UNCLASSIFIED

# DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER

DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY

DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
SUITE 0944
FT. BELVOIR, VA 22060-6218

UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## Policy on the Redistribution of DTIC-Supplied Information

As a condition for obtaining DTIC services, all information received from DTIC that is not clearly marked for public release will be used only to bid or perform work under a U.S. Government contract or grant or for purposes specifically authorized by the U.S. Government agency that is sponsoring access. Further, the information will not be published for profit or in any manner offered for sale.

Non-compliance may result in termination of access and a requirement to return all information obtained from DTIC.

## NOTICE

We are pleased to supply this document in response to your request.

The acquisition of technical reports, notes, memorandums, etc., is an active, ongoing program at the **Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC)** that depends, in part, on the efforts and interest of users and contributors.

Therefore, if you know of the existence of any significant reports, etc., that are not in the **DTIC** collection, we would appreciate receiving copies or information related to their sources and availability.

The appropriate regulations are Department of Defense Directive 3200.12, DoD Scientific and Technical Information Program; Department of Defense Directive 5230.24, Distribution Statements on Technical Documents; American National Standard Institute (ANSI) Standard Z39.18-1987, Scientific and Technical Reports- Organization,Preparation,and Production;Department of Defense 5200. 1-R, Information Security Program Regulation.

Our **Programs Management Branch, DTIC-OCP,** will assist in resolving any questions you may have concerning documents to be submitted. Telephone numbers for that office are **(703) 767-8038,** or **DSN 427-8038.** The **Reference Services Branch, DTIC-BRR**, will assist in document identification, ordering and related questions. Telephone numbers for that office are **(703) 767-9040,** or **DSN 427-9040.**

DO NOT RETURN THIS DOCUMENT TO DTIC

EACH ACTIVITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DESTRUCTION OF THIS DOCUMENT ACCORDING TO APPLICABLE REGULATIONS.

# UNCLASSIFIED

AD-A166 702

DTIC FILE COPY

# AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

STUDENT REPORT

THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

MAJOR THEODORE PAIGE, JR. 86-1930

*"insights into tomorrow"*

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 30 1986
S D
E

86 4 2

## DISCLAIMER

The views and conclusions expressed in this document are those of the author. They are not intended and should not be thought to represent official ideas, attitudes, or policies of any agency of the United States Government. The author has not had special access to official information or ideas and has employed only open-source material available to any writer on this subject.

This document is the property of the United States Government. It is available for distribution to the general public. A loan copy of the document may be obtained from the Air University Interlibrary Loan Service (AUL/LDEX, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 36112) or the Defense Technical Information Center. Request must include the author's name and complete title of the study.

This document may be reproduced for use in other research reports or educational pursuits contingent upon the following stipulations:

-- Reproduction rights do not extend to any copyrighted material that may be contained in the research report.

-- All reproduced copies must contain the following credit line: "Reprinted by permission of the Air Command and Staff College."

-- All reproduced copies must contain the name(s) of the report's author(s).

-- If format modification is necessary to better serve the user's needs, adjustments may be made to this report--this authorization does not extend to copyrighted information or material. The following statement must accompany the modified document: "Adapted from Air Command and Staff Research Report ___(number)___ entitled ___(title)___ by ___(author)___."

-- This notice must be included with any reproduced or adapted portions of this document.

REPORT NUMBER 86-1930

TITLE THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR THEODORE PAIGE, JR. USAF/NG

FACULTY ADVISOR MAJOR STEPHEN L. HAVRON, ACSC/EDOWA

SPONSOR COLONEL NELSON V. WOOD, DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE - NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, HUMAN RESOURCES, NGB/HR

Submitted to the faculty in partial fulfillment of requirements for graduation.

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE
AIR UNIVERSITY
MAXWELL AFB, AL 36112

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>UNCLASSIFIED | 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS<br>AD-A166 782 |
| 2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY | 3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT<br>STATEMENT "A"<br>Approved for public release;<br>Distribution is unlimited. |
| 2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE | |
| 4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)<br>86-1930 | 5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) |
| 6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION<br>ACSC/EDCC — 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) | 7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION |
| 6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)<br>Maxwell AFB AL 36112-5542 | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) |
| 8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION — 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) | 9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER |
| 8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) | 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.<br>PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. / PROJECT NO / TASK NO. / WORK UNIT NO |
| 11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)<br>THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING PROGRAM IN | |
| 12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)<br>Paige, Theodore, Jr., Major, USAF/ANG | |
| 13a. TYPE OF REPORT — 13b. TIME COVERED FROM ____ TO ____ | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day)<br>1986 April — 15. PAGE COUNT<br>39 |
| 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION<br>ITEM 11: THE NATIONAL GUARD | |
| 17. COSATI CODES — FIELD / GROUP / SUB GR | 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) |

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)


An analysis of the National Guard's Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment, a review of sexual harassment training taking place, and a list of recommendations to strengthen the program as presently taught (1986).


| | |
|---|---|
| 20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT<br>UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS ☐ | 21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>UNCLASSIFIED |
| 22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL<br>ACSC/EDCC Maxwell AFB AL 35112-5542 | 22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)<br>(205) 293-2483 — 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL |

DD FORM 1473, 83 APR — EDITION OF 1 JAN 73 IS OBSOLETE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

# PREFACE

The subject of this paper is sexual harassment training in the Air National Guard. In particular, it is a review of the National Guard Bureau's Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment.

