

**Author:** Eric Hovey

**Title:** Marine Corps ROTC and the University

**Course:** Anth411 Section 1G and 1U (Methods of Cultural Anthropology) Fall 2007 -- Nancy A Abelmann

**About the Author:** As the fifth of six children to enter the military (three of whom went via ROTC/Naval Academy paths) and the son of parents who met in the Navy, I have known all my life that I wanted to join the Navy or Marine Corps as an officer. Currently, I am "living the dream," which is perhaps ironic because if and when I commission in 2009, I will be the only person in my family to still be in the military. Why the only one you might ask? Quite frankly I am not entirely sure, but suffice it to say that for all my elder siblings, their initial motivation for joining did not quite jive with their experiences, so all have opted to get out after completing their mandatory service. For my part, I am fascinated by this turn of events and so at least for the University of Illinois, I am drawn towards exploring what motivates students to be involved with ROTC, how do others perceive this motivation, and how can understanding be improved between all parties involved. From there, long term research could ultimately be conducted to see how individuals' expectations matched-up with their experiences, and perhaps how the University was an agent in the process. For me, everything about my project has a very personal and direct relevance to my life, because I am essentially studying what will be my life: a U of I educated officer of Marines. Who knows what the future will hold, but I see this project as potentially giving me (and maybe future ROTC students someday) better insight into my own life down the road.

**Keywords:** rotc, marine corps, motivation, scholarship, war, military

**Abstract:** While I do not have many concrete findings to report on with my project, the biggest points I want to reinforce are that the individuals who participate in ROTC do so for a highly diverse array of reasons and that the University of Illinois is itself an actor in this decision. Not only does the University shape which activities ROTC students can engage in here on campus (which spaces are available, which activities can receive extra funding, etc.), but it also has the potential to influence where ROTC

scholarship students ultimately decide to go to school. Given the current negative public perception of the war on terror, the fact Vietnam-era student protestors frequently targeted ROTC buildings as part of their demonstrations, and the fact that the University of Illinois and its ROTC programs are necessarily intertwined, I think that further research into this relationship can yield valuable information.

Proposed research into this area would include extensive interviews both with current ROTC students, as well as alumni who completed the program in the past. Of particular interest in these interviews would be questions detailing with how much U of I/ROTC factored into their decision to participate in the program, and for the alumni, how well do they feel U of I's ROTC program prepared them for life after college? Also, it would be interesting to find a way to compare U of I's ROTC program to that of other schools, to see how it measures up to the competition (perhaps a survey sent out to different ROTC units across the country). Ultimately, I find this research of the relationship between ROTC and the University of Illinois to be quite fascinating, and highly relevant given the current heated discourse surrounding America's "war on terror."

**Initial Exercises:** For this assignment, I first chose to read the Duneier article concerning the sidewalk dwellers of 6th Ave., hands on ethnographic research, and so called "public characters," among other ethnographic insights. From the very beginning the image of a professionally dressed Caucasian Jewish professor roaming the streets of Greenwich, Eight Street, and the Avenue of the Americas, then stopping to view an African American book vendor named Hakim Hasan was, in all, quite catching. The author then takes the

**Reading Response**

interesting observation that Mr. Hasan is in fact quite intellectual and well-read (despite the preponderance of poorly educated, homeless primarily African American men in the area), and segues into a discussion on “public characters.” The term evidently comes from a Jane Jacob’s book, and is basically any individual that takes it upon themselves to make street life easier and facilitate positive interactions between community members. It is an interesting concept, which then leads to a discussion on exactly why there are so many destitute men of color living on the street, a question that underlies much of the Appendix readings. The fact that Mr. Hasan’s initial objection to the author’s work was that it focuses too much on his (Hakim) experience, at the expense of other vendors, speaks volumes to this point. Discussions on “ethnographic fallacies,” followed by the conclusion that the voices of those on 6th Avenue must be heard, finish out an excellent article. From there, I focused on the “AAA Code of Ethics” and realized just how much of it was reflected in our consent forms last year. Much of the content was unsurprising, if important: obviously any scientific or social research should have provisions about protecting informants, adhering to ethics, and being honest in research. I did have one insight that proved important to both following articles however, that is to say that no matter how disparaged by more technical aspects of science, anthropological research is important and has real world implications (hence the required guidelines). Nowhere is this more readily important than in the opening of the Twine article where the beleaguered author, having read the self-proclaimed “complete guide to South America” and not found any mention of racism, finds herself caught in the clutches of a culture that embraces *embranquecimento*. More importantly, the response of the book’s publisher to reluctantly add material concerning the previously undocumented phenomenon, evidences just how important and just how far ethnographic research has to go. Twine makes this point clear as she transitions into discussions on ethnographic fieldwork and the policy of racial matching, an idea that better research data can be obtained when both subject and researcher are of the same race. As her experience makes clear however, this is not always the case-particularly when race is not the most important “social signifier.” Other factors such as class, economic status, nationality, and religion can be just as important in a culture, if not more so, thereby cautioning against simplistic viewings of commonality through shared race. Similar problems too form the focal point of Stacey’s article, which pointedly asks the question, “Can there be a feminist ethnography?” To answer, this question, discussions concerning how feminism in the 80’s was geared towards being for women, and how possibly a more ethnographic approach might resolve this “contradiction in terms.” From there, Ann Oakley’s

debunking of the “neutral observer” is referenced and its unique problem within the mutual realms of both feminism and ethnography is discussed. A personal example is brought up, basically to point out how the two worlds collide: how compromising ethnographic data to protect a closeted lesbian relationship (for feminist reasons) can be a difficult catch-22. This then may be the reason why the author reports that there is surprisingly little crossover between anthropology and feminism, a fact that surprised me personally. To close, the Stacey qualifies her initial question by coming to the conclusion that while there can never be a completely feminist ethnography, “there can be ethnographies that are partially feminist.” Truthfully though, I found this article to be somewhat confused in its content and a bit out of date. Since many of my other classes in years past have dealt with fundamentalist “honor killings” of women in Europe or how Muslim women can be “agentive and submissive,” I found it hard to get a feel for what I thought was an already pointless premise. Feminist ethnographies do exist in my view.

