Workplace Bullying in Military Organizations

Eva Zedlacher and Sabine T. Koeszegi

Contents

Abstract

Notwithstanding an increase in civilian tasks and peace missions, (western) armies are considered prone to workplace bullying and sexual harassment inside their ranks. An analysis of military culture reveals the persistence of three intertwined organizational factors, which increase homogeneity, but are also a breeding ground for systematic misconduct: (i) The misuse of power and

E. Zedlacher (✉) · S. T. Koeszegi
AU3
Institute of Management Science, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria
e-mail: eva.zedlacher@tuwien.ac.at; evazedlacher@yahoo.com; sabine.koeszegi@tuwien.ac.at

bureaucratical regulations in hierarchical structures; (ii) socialization processes with humiliating hazing rituals and demanding trainings which create in- and outsiders; and (iii) the persistent salience of hypermasculine values including physical dominance. The existing empirical studies on workplace bullying and sexual harassment in national armies reveal high above-average victimization rates, especially for female and young soldiers. Results indicate that misconduct is related to a (sexually) hostile work environment in subunits of traditional branches and academies. Overt hazing rituals, but also covert behaviours like spreading rumours have been reported. Victims often do not report the incidences in fear of retaliation or trivialization, or are unsatisfied with the actions taken. Preventive measures include a departure from traditional performance criteria and the mere focus on physical endurance and social cohesion. Moreover, written materials and leadership trainings, which create awareness for diverse types of misconduct and (gender) differences in perception, are crucial. A range of contact points and official chains of intervention are suggested including external consultants as well as internal "persons of trust". Authors recommend more research on effective prevention and intervention, and more comparable cross-cultural studies on awareness and severity of bullying behaviours and sexual harassment in military organizations.

1   Introduction

Master Chief John Urgayle: Pain is your friend, your ally, it will tell you when you are seriously injured, it will keep you awake and angry, and remind you to finish the job and get the hell home. But you know the best thing about pain?

Lt. Jordan O'Neil: Don't know!

Master Chief John Urgayle: It lets you know you're not dead yet. Quote from the Movie GI Jane (1997)

Military organizations are substantially closed and isolated from the public eye. Nevertheless, most of us conceive military life from the popular discourse: War movies like *GI Jane, Full Metal Jacket* and *Jarhead* depict hazing rituals of newcomers and outsiders, physical drill during training, and abusive behaviour from superiors within elite units in military organizations. Eventually, the targets endure all the hardships and become war heroes. Moreover, in most countries, stories from duty service are passed on between generations and often include themes like solemn watch duties and long marches, authoritarian supervisors and bonding experiences with fellow soldiers.

Because of these popular associations with the military we may reason that pronounced authority, peer loyalty and physical dominance are necessary ingredients for military effectiveness and success. As organizational researchers, we often use the military as a textbook example for an organizational culture, where violence is normalized and initiation or punishment rituals blur with perceptions of workplace bullying and harassment (e.g. Salin & Hoel, 2011).

However, the public at large is frequently shocked by widely published cases, which go beyond harsh training methods and institutionalized rituals. A simple google search on bullying in military organizations 2017 yields various scandals from Western armies. For example, in the US, secret filming of female marines became public in March 2017. Nude photos and videos of the women were shared by thousands of Marine soldiers via Facebook. Marine general Robert Nueller referred to this case as a phenomenon in a defective subculture rather than a general dysfunctional "Marine Culture" (Starr & Cohen, 2017). In April 2017, sadistic training rituals and assaults by instructors of the combat paramedics of the German Armed Forces against young paramedics were revealed. Management had been informed of the wrongdoing before (Gebauer, 2017).

The aim of this chapter is to shed light on why military organizations are particularly prone to such severe and collective forms of workplace bullying and harassment, and to provide recent evidence on prevalence, prevention and intervention.

To do so, we first review the common organizational tasks, goals and social structure of national armies in the twenty-first century. We will show why there is still an overarching "military culture"—notwithstanding distinct functions, branches and goals of peace-making and peacekeeping armies. In this section, we will also present facts and figures on the participation of women and LGBTQ in national forces.