The author has been involved with this specific program for about one year, both as a Guard Bureau trainee and as a certified Guard Bureau trainer. During this time he had the opportunity to hear many comments on the National Guard Bureau's sexual harassment training package. Although many individuals making these comments were themselves trainers, their favorable remarks were few and far between. The author was also disappointed in the program, but never took the time to pinpoint why. This project provided an opportunity to do that with the help of many of the course managers at Guard units in the field. The author hopes the criticism is constructive and will provide those who can make changes the opportunity to hear the voices of those who feel change is necessary.

The author did not intend this project to be a critique of NGB-HR nor does he in any way envy the job NGB-HR faced in coordinating Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment

The author would be remiss if he did not acknowledge the cooperation and assistance of the many states who contributed to this project. Without their support and response this project could not have been completed, nor would he have found that his concerns were few as compared to those in the field. At Maxwell AFB, Majors Stephen Harvon and Ron Sams, and classmates of his first mix listened and provided constructive comments to his first thoughts. Major Stephen Harvon, his advisor, also provided further comment and editorial guidance. The contributions of his sponsor, Colonel Nelson V. Wood, were also invaluable.

# ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Major Theodore Paige, Jr. is a member of the Pennsylvania National Guard. He presently serves as the State's Social Actions Staff Officer, Headquarters, Pennsylvania Air National Guard, Fort Indiantown Gap, Annville, Pennsylvania. He previously served as Chief, Social Actions, and Equal Opportunity and Treatment Officer at Middletown, Pennsylvania. He received his Bachelor's degree in Social Welfare and his Master's degree in Social Administration from Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He was commissioned through the Academy of Military Science in November, 1975. He has completed the Air Force's Squadron Officers School and is presently a resident student of the Air Command and Staff College, Class of 1986.

Accession For
NTIS GRA&I ☒
DTIC TAB ☐
Unannounced ☐
Justification
By
Distribution/
Availability Codes
Dist | Avail and/or Special
A-1

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Preface | iii |
| About the Author | iv |
| List of Illustrations | vi |
| Executive Summary | vii |
| CHAPTER ONE--INTRODUCTION | |
| Background on Sexual Harassment Training | 4 |
| Program | 5 |
| Objectives | 6 |
| CHAPTER TWO--RESULTS OF THE SURVEY | |
| Satisfaction With Mandated Sexual Harassment Program | 8 |
| Available Training Time | 9 |
| Competition for Training Dollars | 13 |
| Specific Training Period | 14 |
| CHAPTER THREE--RATIONALE FOR ALTERNATIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS | 17 |
| CHAPTER FOUR--CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 21 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 24 |
| APPENDICES: | |
| Appendix A - Letter and Questionnaire Regarding Sexual Harassment Training Program (SHTP) for National Guard Personnel | 26 |

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

## TABLES

TABLE 1 - Comparison of Sexual Harassment Programs..... 18

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part of our College mission is distribution of the students' problem solving products to DoD sponsors and other interested agencies to enhance insight into contemporary, defense related issues. While the College has accepted this product as meeting academic requirements for graduation, the views and opinions expressed or implied are solely those of the author and should not be construed as carrying official sanction.

*"insights into tomorrow"*

REPORT NUMBER 86-1930

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR THEODORE PAIGE, JR., USAF/ANG

TITLE THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD


I. Purpose: To determine what is actually being taught in the National Guard as it relates to sexual harassment, per guidance of the National Guard Bureau, Office of Human Resources (NGB-HR).

II. Problem: Sexual harassment in the National Guard environment not only affects the victim and the harassee but also the organization and the mission. In terms of accomplishing the mission, commanders and supervisors must be concerned about sexual harassment because of its potential disruption of the organization.

III. Data: Statistics confirm incidences of sexual harassment exist. However, it is important to remember that the number of actual cases of sexual harassment is higher than those reported to the National Guard Bureau. Guardsmen have many avenues which they use to file a complaint--commander, supervisor, etc. With the projected increase of females in the National Guard, the potential of sexual harassment also increases. Sexual harassment cannot be seen as a female problem; sexual harassment affects the National Guard. In order to make all Guard members aware of sexual harassment, continuous training and enforcement must be the rule, not the exception.

IV. Conclusions: Sexual harassment training is not the problem. The problem is the method in which the training is to be provided, per guidance of the National Guard Bureau.

## CONTINUED

V. Recommendations: NGB/HR, on behalf of the National Guard, should develop and distribute a training program that allows states options in the method of training. Specific guidance on training completion and follow-up should be provided but the states should be granted as much freedom as possible. In addition, a sexual harassment video or film should be developed geared towards the National Guard. The filming, whether video or film, should take place in a National Guard environment.