**Initial Exercises:** Observation For this assignment, I chose the Starbucks located on Fifth and Green St. as my point of observation. I purchased a small cappuccino, sat outside on a table, and from 5:30 PM to 6:30 PM on Labor Day participated in an “immersion” of the Green St. atmosphere-as Emerson would describe it. As my notes record, one of the first things that caught my attention was a man (likely a fellow student, though a few years older) talking rather loudly on a cell phone in front of the Potbelly’s nearby. He was quite animated, though not angrily so, and really what probably caught my eye was how much his experience reinforced the Stilgoe reading’s message of escaping modernity and taking in the ordinary. Watching him talk on the phone made me realize how free I was without mine, and also engendered a strange sense of power or control-I was able to gaze about and let my mine wander, while he was stuck talking with whomever. Across the street on the other side of the intersection it appeared I had a fellow observer, as a homeless man sprawled out on a park bench and just watched his surroundings. Our paths of vision crossed at a few points and I sensed that he knew we were both just there to take in the sights and sounds: he stared at me quite often after that, but eventually moved on and never approached or spoke to me. On a more exciting note, roughly halfway through the hour, I glanced up from my note-taking and saw a young male student walking with his family and wearing an Iron Maiden t-shirt. For me, this would fall into the Becker category of an object that is “sticking its nose up so that it can’t be ignored,” because said band is my favorite of all time and I am instantly drawn to any fellow fan. As luck would have it, the student in question turned out to be an old friend from my high school/Boy Scout days

(two grades younger), and I jumped up to greet the family. Pleasantries were exchanged and I sent them on their merry way to Murphy's for some dinner. Mostly though, my interactions with the environment were more passive and quite less personal. Occasionally a semi-familiar face would drift past (people that possibly lived at FAR too my freshman year), but for the most part it was strangers out on whatever business it was they were doing. I noticed many people walk past with Coldstone cups of ice cream, some of whom were coming from the wrong direction of the store, meaning they likely got the ice cream and then chose to wander Green St. while eating it. Every so often I would notice a large gaggle of Asian students walk past (six or more members), their presence being conspicuous both because of generally how close they walked together, and because of their conversing in a language other than English. Being a spectator from the outside I had the instant, unfortunate image of othering at work-it seemed that even though said individuals were likely fellow students, they seemed more like mobile bastions of whatever foreign culture they shared apart from the more normative campus environment. Personally though, I think what struck me most was how much I was conscious of my own presence within the Green St. area. Wearing sunglasses, having a close-cropped high and tight haircut, and sitting with a tucked in shirt, I got the impression that many people saw me as different somehow. It reminded me of the feeling I got when I wear my uniform every Thursday-people react to you differently, not in a negative sense, just there is a feeling of being an outsider. It was unavoidable, but just heightened the experience overall, as I felt I had a very unique view into such an interesting area. All in all, I enjoyed this observation a lot.

**Initial Exercises:** Analysis of a Text(s) While I do not necessarily feel that the documents I decided to analyze for this assignment will relate to my research project as a whole, I felt that they were nonetheless relevant to the University of Illinois, and to a lesser degree, me. The first and larger of the two is titled Globalization and the University (developed by Amit Prasad) and deals with the complex theme of internationalization within the University of Illinois, while the second, What is the Public Service Archaeology Program? , is a more informative article detailing what role PSAP plays within the University as well as the U.S. as a whole. My reason for picking these two texts was because I wanted to juxtapose the goals each respectively puts forth, and see what commonalities and shortcomings each has. Since the former deals with how U of I should act in "global" terms, and the latter gives an in-depth analysis of one of the University's research programs extends beyond the borders of Illinois, I wanted to see where the two met (if at all). If

Strauss comments very specifically on keyword analysis when reading a text, then without a doubt, “internationalization” and “globalization” figure prominently when discussing Prasad’s article. Basically, the author (as a Fairclough-esque analysis will reveal) makes certain value assumptions concerning the University, then moves towards a defining and discussion of the aforementioned keywords in terms of these assumptions. Right off the bat, Prasad states that U of I “is committed to the goal of ‘internationalization,’” and that it is willing to adjust its policies to meet that goal. From there, he makes the important distinction that internationalization and globalization are not the same thing, and more importantly, mean different things to different individuals and organizations. Obviously this presents a problem to the University, because it is impossible to work towards a goal (increased internationalization) if said objective is not able to be defined. At this point, the “ideas, jargon, and phraseology” of the piece come into play (as taken from the Strauss article), because certain concepts keep coming to the fore. Mainly, Prasad sets up globalization in general terms as the increasing interconnectivity of the world and internationalization as the University’s response to this increasing global activity. Specifically, the term “global citizenship” becomes prominent, with the idea that U of I should seek “to provide quality international education and research.” The article then backtracks to the University of Illinois’ original mission as a Land-Grant college (to educate children of Illinois farmers and workers) and explains how the current world situation makes this charter no longer relevant. While U of I must still cater heavily to the needs of the citizens of Illinois, the demands of globalization and internationalization are such that it must expand its scope, at which point the article mentions that while the University has made progress in increasing international registration, an important challenge still lies in keeping a welcoming environment for these foreign students. In marked contrast to the sweeping global scope of the Prasad piece, the humble charter of PSAP (Public Service Archaeology Program) reflects the disconnect between where the University of Illinois wants to be internationally, and where it is in actuality. The program’s charter never once mentions an international outreach, but constantly stresses a desire to help teach archaeology to students while simultaneously “provid[ing] public service to federal, state, and local governmental agencies as well as private organizations and individuals.” In short, the charter’s word choice and main points reflect a mission more in keeping with the original University of Illinois than the current aspirations towards being an international research university. In comparing the two articles, I am simply trying to demonstrate how before U of I can legitimately work towards being more global in scope; it must reevaluate its own programs and priorities to see whether or not this

outreach is even feasible or desirable. I know from having interned at PSAP that it does valuable work for both the University and the country as a whole, so it is important to find balance such that in trying to keep pace with globalization, we do not neglect projects closer to home.

**Initial Exercises:** After considering my own position within the University of Illinois as a joint student-ROTC midshipman, I decided that for my mini-project I would like to see why individuals involved in said program (Navy, Marine Corps, Army, or Air Force) chose the University of Illinois and how they view themselves as individuals within the University.

