

Executive Summary on Hazing in the Military

LCDR Leedjia Svec, Dr. Daniel P. McDonald, LCDR Loring Crepeau (Ret.),
Dr. William G. McGuire, Dr. Elizabeth Steinhauser, and LTC Vance McLeod

Directorate of Research



DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH

Dr. Richard Oliver Hope Human Relations Research Center

Mr. Ronald M. Joe, Principal Director

Technical Report # 09-12
Executive Summary

Background

Hazing in the military began as a celebration of accomplishments and strengthening of unit bonds. However, it has in some cases transformed through time into degrading and demeaning acts with the potential for deadly consequences. All services find acts of hazing punishable under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) law, yet, it still occurs. At the same time, it is important to note the distinctions between hazing and bullying (see Appendix A).

Task: In January of 2012, the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) was tasked with the examination of hazing within the military.

Definitions and the Current State of Military Hazing

The concept of hazing within the military is unique. Hazing intermingles with other concepts, such as discrimination, racist behaviors, anti-locution (see Appendix J), bullying, and even acceptance, pride, and teamwork. The following conceptual areas outline these important attributes within hazing in the military.

Historical and Current Events: Unfortunately, hazing is not a unique phenomenon, and often pervades most military branches and their specialty communities' cultures. The military Service branches currently lack a method to accurately gauge the prevalence of hazing behaviors. Still, the conventional wisdom maintains that many members engage in hazing behaviors (see Appendix B). Evidence of this is easily noted by searching the web or social media sites. Events such as what occurred at Aberdeen Proving Ground (see Appendix I) can be used to pave the way ahead and prevent similar events from happening.

Definitions: All Services have defined hazing (see Appendix C). These definitions are followed by examples of specific hazing behaviors, the effects of hazing on the individual, and the potential ramifications for the Services if hazing is allowed to occur.

Lacking Definition is Bullying: It is possible that what may be missing is a written distinction between bullying and hazing. The Department of Defense's (DoD) definition of hazing for example only includes hazing behaviors. The militaries of Canada and the UK have separate hazing and bullying policies. It is possible this may reduce the confusion and increase avenues for prosecution. Furthermore distinction may also serve to ensure many such acts are not seen and potentially excused as tradition or indoctrination. See Appendix A.

Distinguishing Bullying from Hazing: The terms bullying and hazing share some likeness; similar to the parallels between discrimination and bullying, the behaviors associated with

hazing and bullying may be identical at times; however, bullying and hazing are distinct constructs. These differences are Not delineated in current policies are procedures. Based on the literature, what we may be witnessing with recent events may actually be act of bullying and not hazing (see Appendix A-F).

Policies/Programs Regarding Bullying: Currently there are no policies that address specifically bullying. In the UK and Canada there are policies and programs to prevent bullying (see Appendix A).

Punishment of Hazing without Severe Consequences: The extent of prosecution of acts of hazing that do not result in death or destruction is unknown. Institutionalized hazing is known to occur and remains difficult to probe (see Appendix A-F). A quote on February 8th, 2012 by a Navy Commander asked about hazing reveals this truth:

I will tell you, when I was with Navy IG (2004-08) we did ask fraternization and hazing questions in our QOL surveys worldwide with Navy and accumulated about 25,000+ responses to our surveys in my tenure there; and, I would say less than 1% would say "yes" to both questions; and, normally there would be no comments in our open-ended "write about anything" section regarding hazing and some comments regarding fraternization. So either it is very hush-hush (requiring carefully-crafted questions) or we had very poorly written questions which did not tease out the hazing issue properly.

Studies on hazing or Bullying in the U.S. Military: Robust studies on hazing in the U.S. military are sparse and dated; the most recent study on U.S. military hazing was published in 1992 and conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO). Most research focuses on collegiate sports and fraternal organization environments. While these studies provide some valuable insights, a glaring lack of current information about hazing in the U.S. military persists (see Appendix A-F).

Hazing Studies in Other Militaries: Timely and current published studies on bullying and hazing in the militaries of Norway, Brazil, the Philippines, Russia, UK, Canada, and Australia may be useful in identifying methods to characterize bullying and hazing behaviors in the U.S. military. Moreover, these countries' current anti-bullying policies may prove valuable models for a DoD policy (see Appendix A-F).

Data on Hazing or Bullying in the U.S. Military: Currently there is very little data collected or maintained regarding hazing in the DoD. Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) reported that there is no database on hazing or bullying in the military. Furthermore, none of their Status of Force Surveys addresses these constructs. Currently, however, DMDC and DEOMI conduct surveys which address bullying-like behaviors within the context of discrimination (see Appendix A-F).

Military Equal Opportunity (EO) Programs: Although in the UK and Canada their Equity and Diversity programs address hazing and bullying as part of their formal complaints process. The U.S. DoD currently does not include hazing or bullying as reportable through this mechanism as a formal complaint unless the victim can demonstrate the behavior was

motivated by their being a member of a protected class (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, religion). All other activities are mostly referred to the IG, Commander, or for judicial review.

Current Actions for Prevention of Military Hazing

The military has no shortage of prevention policies, programs, and practices aimed at preventing hazing. The following items currently exist should prevent hazing practices. The main areas for which prevention practices and policies are in progress are policy, training/behavior, and research. Table 1 summarizes the current avenues of hazing prevention in the military.

Table 1.

POLICY	TRAINING/BEHAVIOR	RESEARCH
Policies Regarding Hazing	Military Training	Send a representative from DEOMI to the
Punishment of Hazing with Severe Consequences	DEOMI Courses	
Military Inspector General (IG) Records on Reported Hazing	Resiliency Training (Army)	
Navy Bureau of Medicine	Military Peer Groups	
	Civilian Prevention Efforts	

POLICY

Policies Regarding Hazing: In Jan of 2012, the Service Chiefs signed policy memorandums concerning hazing. The Army, Navy, Marine Corps and DoD have policies regarding hazing and all services endorse a “Zero Tolerance” posture toward hazing (see Appendix D).

Punishment of Hazing with Severe Consequences: The results of hazing incidents that result in gross violations, death, and injury are punishable by UCMJ for all Services. These instances are often publicized by the news media, bringing unfavorable notice to the military (see Appendix B).

Military Inspector General (IG) Records on Reported Hazing: According to sources, the Army IG does collect and maintain records of alleged hazing incidence along with other data (see Appendix A-F).

TRAINING/BEHAVIOR

Military Training: All Service branches have training requirements that address hazing and other topics that are typically conducted annually. Training is also provided in leadership courses, to help those being promoted to positions of higher authority and responsibility combat and prevent hazing among those under their charge (see Appendix B).

DEOMI Courses: DEOMI teaches components of hazing awareness and prevention in its Military Equal Opportunity Advisor and other courses through topics, including Bystander Intervention, Racism, Extremism, Religious Accommodation, Sexual Assault Prevention, etc. All Military Equal Opportunity Advisors attend this DEOMI course.

Resiliency Training: The Army currently mandates that all Soldiers assigned to MTOE and TDA organization in the Operating and Generating Forces receive “Battlemind” training face their environments with the greatest levels of mental strength possible. Training is tracked for each Soldier (see Appendix K).

Military Peer Groups: The military currently utilizes peer support groups such as BOSS, CSADD, Wingman Program, and More to enhance the life and safety of service members, (see Appendix I & K).

Civilian Prevention Efforts: A number of programs that address hazing have developed awareness and prevention training programs (see Appendix G).

Recommendations

Despite the current anti-hazing practices and policies that should have prevented the deaths of Pvt. Chen and Lance Cpl. Lew, these tragic deaths still occurred. The four main areas for which additional prevention practices and policies can be developed are policy, training/behavior, current programs, and research. Table 2 presents an overview of recommendations. The additional category, “modification of existing programs” explores existing initiatives that may be modified to prevent future hazing incidents.

Table 2.

POLICY	TRAINING/BEHAVIOR	MODIFICATION of EXISTING PROGRAMS	RESEARCH
Definition and Policies (pg 6)	Train EOAs (pg 7)	SAPRO (hotline & database) (pg 8)	Examine Prevention and Mitigation Strategies (pg 9)
Leverage EOAs (pg 6)	Peer Groups (pg 7)	Hotlines (pg 8)	Conduct 30-90 Day Study (pg 9)
Judicial Procedures (pg 6)	Provide Resiliency Training (pg 7)	DEOCS (pg 8)	Examine Scientific Relationships (pg 9)
Navy Bureau of Medicine (pg 6)	DEOMI (pg 7)	DMDC Data (pg 8)	Launch Longer-Term Research Program (pg 9)
Distinguish Bullying from (pg 6) Hazing	Develop Innovative Education and Training (pg 7)	Examine High Profile Historical Violations (pg 8)	Attend Anti-Hazing Task Force Feb 24 th /25 th at SCSU (pg 9)
Restricted/Unrestricted Hazing Reporting (pg 6)	Provide Tools and Resources for CDRs (pg 7)	Awareness Video (pg 9)	Collaborate with Others (pg 9)
Education and Training Policy Revision (pg 6)	Bystander Intervention (pg 7)	BOSS, CSADD, & Other Peer Programs (pg 9)	
Protect Against Retribution (pg 6)	Develop Cognitive Emotional Strategies of Behavior Change (pg 7)	Leverage Resources (pg 9)	
Use Victim-Based Approaches (pg 6)	Challenge Military Hazing Traditions (pg 8)		

Identify Best Practices from Historical Examples (pg 6)	Identify Gateways (pg 8)		
Issuance of a SecDef or U.S.D(P&R) Memo (pg 7)	Military Stand Down (pg 8)		

POLICY

Definition and Policies: Create official definition and policies on bullying similar to that of the UK and distinguish from the concept of hazing. Establish formal and informal complaint processes (see Appendix A-I).