## Chapter One

## INTRODUCTION

In FY 1977, the female population of the National Guard was 14,874, or 3.69 percent of the Guard population. Today, less than ten years later, there are 11,676 women, or 6.27 percent of the Guard population (7:81). As the male population continues to decline after World War II's "baby boom," the number of women in the military is projected to increase to 10.3 percent by FY 1987 for all the services as a percent of total military manpower (1:1). Just as those in authority with specific responsibility for human resources and effectiveness in the National Guard have been concerned over the past four decades with racial discrimination, they must now address the problems of sexual harassment and/or sexual discrimination.

A major concern with sexual harassment lies not only in the fact that it affects the victim and the harasser, but also that it affects the organization and the mission as well. Reviews of sexual harassment complaints show that the victim often becomes frustrated, his or her self-esteem is lost, performance declines, and sometimes jobs are lost. There are many possible effects to the organization because of sexual harassment. One important effect is the additional workload to fellow workers caused by

absenteeism of either the victim or the harasser. Furthermore, the time it takes to investigate a complaint of sexual harassment to the time it takes to resolve the complaint, involves many hours. In the process someone must do the job, for the mission must be accomplished. Accomplishing the mission with less is what every employer wants, but when people have to do additional work because of sexual harassment, the morale of those who must do the additional work suffers. Whether it is the work of the victim or of the harasser doesn't matter. What matters is the workload has increased, thereby affecting fellow workers and other supervisors within the organization. In terms of accomplishing the mission, commanders and supervisors must be concerned about sexual harassment because of its potential disruption of the organization.

Understanding sexual harassment and understanding that sexual harassment is a problem is the first step towards awareness. It is through this awareness that one understands that sexual harassment takes many forms. These forms include sexual assault (unwanted physical contact), request for sexual favors (promising to give an excellent evaluation in return for sex), and sexually oriented behavior (withholding of promotion if person does not commit to having sexual relations). There is no doubt that commanders, supervisors, and co-workers must be educated not only on how to recognize sexual harassment, but also on the impact on the individual and its potential impact on mission effectiveness. If not, the potential negative impact on mission effectiveness

will surely increase. Commanders, supervisors, and subordinates must be educated on their legal responsibilities as well as the legal responsibilities of the organization for the prevention of sexual harassment. For example, if sexual harassment is found, is the responsibility limited to the harasser, or does the organization carry a part of the burden? Many court decisions of late seem to be implying that the organization also carries a major part of the burden (9:121).

In the military, commanders and supervisors have the responsibility for preventing sexual harassment by enforcing standards of conduct that ensure mission accomplishment (17:IV-5). Commanders must provide swift and strong punishment against the harasser. Furthermore, the victim must understand his/her rights and be free from retaliation. Therefore, as on the civilian side, commanders and supervisors must provide a work environment free of sexual harassment (8:3). In addition, commanders and supervisors are held accountable for enforcing the standards and making every effort to discourage acts of sexual harassment.

Swift and immediate action at all levels of command can have a profound impact on reducing sexual harassment in the National Guard. It is important that Guard members, at all levels, be able to identify and understand instances of sexual harassment. In addition, personnel must realize that, if acts of sexual harassment are committed, results of doing so will not be favorable. Sexual harassment must be seen as an unprofessional act that will not be condoned. Therefore, commanders and

supervisors throughout the National Guard must address the issue with firm resolve and productive training programs (10:3B). Before discussing what training is actually taking place, a review of the National Guard Bureau's Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment program is necessary, since this program is the mandated awareness program for National Guard personnel.

## Background on Sexual Harassment Training Program

The following quote is from the policy statement from the Air Force Chief of Staff, General Lew Allen, Jr. and Secretary of the Air Force Verne Orr in support of Secretary of Defense Weinberger's policy statement on sexual harassment:

> It is the Department of Defense and Department of the Air Force policy that sexual harassment is unacceptable conduct and will not be condoned or tolerated.
>
> Every commander and supervisor--military and civilian--will take the necessary action to ensure an environment free from sexual harassment. Specifically, ensure your people are familiar with the available avenues of redress, and take swift, firm corrective action when allegations of sexual harassment are confirmed.
>
> We are committed to eliminating sexual harassment within the Department of the Air Force, and are counting on the personal involvement of every Air Force member, military and civilian to make the policy work (1:1).

In support of Secretary of Defense Weinberger and the joint policy letter of the Air Force Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of the National Guard, Lieutenant General LaVern E. Weber, issued the following policy statement concerning sexual harassment on 10 May 1981:

> Sexual harassment in the workplace has become a matter of increasing concern. Sexual harassment violates the fundamental policy of the National Guard to provide equal opportunity and equal treatment to each of its

members--military, technician, and civilian--men and women.

National Guard personnel have a grave responsibility under the policies of the Department of the Army and Air Force and the Federal Code of Ethics for maintaining high standards of honesty, integrity, impartiality, and conduct to assure proper performance of the government's business and the maintenance of public trust. Personal conduct which violates these policies or standards cannot be condoned. . . .