In the second section, we present three structural and cultural organizational features which are believed necessary for homogeneity and military effectiveness, but whose over- or misuse lays the ground for workplace bullying and harassment: hierarchical and bureaucratical structures; harsh socialization processes and training rituals; and hypermasculine values.

We point out how these characteristics can increase frustration and aggression, group dynamics against outsiders and feelings of injustice and privilege. These are all features, which are regarded as causes or triggers for workplace bullying in the literature (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2005; Neuman & Baron, 2011; Salin & Hoel, 2011). Importantly, the analysis also gives insight why violence or misconduct by soldiers is rarely reported or even regarded as such. AU4

In the third section, we present empirical data on the prevalence of workplace bullying and harassment from different national armies. For clarity, we treat workplace bullying and sexual/gender harassment as overlapping, yet separate phenomena. Since most of the literature on military culture and/or bullying and (sexual) harassment stems from the NATO member countries (especially Canada, Norway, UK and USA) and NATO partner countries, allies and dialogue partners (i.e. Austria, Australia, Israel, South Korea, Sweden, cf. NATO-Website, 2015), our review has a focus on these national armies. Empirical studies from military forces such as Brazil, the Philippines, Russia and South Africa will round out the literature review.

The fourth section deals with the prevention of bullying and harassment in the military context. Based on the preceding analyses and reviews, we present challenges and key starting points to tackle bullying and harassment in military organizations. Also, best practices on prevention and intervention tools are presented in this section.

In the last section we conclude our analysis. We present an outlook and implications for future research and the measurement of bullying behaviours and hazing rituals in a military context. We also discuss cross-cultural differences and future challenges for research in both peacekeeping and peace-making armies.

2   Military Organizations in the Twenty-First Century

Traditional military systems have often been characterized as total institutions much the same as monasteries, prisons and asylums (cf. Goffman, 1968). Traditionally, such organizations are enclosed and "greedy": Total institutions take possession of the whole life of their inhabitants. Uniforms underline the clear distinction between the inside and the outside civilian world. However, there is a clear visible distinction between *staff*, who can have access to the outside world, and *inmates*, who are kept separate from civilian life and values and work, and eat and sleep in the military barracks. Staff controls body and personal life of the inmates through discipline, physical drill and constant monitoring of daily routines (Davies, 1989; Goffman, 1968; Hearn & Parkin, 2001).

2.1   The Post-Modern Military Era

Military organizations have undergone change over time and opened up to the external world: After the end of the Cold War, the former mass armies in industrialized countries became smaller (Carreiras, 2006). For example, in the German Armed Forces, the troop strength was reduced by 60% in the last 25 years—from approximately 465,000 to 180,000 soldiers. By 2016, the US army had 475,000 soldiers on active duty and about 548,000 as reserve soldiers who can be called into duty. This total number is the lowest level since before the Second World War (Tice, 2016). In this so-called *post-modern military era* (Moskos, Williams, & Segal, 2000), ties with the nation state loosen and volunteer missions such as deployment on foreign military engagements as well as on different peacekeeping/peace-making missions increased (Carreiras, 2006, cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014). Also, the art of combat and warfare changed: The miniaturization of weapons as well as the increase in airpower and nuclear weapons reduced the need of individual physical strength (Segal, 1995). Due to these changes, the need for support personnel increased and many soldiers became specialized in civilian tasks like information technology or communications, engaged in different missions on short-term contracts and became less affiliated to only one military unit (Gabbert, 2007; Segal, 1995). With the new assignments, also the interaction with civil society increased (cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014; Nuciari, 2006; Segal, 1995).