Leverage Equal Opportunity Advisors (EOA): Modify EOAs’ duties to handle hazing and bullying as part of their formal process. If so, the Services will need to include updates to existing policies and regulations that add duties and responsibilities to the EO Advisor. This gives the institute the support to add such training and education to the course for EOAs.

Judicial Procedures: Hold all Service members accountable; actively publicize cases where members are adjudicated and punished for hazing. Hold those accountable who haze or are aware of hazing and do nothing. Ensure that even “minor” acts of hazing are appropriately and publicly reprimanded.

Navy Bureau of Medicine (BUMED): Establish a memorandum of agreement between DEOMI and BUMED to allow sharing data obtained from the BUMED Mobile Care Team Behavioral Health Survey questions on hazing collected from military members in combat zones. Data could be valuable to identify patterns of hazing behaviors in deployed environments, which may differ from those seen in non-deployed environments. Investigate other services to leverage data they may have as well.

Distinguish Bullying from Hazing: Educate and Place importance on the two separate constructs in policy, training, and practice (see Appendix A).

Develop Restricted/Unrestricted Hazing Report Format: Implement a system of reporting hazing that allows for two pathways, formal and informal, analogous to the system in place for sexual assault. This may increase the level of reporting, thereby more accurately informing leadership about hazing behaviors (see Appendix E-H).

Education and Training Policy Revision: Revise policies as needed to better meet the needs of the Service.

Protect Against Retribution: Protect all military members who intervene to prevent hazing behaviors from retribution. Hold commanders accountable in those instances where bystanders are not protected.

Use Victim-Based Approaches: To mitigate the impact of hazing and other stressors. This approach removes blame from the victim and examines the process that allowed the event to occur in the first place.

Identify Best Practices from Historical Examples: such as Aberdeen proving grounds (see Appendix K).

Issuance of a SecDef or U.S.D(P&R) Memorandum: Calling for commanding officers to address the prevention of hazing at unit gatherings, town hall meetings, commander's calls, and appropriate unit training sessions.

TRAINING/BEHAVIOR

Train EOAs: Train all EOAs and EO representatives in the Services to handle such complaints formally and informally (see Appendix E & H).

Peer Groups: Use existing peer support groups such as BOSS, CSAD, Wingman Program, and more to align against hazing (see Appendix I).

Provide Resiliency Training: Resiliency is the ability to bounce back from everyday stressors and traumatic experiences. Research shows that resiliency can be trained. It is currently utilized in the Army. Adapting Army Resiliency for all Services could help victims cope with the stressors of the hazing incident and may mitigate or deter counterproductive reactions, such as unauthorized absences, alcohol abuse, spouse and child abuse, and suicide (see Appendix K).

DEOMI: The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) possesses a unique advantage to present information related to hazing policy in its myriad courses, including Leadership Team Awareness Seminar and Equal Opportunity Advisor Course. The DEOMI recently instantiated Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) training in its curriculum and as such, hazing policy could be incorporated into DEOMI training (through on-site and virtual training).

Develop Innovative Education and Training: Develop effective training/education vignettes that personally impact Service members in recognizing hazing behaviors, understanding bystander intervention techniques, and realizing the ramifications of engaging in hazing behaviors. This plan will focus less on factual knowledge and more on salient behavior change and understanding.

Provide Tools and Resources for CDRs to Maintain a Positive Command Environment Free of Hazing: Keep leaders keenly aware of their responsibility to protect the organization's members from hazing and the ramifications of their failing to meet this obligation.

Bystander Intervention: Clearly identify prohibited hazing behavior and witness responsibilities and obligate military members to actively intervene to prevent such behaviors. Develop short vignettes that illustrate the bystander effect and how to prevent it.

Develop Cognitive Emotional Strategies of Behavior Change: Our military is excellent at disseminating knowledge regarding hazing; however, the fact that hazing still occurs today illustrates that knowledge alone is insufficient. A multi-focus approach inclusive of culture,

knowledge, application, and theory must be utilized to stamp out hazing in today's military (see Appendix A-K).

Challenge Military Hazing Traditions: Examine current practices, and determine what is and is not acceptable; ensure that the modification of traditions is mandated from the highest level. Enclosure (2) of Coast Guard Commandant Instruction 1610.1 (23 Jan 1991) represents a good model for other Services to adopt. It clearly defines acceptable behaviors during initiations following promotion or crossing the equator, dateline, Arctic and Antarctic Circle. Herein, the tradition of ceremony and celebration is preserved, while leaders are strictly held accountable to ensure "that there is no degradation of character, sexual overtones, bodily harm or undue harassment." Ensure that the modification of traditions is mandated from the highest level.

Identify Gateways: Determine dynamics and groups that can influence the likelihood— gang activity, peer support groups (e.g., BOSS, CSADD, Wingman program), etc. (see Appendix I).

Military Stand-Down: may be implemented, where training and messages that communicate a zero-tolerance are promulgated, reminding military members of the Services' standards of conduct. This provides all members of the military with standardized training that identifies anti-hazing policy, characterizes prevention strategies, and advocates bystander intervention.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

SAPRO (hotline and database): SAPRO hosts a sexual assault hotline, and is developing a sexual assault database called the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (DSAID). The ultimate infrastructure designed to accommodate both may provide the model for a creating hazing hotline and establishing a hazing database (see Appendix E & H).

Hotlines: Inspectors General hotlines could prove a valuable vehicle for reporting incidents of hazing (see Appendix E & H).

DEOCS: In FY 2011, the DEOMI Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS) was completed by more than 700,000 DoD members. Adding questions that address hazing to the survey's Locally Developed Questions would prove a facile method to gauge the incidence of hazing or bullying behaviors and trends across the service. Commanders could use results to more effectively address and prevent hazing and bullying.

DMDC Data: Collect survey data using the Status of Forces Survey and other mechanisms bi-annually in order to assess the prevalence and trends with respect to bullying and hazing. Currently DEOMI has developed candidate questions which will be shared with DMDC as a first draft. DMDC should also work with SAPRO to develop a DoD-wide database of incidence.

Examine Former High-profile Human Dignity Violations: Adopt best practices, former responses and key changes in policy and practice that resulted from such negative events such as Aberdeen 1997, extremist activity in the Army in 1996, and the recent Fort Hood killing (see Appendix K).

Awareness Video with DEOCS Administration: Amend with a short but impactful video clip to play for every online DEOCS survey taker that conveys the impact and/or negative consequences of hazing or bullying behaviors.

BOSS, CSADD, & Other Peer Programs: Use existing peer support programs, modify materials and implement special hazing campaigns (see Appendix I).

Leverage Resources: Existing programs (see Appendix G & I) have resources, tools, and knowledge in place. Utilizing their trackers, intake forms, and other tools and modifying them for the military will reduce cost and increase the speed of impact for anti-hazing resources and practices.

RESEARCH

Examine Prevention and Mitigation Strategies: Conduct a thorough investigation of theory, literature, and experiments to develop the most military focused and easily applied impactful tools (see Appendix B).

Conduct 30-90 Day Study on Status of Services Regarding Hazing: Examine current definitions, policies, Core Values, judicial procedures, statistics regarding conviction rates and disciplinary actions taken, training and education, to evaluate current efforts and methods (see Appendix B).

Examine Scientific Relationships: among bullying, harassment, suicide, unit cohesion, deployment status, etc. (see Appendix B).

Launch Longer-Term Research Program: to understand the dynamics of hazing within the military culture implement systematic command climate data collection and repository information, collect baseline data on existing hazing factors and outcomes, and test theoretical hypotheses. Develop advanced strategies, programs, tools, methods for prevention of hazing.

DEOMI Representative will attend the First National Anti-Hazing Task Force Feb 24th and 25th at South Carolina State University (SCSU): Attendance at this task force will open up researchers knowledge base, connections, resources, as well as put DEOMI on the forefront of anti-hazing awareness and activity to better serve the military.

Collaborate with Others: Existing academic institutions offer potential, resources, and infrastructure already in place. Leveraging these resources and individuals with hazing knowledge (see Appendix G & I) allows greater strides in military hazing prevention to be made.