**A Practice Interview** Accordingly, for this interview I chose to speak with a male junior in LAS who is involved with Marine Corps ROTC. My reasoning for interviewing him (we shall call him 'Robert') stemmed largely from the fact that I wanted to compare his rationale for attending U of I to mine, and see what commonalities and differences were present. My findings were quite surprising, as though both Robert and I share a similar college path now; we had remarkably different ways and reasons for getting here. "How did you get to (end up at) the U of I?" – Robert's initial reaction to my query was to mention that he has had several generations of Illini in the family and that both his mother and father attended schools in "the Big Ten," thereby explaining his interest in terms of family ties. From there, educational concerns were foremost in his selection of schools, as he recounted that U of I was one of the top five schools for his major of choice. At this point, Robert told me that he was on the fence as a high school senior between the University of Illinois and a different large California research university and that he visited each to try to make a decision. After being accepted to and visiting each institution, Robert said that he settled on the former largely because of their ROTC program, which he felt was more structured and better organized. Here I interjected because I felt that certain key issues for generic college students needed to be addressed: did financial considerations matter, did Robert have a (ROTC) scholarship before applying, and were there geographic/aesthetic considerations that he factored into his decision making? I felt the interruption warranted because I wanted to see what sorts of specific differences in reasoning there are between prospective ROTC students at universities, and the otherwise general student body. Not surprisingly, this vein of questioning proved intriguing. Unlike most non-ROTC students I have spoken with, Robert immediately responded to my questions by saying that a college fund had been set up for him as a child and that school costs were not a large factor in his educational selection. He remarked that he did not have an ROTC scholarship before attending college, but rather was planning (regardless of which school he chose) on picking one up later on as

a student—the college fund thereby supplying him in the meantime. Robert also mentioned that being an Illinois resident, he appreciated the location of the University which would allow him to be reasonably far away from his home residence, but not so much so that it would preclude his driving home for break as necessary. Aesthetically speaking, Robert also described how the California school in question was set in a very urban city environment, and that he was more inclined towards the lightly-urban campus of U of I. At this point I asked whether being a Marine or going to college was more important, to which Robert responded in a very revealing manner: he had initially wanted to enlist out of high school (forgoing college), but had been convinced otherwise by his mother who wanted him to get a degree. To find out this out so late in the interview was, I felt, somewhat shocking to both of us, because having been at college for so long it seemed even Robert had forgotten how close he had once been to not going. Ultimately, Robert had decided to pursue an LAS major in a highly specific field that was more intellectual (as opposed to job oriented) in nature, with the trade-off that he would be able to do ROTC and have a guaranteed job as a Marine Corps officer following graduation. Having described himself as a “tradition-oriented person” and desiring to “be the best,” he concluded by saying that he is quite content at the University of Illinois and enjoys both pursuing his civilian academic studies and participating heavily in ROTC. Overall I found this to be a successful and very important interview. Having interacted with Robert before, there were never really any moments of being uncomfortable or awkwardness of any kind and I feel that I learned a lot. Specifically, what I thought most interesting were his top reasons for going to U of I: family ties, academic excellence in his major, good ROTC programs, and the general feel of the University. I say this because my own reasoning for attending U of I was quite less sophisticated, being based more on financial considerations (I could only attend a school that had an ROTC program-irregardless of quality-because there was no money for me to attend college otherwise) and the fact that the school had a large student body and was decently far from home. Also interesting, was that while Robert had perceived college as a means to becoming a Marine, my main motivation (at least initially) was to use ROTC as a means to getting a degree, with serving one’s country as a side benefit. In short, while Robert and I ended up in quite similar situations, we got to where we are by quite different paths. To build on this, what I thought was quite interesting (and something that I would like to explore more throughout the semester) were some of the commonalities we shared, mainly, that ROTC allows flexibility in academic pursuit. As I mentioned earlier, Robert is studying a highly specific field in LAS which does not have large job appeal, and I myself am studying anthropology and philosophy, subjects not often

regarded as lucrative in nature. By virtue of ROTC, however, one must only get a degree in ANY subject to have a job as a commissioned officer (~\$45,000 a year + health benefits) and your education is entirely paid for, excepting room and board. Thus I wish to explore what sorts of other motivations ROTC students have for selecting the University of Illinois as their school of choice, because such students oftentimes have the benefit of studying without concern for later job prospects and financial considerations (once they have scholarship). Since the ideal of a research university has often times advocated students' "learning for learning's sake," studying the motivations of ROTC students (who have lessened job/financial decision making worries) could provide valuable insight into how the University as a whole could make such studying possible for all students, especially undergrads.

**Question:** Simply turn on the news one day, and you will likely have to wait no more than a few minutes before hearing about a terrorist bomb-plot in Europe, an IED explosion in Iraq, or any number of incidents involving the "war on terror." Given this environment, and a public that has increasingly shown less and less support for the President (and Congress as of late) and his war planning, I want to examine the position of college students in ROTC programs and attempt to learn more about what motivates and or keeps them in the program. Is it for money, patriotism, or perhaps a family tradition? Does the fact that the United States is in a war even have any bearing on their decision to be in the military after college, or would they be serving anyway? Too often in public discourse, it seems that observers trying to answer these questions often default to stereotyped explanations for why individuals serve in the military-John Kerry's "you get stuck in Iraq" comment for example. After our discussions in class, and readings like the Bordieu piece from 26 SEP, it occurred to me that one must "relinquish the single, central point of view that is easily adapted by observers," and instead try to understand the complex, multi-faceted reasoning that governs why individuals make the decisions they do in life. Thus for my question, I want to understand what makes ROTC students both join and continue to participate in a program that will ultimately put them in the military during a time of war? \*Adjusted 23 OCT 2007\* To narrow down my subject matter, I am focusing solely on individuals in Marine Corps ROTC and attempting to find out their motivations for being involved in the program. I am also taking into account political factors (the USMC may redeploy to Afghanistan and pull-out of Iraq completely), as well as micro-factors such as family traditions, financial incentives, and various personal reasonings.