Prevention is the best tool for elimination of sexual harassment. It is incumbent upon each addressee to take all steps necessary to prevent sexual harassment from occurring, such as affirmatively raising the subject, expressing strong disapproval, developing appropriate sanctions, informing National Guard personnel of their right to raise and how to raise the issue of harassment. . . . (5:1-2).

Since 1981, seven sexual harassment complaints were filed with the National Guard. Five were confirmed as sexual harassment. Statistical data on sexual harassment has only been maintained since 1981 (15:--). However, it is important to remember that the number of actual cases of sexual harassment is higher than those reported to the National Guard Bureau. Guardsmen have many avenues which they can use to file a complaint--supervisors, commanders, Inspector General, Senior Enlisted Advisor, etc. Because of the number of complaints and the policy statement of Lt Gen Weber, the Office of Human Resources embarked on a program to educate members of the National Guard in the prevention of sexual harassment.

The method the National Guard Bureau chose for educating National Guard members was adopted from the Department of the Army and Department of the Navy's Training for Prevention of Sexual Harassment. The National Guard's program is divided into two sections: section one is for supervisors and the second for

non-supervisors. The program is geared towards educating members "on understanding sexual harassment and each individual's responsibility in helping to eliminate sexual harassment in the National Guard" (17:SG-3). The training materials are self-paced and individualized and criterion referenced. Furthermore, the course is organized into modules, or units of instruction, each covering a specific learning objective. However, review of available correspondence and guidance provide no mandatory start or stop date for this training.

Even with a self-paced training program the method of instruction is based upon a 3:20 ratio--three instructors to every twenty students. The instructors must be certified by the National Guard Bureau or National Guard Bureau certified course managers. The certification process, as provided by the Guard Bureau, takes approximately five days.

## Objectives

To limit the scope of this project the author concentrated on several major areas: (1) how many states are providing sexual harassment training per the Guard Bureau's training package, (2) the satisfaction of the states with the training program mandated by NGB-HR, (3) the appropriateness of the training program considering the training time available, (4) the cost effectiveness of the training package, (5) the appropriateness of a specific training period, (6) rationale for alternate training programs, and (7) conclusions and recommendations.

In order to address these areas a letter and questionnaire (Appendix A) were developed and sent to all 50 states and the 4 self-governing territories or trusts associated with the United States (Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and Washington, DC). The states were asked questions regarding sexual harassment training, i.e. their views on cost effectiveness, whether or not the sexual harassment training should have a specific time frame, etc. The letter specified that the answers would not be attributed to any state. Responses were received from twenty-eight (28) states/offices, and the author has spoken to ten (10) states via autovon.

## Chapter Two

## RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Now that the background of the National Guard's Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment program and the negative impact sexual harassment has on the individual and the mission have been reviewed, an analysis of the questionnaire is in order.

### Satisfaction With Mandated Sexual Harassment Program

Out of the 28 states responding, 11 states are, to a degree, teaching the program as mandated and 14 have modified or are teaching a different program. The majority of the 14 respondents who are teaching a modified or different sexual harassment program felt the course was inappropriate and that 4 hours is just too long to be training "on one subject area." Furthermore, a major source of contention was the training of drill status--"M" Day troops (part-timers). Over seventy-percent of the respondents, whether they are teaching the mandatory course or not, felt that "4 hours is too long and unrealistic." The remaining three states projected starting some form of sexual harassment training during CY 1986 (16:--).

Many states provided additional comments clarifying their responses. Over eighty-percent of the written comments revolved around the need to train course managers and the time it takes to

teach the course (approximately four hours). On the other hand, approximately eighteen percent of the respondents felt the time (4 hours) was not enough, but they knew they wouldn't get additional time for training. One state responded, "in order to get the proper ratio of instructors/course managers, my state will train more people and course managers than the Guard Bureau has taught in the past 3 years" (16:--).

The main reason states gave for using the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment program was the program is "non-threatening and does not intimidate managers or students, therefore, easily accepted by both parties concerned." One of the comments used for support of the program was also used as a reason for non-support of the program: "The program allows for no class feedback to the statements, questions or readings" (16:--).

## Available Training Time

Responses to the second question on the questionnaire fell into four specific areas:

- Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment is suitable for the full-time force (technicians).
- Requirements of Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment conflict with present training requirements of ANGR 30-2.
- Training of supervisors and non-supervisors should be combined.
- Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment is not suitable for Active Guard Reserve (AGR) personnel (16:--).

A majority of the states, even those who are training per guidance of the Guard Bureau, felt the Training in the Prevention

of Sexual Harassment program is far more suitable for the full-time force (technicians) than for the week-enders (part-timers). The implications of the comments are that technicians could be given four hours to attend training without creating major training problems. Another factor is the belief of some respondents that the remedies available in the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment are all under Title VII, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), civilian and not Title VI, Equal Opportunity (EO), military. One particular respondent felt the Guard Bureau is "mixing apples and oranges" with the training program as it presently exists (15:--).