References

- Alexander, M., MacLaren, A., O’Gorman, K., & Taheri, B. (2011). He just didn’t seem to understand the banter: Bullying or simply establishing social cohesion? *Tourism Management*. In Press. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2011.11.001
- Associated Press. (2012, February 4). *Navy officials say 8 sailors discharged for hazing aboard amphibious assault ship in San Diego*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/navy-officials-say-8-sailors-have-been-discharged-for-hazing-aboard-amphibious-assault-ship/2012/02/04/gIQA3MRqQ_story.html
- Dalton, C. M. (2007). The bully down the hall. *Business Horizons*, 50(2), 89-91. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2006.05.004
- Department of the Army. (1986, August 20) *Army Regulation 600-2, Army command policy and procedures*. Department of Defense: DC.
- Department of the Navy. (1997, June 18). *Marine Corps Order 1700.28: Hazing*. Department of Defense: DC.
- Department of the Navy. (2005, July 15). *SECNAVINST 1610.2A, Department of the Navy (DON) policy on hazing*. Department of Defense: DC.
- Department of Transportation. (1991, January 23). *COMDTINST 1610.1, Hazing awareness training*. United States Coast Guard: DC.
- Finkel, M. A. (2002). Traumatic injuries caused by hazing practices. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 20(3), 228-233. doi: 10.1053/ajem.2002.32649
- Grahlfs, F. L. (2008). Veterans in the political culture. *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*.
- Magerøy, N., Lau, B., Riise, T., & Moen, B. E. (2009). Association of psychosocial factors and bullying at individual and department levels among naval military personnel. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 66(4), 343-351. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2008.10.009
- Steinhauser, E. (2012, in progress). *Psychological bullying climate: Measurement development and validation*. Doctorial dissertation. Melbourne, FL: Florida Institute of Technology.
- StopHazing.org, 2012
- The United Kingdom and the Ministry of Defence Policy on Bullying and Harassment, 2008
- Vergakis, B. (2011, June 27). *Coast Guard: 7 punished for hazing aboard ship*. Retrieved from <http://www.military.com/news/article/coast-guard-7-punished-for-hazing-aboard-ship.html>

Appendix A

Distinction Between Hazing and Bullying Behaviors

Conflating the terms. While this review employs the term “hazing” throughout, it is important to note the respective hallmarks of hazing and bullying, in order to accurately distinguish between them. First, hazing possesses an end point of inclusion, as it typically involves a willing participant who recognizes the activities as a rite of passage or celebratory culmination after striving for membership in an elite group. Bullying behaviors, on the other hand, possess an end point of exclusion, and they are not welcomed nor invited by the victim. Second, hazing usually involves a discrete, finite set of events or behaviors that, once completed, are not repeated; in bullying, the behaviors are repeated, and persist without an identifiable end-point. Third, hazing is meted out by members of the group who possess higher status, by virtue of having been hazed as a requirement to group membership, or as an explicit rite of passage; bullies are targeted because of an unequivocal power imbalance that renders the victim powerless to prevent or stop the behaviors.

Thus, the Services’ definitions of hazing, while identifying clearly abhorrent behaviors that must be prohibited, fail to properly identify the implicit or explicit context that hazing entails. Moreover, the respective contexts of hazing and bullying make it far easier for leadership to identify and anticipate potential hazing opportunities, as these often possess a historical legacy, thereby more effectively preventing their occurrence. At the same time, bullying behaviors, by virtue of their very nature, often elude public exposure and scrutiny. Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, and Cooper (2003) define bullying as:

Repeated actions and practices that are directed against one or more workers, that are unwelcome by the victim, that may be carried out deliberately or unconsciously, but clearly cause humiliation, offence and distress, and that may interfere with job performance and/or cause an unpleasant working environment. (p. 6)

Einarsen et al.’s (2003) definition of bullying hits on many of the common themes across definitions of workplace bullying, including the *persistent* occurrence of negative verbal or non-verbal behavior, behavior that is viewed as inappropriate by the target, and behavior occurring over a period of time which induces psychological, physical, and/or emotional harm (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2007; Heames & Harvey, 2006; Suanders et al., 2007). To be considered workplace bullying, many researchers and practitioners agree that the bullying behavior has to occur more than once, in fact the frequent occurrence of the behavior is one of the most salient characteristics (Branch et al., 2007; Einarsen et al., 2003). However, researchers have not agreed upon the exact frequency of the behavior to constitute workplace bullying. For example, some researchers state that the behavior must occur weekly (Leymann, 1990) while others place less stringent time constraints in defining behavior as bullying (i.e., monthly; Salin, 2001). Because not all bullying behaviors are episodic in nature (e.g., spreading a rumor) some researchers recognize the difficulty in specifying the frequency criterion of bullying (Einarsen et al., 2003). Einarsen et al. (2003) suggests that the behavior may be considered to be bullying if it occurs on a regular (as opposed to occasional) basis.

When defining the criterion of bullying in regards to the duration of the behavior, similar to frequency, it seems arbitrary to designate an exact timeframe in which the behavior must occur (Einarsen et al., 2003). Leymann (1990) suggests that the behavior must occur for at least 6 months. Given the need to differentiate bullying from exposure to social stress at work, many researchers accept the 6 month timeframe proposed by Leymann (Einarsen et al., 2003). Evidence suggests that the longer the abusive behavior occurs the more likely negative consequences will result. As an example, Rospenda, Richman, Wislar, and Flaherty (2000) surveyed employees at two points in time with the measurements separated by one year. These researchers found participants who reported generalized workplace abuse at both points in time were more likely to develop problems associated with drinking alcohol than those not reporting abusive behavior or only reporting the abusive behavior at one point in time.

The predominant view is that power imbalance is a core component of the definition of bullying (Branch et al., 2007; Einarsen et al., 2003; Olweus, 1993). Power differences can arise as a result of formal position, contacts, knowledge, etc. (Branch et al., 2007) and make the victim feel like it is difficult to defend themselves, retaliate, or stop the abusive behavior (Einarsen et al., 2003). Einarsen et al. (2003) suggests that knowledge of the victim's weakness or 'weak point' may become the source of power discrepancies; the perpetrator may exploit the victim's weak point and therefore make the victim feel powerless. To be a victim of bullying, the target must feel a sense of powerlessness (Branch et al., 2007; Einarsen et al., 2003).

Not surprisingly, the most common type of bullying occurs between supervisors and subordinates, where the supervisor abuses his or her power. There are other relationship dynamics within an organization that can be involved in bullying. Coworkers can "gang up" on other coworkers. Although less common, subordinates can "bully up" and antagonize an organizational member of higher status (Einarsen et al., 2003).

In addition to the defining features of bullying (i.e., frequency, duration, power distance), researchers also mention additional characteristics that distinguish bullying from other constructs. Leymann (1990) and Lutgen-Sandvik (2003) discuss how abusive behavior may escalate over time if left unchecked and this behavior may create a hostile work environment. Over the course of the escalating behavior, the victim loses control over the situation. Because the victim is now in a disadvantaged position, he or she may become susceptible to even more abusive behavior by colleagues and supervisors (Einarsen, 2000). During the escalation process, the perpetrator's behaviors may evolve from subtle or indirect acts of aggression to more direct and severely psychologically damaging acts (Einarsen, 1999).

As Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, and Namie (2009) state, "bullying is both an outcome of and a recursive resource for hostile work environments" (p. 31). Further, bullying may take on a pattern of abuse, such that the perpetrator engages in a variety of abusive behaviors (Keashly & Jagatic, 2003). An additional feature of bullying is that communication networks with work colleagues, supervisors, and/or Human Resources personnel are often blocked or stifled (Leymann, 1996; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2009). In some cases, all communication with other employees, especially regarding the abuse, can be risky, forbidden, and punished (Leymann, 1996).

Distinguishing workplace bullying from discrimination. Workplace bullying should be distinguished from workplace discrimination. Workplace discrimination, as prohibited by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, outlaws unfair or unequal treatment because of one's membership to a protected class (Gutman, 2000). Protected class membership, under Title VII, includes: race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In addition, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) and the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) prohibits discrimination based on age (i.e., over 40 years of age) and disability, respectively. The Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) applies to all active-duty, reserve, and guard military personnel. Violation of articles within the UCMJ can result in loss of privileges, confinement and/or discharge. Within the UCMJ, Executive Order No. 9981 outlaws unfair or unequal treatment because of one's membership to a protected class for members of the Armed Forces. Protected class membership, under Executive Order 9981, includes: race, color, religion, or national origin. Further, DoD Directive 1350.2 prohibits sexual harassment and discrimination based on sex. While the term discrimination (from a legal standpoint) may not apply to all types of harassment, the term bullying is more encompassing as it includes same-race and same-sex harassment.

