clear that entering this environment as a recruit might be a 'culture shock'. In this section I endeavour to explain this with reference to 'culture shock theory'. In essence, culture shock refers to the sudden immersion into a new culture that varies from the individual's own. Millennials no doubt experience this when entering the military given the contrasting value system. The transition generally results in a shock with negative consequences on the physical, cognitive, psychological and social level. The second phase of culture shock is known as reverse culture shock which is experienced when returning back to the society and culture of origin, and this is separately discussed below (Abbe, Gulick, & Herman, 2008; Selmeski, 2009; Culhane, Reid, Crepeau & McDonald, 2012:35). This theory is valuable as it explains the way recruits experience the transition to military life, as well as the experiences of soldiers when they return back to civilian life. Therefore, this section engages with both culture shock and reverse culture shock theory.

Culture is "the collective mental programming which separates members of one group from another" (Hofstede, et al., 2010:6). To simplify this, we could use Castells' broad definition of a culture as the collective attributes that differentiates the 'us from them' (Castells 1997:6). In relation to this, culture shock as a concept has been defined as "a state of distress or disorientation brought about by sudden immersion in or subjection to an unfamiliar culture" (Oberg, 2009:12). Others have defined culture shock as the experiences a person has when moving into a new cultural environment that is different from the culture the person claims as his or her own (Macionis & Gerber, 2010). It could also be understood as the personal disorientation a person might feel when experiencing an unfamiliar way of life that could be the result of a move to a new neighbourhood or country, changing work spaces, moving to a new job or school etc. (Barna, 2009). Culture shock is therefore mostly a process that everyone undergoes at some point in time and is probably experienced universally. It contributes to the learning and development process which may take place at different levels in the new environment. Therefore, culture shock should not be perceived as something pathological, but rather a normal process that most of us undergo (Pedersen, 1995). Based on this definition, culture shock and reverse culture shock is useful in that it can provide an explanation of the experiences of young recruits entering into the military, but also those that leave the military and who reintegrate back into civilian life.

In this study, I will use culture shock as conceptualised by Pedersen (1995). His notion of culture shock has been applied in a variety of studies that have found his five stage model beneficial / valuable to understand the changes individuals undergo.

For Pedersen (1995), the five stages of culture shock consist of the honeymoon phase, disintegration, reintegration, autonomy and interdependence. The honeymoon stage is a phase of adjustment to the new culture that is characterised by anticipation and excitement and the euphoria of new experiences. Before entering the new culture, an idealised mental image of the new culture is created. During this phase, the emphasis is on similarities rather than differences, as the individual may not have the tools to deal with the radical differences they experience. This phase tends to be brief in comparison with the other stages, depending on the context in which the individual enters and the duration of their stay. The shorter the 'stay', the more likely it is that culture shock will only be experienced when returning to the home culture (Pedersen,1995). For the military recruit, this is associated with the selection of going to the military and the reality of military life that is about to begin (Bergman *et al.*, 2014).

Stage two is disintegration, where the individual starts to adjust to the stark realisation of the differences between the new culture and the familiar. Individuals in this phase feel dislocated, disorientated or overwhelmed as they start to adjust to the progress outside their comfort zone. This phase is associated with the loss of status that was owned in the previous culture. The individual is no longer the student, the young sport star, or the civilian, but starts to adjust to the new culture. In this phase, the individual starts to understand the new environment and learn to coexist (Adler, 1975; Pedersen, 1995). For the military recruits, this coincides with the realisation that they are being physically and mentally stretched to their limits during the initial training. Individuals who are highly motivated might view this pragmatically; they see the difficult and challenging training as an essential part or a rite of passage to becoming a soldier. However, those that are less motivated may experience disorientation, alienation, depression and withdrawal during this phase and begin questioning whether they made the correct choice to join the military (Adler, 1975). For Culhane *et al*., (2012), this phase correlates to when the recruits realise that the unit is more important than the individual, but starts to realise that they are part of the unit and need to conform to the expected behaviour to exist and adapt to what is required within the system.

Reintegration is stage three, where the individual begins to adjust to the new cultural setting. However, in this phase the individual could experience higher levels of anger toward the new culture. Regardless, the individuals have acquired new skills and coping strategies to deal with

the new environment. This entails creating group cohesion and learning how to deal collectively with threats and challenges (Pedersen, 1995). For the military recruit, this involves beginning to feel like a soldier, and to start to subordinating themselves to the demands of military culture. Recruits begin to form the psychological bonds with the military that binds them together as a group and to the organisation for their lifetime. This is also the phase in which recruits start to exhibit personality changes and these are most clearly perceived when they leave the base for their first leave. The physical changes include short hair and neat clothes and routines like rising early and making their own beds with military precision (Bergman *et al.*, 2014).

Stage four and five are more applicable to those that serve for a longer period of time. The fourth stage of culture shock is autonomy, which represents balanced adjustment. In this stage, a clear sense of self is developed and the new culture is no longer where or what but rather who the individual is. This entails the development of a strong personal identity and communication in the language of the institution, while becoming more adept at navigating the organisational structures of the institution (LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1993). The individual's behaviour will also change to conform to the values and beliefs of the organisation (Pedersen, 1995). For the military, this involves transforming the recruit into a soldier. As the civilian becomes 'the other', recruits can often display a hostile view of civilian life or towards civilians as this is directly opposed to the regulated environment of the military and the norms and values the military embodies (Bergman *et al*., 2014).

The final stage is reciprocal interdependence which refers to biculturalism and is also referred to as the alternation model. This refers to the ability of individuals to understand the two different cultures and to be able to switch between the two effortlessly (Pedersen, 1995). For the military, this is generally applicable to more senior members of the service that engage with civilians in a variety of ways, either by living off base, or by dealing with them in their military work (Bergman *et al*., 2014).

Culture shock is not a smooth process and may result in crises for individuals which they need to learn to overcome. Responses to culture shock may be emotional, psychological, behavioural, cognitive or physiological and can range from a mild discomfort to a profound disorientation (Bergman *et al*., 2014). Where the individual has been socialised into accepting a new culture and this becomes linked to the identity of the person, these emotions can be experienced in the reverse when integrating back into civilian society. This re-entry or reverse culture shock refers to the experiences of returning to the individual's parent culture and is

similar to culture shock (Winkleman, 1994; Huff, 2001; CESA, 2009; Christofi & Thomspon, 2009; Mavrides, 2009).

Return culture shock generally refers to the challenges individuals experience when they return to their culture of origin after a long stay in another culture (Sussman, 1986). However, research on reverse cultural shock is limited (Adler, 1981; Gaw, 2000; Huff 2001; CESA, 2009; Mavrides, 2009). In general, reverse culture shock consists of two parts that flow into each other (Kim, 2001). Firstly, idealisation refers to the process that individuals undergo when they enter a new culture, especially for extended periods of time, as those who spend shorter periods generally do not move past the honeymoon phase. In the idealisation phase, individuals focus on their past, remove the harmful and only focus on the good, which results in an idealised notion of their parent cultures. This disjunction results in an anxiety when the recruits return to their parent culture (Kim, 2001). Doyle and Peterson (2005) studied military veterans that returned from combat deployment and found the veterans constructed an idealised notion of home, the people and the neighbourhood. Upon their return, the reality of the move does not sink in until the initial excitement dissipates and they are confronted with the reality of the divergence of their ideal and the reality. Along with this, their combat experiences add additional strain.

The second part is expectations that the parent culture or setting is unchanged and it is expected that transitioning back would not be traumatic due to the familiarity of the setting. The process of realising that at home things are different and that the world and the recruit have changed fundamentally causes anxiety and in extreme cases could result in depression, similar to the consequences of culture shock (Kim, 2001). Winkelman (1994) adds to this understanding and argues that many individuals do not expect the process of returning home to be difficult as they have an idea of what to expect. Therefore, many do not prepare for any adverse effects or experiences of culture shock when they return. However, when these symptoms of culture shock appear it can create an intensification of these experiences that could result in experiencing all the stages of culture shock when returning to the original culture

In the armed forces, the mismatch between the expectation and the reality of returning has been a topic of much research on military veterans. Schuetz (1945) found in his study on soldiers returning from World War Two that returning veterans have the most challenges in dealing with the changes that occurred in their own community. Equally, the community struggles to deal with veterans due to the way they have changed. This means that their time in the military has changed them in physical and psychological ways, and those at home need to adjust to this.

For Westwood, Black and McLean (2002), military service recreates bodies through training and moulds the self to become a soldier. When soldiers return home, their families and communities need to adapt to the changes in the veteran. Similarly, Faulkner & McGaw (1977) found that veterans returning home after deployment in the Vietnam War were unprepared for the challenges they faced in reintegrating back into the home. The veterans were given few skills to prepare for the changes in the political and cultural climate or for dealing with the changing view of military service in their home context.

What this means is that reverse culture shock can have detrimental results for those who return to their parent culture. Symptoms include anxiety, depression, interpersonal difficulties, anger, hostility and helplessness. For example, Gaw (2000) and Fear, Jones, Murphy, Hull, Iversen, Coker, Machell, Sundin, Woodhead, Jones, Greenberg, Landau, Dandeker, Rona, Hotopf, & Wessely (2010), in their study among veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, found that even family and friends need some time to adjust to the individual returning home, which places more strain on the veterans in terms of reintegrating back into wider society. In the instance of the armed forces, the culture shock from returning to their home community and culture is made worse by the sudden loss of the strong social resilience collectively cultivated in the military. While in the military they had close ties with other soldiers, this support from both fellow soldiers and the institution is no longer available to the individual to assist in readjusting to civilian life.

Culture shock theory has certain limitations as it has an essential deterministic character. It positions individuals in categories linked with specific stages that might not coincide with the individual's experience. The result is that meaning is attributed to experiences to fit the specific category (Furnham, 2012). Similarly, Furnham and Bochner (1986:55) have argued that understanding culture shock in this way is:

> "*too vague and too generalised to be of much use in predicting or understanding sojourner adjustment. Furthermore, it is not so much a theory as a post hoc description that has focussed too much on single-outcome variables rather on the dynamics or process of adjustment*"

However, Loh (2003) argues that the limitations ascribed to Pedersen's conception of culture shock theory might be valid if prediction is the goal, but that the theory remains useful for understanding the impact of culture shock as a changing and ever dynamic process that is shaped by social interaction with others, and affects the individual's perception and sense of self.

2.3 From soldier to civilian: Military Habitus and reintegration

The previous section showed how civilians are socialised into military culture and how their transformation could be explained through culture shock theory. This section will focus on the way military socialisation is continued into civilian life and the impact this has on the individual. This will entail examining the continuity of the military identity via the formation of the habitus. Thereafter, the effects of reintegration are discussed as well as what the effects of reintegration are for former service men and women returning to civilian life.

2.3.1 Habitus

Habitus has been conceptualised in various ways. For Mauss (1934:22), habitus is:

> *"Those aspects of culture that are anchored in the body or daily practices of individuals, groups, societies, and nations. It includes the totality of learned habits, bodily skills, styles, tastes, and other non-discursive knowledge that might be said to 'go without saying' for a specific group"*

The quote illustrates that a habitus is formed by a specific group and is reflected in the way the body and mind is shaped to act and perform in certain ways. For Bourdieu (1991), the body is the 'corporeal hexis' which refers to the way individuals walk, talk and feel in set ways that are determined by how they have been instructed. Thus, Bourdieu (1990) conceptualizes the habitus as a set of dispositions that compel people to act, think and respond in certain ways in a variety of situations. These dispositions create practices of a conscious and an unconscious manner that drive the actions, thoughts and responses of individuals. According to Bourdieu, habitus is composed of:

> *"systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them". (1990:66-67)*

This means that the dispositions that make up the habitus are learnt, structured, robust, reproductive and exchangeable. Simply put, habitus is socially learnt dispositions, skills and ways of acting, thinking and feeling that are learnt and internalised through activities and experiences of everyday life (Witman, 2007:38). A habitus is formed among people that share these dispositions, and predisposes people to act and think in a specific way. This means that the history people create, in terms of the way people think and act, is not a result of their own

rational choice but rather a result of the habitus (Jenkins, 1992:80). The habitus determines future disposition, and deviating from this is considered as unthinkable. Habitus is beneficial as it makes social life predictable, but can also explain or provide the tools to start examining and defining a habitus of a group of people that have a shared experience and how that shapes their future behaviour.

However, Vest (2013) problematizes the fact that the habitus appears to be deterministic and removes agency from the individual. She argues that instead of viewing the habitus as a schema which individuals fit into after they have learnt the disposition, we should rather understand that the habitus is not only subconsciously learnt but also consciously learnt and executed. This gives the individual agency and choice in the way that their future behaviour is shaped. For Vest (2013), this is only possible if we understand that the social learning of habits is influenced by spatial displacement, as conceptualised by De Certeau (1984). For De Certeau (1984), spatial displacement is the physical space where the actions and meanings that make up the habitus are constructed, like schools, the military base, church or any institution. Therefore, the individual has some agency over their actions and behaviours as what they have learnt will shape the way in which they act on this behaviour. This explains why individuals would change their behaviour depending on the context, such as whether or not they are wearing a uniform. While in civilian dress, they tend not to maintain the military behaviour and manners to the same extent as when they are on base or in uniform. In essence the habitus is shaped by a combination of space and social learning and leads to the construction of more than one identity. People can move between different habituses depending on context, like being more of a soldier on a base in uniform than when on a civilian street in plain clothes (Nippert-Eng, 1996; Vest, 2013).

Habitus as a concept has been studied in a variety of settings, like schools, nursing colleges, churches and the military. These include studies to determine the differences between different branches and services of the military (Hahné, 2012), as well as the experiences of former service men and women when they leave the armed forces (Higate, 2001; Maringira, 2015). In this regard, in his study of former Zimbabwean soldiers, Maringira (2013) found that habitus is a useful way to understand and explain the experiences of former soldiers long after they left the military. In his study, the former soldiers carry their bodies in a specific way that is based on the knowledge they have acquired in the armed forces. Through the continuation of a strict training regimen and hegemonic masculinity, they show that their communal experience of military culture continued to shape their lives even if they had fled the military and their

country. Higate (2000) claims that the military leaves a "behavioural residue" in former service men and women. Using the concept of habitus is therefore helpful in understanding and examining the lasting effects of military socialisation on military veterans.

2.3.2 Effects on Reintegration

The effects of undergoing socialisation in a total institution and the formation of the military habitus can, however, have several possible adverse effects on the transition to civilian life.

Research has found that being in a total institution has long lasting effects that result in changes in the values, beliefs and behaviour of individuals when they leave the institution. Research by Haney (2001) has found that when people enter total institutions like prisons, reformative camps or the military, the institutions have a de-humanising effect. However, the effects of the total institutions last longer and create experiences of alienation in individuals when they leave. When individuals leave the total institution, they often exhibit behaviour that is:

> "*characterized by apathy, lethargy, passivity, and the muting of self-initiative, compliance and submissiveness, dependence on institutional structure and contingencies, social withdrawal and isolation, an internalization of the norms of institutional culture, and a diminished sense of self-worth and personal value*" (Haney, 2001).

Reintegration further results in the loss of the status that was received from being in the armed forces, the loss of financial resources and difficulties in readjusting to the family and community from which the individual originates. However, the psycho-social processes that underpin this are still not fully understood (Higate, 2001; Walker, 2013: 299, Maringira, Gibson & Richters, 2014). There are several factors that contribute to the difficulties associated with reintegrating back into civilian society. For de Vries & Wiegink (2011:39), the sudden lack of command structure and hierarchy that regulated the daily lives of former service men and women in the total institution leaves them with a crisis. The crisis entails a fracture in their identity and actions, leaving them in a state of alienation as reflected in the quote below:

> "*…remain[ing] reliant on paternalistic military-social structures and… unable to think and act for themselves, having fostered high levels of dependency in the 'surrogate household' of the military institution*" (Higate, 2001:452).

The military as a total institution fundamentally changes the individual's behaviour, values and attitudes and this affects their ability to adapt to civilian life. This is owing to recruits becoming more authoritarian and disciplined and undergoing fundamental changes due to identifying

with and internalising military culture (Haney, 2001; Ship, 2001; McNown Johnson & Rhodes, 2007). Haney (2001) found that when young recruits leave the military, they tend to identify more with the institutional culture of the military than the civilian culture and display a lack of social skills when interacting with civilians owing to changes in the way in which they communicate.

Similarly, a study conducted by Sun, Sung & Chu, (2007:606) demonstrates that recruits that entered the total institution of the military become more authoritarian and more masculine in their behaviour, but when they leave they are at a loss as they have become more reliant on the authority structure of the military to guide them in their daily lives and tasks. When leaving the total institution there is an immediate loss of strict bureaucratic control and rigid structure which results in the recruits experiencing feelings of loss and alienation.

For this reason, Bergman *et al.* (2014) claims that these feelings of loss and alienation are what hinder the reintegration of military veterans and why most people in civilian life perceive veterans to be overly aggressive, displaying masculine traits, needing constant supervision and being unable to deal with confrontation in the civilian work place. For Haney (2001), the loss of structure has a debilitating effect on the individual, resulting them to become lethargic and passive and longing to return to the institution. This is owing to the identification that individuals acquire through the process of socialisation with military culture. Similarly, Higate (2001) found that those who deal effectively with the loss of structure sometimes over-compensate and become more structured in their civilian lives; dealing with their loss by structuring their own lives and the lives of others with the same military vigour.

Thus, one of the problems facing former service men and women when they reintegrate back to civilian society is the difference between the values that they internalised from military culture, and those of the civilian culture that dominates society (Jelusic, 2006:355). However, Higate (2001) asserts that when we consider military veterans and reintegration, we should not assume that ex-servicemen and women are institutionalised in the ways set out above. Rather, former service personnel experience a clash of cultures owing to the loss of the familiar cultural setting the military produced. Maringira, Gibson & Richters (2014) argue that ex-service men experience these challenges owing to them internalising military identity and maintaining this identity after they reintegrate back to civilian life. The connection between the ex-service men and the military identity is so powerful that it remains a part of their identity for the rest of their life, especially when they have served in the military for a number of years.

One finds that even if soldiers come from different countries with different social, economic and racial backgrounds, their military experience creates a bond between them that often transcends their former connections with their own families and community. This means that soldiers are more likely to get along with other soldiers than with civilians (Higate, 2001; de Vries & Wiegink, 2011, Maringira, 2015). Military service could also impact negatively on friendships with civilians, which exacerbated if the civilian fosters a moral code that challenges and is incongruent with the military habitus and the ethics of being a soldier.

Another element that impacts on reintegration is how the military is viewed by the recruit's community or family. Drummet, Coleman and Cable (2003) found that former service men and women struggle to connect with friends and family owing to changes arising from the internalisation of military culture. But that the move back to the community and family is more challenging if the military as an institution, or the mission/tasks it has been involved in, are viewed in a negative light. For instance, Humensky *et al*. (2013) found that when veterans return home, they struggle to reintegrate and find employment if their missions are perceived as legitimate by the community or employers. In a study among homeless service men and women, Higate (2001) found that they were living on the street due to a break down in the relationship with their family and community, and that this relationship was strained owing to the negative view of the military.

Another factor that hampers veterans' reintegration is the nature of military work. Many veterans experience traumatic events during the course of their duties that might have a lasting impact after their return home (de Vries & Wiegink, 2011:42). In this regard, Elder & Clipp (1989) found that such traumatic life experiences among military veterans have long-term effects on their psychological wellbeing that could hinder reintegration onto civilian life and their ability to obtain and maintain employment. Current studies indicate that the biggest problem facing veterans when returning to civilian life has been Post-Traumatic-Stress Disorder (PTSD) due to their experiences during combat. Numerous studies have researched the link between reintegration difficulties and mental health disorders of those returning after deployment in combat (Higate, 2001). However, there is a small but growing number of authors who argue that this line of logic is flawed as it does not consider the difficulties of those service men and women outside the theatre of war. There is mounting evidence that irrespective of deployment in military operations and length of service, all military veterans experience similar challenges when returning to civilian life (Lafferty, 2013; Buckman, Forbes, Clayton, Jones, Greenberg, Sundin, Hull, Wessely, & Fear, 2013, Bergman *et al*., 2014). However, a lot

depends on the extent to which these veterans have been re-socialised or are supported in terms of their reintegration.

There are several factors that make the transition easier. The first factor that assists the transition is formal support from the armed forces or government. In the UK and the US, there are several formalised programs that provide social, economic and psychological support to service men and women returning to civilian society. The majority of these programs provide specific assistance to help these veterans with education or other skills that will be useful in finding employment in the labour market. This is especially important for those who have limited skills, or only skills related to their military education and training (Kleykamp, 2009). Secondly, Jolly (1996) argues that the experience that ex-service men and women have of the military largely determines the success of their transition back to civilian life and employment. She found that veterans who had positive experiences of their military career have an easier transition to civilian life than those with negative experiences. Thirdly, the length of service and the rank of the veteran affects how easily veterans reintegrate. Vest (2012) argues that the longer soldiers are in the military, and the higher their rank, the more likely they are to be required to move between the military and civilian world or to work constantly with civilians. Therefore, they are more equipped to deal with reintegration. Lomsky-Feder Gazit, & Ben-Ari, (2008) and Griffith (2009) have studied military reserves and argue that reservists should be seen as 'transmigrants' that move their social identity between their military and civilian identity. The more times they move the easier it becomes, but the authors are quick to point out that regardless of this experience, the transition still creates tension between their military and civilian identities.

2.4 Veterans employment

This military identity and habitus influence not only the social relations of former soldiers, but their work relations too. In many cases, depending on corps or branch of the soldier, they have only their military skills to peddle on the labour market and have probably never held a civilian job. Their military work thus shapes the way that they view work, along with their work ethic and expectations (Kelty, Kleykamp & Segal, 2010). Many studies on the employment status of military veterans have been focussed on comparing the income of ex-service men and women and their civilian peer groups (Little & Fredland, 1979; Martindale & Poston, 1979; DeTray, 1982; Fredland & Little, 1985; Goldberg & Warner, 1987; Sampson & Laub, 1996; Teachman & Call, 1996; Hirsch & Mehay, 2003; Teachman, 2003). Others have focused on the rate of employment among military veterans (Kleykamp, 2010). Relatively few studies focus on where

young military veterans find employment and what attributes are valued, which is the focus of my study.

Generally, the literature on the rate of employment of veterans indicates that military veterans are more likely to experience unemployment than their civilian peers (Mare, Winship, & Kubitschek, 1984; Mashike, 2004; Teachman & Tedrow, 2007; Ashcroft, 2012; Kramm & Heinecken, 2015). A study by Humensky, et al. (2013), found that in the US, veterans experience double the rate of unemployment as their civilian peer group in the civilian labour market. In South Africa, Mashike (2004) examined veterans from the liberation movements and found that they experience high levels of unemployment with little or no prospect of finding employment soon. Similarly, Kramm and Heinecken (2015) found that former MSDS military who served in the infantry had difficulty finding employment.