All these changes were also believed to change military culture and the professional ideals of the soldiers (Moskos et al., as cited in Carreiras, 2006; Segal, 1995; Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006). However, empirical research shows that among soldiers, a so-called "institutional orientation" is more prevalent than in "normal"

business organizations (Soeters, 1997; cf. Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006). Institutional orientation implies a focus on communal life and internal career tracks, an elevated level of intrinsic motivation and role commitment—e.g. to serve the state or the king/queen, or to save civilians in life-threating situations (Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006; cf. Zedlacher, 2013). Military researchers suggest that especially in labour-intensive support units, combat units, elite academies and at senior command levels, we are most likely to observe the characteristics and rituals of closed total institutions and a high institutional orientation. In support-oriented functions like logistics, medical care and transportation the interaction with civil society is high, and the culture will be similar to "normal" business cultures (Carreiras, 2006; Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014; Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006).

Another influence on the social structure of post-modern military organizations is the respective civil-military relationship and the political situation of a country (Segal, 1995). Generally speaking, political and societal influence on the Western postmodern military is increasing: This is visible, for example, through plebiscites on conscription versus professional, all-volunteer armies (Nuciari, 2006). In view of the new tasks for soldiers and the very different political and military situation in many countries, the primary goals of national armies today are diverse. These goals range from helping civilians, natural disaster management and border patrolling to ensuring peace and/or preparing for and conducting war (Dandeker & Gow, 1999). However, there is still an overarching military culture (cf. Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006): All military organizations prepare for life-threatening situations and have the mandate to execute violence to protect civilians (Basham, 2009; Nuciari, 2006). National armies often follow the ideal of a *Prussian Corps* including rigid structures and high discipline (Ben-Ari & Elron, 2001, in Tomforde, 2010, p. 200). Basis trainings and socialization into the military life are important in all ⬚AU5 military organizations (Tomforde, 2010). Even within peacekeeping armies, military training focuses essentially on preparation for a combat emergency, i.e. high-intensity fighting (Basham, 2009; Dandeker & Gow, 1999; Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014; Zedlacher, 2013). Tomforde (2010) found in her analysis of the German Armed Forces, that within *multinational* deployments like the NATO-led *Kosovo Force* (*KFOR*), identification with the own national army often increases. However, regulations and symbols of the traditional military culture like uniforms, ceremonies and specific vocabulary are often adapted or less rigidly applied.

2.2 Women, Ethnic Minorities and LGBTQ in the Military Then and Now

Women, ethnic minorities and LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people) have held an exposed minority status in national armies worldwide throughout history. In pre-modern times, women were officially excluded from military institutions. This was because sexuality and emotions were ascribed to women as a defining attribute; the inclusion of a female body and the increase of individual sexual desires would thus threaten the collective organizational interest