As discussed above, a defining characteristic of bullying is its frequent occurrence. While discrimination can be frequent in occurrence (and therefore may be perceived as bullying), it is not a defining feature. For instance, failure to promote an employee because of their race or ethnicity may be considered discrimination but not necessarily workplace bullying. It has been estimated that only one fifth of all workplace bullying may potentially meet the legal criteria for discrimination (Namie, 2007). Even though bullying may be four times more common than discrimination and sexual harassment, organizations are reluctant to create and enforce anti-bullying policies because U.S. laws do not protect employees from this abuse; therefore concern regarding organizational liability is low (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2009). The policies and laws an organization enforces will influence the climate of an organization (Kohut, 2008).

Distinguishing workplace bullying from hazing. The terms bullying and hazing share some likeness; similar to the parallels between discrimination and bullying, the behaviors associated with hazing and bullying may be identical at times; however, bullying and hazing are distinct constructs (Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001). Hazing has been defined as "initiation rituals by which newcomers to an organization are harassed and humiliated as a test or preparation for acceptance into the group" (Bersani, Nesci, & Pozzi, 1980 as cited in Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001, p. 18). Ostvik and Rudmin (2001) outline several distinct differences between these two constructs. Hazing is done by a group of senior members to newer members of the organization, whereas bullying is targeted towards isolated members and perpetrators of bullying can act independently of other members and can be of higher or lower organizational position compared to targets. Hazing has ritualistic characteristics and therefore remains relatively constant over time; bullying behaviors can be less constant and much more varied. Hazing will discontinue after newcomers are initiated into the group, bullying can last indefinitely. After initiation, hazing victims are welcomed into the group whereas victims of bullying are often subjected to continued exclusion.

While the terms bullying and hazing are theoretically distinct (Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001), the department of defense does not have a policy against bullying. The media has been portraying the deaths of Pvt. Danny Chen and Lance Cpl. Harry Lew to be related to hazing. This is an

inaccurate portrayal for several reasons. First, Pvt. Chen and Lance Cpl. Lew were not mistreated in an effort to earn group acceptance; they were targeted in an effort to exclude them from the group- indefinitely. Second, Pvt. Chen and Lance Cpl. Lew were singled out to receive the abusive treatment- hazing is often done to numerous newcomers. Third, Pvt. Chen and Lance Cpl. Lew were not only abused by superiors- but also peers. During the hazing process, senior members target only new members. Sadly, Pvt. Chen and Lance Cpl. Lew presumably did not see an avenue to stop the abuse other than suicide; this is not uncommon for victims of bullying. Victims of hazing are more likely to get injured or die during the hazing event itself (such is the case in the recent A&M Florida Band scandal) and not willingly take their own life.

On December 11, 2011, Secretary of Defense Panetta released a policy statement, which specifies “Recently, we have seen incidents of bullying, hazing, and actions that have show poor judgment..... I will not tolerate any instance where one Service member inflicts any form of physical or psychological abuse that degrades, insults, dehumanizes, or injures another Service member.” (R 232225Z, original source written in all caps). While the sediments in Secretary of Defense’s policy statement were well stated; the DoD does not have a policy against bullying.

The militaries of Canada and the UK have separate hazing and bullying policies, and identify these as a form of harassment. The DoD has the opportunity to use these two countries’ policies as a model to create a separate policy that prohibits bullying. While bullying behaviors clearly violate UCMJ Articles, an established DoD policy could elevate awareness, which by itself may help prevent bullying. Because the UK has an explicit anti-bullying policy, military members can file informal or formal complaints for bullying. One striking statistic from that country is how complaints of bullying outnumber complaints of sexual harassment by a factor of ~2.5 to 1. According to DEOCS data from all DoD personnel during the 4th quarter of FY 11, 10,460 (5.2%) of the men, and 4,963 (11.3%) of the women reported being sexually harassed while working in their current organization within the past 12 months. Extrapolating these numbers to the U.S. military portends a stunning number of potential complaints for bullying.

Appendix B

Hazing in the Department of Defense (DoD)

Background

The most recent cases of suicide in the United States Military have spurred conversation concerning the act of *'hazing'* as a significant contributor to the cause of the death of our most precious commodity, our military members. U.S. Army Private Danny Chen took his life on October 3, 2011 after enduring weeks of physical abuse, humiliation, and racial slurs and forms of hazing. U.S.MC Lance Cpl. Harry Lew took his life on April 3, 2011 after being treated in a similar way. To better understand what might have happened, we can start by defining hazing. The term 'hazing' (as defined by Stop Hazing.org) can be defined as; any activity expected of someone joining a group (or to maintain full status in a group) that humiliates, degrades or risks emotional and/or physical harm, regardless of the person's willingness to participate. In years past, hazing practices were typically considered harmless pranks or comical antics associated with young men in college fraternities. These practices might have been acceptable and unacceptable levels for individual, groups, and organizations.

The most recent major hazing incident in the Navy took place in February of 2012, 8 sailors were removed from the service after they were found guilty of hazing. The Coast Guard's most recent major event occurred last Jun-Jul. Seven coast guard members were charged with hazing aboard a cutter. One had to register as a sex offender as a result of the investigation.

Today we know that hazing extends far beyond college fraternities and is experienced by boys/men and girls/women in school groups, university organizations, athletic teams, the military, and other social and professional organizations. Hazing is a complex social problem that is shaped by power dynamics operating in a group and/or organization and within a particular cultural context.

Hazing

Accounts of hazing have been recorded as early as the 1600's when Oxford University students came to Harvard and introduced fagging and other forms of hazing. The word 'fagging' as defined by Dr. Christopher Wordsworth as the act of toiling or working hard. The use of the word transitioned to include beatings, humiliation, and servitude, among other hazing-like practices. Fagging was encouraged by the school's administration, believing that it was a good way to teach obedience. There have been very recent hazing atrocities in colleges and universities that led to death and reports from various agencies suggest hazing continues. In the United States, there are sufficient numbers of hazing taking place at the elementary and secondary level in schools to cause tremendous concern for teachers and parents.

- 1) The need to belong often supersedes the need for respect, dignity, and safety that the act of hazing can remove.

- 2) The environments that military members go through are more arduous than that of a college or athletic team. Belonging can be seen as the only way to survive. Belonging is a celebration, particularly in the military with its high standards and elite professions.
 - a. factors present in the military that facilitate the occurrence of abusive behaviors include: hierarchical structure/ high power distance between members, masculine culture, emphasizing discipline and deindividualization, authoritarian leadership, and stress associated with military deployments (e.g., lack of personal space). These concepts are all in need of further research.
- 3) Unfortunately, the ceremony of inclusion has evolved into hazing, the act of demeaning, degrading, and awful behaviors toward an individual.
- 4) This becomes especially true once the group determines that the individual cannot or does not fit into the group for any reason. The focus of hazing then can turn from initiation or indoctrination into rejection, punishment and vilification.

The following are some examples of hazing divided into three categories: subtle, harassment, and violent. It is impossible to list all possible hazing behaviors because many are context-specific. While this is not an all-inclusive list, it provides some common examples of hazing traditions.

A. SUBTLE HAZING:

Behaviors that emphasize a power imbalance between new members/rookies and other members of the group or team. Termed “subtle hazing” because these types of hazing are often taken-for-granted or accepted as “harmless” or meaningless. Subtle hazing typically involves activities or attitudes that breach reasonable standards of mutual respect and place new members/rookies on the receiving end of ridicule, embarrassment, and/or humiliation tactics. New members/rookies often feel the need to endure subtle hazing to feel like part of the group or team. (Some types of subtle hazing may also be considered harassment hazing).

Some Examples:

- Deception
- Assigning demerits
- Silence periods with implied threats for violation
- Deprivation of privileges granted to other members
- Requiring new members/rookies to perform duties not assigned to other members
- Socially isolating new members/rookies
- Line-ups and Drills/Tests on meaningless information
- Name calling
- Requiring new members/rookies to refer to other members with titles (e.g. “Mr.,” “Miss”) while they are identified with demeaning terms
- Expecting certain items to always be in one's possession

B. HARASSMENT HAZING: Behaviors that cause emotional anguish or physical discomfort in order to feel like part of the group. Harassment hazing confuses, frustrates, and causes undue stress for new members/rookies. (Some types of harassment hazing can also be considered violent hazing).

Some Examples:

- Verbal abuse
- Threats or implied threats
- Asking new members to wear embarrassing or humiliating attire
- Stunt or skit nights with degrading, crude, or humiliating acts
- Expecting new members/rookies to perform personal service to other members such as carrying books, errands, cooking, cleaning etc
- Sleep deprivation
- Sexual simulations
- Expecting new members/rookies to be deprived of maintaining a normal schedule of bodily cleanliness.
- Be expected to harass others

C. **VIOLENT HAZING** : Behaviors that have the potential to cause physical and/or emotional, or psychological harm.

Some Examples:

- Forced or coerced alcohol or other drug consumption
- Beating, paddling, or other forms of assault
- Branding
- Forced or coerced ingestion of vile substances or concoctions
- Burning
- Water intoxication
- Expecting abuse or mistreatment of animals
- Public nudity
- Expecting illegal activity
- Bondage
- Abductions/kidnaps
- Exposure to cold weather or extreme heat without appropriate protection

Appendix C

Definitions of Military Hazing

Army: Any conduct whereby one military member or employee, regardless of service or rank, unnecessarily causes another military member or employee, regardless of service or rank, to suffer or be exposed to an activity which is cruel, abusive, oppressive or harmful. It is a violation of AR 600-20 and UCMJ Art 92.