There are various reasons why military veterans experience higher levels of unemployment in the civilian labour market. The first reason is ascribed to the veterans themselves (Mare & Winship, 1984; Kilburn 1992; Teachman, Call, & Segal 1993a, 1993b; Kilburn and Klerman 1999; Bachman *et al*. 2000; Kilburn & Asch 2003). For Kilburn (1992), the reason why military veterans experience unemployment is owing to them being unable or unwilling to enter tertiary education of any form. Therefore, they have less education, experience and skills than their civilian peers. Teachman *et al*., (1993a, 1993b) provide a similar assessment, and argue that those that join the military generally achieved lower grades at school and joined the military owing to lack of other options. A common thread in the two studies is that former service men and women have fewer skills than their civilian peers.

Mangum and Ball (1987) support this view and found that if veterans compete with their civilian peers, they generally have fewer skills that are required in the civilian market place. In conjunction with the less marketable skills, these former service men and women need to compete with each other but also with younger and cheaper employees for generally unskilled work or security work (Cock, 2001; Maringira, 2015). A study by Mashike (2008) found similar results among veterans from liberation movements in South Africa, in that they generally have skills associated with fighting and war that are not marketable to employers.

The second reason links in with the first, which is that former service men and women have less experience than their peer group. Therefore, they struggle to find employment owing to their lack of work experience and networks for finding employment (Asch *et al.*, 2009). However, others argue that former service men and women experience the return to the civilian

labour market as effectively starting their careers from scratch and often have to compete with younger cheaper labour for unskilled jobs (Cock, 2001). Kleykamp (2013) found that when former service men and women return to the civilian labour market, in some instances need to restart their career from scratch as what they have done in the military is only valued in the military context. However, if the skills they have received and the work they engaged with in the military are useful in the labour market, they might mitigate some of these negative influences.

There are other more salient features that impact on the probability of veterans gaining access to civilian employment. One of the issues that influence the employment of veterans is the way that employers view them. Kilburn and Klerman (1999) found that if employers view veterans as institutionalised (rigid and aggressive), they are less likely to employ them. This means that if employers have experienced veterans as being overly aggressive, depressed or unable to deal effectively with conflict in the work place, they are less likely to employ veterans (Ashcroft, 2012).

Along with this, there are also the mental and physical effects of military service which can affect the productivity of military personnel. This pertains to the effect of psychological disturbances like Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other physical ailments resulting from injuries during deployment (Bordieri & Drehmer, 1984). Ashcroft (2012) illustrates this in his study on veterans in the UK, where nearly 57% of his participants believed that it is common and 34% that it is very common for veterans to suffer from psychological difficulties. However, what needs to be considered is that this is a defence force that is active in peace keeping and offensives in the war against terror that creates more possibilities for psychological risk among soldiers.

Another factor influencing veterans' employability is their skill set. In general, the literature shows that the skills former service men and women attain during their tenure with the armed forces are not easily transferred to the civilian labour market (Goldberg & Warner 1987; Barley, 1998; Cock, 2001; Maringira, 2015). This is especially true for those skills associated with the fighting corps. The former service men and women who served in the fighting corps generally have less marketable skills (Kramm & Heinecken, 2015).

However, not all military personnel battle to adapt to civilian life and much depends on where and in what occupational categories they served in the military. Research has indicated that administrative skills like human resources, logistics, technical services, intelligence and

financial planning are more easily transferrable (Higate, 2001) and those working in technical branches, personnel and logistics are often sought after in the civilian labour market (Kleykamp, 2009). However, the bulk of military personnel serve in combat branches where the skills are mostly related to military tasks and functions that are less transferable or valued in the private sector. Irrespective of this, Jelusic (2006) argues that even where skills are transferable, military personnel find it difficult to adapt to the civilian work environment because they are not used to using their own initiative.

Military service can also provide some skills that could be valued in the civilian labour market, such as discipline, physical fitness, cohesion and the ability to work in teams (Kleykamp, 2009). Therefore, military service can translate into some human capital endowments. Barley (1998) argues that military service can be a marker that shows the veterans are disciplined and team players, which is in demand in some workplaces.

Generally, military veterans have one similarity in that they share the skills of being able to fight, which can be detrimental to society. Mashike (2004:87) highlights the necessity of researching military veterans' employment in society, as veterans return home with a specific set of skills that can be used to fight, disrupt and trigger civil unrest. Where former service men and women cannot find productive employment, this can become problematic not only for the individual, but for society as well as it can create more complex social problems that are not easily resolvable (Gear, 2002, 2005; Mashike, 2007; Sun, Sung & Chu, 2007). For Heinecken and Bwalya (2013), ignoring the needs of military veterans can have dire effects on the country as a whole that could lead to political instability as military veterans have skills that can be used for collective action and violence. Similarly, Higate (2009) asserts that military skills are only productive and functional in systems that use violence.

2.5 Conclusion

Based on the discussion of the literature, it becomes evident that as a generation, millennials are perceived to emulate specific characteristics that might contrast to what the military requires from recruits. Millennials are individualistic and rights based, which is not ideal for the collectivist military system that limits the civic liberties of members. Along with this, millennials vary from older generations as they are less motivated to engage in selfless service, which is opposed to the selfless service the military requires. As a cohort, millennials prefer to work for organisations that provide: flexible work conditions, a technology-friendly environment, high remuneration and work-life balance. These ideals are counter to what the

military requires, as military work is based on routine, affording a limited number of recruits the opportunity to work with highly advanced technology. The military further is a greedy institution that does not provide a work-life balance as the needs of the military will remain primary. In the literature, it appears that millennials lack self-discipline, loyalty and commitment and are willing to let others take control over their lives, which is contrary to the military requirements of high levels of discipline and high levels of commitment and loyalty. As a generation, millennials appear to be risk-averse with a clear unwillingness to engage in work that puts them in mortal danger. Millennials prefer working in collaboration in teams in organisations that support and foster their development and in spaces where they can be treated as equals.

The military needs to socialise young recruits to conform to the required values of the military and is achieved through the total institution, which controls and shapes the days of recruits while isolating them from the rest of society. The total institution introduces recruits to a military culture that instils a specific set of values based on discipline, cohesion, masculinity and the warrior ethos. For most, military culture is quite foreign and they experience entering it as a culture shock that moves through different stages determined by the duration of time they spend in the institution. What is significant is that culture shock displays that the more experienced a person is in a culture, the more able they are to deal with moving between cultures; those with less experience have not developed the coping mechanisms to deal with the moving between the cultures.

The reality of military service is that many young soldiers need to prepare to reintegrate back into civilian life. There is a behavioural residue from the military service that changes the way the body is maintained, but fundamental psychological changes can also be observed which is explained with the concept of habitus. Reverse culture shock is useful to help understand the psychological changes that the individual undergoes as former service men and women create expectations and ideals of what they can expect at home. Reverse culture shock occurs when these expectations do not match reality. Reverse culture shock can explain some of the negative feelings they have experienced. Reintegration is problematic for most former service men and women and affects them all in different ways. For some, leaving the military creates feelings of alienation apathy, lethargy, passivity, and the muting of self-initiative, compliance and submissiveness owing to the sudden loss of paternalistic military social structures, while transforming an individual's behaviour fundamentally as they become more authoritarian,

aggressive and masculine. As a result of their time in the military, most former service men and women struggle to maintain relationships with family, friends and their community.

Finally, military service impacts former service men and women as it shapes their views and expectations on work. For those serving in a combat branch, military service is problematic as it provides them with no skills to take to the civilian labour market, while those in the technical branches have skills that can be used to find gainful employment. Regardless of this, military service could be beneficial as it can be a marker of good physical health and fitness, discipline and loyalty. However, the reality is that military veterans experience more than double the levels of unemployment than their civilian peers, and this could be attributed to the lack of skills the former service men and woman have.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research strategy employed in this study, including the sampling strategy, description of the sample, data collection process, data analysis and ethics. This is followed by a reflection on the research process and some of the challenges experienced during the research process. Lastly, I reflect on my positionality as researcher in the field engaging with research participants.

3.2 Research strategy

This study aimed to explore the experiences of young veterans who entered the SANDF through the MSDS, completed their training and left the Defence Force without being dishonourably discharged. Consequently, this study was explorative and adopted a qualitative research approach. This approach was selected owing to the limited number of studies on former MSDS's, as well as the lack of research detailing the position of military veterans in the current social and political context. This study was focussed on the employment status and reintegration of military veterans in the South African context. The research used a social constructionist approach, as the emphasis in this research was on the individual in society and in their communities, and on how they interpreted, understood and experienced the world in which they lived. The constructionist approach places importance on the context, the culture and the complexity of factors that are examined in a variety of situations in which the participants find themselves (Bryman, 2008; Rubin & Rubin, 2012:19). As such, a qualitative research design was used in this study to explore the reintegration and employment status of young military veterans in South Africa. A survey questionnaire study would have required some baseline information on young MSDS members who have left the SANDF, and this did not exist at the time.

A qualitative research design does have limits in terms of the generalisability of the findings. As a result, the findings are often restricted to the specific study population or location (Johnson, 1997; Flick, 2007; Bryman, 2008). This is due to the smaller sample sizes, unrepresentative samples that might be biased, being over subjective and the failure to replicate studies which undermines the reliability and validity of the research (Johnson, 1997; Bryman, 2012:406). Various qualitative researchers have argued that validity and reliability as understood in quantitative research should be rejected in qualitative research due to the ontological and epistemological differences, or that only validity should be used to determine

the quality of research. Thus, a measure of good quality research should be that it is plausible, credible, trustworthy and defensible (Johnson, 1997).

One method used to improve the external validity of qualitative research is triangulation. Triangulation refers to the use of a variety of methods and/or sources of data so that findings can be cross-checked (Flick, 2007; Bryman, 2012: 392). This is also known as replication logic, which argues that the more times the findings are shown to be true with different methods and sets of people, the higher the confidence that the research findings can be generalised outside of the people studied in the research (Johnson, 1997:290). In this study, different groups of people were interviewed to gain a more holistic view of how military training and socialisation was seen to affect reintegration back into civilian life. This included current MSDS members (infantry), MSDS instructors (infantry), MSDS members that have left the SANDF (infantry, medical corps, navy, airforce) and also employment agencies that placed former MSDS members in various jobs. Within each group, different data collection methods were used and the findings compared with each other to triangulate the findings within the groups. These findings were then compared with other studies conducted internationally in order to determine the extent to which these findings were specific to South Africa or generalizable more broadly.

3.3 Data collection methods

This study used individual qualitative interviews and focus groups to collect experiences, views and perceptions from participants. The reason for opting to use focus groups was that they enabled one to obtain the views and perceptions of participants, in both a formal and informal way, by asking questions and creating discussions among specific individuals on specific topics (Smithson, 2008:358). Focus groups enabled the collection of meanings and perceptions from groups on a specific topic.

Focus groups as a methodology are useful when examining issues with young people (Kitzinger, 1995; Daley, 2013). This is owing to the environment that focus groups create as spaces in which young people feel comfortable to talk about their experiences and feel less intimidated by the interviewer. The presence of peers or other people with a shared experience created a space that felt more comfortable and resulted in a feeling of assurance. In this study, many of the participants were young and the focus group setting provided a feeling of assurance among the participants after a couple of minutes. The shared experience among the participants, especially the current and former MSDS members, helped them to become more comfortable with each other and with the facilitator. Focus groups create a shift from the individual to the

group and provide an opportunity for individuals to build their ideas on others' experiences by talking to and listening to others in the group. In the study, the group setting allowed the participants to share their ideas, feelings and experiences, and through listening they realised that their peers have similar experiences, or that others could express ideas that they were not able to express themselves. The former MSDS group 2 focus group allowed some of the participants to open up about experiences in a way that they had not done with anyone else. Focus groups created a space where participants in the study did not feel pressured to respond in a specific or an expected manner, and resulted in a climate of confidence in which the participants could have raised issues around a topic as broadly as they wanted, creating a large set of data full of rich descriptions. This occurred in this study as large data sets were collected but the focus groups resulted in discussions with no pressure to respond. This was useful as in one of the focus groups with former MSDS members, one participant was extremely quiet and did not participate. However, as she became more comfortable and realised she did not have to respond in expected ways, she started to participate actively. Focus groups allow topics to be explored and unpacked more extensively and a large set of data can be collected rapidly (Punch, 2008, 48; Bryman, 2012).

There are various positives when using focus groups. These include that focus groups are helpful when exploring a new field of study or a topic that has not been studied extensively, as it can be used in exploratory research or as a preliminary method for the development of questionnaires for surveys (Babour, 2007; Sagoe, 2012). In this study, focus groups helped in mapping the field to determine what was relevant and what the experiences and perceptions of the participants were. It was also useful to triangulate the data collected from the interviews to test if the views raised were valid and experienced by the participants more widely. Additionally, focus groups allow for the collection of a large set of data from many people with different views (Morgan, 1996). In the focus groups, the base data was collected from groups of men and women of the same rank to understand their experiences inside the military. It was useful as I could examine their shared experiences. The focus groups with former MSDS members were more diverse, to determine the extent of the difference between the Arms of Service and the different branches. For instance, former MSDS group 1 consisted of members from the army, navy and the medical service and yielded different views with large sets of data highlighting different experiences. Focus groups solved time constraint issues, especially when the participants were only available at specific or limited times. This was valuable for this study as the focus groups solved time constraints for many of the participants. The data collection

41

carried out at the base in Oudtshoorn had to be conducted within a specific period of time, and focus groups made it possible to gather the data in the shortest possible time. Similarly, former MSDS member Focus groups 1 and 3 were conducted as a result of time availability of the participants.

Focus groups as a data collection method also have some weaknesses that need to be considered and proactively mitigated against by the researcher. During focus groups, the norm between participants can become more powerful than the individual voice and can result in the suppression of certain experiences where opinions differ from those of the rest of the group (Smithson, 2000). Group dynamics can also impact on participation levels, especially if there is one dominant person in the group that hinders the formation of a discussion. This had to be mitigated for in this study at several focus groups. During one of the focus groups on the base, one of the participants was dominant. The only option I had was to ensure that I followed up with questions to the rest of the group and provided them with a space to answer or add to the dominant participant's views. The same occurred in one of the former MSDS focus groups with three divers. However, in this group it was easily mitigated as the group were all friends and the group dynamic was corrected by the other participants. Furthermore, it is often the case that certain individuals simply do not want to partake in discussion in large groups for numerous reasons, such as them not feeling that the confidentiality of their opinions will be respected by the group. This is more important when the research is focussed on intimate or sensitive topics (Smithson, 2000; Barbour, 2007; Bryman, 2012).

Along with focus groups, semi-structured qualitative interviews were used in this study, and these are the most commonly used data collection method in qualitative research. Semi-structured interviews following an interview guide were used in this study to create a conversation between the researcher and the participants.[2] This enabled me to ask specific questions that needed to be covered, as well as using various prompts to solicit explanation where the participant raised important issues that I wanted to unpack further. In this regard, Bryman (2012) indicates that the strength of a semi-structured interview lies in the possibility that the discussion yields the views of the participants, rather than limiting responses, ensuring that the experiences and world views of the participants are collected. For this reason, semi-structured interviews were chosen for this study.

---

[2] Appendix A: Interview Schedules.

This approach allowed greater flexibility around certain themes related to the objectives of the study, which allowed a more natural conversation to develop instead of a rigid and formally-designed questionnaire. As qualitative interviews enable one to collect personal data and allow for a more detailed account of experiences that might not be heard in focus groups, it was necessary to conduct such interviews to allow for some triangulation. For many of the participants, the interviews were a space in which they shared personal experiences and frustrations that could not be discussed in focus groups. Besides this, having one-on-one semi-structured interviews assisted in creating a setting where trust could be established, which was important for many research participants. It provided them a space to tell their story to someone that listened enthusiastically to their experiences in the military and their experiences since they have left.

A combination of focus groups and semi-structured qualitative interviews was useful in this study for the following reasons. Focus groups enabled rapid collection of data and contributed to creating an understanding of the experiences of MSDS members within the SANDF as well as MSDS members that have exited the SANDF. By using both methods, the findings could be triangulated and tested in the focus groups and the semi-structured interviews. This was done with the employment agencies and the instructors to compare insights, and the same was done with the current and former MSDS members to triangulate the information. By using the two methods in tandem, I was able to refine the interview guide and the talking points for the one-on-one sessions with the participants.

3.4 Sampling

The selection of the sample for this research was challenging, partly owing to difficulties in obtaining access to the database of MSDS members who had exited the SANDF. Although such a database exists, it would have required approval from military intelligence as well as consent from the former MSDS members, according to the Protection of Personal Information (POPI) Act, and time did not allow for this process to be completed. However, it would be interesting to investigate in more detail for more quantitative research in future. Therefore, two types of purposive sampling were used to access participants in the SANDF, which included current MSDS members and trainers. Participants outside of the SANDF included MSDS members that left the SANDF, as well as employment agencies who often placed MSDS members in jobs.

The study participants in the SANDF were based at the South African Infantry School in Oudtshoorn. This site was selected due the large numbers of MSDS recruits who were receiving their training at this unit. The reason for selecting this group was to obtain their views on how they experienced their training in terms of their personal development and skills acquired. To select the sample at the base, purposive and convenience sample methods were used. Purposive sampling refers to the selection of individuals, groups of individuals or institutions based on a specific objective correlated with answering the research question (Teddie & Yu, 2007). This could entail selecting participants that are representative of the entire population of a society on a specific characteristic, like gender, race or socio economic status.

Table 1: Profile of MSDS instructors focus groups

Focus Group	No of members	Gender and Rank
MSDS Instructors Group 1	5	All Male (1 Captain, 4 Sergeant Majors)
MSDS Instructors Group 2	5	1 Female (Captain) 4 Male (Sergeant Majors)
MSDS Instructors Group 3	3	All Male Corporal and Lance Corporal
MSDS Instructors Group 4	5	All Male Corporal and Lance Corporal
MSDS Instructors Group 5	3	All Male (Corporal and Lance Corporal)
MSDS Instructors Group 6	4	All Female (Corporal and Lance Corporal)
MSDS Instructors Group 7	4	All Male (Corporal and Lance Corporal)
MSDS Instructors Group 8	5	All Male (Corporal and Lance Corporal)

44

In this regard, there was also an element of convenience sampling as access depended on whether the persons were on duty, were in class or involved in any other activity. However, this had little impact on the overall profile of participants, as they could be scheduled to meet for the interviews at various times. A possible bias which could have influenced the sampling was that I did not have direct access to select participants (Hennicink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011:164; Marshall & Rossman, 2011:145). However, in the case of participants from the SA Infantry School, care was taken that the sample was representative of the unit population. This was done by selecting focus groups from each of the different companies (Alpha, Bravo, Charlie) and from each of the various platoons in the unit. In addition to this, the trainers and instructors of each of these companies were selected by a wing commander from the Infantry School to form their own focus groups. Table 1 provides a description of the focus groups.

The instruction was that when selecting the participants, they should be representative of race and gender. In compiling the focus groups for instructors, an attempt was made to keep these groups on the same rank level so as to compensate for different power dynamics associated with this. Below is a profile of the current MSDS members group. Table 2 provides a description of the focus groups of current MSDS members.

Table 2: Current MSDS members

Focus Group	Number of members	Gender and Rank
Current MSDS Group 1	5	All Female (Private)
Current MSDS Group 2	5	All Male (Private)
Current MSDS Group 3	5	All Female (Private)
Current MSDS Group 4	6	All Female (Private)
Current MSDS Group 5	3	All Male (Private)
Current MSDS Group 6	5	All Male (Private)

The sampling of participants outside of the SANDF used convenience sampling, and specifically snowball sampling was used to gain access to participants. Snowball sampling is used when there is no clear sampling frame or when it is difficult to gain access to research participants, and further participants are selected based on referral by existing study

participants (Bryman, 2012). However, snowball sampling has the weakness that informants tend to refer participants that have the same issues and perceptions on the topics (Barbour & Schostak, 2011; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This was mitigated in this project by using a variety of informants to select participants. It included not only MSDS members that had exited and who identified others, but serving MSDS members who knew of members who had left, as well as employment agencies who had placed MSDS members. Similarly, employment agencies were selected based on their experience in dealing with and placing ex-MSDS personnel.

Table 3 provides a description of the MSDS members (40) who have left the SANDF with who semi structured interviews were conducted. Table 4 provides the details of the focus groups with these participants. Profiles of the employment agencies are presented in Table 5.

