TARGET MARKETING IN SOCIAL MARKETING: GENDER DIFFERENCES IN IMPORTANCE ASCRIBED TO RESTRICTED EXCHANGE BENEFITS PROMOTED IN UNITED STATES MILIARY RECRUITMENT CAMPAIGNS

KIMBALL MARSHALL, Loyola University New Orleans
ULYSSES BROWN, Florida A&M University

Social marketing involves influencing voluntary behavior to a societal end. Examples are campaigns to encourage healthy behaviors, tax support for public education, and patriotism. With data from a Summer 2001 telephone survey of 600 young adults, this paper addresses how military recruitment campaigns, can use target marketing by exploiting gender differences in importance ratings of benefits promoted by the United States military. Differences are assessed using means and variances tests and analysis of covariance in a multiple regression context.

INTRODUCTION

Social marketing involves influencing voluntary behavior toward a social end by offering benefits for desired behaviors (Bagozzi 1975; Kotler and Andreasen 1991). Examples include campaigns to encourage healthy behavior, and tax support for public education, and "patriotic" behaviors such as military service (Marshall 1998, 1999; Kotler and Andreasen 1991). While military recruitment as marketing clashes with idealistic views of service to country (Faris 1995), the all volunteer military faces marketing challenges in which needs of the country and wants and needs of potential recruits must be considered (Ryan 2001). Military recruitment campaigns are here considered social marketing programs that make exchange offers to young persons. The military offers financial rewards, social prestige, job training, comradeship, travel, and adventure, and seeks commitment to an extended period of time, conformity to a structured life style, and obedience to a formal command structure. Marketing challenges are indicated by long-term problems meeting recruitment goals, and the needs anticipated by the United States military for the next decade (Abrashoff 2001; Brady 2000; Peters 2001; Ryan 2001; United States Navy 1998). These challenges are particularly difficult today as attention focuses on women despite controversies and scandals over the treatment of women (Fenner 1998; Grossman 2001; Gutmann 2000).

This paper illustrates gender-based target marketing in a social marketing context by assessing gender differences among young adult men and women in regard to thirteen restricted exchange benefits of military service promoted in United States recruitment campaigns. First, gender differences in means and variances are assessed. Second, analysis of covariance is used to assess gender differences in associations of importance ratings of promoted benefits with interest in military service. Last, multiple regression models of associations of promoted benefits on interest in military service are presented by gender. Given the long history of research into gender differences in job values, job experiences, educational and occupational opportunities, and impacts of sex role socialization (Johnson 2001; Lee and Farth 1999), gender differences are to be anticipated. Data were provided by a national telephone survey of 600 young adults (300 male and 300 females) age 18 to 24 in the

The Marketing Management Journal
Volume 13, Issue 1, pages 53-63

continental United States carried out in Summer 2001.

PRIOR RESEARCH

Since the draft was abolished in 1973 two projects have monitored American youth regarding military service. Monitoring the Future (MtF) has tracked interest in military service among high school seniors since 1975 including follow-up interviews after graduation to track enlistments (Segal et al. 1999; Segal 1986; Bachman et al. 1998). Beginning in 1980 the High School and Beyond (HSB) study has tracked panels of high school seniors with follow-up interviews in 1982, 1984 and 1986 (Teachman and Call 1993; Sebring et al. 1987). These studies provide demographic patterns and trends in interest in and actual military service among United States youth. Findings from both studies reveal relatively low levels of anticipation of military service in terms of expectations to enlist, lower levels of anticipation of serving as compared to "want" to serve, lower levels of actual enlistment compared to expectations particularly among young women, generally negative associations between socio-economic status and expectations of military service at the enlisted-rank levels, a disproportionate tendency of African Americans to serve in the military until the 1990s, and increasing numbers of women serving in the military.