Navy: Any conduct whereby a military member or members, regardless of service or rank, without proper authority causes another military member or members, regardless of service or rank, to suffer or be exposed to any activity which is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Soliciting or coercing another to perpetrate any such activity is also considered hazing. Hazing need not involve physical contact among or between military members; it can be verbal or psychological in nature. It is a violation of UCMJ Art. 92 and other UCMJ articles as they apply.

Marine Corps: Any conduct whereby one military member, regardless of Service or rank, causes another military member, regardless of Service or rank, to suffer or be exposed to an activity which is cruel, abusive, humiliating, or oppressive. Hazing includes, but is not limited to, any form of initiation or congratulatory act that involves physically striking another to inflict pain, piercing another's skin in any manner, verbally berating another, encouraging another to excessively consume alcohol, or encouraging another to engage in illegal, harmful, demeaning or dangerous acts. Soliciting or coercing another to participate in any such activity is also considered hazing. Hazing need not involve physical contact among or between military members; it can be verbal or psychological in nature. It is a violation of UCMJ Art. 92 and other UCMJ articles as they apply.

Air Force: Any conduct whereby someone causes another to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful.

Coast Guard: Typically occurs in connection with various impromptu and unsupervised "initiations" and is the result of the erroneous perception that the event gives license to subject an individual to personal abuse. It is a violation of UCMJ Article 92 and other UCMJ articles as they apply.

Department of Defense: any conduct whereby someone causes another to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful.

Appendix D Military Policies on Hazing

Military members are encouraged to report incidents that violate or are not in compliance with the good order and discipline of their units to their chain of command, military police, chaplain, inspector general or equal opportunity representative, or others in a position of authority. The Services have at their disposal the discretion to pursue correctable actions which are punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). For example, some incidents concerning the assault, cruelty and maltreatment of Soldiers under Articles 128 and 93 (respectively) of the UCMJ which are subject to punitive punishment. Further, a violator may also be subject to Article 92 of the UCMJ (Failure to obey a lawful general order or regulation), Article 80 (Attempts), Article 81 (Conspiracy), Article 124 (Maiming), and Article 133 (Conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman).

Commanding officers or heads of units also use unit gathering forums (e.g., town hall meetings, commander's calls, enlisted calls, etc.) to communicate or review Service or unit policy and procedures on handling misconduct or special interest items, such as hazing.

Air Force

In 2005/6, AF leadership determined the Hazing policy would fall under the purview of Commander' Programs (Standards of Conduct). Moreover, MEO's only nexus to hazing occurred if discrimination/sexual harassment were a contributing factor. If a hazing incident occurred that did not involve MEO factors, commanders typically conduct Commander-Directed Investigations (CDIs); If the hazing incident involves MEO factors, commanders typically refer the equal opportunity (EO) portion of the incident to the EO office for processing; or a CDI is conducted and the EO office serves as subject matter experts or technical advisors to ensure all EO-related issues were addressed appropriately.

Additionally, if the Security Forces, Medical staff, etc., notifies the EO office of a hazing incident with possible racial/sexual/ethnic/religious overtones, the EO office will immediately initiate an Equal Opportunity and Treatment Incident (EOTI) reporting. The EOTI process includes rapid reporting to the Major Command, Air Force Personnel Center and Air Staff, followed by an incident clarification.

The procedures are contained in AFI 36-2706, Chapter 5.

Navy

1 - Hazing Policy:

http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/navy/secnavinst/1610_2a.pdf

2 - Hazing Complaints Procedures:

[http://www.ig.navy.mil/complaints/Complaints%20%20\(Hazing\).htm](http://www.ig.navy.mil/complaints/Complaints%20%20(Hazing).htm)

Marines

Marine Corp Order 1700.28

Army

The Army's Hazing Policy (also covers the U.S.AR) is outlined in paragraph 4-20, AR 600-20, Army Command Policy.

United States Coast Guard

Hazing Policy Attached as enclosure to CI 1610.1 memorandum.

http://www.uscg.mil/directives/ci/1000-1999/CI_1610_1.pdf

Appendix E

Process of Reporting Hazing and Prevalence

The Department and the individual military Components do not maintain an enterprise-wide system of records that provide a centralized comprehensive or automated reporting database that is specifically related to hazing offenses. While the Department does not specifically “track” hazing incidents per se, each of the military Components do track unacceptable behaviors (i.e., punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)).

Aggrieved Service members have several avenues of raising or reporting such behavior. These include, but are not limited to, direct reports to the chain of command at all levels, including: the use of “open door” policies; anonymous or attributable means; reports to inspector general (IG); equal opportunity advisors; and reports to chaplains and or other commissioned and senior noncommissioned officers (see attached document for avenues available to service members).

Commanding officers or heads of units can gain a sense of the prevalence of hazing and other forms of misconduct by using organizational climate surveys or unit climate assessments. The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) has an outstanding climate assessment instrument which is available to the Services. This instrument has been used by the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the recent past.

The commanding officer must be informed immediately of any allegation of hazing as every allegation of hazing must be investigated. Upon notification, a commander typically conducts a preliminary inquiry or command investigation in order to best ascertain the facts and circumstances, maintain objectivity and receive guidance for action. Commanders also ensure appropriate assistance is available for any victim, potential victim or witness of a hazing incident. In those cases where an allegation is substantiated, the Commander must determine how to address the violation. They can address the issue through (non-judicial punishment) or through disciplinary (UCMJ) proceedings. In some instances, remedial training may be conducted.

In some instances, such as deployed environments, service members may not have immediate access to a traditional chain-of-command (e.g., commanding officer, first sergeant, or senior enlisted advisor). In those cases, other avenues or forms of communication should be used to report such incidents. These avenues could include chaplains, inspectors general, or any other persons in a position of authority and the forms of communications could consist of hotlines or advice lines, text messages, phone calls, written notes, etc.

Appendix F Military Hazing Training

Secretary Panetta recently issued a message regarding standards of conduct in which the Department “will not tolerate any instance where one service member inflicts any form of physical or psychological abuse that degrades insults, dehumanizes, or injures another service member. We will protect each other through fair, scrupulous, and unbiased treatment as individuals - caring for them, teaching them, and leading them.” Subsequently, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Secretary of the Army, and Sergeant Major issued a tri-signed statement that emphasizes that hazing is not tolerated amongst the ranks of the armed forces.

In the past, the Department issued policy memoranda that prohibited hazing and set forth guidance for dealing with violations. The policy also stated that “Hazing must not be allowed to occur; and when it does, action should be prompt and effective – not only to deal with the incident, but also to prevent further occurrences.”

The Department has enterprise-wide directives and instructions on diversity and military equal opportunity (harassment), sexual assault and suicide. Execution and implementation of these policies is de-decentralized to the military Components and Defense activities. In addition, the Department has a DoD directive on Victim and Witness Assistance which governs assistance to victims and witnesses of crimes committed in violation of the UCMJ. Furthermore, the military Component have their own specific policies and instructions regarding prohibition on hazing and harassment. The Navy’s policy for example, states that it is the “Responsibility of every Sailor and Marine to ensure that hazing does not occur in any form at any level.”

Military senior leaders (Officers/Enlisted) are provided leadership training prior to be assigned to key roles. Training at military institutions, including boot camp, OCS, ROTC, PME, War College, prospective commander courses, etc, represent a rich opportunity to introduce/reinforce hazing policy to military members. Furthermore, all commanding officers are required to conduct annual organizational climate surveys. Corrective action or re-training is provided as well as reviewing course content and updating as appropriate.

Services

Army

The Army's Hazing Policy (also covers the U.S.AR) is outlined in paragraph 4-20, AR 600-20, Army Command Policy. The policy as written does not require periodic training. The Army Reserve does not have a requirement to conduct this training. The Army’s initial entry training program (basic and advanced) receives continuous trainings on hazing IAW TRADOC REG 350-6 for leaders and trainees.

Training on topics from AR 600-20, Command Policy, such as Equal Opportunity (EO), Fraternalization, Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP), and human relations begins at initial military training for all soldiers and officers. Commanders are required to conduct training at a minimum of semi-annually within their units to ensure awareness and

emphasize compliance with Army policies. The aforementioned training is considered part of a commander's requirement to conduct semiannual training. Aside from this, there is no separate additional training conducted prior to a deployment.