Table 3: MSDS members that left the SANDF

	Age	Gender	Arms of service and functional area	Exited:
MSDS 1	23	Male	Army – Infantry	2011
MSDS 2	24	Male	Army – Infantry	2009
MSDS 3	21	Male	Army – Infantry	2011
MSDS 4	22	Male	Army – Infantry	2011
MSDS 5	26	Male	Army – Infantry	2007
MSDS 6	25	Male	Army – Infantry	2007
MSDS 7	25	Female	Army – Infantry	2011
MSDS 8	26	Male	Army – Infantry	2007
MSDS 9	26	Female	Army – Infantry	2008
MSDS 10	28	Male	Army – Infantry	2006
MSDS 11	27	Male	Army – Infantry	2008
MSDS 12	24	Male	Navy – Maritime reaction	2011
MSDS 13	25	Male	Navy – Maritime reaction	2009
MSDS 14	23	Female	Navy – Maritime reaction	2011

MSDS 15	26	Male	Navy – Logistics	2011
MSDS 16	27	Male	Navy – Fire fighter	2011
MSDS 17	27	Male	Navy – Signal communication	2011
MSDS 18	23	Male	Navy – Maritime reaction	2013
MSDS 19	25	Female	Navy – Signal communications	2013
MSDS 20	28	Female	Navy – Human Resources	2009
MSDS 21	25	Female	Navy – Human Resources	2013
MSDS 22	26	Male	Navy – Technical officer maintenance	2009
MSDS 23	28	Male	Navy – Diver	2008
MSDS 24	27	Male	Navy – Diver	2006
MSDS 25	29	Male	Navy – Diver	2007
MSDS 26	25	Male	Navy – Technical officer maintenance	2014
MSDS 27	27	Male	SAMHS – Logistics	2009
MSDS 28	28	Male	SAMHS – Logistics	2013
MSDS 29	28	Male	SAMHS – Paramedic field medicine	2014
MSDS 30	25	Female	SAMHS – Nurse	2013
MSDS 31	26	Female	SAMHS – Nurse	2013
MSDS 32	26	Female	SAMHS – Patient admin	2012
MSDS 33	28	Male	Air force – Fire fighter/ health and safety	2011
MSDS 34	29	Male	Air force – Material support clerk	2011
MSDS 35	31	Male	Air force – material support logistics	2014
MSDS 36	26	Male	Air force – Human resource administration	2012
MSDS 37	24	Male	Air force – Protection services	2009
MSDS 38	25	Male	Air force – protection services	2009

MSDS 39	23	Female	Air force – Bowser driver	2014
MSDS 40	23	Female	Air force – Information Communication Technology Management	2014

Table 4: Profile of MSDS focus groups that have exited the SANDF

Focus Group	Number of members	Gender	Branches
Former MSDS Group 1	5	All male	1 Infantry 2 Navy 2 SAMHS
Former MSDS Group 2	4	2 male, 2 female	2 Infantry 2 SAMHS
Former MSDS Group 3	3	All male	3 Navy

Table 5: Profile of the employment agencies

	Description	How selected	Where operate	Year's experience
Employment Agency 1	This agency is located in Johannesburg and recruits ex-military personnel for private military companies that operate in the Middle East and specializes in combat ready personnel.	Referral former MSDS participant	Local	10 years
Employment Agency 2	This agency is located in Cape Town and recruits for many large businesses that range the service, hospitality and security sectors. The agency has successfully	Telephone enquiry	Local and regional	10 years

	placed military veterans in these sectors in South Africa.			
Employment Agency 3	This agency is located in Pretoria and recruits for many large businesses in the security sector. The agency has successfully placed military veterans in the security sector for the past 10 years in Gauteng.	Telephone enquiry	Local	10 years
Employment Agency 4	This agency is located in Cape Town and recruits for a variety of sectors. The agency has successfully placed military veterans in a variety of sectors in the Western Cape.	Telephone enquiry	Local	10 years
Employment Agency 5	This agency is located in Cape Town and recruits for the retail sector. The agency has successfully placed military veterans in the retail sector in the Western Cape.	Telephone enquiry	Local	10 years
Employment Agency 6	This agency is located in Cape Town and recruits for many large businesses that range the service and security sectors. The agency has successfully placed military veterans in these sectors in South Africa.	Telephone enquiry	Local	10 years
Employment Agency 7	This agency is located in Cape Town and recruits for many large businesses that range the service, hospitality and security sectors. The agency has successfully placed military veterans in these sectors in South Africa.	Referral by agency 3	Local	10 years
Employment Agency 8	The agency is located Johannesburg and recruits in the mining security sector. The	Referral by agency 3	Local and Africa	10 years

	agency has successfully placed MSDS members in mining companies in Africa.			
Employment Agency 9	This agency is located in Johannesburg and Cape Town. It recruits for a variety of companies that includes temporary workers that fill in industry. (Finance, banking, hospitality, security). It has placed MSDS members with all of their clients.	Referral by agency 7	Local	13 years
Employment Agency 10	This agency is located in Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town and specializes in maritime employment. It seeks and provides employment to a variety of sectors these include hospitality, manufacturing, mining and oil refineries. MSDS members have been placed in employment over the globe in a variety of countries.	Referral by agency 8	Local	18 years

3.5 Data collection

Data collection was done at the South African Infantry School in Oudtshoorn during October 2013 involving MSDS instructors and MSDS members to determine what training they received and how they were introduced into military culture. Focus groups were selected and used for the data collection from the current MSDS members and instructors in the SANDF. This method was primarily used owing to the time limit of two days available for data collection. To facilitate data collection, Prof L. Heinecken provided the initial guidance in conducting the first focus group interviews. Along with this, Ms M. Smith who was working on a similar project on military recruitment conducted some of the focus groups in order to ensure that as much data as possible was collected. The focus groups lasted approximately 45 to 60 minutes, and were conducted in offices on the base with as much privacy as possible.

Data collection from employment agencies and former MSDS members was done from 2013 to 2015. Gaining access to ex-MSDS members was a significant challenge as no access was given to a database to contact former MSDS service men and women and thus resulted in a significant period of time spent on data collection. The group interviews were fairly representative of the different Arms of Service and the different branches, ranging from combat to support and technical branches.

The interviews with former MSDS members lasted between 45 and 90 minutes, and some of the interviews resulted in discussions between myself and the participant. Many of the participants wanted to continue the discussions after the interview was done and I made detailed notes of the interviews, including the conversations afterwards. Many of the interviews were done in the MSDS member's home if situated in the Western Cape, while others were conducted in a quiet coffee shop in Cape Town. The former MSDS members came from across South Africa, and some were interviewed when they were on holiday which I accommodated by conducting the interviews either where they resided for the holiday, or a coffee shop. During the study, some former MSDS members were interviewed in Johannesburg and Pretoria - Gauteng. Some of the interviews were conducted in a conference room at a guest house, while the majority were done at the residences of the MSDS members. The aim was to try and keep the setting as natural as possible in order to ensure that the participants were as relaxed as possible. In most of the interviews, a natural progression occurred that answered or attempted to answer the topics for discussion.

Interviews with employment agencies were also conducted from 2013 to 2015. A group of agencies that recruits for a variety of sectors ranging from mining, security, medical, logistics, security, retail and film production sectors was interviewed. It was challenging to obtain commitment to dates and times, and meetings were cancelled on a number of occasions.

The interviews with employment agencies lasted an average of 45 to 60 min. It was in most instances challenging to acquire the buy-in of the agencies as they were reluctant to divulge proprietary knowledge, or to release confidential information of their clients and potential employers. However, once the agency representatives understood the aim of the research, they were more willing to participate. From the ten interviews with agencies, nine were completed at their offices and one was conducted at a restaurant.

Data collection was stopped when data saturation occurred. This was established when the participants started providing the same views and perspectives and they were not raising new

ideas or issues during the interviews or focus groups. Triangulation was done to test the ideas and perceptions raised in the other discussions to test the data but also to try and get an additional response. When this did not generate new ideas and became a repetition it was decided that collection can be stopped.

3.6 Data analysis

All the interviews were recorded and transcribed, after which thematic data analysis was done in order to identify various themes. Thematic analysis enables the researcher to identify patterns across the data, rather than merely looking for themes to answer specific questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006:100). The interpretation of the themes is up to the researcher and will typically be based on the concepts and theories that have guided the research (Bryman, 2012). The discussion of the themes identified will therefore be in relation to both the literature and the issues surfacing from the data.

The data analysis was approached in a variety of ways. Data analysis requires that the researcher is familiar with the data to identify themes and patterns (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Bryman, 2012). In this study, some of the data was collected by other researchers using the same open ended interview schedule which I had to transcribe. This familiarized me with the content but also enabled me to draw comparisons with my own interviews in terms of the themes and issues that came to the fore. The themes generated from the research were derived from the data itself following the inductive or grounded approach to data analysis (Bryman, 2012).

3.7 Ethical Considerations

This research required institutional permission to conduct research on a military base with military personnel. Institutional permission was received from the Chief of the Army as well as the General Officer Commanding of Infantry Formation allowing access to the instructors and MSDS recruits. For the participants on the base, informed consent forms were drafted and handed to participants. During the focus groups, the aim of the study was explained. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary and could be terminated at any time during the focus group without any consequence to themselves or peers in the group. A few of the participants opted not to participate, but most relished the opportunity to speak to 'civilians' about their experiences. It was also stressed that the study was independent form the SANDF and that names and responses would be held confidential and privacy would be ensured. The participants were also informed that the session would be recorded and

transcribed and thereafter destroyed once transcriptions were completed. The participants were also given an opportunity to ask questions about the research and the interviewer. After the focus groups were completed, participants were given the opportunity to ask the interviewer and each other questions about any concerns raised about the research or during the research could be addressed.

The research with the employment agencies and the former MSDS members did not require institutional permission. With the employment agencies, the representatives were asked if they required permission from management, and in all cases none was required. An informed consent was form was created for the agencies. The former MSDS members had to sign an informed consent form for their participation.[3] In all the interviews and focus groups with the former-MSDS members and the agencies, the aim of the study was explained and the independence of the study was communicated. Thereafter, the participants were provided with time to ask questions. The recording of the session was explained, permission was obtained in all cases, and the anonymity of participants was ensured.

3.8 Limitations and reflection of methodology

Conducting this research posed a number of challenges. In the case of the focus groups with current MSDS members, a dominant participant emerged, to the point that there was conflict between the participants. I stopped the discussion and reminded the participants that all views were important, and then specifically asked other participants to give their opinion. However, the focus groups mostly worked well with the MSDS instructors, current and former MSDS members as they provided the study with a more in-depth insight into the realities many former MSDS members faced. This was especially valuable for me as I am outside of the military and have never served. Focus groups were very useful to triangulate the data collected to check if there were similarities in the experiences of former MSDS men and women. The setting was sometimes distracting for some of the participants from the focus groups among former MSDS members. One group was interviewed in a restaurant with a good view and the participants sometimes had to be probed with questions to keep them focussed.

The semi-structured interviews with former MSDS members and agencies yielded the best results in terms of the richness of the data. While initially the biggest challenge was finding MSDS members and employment agencies to participate, this gained momentum over time as

---

[3] Please see attached, the informed consent forms that was explained to the participants.

the snowball sampling increased the names of people and agencies I could interview. However, getting access to participants and setting a time and date that suited the participants was time consuming and a significant challenge.

The employment agencies were particularly challenging as interviews were often cancelled and had to be rescheduled at the last moment. This not only frustrated the research process, but resulted in delays and loss of valuable time. As frustrating as the wait was, these interviews were often the longest and most enriching.

The interviews with the ex-MSDS members had similar time challenges. Three participants did not pitch up for sessions and rescheduled, only to miss the sessions a second time, and I decided to exclude them from the study as communication with them became strained. The participants' patience was limited when follow-ups were done to reschedule. They were reminded of the right not to participate which resulted in the participants cancelling their participation. The three participants were all former infantry soldiers, who were a better-represented demographically in this study, so it was unlikely that their input would have made a significant difference to the results. The session with the former MSDS members was also often intense and draining for them, as they had to recall the experiences of both becoming a soldier and reintegrating back into their community as a civilian. However, the majority of the participants reported feeling more in touch with themselves after the session, as it made them reflect on their experiences in the SANDF and how this influenced their lives. In this regard, it helped them to reflect on reasons for their emotions and to express their frustrations on their current unemployment. However, I also felt at that point that I could offer something back to them by referring them to various employment agencies that had placed former MSDS members in a range of jobs and understood where they were coming from.

The methodologies utilised and sample size in this study has limited the generalizability of the findings. However, the sample size was sufficient to draw some preliminary conclusions on the experiences of the MSDS, the challenges they experienced, what skills they considered beneficial for gainful employment and how employers viewed such members from the different corps of the SANDF. However, there were certain limitations that need to be acknowledged. Firstly, the sample had a bias towards the army and the data pointed to very important differences in terms of the navy, air force and South African Military Health Service (SAMHS) with regards to employability and skills acquired. The different arms of service each have their own iteration of military culture. One of the current MSDS members pointed out that there was a difference between the Army and the Navy, with the Army's military culture being more

overt with an unquestionable sense of following orders, while in the Navy, it was acceptable to ask questions to understand orders.

The findings on the skills received during training cannot be generalised. With the Infantry School, we were given access to their training documents and could interview their instructors but not for the SA Navy, Air Force or Medical Services. In these cases the details of their training were gathered from the interviews and focus group discussions with the research participants. The description of the training by former MSDS members from the infantry was tested against the information we had and they provided enough information to provide useable detail of the skills received. However, the participants were reporting their own experiences which could impact on the quality of the data on skills which could have been done more formally. The reality is that if this had to be outlined for all the different roles, a significant study would need to be conducted to report on this.

Reintegration into civilian life could also be influenced by factors like race, gender, class, level of education and family bonds, but were not explored in detail in this study. For instance, it would have been very useful to have interviewed some family, friends or community members on their perception of the change of behaviour in the former MSDS men and women, and to understand their views on the reintegration of the former MSDS members.

3.9 My role as researcher

During data collection, the issue of insider and outsider dynamics was prevalent, as well as the factors of race, gender and age, all of which could have impacted on the data collection. Within some of the interviews and focus groups, it was easy to be considered an insider, as the age difference between myself and the participants was not significant, and we shared experiences of looking toward the future of employment and generating some form of income and starting a career. This enabled me to ask questions that were easily interpreted by the participants, but still vague enough to create a discussion that resulted in a meaningful understanding of the experience and the culture of the participants.

One element that did impact on the study was that I am a white student, at an institution that is classified as privileged in South Africa. This definitely affected the way that the participants experienced me. Initially, they seemed to be watching their tone and content, but this seemed to dissipate as they became more relaxed, and they revealed more. However, an advantage was that some of them were aspiring to study and qualify as officers at the South African Military Academy which is a faculty of Military Science, at Stellenbosch University. As a result of this,

the current MSDS members enquired about what I was studying and how they could access studies in future. They shared thoughts of studies and fears about studying again. However, most preferred not to study or entertain any possibility of further studies. This was most prevalent with the former MSDS members. Some enquired about employment possibilities which they expected I could give them. I referred them to employment agencies participating in the study. This had a positive outcome as six of the participants actually received employment within three months of contacting the agencies.

Language was a salient issue for some of the participants. The majority of the research participants were black South Africans who speak primarily Xhosa or Zulu. English was not a first language and some experienced difficulty in expressing thoughts in English, although all were able to converse relatively easily given that English is the 'thread' language of the SANDF (Heinecken, 2009). Within the focus groups, this was easily mitigated as the other participants could collectively translate and express the idea or experience. When participants struggled to express themselves, it was a good way to probe for deeper meaning from all the participants. In the interviews probes were also used when participants struggled to express themselves.

Gender was a salient issue as well and was dealt with differently in the various parts of the study. The focus groups at the infantry school were controlled and focus groups mostly segregated in terms of gender to control for gendered experiences on the base. The facilitators conducting the focus groups were women which provide them with the opportunity to discuss topics and issues more freely in terms of their experience of military socialisation, which is steeped in hegemonic masculinity and the warrior ethos. I conducted interviews mostly the male focus groups. With the ex-MSDS members, however, the situation was different. The interviews were conducted with women and men on a one-on-one basis, and I conducted all these interviews myself as I was not constrained by time or institutional arrangements. There were some differences initially when interviewing the women. They were reluctant to share their experiences as easily and to discuss the topics at length as men did. After the first interviews, I asked for feedback from the female participants to improve my communication. The feedback I received assisted me in preparing for the interviews that followed, and the participants engagement and discussion in the interviews increased.

The majority of the participants were black African males and females, with other races in South Africa being in the minority in this study. This is owing to the racial profile of the SANDF which consists of 70 % black Africans, 13 % Coloureds, 1 % Indians and 16% Whites

(Heinecken & Van der Waag- Cowling, 2009). I believe that participants initial opinion of me was based on my race. As we discussed the issues and the conversation progressed, the issue of race become less relevant, and I think this was owing to the way that MSDS members were socialised in the SANDF. Race becomes a secondary frame of reference as in the military they live, work and eat together, and it becomes less of a salient issue. Krebs (2004) has argued that the military can and should be used as a school for the nation to ensure that stereotypical views that people have of others are broken down. It can be done in the unit by forcing interaction of different people. I think that this forced interaction diminishes the problem of race for many former MSDS members. This was also true for the MSDS members that have left the SANDF.

While the qualitative approach was useful, now that we have deeper understanding, it would be interesting to conduct a quantitative study to measure certain issues that affect reintegration. However, this would require a huge logistical effort. Firstly, to obtain access to the database and afterwards to roll it out in terms of contacting the members. Additionally, survey research has to deal with poor response rates and the quality of the data could be problematic as the contact details might not be current. Therefore, a survey needs to be considered carefully.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the findings and discussion of the data analysis. It entails establishing the values of millennials and how these values relate to what the military requires from recruits, in order to understand who the youth, going into the military, is. The participants had different racial, cultural and class backgrounds; this section does not aim to predict or classify each individual but rather to understand how others and organisations view and experience the generation (Stafford & Griffis, 2008; Rainer & Rainer, 2011). Thereafter, I will present the skills MSDS members receive during their military training, along with the socialisation they undergo when moving into the military. The focus shifts to how the military identity is formed and sustained in the post military life, and how this influences the reintegration process and ability to find employment of former members.

4.1 MSDS: millennials and the SANDF

As highlighted in Chapter 2, generational theory has various limitations as no generational group is homogenous and different social realities shape how a cohort experiences the society that shapes their world view. Regardless of these limitations, certain themes emerged from the data which highlighted the fact that some of the characteristics identified with millennials were present in the social worlds of the participants. Demographically, all the former and current MSDS members that were interviewed for this study were born between 1980 and 1990 and were between 22 and 29 years old. This conforms to how Ender, Rohall and Matthews (2014) classify millennials demographically.

4.1.1 Individualism and rights-based mind-set

For all the employment agencies, a strong sense of individualism was established among the millennials. For them, the young people that they work with were very in tune with their rights, and were willing to stand up for them. The following two short quotes illustrate a general view from the agencies.

> *"...the young people I engaged with know their rights, they keep me in check...."*[4]

---

[4] Employment agency 10: recruits for maritime companies that operate in hospitality, manufacturing, mining and oil sectors.

> *"…employees they are very aware of their rights…. and want what is due to them…more than the older people I engage with…"[5].*

These quotes indicate that millennials are generally quite well educated about their rights and will in most instances insist that their rights are not infringed upon. The second quote further illustrates that there is a marked difference in the extent to which millennials will demand their rights, as compared to other generations. This implies that for the employment agencies, millennials tend to be more demanding of their rights in comparison with older generations, creating a view that millennials are more rights-based than previous generations. This finding supports the view by Elliott & Lemert (2009) who similarly argues that millennials are more rights-based. For the majority of employment agencies and former MSDS members, the reason for millennials being aware of their rights was grounded in the education they received on their rights at school, but also through access to the internet. This supports the observation made by Shaw & Fairhurst (2008) who attributed millennials' heightened awareness about their rights to internet resources like social media platforms, such as Facebook groups and chatrooms.

Another theme which emerged from the data was that millennials were viewed as willing to stand up for the rights of others in a similar way as they would demand their own rights. This was a theme that the majority of the employment agencies supported. For these participants, millennials would rally around issues they perceived to be legal or social injustices and attempted to speak up for those it affected negatively, to the point that some would argue that it was overbearing. The following quote illustrates the views of the employment agencies.

> *"…I meet regularly with the employers and they give me feedback on the people I have recruited. I get the general sense that the young people will stand up for the rights of others. One production company was working on set in an informal settlement and this young guy insisted that locals need to be used as extras and that the company needs to give back to the community in a sustainable way. This from a young guy who worked for the navy and got into this industry by chance. I have had similar experiences with others as well."[6]*

---

[5] Employment agency 6: recruits for large business that place service and security sector personnel.
[6] Employment agency 2: recruits for the service, hospitality and security sectors including movie production companies.

Similarly, former MSDS members have also reported that they were more mindful of the rights of others. The following two quotes illustrate a general view reported among the former MSDS service members.

> *"I have worked in various places since I left the navy. One was a security company and I worked with a woman there. The company did not respect women, and the men who worked there treated them like you know second class. The one lady was in the SANDF too and we stood up against the men to make sure they respect the women and what they can do…."*[7]

> *"I work in a space that requires a lot of focus. I train people in fire prevention on ships… so it is obvious that I will be demanding of my rights, they are there for a reason to protect me and others..."*[8]

The views highlight that millennials are willing to act to ensure social justice is achieved, concurring with the ideas of Howe and Strauss (2000) and Lancaster and Stillman (2002). However, one element that was not mentioned directly or named as being of any significance in this study was the role of social media or the internet when millennials made a stand for these rights, in contrast to the arguments of Tulgan (2009) and Wellman (2008). Rather, the experiences of standing up for the rights of others have been through direct communication and not via social media. This could be explained by the lack of access to the internet among the study participants, but could also be a result of not being probed enough during the interviews.

For the majority of employment agencies, millennials demanded to be taken seriously and have their voices heard and opinions valued. This manifested in an increase in conflict in the workplace. The following quote illustrates the rights-based values of millennials and their demands for respect, authority and voice in general.

> *"… the young people challenge a lot of the ways things are being done. I am not saying that it is bad, sometimes it is legitimate things like not abusing the communities or places that film is made and giving something back to the community. But they are just seen as being arrogant. The film industry operates on strict time lines and is generally a tough industry with no time for softer things*

---

[7] MSDS 15: Male form the Navy working in the infantry section specializing in anti-piracy.
[8] MSDS 16: Male from the Navy trained as fire fighter.

like worry about the community when they are shooting…. The guy I placed challenged them on community interaction on the day of the shoot. He challenged the director and he became confrontational that spread through the entire production… the director wanted to fire him on the spot…"[9]

The quote illustrates an extreme example of how millennials are viewed by employers and employment agencies as a group of youth that are willing to stand up for their rights, but who also need to challenge ways of doing things. As in this case, they are willing to challenge employers to ensure social justice. Another important component to the conflict was that employment agencies argued that the conflict was more severe when millennials needed to work with other generations. The following quote displays this view.

"…some of the personnel I have placed give feedback that there is a lot of tension between the older workers and the young people I place… and always try to show that they are better, and don't respect the older people that work in the companies… so there is an increase in the conflict that is happening that many blame the young people for…"[10]

The quote illustrates that in general the millennials in this study struggle to work with older people owing to a difference in their values. It includes more senior people seeing millennials as juniors with little experience and therefore not taking them seriously, while millennials believe that they need to be listened to as they can contribute and have the correct answers. By demanding being listened to, conflict is started that spreads to the rest of the work place. This explains that millennials challenge traditions in the work place and will advocate for change even if it challenges everything in the organisation. Thus, millennials in this study demanded their rights and the rights of others and aspired to achieve social justice. As a result, they created some conflict in the work place when they started demanding the cultural values, like being treated as equals and being listened to, that accompanied their rights-based approach, such as being respected and listened to as equals. This finding supports the views of Twenge (2006) and Ender *et al*. (2014) who have both argued that millennials demand respect and authority, and this results in conflict in the work place.

---

[9] Employment agency 2: recruits for the service, hospitality and security sectors including movie production companies.

[10] Employment agency 2: recruits for the service, hospitality and security sectors including movie production companies.

From the findings described above, we can conclude that a rights-based individualism exists amongst the millennials, which is the direct opposite of military requirements. The military operates under a system of collectivism that is justified by military law which limits some personal freedoms to ensure that the military can operate as fighting force. This signifies that social justice and individual rights and freedoms become limited (Shi Hao, 2013). This limitation is to ensure that the chain of command is maintained; that insubordination is not tolerated and can lead to corrective measures like punishment, rejection from the unit or incarceration (Strachan, 2006). As a result, the individualism of millennials could be seen as a problematic characteristic for recruits who join the military. The individualism also relates to how work and employment are viewed, and the motivation for joining an organisation or the reason for following a specific career.

4.1.2 Work and employment

Millennials vary from previous generations. For instance, the baby boomers believed in a calling and service to the community in their work, along with selfless service to others. The interviews with employment agencies indicated that most of the youth wanted employment but there was little interest in selfless service. The participants reported that the youth would enter into any employment as long as it paid and there was a decline in the motivation for employment that required working for a cause. One of the agencies highlighted this by indicating their organisations' experience recruiting health care workers.