In the MtF study, from 1976 to 1980, the percentage of high school seniors who indicated they "definitely will" serve in the military varied between 3.7 to 4.8 percent; from 1980 to 1983 the figure rose to 7.1 percent; but in the 1990s the figure dropped back below five percent (Segal et al. 1999). Throughout the years, women's levels of "definitely will" responses remained below males, with men in the "definitely will" category averaging approximately 12 percent over the 1976-1991 period and women averaging approximately 2.5 percent. Moreover, using follow-up data, Bachman (Bachman et al. 1998) estimates that 61 percent of high school senior males and 37 percent of high school senior females who said they would "definitely" enlist actually did so within two years of high school graduation. Although from a marketing view of "purchase intent" these figures might indicate high "purchase" rates (Bemmaor 1995; Morwitz, Johnson and Schmittlein 1993; Tung-Zong and Wildt 1994), the low intent-to-enlistment conversion rates of women as compared to men has led MtF researchers to suggest that military recruiters target females more strongly due to their unrealized recruitment potential (Segal et al. 1999). Historical trends justify this emphasis on women. While still a numerical minority, women have steadily increased representation in the military from approximately 2 percent before 1973 to over 14 percent of the all-volunteer military in 1998 (Segal et al. 1999).

APPLICATION OF EXCHANGE THEORY TO MILITARY RECRUITMENT

Demographic data and data on expectations and actual service are helpful but do not offer insight into the needs or wants of potential recruits. This study addresses this gap. Recognizing military recruitment as social marketing we address exchange benefits. The military seeks physically and intellectually capable recruits who will commit several years to a challenging, structured life style, dangerous work assignments, and separations from family. In return, as indicated by military advertisements, brochures, and web sites (e. g., www.goarmy.com, www.seal.navy.mil, www.navyjobs.com, www.navyjobs.defense.gov.au, www.airforce.com, www.uscg.mil), the military offers financial rewards, job training, adventure, travel, group belonging, and social prestige. These are restricted exchange rewards that incorporate intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of military work. Bagozzi defined restricted exchange as direct, reciprocal transfers of utilitarian and symbolic values between two parties (Bagozzi 1975; Levy 1959). Military recruitment and service involves each party directly providing the other with desired benefits. Moreover, under current recruitment arrangements in the United States, both parties *voluntarily* enter into exchange, a key aspect of marketing exchange as defined by Houston and Gassenheimer (1987).

METHODOLOGY

The data for this project were gathered through a national telephone interview survey of 300 male and 300 female young adults between 18 and 24 years of age who were not married, did not have children living at home, lived in the continental United States, and had not enlisted in or been rejected by the military. Data were collected in June and July of 2001 using a purchased list of 24,000 randomized names and phone numbers of young adults. Initial interviews were limited to persons age 18 to 20 and not enrolled in a four-year college. Because locating such respondents became too expensive (the list provided names in age break 18 to 24 without regard for college attendance), after approximately 150 respondents were interviewed, the sample frame was expanded to include persons through age 24 and persons enrolled in four-year colleges. Fixed list calling was carried out with a purchased sample frame of 24,000 names and phone numbers. Calls were placed in random order. 52,431 call attempts were made and 14,642 individuals were contacted. The overall response rate was 63.7 percent (9,321 agreeing to be interviewed); the overall disqualification rate was 93.1 percent (due to screening criteria - primarily age and four-year college attendance before the sampling criteria were relaxed). The overall completion rate was 93.2 percent. These indices correspond to American Association for Public Opinion Research (2000) recommendations.

Sample Demographics

All respondents provided information on all variables used. Of the 300 males, 92 percent were age 18 to 20, 89 percent graduated high school, and 32 percent were enrolled in a four year college. Twenty-two percent of males were enrolled in high school or GED programs, trade or vocational schools, or two-year colleges. All were U. S. citizens. One had been married. Of the 300 females, approximately 90 percent were age 18 to 20, 90 percent graduated high school, 41 percent were enrolled in four year colleges, and 36 percent were not in school. Twenty-four percent were enrolled in high school, GED programs, trade or vocational schools, or two-year colleges. One female was not a U. S. citizen. Four had been married.