Navy

Hazing is NOT currently a "core" topic for GMT (Equal Opportunity, Sexual Harassment and Grievance Procedures; Sexual Assault Prevention and Response; Suicide Prevention; and Operational Stress Control. Because of the critical nature of these topics, the core GMT lessons must be delivered in instructor-led training sessions by command leadership). Hazing IS a required GMT topic for Sailors who are re-enlisting. Hazing is currently under review, and there is a NAVADMIN in DRAFT that will charge EOAs with tracking (not processing) hazing complaints.

Officers in accession training (Officer Training Command (OTC), Direct Commission Officer (DCO)/Officer Development School (ODS), Officer Candidate School (OCS), United States Naval Academy (U.S.NA) and all NROTC students including Midshipman) receive classroom training on hazing, fraternization, sexual harassment, sexual assault, and Navy/Marine Corps core values training.

The lecture/briefing is augmented with facilitated discussion with a senior and experienced Navy leader on a wide range of topics related to expectations of moral and ethical performance for commissioned officers, as well as programmatic support available to enforce standards. Topics include Navy Command Managed Equal Opportunity (CMEO) policy and procedures for uniformed personnel; Navy Equal Opportunity policy and procedures for the civilian workforce; the purpose, composition, and function Command Assessment and Training Teams, and procedures to be followed in the event of a discrimination or sexual harassment complaint.

Enlisted personnel receive classroom training during Recruiting Training on Navy Core Values and Equal Opportunity. The Navy Core Values lesson defines terms: hazing, sexual harassment, and fraternization within the context of the Navy Core Values of Honor Courage and Commitment. The Equal Opportunity lesson provides classroom instruction on how social backgrounds affects prejudice and discrimination, including their relationship to race, color, religion, gender, age, national origin, ethnic background, or sexual orientation.

This lesson also provides information and Navy policies on extremist groups and their beliefs, participation in these groups, and policies related to sexual harassment. Additionally, prior to graduation, the Recruit Division Commander facilitates an open forum discussion that introduces the topic of diversity within the Navy. This provides an opportunity for recruits to exchange values and beliefs with the facilitator focusing discussion on the benefits of diversity in the Navy and achieving goals and mission through team building.

Through CNO-required general military training, all officer and enlisted personnel receive annual instructor-led command leadership equal opportunity training, which includes the topic of unlawful discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender and religion.

Marine Corps:

All Marines receive hazing policy training during entry level training for both officer and enlisted Marines. Hazing policy is included as part of leadership training in Professional Military Education Courses and the annual Commanders Course. Per the Marine Corps policy, all units are required to provide appropriate training as part of its unit's orientation (i.e., when a Marine joins a new unit) and annual Troop Information Programs to ensure Marines are explicitly aware of the Marine Corps hazing policy.

The Marine Corps requires that Marines are taught the hazing policy and prohibitions contained in the Marine Corps Order during unit orientation, Military Professional Education, and annual Troop Information Programs.

Those Marines selected for command also receive instructions concerning hazing during the Commander's Course. In summary, the Marine Corps provides extensive instruction toward preventing hazing and discrimination and has a zero tolerance policy in these areas. This instruction is well-coordinated between the various schools that Marines attend during entry level training and in subsequent unit-level training.

Air Force

The Air Force utilizes a comprehensive education and training program designed to equip our Airmen with the appropriate tools needed to prevent and/or respond to hazing and harassment. By integrating these concepts across the continuum of learning throughout an Airman's career (i.e. Basic Training/Commissioning Sources, Professional Military Education (PME), Commanders Courses, First Term Airmen Center (FTAC), and Ancillary Training), these preventative measures are instilled in our Airmen, become part of the AF culture and help to ensure good order and discipline. During basic training, all Airmen receive initial Equal Opportunity (EO), Free Exercise of Religion and Human Relations training in addition to an Article 137 and Commander's briefing that specifically addresses the themes of bullying, hazing, and maltreatment. This training is then reiterated during tech school orientation and reinforced at first duty stations via FTAC.

Additionally, anti-discrimination themes and current events, such as the alleged hazing incidents in the AOR and several university campuses, are woven into classroom discussions and case studies where appropriate as part of officer and enlisted leadership development (i.e. Air Command and Staff College, Air War College, Airman Leadership School, and Senior Noncommissioned Officer Academy). Furthermore, those Airmen selected for command, to include those selected to serve as senior enlisted advisors, also receive this training during the Commander's Course and First Sergeants Academy respectively. Thereafter, Human Relations training is reinforced annually across the Total Force with units retaining the discretion to provide additional training (i.e. Human Relations, Free Exercise of Religion, and EO) in conjunction with Wingman's Day/Commander's Call based on local conditions or mission requirements.

Finally, as Airmen prepare to deploy, they are also required to complete deployment-related EO and Human Relations training. In a nutshell, although no training regimen is foolproof, we believe that using our comprehensive, continual training approach ensures the right training is delivered to the right Airmen at the right time.

Coast Guard

Complete one time Hazing Awareness Training; however, commanders are encouraged to incorporate the training into the annual unit training schedule. (IAW COMDTINST 1610.1 23 JAN 1991)

Appendix G Civilian Resources

1992 Report DOD SERVICE ACADEMIES
More Changes Needed, to Eliminate F lazings
<http://161.203.16.4/d36t11/148057.pdf>

The National Collaborative for Hazing Research and Prevention
<http://www.hazingstudy.org/index.php>

Initial Findings of the National Study of Student Hazing: Examining and Transforming Campus Hazing Cultures: This investigation is the most comprehensive study of hazing to date and includes survey responses from more than 11,000 undergraduate students at 53 colleges and universities in different regions of the U.S. and interviews with more than 300 students and staff at 18 of these campuses.

The Gordie Foundation: The mission of the Gordie Foundation is to provide today's young people with the skills to navigate the dangers of alcohol, binge drinking, peer pressure and hazing.

National Collegiate Athletic Association: NCAA is a voluntary association of about 1,200 colleges and universities, athletic conferences and sports organizations devoted to the sound administration of intercollegiate athletics

Alfred University Study
http://www.alfred.edu/hs_hazing

We want people to be aware of the prevalence and nature of this problem, and ways in which we may be able to prevent it.

Bellmore-Merrick Parents for Change
<http://www.bellmore-merrickparents.org>

Bellmore-Merrick Parents for Change is a grass roots organization of parents, families, committed to improving the culture of the schools. The group was created in response to the football hazing fiasco at Mepham High School.

Cornell's Hazing Resource
<http://hazing.cornell.edu>

This site is a resource for students, staff, faculty, alumni and others interested in learning about hazing within student groups at Cornell University. Since hazing is a national problem that occurs in high schools, colleges, and other settings, this information may be useful to visitors as well. Although hazing is not unique to Cornell, we believe that it is important to examine these practices explicitly in an attempt to overcome the secrecy that perpetuates them.

Hank Nuwer
<http://hazing.hanknuwer.com>

Unofficial clearinghouse that tracks hazing deaths and incidents by author of three books on hazing.

Hazing Lawyer and Attorney—Douglas Fierberg, Esq.
<http://www.hazinglaw.com>

Doug Fierberg is an attorney who resolves claims nationwide involving wrongful death, personal injury, hazing, sexual assault, and other civil disputes.

Mothers Against School Hazing
<http://www.mashinc.org>

The mission of MASH, Mothers Against School Hazing is to eliminate hazing, bullying, and/or abusive acts toward our children.

Report-it
<http://www.report-it.com>
A site with information on how to report various incidents.

Stop Hazing.org
<http://www.stophazing.org>
We have an extensive site covering many aspects of hazing including fraternity, sorority, athletic, high school and military hazing

Inside Hazing
<http://www.insidehazing.com/index.php>
To provide methods of prevention and intervention in hazing; to explain the psychology of hazing in high school, college, the military, and the workplace. Educational information is included for use in anti-hazing and anti-bullying initiatives among fraternities, sororities, teams, and other groups.

Bully Intervention Experts
<http://www.bullyinterventionexperts.com/>

Anti-bullying Network
<http://www.education.unisa.edu.au/bullying/>

Stop Bullying Now
<http://www.stopbullyingnow.com/>

Safe Communities/Safe Schools
<http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/safeschools/bullying/overview.html>

Olweus Program U.S. site
<http://www.clemson.edu/olweus/>

Survey and Intervention System
targetbully.com (contact for survey and intervention system)

Stop Bullying Now (government site)

<http://www.stopbullyingnow.hrsa.gov/kids/>

Reporting System

<http://www.bullystoppers.com/> (reporting system)

Champions for Students with Disabilities

<http://www.pacer.org/>

White House Conference on Bullying

managed by the Department of Health & Human Services in partnership with the Department of Education and Department of Justice

http://www.stopbullying.gov/references/white_house_conference/

How to Avoid the Hazing Trap

© Copyright 2002, Civil Air Patrol.

Robert B. Smith, Lt Col, CAP

Chief, Curriculum Development

Cadet Programs Directorate, Civil Air Patrol National Headquarters

Timothy S. Doty, Lt Col, USAF

Former Commander (1998-2002)

Northeast Liaison Region

CAP-USAF

In addition there are numerous books on the subject.