> *"We recruit nurses and other health care workers. I tried to recruiting for a government hospital. Some people applied but when we talked salary they all requested to look for something else, private health care or work abroad. They want to do this for the salary benefits and not to help their community… so I would say that as a generation I think that these young people will do the work for more money… and if they are desperate enough they will work for the government hospital."[11]*

Hence, there is a decline in interest in serving the community, with young people pursuing employment for higher income or other immaterial gains. The same employment agency stated that millennials were generally more willing to work for state institutions, where there was a

---

[11] Employment agency 4: recruits for the health care sector, service, hospitality and security sectors including movie production companies.

perceived gain such as getting credits or practical experience. This indicates that there is a general decline in selfless service among millennials. This finding supports the work of Twenge *et al.* (2012), which showed a marked decline in civic engagement on issues that were identified as important, with a clear increase in self-centred individualism, accompanied by increased self-importance and narcissism among the millennials. The findings are also similar to those of Vézina and Crompton (2012) who have argued that millennials tend to engage more in civic duties if there is some gain for them. Therefore, there is a general lack of selfless service among millennials, which can also be seen in the reasons why many of the MSDS members have joined the SANDF. The reasons will be discussed now.

In general, the majority of the current and former MSDS members joined the military to secure employment after they had completed their schooling. To secure employment with a dependable income was the most important motivation for these members. The following two quotes from a former MSDS member illustrate their motivation to secure employment and income.

> *"I needed to get a job as soon as possible. I need to support my family and look after my siblings. Life is tough in the township…"[12]*

> *"…I applied because I wanted a job…I don't want to study further I had enough of school I want to work and earn money. Working for the government is the best work there is maybe I can start here and end in an office somewhere… we only come here to get a job and some money"[13]*

Based on these responses, it is apparent that military work was seen as a job that provided secure and stable income for the majority of these MSDS members. It also provided an alternative to studying, but was seen by participants as a way to improve their material position. In addition to securing an income, for most participants, the benefits of the military life style were an important motivator. The cost-free boarding and lodging that members received from the military was significant as they could save on these expenses or sent some money home. The possibility of getting deployment and danger pay was very enticing for many of the participants. The following quote illustrates this view, which was held by the majority of MSDS members.

---

[12] Former MSDS member – Air force – Protection services – male.
[13] Former MSDS member – Navy – Maritime reaction/infantry – male.

> *"life in the Army is good you get food even clothes. You can save money and send home. That is why I wanted to join. Also if you can get deployed you can bring back good money, those people (who deploy) can buy car cash when they come back." [14]*

This quote highlights that fact that the various benefits from the military can be a motivator for joining the force. Others mentioned access to health care, subsidies and other benefits that they could access if they joined the military.

For a small group of the participants, the military was seen as a way to access training and education. For instance, the former MSDS members who were formerly deployed in the SAMHS all completed formal courses in nursing and emergency medicine which they would not have been able to afford themselves. The following quote illustrates their view on training and education as a motivator.

> *"… I wanted to work in nursing all my life. But I could never afford paying for the training. I saw that SANDF take people and pay for training. I applied and started, did my training, and they paid for it…" [15]*

The motivation for joining the SANDF for this group was primarily to gain a skill or qualification that they could use when they leave the military. Similarly, those who qualified as navy divers were also motivated by the training potential of the military as an employer. For all of these participants, the training potential was what motivated them to join the military.

What became apparent from the discussions of motivations for current and former MSDS members was that they were motivated to join the military for mainly occupational reasons. Only a few indicated that they wanted to join because they wanted to serve their country, or that it was a calling. The reasons for this group that joined for a calling were centred around ideas of defending their country, service to their country and community, family tradition, or for personal satisfaction and development. The following quote from the interviews illustrates some of the reasons why former MSDS members wanted to join the military.

---

[14] Former MSDS member – Army – infantry – male.
[15] Former MSDS member – SAMHS – Nurse – female.

> *"… I joined Navy cause we live in a democracy that we all need to protect and we need to serve our community. I always wanted to join the Navy since my father served when he was younger"[16]*

Another former MSDS member describes the familial tradition of service.

> *"My father was an MK fighter in exile and he always said that we must serve our community and protect our democracy and the country. I can't think of anything else I wanted to do…joining the SANDF is in my family… we all have served in one way or another"[17]*

As shown in these quotes, this group was motivated by selfless service or a calling to serve in the military, with none of them even mentioning income or any of the other benefits which the first groups mentioned. For this group, serving in the military was more important than the material benefits that could be gained from the military.

Among the current and former MSDS members, only two indicated that they were motivated to join the military for a combination of reasons. This included gaining access to the income and benefits, but also to serve their country and community and to fulfil the familial tradition of service in the military.

> *"… my family all have been in the army. My dad wanted me to go to the police service. But I came here I want to serve my country but also make a living in the process…" [18]*

Therefore, these members were motivated by a combination of the material benefits and the calling they felt to serve in the military.

From these findings we can draw the following conclusions. The majority of the current and former MSDS members were motivated to join the military for occupational reasons like securing employment with a stable income, along with benefits like access to healthcare and training and education possibilities which were primarily for their own gain. A smaller number joined for reasons including honour, familial tradition and a calling to serve. The smallest group was motivated by a combination of material benefits, honour and calling. The findings support the intuition/occupation thesis of Moskos (1977) that argues that the majority of people join

---

[16] Former MSDS member – Navy – Communications/signal corps – female.
[17] Former MSDS member – Army – Infantry – male.
[18] Current MSDS member – Army infantry – focus group 5 – All male.

the military for occupational reasons that include tangible benefits like remuneration, danger pay, leave, traveling, education, medical care and housing. The minority join for the institutional reasons, such as honour, self-sacrifice and service to the country, that are preferred by the military. Only a few could be called pragmatic professionals who joined the armed forces for a combination of institutional/occupational reasons (Segal, 1989). As a result, military work was seen as 'just another job' by these members, which is similar to findings of a study completed by Drago (2006) who found that US recruits join mostly to gain access to income, training and job security. Similarly, Heinecken (1997a; 1997b) found that junior officers join the military for job security, benefits, discipline and interest in the military tasks, rather than selfless service ideals.

4.1.3 Flexible working conditions and technology

Another theme which emerged from the interviews with employment agencies was that millennials preferred working for organisations that provided flexible work conditions and variety, and which were constantly changing. The following excerpt from an interview with an agency in Cape Town highlights the general theme raised by the other agencies.

> *"I have placed many young people in positions over the last 8 years. The young people want to work for an employer that offers an exciting workplace that is changing constantly. Routine work kills them…*

I then asked "All of them?" and the response was,

> *Not all of them, but most of them they don't like routine work they get bored and that is when they want to leave. Many of the posts that are routine like nightshift work in security on sets are generally very boring, so I experienced a high labour turn over… but the guys who work on set with actors in protection and other types of jobs stay as no day is the same working in the entertainment industry is tough, but always changing…." [19]*

This view was held by all the employment agencies interviewed. Some added that millennials were the least adapted to working in cubicles in nine-to-five roles, while older generations were more adaptable to this type of work. Employment agencies held the view that millennials would prefer work that was less routine, in a setting that was constantly changing. This finding is

---

[19] Employment agency 2: recruits for the service, hospitality and security sectors including movie production companies.

similar to those reported by Hershatter and Epstein (2010) who found that millennials aspire to work in fluid and constantly changing work spaces that have less routine tasks. Similarly, this supports the findings of Ozkana and Solmaz (2015) who argued that millennials differ from the other generations like the baby boomers who are more adapted to working in traditional office roles.

An additional theme that emerged related to the use of technology, as many recruitment agencies believed that millennials wanted to work with technology in the work place and that this would provide millennials with employment, skills and some flexibility in their work. The following quote illustrates this view.

> *"The young people who I see all want to work with technology. They see it as way to secure work. The problem is that some don't have the skills to work with MS Word and basics like that.* [20]

Another added that,

> *"... I recruit high end security and the employer started using drones I had so many applications it was amazing. The use of technology is so important for the young people."* [21]

These two quotes highlight the importance of technology for millennials in their work. Using and being able to use technology is central in securing employment but also in creating a work environment that is changing and evolving. The quotes also show a reality that nearly all of the recruitment agencies identified. Technology was important for millennials, but not everyone had the same exposure to the technology or had the skills to use the technology for employment. An element that was lacking was basic word processing, accounting, programming and other soft skills that could secure access to these kinds of work. So, even though many millennials want to work with technology, some still lack the training to secure employment using technology. The finding on technology supports the work of Moss (2011), who argues that technology might provide millennials some flexibility in their work, but not to the extent to which Moss argues that it would enable them to work remotely from coffee shops. However, my own findings are more similar to those of Meister and Willyerd (2010) on the central importance of technology in the development of skills. This finding raises the question of how

---

[20] Employment agency 7: recruits for the service, hospitality and security sectors.
[21] Employment agency 8: recruits for the mining sector.

attractive the military is to young recruits, given that military work is often routine and physical for the majority of the soldiers. While a number of positions in the military do entail the use of advanced technology associated with weapons systems, this does not pertain to many other jobs in the military. Similarly, many positions require special training for which there are limited positions available therefore excluding the majority from working with technology (Grint & Woolgar,1997).

4.1.4 Work-life balance

Recruitment agencies indicated in the interviews that millennials preferred working for employers that provided a work-life balance. They argued that in most cases, millennials wanted to work for employers that respected their private time and gave them sufficient time off, while still giving them an income that was large enough to sustain and support their families and extended families. This view was supported by eight of the ten agencies interviewed, of which four reported that employers shared the same views. The following quote illustrates the views from the agencies.

> *"The young people coming to the labour market now want to work in places where they can take enough time off for family commitments, but just generally want to have time off over the weekend to spend with their family. But they want to make enough money to ensure that they make enough to support their family as well as their siblings."*[22]

For the employment agencies, the fact that millennials attached more value to their family than their work life was a significant departure from other generations, where work was more central to employees' lives. These findings support those of Schweitzer, Lyons and Ng (2012) and Zemke, Raines & Filipczak (2000) who found that millennials tend to seek employment that provides them with time to spend with their families, while simultaneously preferring work that provides an income to support their families. However, the findings of this study departs from those of Schweitzer, Lyons and Ng (2012), as all of the agencies made a distinction between skilled and unskilled millennials. For those that were unskilled in South Africa, finding any job was more important than having enough time to spend with the family. This is a distinction that is not made clear in the literature, and is a reason why generational theory is

---

[22] Employment agency 10: recruits for the service, hospitality, maritime, oil and security sectors.

often criticized for not considering aspects such as class, race and gender. Nevertheless, the fact that millennials generally prefer a work-life balance is something which can be opposed to what is expected from military work. The military is a "greedy institution" that requires a high degree of institutional commitment, to the extent that the needs of the soldier and their family become secondary to the requirements of the military (Segal, 1988).

4.1.5 Discipline, loyalty and commitment

A theme which emerged from the interviews with employment agencies was that the young people they engaged with generally tended to lack self-discipline, loyalty and commitment. For instance, the following quote by an employment agency representative recruiting people for work at the airport explained this in the following way:

> *"I place specific people in positions that are different from office jobs. They need to handle pressure and do what needs to be done to remain compliant with the rules of the airport. From a cleaner to a pilot has standard operating procedures they have to comply with… now with the young people this becomes problematic they do not do things correctly. They do not perform consistently, and don't pitch up for work… and are like "well I was sick and I can stay at home….it is my right… it places others who work with them under pressure…"[23]*

The quote above highlights a perception that was widely held by employment agencies and employers about millennials as an age group. Implicit within the quote is that there was a 'don't care' attitude among millennials, along with a lack of commitment to the organisation and their own actions. For the agencies, this was a marked difference from previous generations who valued work and were committed to ensure that they maintain their responsibilities. For example, many employers told the employment agencies that millennials had a tendency to not make arrangements if they were late or ill, and if they were struggling with a work problem, they did not actively try to resolve it, showing millennials' lack of commitment to their responsibilities. The lack of self-discipline among millennials was a concern for the majority of the agencies. The following view of an agency that recruits for maritime work illustrates their views.

> *"…I make my income by placing individuals in posts. But the young people I place are not driven. I need to follow up all the time. Even if they go to*

---

[23] Employment agency 6: recruits for service and security sectors.

interviews. I have to hold their hand and guide them all the way to the end…it is a problem I have with every one that comes here men, women, black or white… Many of them don't even know where their ID's are. I place people everywhere in the world. I help them get passports and police clearances, but they still need me to push them. If I don't follow up they won't either, it is like they live in a bubble they are lazy and never take full control"[24]

The lack of self-discipline was seen to be widespread for some of the recruitment agencies, who reported that many of the young people they engaged with did not take control of their own lives and would be happy to let them take over. This was problematic as the agents received the first impression of individuals in the manner in which they prepared themselves. Nearly all the recruiters were of the opinion that there were no clear differences between older and younger job seekers in terms of self-discipline and commitment, but rather something that was dependent on the individual attributes. What became apparent was that, as the millennials mature, they tended to be more prepared when engaging with the employment agencies. This means that the willingness of millennials to rely on others could just be a phase that could be ascribed to youthful inexperience.

In this respect, the themes that emerged from this study both support and contradict some of the literature. Firstly, Ender *et al*. (2014) argued that the lack of commitment is more prominent among millennials than other generations like the baby boomers. The findings of this study contradict this, as there was no clear difference between the millennials and older people in terms of their levels of commitment. Secondly, this study found similar results to the study by Shapira (2010) which reported an evident 'don't care' attitude among millennials. Lastly, this study supports Warner's (2010) suggestion that millennials are more than happy to be taken care of by others. In this case, millennials were happy to be nurtured and organised by the agencies. What was lacking from the data was a clear willingness by millennials to be taken care of by their parents, family or friends, marking a departure from the literature which shows millennials being dependent on their over-protective and interfering helicopter parents. Therefore, millennials in South Africa share many similarities with millennials elsewhere, but not helicopter parents. This finding reveals that the military might not be the best organisation for millennials, as the military requires disciplined individuals who are able to commit to the organisation. Alternatively, the opposite might be just as valid in that the military can be the

---

[24] Employment agency 4: recruits for a variety of sectors.

ideal career as it provides a structure to daily life and instils discipline in the way it socialises soldiers and through military culture. Additionally, the military can provide a family support structure if that is what millennials are looking for.

4.1.6 Avoidance of risk and bureaucracy

A theme that emerged from the employment agencies was that the millennials were more risk-averse than previous generations. The following quote illustrates an experience that is shared by the recruiters.

> *"The young people now do not like high risk work. I recruit cash in transit drivers and guards and it is a challenge. The older guys are still better my best success are with people around 40 years old and even the companies know it. The young people want to work in the office or somewhere else but not in the trucks… what happens is that we are actually struggling to find young people to work in the trucks"[25]*

This supports the findings of Hyler (2013) which showed that millennials tend to be risk-averse. The finding in this study similarly supports an analysis by Eighmey (2006) who found that a number of youth surveys indicate that young adults prefer an environment free from physical harm or danger, and this influences their choice of employer or career. As a result, millennials might not be the ideal recruits for the military, as they would probably prefer not to serve in the frontline.

For the recruitment agents, another theme which was highlighted was that millennials preferred to work for organisations that were less hierarchical and that provided a supportive environment, with mentors to help millennials develop in the workplace. Seven of the ten employment agencies supported this perspective. The following quote summarises the views from the majority of the employment agencies.

> *"Millennials want to work in a company where they are not just a cog in the machine they want to feel at home, safe and acknowledged and able to challenge the managers and supervisors. But not too much, they also want to be cuddled and developed by these supervisors but also not degraded, I mean you know part*

---

[25] Employment agency 3: recruits for the security sectors specializing in cash in transit placements.

> *of the buro… they don't like authoritarian managers … and must be respected like equal colleagues"[26]*

Another agency added one more element to this description of what millennials expected from an employer:

> *"the youth of today want to challenge everything at work and organisations need to be able to handle this. Managers need to develop them."[27]*

What is apparent from these quotes is that millennials prefer to work in organisations that are structured in such a way that the manager and supervisors are able to share ideas, and get ideas from millennials as equals, while still providing a context that will assist millennials in developing their skills. The recruiters also highlighted the fact that millennials valued advancement in the work place, and would prefer to work in a space where they could advance. The agents explained that millennials liked to move from one employer to another for advancement or for better benefits, but that they stayed with employers who could provide them with a stable income and had similar values, rather than being loyal to a manager or supervisor. These findings support the research by Stuart and Lyons (2008) who found that that millennials dislike working for organisations that have an overly developed bureaucratic structure and would prefer working in a flatter environment. In other words, millennials prefer an environment that promotes collaboration between management and staff in a collaborative work place that feels like a home away from home, as argued by Puyabaraud and Pimm-Jones (2010). The findings of this study are further supported by the findings of a study by Schweitzer, Lyons and Ng (2012) who found that millennials prefer to work for organisations that provide the possibility of advancement.

4.1.7 Teamwork

The last theme that emerged from the interviews was that millennials generally preferred not to work in teams. This view was supported by half of the recruitment agencies, while the other half believed that millennials could work in teams to an extent. The following quotes illustrate these views.

---

[26] Employment agency 4: recruits for a variety of sectors.
[27] Employment agency 2: recruits for the service, hospitality and security sectors including movie production companies.

"…most of the young people that come to me are not team workers they are individuals and need to work in a space that values them and not just the team…" [28]

Another recruiter added the following.

"…when we get feedback about some of the young people we place our clients (the employers) are very much individuals…not team players like what you would expect…and what you have in older people…" [29]

In contrast to this, those who argued that millennials preferred to work in teams said the following.

"…the young people want to work with someone not by themselves in isolation. I am not saying that all of them don't want to work alone some do it is a personal preference but generally they can work with others quite well" [30]

What becomes apparent from these quotes is that the agencies have differing views regarding whether millennials could work in teams. Those who argue that they could work in teams described them as being able to communicate well in teams that were diverse. Those who argued that millennials were better suited to individual work stated that they were unable to deal with diversity in groups and this lead to conflict, especially if the team consisted of older people (Lipkin and Perrymore, 2009). However, from the description given by the recruiters, millennials might be good collaborators instead of pure team workers, as argued by Casner-Lotto and Barrington (2006). Thus, these findings do not directly contribute to the view that millennials have a preference for group work. For the military, it might have some implications. In an environment where teamwork is imperative, individualistic millennials have to put in an increased in effort to be able to do the work.

4.2 From citizens to soldiers: socialisation

Given these findings, the question arises how does the military as a 'workplace' with specific requirements mould these civilians into soldiers? Typically, what challenges do they face, and how do the recruits, many of whom see the military merely as a place of work, adapt? How do

---

[28] Employment agency 5: recruits for retail operations.
[29] Employment agency 6: recruits for large business that place service and security sector personnel.
[30] Employment agency 4: recruits for variety of sectors.

they experience this total institution which controls almost every aspect of their lives, especially in the initial first year of training?

4.2.1 Military socialisation

The first step in the socialisation process is to try and reshape these individuals by isolating them from society in order to separate them from their previous life and identity. One instructor[31] commented:

> *"...they are kept here all the time... [when they go to town once a month for four hours] they are marched there [in uniform] their leisure is together they will learn and accept that they do everything together here".*

Two of the former MSDS members that exited the SANDF explained the extent of this isolation and how this fosters group unity:

> *"We got to the base and the first thing they put you in a unit. All people from different [racial, cultural, linguistic] backgrounds. You spend all the time with them from eating, showering, running and suffering. You even go to the shops together. After a while you can't think about doing things without them. You don't worry about family and friends, inside the guys here are all family...we are a unit and will go to war together"[32]*

The other MSDS member added to this.

> *"We all were put in a unit we do everything together… after a while it was not so bad as long as you are with your unit. Before you know you are a soldier… you suffered with other privates, we are all the same and we suffered together…we know that we did basic together and nothing will change that even someone from another unit, we know what we all went through in basic, so we can trust them always…"[33]*

The extent of the isolation goes further than just the physical isolation, as the SANDF controls and limits communication with the outside world. Depending on the Arm of Service, the recruits' cell phones were confiscated during basic military training, and these were only returned after three months. From the quotations above, we can conclude that the isolation from

---

[31] Lance Corporal Infantry School – Male.
[32] Former MSDS Focus group 3: Navy all male group.
[33] Former MSDS 7 – Army – Infantry – Female.

the rest of society and the forced communal living forges the identification of the individual with the institution. In this regard, Davies (1989) argues that isolation ensures the individual identifies with the institution, supporting the view of King (2006) that cohesion in the military is a product of communal living which forges a bond transcending previous social relations.

For all the current and former MSDS service men and women, military life was planned down to the last detail and followed a strict routine that they did not control. This shaped their daily lives, the way in which they behaved and controlled their time. The following view from a former MSDS member illustrates the theme that emerged from the interviews.

> *"In the Air Force they keep you busy. You get told what to do when to eat, sleep and everything. Every day you know exactly what to do if not there will be orders coming soon. When you just arrived it is every day and still it is every day training. Packing and stacking how will you prepare for this and that… this is on top of what we actually do with flights and logistics that are going to different places… training keeps us busy and ready for anything, it also makes our team stronger…"[34]*

This experience was shared by those across the different Arms of Service, to varying degrees of severity. Those from the Army reported the most direct form of control, while the Navy, Air Force and SAMHS participants had similar experiences, but to a lesser degree. For the participants, the control over their actions made them reliant on orders, but also provided them with a common goal to work towards. The quotation above highlights that the bulk of the daily plan was concentrated around training in preparation for deployment, or other functional posts in the Defence Force. These experiences were indicative of what Goffman (1961) identified as typical of total institutions, in that the daily lives of members are rationally planned and administered to assimilate recruits into the values of the organisation to achieve institutional goals. As a result of this, the recruits became de-individualised to integrate as part of the group and became dependent on their peers.

For Goffman (1961), the aim of the total institution is to ensure that the individual and their peers identify with the norms and values of the institution as their primary group. This is only achieved when the individual places their wants and needs secondary to the needs of the

---

[34] Former MSDS 35: Air force – Male.

institution. This is achieved by breaking down the resistance of recruits and remoulding or reprogramming them into accepting the new value system of the institution. The following quote from one of the instructors illustrates how this happens in the SANDF:

> *"Basic military [training] is basically taking a child from school. In the old time we say you deprogramme him and reprogramme him to become a soldier... It is a long process. It is more in the line of discipline, instilling discipline, telling them what to do, [to be] time conscious; you must force them to do certain things at certain times. Starting early in the mornings, ending late at night. So it is a vast thing and during the day they must still do training. You must still enforce self-discipline that is the most important. Which at the end of the day [in the socialisation process, you] psychologically programme them to start to act, they must just do. It is not a question of they start to think on their own if I can put it like that. They must do what they are told and know they are part of the group [and] not single people..."[35]*

A former MSDS member in the army shared a similar view about entering the SANDF.

> *"There we got welcomed into the army, they break us down and build us up. I was so inspired by the lance corporal she drilled hard, but was ready and square all the time. My unit helped me get through the basic but the corporal was our inspiration...".[36]*

These experiences confirm the notions of Dyer (1985) and Krebs (2004) who have both observed that recruits are taken in when they are young and impressionable and by being controlled in the total institution they change their behaviour and conform to the requirements of the organisation. The last quotation highlights another important element of the total institution, as the rank and file system of the SANDF not only controlled the majority of the members, but also served as an inspiration for the recruits to conform to military culture. Therefore, the rank system creates aspiration in recruits, as Davies (1989) has argued.