Study Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is low representation of racial and ethnic minorities in the final sample. Low representation of minority groups is not unusual in telephone interview projects (Adams-Esquivel and Lang 1987; Keeter; 1995; Marin, Vanoss and Perez-Stable 1990; Smith 1990). African Americans represented only 6.2 percent of the final sample (5.7 percent of males and 6.8 percent of females). Native Americans represented only 1.3 percent (1.3 percent of males and 1.3 percent of females). Asian and Pacific Island respondents represented only 2.4 percent (3.0 percent of males and 1.7 percent of females). Hispanics represented only 4.4 percent of the final sample (4.4 percent of males and 4.4 percent of females). The under-representation of African Americans is an important limitation. Young African Americans have had until recently (the 1990's) high expectation and actual rates of service in the United States military (Segal et al. 1999; Teachman and Call 1993), while Hispanics expressed lower expectation of military service than either African Americans or Whites. However, in the 1990s African American males' expectation of military service declined and by 1999 was similar to that of Whites and Hispanics. Prior to the 1990's African American women were more likely to enlist than White or Hispanic women. During the 1990's Hispanic women's expectation of military service exceeded then converged with that of African American (Segal et al. 1998). By the end of the 1990's more African American women were in the military than African American men (Segal et al. 1998).

Operationalization of Variables

Interest in Military Service. Three items were considered in assessing interest in military service (Table 1). The first question asked "To what extent have you discussed serving in the military with family members? Would you say __?" Options read included

"A great deal" coded "5," "Very much" coded "4," "Some" coded "3," "Not much" coded "2," and "Not at all" coded "1." Volunteered "Don't know" responses were coded as "1." The second question used the same wording and codes in regard to "friends." The third question asked "At this time, how interested are you in enlisting in the United States military? Would you be ____?" Options read included "Not at all interested" coded "1," "Somewhat disinterested" coded "2," "Neither interested nor disinterested" coded "3," "Somewhat interested," coded "4," and "Very interested," coded "5." Volunteered "Don't know" responses were coded as "3." Responses to these three questions were summed to create Propensity of Military Service scale scores.

Potential Restricted Exchange Benefits. While developing the interview schedule the study team visited recruiting offices, reviewed recruiting materials and web sites, and spoke with recruiters in person and by telephone to identify key benefits of military enlistment stressed in recruitment campaigns. Many themes emerged and were reduced to thirteen key restricted exchange benefits that were incorporated into the 20-minute telephone interview schedule. These are presented in Table 2. During the telephone interview the respondent was asked, "*Now I'm going to read a few reasons people might give for enlisting. For each, tell me if that reason would be very important, somewhat important, neither important nor unimportant, somewhat unimportant, or not at all important if you were to enlist in the U.S. military*?" The benefits were then read with random rotation to prevent order bias. In the current analyses responses were coded "1" for Not Important," "2" "Somewhat Unimportant," "3" "Neither" (interpreted in these analysis as a neutral response, "4" "Somewhat Unimportant," and "5" for "Very Important."

FINDINGS

Propensity for Military Service

When asked how interested they were in enlisting, 12.7 percent of males and 11.3 percent of females reported being "somewhat" interested, and 5.3 percent of males and 1.0 percent of females, reported "very" interested. Regarding having discussed service with family members, 5.7 percent of males and 4.3 percent of females reported "a great deal." Approximately 5.3 percent of males as compared to 4.7 percent of females reported having discussed serving in the military with friends "a great deal." Mean scores for these variables are reported in Table 1. Males' scores exceeded females' scores for every indicator, averaged significantly above the "not much" category for having spoken with friends and family about enlisting, but were significantly below the neutral category for interest in enlistment. Females' mean scores for having spoken with friends was significantly below the "not much" category and significantly below the neutral category for interest in enlistment. Summing these three indicators produced a Propensity for Military Service Scale (Propensity) with a Cronbach's Alpha of .719, within acceptable reliability levels as suggested by Nunnally (1978) and Peterson (1994). Males had significantly higher Propensity scores than females, but significantly greater variance indicating lower consensus.

These indicators attest to the social marketing challenge. Military service is not a popular option among young adults. It is the objective of marketing campaigns to increase the level of interest. What benefits can the military offer to appeal to young adults? How might such benefits appeal differently to males and females? We now address these questions.