Paraphrasing several states, "although the basic concepts for the prevention of sexual harassment are the same, the method of disciplinary ramifications are resolved differently. For National Guard technicians (Title VII) and National Guard military members (Title VI) who experience sexual harassment, have separate systems of protection and recourse" (16:--). National Guard technicians are protected from sexual discrimination (sexual harassment) under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. National Guard military members, on the other hand, are covered under Title VI.

Continuing this perception of a civilian training course, several telephone respondents stated, "the program has no military application whatsoever." This comment was followed up by several respondents addressing the military scenario in the videotape as "several good, but weak attempts to see the military

in uniform." The respondents were quick to follow with, "if you are going to," and they felt it should, "use a military situation, use one that is realistic" (16:--).

The area of greatest frustration was from those who felt that Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment conflicts with ANGR 30-2, and Human Relations as taught by Social Actions. Respondents felt that sexual harassment was a required part of the human relations training; however, the majority of Social Actions personnel could not teach Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment because they were not certified as course managers by the Guard Bureau or by a certified Bureau course manager. Many understood sexual harassment being a part of Social Actions, but couldn't understand why the Social Actions officers are not certified to teach it. The problem of Social Actions officers and Social Actions is further compounded by ANGR 30-2, requiring two hours of human relations/social actions training once every three years as compared to a one time four-hour training not included in the Social Actions training. Therefore, states wanted to know how to address the conflict of what gets taught, Sexual Harassment as a single course or Social Actions/Human Relations with sexual harassment being a part of the training block?

Clearly the conflict of Social Actions training and Sexual Harassment training is the most frustrating problem to be addressed. One state went as far as to quote ANGR 30-2, Social Actions Program, figure 5-3,3b2, ". . .modify instructional

emphasis where necessary to place stress on those phases of the curriculum that are topically related to "installation issues or environmental conditions" (16:--). A follow up to this question by this writer to the remaining interviewees turned up the following additional questions:

- If the curriculum is modified to place emphasis on sexual harassment.
  - -- does that mean 2 hours or 4 hours of training?
  - -- does that mean, use the regulation which states no more than 35 in the class or the requirement of the Bureau of no more than 20 in the class?
  - -- does that mean take 3 years to train all personnel, per guidance of the Bureau or take 3 years to train E-4's and above, per regulation?
  - -- does it mean take all the time necessary to train sexual harassment (The Guard Bureau placed no ending date of training, nor did they give formal requirements to teach Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment) (15:--).

There were many concerns expressed on the relationship of Social Actions and the mandated Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment.

Over sixty-percent of the respondents felt the program would be more effective if the training program combined supervisors and non-supervisors. Feelings ran high for both groups being present in the training sessions. However, defining a supervisor and a non-supervisor appeared to be quite a chore.

Seven of the respondents wanted to know if a supervisor was an E-4 and above, or if supervisors had to be actually supervising someone to be a supervisor. Or, is a Guardsman, once he/she reaches the rank of E-4 and above (specifically E-5, a NCO

rank) automatically considered a supervisor? The bottom line of this issue is that all military personnel have the potential of being supervisors, based upon the structure of the military system.

## Competition For Training Dollars

Although the majority of the states agreed that sexual harassment training was necessary, they rejected by more than three to one the idea that Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment was the proper one considering the training time available to Guardsmen (two days a month and 15 annual training days), the cost of presenting this program, and the reality of competition for training time and training dollars.

Although many states felt the program was not cost effective, one state's respondent was unyielding:

> The cost effectiveness, if there is any, is lost when the average state has to train, at the minimum, 32 course managers from all over the state, costs of reproducing books and video tapes, travel allowances and expense, and the time lost of course managers who teach the course from their actual job."
>
> Furthermore, just looking at the supervisors training booklet of approximately 50 pages each on both sides, run the state a little more than $10.00 a book to print. Just to carry this item a little further, a state with 500 supervisors would be $10,000 in cost prior to beginning the program.

This writer was quickly reminded that this cost does not include shipping cost. The cost from the printers to the central point and then forwarding by mail, most times to the training locations, adds additional cost, even if by fourth-class mail. Another state probably best summed up the total cost

effectiveness by his comment, "just think what it costs a state that has 17,000 plus guardsmen" (15:--).

## Specific Training Period

There is no written guidance, but the author believes Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment is only a one-time requirement. Again, several states address the legal aspect of the training from the Social Actions regulation. Should the program be taught at the expense of the Social Actions/Human Relations program, or should human relations be taught to individuals once every three years with or without sexual harassment? A little better than seventy-percent of the respondents felt the program should have a specific completion date for it "gives the program priority and added emphasis." The remaining states, with the exception of the three beginning in CY 1985, felt the "commanders would like the flexibility which allows them to coordinate the training (sexual harassment) with their other training requirements" (16:--).

Because 30 percent of the respondents interpreted, "Does your state feel Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment should have a specific training period?" as actual class training time, instead of a specific completion of training date, specific emphasis was provided to this question during the telephone interview. This allowed states to expand upon written responses previously received. Several states felt, "without a specific completion date, many people would not receive the training, nor is there any real urge to get people trained." As a matter of

fact, many states suggested that the training be set up similar to the initial Social Actions program, train all the Guardsmen within three years. At that time, sexual harassment should be integrated back into the human relations training/social actions and into all professional military education courses (i.e. State Military Training Academies, NCO acadamies, and all management courses).