188 and soldiers' discipline (Burrell, 1992; Gabbert, 2007; cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, &
189 Hudribusch, 2014). Paradoxically, while the expression of sexuality and femininity
190 have been tabooed and feared, the closed nature of total institutions increases the risk
191 of (homo)sexual relationship between inmates (cf. Rastetter, 1999; Zedlacher, 2013).
192 While soldiers should work together closely, overt homoerotic behaviour is not
193 tolerated (e.g. Winslow, 1999).
194   The situation of minority nationals in armies is also shaped by the changes in
195 warfare and the socio-political situation of a country. Throughout history, women
196 have unofficially participated in warfare and have often served as reserve soldiers in
197 many national armies (for an overview see Segal, 1993). After the Cold War and
198 with the introduction of all-volunteer armies and the need for more support person-
199 nel, official participation of women in national armies increased (Segal, 1995;
200 Sinclair, 2009). For example, the German Armed Forces opened all ranks to female
201 soldiers in 2001. In 2011 an all-volunteer army was introduced. Since 2001 their
202 share rose from 1.5% to 12.8%, i.e. roughly 20,000 female soldiers in 2016 ("Frauen   [AU6]
203 in der Bundeswehr", 2017). As of 2015, the rate of active female duty members in all
204 NATO-member and partner countries is approximately 10.8% (NATO-summary of
205 the national reports, 2015). Only in Latvia, New Zealand, Australia and the US is the
206 proportion of female soldiers slightly higher than 15% (NATO summary, 2015).
207 Most female soldiers work in support and medical functions. An examination of
208 national armies of large nations depicts the high horizontal gender segregation. For
209 example, women make up roughly 35% of all medical personnel in the German
210 Armed Forces, whereas in the Army, Air Force and Navy the share of female soldiers
211 is only approximately 7.2% ("So weiblich ist die Bundeswehr", 2016). In the Israeli
212 Defence Forces with conscription service for men and women, only 5.7% of combat
213 positions were occupied by women by 2016. About 10% of military jobs—among
214 them submarine positions—are still closed to women ("By the numbers", 2017).
215 Also in the all-volunteer US army, close combat positions had been closed to women
216 until 2016 when the Obama administration allowed female soldiers to serve in
217 infantry, armour, field artillery and Special Forces (Kimmons, 2016).
218   Comparable to the situation of women, restricting, barring or discharging homo-
219 sexuals and ethnic minorities from service has also been dependent on the respective
220 need of personnel for warfare (Sinclair, 2009). For example, non-whites had only
221 restricted access to the British military up to the 1970s. Until the year 2000 "sexual
222 minorities" were routinely prohibited from service (Basham, 2009). In the US,
223 especially during the Second World War homosexuality was viewed as a mental
224 illness; psychiatric screening procedures with background checks determined if the
225 recruit was homosexual, and, thus, unfit for service (Sinclair, 2009). After the
226 Second World War homosexuals were officially banned from the US military.
227 President Clinton introduced the *Don't ask, don't tell* policy in 1992 to grant official
228 participation to homosexuals in the military by interdicting disclosing or asking
229 about their sexual orientation. This policy was abolished in 2011. In general,
230 political pressures for the inclusion of LGBTQ people increased in the last decades
231 (cf. Nuciari, 2006; Sinclair, 2009). For example, during the Obama administration,

the ban against the participation of transgender individuals in the US military was repealed. However, in 2017, President Trump directed the military not to move forwards with the plan (Diamond, 2017).

Summing up, the socio-political situation of a country impacts the core tasks of the military and the integration of minorities. However, despite national differences, military organizations worldwide still share common characteristics due to the ongoing salience of combat-readiness. In the following literature review we focus on three related characteristics, which taken together we deem most relevant for the normalization of bullying and harassment in a military environment: Hierarchical and bureaucratical structures, harsh socialization processes and training rituals, and hypermasculine values in subunits.

3   Structural and Cultural Risk Factors for Workplace Bullying and Harassment in Military Organizations

3.1   Misuse of Hierarchical and Bureaucratical Structures

Military systems worldwide reflect features, which Max Weber associated with ideal bureaucracies: Overall, they have a strict top-down chain of command with one single authority, written pre-defined procedures, rules and clear control mechanisms (Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014; Zedlacher, 2013). Soldiers of one cohort are subject to the same tasks and performance criteria. Excessive rules and regulations foster self-control and conformity (cf. Davies, 1989). These structural characteristics should create a disciplined and homogeneous unit, which will operate effectively in warfare (cf. Titunik, 2000). Moreover, there is a clear formal and informal power distance between the different ranks or service grades. Uniforms display the differences to the outside world and the differences within the ranks. Usually military careers and pay levels are fixed and embedded in a clear system of service grades. To reach a higher service grade and thus, pay, specific formal qualifications for each position must be obtained. However, as Weber noted, such bureaucratic features and the communal character of the military stand in contrast to the wish of single individuals to stand out as war heroes (Titunik, 2000; cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014).

Empirical research shows that formal power as well as bureaucratic rules and procedures are often misused. For example, Kimmel (2000) revealed that supervisors and second-year cadets in the US Virginia military institute used seemingly random and unnecessary orders for subordination of the freshmen. Pershing (2001, 2002, 2003, 2006) observed organizational misconduct at the elite US Naval academy, where midshipmen are trained to become Naval officers after graduation. Most midshipmen reported unrealistic time constraints, close monitoring and excessively regulated schedules imposed by supervisors, as the following quote demonstrates:

We were issued book bags to carry to classes because we had to carry all our books to classes every day. I had to walk about a quarter of a mile to class, so I used the shoulder strap that

was attached to the bag. However, it was against the regulations to walk using our shoulder straps because it looks unprofessional. I can't tell you how many times I was stopped by officers who asked: 'What are you doing using these shoulder straps. Don't you know it's against the regulations? You're here to obey orders. It's in the rules.' Technically I would have been fried (charged with a violation), and lost 10 days of liberty (permission to leave the Academy grounds). (graduate of US Naval academy, as cited in Pershing, 2002, p. 163)

Especially in non-operational times and on peacekeeping missions, a very formalistic organizational design can be perceived as dysfunctional and coercive (Archer, 1999; Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006). In such situations, lack of opportunity to demonstrate strength, skill and dominance, or dissatisfaction with seemingly meaningless role assignments and monitoring can increase frustration and aggression among soldiers (Archer, 1999; cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014; Zedlacher, 2013).

Hierarchical structures promote the striving of individuals to gain power over their subordinates. In (tall) hierarchies, the exercise of power and control, and the associated feelings of dominance and subordination, become routine and normalized (Hearn & Parkin, 2001; Robinson, 1994). Hierarchical structures can induce the so-called *moral disentanglement*, i.e. cognitive processes, which make members act unethically without feeling distress (Moore, Detert, Trevino, Baker, & Mayer, 2012). For example, members may displace the responsibility for their actions to authority figures or to the peers who have tacitly or explicitly granted permission for the behaviour (Moore, Detert, Trevino, Baker, & Mayer, 2012). Vice versa having many hierarchical levels in an organization makes the management prone to be strategically ignorant to bullying and harassment in subunits (cf. Ashforth & Anand, 2003). Moreover, being a member of an organization, department, workgroup or function automatically creates and fosters insider and outsider status (Moore, Detert, Trevino, Baker, & Mayer, 2012).

In total institutions like the military the consequences of such an organizational structure are more pronounced. While cadets lack a personal life, and lead an "*enclosed formally administered round of life*" (Goffman, 1968, as cited in Davies, 1989, p. 11), staff members can punish them by using diverse types of sanctions for whatever staff deems *deviant* behaviour. As a form of *nonjudicial punishment*, supervisors can even imprison soldiers. Such discretionary powers of staff members can be a breeding ground for workplace bullying and harassment. Likewise, supervisors can grant rewards and privilege to individual soldiers for obedience and discipline, e.g. by allowing them to break the curfew. By doing so, staff recognizes and fosters adherence to military values (cf. Davies, 1989; Zedlacher, 2013).

3.2   Socialization Processes and Training Rituals in the Unit

Values and norms of a military culture and taught to new members during their first days and months in the military or a new unit. In this socialization phase, recruits' personal life is heavily restricted in order to crush their old identities and to

indoctrinate the new military values (cf. King, 2006; Morris, 1991). Also, recruits learn that they must *earn* their status as soldiers. For entry in elite units, individuals undergo severe physical and psychological admission tests and training phases (e.g. Kimmel, 2000; Pershing, 2002). This usually happens in a company of a large batch with one authority (Davies, 1989). The application of violence and harassment during military training and fitness is regarded as instrumental in non-operational times as a preparation for dehumanizing the enemy. Lukowiak (2000) provides an account of outdoor training for entry into the *Parachute Regiment* in the British Armed Forces.

> If I had one major problem during basic training—that is, besides the physical exercise and the weather conditions and the food you could never get enough of and the lack of sleep and the mornings before dawn and the late nights, oh, and the drill and the discipline and the constant cleaning and scrubbing, not to mention the persistent shouting— then I guess it was my aggression. Or should I say my lack of it? If I was to become one of our nation's elite killers, then this was obviously something they were going to have to change in me, and change it they did. (Lukowiak, 2000, as cited in Woodward, 2003, p. 48)

The soldier further recounts being bullied by his supervisor during a long march in a chilly morning, pushed into a canal and laughed at. But he, enraged and full of aggression, managed to get back to the barrack. There he was applauded by the supervisor, and, now proud, he eventually felt belonging (Lukowiak, 2000; in Woodward, 2003, pp. 48–49).