Importance Ratings of Promoted Benefits

Table 2 provides means and standard deviations for the importance ratings of the thirteen benefits of military service. With the total sample considered, all promoted benefits except one were rated statistically significantly important (i.e., above the neutral category "3"). This indicates the validity of these benefits as potential motivators of interest. It is interesting that "Combat and firearms training" produced a mean value of 2.88, which was significantly below the neutral value of "3" and on the "unimportant" side of the scale. This is especially important as combat training experiences are often stressed in military recruitment campaigns.

Table 1
Gender Differences in Means and Standard Deviations of Propensity for Military Service Indicators. (Male N=300, Female N=300).

Propensity Scale and Items	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
Propensity for Military Service Scale Cronbach's Alpha = .719	6.500[1]	2.769	5.400[1]	2.632	5.950	2.755
Discussed serving with family?	2.260[1,3]	1.090	1.920[1]	1.100	2.090[3]	1.108
Discussed serving with friends?	2.260[1,3]	1.120	1.870[1,3]	1.100	2.067	1.123
How interested in enlisting?	1.977[1,4]	1.300[2]	1.610[1,4]	1.090[2]	1.793[4]	1.211

[1] Differences in means statistically significant. P<.001 (1-tail)
[2] Differences in standard deviations statistically significant P<.001 (1-tail)
[3] Difference from "not much" (coded 2) statistically significant. P<.025 (1-tail)
[4] Difference from neutral ("neither interested nor disinterested") (coded 3) statistically significant. P<.001 (1-tail)

Table 2
Gender Differences in Means and Standard Deviations of Importance Ratings For Restricted Exchange Benefits Promoted by the Military (Male N=300, Female N=300).

Restricted exchange benefits promoted by the military (Wording paraphrased)	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
Intrinsic Rewards						
Training in the job I choose	4.347[1,5]	1.041[4]	4.507[1,5]	0.934[4]	4.427[5]	0.991
Belonging to a team	3.547[1,5]	1.342[3]	3.820[1,5]	1.265[3]	3.683[5]	1.310
Combat and firearms training	3.010[1]	1.561[3]	2.743[1,6]	1.623[3]	2.877[7]	1.597
Adventure	3.863[5]	1.223	3.880[5]	1.259	3.872[5]	1.240
To make life-long friendships	3.793[1,5]	1.330[3]	4.083[1,5]	1.192[3]	3.938[5]	1.270
To have a disciplined lifestyle	3.453[5]	1.440	3.353[6]	1.481	3.403[6]	1.461
Extrinsic Rewards - Financial						
The pay is good	4.080[5]	1.177	4.197[5]	1.099	4.138[5]	1.139
Retirement after 20 years	3.900[5]	1.300	4.037[5]	1.276	3.968[5]	1.288
VA home loan benefits	3.453[1,5]	1.398[3]	3.720[1,5]	1.314[3]	3.587[5]	1.362
Guaranteed medical care	4.377[1,5]	1.089[2]	4.580[1,5]	0.902[2]	4.478[5]	1.004
Extrinsic Rewards - Location and Travel						
Selecting the place that I would serve	3.877[1,5]	1.304[3]	4.170[1,5]	1.163[3]	4.023[5]	1.243
Travel opportunities	3.843[1,5]	1.235[3]	4.113[1,5]	1.067[3]	3.978[5]	1.160
Extrinsic Rewards - Social						
Social Respect and Prestige	3.597[5]	1.445	3.753[5]	1.402	3.675[5]	1.425

[1] Differences in means statistically significant P<.025 (1-tail)
[2] Differences in standard deviations statistically significant P<.001 (1-tail)
[3] Differences in standard deviations statistically significant P<.025 (1-tail)
[4] Differences in standard deviations statistically significant P<.05 (1-tail)
[5] Difference from neutral statistically significant P<.001 (1-tail)
[6] Difference from neutral statistically significant P<.025 (1-tail)
[7] Difference from neutral statistically significant P<.05 (1-tail)