Overall, the information presented in writing or discussed telephonically supported the need for sexual harassment training. However, less than ten-percent of the respondents supported the program anywhere near the manner in which it's required to be taught.

While a total agreement on Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment doesn't appear to be forthcoming, there is agreement on the estimated cost of sexual harassment to the federal government (non-military) of $189 million during the period May 1978 to May 1980. The above figure represents the cost of:

- replacing employees who left their jobs because of sexual harassment ($26.8 million)
- paying medical insurance claims for services to employees who sought professional help because of physical or emotional stress brought on by their experiences ($5 million)
- paying sick leave for employees missing work ($7.9 million)
- absorbing the cost associated with reduced individual and work group productivity ($76.9 million) (3:71-74).

Now that the extent of the problem of sexual harassment is understood, and the States' views of Training in the Prevention

of Sexual Harassment has been discussed, it is appropriate to look at what options are available for teaching sexual harassment prevention in the National Guard.

## Chapter Three

### RATIONALE FOR ALTERNATE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE TRAINING OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The responses from the questionnaires identified a major problem between what is mandated by the Guard Bureau for sexual harassment training as compared to what's actually being taught. Several states have modified the program to reduce presentation time. Some have resorted to using different sexual harassment training programs such as Office Personnel Management Sexual Harassment training and Department of Army Phamplet 350-20. Finally, there are those states who have not begun any type of sexual harassment training, although they have projected beginning some type of sexual harassment training in CY 1986. Table 1 shows a comparison of sexual harassment training programs presently being used.

Approximately 50% of the states responding modified the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment as mandated by the Guard Bureau. One state "modified the program to a two-hour block which included changing the video tape. The tape was tailored to "the type of complaints we had been receiving in this state" (16:--). Several others modified the program and "taught it to company and battalion commanders only, and required that the course be taught to the states military academy and its NCO

Table 1

Comparison of Sexual Harassment Programs

| PROGRAM | NGB | O.P.M. | DA 350-20 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Hours | 4 | 5 1/2 - 6 | 1 - 2 |
| Students Per Instructor | 20 | 30 | Per local training policy |
| Method | Lecture/video | Lecture, video films, participation | Lecture,video, films, participation |
| Target | Supervisors/ non-supervisors, military/ non-military | Supervisors & managers Civilians/ technicians | Military |
| Qualification of Trainers | National Guardsmen Certified | Approved by Office of Personnel Management | Personnel with unit level assignments and experienced |
| Modifications Authorized | No | Per target audience | Per target audience |
| NGB Approval | Yes | Yes | Yes |

schools" (15:--). These modifications were necessary to reduce the program to two hours or less, in many instances one hour or less.

Twenty-percent of the states responding modified the program because the amount of training time (four hours) prohibits formal

training for all guardsmen. Because of the prohibitive time constraints, several of the states came up with a correspondence course. The guardsmen are given a correspondence package and given a specific time to complete and return. The package is then reviewed and, if necessary, follow-up provided.

Several states had merged the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment and the Army sexual harassment program (DA Pamphlet 350-20), and came up with a single program. The same states, however, provided units the option of using the combined programs as modified, the Guard Bureau's program, or the Army's sexual harassment training package. If units chose to use the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment, they had to make sure they had qualified course managers. If they selected to use the Army's program because of its format, it could be taught by the commander, first sergeant, or any person selected to do the training. The modified program nor the Army program requires course managers. In addition, both programs, modified or Army's, can be taught in a 60 to 90 minute time frame.

One state specifically modified the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment for a variety of reasons. "The training time of 4 hours is too long for military drill periods and requires entirely too much reading for many of the army enlisted troops." (Program as modified requires no reading.) "Course as mandated requires too much material (waste of paper, reproduction and/or printing costs) and it's not geared towards working with large groups. In addition, Training in the Preven-

tion of Sexual Harassment focuses on the negative and provides no opportunity for discussion" (15:--). Several states addressed the issue of no discussion time, and stated it as a reason for modifying the program.

Several of the states projecting starting in CY 1986 will train from a modified program. Their main reasons for modifying the program: "materials too costly, and commanders will not give up 4 hours for training in what they consider to be a non-mission related program" One state responded by saying, "the commander felt if the program was given for 4 hours, it would heighten resistance of men to women in uniform."

Other states rejected the Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment program in its totality. They substituted sexual harassment training or awareness programs taught by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), or the Social Actions officer, and some utilized the Army's program in its entirety. Some placed additional emphasis on existing social actions/human relations training, and others contracted with sexual harassment training organizations such as BNA Communications, Inc. or private consultant agencies. As one state put it, "as long as there is a documented sexual harassment program, it should not make any difference. Should not the purpose be sexual harassment training and should not the training be geared to the needs of the guard and of the states?"