**Plan:** To begin answering my question, it will first be necessary for me to outline some of the history and facts about ROTC (Reserve Officer

Training Corps), just so that anyone unfamiliar with the program can have a baseline understanding of what it is. From there, I would like to research the mission statements of the separate military/ROTC branches, and see where there are any similarities or differences. For example, if the mission statement of the Army is drastically different from that of the Air Force, it would follow that an individual in Army ROTC would have different motivations for serving than an individual in Air Force ROTC. Oftentimes it seems that outside observers use terms like “army” and “soldier” as blanket phrases to encompass all military members, when really these are select terms that refer to the Army only. That is to say, individuals in the Navy or Air Force are not part of the army and not soldiers, but rather, sailors and airmen, respectively. Furthermore, I would like to supplement this research aspect of my project with interviews of individuals in ROTC (preferably at different ages, genders, services, etc.) and get a broad feeling for their motivational backgrounds. At this point, I do not have any solid hypothesis for why I think individuals participate in ROTC; I just merely want to find out why. In light of our readings on the do’s and don’ts of good interviewing, I do not want to handicap my learning by going into any questioning with preconceived notions for why someone is in the program. Thus I plan on doing research and interviews first, and then hopefully as the semester progresses, I can move towards some more specific reasoning for why individuals are involved with ROTC. \*Adjusted 23 OCT 2007\* First, I will only be conducting interviews with individuals somehow connected directly to the Marine Corps or associated ROTC program. Also, I would like to get some interviews with people who went through the Marine Corps ROTC program in the past and see how their reasoning for joining played out vs. the reality of their service. Lastly I would like to conduct more observation of Marine Corps training to evaluate which elements are stressed, and compare this to perceptions about what values individuals joining ROTC think are important.

**Data:** First off, I want to note that in light of last week’s exercises and the excellent discussions I had with my comment group, I have decided to make some large cuts to both the focus of my project and my plan of attack for completing research and interviews. Although I am up in the air for some aspects of my original plan, the main changes are that I will only focus on male Navy/Marine Corps ROTC students (and maybe only the Marine Corps down the road), with a bias towards those who are juniors and seniors. My reasoning for focusing solely on males is really only for purposes of anonymity (there are not very many women in ROTC, especially NROTC) and I will focus only on NROTC students because otherwise the scope of my project will be simply too large for a semester proposal to be in any sense realistic. Finally, as for limiting my focus to juniors and

**A Project Interview**

seniors, my main reasoning in this matter is to reinforce the aspect of why individuals would join NROTC during wartime. This is because as of three to four years ago, both the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were still going strong with not nearly as much popular opposition, such that any now juniors and seniors would have entered the program with the most chance of commissioning and going into combat. That being the case, I will now introduce the subject of my latest interview, Steve. His was an interesting conversation and both reinforced some of the earlier interviewing/research I had done, as well as brought some interesting new points to the table. Unfortunately though, I will say that at times the interview felt rushed: it seems that there was a failure to communicate (on my part) concerning Steve's schedule and so it seemed that he gave shorter answers than I would have liked for want of quickening things up. However quick though, there were not too many of the "awkward moments" mentioned in our Weiss readings from last week, and I felt that by virtue of our similar status as ROTC students, an effective "working research partnership" was maintained. With that in mind I will now give a quick biography of my informant: Steve is a junior in Marine Corps ROTC who is majoring in LAS (though in a less prestigious major than my previous informant, Robert) and comes from a more rural area of Illinois. He has been in the program for three years and is very involved with the Navy Battalion life. I started off the interview with the following question: "What made you decide that you wanted to be in Marine Corps ROTC?" From my fieldnotes concerning this topic, I jotted down the following: "First in family, desire to be 'badass.'" I found this statement to be interesting: Steve felt that to be a Marine was "badass," yet presumably from his earlier remark there was no familial basis for this assumption that being a Marine was so exciting. Accordingly, I asked him to elaborate on this fact, how were Marines cool and when did he come to view this bell belief? My notes at this point read as follows: "grew up around U of I JAG," "flag raising lwo Jima, brotherhood," and team," "wanted to fly a lot "Marine first, college wanted by parents." Basically, my asking Steve to elaborate hit upon a rich vein of response, the likes of which was varied and intriguing. The first remark harks back to the Robert interview and references the fact that Steve had a personal connection to the University of Illinois, only where Robert had parents that attended Big Ten schools, Steve had lived next to the University of Illinois in the past. As for the Bell Team, for anyone who has not attended a U of I football game, the NROTC has its members ring a giant bell for every point that our football team scores during a home football game-implying that Steve attended said games as a child and this experience tied into his decision to do NROTC here. His second comments were somewhat made in jest, but nonetheless significant: Steve commented that he wanted to fly a

lot growing up (only Marine Corps officers can be pilots) and that he liked the TV show JAG which has many Navy and Marine Corps officers in its episodes. The third comment was a bit more serious, and regards what is arguably the Marine Corps' most defining moment, the flag-raising during the Battle of Iwo Jima. At this point, I sensed a personal connection and made a mental note to bring up both this battle and the key term "brotherhood" later on. Steve's last comment was in response to my request for clarification, mainly whether or not he wanted to be a Marine first or receive a college education. His answer was that he would have been happy to enlist out of high school, but reached a compromise with his parents (who wanted him to go to college no matter what) whereby he would attend U of I if accepted, and then attempt to enter the Marine Corps by picking up an ROTC scholarship. It is obvious what happened from there. At this point in the interview though I wanted to change the direction of conversation, mainly because several of the reasons that Steve gave for wanting to be in Marine Corps ROTC were based on Hollywood-ized, or otherwise stylized expectations. Accordingly, I asked the following question, "Do you feel that your expectations about what the Marine Corps was like have changed now that you are involved in ROTC?" Steve's reply was to answer with an immediate "yes," and then pause. I sensed that he was at this point trying to quicken the interview by giving non-elaborate answers, so I attempted to narrow my focus and get what information I could. Thus, I touched upon his earlier use of the word "brotherhood" and asked him to focus on this term and used the classic "What do you mean by that?" question. Fortunately, this elicited an unexpected response, which was mainly to comment on some past negative incidents that Steve had had with female individuals both at his current ROTC-student level, as well as those higher above in rank structure. He prefaced his remarks by saying that while not all women were "bad," the majority were lacking in one area or another (physical fitness, bearing, command presence, et.al.), implying that expectations of "brotherhood" were overall negatively impacted by females in NROTC. In light of shirts that proclaim the USMC to be "the world's greatest fraternity" and the fact that the Marines are the only major branch of the U.S. military to separate women and men during basic training, these comments were interesting and in future interviews I may focus on male/female interaction more often. At this point, the only real other points of notice were in regards to my further requests for elaboration on wanting to be a Marine, at which point I wrote down "military curiosity, WWII stuff." Steve mentioned "commercials, Grandpa (Navy) that he had a grandpa who had served in the Navy (the only real military individual in his immediate family) and that his "sea stories," combined with an innate military curiosity and recruiting commercials, all factored into his

decision to be in the Marine Corps. I would really have liked to talk more about Steve's grandpa, but by this time I could sense clear agitation for time, so I decided to end the interview somewhat more abruptly than I would have liked. Thus, my overall reaction to this interview is one of mixed success and disappointment. The failure to accurately clarify schedules resulted in a premature ending of the interview, and what could have been some interesting insights for being involved with Marine Corps ROTC. However, not all was negative because in light of Steve's many and varied responses, my initial hunch that individuals join the military for many multi-faceted reasons was confirmed. Furthermore, at no point was the War on Terror a significant factor in his decision-making process, nor was there any implication that military service was a 'way out' of a hard time in life. If anything those two factors were more conspicuous in their absence, especially since Steve did not name a central reason for wanting to be a Marine Corps officer, but rather he had a plethora of responses. Also, his reaction to my question about "brotherhood" caused me to open my eyes to a new, potentially rich area of questioning-that of male/female relations between Marines. Thus, I remain optimistic about my project and look forward to doing more research in the future.