Gender Differences in Means and Variances. As indicted in Table 2, of the thirteen restricted exchange rewards considered, eight produced statistically significant differences between males and females in regard to means and nine in regard to standard deviations of responses. On three of the six intrinsic rewards items mean scores for females were statistically significantly higher than for males and the standard deviations among females were statistically significantly smaller. These items addressed "Training in the job I choose," "Belonging to a team," and "To make life-long friendships." For females these issues were more important than for males and females had more consensus than did males on these ratings. On "Combat and firearms training," males had a significantly higher mean score and a significantly smaller standard deviation than did females. Males placed greater importance on such training than did females and exhibited greater consensus. Two intrinsic rewards items, "Adventure" and "To have a disciplined life style" produced no statistically significant gender differences.

Two Extrinsic Rewards-Financial items produced significant gender differences: "VA home loan benefits" and "Guaranteed medical care." Females exhibited higher importance ratings and smaller standard deviations on both. While this suggests financial motivations, neither "The pay is good" nor "Retirement after 20 years" produced statistically significant gender differences. Both the "Extrinsic Rewards - Location and Travel" items produced statistically significant differences by gender. Females gave higher importance ratings than males to both items and exhibited significantly greater consensus. Finally, in regard to "Extrinsic Rewards-Social," women gave greater importance to social respect and prestige than did men. Military service may be seen by women as an opportunity to enhance social esteem, despite a long history of gender discrimination within the military and in general social life (Fenner 1998).

Analysis of Covariance Multiple Regression Comparisons

In light of the observed differences in importance ratings of promoted restricted exchange benefits of military service, analysis of covariance, a form of multiple regression, was used to assess the influences, by gender, of the importance ratings for the promoted benefits on Propensity for Military Service scale scores. A three-step process was used. First a multiple regression model was run which included all thirteen benefits and Gender (coded male=0, female=1) as independent variables and Propensity as the dependent variable (due to space the resulting coefficients are not reported here.) That model demonstrated that the Gender dummy variable had a statistically significant effect on Propensity in the context of the thirteen benefits. This finding justified running a second model that added thirteen gender-benefit interaction terms (Gender was multiplied by importance ratings to produce these terms). In this model significant interaction terms indicate statistically significant differences in b-coefficients by Gender for the corresponding benefit. In addition, the b-coefficients for the restricted exchange benefits are the b's that would obtain if only males were considered. The b-coefficients for the interaction terms represent the differences between the b's for Males and Females for the corresponding benefits on Propensity if separate models were run for males and females. Also, if the Gender variable is no longer significant when the interaction terms are considered, it may be concluded that the interaction terms have captured the statistical variance in Propensity (i.e., effect) due to Gender. Finally, to verify the proceeding and for clarity in assessing influences for each target market, separate models of importance ratings of benefits on Propensity were run for males and females.

Table 3 provides the results of the final models and the analysis of covariance gender comparisons of influences of the thirteen benefits on Propensity for Military Service. The gender differences are remarkable. We ask two questions of this table.

Table 3
Analysis of Covariance and Independent Multiple Regression Models of Restricted Exchange Benefits Promoted by the Military on Propensity for Military Service by Gender (Male N=300, Female N=300).

Restricted Exchange Benefits Promoted by the Military	Male		Female	
(Wording here paraphrased)	Beta	b	Beta	b
Constant		2.432[3]		2.353[3]
Intrinsic Rewards				
Training in the job I choose[7]	.109[4]	.289[4]	.022	.062
Belonging to a team[7]	.110	.228	-.069	-.144
Combat and firearms training[5]	.220[2]	.389[2]	.042	.068
Adventure	.032	.073	.176[3]	.368[3]
To make life-long friendships	-.041	-.084	-.053	-.118
To have a disciplined lifestyle[5]	.188[3]	.362[3]	.259[2]	.460[2]
Extrinsic Rewards - Financial				
The pay is good	-.062	-.147	-.167[3]	-.401[3]
Retirement after 20 years[5]	.148[3]	.315[3]	-.062	-.127
VA home loan benefits[7]	-.119[4]	-.237[4]	-.007	-.019
Guaranteed medical care[7]	-.185	-.073	.098	.286
Extrinsic Rewards - Location and Travel				
Selecting the place that I would serve	.054	.115	.049	.111
Travel opportunities	.058	.131	.130[3]	.321[3]
Extrinsic Rewards - Social Prestige				
Social Respect and Prestige	-.047	-.090	-.029	-.055