## Chapter Four

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has made it quite clear that the number of women in the National Guard will continue to grow, and that all commanders and supervisors must do two things. First, they must provide some type of sexual harassment training (which should include non-supervisors), and second, they must establish an atmosphere which allows those who feel they are being sexually harassed to come forward without fear of reprisal. In addition, the harasee must feel that his/her complaint will be investigated and immediately dealt with. Sexual harassment should be a part of the commander's presentation at the newcomers' orientation. Commanders and/or supervisors must work at eliminating sexual harassment or creating an environment that says sexual harassment (like racial discrimination) will not be tolerated.

In addition, all personnel, commanders, supervisors, managers, co-workers, peers, and subordinates must address the problem of sexual harassment if they see it taking place. In addition, all personnel must assist and be cooperative when sexual harassment complaints are being investigated. Furthermore, personnel must not fear reprisals by being cooperative.

## Recommendations

Based upon the information analyzed during this research effort, certain shortcomings and weaknesses are evident in the National Guard's Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment program. Some corrective measures have been identified and are offered in an attempt to help NGB-HR accomplish their goal of providing sexual harassment training to all National Guard personnel which, in turn, may help reduce sexual harassment in the National Guard and create an atmosphere that is conducive to mission accomplishment.

The following recommendations are offered for review and follow-up:

1. Appropriate National Guard regulations should be revised to include specific requirements for sexual harassment prevention training to include training requirements and specific completion date. In addition, these regulations should include specific details on how the program could be integrated into all training programs, i.e. State Military Academies, NCO Academies, etc.

2. Integrate sexual harassment prevention into Equal Opportunity/Human Relations training and all professional military education, i.e. State Military Academies, NCO Academies, etc.

3. Establish formal requirements for sexual harassment prevention training.

4. Establish separate training for technicians, with an additional thirty minutes to cover Title VI.

5. Adopt or allow states to adopt a correspondence course so that states may have options for training in sexual harassment.

6. Certify all Social Actions/Human Relations officers as trainees for "M" day troops and Active Guard Reserve (AGR) personnel.

7. Certify all Equal Opportunity managers and specialists, plus one additional person (because of rapid turnover of personnel) to train technicians, and reduce the number of trainers required per class to one. Furthermore, increase the number of personnel per class to be trained from 20 to 25.

8. Add sexual harassment certification to the curriculum at Defense Equal Opportunity Military Institute (DEOMI).

9. Add sexual harassment prevention to the training provided to new general officers and commanders (The General Officer's Course).

10. Develop a video tape specifically for military training. Actors or actual military personnel should wear uniforms and filming should take place in a military environment. This action will provide a realistic training approach to properly emphasize the potential sexual harassment problem in the National Guard.

11. Establish a training program that requires less supporting materials.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. REFERENCES CITED

### Reports and Letters


1. Allen, Lew Jr., "Air Force Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment." Air Force Chief of Staff, 12 August 1981.

2. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics). "Manpower Requirements Report for FY 1983," March 1981.

3. U.S. Congress, House, Subcommittee Report on Post Office and Civil Service, Sexual Harassment in the Federal Government. 96th Cong. 2nd Sess. 1980, Committee Print 96-11, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1980.

4. U.S. Merit System Protection Board. Office of Merit System Review and Survey. Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is It a Problem? Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, March 1981.

5. Weber, LaVern E. "Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment." Chief, National Guard Bureau, 20 May 1981.

6. Weinberger, Caspar W. "Department of Defense Policy on Sexual Harassment." The Secretary of Defense, July 17, 1981.


### Periodicals


7. Gordon, Sol and Pierce, Tori (ed). National Guard Almanac, Uniform Services Almanac, Inc. Washington, DC, 1985, pp. 81-102.

8. National Guard Pamphlet 600-4, Air National Guard Pamphlet 30-02, Prevention of Sexual Harassment, 30 June 1982.

## CONTINUED


9. "Sexual Harassment Lands Companies in Court." Business Week. October 1, 1979, pp. 119-122.

10. "Sexual Harassment Called Unacceptable Conduct," Air Force News Service (10 September 1981): pp. 2B-3B.

11. Women in Uniform Confront a Sometime Enemy Among Them: Men in Uniform." People, Vol 13, No. 11, March 11, 1980, pp. 26-29.


Other Sources


12. Air Force Regulation 30-2, Social Actions Program, 22 June 1981.

13. Air Force Regulation 111-9, Nonjudicial Punishment Under Article 15, UCMJ, 31 August 1979.

14. Air National Guard Regulation 30-2, Social Actions Program, 29 October 1982.

15. 10 Interviews. Topic: Training in the Prevention of Sexual Harassment. Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. October-November 1985.

16. Report of Survey. Topic: Sexual Harassment Training Program (SHTP) for National Guard Personnel. All States, 20 Sept 85.

17. Training Package--Training In the Prevention of Sexual Harassment, National Guard Bureau, Office of Human Resources (NGB-HR), undated.

# APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A

LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING PROGRAM (SHTP) FOR NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE (AU)
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, AL 36112-5542

REPLY TO ATTN OF: Major Theodore Paige, Jr.
4219-H Strathmore Drive
Montgomery, Alabama 36116

20 Sept 85

SUBJECT: Sexual Harassment Training Program (SHTP), for National Guard Personnel

TO: All States: SPMO/EEO Managers
Support Personnel Mgt Officers
Equal Employment Opportunity Managers

1. PURPOSE: To determine what is being taught in the National Guard, as it relates to Sexual Harassment, per guidance and instructions issued from the National Guard Bureau, Office of Human Resources (NGB-HR). Based on the results provided by you of the enclosed questionnaire, provide recommendations for actions by NGB-HR.

2. PROBLEM: Sexual harassment has been determined to have negative impact on morale and mission. However, it has been added to an ever growing list of required/mandated training for National Guard personnel. Because of the competition for training dollars and training time, we must assess the training presently taking place. If, after assessment, it is determined that training time and training dollars are prohibitive, recommend to National Guard Bureau HR options to Sexual Harassment training program.

3. BACKGROUND: As a member of the National Guard and presently a student at Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, I have elected to do my research paper on the above listed subject. Therefore, I am requesting that the enclosed questionnaire be completed by your State Equal Opportunity Manager. Your cooperation will help me to fulfill a requirement for graduation.

NOTE: All information received from you will remain in the strictest of confidence, and all materials received shall be non-attributive. With these thoughts in mind request all responses be forwarded to the above listed address. In addition to the enclosed questionnaire, I will make every effort to talk to at least 10 states by telephone. So please include your autovon number in your return package. If you have any questions give me a call, autovon 875-6794 and leave a message. I will return your call.

4. DATA: The National Guard Bureau, Office of Human Resources has mandated that the Recognition and Prevention of Sexual Harassment be taught to all National Guard Personnel. This mandate came complete with a required method of training, i.e. personnel will be taught by qualified course managers only, that supervisors will be taught a specific facet of the program, whereas, non-supervisory will be taught a different facet, all personnel will be taught a specific number of hours. The only thing the Bureau did not mandate was that the course be taught to all personnel by a specific date (at least not in my package). This program has been out for approximately three years and the Bureau needs to get a handle on what has actually been taught. On the other hand, the question being raised is, are National Guard personnel being taught Recognition and Prevention of Sexual Harassment and is it a quality program in the eyes of those receiving it. Please be honest and forthright with your responses.

5. SUSPENSE DATE: Must request I receive your responses no later than 26 Oct 85. All questionnaires returned prior to that date WILL BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

6. ARMY/AIR GUARD: If your state has two separate programs, please identify, and respond on separate sheets, clearly marked Air National Guard, or Army National Guard.

7. THANKS: Would like to take this opportunity to thank each State and the National Guard Bureau, Office of Human Resources (NGB-HR) for its cooperation.

THEODORE PAIGE, JR., MAJOR, USAF
Student
Air Command and Staff College

SUBJECT: Recognition and Prevention of Sexual Harassment Training Questionnaire

PURPOSE: The following questionnaire is designed (1) as a partial fulfillment of requirements for graduation from ACSC, (2) to assist NGB-HR determine whether the program as designed should continue in its present form, and (3) based on the results, provide recommendations for action by NGB-HR. Answer all questions as fairly and candidly as possible.

NOTE: All questionnaires and/or interviews are non-attributive.

1. Is your State satisfied with the Recognition and Prevention of Sexual Harassment Training Program as mandated by NGB-HR?

   Yes _____ No _____

   Please explain: _____

2. Does your State feel that the Sexual Harassment Training Package and the format that you have been requested to instruct is the proper one considering the training time that is available (2 days a month and 15 annual training days)?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If NO - State what you feel is a proper training program considering the training time. _____

3. Considering the competition for training dollars, does your State feel "Recognition and Prevention of Sexual Harassment" package is cost effective?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If NO - What does your State feel is a more cost effective method without losing the quality of the training? _____

4. Does your State feel the Sexual Harassment Training Program should have a specific training period?

Yes _____ No _____

NOTE: WHETHER YOU ANSWERED YES OR NO PLEASE EXPLAIN:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Has there been a change in the number of sexual discrimination and/or sexual harassment complaints in your State since implementation of Sexual Harassment Training?

Increase ____ No Change _____ Decrease _____

6. If your State has implemented a modified or totally different Recognition and Prevention of Sexual Harassment Training, please identify the course and tell why you think it is better._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

END

DTIC

5-86

UNCLASSIFIED

**DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER**
**8725 Kingman Rd Ste 0944**
**Ft Belvoir, VA 22060-6218**

OFFICIAL BUSINESS - PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE $300
POSTMASTER: DO NOT FORWARD

| AD Number | Class | Pages | Type Copy | Source | Priority |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A166702 | U | 40 | H | F | |

Received Date: 13-JUL-00 21

To : 20439
Req By : MS. EMILY COURT
ATTENTION: D ZEHNPFENNIG

**ARMED FORCES MED LIB**

**5109 LEESBURG PIKE RM 670**
**FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041-3258**

654100001

UNCLASSIFIED