**Data:** Fortunately for my project, a quick search of the archives turned up some useful material, as number 27 on the "Campus Units" page was conveniently titled "Armed Forces," which I next followed to the "Naval Science" page. One box in particular, titled "Naval ROTC Issuances, 1946, 1957, 1962, 1968-" seems like it could provide much useful information. Specifically, it could provide an interesting basis for comparison for both what the financial incentives for NROTC are now vs. what they were in the past, and also give insight into what the service obligations were then vs. what they are now. With this information, I could better gauge what motivates current Marine Corps (as a reminder, Marine Corps ROTC is attached to Naval ROTC) ROTC students to join the program, and how that may have changed from the past. Unfortunately there was no time this past week to investigate the documents at the Archives, so I opted instead to conduct an "Observation" in light of some very new and exciting developments within the Marine Corps. Basically, it has been reported in the NY Times that a push is being made in certain circles to redeploy all Marines out of Iraq and instead send them to fight Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. Thus, the Marines would be the dominant force in Afghanistan, while all Army forces currently deployed there would switch over to Iraq. Politically this is huge, because currently much more public and international support exists for hunting down the terrorists directly concerned with 9/11 (Al Qaeda), than does the war in Iraq. By default then, moving the

Marines to Afghanistan would guarantee a larger and longer combat commitment, even as the public outcry for a pull-out in Iraq increases. Keeping this information in mind, I decided to assess as objectively as possible a MOLAB (Marine Option Laboratory) session this Tuesday and see whether or not this new information had any impact on the training. For those unfamiliar, MOLAB is a two hour course every Tuesday that involves the training of Marine, Marine ROTC, and interested NROTC students in subjects ranging from history and uniform maintenance, to COD (close order drill, i.e. marching) and squad tactics. It is supervised overall by a commissioned Marine Corps officer (MOI – Marine Officer Instructor) and a non-commissioned Marine Corps officer (AMOI – Asst. “ ”), both of whom are recognized by the University of Illinois as faculty. For the day I visited, the training consisted of an endurance competition between three different squads (7-10 people), with the express purpose of improving abilities such as “leadership,” “resistance to pain,” and “unit cohesion.” An emphasis was put on each group to push as hard as it could through the different events (including rope climbing, pull-ups, push-ups, running, gear carrying, among others), but not at the expense of leaving any members behind. Accordingly, each squad leader walked a fine line between getting everyone going as quickly as possible, but also looking out for the safety and accountability of all members of his team. Weaker members in different events were encouraged by those more physically able, and at times gear was adjusted (each squad had a specific amount of military equipment to be moved to different events) such that more weight was carried by the strongest individuals. What was most interesting though, were the four core elements that were supposed to be stressed by the training: Knowledge (knowing what to do, where to go), Integrity (individuals were trusted to complete all events and do all exercises), Loyalty (looking out for your peers at the expense of self), and Leadership (directing the actions of your peers). That these character traits spell out the acronym KILL was a fact not lost on the participants, and was in fact encouraged for memorization. In such an environment, public discourse concerning troops not wanting to be deployed overseas or hesitating to be put in a combat situation seems laughable—why would you use “KILL” unless you were stressing the possibility of fighting? At the same time though, the somewhat incongruous elements of helping weaker members throughout the training and caring for others serves as a balancing force for the stress on competition and training hard (for combat). With the actual training element better understood, I would like to conduct interviews with the participants in the future to see whether or not their actual perceptions of the Marine Corps match-up with the training NROTC provides.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/11/washington/11military.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/11/washington/11military.html?_r=1&oref=slogin)

**Data:** In light of the information I have uncovered concerning both my informants' motivations for participating in Marine Corps ROTC, as well as data from outside sources, I decided to backtrack a bit and analyze both how the program perceives and is perceived by others. Specifically, I consulted three different sources that-despite hawking the same ROTC program-all gave differing perspectives as to its main goals: the U of I NROTC homepage (<https://rotc.navy.uiuc.edu/index.php>), the USMC Recruiting Command ([https://web.mcrc.usmc.mil/G3/Officer/mcrc\(on\)%20main.htm](https://web.mcrc.usmc.mil/G3/Officer/mcrc(on)%20main.htm)), and the Princeton Review (<http://www.princetonreview.com/cte/articles/military/marinerotc.asp>). In their respective order, the following are the main reasons given for participating in (Marine Corps) NROTC: “the training and education of America's young leaders...through physical readiness, academic excellence, and military professionalism,” “to educate and train highly qualified young men and women for careers as commissioned officers in the United States Marine Corps,” and lastly to pay “for students' college tuition, [while] they earn their degree while being groomed for their military commission...the primary benefit of participating in ROTC is the financial assistance.” What is fascinating about all of these responses, is how depending upon the perspective of the organization, different aspects about USMC NROTC are stressed. Take the WGNB (“World’s Greatest Naval Battalion” – the self-proclaimed moniker attached to U of I’s NROTC program) homepage, which is meant both to serve existing U of I NROTC members and encourage recruitment from those yet in high school. With phrases like training “America’s young leaders” and the playing up of attributes such as academics and professionalism, there is a definite bias towards the positive aspects of the program with little mention of the obligations. In fact, the homepage has no direct reference to any of the actual requirements of NROTC, but rather serves to play-up the ostensible long-term advantages of the program and provide contact information for both existing and prospective Battalion members. Contrast this with the more Spartan USMC Recruiting Command webpage, and one finds a more definite gearing to the perceived elite element of Marine Option individuals in NROTC. Here, terms such as “highly qualified” and “highly competitive selection process” are employed to emphasize the specificity in requirements for USMC NROTC; mainly, that those individuals have clean records, are physically fit, and have the educational potential to earn a college degree. In this light, applications for the program are seen more as a contest against