[1] Male R= .441, R^2= .195, R^2adj=.158, P<.001 (2-tail), DF=13, 286..
Female R=411, R^2= .169, R^2adj=.131, P<.001 (2-tail).DF=13, 286
[2] Coefficient statistically significant P<.01 (1-tail)
[3] Coefficient statistically significant P<.025 (1-tail)
[4] Coefficient statistically significant P<.05 (1-tail)
[5] Analysis of Covariance gender difference in b's statistically significant P<.01 (1-tail)
[6] Analysis of Covariance gender difference in b's statistically significant P<.025 (1-tail)
[7] Analysis of Covariance gender difference in b's statistically significant P<.05 (1-tail)

First, are the gender differences in coefficients sufficient to treat males and females as separate target markets? Analysis of covariance addresses this question. Second, which restricted exchange benefits are most influential on males and which are most influential on females? This is best addressed by the b-coefficients from separate models (the Beta's and b's in Table 3 are from the separate models).

In regard to the first question, seven of the thirteen promoted restricted exchange benefits were related to Propensity differently for males and females. High importance of "Training in the job I choose," "Belonging to a team," "Combat and firearms training," and "Retirement after twenty years" were more strongly positively related to Propensity for Military Service among males than among females based on the analysis of covariance findings. The

influence of VA home loan benefits was negative for both groups, but was significantly more negative for males than females. The benefits "A disciplined lifestyle," and "Guaranteed medical care" had significantly greater influence on Propensity for females than for males, although for neither gender was the influence of "Guaranteed medical care" significant. Clearly, the observed gender differences in coefficients justify treating each gender as a separate target market.

The Beta and b-coefficients in Table 3 address the second question regarding which benefits are most influential for males and which for females. In sum, among women Propensity was positively associated with ratings for adventure, travel and a disciplined life style, and negatively with the importance of pay. This may reflect a realistic view of military pay and the economic pressures women face in the larger society. Among males Propensity was positively associated with job training, combat and firearms training, a disciplined life style, and retirement after twenty years, and negatively with valuing VA home loan benefits. These findings suggest two very different benefit profiles for you males and females currently attracted to military service.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The means of importance ratings of restricted exchange benefits promoted by military recruiters, coupled with the analysis of covariance multiple regression models, suggest ways to redirect military recruitment campaigns. Males and females should be targeted as separate market segments, but the benefits considered here provide a useful starting point for both groups. Despite important gender differences, there is surprising agreement across genders regarding the importance of the considered benefits. Both males and females rated all benefits except "Combat and firearms training" significantly on the important side of neutral. This validates the major themes used in recruitment campaigns, and calls into question their relative emphases. This is reinforced by the analysis of covariance multiple regression models of importance ratings for benefits on Propensity where two major findings stand out. First, different benefits influenced Propensity for males and females. Among males, high importance ratings for combat and firearms training, disciplined lifestyle, and retirement after twenty years were associated with Propensity. Among females, high importance ratings for disciplined life style, adventure and travel were associated with Propensity. Second, although respondents rated twelve of the thirteen restricted exchange benefits as important if they "were they to enlist," only four were positively associated with Propensity for males and only three for females. In effect, many promoted benefits that respondents say are important to their consideration of military service are not effectively communicated to young adult males and females.

The regression models reveal benefits profiles of the types of men and women current military recruitment campaigns attract. But, current campaigns are not attracting sufficient numbers of committed recruits. Therefore, the findings from the means analyses in this study may be particularly important in redirecting campaigns in ways that could broaden the pool of interested young adult males and females.