From the interviews, with current and former MSDS service men and women, it became apparent that the SANDF has a culture that is based on tradition and customs that shape the total institution in a symbiotic way. For the participants, the difference between military culture

---

[35] Instructor Focus Group 1 – All male – 1 Captain 4 Sergeant Majors.
[36] Former MSDS Focus group 2: 2 Infantry (1 male/1 female) 2 SAMHS (1 male/1 female).

and civilian culture was in the way that the culture of the military valued wearing uniform proudly, the rigid hierarchical rank system, saluting and the centrality of discipline. A discussion between two former MSDS members in a focus group indicated the difference well.

> *"Participant 1: the biggest way the Army is different from home uhm is that here we wear uniforms always. And you must look neat all the time…"*
>
> *Participant 2: the same here and we must always wear the right uniform and look professional.*
>
> *Participant 1: then you need to salute everywhere you go no matter what all the time it is nice in the beginning but then it becomes too much man it must be straight or your unit can be disciplined.*
>
> *Participant 2: even here at the Navy. But not as hectic as when we went to Infantry School in Oudtshoorn. There they are strict on discipline. We get shouted to and your bed must be square if not eish man…."*
>
> *Participant 3: yah bra the time like that is hectic the Navy guys are softer they come to Infantry School to learn discipline…."*[37]

This suggests that wearing a uniform, along with saluting and enforced hierarchy was new and foreign to MSDS members, but was forced on them. Others suggested that the difference between their culture of origin and military culture was in the communal life style and the way that people communicated in the military. The following MSDS member, who came from a family that has served in the armed forces for two generations, demonstrates this theme.

> *"We all stay and training and do everything together. So close there is no privacy and when I came here they are shouting do this do that and saying things I don't understand. It is like you need to learn a new language that is quite foreign …. SAI 9 and things like that things I don't know about"*[38]

These findings show that military culture is different from civilian culture in terms of the communal nature, the wearing of uniforms, saluting officers, military discipline and the use of acronyms and technical terminology. Bergman *et al.* (2014) argue that these physically observable things make the military culture distinct from any other culture, working with the

---

[37] Former MSDS FGD 1: 1 Infantry, 2 Navy 2 SAMHS – All Male – Participant 1 is from the Army Infantry and participant 2 and 3 are from the Navy both were former Maritime protection operators.
[38] Former MSDS 6: Army – Male.

total institution to produce soldiers. The authors further argue that no matter how prepared the recruits may be, even if they come from a military family, it is still an adaption to military culture.

An important element of military culture that all the participants identified was the 'warrior ethos', or the centrality of masculinity in the military. This was most prominently identified by the female participants. The following quote from an interview with a female infantry soldier illustrates a theme that emerged clearly among the current and former MSDS members.

> *"The Army is a space where there is no real place to just be a woman. From the uniform to everything else this place is made for men. You cannot be soft you must become a warrior or you won't fit in…if you cry you are soft even the men they can't cry, if you do you're a woman. Most of the women here have also become more like men that is what you have to do be tough like them or fail. You need to push to prove and compete with the men. But being a woman you are always different…"*[39]

Similarly, a former navy maritime defence MSDS member said that,

> *"The military is a man's world; it is like that in the Navy. You need to show physically you are able to be here, swim that in that time, run this and be able to live on a ship with other people for a long time. That is a challenge guys get irritable and the military is a space for testing you… there is not space for emotions in the SANDF…"*[40]

These views were widely reported by participants, and this resulted in a culture that valued competition and emotional control. For the female participants, this was significant as they felt that in the military there was no place for emotions and if they cried they were ostracised or humiliated, seen as soft and not fit for duty by their male and female peers. Therefore, feminine values were less desired in military culture. Interestingly, there was some difference between the different Arms of Service, with the Army and other combat branches being more masculine than others. These findings support the views of Barret (1996) and Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) who both argue that hegemonic masculinity subordinate femininity to masculinity and values heterosexual masculinity above all in the military. The findings also support the view

---

[39] Former MSDS 9: Army – Female.
[40] Former MSDS 14: Navy – Female.

of Morgan (1994) that hegemonic masculinity values emotional control and the physical competitive nature of militarised masculinities.

4.2.2 Effects of the total institution

When the current and former MSDS members were asked if their time in the military had changed them in any way, a clear theme emerged. One of the current MSDS members stated,

> *"The military will change any one. It did with me. I was no longer the same as I was in civilian life. I am no longer that person…even others are changed".[41]*

The quote shows that the military has a transformative character that is consistent through all the Arms of Service and the different branches. It implies that military service has an effect on the individual that remains with them for the rest of their lives. All the former MSDS members stated that they had still experienced these changes regardless of how long ago they had left the service. This general finding supports the research by Haney (2001) and Ship (2001), who both argue that the military as a total institution has a transformative character that would remain with members for the remainder of their lives.

Some of the current and former MSDS service men and women reported that their time in the military made them more authoritarian and masculine. The following experience from a female former MSDS service women illustrates this view that was widely reported by MSDS members.

> *"Before I joined the navy I was so reserved. I would agree with any one and would do what they wanted. But when I went to the Navy that changed, it gave me confidence in myself, but also made me more demanding. After my time there I had learned that you need to be demanding and not accept no for an answer. You must fight for what you want… my friends say that I am like a man. I get very cold no emotions and things. Even the way I walk and talk they say it is like a man, that is weird for them not like before. But I am still a woman [laughs]…"[42]*

The experience by this former service woman was similar to others, who reported that they have become more authoritarian or demanding in the way they dealt with others. For most of

---

[41] Current MSDS member – Army infantry – focus group 2 – All male.
[42] Former MSDS 19: Navy – Female.

79

them, this was more evident when they had to deal with conflict outside of the military, not necessarily in physical altercations, but rather that they developed to be more assertive in enforcing their views. Interestingly, none of the MSDS members reported that they were more physical in dealing with conflict.

Former MSDS members further reported that they have become dependent on the structure provided by the total institution, as well as on the chain of command to plan and structure their daily lives. The following experience was reported by a former MSDS member that left the SANDF.

> *"After I left the army, I felt lost with no goal or mission. I did not know what to do. After a while I started to get myself again. But people started saying that I am controlling their lives. I still have discipline and I manage with my loss by giving structure to my house…"[43]*

The feeling of loss of structure and alienation was reported by all the former MSDS members, as they had become dependent on the authority structure and bureaucratic control that shaped their lives. For instance, one of the participants said that they had a balanced life in the military as they had time to work, dedicated sport times and leisure times. Therefore, they missed the space that provided the routine and shaped their lives. By controlling the lives of others, they felt that they could deal with the loss. From these findings, we can conclude that the military as a total institution provides structure in the lives of its members but when the institution releases them it leaves a vacuum that leads to feelings of loss and alienation that either need to be filled, or be to adjusted to. This supports the findings by Sun, Sung and Chu (2007) who argue that members of the total institution become reliant on the authority structure of the military to guide them in their daily lives and tasks. Similarly, Higate (2001) found that members try to deal with their loss by structuring the lives of those around them.

Regardless of the negative undertones of loss, former MSDS service men and women reported positive changes too, as illustrated by the comments of three navy divers.

> *"The navy was a place where I learned what discipline is. Before joining I was on a road to nowhere. The navy gave me the skills and showed me that I can do amazing things. Then I also met these two guys [referring to the other two participants] we are the best friends for many years now. We would never have*

---

[43] Former MSDS Group 3: all male navy divers.

met if it was not for the navy [why?] Because we are from different places and different cultures [races]...." [44]

For most, the discipline instilled was positive. Along with this, participants felt that they had gained more self-confidence and drive to succeed in anything they did. Therefore, their military experience was a motivator and seen as a positive experience in their life. The quotation further highlights something interesting in that the military experience, for most, was the first time they really engaged closely with other people from different cultures and races. This changed the stereotypical views some of the members had about different cultures and races. The focus group was significant as the three participants were friends, despite coming from different parts of the country and having different racial and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, it raises the possibility that the total institution has transformative potential that can provide positive consequences.

4.2.3 Culture shock theory

An analysis of the MSDS members' experiences of socialisation in the military yielded themes that can be explained by the different phases of culture shock theory outlined by Pedersen (1995). It provides a framework by which we can understand the immersion of MSDS recruits in the unfamiliar culture of the military, and the resulting feelings of distress and disorientation. Firstly, as highlighted above, military culture is distinct from any other culture and is therefore new for the young recruits. All of the MSDS members reported excitement and anticipation about joining the military. They all created some form of an ideal of what they could expect when they arrived. What was interesting was that for most, this started long before they even entered the gates of a base; when they received a letter to report for duty. Most of them already anticipated what could be in store for them once they started their training and prepared by watching videos on military training. The quotes below indicate some of the experiences of these recruits.

"... I got the letter to report for duty in January and I was excited I could already see myself in uniform. Running with my rifle doing amazing things and being a soldier. I watched a lot of movies and stuff on soldiering..." [45]

---

[44] Former MSDS member - focus group 5 – All male – Navy Diver.
[45] Former MSDS 2: Army – Male.

Some prepared for the physicality by running and maintaining their fitness by playing sport. Some reported trying to look for similarities between their lives and the idealised view of the military that they have created for themselves before they entered the military. For most, this only lasted until they reached the base. Consequently, when MSDS members are recruited, their culture shock starts when they have been accepted into the military, as they create an ideal of what to expect when they enter the military. These experiences support the idea that Pedersen (1995) developed around the honeymoon phase, in which an idealised mental image of the new culture is created that is brief in duration but starts long before the recruit enters the base.

Secondly, MSDS service men and women reported that the realities of military life started becoming apparent in their new life style and the training they received. The following quote illustrates an observation made by the majority of the MSDS members.

> *"We get haircuts, uniform and get put in a unit. All very weird you know no one,*
> *and do everything together. It was like I was not there only my body…"* [46]

Nearly all MSDS members reported that they experienced feeling of dislocation, confusion and disorientation. For the majority, this started when they had to live with their unit members in a communal life style. For most, the training and the new life style challenged them and they had to move outside of their comfort zones, sharing their sleeping space, eating and recreation with the same people constantly. The required level of neatness in making their beds and ironing the sheets to straighten the lines all contributed to these feelings and realising the differences between their previous life and the new reality of the military. The physical nature of the training also challenged the MSDS members and stretched them physically too close to their breaking point.

The members therefore started seeing the differences between the military culture and their civilian culture. As a result, nearly half of the members questioned their decision to join the military. However, as they started forming the unit and started to adjust to the requirements of military culture, they reported that they started to understand how they could live in the military. Along with this, their previous identity became less important as they started to identify with the military. Confirming Pedersen's work (1995), participants mentioned how they started to see the difference between their previous culture and questioned their decision

---

[46] Former MSDS 18: Navy – Male.

of joining the military. However, during this phase they reported adjusting to the new reality of military culture, and how to coexist with others (Culhane *et al.,* 2012).

As they received more skills from the military, participants adapted more to having to get up early, make their beds and maintain their physical fitness. They could also see the changes in themselves and their bodies, and in the way that they conducted themselves. However, the reality could only be seen when they returned home for their first break.

> *"I got home and it was very weird. I could not relate to things I normally do like to sleep late. I make my bed every day get up at five AM and iron the clothes of the house, and clean the house. Before I never did that, I never help just like that. My mother was really happy, and she said that I changed. They like the discipline and say that I changed. I feel like I have changed a lot, like I have become a strong woman at the military."[47]*

Another MSDS member added to this.

> *"You go home and it is frustrating things don't feel right. I prefer the military is what I felt even up to now. I will rather still be in the military." [48]*

This was a common experience among those interviewed. They realised very directly when they moved back home for a brief period that they have been changed physically and mentally. Along with this, the second quote highlights the frustration some participants had with the civilian culture. These participants were speaking about their first visit back home and one can see the effect of just three months of military socialisation. These findings are similar to that of Bergman *et al*. (2014), who argue that during this early phase, personality changes start to emerge that manifest physically and mentally in the recruits

Lastly, as indicated by the literature, stage four and five of the culture shock theory applies more to service men and women that have extended periods of service. However, there is no real mention of how long this period is. Nearly all of the MSDS members indicated that regardless if they served for the minimum of two years, or as long as seven years, they had experienced elements of stage four: autonomy. Nearly all of the former MSDS members indicated that they have a profound identification as soldiers as their primary identity, and

---

[47] Former MSDS 7: Army – Female.
[48] Former MSDS 13: Navy – Male.

would have wanted to continue their role as a soldier. They have mastered the structures of the institution, as can be seen by the following views from former MSDS members whose contracts expired. One former air force protection unit operator stated that:

> *"… I was in the Air force for two years. It was a place where I spent a lot of effort in becoming part of training and learning how to be part of it. I was happy there… I know what was expected of me and what I needed to do to be promoted…"[49]*

Similarly, a former infantry soldier indicated the same feelings towards their time in the army.

> *"I was and am a soldier. I see myself as one today still. I will go back today if I could. You spend so much time and effort to become a military man…"[50]*

The same MSDS member stated that they viewed civilian life with more hostility when they compared it to military life.

> *"… then you go back to become a civvy. It is the worst place. No routine, no respect and no discipline."[51]*

Stage five of the culture shock theory argues that reciprocal interdependence occurs in long serving members. In this study, long periods of service had not occurred among most of the MSDS members. However, four former MSDS service members joined the reserve force and their experiences can be understood using reciprocal interdependence. These recruits reported that they were able to move between civilian and military culture seamlessly and the more they did it, the easier it became. Therefore, they were better equipped for the switch without compromising their cultural identity. This is quite significant as it departs from the theory that argues that this stage is more applicable to senior ranking officers that have developed the skills to be able to move between the two settings (Bergman *et al*., 2014). However, as already hinted, reintegrating back into civilian life was often fraught with difficulties.

4.3 From soldier to citizen: reintegration

Military culture is in many ways an antithesis to civilian life, which is free of movement, values initiative and creative thinking, and is highly fluid and insecure. Hence, both socialisation into

---

[49] Former MSDS 38: Air Force – Male Army – Male.
[50] Former MSDS 10: Army – Infantry – Male.
[51] Former MSDS 10: Army – Infantry – Male.

the military and reintegration back into society were difficult for many of these young military veterans.

4.3.1 Military continuity: habitus

For the majority of the former MSDS service members, military socialisation affected their transition back to civilian life. All the participants, to a greater or lesser extent, described the behavioural residue which they attributed to their time in the military. This can be seen in the following quotes.

> *"After I left the SANDF I could see the difference between myself and my civilian peers in my body and the way I look after it. In the army you, you must be fit and I keep fit. I even started a running group. I even maintain the discipline in the group..."*[52]

Another stated:

> *"These civilians are soft. I am out of the SANDF for nearly four years now uhm yet I am still, still more tough and fit. I can run and carry..."* [53]

A former female MSDS said:

> *"The things that stay with me is the fitness. I left home a heavy women and came back fit, strong and able to do anything. My fitness and discipline in my body is what I appreciate the most, it stays with me..."*[54]

Maintaining a physically fit body was important for all the former MSDS men and women after they left the SANDF. The training also changed the way they carried their bodies, by inculcating a sense of pride in the physical appearance, as the following quote illustrates.

> *"The military showed me what is important. You must look good, have a haircut, be shaved clean. You must exercise and keep fit. Rise every day make your bed and do thing now right then you don't do them again. These are the things that make you different from civilians. They do these things but not as good... I still maintain these things now"*[55]

---

[52] Former MSDS 1 – Army – Infantry – Male.
[53] Former MSDS 17 – Navy – Signal and communications operator – Male.
[54] Former MSDS 9 – Army – Infantry – Female.
[55] Former MSDS 28 – Navy – Diver – Male.

A former Air Force protection services operator commented that,

> *"The time I was in the Air Force made it important to always look professional, prepared in uniform straight if that is right the work is right. I still do it up to now in my job."*[56]

What this illustrates is that current and former MSDS members carry with them the importance and value of fitness, not for the organisation, but for themselves. At the same time, they use this importance of their fitness to distinguish themselves from civilians who do not have the same values. Their physicality becomes a clear marker of their military identity, along with the way they carry themselves, their cleanliness and their conduct. In the interviews and through the conversations, the military habitus was observed in the way that the participants behaviour, tone, register and mannerisms is shaped by the military habitus.

For others, the continuity of the military identity was apparent in the psychological mind-set that set them apart from their peers, co-workers and other members in their community. The following statements reflect the perceived difference.

> *"The military stays with you, what you learn there stays. I have been out for six years. And still you can see I am fit. I still have discipline and I still am hard … not like most civilians that work with me…they are soft…"* [57]

Another former navy logistics planner added that,

> *"I have done many things and worked in teams. But I still work the best with former military people no matter if they are army, navy or whatever. We can get anything done. It's not the same with civilians…"*[58]

A former female infantry soldier added another element of their experiences.

> *"Civilians sometimes look at you… and you think man it would be so easy to take you down. I know I can fight and defend myself then you think it won't be right… these guys out here are bitches, they don't know what it means to be a man, or a soldier. They will not survive in the army"* [59]

---

[56] Former MSDS 38 – Air force – Protection services – Male.
[57] Former MSDS 13 – Navy – Maritime Protection – Male.
[58] Former MSDS 15 – Navy – Logistics – Male.
[59] Former MSDS 7 – Army – Infantry – Female.

The experiences of former MSDS members can be explained by using Bourdieu's (1990) concept of habitus, as described in Chapter 2, and how this creates a 'corporeal hexis' that shapes the way in which the body is maintained and used and engaged in practices that are conscious and unconscious.

What all these comments illustrate is the long term effect that military socialisation has on the individual and how this socialisation is framed in masculine terms, even by the female participants who speak about the brotherhood in the military and refer to other civilian men as 'bitches'. It shows how militarised masculinities contrast other forms of masculinity, which are seen as lesser because of their inability to fight. This is reflected in the talk of both male and female soldiers when they compare themselves to civilians.

Habitus explains that there is a continuity of the military identity or military habitus that influences the lives of former MSDS members. However, this does not provide an understanding of what the individual experiences when they reintegrate after military service. Here, the concept of reverse culture shock is useful to explain these experiences on the individual level. The theory assumes that culture shock is a normal part of life and that individuals experience this in varying degrees when they move to a new culture and back to a familiar/parent cultural setting. Therefore, culture shock should not be seen as something pathological, but rather a normal part of the reality of a social life (Woeser, 2009).

4.3.2 Reverse culture shock and reintegration

Among the former MSDS members, there was a definite experience of reverse culture shock when they returned to their communities after their contracts expired. The majority of the former MSDS members expected their transition back into civilian society to be easy, but this was not the case. Many reported feelings of distress, anxiety and a disconnect with family, friends and the community after their return. Virtually all the participants reported experiences that can be explained by using the first stage of reverse culture shock of idealisation. This former female infantry soldier's view sums up this experience.

> *"When my contact ended I was thinking that it was ok. I was going home I know it there. Friends and family we will support each other. After a very short time I realised that, shit man, I am here now. Between the drunks, the drugs and criminals. I did think of these things when I was at the base, but you don't see it so much when you are back in the early days. You only remember the good things*

> *and that is what you prepare for, not for the bad stuff. Uhm I, I battled with*
> *moving back I was depressed for a while"* [60]

The majority of former MSDS members created an idealised view of their home culture. They created nostalgic views of what to expect, ranging from a hero's welcome, to peaceful households with less of the social realities like conflict, drugs, gangsterism and criminal behaviour that might have been their social reality before they have left for the military but which they chose to suppress. However, as the differences between the ideal and the reality became more apparent, they experienced emotions ranging from anxiety and depression to aggression and sadness about being back. This meant that for most MSDS members the idea of leaving the military started a process by which they created an ideal picture of what was waiting at home in their family and community. They constructed this ideal, and used it to prepare for their departure back home. However, there reality was that when they left, it was more than just leaving a job, as a former MSDS nurse highlights: "You don't just leave a job but you leave everything you know, friends and a way of life and becoming one of them [civilians]"[61]. The return home then challenged these idealised images that in most cases were different from the social reality, which resulted in reverse culture shock. These findings support the studies of Loh (2003) and Gaw (2000) who found that the ideal image is constructed and upon the return to the parent culture, and the variations between the ideal and reality result in culture shock.

Similarly, the experience of former MSDS service members can be understood by the second stage of reverse culture shock expectations. In this stage, former MSDS members expected their cultural reality to have remained the same as they left it. When they started to realise that this was not the case, it caused anxiety and feelings of depression, interpersonal difficulties, anger, hostility and helplessness among former MSDS members. The following quote illustrates feelings of anger and hostility experienced by former MSDS service men and women.

> *"I expected that things would be the same. My friends moved to Jozi and Cape*
> *Town so I had no more friends at home. The ones that stayed did not want me to*
> *go to the army so they treat me like I don't exist. I thought that we were all good*

---

[60] Former MSDS 9 – Army – Infantry – Female.

[61] Former MSDS 30 – SAMHS – Nurse – Female.

friends. I was so cross with them for leaving and the other ones for rejecting me"[62]

Another MSDS had a similar experience that related to her family.

"My family was not very happy about me signing up for military service. Even if it is working as a nurse. They were so scared I would have to go to fight and be in risky places... I came back. I was supporting the people at home with money, furniture and schooling money... but when I came back we were still fighting about going to the SAMHS" [63]

Virtually all the former MSDS members described the difficulty of reintegrating back into civilian society. What was interesting in all three of these responses were the feelings of alienation experienced by some of the former MSDS members at different levels, including family, friends and community.

In general, all the former MSDS members reported experiencing the honeymoon phase with some excitement when leaving the military only to have the reality set in, which led to stage two of disintegration where they started seeing the differences between the military culture and that of home. The duration of this process was different for nearly all the participants and determined largely by their family and friends. Those who were accepted back transitioned faster than others. Where there were negative perceptions about the military, this made it even more difficult for former service men and women to reintegrate leading to heightened feelings of alienation.

There were other factors associated with the military habitus that affected this reintegration, predominantly related to the sudden loss of structure associated with the military. This created considerable anxiety owing to the dependence they formed in terms of their external locus of control, as explained below.

"I left the army after two years. It was hard going back you don't know if you are going back the following year. But you then miss the structure - get up, clean, shave, make the bed, do this now, and then and sport day etc. you realise that

---

[62] Former MSDS 1 – Army – Infantry – Male.
[63] Former MSDS 31 – SAMHS – Nurse – Female.

89

you have a balanced life at the base… I was so stressed at home I missed that structure and orders of what to do next…" [64]

This was shared by other members in terms of the effect that the sudden loss of routine.

"Me I was at stationed at 1 Mil for my training and we had to conform to standards and I found myself depressed and disorientated when I left. Once I started working again in the hospital I was able to quickly get out of it, but some days I still miss the orders and structure from the Staff [sergeant]…"[65]

Across the board, the majority of the former MSDS members indicated that they battled to adjust to life outside the military owing to their dependence on the bureaucratic structure that the military provided. Besides the anxiety which arose as a result of the loss of the strict routine, many felt a sense of disempowerment, as they were suddenly confronted with having to make decisions on their own, without depending on someone else to do this for them. This was well-described by a former army MSDS member.