one's peers, with the prizes being free tuition/book money, and ultimately, a commission as a 2nd Lt. in the Marine Corps. The wording seems to imply that the individual reading the webpage already has a desire or at least an interest in being a Marine Corps officer, and that they must first prove themselves before getting the benefits (again though, with no mention of the responsibilities) of a NROTC scholarship. Most telling of the three links though, is that which comes from arguably the most objective source, The Princeton Review. Of the three, only this page (which I remember from high school as being very influential in the college application processes of my peers) offered both a summary of the benefits AND the costs of USMC NROTC. Furthermore, it approaches the program from a more neutral standpoint, describing that "the primary benefit of participating in ROTC is the financial assistance," and not mentioning any guarantee of improved personal characteristics. The reader is made aware of the purpose of NROTC, a brief history, a quick summary of both short and long-term obligations, and finally provided with contact information for the Marines. Had a prospective college student only read the first two web pages, they might never have read of the mandatory classes, Drill periods, and eight year contract that a NROTC scholarship entails. Ultimately, what this analysis means for my project is that I will further have to explore the paths that individuals took to get where they are in USMC NROTC. Though all participants in the program are at some point made aware of the implications of their contract, the fact of the matter is that the military-related websites which discuss the NROTC program actively bias their information towards the positive end. Potentially then, individuals who sign up for an NROTC scholarship can have unrealistic expectations for what the program is really about (generating college educated officers for the Marine Corps) and it would be interesting to see how many individuals found a disconnect between their assumptions going into the program and how they felt once they were already in. So far my informants have had overall positive experiences with USMC NROTC, but in the future I will be more active in asking about the specific means that individuals followed to join the program.

**Data:** Quite frankly, given the large amounts of recruiting videos that the Marine Corps itself produces, I am not entirely sure that my project  
**Video/Plan** would require new material. If anything, my plan for a 2-3 minute video would be to splice together preexisting Marine Corps recruiting videos with the intention of showing how, given changes in time and audience, these movies change as well. For example, take the following two videos which both stress a fantasy element and debuted on television prior to the full-scale war on terror:  
<http://youtube.com/watch?v=ZjIEZH8VSNM> and

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=62tnJtLBQzQ>. In the former, chess is used as a metaphor to stress the values of being “strong” and “smart,” while the latter portrays a lone male figure conquering a labyrinth of obstacles in order to fight a mythical monster and ultimately become a Marine. In both cases, the recruiting message displayed bears no resemblance to the reality of being a Marine. Nowadays, however, recruiting videos have changed drastically, as evidenced by the following two videos:

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=vhuKV0Y--ZI&feature=related> and [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iOjn9\\_iAN-c&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iOjn9_iAN-c&feature=related). In the former, rock music blares while images of the Marine Corps Silent Drill Team are interspersed with scenes from boot camp and the “war on terror,” while the latter has a much more somber tone and depicts Marines engaged in training or otherwise noncombatant roles. For both videos however, there is much more of a stress on depicting Marines in action and a more noted emphasis on realism than the earlier films. Thus, any video I would propose for this class would take this change in recruiting material to account, while simultaneously using footage of Marine Corps ROTC training here at U of I. My ultimate goal would then be to draw comparisons to the training of Marines (and prospective Marines) on campus and the images of Marine training depicted in recruiting videos. Any similarities or differences between actual training vs. recruiting images could then be noted, and any associated relevance to the University discovered.

**Discuss:** Thus far I feel that my project, while quite fascinating, keeps taking on greater and greater proportions than the University of Illinois, and is at the point where I am struggling constantly to reign in the focus. Originally the plan was to focus solely on individual members in ROTC (long since changed to solely members in Marine Corps ROTC) and “get a broad feeling for their motivational backgrounds” in light of their military service branch. The idea was to take individuals’ motivations, compare and contrast it to the mission and expectations of the Marine Corps, and then ultimately see where the University acted as an “agent” in between. As an example, if an individual had hypothetically joined ROTC for the financial incentives, my goal would be to see how that individual would fit in amongst the Marines (do most members join for financial reasons, would they be viewed poorly if money alone was a dominant factor in the decision, would anyone notice either way, etc...?) and where the University of Illinois factors into the matter. Indeed, while at first glance it might not appear that U of I has any large part in the matter, it is important to realize that there are large time commitments (mandatory PT sessions, classes, special events, teams) associated with ROTC, many of which can overlap with school functions. In

particular, all ROTC branches utilize University spaces—mainly the Armory— for training, can gain University funding for RSO related team activities, get credit hours for certain classes, and sometimes even can get special dispensation to leave classes for ROTC-related training. Thus, the University has the potential to dictate high terms to the different ROTC branches, because so much of the military and educational training is dependant on University support. Do the military and the University act in accordance with each other, does the University's sanctioning (or censoring) of certain ROTC related activities count as de facto support of the military's mission, or does the individual student/University relationship not factor into the ROTC program's goals? These are all macro questions that sprang-up as I set about my research, constantly frustrating my attempt to keep the project as small and specific as possible. It is obvious then that the University of Illinois is closely intertwined with all of the ROTC branches and, by virtue of this fact, directly and or indirectly influences the motivations of all cadets/midshipmen. With the sheer scope of differences in motivation for participating in Marine Corps ROTC given, I then attempted to discern what the salient factors were. Though it is certainly not the main factor, one that consistently came up was financial reasoning, which was both intriguing and problematic. For both my informant interviews the matter of money for school came up and, though it was apparent that money was more of an issue for Steve than Robert, the fact that each voluntarily brought the matter up was evidence in itself of the importance of financial aid. Specifically too, both informants hinted that parental motivations for them to attend college (but at the same time getting financial aid) were a big reason for altering their path to Marine Corps ROTC, vice a more direct enlistment contract straight out of high school. The reason that I find this motivational aspect interesting is largely twofold: for the University it means a relatively stable group of students who will automatically be able to pay tuition on the government dole (thusly encouraging the University to sanction ROTC related events for the secure revenue), while at the same time bringing about the possibility that individuals will unwisely participate in such training mainly for a financial break (note the case of Pablo Paredes, a sailor who was court-martialed after refusing to deploy to his ship and cited financial incentives/education as a main reason for joining the military -

<http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=05/03/28/1434217>).