The means analyses findings contrast with recruitment themes that stress combat training and individual achievement such as the Army slogan "Be all that you can be" and the more recent "Army of One" campaign (Peters 2001; Shyles and Hocking 1990). Instead of individualistic achievement themes, it is recommended that recruitment campaigns stress teamwork, peer group membership, disciplined lifestyle and long-term relationships. While such themes are present in military recruitment campaigns (the older "Join the Navy and see the world" theme is well known), but it they may be overshadowed by images of combat training and powerful weapons. Although the adventure theme seems consistent with the combat training theme, this view of adventure may be in error given the high scores men and women placed on adventure and the low scores for combat training. The meaning of adventure to young adults may be better suggested by high ratings provided for selecting the place to serve and travel opportunities. Opportunities to serve in far-away places may be the adventure sought, as distinct from dangerous,

physically challenging assignments. Such service opportunities coupled with belonging to a group may resonate with desires of youth to express independence and share experiences with peers.

Given the observed gender differences in ratings of friendships and team membership, greater stress on team memberships as well as opportunities for meaningful friendships may be an important way of stimulating enlistment interest among young women, although both groups rate these themes as important. Similarly, the importance of social respect and prestige to both groups, but especially to females should not be overlooked. This is particularly pertinent given the history of low prestige that women have often suffered in the military in contrast to the experience of their male counterparts (Fenner 1998; Cohen 2000; Grossman 2001).

Without doubt, job training in the young person's chosen field is important to young adults. Already, military campaigns emphasize opportunities to learn important technical skills (Barley 1998) and innovative programs linking military enlistment to job opportunities with private industry partners following military service hold promise (Poe 2001; Winston 2001). However, not all enlistees can be assigned to popular jobs. Despite the need of the military to assign jobs based on the organization's requirements, linking military assignments to good paying jobs after military service may be an especially important vehicle for attracting and retaining female recruits.

A final important factor that stands out as a potential motivator is "Guaranteed medical care." Here also, both genders gave higher importance ratings to this benefit over all others, and it was rated higher by women. However, despite medical services available in the military, this benefit was not significant for either gender in the multiple regression models. This important benefit, especially for women, might not be adequately communicated in current campaigns.

In summary, we have demonstrated the potential utility of target marketing in a social marketing context by assessing differences in males' and females' importance ratings of key restricted exchange benefits promoted by the United States military. We have assessed the relative influences of these benefits on interest in military service. In so doing we have demonstrated important differences between men and women regarding the magnitudes of importance ratings and patterns of influence of ratings on interest in military service. Finally, we have made recommendations for new emphases in social marketing recruitment campaigns that may enhance interest in military service among both young adult males and females.

REFERENCES

Abrashoff, D. Michael (2001), "Retention Through Redemption," *Harvard Business Review*, 79 (2), 137-141.

Adams-Esquivel, H. and D. A. Lang (1987), "The Reliability of Telephone Penetration Estimates in Specialized Target Groups: The Hispanic Case," *Journal of Data Collection*, 27 (1), 35-39.

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2000), *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html).

Bachman, J. G., D. R. Segal, P. Freedman-Doan and P. M. O'Malley (1998), "Does Enlistment Propensity Predict Accession? High School Senior's Plans and Subsequent Behavior," *Armed Forces and Society*, 25 (1), 59-81.

Bagozzi, R. P. (1975), "Marketing as Exchange," *Journal of Marketing*, 39 (October), 32-39.

Barley, S. R. (1998), "Military Downsizing and the Career Prospects of Youths," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 559 (September), 141-158.

Bemmaor, Albert C. (1995), "Predicting Behavior from Intention-to-Buy Measures: The Parametric Case," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32 (May), 176-91.

Brady, Diane (2000), "Uncle Sam Wants You ..., to Have Fun!," *Business Week*, February 21, 98-101.

Cohen, Eliot A. (2000), "The Kinder, Gentler Military: Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars," *Foreign Affairs*, (July/August), 152-153.

Faris, J. H. (1995), "The Looking-Glass Army: Patriotism in the Post-Cold War Era," *Armed Forces and Society*, 21 (3), 411-435.

Fenner, Lorry (1998), "Either You Need These Women or You Do Not: Informing the Debate on Military Service and Citizenship," *Gender Issues*, 16 (3), p. 5-34.