Appendix H Creating a Hazing Database

To improve the tracking of sexual assaults, the Department is implementing the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database. We can collaborate with the Sexual Assault Prevention Response Office (SAPRO) and explore the possibility of collecting data on “hazing” incidents as part of the Sexual Assault database or any other existing databases used by other functional areas, such as the Inspector General, Military Police, Legal, or criminal investigative agencies.

Additionally, the Department’s Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity office is working closely with the Services to identify uniform data elements to capture information on discrimination and sexual harassment. Data on hazing incidents could also possibly be rolled into this review. Using an existing database system is preferred over creating a separate or new data collection system for a single category of misconduct.

A hazing database would require a management plan that strategically included awareness, use, accessibility, maintenance, and security. As hazing can also be tied to suicide, as much as 5% of suicides/attempts are related to hazing. Existing policies, departments, and suicide prevention resources and databases may be a strong framework from which to align tracking, education, and resources regarding hazing.

Again, DEOMI is in the unique position to identify the incidence of hazing in commands, by leveraging Locally Developed Questions (LDQs) in the DEOMI Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS). DEOMI recently created the following list of LDQs that, if approved, can be posted along with the extant list of LDQs, and leveraged by commanders. Moreover, if a Service commander wished to, all commanders could be directed to use specific LDQs from the list; a rollup DEOCS report would provide higher-echelon commanders with an estimate of hazing prevalence within specific Service communities.

The current list of LDQs:

- While at this unit, I have never witnessed hazing activity.
- While at this unit, I have never been hazed.
- While at this unit, I have never been pressured to participate in hazing activities directed toward others.
- Hazing activities do not occur at this unit.
- Unit leadership discourages hazing.
- Unit leadership does not tolerate hazing.
- Unit leadership has published a policy that prohibits hazing.
- Unit leadership would punish anyone who hazes others.

Appendix I

ARMY Better Opportunities for Single Soldiers (BOSS)

Who is BOSS?

The BOSS program focuses on the department of the Army active duty single Soldier, but BOSS activities are open to all MWR patrons to include the National Guard, Army Reserve, other branches of service, Department of Defense civilians, Foreign Service members and geographical bachelors. Anyone can participate with the BOSS program.

What is BOSS?

Better Opportunities for Single Soldiers (BOSS) is a dynamic Department of the Army program that single Soldiers can participate in to enhance their Quality of Life, contribute to their community through Community Service activities, and assist in the planning and execution of their own Recreation and Leisure events.

BOSS Components

Quality of Life

Quality of Life includes those issues that Soldiers can directly or indirectly influence to enhance their morale, living environment, or personal growth and development. Issues raised during BOSS meetings will be directed to the appropriate command or staff agency for resolution on the installation. Army-wide issues are forwarded to the Army Family Action Plan Conference for possible DA resolution.

Recreation and Leisure

Fun activities are planned by the BOSS council working in conjunction with the MWR Advisor and CSM. These events are geared towards the desires of the Single Soldiers on that installation.

Community Service

BOSS makes a difference by volunteering in community projects and events. This is always voluntary in nature, and Soldiers find this to be personally rewarding.

Mission and Vision

Mission

To enhance the quality of life and morale of single Soldiers, increase Soldier retention, and sustain readiness

Vision

Be the advocate for single Soldiers to ensure they have a Quality of Life commensurate with their service <http://new.armymwr.com/reclisure/single/default.aspx>

NAVY COALITION OF SAILORS AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE DECISIONS (CSADD)

NAVADMIN 379/10 COALITION OF SAILORS AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE DECISIONS
MONTHLY TOPICS

September 24, 2011 Posted by NavAdmin under [NAVADMIN](#), [NAVADMIN 2010](#)

R 010141Z DEC 10
FM CNO WASHINGTON DC
TO AL NAVADMIN
NAVADMIN 379/10

SUBJ/COALITION OF SAILORS AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE DECISIONS MONTHLY
TOPICS//

REF/A/DOC/OPNAVINST 1500.80/18JUN2010//

AMPN/REF A OUTLINES THE POLICY AND GUIDANCE OF THE COALITION OF
SAILORS

AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE DECISIONS (CSADD) PROGRAM//

RMKS/1. THIS NAVADMIN ANNOUNCES THE MONTHLY TOPICS FOR THE PEER MENTORING PROGRAM: COALITION OF SAILORS AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE DECISIONS (CSADD) FOR 2011. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROGRAM WAS DESIGNED AS A RESOURCE AND TOOL FOR ACTIVE AND RESERVE SAILORS, RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) CANDIDATES AND JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (JROTC) PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE GOOD DECISION MAKING PROCESSES, ENABLING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND INFLUENCE AMONG PEERS AT THE MOST JUNIOR LEVELS.

2. MONTHLY TOPICS ARE LISTED BELOW. THESE TOPICS WILL BE USED BY THE CSADD CHAPTERS IN DEVELOPING THEIR MESSAGES OF SUCCESS FOR THEIR SHIPMATES. REFERENCE INFORMATION AND LINKS WILL BE POSTED ON THE CSADD FACEBOOK PAGE AT [HTTP://WWW.FACEBOOK.COM/PAGES/COALITION-OF-SAILORS-AGAINST-DESTRUCTIVE-DECISIONS-CSADD/299642495316](http://www.facebook.com/pages/coalition-of-sailors-against-destructive-decisions-csadd/299642495316) (ALL LOWERCASE). IN ADDITION, CHAPTERS CAN POST INFORMATION ON THE BEST PRACTICES THEY ARE USING TO SUPPORT THEIR CHAPTER VIA THE CSADD BLOGSPOT AT [HTTP://CSADD.NAVYLIVE.DODLIVE.MIL](http://csadd.navylive.dodlive.mil).

COMMANDS NOT UTILIZING FACEBOOK MAY ALSO ACCESS THE INFORMATION THROUGH THE NAVAL SAFETY CENTER WEBSITE [HTTP:WWW.SAFETYCENTER.NAVY.MIL](http://www.safetycenter.navy.mil) BY VISITING THE CMC TOOLBOX. FOR EXISTING FACEBOOK SUBSCRIBERS, ACCESS TO THE CSADD FAN PAGE CAN BE FOUND BY TYPING COALITION OF SAILORS AGAINST

DESTRUCTIVE DECISIONS IN THE SEARCH ENGINE. ONCE ON THE PAGE, CLICK THE "BECOME A FAN" BOX AND YOU WILL RECEIVE PAGE UPDATES AND POSTS ON A REGULAR BASIS. THE MONTHLY TOPICS LISTED BELOW ARE DESIGNED AS KEY FOCAL POINTS FOR EACH MONTH FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

THE DESIGNATED TOPICS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

- A. JAN – OPERATIONAL UNPLANNED PREGNANCY PREVENTION
- B. FEB – FLEET AND FAMILY SUPPORT CENTERS
- C. MAR – PHYSICAL HEALTH READINESS
- D. APR – SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE
- E. MAY – OPERATIONAL STRESS CONTROL/SUICIDE AWARENESS
- F. JUN – DRIVING SAFETY (TEXTING/SPEED/SEATBELTS)
- G. JUL – OFF-DUTY RECREATION
- H. AUG – NEW AGE DRUG AWARENESS
- I. SEP – CSADD VOLUNTEER OUTREACH MONTH
- J. OCT – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
- K. NOV – GREAT AMERICAN SMOKEOUT
- L. DEC – DRUNK AND DRUGGED DRIVING

3. THESE KEY FOCAL TRAINING TOPICS ARE DESIGNED TO PROVOKE THOUGHT AND INSPIRE YOUNG LEADERS WITHIN OUR NAVY TO DISCUSS THESE ISSUES AMONGST THEIR PEER GROUP AND CREATE AWARENESS THROUGH A VARIETY OF SOCIAL NETWORKS AND ACTIVITIES, ALL OF WHICH SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND EXECUTED AT THE MOST JUNIOR LEVEL. CSADD ENCOURAGES POSITIVE INFLUENCE AND BEHAVIOR WHILE AT THE SAME TIME BRINGING TOGETHER ON-LINE SOCIAL NETWORKING WITH PEER INTERACTION, AND IN PERSON NETWORKING, REINFORCING THE MESSAGE OF SHIPMATES HELPING SHIPMATES. ALL COMMANDS ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO ENERGIZE THIS GROUP OF LEADERS IN GROWING SUCCESS WITHIN THEIR COMMANDS AND THROUGHOUT OUR NAVY. WE HAVE EXPERIENCED IMPROVEMENTS IN ALL AREAS OF PERSONAL CONDUCT AND SAFETY DURING THIS FIRST YEAR OF CSADD. YOUR EFFORTS TO SUPPORT THESE GROUPS AND ACTIVITIES WILL ENABLE US TO CONTINUE TO SUCCEED AS OUR YOUNG SAILORS TAKE ON LEADERSHIP CHALLENGES ON AND OFF-DUTY.