What was frustrating to me was that I do not have the time or resources to pursue this vein of thought in greater depth, but for any future projects the matter of military financial aid is a great place to start with any ROTC-related research. To do this, I would suggest more active interviewing (and possibly confidential polling) of active ROTC members to see how much they value their military financial

aid, particularly in comparison to their other motivations for being involved with program. As for said 'other' motivations, what was clear that for the Marines at least, themes of excellence, tradition, brotherhood, being the "best," leadership, and becoming an officer predominate. From viewing mission statements from both military and non-military sources, observation of Marine ROTC training, and my informant interviews, it is quite clear that the Marine Corps places a very high value on generating an image as a premier military institution with core values of Honor, Courage, and Commitment. As a contrast to the above paragraph, these latter motivational examples are more selfless in nature and deal more with service to others, vice the personal gain of college money. I would stress that these factors are just as important as financial aid and that future research work towards analyzing the relationship between the two, especially in areas that can overlap directly to the University as a whole. I would suggest broad-based interviews aimed towards finding out whether or not finance trumps the (proposed) benefits of being a Marine in conjunction with research that details how current ROTC-commissioned Marine officers view their experiences with the Marine Corps, particularly as compared to their assumptions before joining. The results could then be used to help the University of Illinois in understanding the goals of the ROTC program in relation to student expectations, thereby allowing better communication between all parties. To do so would mean less conflict as concerns class registration problems for mandatory major vs. mandatory ROTC classes, lack of credit hours given for ROTC classes, and use of University spaces for training. With all said and done, I think the most important finding to take away is this: student motivations to participate in Marine Corps ROTC (and likely any ROTC) are both highly broad-based and highly relevant to the University. In better understanding the relationship between such students, the University, and the military as a whole, all parties have the potential to benefit and much can and should be done to understand how all three parties are intertwined.

**Research Proposal:** It goes almost without saying that throughout the course of the semester, I have had to constantly refine my research parameters concerning my EUI project because of the complex relationship between the University of Illinois and its ROTC program. From the get go, it has involved walking along a razor's edge of information: stray too far to one side and risk being

overly specific in regards to your findings, or go too far over the other way and risk losing perspective to the University. Thus in writing this proposal, there are certain matters I would like to clarify to avoid confusion. Most importantly, anytime “ROTC” is used (unless otherwise specified) I am referring solely to those in Marine Corps ROTC and not to any of the other service branches. As mentioned elsewhere in my project, this was an attempt on my part to keep the focus of my research small enough to be relevant to the University, while simultaneously large enough to be important in terms of national discourse concerning the war on terror, military recruiting, and the like. This in turn leads me to my next point of clarification, which is to say that while my research primarily concerned the different motivations individuals had to join and continue to participate in ROTC, I believe that this information—combined with the unique ROTC/University relationship—is relevant even beyond campus issues. Thus, my problem question for the EUI is to ask what *is* the specific relationship between the University of Illinois and its ROTC program and where do students’ motivations (be they more academically or ROTC inclined) play into this relationship?

In setting about to answer this question, I am immediately cognizant of Becker’s warning when he says “A major obstacle to proper description and analysis of social phenomenon is that we think we know most of the answers already” (Becker 83). Accordingly, I tried to be as introspective as

possible in finding out what *my* motivations were for participating in ROTC, so that I might not ascribe my own values to the reasoning of others. In this state of reflexive analysis, I concluded that financial reasoning for college costs, past family military experience, and a general desire to be a Marine were my major motivations, and so I would have to be careful to not let these factors direct my research questioning (i.e., presume that these were the major reasons for all individuals in the program). For my research, this was particularly important because as a member of ROTC myself, there could be a tendency for my own position within the organization to influence the responses of my interview subjects. As such, I was careful in taking heed of Stacey's warning, as when she attests in her writing that "the greater the intimacy between researcher/researched, the greater the danger" that a collaborative interview process will be exclusively authored by the ethnographer. Thus throughout my project I tried to position myself as neutrally as circumstances would allow, and was ever mindful of Becker's (perhaps too paranoid) warning to "identify the case that is likely to upset you thinking and look for it" (Becker 87).

Luckily, I was not disappointed because what my interviews managed to reveal was that great differences exist behind motivational factors to participate in the University of Illinois ROTC program. Of particular note was the fact that for some individuals, monetary and military considerations (more so the ROTC's domain) seemed more important, while for others,

educational and familial considerations (more so the University's territory) seemed of greater importance. In creating a proposal for further research then, I would have to argue for more and more individual interviews with members of ROTC. After collecting numerous transcripts of individual interviews, it would then be possible to apply a Strauss-ian analysis to the documents and attempt to find both major commonalities and differences. What *key words* keep popping up? What does an informant's change in *voice* when describing their reasoning behind being in ROTC and the presence (or lack thereof) of different *emotional and motivational hotspots* during their conversation reveal about their experiences? While I had considered group interviews right off the bat, I ruled out this possibility because I was concerned about a "group-think" mentality taking over the process. My reasoning was that since most members in ROTC are at least somewhat familiar with each other, the temptation might exist to not answer questions completely honestly in a group setting for fear of alienation. As such, the end goal would be to compile data from as many members in the ROTC program as possible, and then utilize informant responses from individual interviews so as to generate a series of questions for group interviews and or survey questions. Ideally, the initial interviews would have the effect of discovering what factors *most* influence individuals' motivation to be in ROTC, while this latter questioning could then go greater in depth by focusing on these key issues. Thus a researcher would get the best of both worlds and gain greater insight into not only the

individual motivations concerning ROTC, but the *social discourses* and *cultural standing* of members as well, i.e. what motivations are considered to be more common (education/financial), those that are debatable (become a Marine), and those that controversial(fight in a war)?

As concerns human subjects research then, such an aggressive and intrusive research process would necessarily require extensive IRB approval and very careful precautions taken to ensure that informants' identities were kept secret. Given that military members are not allowed (or at least not supposed) to comment on politics or other social issues, it would be of even greater importance than normal to ensure that any individual who participated in this proposed research project be guaranteed anonymity. Indeed, if someone was to make a controversial statement in an interview and their identity were discovered, they could be at risk for losing their scholarship and or be kicked out of the ROTC program entirely. That being the case, I would ensure that pseudonyms be mandatory for all informants and that any personal information that could be too specific concerning an individual's identity *not* be archived, so as to prevent the possibility of a leak.