"After I left the army I was anxious and I was feeling powerless. Not just because I don't have a job but in general. The army had your days planned out with orders. I miss that, it was from me the hardest to get over"[66]

This is quite an important finding in terms of the effect that military culture has on military personnel, where every aspect of their lives was regulated and controlled by the 'total institution'. Routine was drummed into the minds of recruits to the extent that when it was gone, it left a vacuum and a certain loss of security.

What also came to the fore was that this structure added meaning and purpose to the lives of many; when it was no longer there, the result was feelings of isolation and meaninglessness. Members of the military became dependent on the military social command structure and the control of the total institution to provide purpose and to give direction and structure to their everyday lives. In many respects, these findings resonate with those of Higate (2001) on veterans in the UK in terms of how the military provides a 'paternalistic military-social structure' that thinks for them, plans and orders their daily lives. The negative side of this is that both military socialisation and military culture, produces members who are passive, have

---

[64] Former MSDS 11 – Army – Infantry – Male.
[65] Former MSDS 29 – SAMHS – Paramedic/field medicine – Male.
[66] Former MSDS 5 – Army – Infantry – Male.

limited self-initiative, and suffer from a sense of a reduced self-worth after leaving the military. For Haney (2000), all service leavers go through this crisis as a result of the loss of purpose and direction, and this is long-lasting. This is also because they have not only lost the structure that the institution provided them, but the social bonds and friendships formed.

The experience of the military is often explained as being part of a family, and strong bonds of friendships are formed through training and having to work and live together. This affects their relationships with those back home, as seen in the following comments.

> "*When you get home [and] you are with your friends, you don't feel as welcome as before, you don't know what to talk about, to socialise, as if it is boring that life, compared to the life you know right now, so it is difficult to adapt back there.*"[67]

A former female soldier commented,

> "*My family says I have become too aggressive and it is not lady like, and the way that they know me. Even my neighbours have said so*"[68]

This was the general experience of the majority of former MSDS members after they integrated. For some, the military transformed the way they communicated with others, while others were seen as becoming coarser (using bad language), and demanding on family and friends. A number also tried to emulate the military values in their relationships.

What becomes apparent from these experiences is that these former MSDS members have been socialised into a military culture that is predominately masculine and embodied in the warrior ethos, as argued by Barret (1996) and Morgan (1994). Both have argued that hegemonic masculinity values being aggressive, unemotional, competitive and communicating directly with abbreviations and swearwords. These behaviours and ways of communicating have become part of the habitus that shapes the way former service men and women communicate, behave and interact with others. From the findings, it can be inferred that military socialisation affects the way in which individuals behave after they leave the armed forces. This supports the literature by de Vries and Wiegink, (2011:42) and Elder and Clipp (1989:335), who argue that veterans experience difficulty in maintaining relationships with significant others. A possible reason why is because their norms and values distinguish them from civilians,

---

[67] Former MSDS 22 – Navy – Technical officer – Male.
[68] Former MSDS 14 – Army – Infantry – Female.

affording them a specific identity and power in a civilian environment where they feel a sense of alienation.

One part of reintegration that triggered significant anxiety among all the former MSDS was that when they reached the end of their initial contract, none of them knew if the contract would be renewed. Thoughts about employment in the civilian labour market and the search for employment was very stressful, as explained below:

> *"I left at the end of the year. I had no idea if I will be back the following year. My contract ended. The NCO said you will know if you can come back for a new contract if they ask you to report then you will know. So I believed that I will be back and spent my bonus in December so January I had nearly nothing and left and I did not make provision for not having a job from then."* [69]

These experiences indicate the tension and stress that is generally experienced by MSDS members when they leave the military. What is problematic is that all of them reported that they did not have a briefing, or some form of preparation of what to expect when they returned to civilian life. They were also not properly advised on how to make sure that they managed their finances properly until they were employed again.

4.4 Skills Transfer and Employment

MSDS members are employed by the SANDF on a two-year contract, after which their contract can be extended for another five years or longer, depending if the recruits are selected for officer training, or other critical positions in the SANDF. MSDS status is therefore temporary and serves to enrol young able bodies into the SANDF, while providing the young recruits with skills that can assist them in their military careers. Finding employment posed a major challenge for most MSDS veterans.

Across the different Arms of Service, the first year for all MSDS training consists of initial basic military training (BMT)[70]. The first year is also used for the selection of trainee officers and other specialised units like divers, special forces and musterings that require specialised skills or further training, such as engineers. During the second year, the MSDS trainees are

---

[69] Former MSDS 11 – Army – Infantry – Male.
[70] Basic military training begins with an introduction to military traditions and customs, military law, government structures and the Constitution, civic education, health and safety training, information on HIV and AIDS, personal hygiene as well as mess etiquette across the different arms of service.

placed into functional positions and possible deployment on peacekeeping operations, depending on the arms of service and the organisational requirements.

Each different arm of service and different branches have a distinct environment in which they operate that requires specific physical and psychological training in their own culture and traditions. Basic military training is in most instances the first phase of training, and is used as a means to socialise new recruits into the military way of work and life through training and putting them through physically and psychologically demanding tasks. One of the most important and most emphasised elements of basic military training is to instil military discipline which is done by introducing and enforcing strict rules regarding personal conduct, the military rank system, living quarters and personal hygiene, including providing strict routines in terms of starting and ending the day at a specific time.

After basic military training, each recruit receives corps-specific training. This phase of the training entails introducing the recruits to their specific corps and the execution of their core functions. For instance, the infantry schools provide weapons training, field craft etc. During this phase, recruits also undergo training on the Fire Arms Control Act which is the only accredited module in the infantry MSDS curriculum that is recognised outside the SANDF, and allows for the handling of fire arms as a vocation (Curriculum for the: Platoon Weapons training, 2012:6-7). Similarly, other combat corps introduce the MSDS members to weapons, survival skills and field medicine to prepare them for deployment.

For those MSDS members selected to serve in the support branches, their training starts in their functional areas. For those in SAMHS, this entails formal courses at University or training colleges to complete a diploma or degree in nursing. For the people working in logistics across the different Arms of Service, functional training entails internal course work on logistics management and the systems used to manage the inventory that is moved. Similarly, the MSDS members that work in human resources complete internal course work on the fundamentals and the operating system and filing system used. The divers similarly had to qualify for selection into the training program and complete their internal qualifications and accredited training.[71]

From this brief outline of the training MSDS members receive, it is evident that the skills are centred around preparing recruits for any situation that could occur during deployment on a

---

[71] Due to the variation in the training received I briefly outline the different processes to provide an idea of how the training is done and where and if it is accredited.

combat mission or a peacekeeping mission. Therefore, MSDS ETD primarily provides the members with military skills required to perform in dire circumstances centred on deployment locally or internationally, with the prime emphasis on preparing soldiers for warfare and with the skills and ability to be a cohesive and effective fighting force.

To determine what skills, if any, are transferable, the interviews with the recruitment agencies provide insight into whether these skills have any value and would assist MSDS service men and women in finding employment in the civilian labour market. From these interviews it became apparent that the skills provided by the military centred around combat training, which has limited transferability to the civilian labour market, while the majority of the skills from the support and technical branches were more valued. The following extract from an interview with a recruiter that specialised in placing workers in the film industry and various other sectors:

> *"I have some young people that worked in the SANDF on the books. Those with infantry experience and others that have fighting skills are difficult to find work for. Only security companies deal with their skills. But if you have technical skills like electricians or someone that did engineering you don't have to be an engineer you can get work easy."[72]*

This view was held by all the recruiters who argued that the skills of those from the combat branches such as the infantry have limited transferability, with their employment opportunities in the local sector limited to security companies. An added challenge is that many of the security positions require accreditation that many of the former infantry men and women do not have. This, therefore, places many of them on the back foot as they need to get accreditation to work in the sector. Recruiters who operate in the security sector said that the added problem was that former MSDS members have to compete with other civilians with more qualifications and experience. Those with some education like divers, nurses, paramedics, artisans, logistics workers and fire fighters were easier to place. However, the recruiters highlighted one element of concern for future employers that could be detrimental for MSDS members. The following excerpt from an interview with a recruiter that operates in a variety of sectors highlighted this aspect.

---

[72] Employment agency 2: recruits for a variety of sectors including the movie industry.

94

"The problem is that you can have excellent skills that are learnt, but the question is if they are accredited. Like the driver's license I have work for drivers into Africa suitable for you guys or women, but preferably men that pay well and MSDS guys will be ideal. But they need to do the license again and some never come back. So it is problematic. I have had some guys come in and say that they are diesel mechanics, but the accreditation is not right so they need to redo or start again with their training. These jobs pay well, but require that you have the basic qualifications required." [73]

Another recruiter shared a similar view.

"We have a couple of people with great experience that we can sell to get a job. But they are not accredited. We have a mechanic and drivers even human resource generalists with experience needed in the work place. But the training is not accredited so they don't qualify for the jobs." [74]

This means that former MSDS with technical skills will transfer their skills more easily than those from combat branches. However, it becomes complex if the qualifications are not sufficiently accredited, and the reality is that many of the former MSDS members from combat branches need to compete with a large number of civilians for relatively unskilled positions in the poorly paid security sector. This finding supports the conclusions of Kramm and Heinecken (2015) who found that combat skills were not easily transferred to the civilian labour market. Likewise, the findings support the view of Cock (2001) who argues that many veterans compete for jobs that require minimal skills which many of them lack.

Even though the transfer of skills was problematic for recruiters, a theme emerged that military service is seen as indicator that provided the military veterans with certain attributes that are valued by employers. For nearly all the recruiters, physical fitness was not viewed as a positive attribute of military service. Again there was some variation, as one recruiter believed that military service meant that veterans maintained their fitness levels on the same level as in the military and was viewed positively by employers. The quote below shows the view that was shared by most recruiters.

---

[73] Employment agency 2: recruits for a variety of sectors.
[74] Employment agency 5: recruits for the retail sectors specialising in retail and logistics.

95

> *"When they get out they are in great shape. But it is not maintained so it is problematic as it is not consistent."*[75]

Even though some did not maintain the same level of fitness once they left the military, for most of the recruiter's military service generally show that the veteran was at the very least physically capable if there were no physical injuries that they could see. Among the MSDS members, physical fitness was reported as an attribute that could assist them in securing employment. This means that there is a difference in perception of the value of physical fitness that military service gives to former MSDS members. This finding is contrary to the literature by Higate (2001), Mashike (2004) and Kleykamp (2009), who have argued that physical fitness can be valuable in securing employment in the civilian labour market. This also places a question mark if the military habitus is observable by recruiters, or is it normalised for them as they deal considerably more frequently with veterans.

Another attribute that military service gives veterans is discipline. For all the participants, the discipline instilled in the military was an important attribute that would be useful in securing employment. The majority of the employment agencies agreed with this, and felt that "former military personnel generally have good discipline that is valued by employers." What was more crucial for employment agencies was that military veterans could work well in teams, and the combination of discipline and commitment to the team generally was well received by employers, especially when team work and discipline was required. For employment agencies, personal attributes such as good time management and the ability to follow orders were very important in terms of their placement. The following quote by one of the recruiters that specialised in retail and logistics area illustrate this:

> *"The employers to who I would send these guys value the values they have due to being in the military. Team work, following orders and the discipline that is expected is valued by employers. But you know there are those that slip by and some employers are sceptical about working with these ex-military people"* [76]

The quote illustrates a view that was held by the recruiters and the MSDS members alike, indicating a similar view of an attribute that could assist former MSDS members in attaining employment. However, there are some negative connotations attached to former MSDS

---

[75] Employment agency 1: recruits for the private security consultants.
[76] Employment agency 5: recruits for the retail sectors specialising in retail and logistics.

members because of their service in the military. The following view of employment agencies illustrates this in more detail:

> *"Some of these guys are institutionalised (aggressive) they cannot work with others they are crass and too aggressive in the work place. Even the women have male traits that is not easily accepted in some work places. I have a lady who is working in security, but high end stuff you know personal and even the clients have said that she is a bit much."[77]*

This comment illustrates the perceptions that some employers have of veterans as being institutionalised (aggressive), meaning that they display hegemonic masculine values which are dependent on highly regulated bureaucratic work environments to function effectively. What is interesting is that this negative view was mostly associated with those coming from the combat branches, meaning that there is a perception that those veterans from combat formations are more prone to be problematic in the work place as they are not able to move past the military habitus. This is similar to the findings of Humensky, Jordan, Stroupe and Hynes (2013) and Ashcroft (2012). However, the findings depart from the literature in that it appears that the perception is that only those from combat branches have become institutionalised, and struggle to adapt to the new reality outside of the military. However, the attributes that can assist former MSDS members in securing work are all closely related to the habitus they have learnt from the military.

The question now is how are the former MSDS member doing in the civilian job market. Table 6 provides an overview of the employment status of the former MSDS members, and includes a breakdown of what functional areas they were operating in the military.

---

[77] Employment agency 3: recruits for the security sector.

Table 6: Employment status. [78]

Branch	Functional area	Number of former MSDS	Number employed	Number unemployed
Army	Infantry	11	1	10
Navy	Infantry	4	0	4
	Logistics	1	1	0
	Fire	1	1	0
	Signal	2	1	1
	Human resources	1	1	0
	Administration	1	0	1
	Technical maintenance	2	2	0
	Diver	3	3	0
SAMHS	Logistics	2	1	1
	Paramedic	1	1	0
	Nurse	2	2	0
Air force	Fire	1	0	1
	Logistics	2	2	0
	Human resources	2	1	1
	Protection services	2	0	2
	Bowser driver	1	0	1
	ICTM	1	1	0
		40	**18**	**22**

---

[78] The table is a representation of the responses and no quantitative data analysis was conducted.

98

The table indicates that more than half of the former MSDS service men and women interviewed are unemployed, with the majority of the unemployed coming from combat functional areas in the SANDF, while the former MSDS members from support roles have secured employment in areas that were aligned with the skills they have received in the SANDF. This finding is similar to what Kleykamp (2009) has argued that support roles will transfer their skill more easily to the civilian labour market, but also indicates that military veterans are likely to experience high levels of unemployment when they return to the civilian labour market. What was interesting about those members that had secured employment was that they mostly worked for organisations that had characteristics similar to the military. These included work that was more team orientated, and that valued masculinity and to some degree physical fitness. This finding is similar to what Kramm and Heinecken (2015) found in their study on infantry members that found employment in organisations that provide similar social support as the military.

4.5. Conclusion

Based on the review of the findings, millennials as a generation are characterised as being more individualistic and rights-based and want to be taken seriously in general. They have a high regard for their own rights, as well as social justice for others. As a generation, they are less inclined to partake in civic duty when compared with older generations. They prefer to work for organisations that provide flexible working condition with little routine, and contact with technology in their work. For millennials, work-life balance is important and they want enough time away from work to spend with their family, but also want work that provides a salary to support their family. As a generation, millennials lack discipline and are more than willing to let someone else take over. Millennials are risk-averse and prefer working for organisations that are flatter and provide support to them, with managers and supervisors that are approachable and treat them as equals. Millennials can work in collaboration with diverse groups but might have difficulty working with older generations. In general, from the findings it appears that millennials are not the ideal candidates to serve in the military as they differ in most of the characteristics from what the military requires from recruits.

Socialisation in the military is achieved through a total institution that takes control of the individual completely, isolating them from the rest of society and their previous identity and fostering a dependence on the military culture and the unit to ensure that military culture is viewed as the dominant culture. Military culture and the total institutions reinforce each other

in a symbiotic way, as military culture shapes the total institution and the total institution instils military culture in recruits that stays with MSDS members for the remainder of their life time. Total institutions have lasting effects on the individual MSDS members which made them more authoritarian, masculine and dependent on the chain of command. Leaving the SANDF has resulted in them feelings of demise and alienation owing to the loss of structure provided by the total institution. For some former MSDS members, their time in the SANDF has led to increased self-confidence and discipline and provided them with exposure that broke down stereotypical views of others from different races and cultural backgrounds.

The experiences of former MSDS members make it clear that recruits experience the socialisation into military culture as a culture shock, which can be explained by the different phases of culture shock theory. All of the participants indicated that they experienced the honey moon, disintegration, reintegration and autonomy stages when they entered the SANDF. However, the final stages in culture shock, reciprocal interdependence, were not experienced as this only applies to those who have served longer. This is quite significant as it highlights that only those who have served for longer periods can move between the military and civilian life easily.

Based on the experiences of the former MSDS members, it is evident that former MSDS members have been significantly transformed owing to their socialisation into military culture. It has resulted in them becoming more communal instead of individualistic, willing to sacrifice some of their rights, and for some it augmented and gave them a sense of voice and self-confidence to stand for social justice in various contexts. Initially, most of the current and former MSDS members joined the military for selfish reasons but this has changed as they would prefer to serve in the military than enter any other job. Their military service has transformed these young MSDS members from young people with a lack self-discipline, loyalty and commitment into self-disciplined, loyal and unquestioningly committed young people, although to some extent this was overly developed. Therefore, many of the characteristics that millennials are criticised for, are changed by the military.

For the majority of the former MSDS service members, military socialisation affected their transition back to civilian life. All of the participants, to a greater or lesser extent, described the behavioural residue which they attributed to their time in the military. This included changes in the physical body and the way in which they maintained, trained and handled their bodies that is different from their civilian peers. For others, the continuity of the military identity is apparent in the psychological mind-set that set them apart from their peers, co-

workers and other members in their community. This includes becoming more authoritarian, disciplined and more masculine. All of this can be understood using the concept of habitus.

Reverse culture shock helps construct an understanding of the individual experiences of reintegration. Nearly all of the former MSDS members experienced feelings of anxiety, distress and a disconnect with family, friends and the community after their return. This was owing to them conforming to the stages of reverse culture shock in which they created idealised views of home with the expectation that the home setting has remained stagnant during their time away. The realisation of the difference in their home environment resulted in the symptoms of culture shock for the participants. Virtually all the former MSDS members explained the difficulty of reintegrating back into civilian society. What is interesting are the feelings of alienation experienced by some of the former MSDS members at different levels, including family, friends and community, indicating that they are not prepared sufficiently for reintegration back to civilian life.

The findings on the skills MSDS members receive from the military suggest that these skills are oriented towards deployment. The skills MSDS members are trained in also have different values for recruitment agencies. From these interviews, it became apparent that the skills centred around combat training had limited transferability to the civilian labour market, while the majority of the skills from the support and technical branches were more valued. Recruiters also flag a problem in that some of the skills former MSDS members receive are not accredited formally and therefore have no value in the civilian labour market. Regardless, military service provides some positive attributes to recruits as military service is seen as producing people that are fit and have high levels of discipline, which are valued in the labour market. Significantly, the study found that unemployment is a problem for many former MSDS men and women. This is especially the case for those from the combat branches of the SANDF.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

In this concluding chapter, some of the findings are reflected upon in relation to the research problem this study sought to investigate: to determine what effects military socialisation has on MSDS members and how it influences the ability to adapt to civilian life and find gainful employment. This chapter therefore reflects on each of the aspects of the main research questions.

5.1 Millennials and work

The first objective of this study was to determine how the youth entering the SANDF were typically defined and if their values were similar or different to that of the military. For the greater part, the literature indicates that millennials typically tend to be more individualistic, focussed on their rights and willing to take a stand for these rights and the rights of others (Ogihara & Uchida, 2014). Wellman (2008), argues that millennials' knowledge about their rights is fuelled by information communication technology, which is utilised to take a stand for social justice. The findings of the current study show similar results and most of the employment agencies that deal with the youth share these views. Given this and the fact that millennials typically want to be heard, it is not surprising that an authoritarian institution like the military is typically not their employer of choice (Smith & Heinecken, 2014). Where they join, it is often as a result of a lack of alternative employment opportunities, and therefore enter the military with the same values as other millennials.

Typically, millennials seek jobs which have both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, such as high salaries and service benefits, but are also rewarding, allow work-life balance and personal advancement. According to Twenge *et al*. (2012), this generation is more individualistic and there is a general decline in the level of selfless service among millennials, when compared to older generations (Vézina & Crompton, 2012). The latter concurs with the findings of this study that those who join the military predominantly do so for occupational reasons, whereas only a small group join because they consider the military an honour or a calling. For most, the military is 'just another job'. This is problematic for the military, as the organisation requires a sense of duty and selfless service in order to achieve its objectives (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

In terms of the workplace, millennials prefer to work for organisations that provide flexible working conditions and variety; they are less-suited to routine work. Millennials want to work in spaces that are fluid and constantly changing, with little routine, while engaging and working

with technology (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Ng, 2012). A study by Ozkana and Solmaz (2015) found that millennials differ from their elders and prefer not to work in the traditional office environment. The belief exists that technology sets them free and that they are not bound by time and space in terms of their workplace. Moss (2011) found that millennials view technology and access to the internet as an enabler to shift the boundaries between leisure and work time. Military work is typically routine and rigid. In fact, almost every aspect of the daily military routine is regulated. Although this study did not explore this aspect in detail, one can presume that young people may experience the military as stifling, leading to high levels of attrition or discontent. This invariably has an influence on the commitment, loyalty and discipline of members.

Given that the millennial generation have been labelled as a generation that lacks discipline, fails to obey orders and questions instructions, the challenge the military faces becomes clear (Sigman, 2009). Similarly, the recruitment agencies in this study mentioned that this generation lacks self-discipline, loyalty and commitment, and has a 'don't care' attitude towards their responsibilities, including an element of dependency on others to do things for them. For example, many reported that they had to follow up and remind young people to go for their interviews. It seems that millennials are the opposite of what is required by the military. This pertains to how they view a work-life balance as well.

According to the literature, millennials prefer working for organisations that allow their work life to be subordinate to their personal life and allow them time to spend with their families (Schweitzer, Lyons & Ng, 2012). However, what this study pointed out was that even though this might be true for millennials, it depends on the level of job security experienced, income and level of skill. For example, the recruitment agencies found that finding a secure job was more important than having enough time to spend with the family, especially for unskilled workers that did not typically engage with technology in their work environment. This distinction is not made clear in the literature and points to why generational theory is often criticized for not considering aspects such as class, race and gender. Regardless of this difference, generally work-life balance is more important for millennials than previous generations. This poses a challenge to the military, given that it is considered a "greedy institution" that requires a high degree of institutional commitment and that the soldier's family is typically secondary to the requirements of the military (Segal, 1988). From this, one can deduce that both, the organisational culture of the military as well as military work, are not something which is typically attractive to the youth, besides offering some degree of job

security (albeit limited to two years in the case of MSDS members) and a support structure. However, the nature of military work is not something that millennials are typically attracted to.

As a generation, millennials tend to be more risk-averse, and this could be attributed to the way in which they were raised and protected by their parents. For Eighmey (2006), young adults prefer an environment free from physical harm or danger and this is an important job condition for choosing an employer or a career. Similarly, millennials dislike working for organisations that are bureaucratic and have a pyramid-like corporate structure as such organisations typically limit their movements, behaviour, initiative and creativity (Okros, Verdon & Chouinard, 2011). On both these issues, the findings of this study confirm that millennials tend to be more risk-averse and prefer to work for organisations that are less hierarchical where they can share ideas and be treated as equals. Again, this stands in stark contrast to the nature of military work, the organisational structure of the military and military culture.