4. POINT OF CONTACT: YN1(SW/AW) MONICA LONG, CNO (N1) ASSISTANT TO THE FLEET MASTER CHIEF FOR NAVY'S TOTAL FORCE, (703) 697-3372 OR VIA E-MAIL: MONICA.LONG(AT)NAVY.MIL.

5. RELEASED BY VADM MARK FERGUSON, N1.//

<http://www.navadminlibrary.com/2011/09/24/navadmin-37910-coalition-of-sailors-against-destructive-decisions-monthly-topics/>

AIR FORCE WINGMAN PROGRAM

Posted 10/29/2009

[Printable Fact Sheet](#)

The Air Force established the Wingman program to encourage Airmen and their families to look out for each other and to intervene when signs of stress are observed.

The Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Wingman Support Coordinator serves as the point of contact for providing guidance and education on adopting the Wingman culture and integrating the Wingman concept into unit activities. This office is also responsible explaining the principles of the Wingman "BOLD FACE" concept and the dimensions of wellness. The Wingman Support Coordinator can be reached at (937) 257-7272, or via e-mail at 88ABW.CVK@wpafb.af.mil.

What is a Wingman?

The term Wingman stems from a time-honored tradition within our Air Force flying community that essentially says a lead pilot will never lose his/her Wingman. It's a promise, a pledge, a commitment between Airmen who fly. The Air Force wants to cultivate and instill this same culture of commitment between all Airmen and Air Force civilians in all career fields and specialties via the Wingman program.

BOLD FACE actions

Also borrowed from the aviation community, "BOLD FACE" actions are the steps necessary to promptly and completely deal with in-flight emergencies. They are committed to memory by pilots to ensure a methodical, consistent approach to a hazardous situation. The lessons learned after a suicide indicate the "in-flight emergency" signs were present, but not addressed by fellow Wingmen. If those Airmen knew the 4 basic steps of the Wingman "BOLD FACE" they would have:

- 1) Assessed the desire for self harm
- 2) Assessed the means for self harm
- 3) Assessed the status of the 4 dimensions of wellness (Physical, Emotional, Social, Spiritual)
- 4) Stayed on their Wingman's wingtip until a positive hand-off was complete (In other words, don't leave the Wingman alone, hand over to a supervisor, first sergeant, commander, and/or other helping agency).

While suicide prevention is an important objective, the Wingman program is much broader than that.

Be Alert, Get Involved, and Take Action!

Airmen at all levels of command have a role as Wingmen. Commanders bear responsibility for the total welfare of their assigned personnel, including the physical, emotional, social and spiritual dimensions. They recognize when their people need help and know where to send them to get it. Supervisors are the first line of defense for the well being of the people they supervise.

Often they are in a position to spot the first signs of trouble and are in the best position to listen and engage. All Airmen are encouraged to lead by example -- to be good Wingmen, by taking care of themselves and those around them -- and taking action when signs of stress are observed.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Integrated Delivery System

The mission of the IDS is to integrate helping agencies into one seamless team that provides assistance to active duty military, Reservists, family members, DOD civilian employees and retirees. The IDS is committed to improving the delivery of family services, prevention and education activities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The IDS helping agencies include:

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Treatment Program (ADAPT) - 257-4121.
American Red Cross - 257-9876
Chaplain Services - 257-7427
Employee Assistance Program - 904-2807 or (800) 222-0364
Family Advocacy - 257-6429
Family Member Programs - 257-2644
Airman & Family Readiness Center - 257-3592
Health & Wellness Center - 904-9355
Mental Health Clinic- 257-6876/6877
Military Equal Opportunity 257-5028
Sexual Assault Response Coordinator - 257-7272
Victim Witness Assistance Program - 257-6142
Wingman Support Coordinator - 257-7272

Be a Wingman! Changing the culture starts with leadership, but depends upon all of us!

<http://www.wpafb.af.mil/library/factsheets/factsheet.asp?id=9135>

Marine Corps

The Marine Corps does not have a system similar to BOSS or CSADD, however, they are leveraging existing programs and concepts in place, as illustrated below.

Marines Use Buddy System to Address Suicides: Speaker Stresses Duty to Rescue other Corpsmen

Tony Perry Los Angeles Times
Posted September 12 2010 at midnight.

HELMAND PROVINCE, Afghanistan - The young Marine had just gotten a Dear John letter from a woman he had described as "my everything." Days later, he killed himself while on guard duty here in Helmand province. None of his buddies had seen the signs of the man's downward emotional spiral. The pain of his death was visible on their faces as Sgt. Maj. Carlton W. Kent, the senior enlisted man in the Marine Corps, delivered a message he has repeated at a dozen bases and outposts throughout this dangerous Afghan desert region: Marines are committing suicide in record numbers, and something has to be done.

Last year, 52 Marines killed themselves, compared with 42 the previous year. The 2009 toll is the highest since record-keeping began, giving the Marine Corps the grisly distinction of having the highest rate of suicide of any U.S. military service. The corps, Kent said, can't wait five years for a study to propose solutions to the growing problem. The answer, he said, lies within the corps itself. Marines have a solemn duty to rescue other Marines from suicide, just as they would come to their aid in combat, he said. At each location, young Marines listened intently. But at the outpost where the young Marine had killed himself, the troops seemed particularly struck by Kent's admonition. (In deference to his family's privacy, the Los Angeles Times is not disclosing the Marine's name or unit.)

Of the 52 who committed suicide last year, 16 had never deployed to a war zone; 25 committed suicide after such a deployment; and 11 killed themselves while in Iraq, Afghanistan or Africa. Along with the deaths, there were 154 attempts, also a record. Some kill themselves at the beginning of a deployment, others soon after returning home, unable to adjust to garrison duty or civilian life. Some suicides occur just as a battalion is preparing to return home, possibly because the Marine feels that he did not perform well in the war zone. The unrelenting stress of back-to-back deployments is a key factor in the rise in suicides, researchers say. Recently, the "dwell time" has been 1:1 - for example, seven months at home, seven months deployed. Marine leaders hope the current dwell time of 2:1, or 14 months at home for each seven months deployed, will help. Other factors include relationship, family and money problems; run-ins with authority figures; and a sense of isolation.

Since the beginning of the war in Afghanistan in 2001, and of the Iraq war in 2003, the Marines have tried various programs to sharpen awareness of suicide in their ranks and to break down the stigma that keeps Marines from seeking help. Recruits in boot camp are told to watch out for their buddies. Sergeants are given training in how to spot Marines nearing the edge. Chaplains and medical corpsmen are tutored on how to intervene when a Marine begins showing signs of depression. Still, the rate has increased, and last year, for the first time, it exceeded that of a similar age group in civilian life.

For U.S. civilians age 18 through 25, the rate is 20 suicides per 100,000; in 2009, the Marine Corps' rate was 24 per 100,000. The rate also exceeded that of the Army (now at 22 per 100,000) for the first time. In response, the corps is preparing a series of updated videos for Marines, showing realistic scenarios of a fictional "Cpl. Decker" who, with marital and job problems, begins thinking of suicide. The Marines are also developing a "de-stress" telephone line with former Marines and corpsmen available to provide confidential counseling. The idea, said Col. Grant Olbrich, section head of the Marine Corps Suicide Prevention Program, is to "leverage" a culture that calls for the men and women to "leave no Marine behind," in the famous combat motto. "It doesn't mean they are less of a Marine if they need some help to get through a rough patch in their lives," Olbrich said. For the Marines at this Helmand province outpost, the death that mattered most was that of the Marine who killed himself there without apparent warning. "We never knew that he was hurting," one Marine said quietly.

Appendix J

Allport's Scale

Allport's Scale is a measure of the manifestation of prejudice in a society. Allport's Scale of Prejudice goes from 1 – 5.

1. Antilocution: Antilocution means a majority group freely makes jokes about a minority group. Speech is in terms of negative stereotypes and negative images. This is also called hate speech. It is commonly seen as harmless by the majority. Antilocution itself may not be harmful, but it sets the stage for more severe outlets for prejudice.

2. Avoidance: Members of the majority group actively avoid people in a minority group. No direct harm may be intended, but harm is done through isolation. (e.g. Social exclusion)

3. Discrimination: Minority group is discriminated against by denying them opportunities and services and so putting prejudice into action. Behaviors have the specific goal of harming the minority group by preventing them from achieving goals, getting education or jobs, etc. The majority group is actively trying to harm the minority. (e.g. Jim Crow laws, Apartheid, Koreans in Japan)

4. Physical Attack: The majority group vandalizes burns or destroys minority group property and carry out violent attacks on individuals or groups. Physical harm is done to members of the minority group. Examples are lynchings of blacks, pogroms against Jews in Europe and British Loyalists in the 1700s.

5. Extermination: The majority group seeks extermination or removal of the minority group. They attempt to eliminate either the entire or a large fraction of a group of people.

Appendix K
The Secretary of the Army's Senior Review Panel Report on Sexual Harassment
&
Resiliency Training