Ultimately, with this two-tiered interview process complete (individual interviews being the first tier, followed by group interviews and or surveys for the second tier); my research proposal would involve a comparison of the interview data with my existing research on ROTC mission

statements. Listed under the “Data – Data Continued” portion of my EUI page, this research basically describes how depending upon the source consulted (U of I’s ROTC homepage, the USMC Recruiting Command, or the *Princeton Review*), different aspects of the ROTC are stressed over others. The goal here would be to see which information source most accurately reflects the majority’s motivation for participating in ROTC. This would be an invaluable aid to both current and prospective University students then, because if they knew which information source was the most reliable, they would have a better idea of whether or not ROTC would be a program they would be interested in.

If I was to be highly ambitious in listing a research proposal though (and perhaps a tad bit unrealistic), in addition to the interviews and comparison work already listed, I would opt for two more veins of research. First, and more feasible of the two, would be a nationwide survey to all schools that have an ROTC program: in addition to motivational questions, I would include sections that attempted to discern how happy individuals were with their college/ROTC program, and how they felt they compared to other schools. The idea here would be to get a broader feel for how U of I and its ROTC program is perceived nationally, and how both are ranked against their peers. Secondly though, and this would be quite difficult, would be to conduct interviews with former alumni of U of I’s ROTC program, because this information could be used to gauge the long-term satisfaction of its

participants. Take the following simplistic scenario: if A, B, and C are the three main motivations for joining ROTC, and most members participate in the program because of reason A, what happens when an alumni survey indicates that of all those who successfully completed ROTC at U of I, only those who were mainly motivated by C report being happy? I feel that this is a valid question and one that could have real importance in determining which activities the U of I supports ROTC in, and how the program itself is marketed towards students. With that being said, such a research project would have to be quite large and time-consuming in nature, and while I feel the information generated could be quite useful, it would be too large for a semester of research. For now I am only truly comfortable in saying that the motivations behind student participation in ROTC at the University of Illinois are complex and multifaceted, and that they can give greater insight into not only how the University is perceived on whole, but can have relevancy to current dialogues concerning “the war on terror” and where the school participates as an “actor” within such dialogue.

**EUI Links:** The link I chose for my project was titled “Beyond precision: issues of morality and decision making in minimizing collateral casualties” and was written by Lt. Col. Dwight A. Roblyer of the United States Air Force (USAF). Ironically enough, I found this EUI project the very day that I had been talking with a T.A. in my ANTH 267 course who had mentioned it. He had shown surprise at my wanting to be an anthropology major and serve in the Marine Corps, and had mentioned Lt.Col. Roblyer’s work as worth checking out (though I found this completely by accident). Thus, when I stumbled upon his project by chance, I naturally investigated it and was only mildly surprised to find that the author had started off on his career path doing (Air Force) ROTC. What I really liked about this paper was how he defined “air forces,” as any military air assets, thereby

including the Marine Corps in this definition. Also, his mentioning that today's modern military stresses "jointness" was of further interest, because it reinforced the fact that the boundaries between services are becoming ever more blurred in the modern war on terror (Roblyer 2-3). As the author details, our 'separate' branches fight hand in hand with one another and it is not at all an unlikely scenario to have an Army unit calling for reinforcements in a fire-fight, and having Air Force/Navy support from above or Marines aiding from the ground. Given a protracted conflict like Iraq or Afghanistan, all of America's military assets will be deployed to the fight, so it is not really a question of where you will fight, but more so when. This got me thinking on a tangent, basically to ask what it is about the Marine Corps that inspires individuals to join it over other branches? For my later interviews, I plan to ask this question in greater force, because though Marines take pride in being "first to fight," in today's combat environment, it is just as possible for even Navy or Air Force service members to be involved in conflict. Dwight A. Roblyer, "Beyond precision: issues of morality and decision making in minimizing collateral casualties" in the Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship, <http://www.ideals.uiuc.edu/bitstream/2142/39/1/RoblyerOP.pdf> (16 OCT 2007).

**Reflect:** While at times the research process for this EUI project could be quite demanding, I felt that overall it was quite rewarding and I learned a lot. For one, between all of the consent form documentation and the many readings that we had to complete for class, I got a taste for just how much work and effort must go into even a modest research proposal. Whether conducting interviews, trying to make video documentaries, or otherwise conduct theoretical research, a cultural anthropologist can expect to put in hundreds (perhaps thousands, depending on the size and length of the project) of man-hours towards conducting their research, and only then can they begin to condense the information towards reaching a meaningful, supported conclusion.

Probably the biggest aspect of this class that I took away was not so much what I learned from my project, but rather what I learned about conducting future ethnographic projects. Mainly, if you want to get the most out of your research it is necessary to focus on certain research methods more than others and that it pays to be selective. For example, if you were to conduct a project that dealt heavily with personal or otherwise sensitive matters in a community, a group discussion may not be the best ethnographic method towards conducting research, because individuals might feel compelled to not speak or otherwise alter their responses for fear of being alienated. Also, from both our readings and my own personal experience, I learned that knowing how to conduct a good interview is a skill, and one that must be learned, along with patience and the ability to know how to not give leading questions.

Overall, I hope that the EUI continues to expand and that more and more emphasis is put on undergrads researching and studying alongside graduate students. As I have mentioned elsewhere in the Moodle, this has forced me to work at a higher academic level than I might have otherwise and view my work with greater scrutiny. Perhaps the University of Illinois is on to something with this untraditional (so far as I know) type of teaching, but for my part, I know I am definitely the better off for having participating in this unique research experience.

**Recommendations:** I would say that much of my recommendations to the University hark back to my writing in the "Discuss" portion of this project. Basically, I

would suggest that the University be more active in reaching out to not only ROTC-related students, but also the respective military branches themselves, with the ultimate goal being improved communication and understanding of each other. As things stand now, too often students in ROTC find themselves struggling to graduate on time-not for want of bad grades or other failure-but because of conflict concerning class registration for mandatory ROTC/major-related classes or a lack of credit given for mandatory ROTC classes. These are some of the more pressing issues, but many other concerns exist as well (conflict with use of University spaces, funding from the University, etc.) which stem directly from a lack of knowledge on the part of the University both of the ROTC program as a whole, and its participants motivations. Thus, more outreach on their part is necessary.