Given that millennials are more individualistic, working in teams is something they both like and dislike. According to Casner-Lotto and Barrington (2006), millennials prefer group work that is collaborative and where diverse opinions are respected and accommodated. Others, such as Likin and Perrymore (2009), claim that millennials work better as individuals than as teams as many find collaborative team work frustrating. In this study it was unclear to what extent South African millennials liked or disliked team work. However, if they are better collaborators and are tolerant of diversity and the rights of others, it might make them suitable for military work. However, the military is neither democratic nor tolerant of opposing views, instead greater emphasis is placed on cooperation than collaboration, especially during the early phase of military training.

5.2 Total institutions and culture shock

The rationale for exploring the attitudes of millennials towards life and work is because this is the cohort currently entering the military. When millennials enter the military with these values, it is understandable that the military comes as a 'culture shock'. At the same time, the military institution faces a challenge in re-socialising these young recruits and turning them into soldiers. Consequently, examining the characteristics of this group was important to help understand how military socialisation affects recruits and how they adapt to military culture.

The military is a typical total institution which serves to transform the attitudes and behaviour of individuals who enter it (Goffman, 1961). Unquestioning obedience to the chain of

command is considered a key element of the total institution and the individual needs to identify with the organisational goals, values and culture (Davies, 1989).

The main goal is to socialise recruits into a military culture that consists of discipline, professional ethos, ceremonies and etiquette, *esprit de corps* and cohesion (Burk 1999). Teamwork and cohesion form two important elements of military culture. The collectivist nature of the military culture requires that individual identities becomes secondary to the unit identity, and the needs of the individual subordinate to the needs of the unit and the military (Buckingham, 1999:34). Another element of military culture is the 'warrior ethos' which endorses masculinity and subordinates' femininity. This hegemonic masculinity consists of values that include a capacity for violence and aggression, emotional control, adventurous risk-taking, stoicism in the face of hardships, the recognition that one is part of a greater group of interdependent individuals and self-reliance (Morgan, 1994). The findings of the current study indicate that this is typically what is required and inculcated in the youth, both those serving and those who have left the SANDF.

All the participants showed that they had identified with the warrior ethos and elements of hegemonic masculinity in the SANDF; this was true for both male and female MSDS members.

What the findings of this study indicated was that all participants experienced various degrees of culture shock when they entered the SANDF. All of them went from a brief period of excitement to questioning their decision to join the SANDF. As they received more training and exposure to military culture, they began to internalise the values of military and started to identify as soldiers. This could be seen clearly in the frustration they felt with civilian culture when they left the base. Perhaps the most significant finding of this study, which is illuminated through engaging with culture shock theory, is that those serving for a short duration, as MSDS members do, often face real trouble in making the transition back to civilian life. In many cases, those serving for a short duration experienced more difficulties than those who served longer and who moved between military and civilian life for a greater period. Hence, what this study reveals is that the effect of military socialisation, which is imposed and instilled through the total institution during the first two years of military service in the SANDF, is long-lasting. (Bergman *et al*., 2014).

5.3 Reintegration, habitus and reverse culture shock

Given this, the third objective of the study was to determine what difficulties former MSDS men and women experienced when they reintegrated back into civilian society. What the

findings show is that all former MSDS members are ill-prepared for reintegration into civilian life, and that they all have some form of 'behavioural residue' arising from a military habitus that affects their behaviour both consciously and subconsciously. This is reflected both in their external appearance as well as attitudes, behaviour and practices. They continue to value their fitness and neat appearance, and to value timeliness and routine, but also become more authoritarian, aggressive and masculine in their mannerisms and interactions with others.

Taking into consideration the typical values of millennials, one can now understand why these young MSDS recruits experience a reverse culture shock when making the transition from being a soldier back to being a civilian. All of the former MSDS members reported that they expected their transition back into civilian society to be easy. However, most reported feelings of distress, anxiety and a disconnect with family, friends and the community after their return. They had a nostalgic view of what to expect, ranging from a hero's welcome to peaceful households. They had forgotten the 'outside' realities of conflict, violence, drugs, gangsterism and criminal behaviour which they were sheltered from while in the military.

As the differences between the ideal and the reality became more apparent, they experienced emotions ranging from anxiety depression to aggression and sadness. Looking at the process on the individual level adds an element to our understanding of the experiences of former MSDS members, and also highlights that they should be better prepared for reintegration. Besides these feelings of anxiety and despair, there were other emotional factors that affected their reintegration. Most experienced a loss of 'identity' and status which was associated with the meaning attached to their uniform and with their sudden loss of income. Added to this was the sudden loss of a support structure.

One of the effects of the sudden loss of the paternalistic command structure and routine was feelings of anxiety which arose as a result of the loss of the strict routine. Many felt a sense of disempowerment, as they were now suddenly confronted with making decisions on their own without depending on someone else to do this for them, and former MSDS members who returned to civilian life experienced this loss in various ways. They became passive and lethargic, and over time started to develop a diminished sense of self-worth. This was similar to findings of Higate (2001), who looked at military veterans in terms of how they experienced the sudden lack of command structure.

Another concerning aspect of military socialisation is the effect it has on personal relations. The majority of former MSDS members reported difficulties in their relationships with friends,

family and the community owing to changes in behaviour and thought patterns after being socialised into the military. This is similar to the findings reported by Drummet, Cole and Cable (2003), who found that former service men and women struggle to connect with friends and family owing to changes arising from the internalisation of military culture. As previously indicated, most former MSDS members reported becoming more authoritarian, aggressive, unemotional, competitive and coarse in the way they communicate. This is attributed to the way they internalise the 'warrior ethos' and hegemonic masculinity of the military. From this, it can be concluded that being socialised into military culture changes these young people fundamentally and the military habitus affects their interactions, their identity and how they experience reintegration (Maringira, Gibson & Richters, 2014). This not only affects their relationships with their peers, family and friends, but also their ability to find suitable employment.

5.4 Skills transfer and Employment

One of the main objectives of this study was to determine how transferable military skills were to the civilian context, and to what extent military attributes such as fitness, discipline, routine and the ability to follow orders were considered an asset in finding gainful employment. It needs to be borne in mind that for many of these young military veterans, the military were their first employer. After two years of military service, their military habitus invariably affected their ability to fit into the civilian workforce. What this study found is that MSDS veterans have very few marketable skills to peddle on the civilian labour market. This is particularly true for those who served in branches like the infantry, but less so for those in the more technical and support branches who had recognisable skills and qualifications, such as nurses, divers, paramedics, logistics workers and artisans. However, many of the military courses are not certified and accredited and resulted in that former MSDS members often have to start their 'second' career at the bottom of the ladder, competing with their peers on the civilian labour market.

Nonetheless, the two years of military training contributed something to their development and attributes such as physical fitness, ability to work in teams, timeliness and discipline which were considered positive by employment agencies. However, some negative attributes were that they tended to be too aggressive and dependent on the highly regulated bureaucratic work environment to function effectively. This was more these case for those who served in the combat branches.

More research is needed on this, but it appears from the data that there is a definite split between those in combat branches and those in support or technical branches in terms of finding employment. Typically, those from the army were drawn to, and more easily placed in, masculine work environments where their physicality and conformity to routine and command structure was required. Thus, it was not surprising that many ended up in private security work and had a higher rate of unemployment. This was as a result of none of their military training, except their fire arms (FACA) qualification, was accredited and they required further skills development to be employed.

If military service is being considered as a means for social upliftment and to empower the youth, then these findings require serious consideration. Clearly, military service leads to some form of militarization for those who have served in the SANDF and reintegration back into civilian life and employment is not easy. Some positive attributes can be gained, such as discipline, being able to follow and respect orders, tolerance, and the ability to work in teams. However, militarization includes the assimilation of traits of 'negative' masculinities, such as aggression, lack of compassion, and insensitivity, and these are not valued in a society already beset with. The fact that there is no re-socialisation programme for the return to civilian society is problematic. While these findings cannot necessarily be generalised, they do point to some areas of deep concern. Given the triangulation adopted in terms of the research strategy, the findings are quite compelling, but need further research to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of former MSDS members across race, gender, class and education, as well as Arm of Service and branch. Nonetheless, based on these findings the following recommendations are suggested:

Firstly, the SANDF needs to consider implementing a reintegration program that is designed into the socialisation process to equip young recruits with the capabilities to effectively deal with reintegration and how to reconcile their military habitus created by the SANDF with that of the community to which they are returning. Such a program needs to take into consideration that nature of military culture and the militarised masculinity they have been instilled with, to equip young recruits with skills to mitigate and understand the changes they have undergone. Thereby, providing them with skills to effectively deal with the effects of reintegration.

Secondly, the skills training that young MSDS members receive from the SANDF needs to be reconsidered especially with regards to those members that are from combat branches who have the least success in securing employment with the skills they have received. For the majority of those reintegrating their job in the SANDF was their first one and needs to

contribute to their careers outside of the military. This could be achieved by either providing additional skills training like vocational training or provide them with the resources and information to further develop their skills to secure employment. For the members from the support and technical branches the qualifications need to be accredited to ensure that those serving in the military have the best skills but that the skills are useable to secure employment when they leave to fully act a means for social upliftment.

REFERENCE LIST

Abbe, A., Gulick, L. M. V., & Herman, J. 2007. *Cross-cultural competence in army leaders: A conceptual and empirical foundation*. Report prepared by the United States Army Research Institute for Behavioural and Social Sciences, Arlington, VA.

Adams, M. 1997. *Sex in the Snow: Canadian social values at the end of the millennium*. Toronto: Viking.

Adler, N.J. 1981. 'Re-Entry: Managing Cross-Cultural Transitions'. *Group and Organization Management*, 6(3):341–56.

Adler, P.S. 1975. The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 15(4): 13–23.

Agati, H. A. 2011. The millennial generation: Howe and Strauss disputed. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Williamsburg: The college of William and Mary.

Asch, B., Buck, C., Klerman, J., Kleykamp, M. & Loughran, D. 2009. *Military Enlistment of Hispanic Youth: Obstacles and Opportunities*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Baker, A.P. 2008. *Life in the U.S. Armed Forces: (not) Just Another Job*. Praeger Security International: London.

Barbour, R. 2007. *Doing focus groups*. London: Sage Publications.

Barbour, R.S. & Schostak, J. 2011. Interviewing and Focus groups, in Somekh, B. & Lewin, C (eds.) Theory and methods in social research. London: SAGE Publishing, 61-68

Barley, S.R. 1998. Military Downsizing and the Career Prospects of Youths. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 559: 141–157.

Barna, L.M. 2009. How culture shock affects communication. *Communication*, 5.1:1-18.

Barrett, F.J. 1996. The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the US Navy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3(3):129–142.

Ben-Ari, E. & Sion, L. 2006. Hungry, weary and horny': Joking and jesting among Israel's combat reserves', *Israel Affairs*, 11(4): 655-671.

Bergman, B.P., Burdett, H.J. & Greenberg, N. 2014. Service life and beyond- Institution or culture. *The RUSI journal*, 159(5):68-68.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Polity Press.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2):77–101.

Brett, R. & Specht, I. 2004. *Young Soldiers: Why They Choose to Fight*. Lynne Rienner publishers: Boulder.

Bryman, A. 2008. On methods and methodology. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 3(2): 159-168

Bryman, A. 2012. Social research methods. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buckingham, D.W. 1999. *The warrior ethos*. Naval War college.

Buckman, J.E., Forbes, H.J., Clayton, T., Jones, M., Greenberg, N., Sundin, J., Hull, L., Wessely, S., & Fear, N.T. 2013. Early Service Leavers: A Study of the Factors Associated with Premature Separation from the UK Armed Forces and the Mental Health of Those that Leave Early. *European Journal of Public Health*, 23(3):410–15.

Burk, J. 1999. Military culture. In Kurtz, L. & Turpin, J.E. (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of violence, peace and conflict.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 447-462.

Caforio, G. & Nuciari, M. 1994. The officer profession: Ideal-type. *Current Sociology*, 42(3):31–56.

Caforio, G. 2006. Some Historical notes, in Gaforio, G. (eds). *Handbook of the sociology of the military*. New York: Springer. 7-26.

Carreiras, H. 2006. *Gender and the military: Women in the armed forces of Western democracies*. Oxon: Cass Military Studies.

Castells, M. 1997. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Volume II. The Power of identity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, M. 2005. *The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy*. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins Centre for Transatlantic Relations.

Casner-Lotto. J., & Barrington, L. 2006. *Are they really ready to work? Employers' perspectives on the basic knowledge and applied skills of new entrants to the 21st century U.S. workforce*. New York: The Conference Board.

CESA. "dealing with culture shock." Management Entity: Office of International Research, Education, and Development. Web. 29 Sept 2009. http://www.oired.vt.edu/cesa/currentstudents/cs_culturalshock.htm

Christian, J. R., Stivers, J. R., & Sammons, M. T. 2009. Training to the warrior ethos: Implications for clinicians treating military members and their families. In S. Morgillo-Freeman, B. Moore, & A. Freeman (Eds.), *In harm's way: A psychological treatment handbook for pre- and post deployment*. New York: Routledge, 27-50.

Christofi, V. & Thompson, C.L. 2007. You Cannot Go Home Again: A Phenomenological Investigation of Returning to the Sojourn Country After Studying Abroad. *Journal of Counselling & Development*, 85(1): 53-63.

Cock, J. 2001. Gun violence and masculinity in contemporary South Africa. In: Morrell R (ed.) *Changing Men in Southern Africa.* Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 43–56.

Cole, T.A. 1999. *We won't fight and you can't make us: A study of American citizenry that will not serve their country*. Pennsylvania: US Army War College.

Connell, R.W. & Messerschmidt, J.W. 2005. Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender Society*, 19(6):829–859.

Culhane, E.; Reid, P.; Crepeau, L.J. & McDonald, D. 2012. The Critical Role of Cross-Cultural Competence in the Military. *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 50(1):30–37.

Dandeker, 2006. Building flexible forces for the 21st century: Key challenges for the contemporary armed services. in Gaforio, G. (eds). *Handbook of the sociology of the military*. New York: Springer. 405-416.

Daley, A. M. 2013. Adolescent-friendly remedies for the challenges of focus group research. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 35(8):1043–1059.

Davies, C. 1989. Goffman's Concept of the Total Institution: Criticisms and Revisions. *Human Studies*, 12 (1):77-95

De Certeau, M. 1984. The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley: University of California Press.

de Vries, H. & Wiegink, N. 2011. Breaking up and Going Home? Contesting Two Assumptions in the Demobilization and Reintegration of Former Combatants. *International Peacekeeping*, (18)1: 38-51.

Deliotte. 2016. The 2016 Deloitte Millennial Survey Winning over the next generation of leaders. [Online]. Available: https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-millenial-survey-2016-exec-summary.pdf [Accessed 2016 June].

DeTray, D., 1982. Veteran status as a screening device. *American Economic Review*, 72: 133–142.

Doyle, M.E. & Peterson, K.A. 2005. Re-entry and Reintegration: Returning Home after Combat. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 76(4): 361–70.

Drago, J.P. 2006. *Generational theory: Implications for recruiting the millennials*. Pennsylvania: US Army War College.

Drummet, A.R., Coleman, M. & Cable, S. 2003. Military families under stress: Implications for family life education. *Family Relations*, 52(3):279–287.

Dunivin, K.O. 1994. Military culture: Change and continuity. *Armed Forces and Society*, 20(4):531–547.

Dyer, G. 1985. *War: past, present and future*. Media Resources: New York.

Ehlert, R., Senn, K, Kling, C., & Beers, R. 2013. It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success. *Liberal Education*, 99(2).

Eighmey, J. 2006. Why do youth enlist? Identification of underlying themes. *Armed Forces & Society*, 32(2), 307–328.

Elder, G. 1999. *Children of the Great Depression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elder, G.H. & Clipp, E. 1989. Combat Experience and Emotional Health Impairment and Resilience in Later Life. *Journal of Personality*, 57(2): 312-341.

Elliott, A. & Lemert, C. 2009. *The New Individualism: The Emotional Costs of Globalization*. Abington: Routledge.

Ender, M.G., Rohall, D.E. & Matthews, M.D. 2014. *The Millennial generation and national defence. Attitudes of future military and civilian leaders.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Enloe, C. 1993. *The morning after: sexual politics at the end of the Cold Era*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Faulkner, R.R. & McGaw, D.B. 1977. Uneasy Homecoming Stages in the Re-entry Transition of Vietnam Veterans. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 6(3): 303–28.

Ferreira, R., Liebenberg, I. & Roefs, M. 2002. Loyal service and yet 'Demobbed'--demobilization and the economic reintegration of South Africa's demobilized military personnel. *Journal of Asian and African Studies,* 299-321.

Flick, U. 2007. Managing quality in qualitative research. London: SAGE Publications.

Franke, V. & Heinecken, L. 2001. Adjusting to peace: Military values in a cross-national comparison. *Armed Forces and Society*, 27(4):567–595.

Fredland, J., Little, R., 1985. Socioeconomic status of World War II veterans by race: an empirical test of the bridging hypothesis. *Social Science Quarterly,* 66: 533–551.

Furnham, A. 2012. Cultural shock. *Journal of Psychology and Education*, 2012, 7(1), 9-22

Furnham, A. & Bochner, S. 1986. *Culture shock: Psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments*. London: Mehuen.

Gaw, K.F. 2000. Reverse Culture Shock in Students Returning from Overseas. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1): 83–104.

Gear, S. 2002. *Now that the War is Over. Ex-combatants Transition and the Question of Violence: A Literature Review*. Violence and Transition Series. Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Gear, S. 2005. *Wishing Us Away: Challenges Facing Ex-combatants in the 'New' South Africa. Violence and Transition Series*. Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Goffman, E. 1961. *Asylums. Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates.* New York: Anchor Books.

Goldberg, M., Warner, J., 1987. Military experience, civilian experience, and the earnings of veterans. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 22, 62–81.

Goldgehn, L.A. 2004. Generation who, what, Y? What you need to know about Generation Y. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(1):24–34.

Griffith, J. 2009. Being a reserve Soldier: A matter of social identity. *Armed Forces & Society*, 36(1): 38-64.

Grint, K. & Woolgar, S. 1997. *The machine at work: technology, work and organisation*. Polity Press; Cambridge.

Hahné, L.H. 2012. Military Habitus vs. Medical Habitus: The Complicated Relation between Military and Medical Officers in the Medical Corps of the Dutch Army. Unpublished master's thesis.

Haney, C. 2001. The psychological impact of incarceration: Implications for post-prison adjustment. [Online] Available: http://aspe.hhs.gov/HSP/prison2home02/Haney.htm. [November 15, 2013].

Heinecken, L. & Bwalya, H. 2013. Compensating military veterans in South Africa. *African Security Review*. 22(1):30-46.

Heinecken, L. 2009. A diverse society, a representative military? The complexity of managing diversity in the South African armed forces. *Scientia Militaria*, 37(1): 25-49.

Heinecken, L. & Van der Waag- Cowling, N. 2009. The politics of race and gender in South African armed forces: Issues, challenges, lessons. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 47(4): 514-538

Heinecken, L. 1997a. Stress and change in the military profession: Attitudes of officer students at the South African Military Academy. *Scientia Militaria*, 27:53–66.

Heinecken, L. 1997b. Is selfless service becoming a misplaced service ethic? Attitudes of officers serving in the South African National Defence Force. *Society in Transition*, 28(1):43–53.

Heinecken, L. 2013. South African officers' view on aspects of military culture: grappling with change and what needs to be done, in Vreÿ, F., Esterhuyse, A. & Mandrup, T. (eds.). *On Military culture, theory practice and African armed forces*. Claremont: UCT Press. 249-264.

Hennicink, M., Hutter, I. & Bailey, A. 2011. *Qualitative research methods*. London SAGE Publications: 132-170.

Hershatter, A. & Epstein, M. 2010. Millennials and the world of work: An organisation and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2):211–223.

Higate, P.R. 2000. Tough bodies and rough sleeping: Embodying homelessness amongst ex-servicemen. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 17: 97-108.

Higate, P.R. 2001. Theorizing continuity: from military to civilian life. *Armed forces and society*, 27(3):443-460.

Higate, P. R. 2003. *Military masculinities: Identity and the state*. London: Praeger.

Higate, P.R. 2009. The private militarised and security contractor as geo-corporeal actor. School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies, University of Bristol: Working Paper no. 09–12.

Hinojosa, R. 2010. Doing hegemony: Military, men and constructing a hegemonic masculinity. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 18(2):179–194.

Hirsch, B. & Mehay, S. 2003. Evaluating the labor market performance of veterans using a matched comparison group design. *Journal of Human Resources*, 38, 673–700.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, J. & Minkov, M. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind – Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. 1991. Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069. New York: Harper Collins.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. 2000. *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York: Vintage Books.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. 2007. *Millennials go to College*. New York: Life Course Associates.

Huff, J.L. 2001. Parental attachment, reverse culture shock, perceived social support, and college adjustment of missionary children. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 29(3): 246-264.

Humensky, J.L., Jordan, N., Stroupe, K.T. & Hynes, D.M. 2013. How are Iraq/Afghanistan-Era Veterans faring in the labour Market? *Armed Forces and Society,* 39(1): 158-183

Hyler, J.N. 2013. Millennial generation opinions of the military: A case study. Unpublished Master's thesis. Monterey: Naval Postgraduate School.

Jelusic, L. 2006. Conversion of the military: Resource-reuse perspective after the end of the Cold War, in Gaforio, G. (eds). *Handbook of the sociology of the military*. New York: Springer. 345-360.

Jenkins, R. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu*. London and New York: Routledge.

Jolly, R. 1996. *Changing step: From military to civilian life: people in transition*. London: Basey's.

Johnson, B.R. 1997. Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education*, 118(2):282– 292.

Kelty, R., Kleykamp, M. & Segal, D.R. 2010. The military and the transition to adulthood. *Future Child*, 20(1):181-207.

Kilburn, M. R. & Klerman, J.A. 1999. *Enlistment Decisions in the 1990s: Evidence from Individual-Level Data.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Kilburn, M.R. 1992. Minority Representation in the U.S. Military. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Chicago, Department of Economics.

Kim, Y. Y. 2001. *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation.* Sage: New York.

King, A. 2007. The Existence of Group Cohesion in the Armed Forces. *Armed Forces and Society*, (33)4: 638-45.

Kitzinger, J. 1995. Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*, 311:299–302.

Kleykamp, M. 2009. A Great Place to Start?: The Effect of Prior Military Service on Hiring. *Armed forces and society*, 35(2): 266-285.

Kleykamp, M. 2013. Unemployment, earnings and enrolment among post 9/11 veterans. *Social Science Research*, 42: 836–851.

Kramm, N. & Heinecken, L. 2015. We are different now? The effect of military service on youth reintegration and employment in South Africa. *African Security Review*, 24.2, June 2015, 122–137

Krebs, R. 2004. A School for the nation? How military services does not build nations, and how it might. *International security*, 28(4): 85-124.