Grossman, Robert J. (2001), "It's Not Easy Being Green ... and Female," *HR Magazine*, 46 (9) (September), 38-48.

Gutmann, Stephanie (2000), *The Kinder gentler Military: Can American's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?* New York: Scribner.

Houston, F. S. and J. B. Gassenheimer (1987), "Marketing and Exchange," *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (October), 3-18.

Johnson, Monica Kirkpatrick (2001), "Change in Job Values During the Transition to Adulthood," *Work and Occupations*, 28 (3), 315-345.

Keeter, S. (1995), "Estimating Telephone Non-Coverage Bias with a Telephone Survey," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59 (2), 196-217.

Kotler, P. and A. Andreasen (1991), *Strategic Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lee, Cynthia and Jing-Lih Farh (1999), "The Effects of Gender in Organizational Justice Perception, *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 20 (1) (January), 133-143.

Levy, S. J. (1959), "Symbols for Sale," *Harvard Business Review*, 37 (July-August), 117-119.

Marin, G., B. Vanoss and E. J. Perez-Stable (1990), "Feasibility of a Telephone Survey to Study a Minority Community: Hispanics in San Francisco," *American Journal of Public Health*, 80 (3), 323-326.

Marshall, K. P. (1998), "Generalized Exchange and Public Policy: An Illustration of Support for Public Schools," *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 17 (2), 274-286.

Marshall, K. P. (1999), "Volunteerism Among Non-Clients as Marketing Exchange," *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 6 (2,3), 95-106.

Morwitz, Vicki G., Eric Johnson and David Schmittlein (1993), "Does Measuring Intent Change Behavior?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (June), 46-61.

Nunnally, Jum C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory, 2nd Ed.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Peters, Katherine McIntire (2001), "Race for Recruits," *Government Executive*, Vol. 33 (9) (July), 36-41.

Peterson, Robert A. (1994), "A Meta-analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (September), 381-391.

Poe, Andrea C. (2001), "I Want You After the U. S. Army," *HR Magazine*, 46 (4) (April), 54-58.

Ryan, N. R. (2001), Military Recruiting and Retention. *FDCH Congressional Testimony*, Chief of Naval Personnel, April 24th.

Sebring, P., B. Campbell, M. Glusberg, B. Spencer and M. Singleton (1987), *High School and Beyond 1980 Senior Cohort Third Follow-up (1986) Data File User's Manual*, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Center for Education Studies.

Segal, D. R. (1986), "Personnel," in J. Kryzel, Ed., *American Defense Annual*, Lexington, KY: D.C. Heath, 139-152.

Segal, D. R., J. G. Bachman, P. Freedman-Doan and P. M. O'Malley, (1999), "Propensity to Serve in the U.S. Military: Temporal Trends and Subgroup Differences," *Armed Forces and Society*, 25 (3), 407-427.

Segal, M. W., D. R. Segal and J. G. Bachman (1998), "Gender and the Propensity to Enlist in the U.S. Military" *Gender Issues*, 98 (3), 65-88.

Shyles, L., and J. E. Hocking (1990), "The Army's 'Be All You Can Be' Campaign," *Armed Forces and Society*, 16 (2), 369-383.

Smith, T. W. (1990), "Phone Home? An Analysis of Household Telephone Ownership," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 2, 369-390.

Teachman, J. D. and V. R. A. Call (1993). "Family, Work, and School Influences on the Decision to Enter the Military," *Journal of Family Issues*, 14 (2), 291-314.

Tung-Zong, Chang and Albert R. Wildt (1994), "Price, Product Information and Purchase Intention: An Empirical Study," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (Winter), 16-37.

United States Navy (1998), *Sailor 21: A Research Vision to Attract, Retain, and Utilize the 21st Century Sailor*, Washington, D. C.:Navy Personnel Research Studies and Technology.

Winston, Sherri (2001), "U. S. Army is Teaming Up with Firms to Attract and Train New Recruits," *ENR (Engineering News Record)*, 246 (23) (June 11), 13.