Mangum, C.L. 2013. Did you shoot anyone? A practitioner's guide to combat veteran workplace and classroom reintegration. *SAM Advanced management journal*, Autumn: 4-18.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H.L. & Gerton, J. 1993. Psychological Impact of Biculturalism: Evidence and Theory. *Psychological Bulletin,* 14(3): 395–412.

Lancaster, L. C., & Stillman, D. 2002. When generations collide: Who they are. Why they clash. How to solve the generational puzzle at work? New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Lipkin, N.A. & Perrymore, A.J. 2009. *Y in the workplace: Managing the 'Me First' generation*. Franklin Lakes: Career Press.

Little, R., Fredland, J.E., 1979. Veteran status, earnings, and race: some long term results. *Armed Forces and Society,* 5: 244–260.

Loh, B. Constructing home and identity across cultures: The culture shock and return culture shock experience of international students. Unpublished thesis. Carleton university: Ontario.

Lomsky-Feder, E., Gazit, N. & Ben-Ari, E. 2008. Reserve soldiers as transmigrants: Moving between the civilian and military worlds. *Armed Forces & Society*, 34(4): 593-614.

Loveless, A., & Holman, T. 2006. *The family in the new millennium world voices supporting the "natural" clan*. Westport, Conn: Praeger Publishers.

Macionis, J. & Gerber, L. 2010. Sociology. Toronto, ON: Pearson Canada Inc.

Mangum, S.L. & Ball, D.E. 1987. Military Skill Training: Some Evidence of Transferability. *Armed Forces & Society*, 13: 425–441.

Mare, R. D., and C. Winship. 1984. The Paradox of Lessening Racial-Inequality and Joblessness Among Black-Youth—Enrolment, Enlistment, and Employment, 1964–1981. *American Sociological Review*, 49(1):39–55.

Maringira, G. 2015. Militarised Minds: The Lives of Ex-combatants in South Africa. *Sociology*, 49(1): 72-87.

Maringira, G., Gibson, D. & Richters. 2014. 'It is in my blood': The military habitus of former Zimbabwean soldiers in exile in South Africa. *Armed Forces & Society*, 41(1):23-42.

117

Marshall, C. & Rossman, C.B. 2011. *Designing qualitative Research*. California: SAGE Publications.

Martin, C., & Tulgan, B. 2006. *Managing the generation mix: From urgency to opportunity*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

Martindale, M., Poston, D., 1979. Variations in veteran /nonveteran earnings patterns among WWI, Korea, and Vietnam war cohorts. *Armed Forces and Society*, 5: 219–243.

Mashike, L. 2004. You Are a Time Bomb: Ex-combatants in Post-conflict South Africa', *Society in Transition*, (35)1:87–104

Mashike, L. 2007. *Former Combatants' Involvement in Crime and Crime Prevention.* Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Mashike, L. 2008. Age of despair: The unintegrated forces of South Africa. *African Affairs,* 107(428): 433–53.

Massey, M.E. 1979. *The People Puzzle: Understanding yourself and others*. Reston, VA: Reston.

Mavrides, G. 2009. *Culture Shock and Clinical Depression. Foreign Teachers Guide to Living and Working in China*. Middle Kingdom Life.

Mauss, M. 1934. Les Techniques du corps, Journal de Psychologie, 32 (3).

McCrindle, M. 2011. *The ABC of XYZ: understanding the global generations*. Bella Vista, Australia: McCrindle Publication.

McNown, J.M. & Rhodes, R. 2007. Institutionalization: A theory of human behaviour and the social environment. *Advances in social work*, 8(1): 219-236

Meister, J.C. & Willyerd, K. 2010. Mentoring Millennials. Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2010/05/mentoring-millennials

Morgan, D. 1994. Theatre of war: Combat, the military and masculinities, in M. Kaufman (ed.). *Theorising masculinities*. London: Sage Publishers, 165-182.

Morgan, D.L. 1996. Focus groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22:129–152.

Morris, M. 1996. By Force of Arms: Rape, War, and Military Culture. *Duke Law Journal*, (45)4:651-781

Moss, A. 2011. Generation Y: An exploratory study of worker experiences, values, and attitudes in the Federal Government. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH.

Nesbit, R. & Reingold, D.A. 2011. Soldiers to citizens: The link between military service and volunteering, *Public Administration Review*.

Nippert-Eng, C. 1996. *Home and Work: Negotiating Boundaries through Everyday Life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ng, E.S.W., & Gossett, C.W. 2013. Career choice in Canadian public service: An exploration of fit with the Millennial generation. *Public Personnel Management*, 42(3): 337–358.

Nuciari, M. 2006. Models and explanations for military organisation: an updated reconsideration, in Gaforio, G. (eds). *Handbook of the sociology of the military*. New York: Springer. 7-26.

Oberg, K. 2009. Culture Shock and the problem of Adjustment to the new cultural environments. *World Wide Classroom Consortium for International Education & Multicultural studies*.

Ogihara, Y. & Uchida, Y. 2014. Does individualism bring happiness? Negative effects of individualism on interpersonal relationships and happiness. *Frontiers in Psychology,* (5):136-145.

Okros, A.C., Verdon, J., & Chouinard, P. 2011. The meta-organization: a research and conceptual landscape. Ottawa, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada.

Ozkana, M. & Solmaz, B. 2015. The Changing Face of the Employees – Generation Z and Their Perceptions of Work (A Study Applied to University Students). *Procedia economics and finance*, 26: 476-483.

Parliamentary Committee of Defence. 2013. Department of Defence briefings: National Youth Service & youth programmes, Defence skills development & retention, Military Skills Development System, Provision of skills in SA Air Force. [Online] Available: http://www.pmg.org.za/report/20131008-department-defence-briefings- national-youth-service-youth-programmes-defence-skills-development-retention [2013, October 18].

Pedersen, P. 1995. *The Five Stages of Culture Shock: Critical Incidents around the World.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Punch, S. 2002. Interviewing strategies with young people: The 'secret box', stimulus material and task-based activities. *Children and Society*, 16:45–56.

Puyabaraud, M. & Pimm-Jones, A. 2010. Oxygenz Country Report: South Africa. [Online]. Available: http://www.johnsoncontrols.co.za/content/dam/WWW/jci/be/global_workplace_innovation/oxygenz/South_Africa_Oxygenz_report_low_res.pdf [2015, September 4].

Raines, C. 2003. *Connecting generations: The sourcebook for a new workplace*. California: Crisp Publications.

Rainer, T., & Rainer, J. 2011. *The Millennials: Connecting to the largest generation*. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group.

Reger, M. A., Etherage, J. R., Reger, G. M., & Gahm, G. A. 2008. Civilian psychologists in an Army culture: The ethical challenge of cultural competence. *Military Psychology*, 20, 21–35.

Rukavishnikov, V.O. & Pugh, M. 2006. Civil-military relations, in Gaforio, G. (eds). *Handbook of the sociology of the military*. New York: Springer. 131-150.

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I. 2012. *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data*. California: Thousand Oaks.

Sagoe, D. 2012. Precincts and prospects in the use of focus groups in social and behavioural Science research. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(29):1–16.

Sampson, R.J., Laub, J.H., 1996. Socioeconomic achievement in the life course of disadvantaged men: military service as a turning point, Circa 1940-1965. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 347–367

Sasson-Levy, O. 2002. Constructing identities at the margins: Masculinities and citizenship in the Israeli Army. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 43(3) :357-383.

Schweitzer, L., Lyons, S.T. & Ng, E. 2012. *Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the millennial generation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Schuetz, A. 1945. 'The Homecomer'. *American Journal of Sociology*, 50(5): 369–76.

Scott, S. 2010. Revisiting the Total Institution: Performative Regulation in the Reinvented Institution. *Sociology,* 44(2): 213-231.

Segal, D.R. 1989. *Recruiting for Uncle Sam*. Lawrence: University press of Kansas.

Segal, M.W. 1988. The military and the family as Greedy institutions, in Moskos, C.C. & Wood, F. (eds.). *The military: more than just a job?* Washington: Pergamon-Brassey International defence Publishers.

Shapira. I. 2010. Millennials accused of lax work ethic say it's not all about 9-5 [Online]. Available: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/02/AR2010040201452.html [2016, August 11]

Shaw, S. & Fairhurst, D. 2008. Engaging a new generation of graduates. *Education and training*, 50(5): 366-378.

Shefer, T. & Mankayi, N. 2007. The (hetero)sexualisation of the military and the militarization of (hetero)sex: Discourses on male (hetero)sexual practices among a group of young men in the South African military. *Sexualities*, 10(2):189–207.

Shi Hao, C. 2013. Revisiting "Putting People First": an organizational culture perspective. *Journal of the Singapore armed forces*, 39(1): 23-33.

Ship, S. 2001. On Making Soldiers: Socialization and the Army. *The Army Doctrine and Training Bulletin*, Summer (6)

Siebold, G.L. 2001. Core issues and theory in military sociology. *Journal of political and military sociology*, 29:140-159.

Sigman, A. 2009. *The spoilt generation: Why restoring authority will make our children and society happier*. Great Britain: Piatkus.

Smith, C. 2011. Black to the future – South Africa's Gen-Y. Available at http://www.tomorrowtoday.co.za/2010/03/02/%E2%90%9Cblack-to-the future%E2%80 (accessed 15 October 2011).

Smith, M. & Heinecken, L. 2014. Factors influencing t military recruitment in South Africa: the voices of Cape Town high school learners. *African Security Review*, 23, 102-116.

Smithson, J. 2008. Focus groups, in P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman & J. Brannen (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publishers, 357–370.

Soeters, J.L., Winslow, D.J. & Weibull, A. 2006. Some Historical notes, in Gaforio, G. (eds). *Handbook of the sociology of the military*. New York: Springer. 237-254. a

South African Department of Defence (DOD), South African Defence Annual Report, 2003. http://www.dod.mil.za/documents/annualreports/AnnualReport2003.pdf (accessed 7 February 2013).

South African Department of Defence (DOD), South African Defence Annual Report, 2012. http://www.dod.mil.za/documents/annualreports/AnnualReport1112n.pdf (accessed 7 February 2013).

Stafford, D.E. & Griffis, H.S. 2008. *A review of millennial generation characteristics and military workforce implications*. Virginia: CNA Corporation.

Strachan, H. 2006. Training, morale and modern war. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 41, 2: 211–227.

Stuart, A., & Lyons, D. S. 2008. *Millennials in the workplace*. Halifax, NS: Knightsbridge Robertson Surrette.

Suleman, R. & Nelson, B. 2011. Motivating the millennials: Tapping into the potential of the youngest generation. *Executive Forum*, 39–44.

Sun, I.Y., Sung, H. & Chu, D.C. 2007. Collateral gains from the military? A cross-National analysis of the armed forces- crime relationship. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, (91)5:599-614.

Sussman, N.M. 1986. 'Re-Entry Research and Training: Methods and Implications'. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 10(2): 235–54.

Taylor, P. 2014. T*he Next America: Boomers, Millennials, and the Looming Generational Showdown*. New York: Public Affairs.

Teachman, J. & Tedrow, L. 2007. Joining up: Did military service in the early all volunteer era affect subsequent civilian income? *Social Science Research*, 36: 1447-1474.

Teachman, J., 2003. Military service during the Vietnam Era: were there consequences for subsequent civilian earnings. *Social Forces,* 83, 709–730.

Teachman, J., & Call, V., 1996. The effect of military service on educational, occupational, and income attainment. *Social Science Research* 25, 1–31.

Teachman, J.D., Call, V.R.A & Segal, M.A. 1993a. The Selectivity of Military Enlistment. *Journal of Political & Military Sociolog*y, 21(2):287–309.

Teachman, J.D., Call, V.R.A & Segal, M.A. 1993b. Family, Work, and School Influences on the Decision to Enter the Military. *Journal of Family Issues*, 14: 291–313.

Teddie, C. & Yu, F. 2007. Mixed Methods Sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1):77-100.

Triandis H. C. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

Twenge, T.S. 2006. *Generation Me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled and more miserable than ever before.* New York: Free Press.

Twenge, J.M., Campbell, S.M., Hoffman, B.J. & Lance, C.E. 2010. Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5):1117–1142.

Twenge, J.M., Campbell, W.K. & Freeman, E.C. 2012. Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966–2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(5): 1045–1062.

Vest, B.M. 2013. Citizen, Soldier, or Citizen-Soldier? Negotiating Identity in the US National Guard. Armed Forces & Society, 39(4):602-627.

Vézina, M. & Crompton, S. 2012. *Volunteering in Canada.* Component of Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 11-008-X Canadian Social Trends.

Vreÿ, F., Esterhuyse, A. & Mandrup, T 2013. Introduction, in Vreÿ, F., Esterhuyse, A. & Mandrup, T. (eds.). *On Military culture, theory practice and African armed forces.* Claremont: UCT Press. 249-264. i-xxvi

Walker, O.C. & Mullins, J.W. 2011. *Marketing Strategy: A Decision-focused Approach.* New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Walker, D.I. 2013. Anticipating Army EXIT: Identity constructions of final year UK career soldiers, *Armed forces and Society*, 39(2): 284-304.

Warner, J. 2010. The why-worry generation [Online]. Available: http://www.somers.k12.ct.us/~pstone/ps_current_affairs/documents/NYT_Why_Worry_Gen_article.pdf. [2016, September 11].

Weber, M. 2009. *From Max Weber essays in sociology*, in Gerth, H.H. & Mills, C.W. (eds). Routlegde: Oxon

Well-Greenberg, E. 2006. *10 Excellent Reasons Not to Join the Military*. The New Press: New York.

Wellman, B. 2008. The rise of networked individualism. In Keeble, L. (ed.) *Community networks online*. London: Taylor & Francis

Westwood, M.J., Black, T.G & McLean, H.B. 2002. A Re-Entry Program for Peacekeeping Soldiers: Promoting Personal and Career Transition. *Canadian Journal of Counselling,* 36(3): 221–32.

Williamson, M. 1999. Does Military Culture Matter?', *Orbis*, 43(1): 27–42.

Winkelman, M. 1994. Cultural Shock and Adaptation. *Journal of Counselling & Development*, 73(2): 121–126.

Winslow, D. 1994. Rites of passage and group bonding in the Canadian Airborne. *Armed Forces & Society*, 25(3): 429-457.

Witman, Y. 2007. *De medicus maatgevend: Over leiderschap en habitus*. Van Gorcum.

Wong, L. 2000. Generations apart: Xers and Baby Boomers in the Officer Corps. [Online]. Available: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=281 [2016, February 12].

Woodward, R. 2000. Warrior heroes and little green men: Soldiers, military training and the construction of rural masculinities. *Rural Sociology*, 65(4):640–657.

Zemke, R., Raines, C. & Filipczak, B. 2000. *Generations at work: Managing the CLASH of boomers, genXers and GenYers in the workplace.* New York: McGraw Hill.

ADDENDUM A: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

MSDS OUDSTHOORN INTERVIEW GUIDE

Focus group: Instructors

1. What does the MSDS training entail? In other words what is covered in the MSDS curriculum?
2. What is your role in the programme?
3. What branches/corps do they go into after the MSDS training is complete?
4. On what basis do they get selected into the different corps?
5. What aspects do you regard as most valuable? Is any of this training accredited?
6. Are any of these skills transferrable to the civilian sector?
7. What military skills/ military culture do you value the most?
8. Do members receive any support with transition back to civilian life?
9. Looking at the recruits, what are challenges surrounding the recruits and their training?
10. Why do these recruits typically join the military? What motivates them to join the military? (Are there differences by race, gender, age or education)
11. What are the major factors influencing attrition and retention?
12. Do the recruits typically come from rural or urban/township areas?

Focus group: current MSDS Recruits

1. How where you recruited?
2. What motivated you to join the military? (Are there differences by race, gender, age or education)
3. What aspects of your MSDS training do you find most valuable to you as a person?
4. What skills do you think is transferrable to the civilian sector?
5. Have you considered what you would do if your MSDS contract is not renewed? What kind of employment would you go into?
6. What are your experience of military life?
7. What do you think are the main factors for people leaving or staying in the military?
8. Do you know of any MSDS members who have left the military and where are they working? Have you got any details?

FORMER MSDS INTERVIEW GUIDES

Focus group: former MSDS Recruits

1. How where you recruited?
2. What motivated you to join the military? (Are there differences by race, gender, age or education)
3. What aspects of your MSDS training did you find most valuable to you as a person?
4. What skills do you think is transferrable to the civilian sector?
5. Are you employed?
     a. If no - What kind of employment would you go into?
6. What was your experience of military life?
7. What do you think are the main factors for people leaving or staying in the military?
8. Do you know of any MSDS members who have left the military and where are they working? Have you got any details?

Qualitative interviews: former MSDS members

1. How where you recruited?
2. What motivated you to join the military? (Are there differences by race, gender, age or education)
3. What aspects of your MSDS training did you find most valuable to you as a person?
4. What skills do you think is transferrable to the civilian sector?
5. Are you employed?
     b. If no - What kind of employment would you go into?
6. What was your experience of military life?
7. What do you think are the main factors for people leaving or staying in the military?
8. Do you know of any MSDS members who have left the military and where are they working? Have you got any details?

Qualitative interviews: Employment agencies

1. For which type of employers do you recruit for?
2. Who do you normally take on as clients (job seekers)?
3. Do you deal with many former MSDS members?
4. What are the skills that you look for in former MSDS members?
5. Do they have any beneficial attributes compared to their peers?
6. How do employers see former MSDS members?
7. Do you have difficulties dealing with former MSDS members?
8. Are the skills they receive in the military of value in the labour market?

ADDENDUM B: INFORMED CONSENT FORMS

Informed consent SANDF Staff

STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Military skills development system (MSDS): what happens hereafter?

Army MSDS trainers and administrators

I am Neil Kramm, Masters student at the Department Sociology and Social Anthropology, Stellenbosch University. You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because you have knowledge of the Military Skills Development System (MSDS). This research has been approved by the Chief of the South African Army

1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to establish how MSDS training can benefit members when they leave the military in terms of their possible employment opportunities.

2. PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, I would ask you partake in an interview that should not last longer than 60 minutes. During the interview questions would be asked regarding the training that members of the MSDS receive.

3. POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

If you do not feel comfortable with the questions please inform me, and we can terminate the interview.

4. POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The results of this study will form part of my Honours research report and will be published in a journal article. There are no direct benefits to you, but the findings could benefit future MSDS recruits in terms of their reintegration into civilian life and the way MSDS training is provided.

5. PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There will be no payment for participation in the study.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY

127

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential. The only information that would be communicated to any other party would be in the form of research findings and possible research publications.

7. PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study.

8. IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact me or my supervisor.

Researcher: Neil Kramm   071 420 5554 email: 16209761@sun.ac.za

Supervisor : Prof. Lindy Heineken 021 808 2420 email: lindy@sun.ac.za

9.   RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact Ms Maléne Fouché [mfouche@sun.ac.za; 021 808 4622] at the Division for Research Development.

The information above was described to me by Neil Kramm in English and I the participant is in command of this language. I was given the opportunity to ask questions and these questions were answered to my satisfaction.

I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this study and I have been given a copy of this form.

_____   _____

Signature of Participant   **Date**

I declare that I explained the information given in this document to the participant. The participant was encouraged and given ample time to ask me any questions. This conversation was conducted in English.

_____   _____

Signature of Researcher   **Date**

Informed consent former MSDS members

UNIVERSITEIT·STELLENBOSCH·UNIVERSITY
jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner

STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Military skills development system (MSDS): what happens hereafter?

Army MSDS trainers and administrators

I am Neil Kramm, Masters student at the Department Sociology and Social Anthropology, Stellenbosch University. You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because you have exited the Military Skills Development System (MSDS). This research has been approved by the Chief of the South African Army

1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to establish how MSDS training can benefit members when they leave the military in terms of their possible employment opportunities.

2. PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, I would ask you partake in an interview that should not last longer than 60 minutes. During the interview questions would be asked regarding the training that members of the MSDS receive.

3. POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

If you do not feel comfortable with the questions please inform me, and we can terminate the interview.

4. POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The results of this study will form part of my Honours research report and will be published in a journal article. There are no direct benefits to you, but the findings could benefit future MSDS recruits in terms of their reintegration into civilian life and the way MSDS training is provided.

5. PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There will be no payment for participation in the study.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential. The only information that would be communicated to any other party would be in the form of research findings and possible research publications.

7. PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study.

8. IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact me or my supervisor.

Researcher: Neil Kramm   071 420 5554 email: 16209761@sun.ac.za

Supervisor : Prof. Lindy Heineken 021 808 2420 email: lindy@sun.ac.za

9.   RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact Ms Maléne Fouché [mfouche@sun.ac.za; 021 808 4622] at the Division for Research Development.

The information above was described to me by Neil Kramm in English and I the participant is in command of this language. I was given the opportunity to ask questions and these questions were answered to my satisfaction.

I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this study and I have been given a copy of this form.

_____   _____

Signature of Participant   **Date**

I declare that I explained the information given in this document to the participant. The participant was encouraged and given ample time to ask me any questions. This conversation was conducted in English.

_____   _____

Signature of Researcher   **Date**

Informed consent Employment agencies

UNIVERSITEIT·STELLENBOSCH·UNIVERSITY
jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner

STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Military skills development system (MSDS): what happens hereafter?

Army MSDS trainers and administrators

I am Neil Kramm, Masters student at the Department Sociology and Social Anthropology, Stellenbosch University. You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because you have indicated that you have and/or are dealing with former SANDF personal that have exited the Military Skills Development System (MSDS).

1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to establish how MSDS training can benefit members when they leave the military in terms of their possible employment opportunities.

2. PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, I would ask you partake in an interview that should not last longer than 60 minutes. During the interview questions would be asked regarding the training that members of the MSDS receive.

3. POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

If you do not feel comfortable with the questions please inform me, and we can terminate the interview.

4. POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The results of this study will form part of my Honours research report and will be published in a journal article. There are no direct benefits to you, but the findings could benefit future MSDS recruits in terms of their reintegration into civilian life and the way MSDS training is provided.

5. PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There will be no payment for participation in the study.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential. The only information that would be communicated to any other party would be in the form of research findings and possible research publications.

7. PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study.

8. IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact me or my supervisor.

Researcher: Neil Kramm   071 420 5554 email: 16209761@sun.ac.za

Supervisor : Prof. Lindy Heineken 021 808 2420 email: lindy@sun.ac.za

9. RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact Ms Maléne Fouché [mfouche@sun.ac.za; 021 808 4622] at the Division for Research Development.

The information above was described to me by Neil Kramm in English and I the participant is in command of this language. I was given the opportunity to ask questions and these questions were answered to my satisfaction.

I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this study and I have been given a copy of this form.

_____   _____

Signature of Participant   **Date**

I declare that I explained the information given in this document to the participant. The participant was encouraged and given ample time to ask me any questions. This conversation was conducted in English.

_____   _____

Signature of Researcher   **Date**