However, while soldiers need to strive for individual (physical) dominance, emotional control and endurance, they must at the same time learn to protect the fellow soldier and regulate physical aggression; be selfless, trustworthy and loyal (cf. Johnson, 1990). Even after the Cold War, these features of *social cohesion* between peers and between supervisors and peers were regarded as essential for military effectiveness and combat morale. Social cohesion has been considered a prerequisite for *task cohesion*, i.e. cohesion achieved through a common goal and coordination of efforts (cf. Basham, 2009; MacCoun, Kier, & Belkin, 2005, Nuciari, 2006; Siebold, 2007). Women, ethnic minorities and homosexuals have been banned from military service mainly on the grounds of social cohesion. They were considered a threat to the homogeneity and combat morale of military units—and consequently, heterosexuality was equalled with operational effectiveness, regardless of actual ability (Basham, 2008).

Social cohesion, or *male bonding,* is learned behaviour. To foster the separation from civilian values, recruits are taught values like honour, duty, assertiveness and fairness (e.g. Franke, 2000; Winslow, 1999). Especially *honour* is a recurring theme and often referred to official brochures, speeches and programmes (e.g. Cotter, 2016, McCoy, 1995). McCoy (1995) showed in his analysis of hazing in the *Philippine Military Academy,* that the term *honour* is often used by officers and supervisors to indoctrinate or reaffirm values like subordination, control and machismo.

Those members, who are either new and must prove themselves, or who are not fit enough and do not conform, are denigrated and punished.

356 They teach you about comradeship and sticking together and stuff, and suddenly they tell
357 you in preparation class (for military academy) that if one lies on the ground, then let him
358 lie there. We said, we need to go there, I mean I can't (...)' 'No, leave him there, he's
359 just too weak.' Like this it went all the time (...). (Fanny, Austrian Soldier, as cited in
360 Zedlacher, 2013, p. 170; translated by authors)

361   Hazing rituals by supervisors and peers are common in socialization processes. In
362 the *Bahia Military Police Academy* in Brazil, aggressive physical behaviours and   AU9
363 also embarrassing tasks like having to eat the dessert before the main plate with the
364 mouths wide open are an institutionalized part of the first week (Albuquerque &
365 Paes-Machado, 2004). Another example is the *Canadian Airborne Regiment,* where
366 group cohesion is considered especially important because members must rely on
367 each other for the appropriate preparation of their equipment before the jump
368 (Winslow, 1999). All soldiers participate in a formal initiation program, where
369 they are indoctrinated into a sense of duty and history of the Canadian Airborne
370 and undergo an intensive training program. When they are finally granted group
371 membership, they receive a coin denoting their new status. Apart from that, there is
372 also an informal initiation rite. In the so-called separation phase, new soldiers are
373 first denigrated and levelled by seniors, i.e. they are all made look alike (e.g. by
374 shaving their heads, having them dig through the mud, by covering black soldiers in
375 white powder), while the seniors stay clean (Winslow, 1999). This phase teaches
376 recruits that before they can rise, they must separate from their old identities and
377 become just like everyone else (Albuquerque & Paes-Machado, 2004). Afterwards
378 they are forced to stand in a row and urinate or vomit on a piece of bread, which they
379 then must chew. In this "liminal phase" they are not yet part of the airborne, but also
380 no more civilians. In this stage, established social norms and taboos are often
381 suspended and behaviours like ridiculing the only black soldier or performing
382 homoerotic dances are performed. Finally, in the re-integration phase life scenarios
383 of airborne soldiers are tested among recruits. For example, they must jump from a
384 table blindfolded. Hereby they learn to do whatever their superiors tell them to do
385 (Winslow, 1999). The recruits who go through these rituals often do not find them
386 harmful, but are proud to have demonstrated self-regulation and physical endurance
387 (Albuquerque & Paes-Machado, 2004; Winslow, 1999). It appears that the more
388 severe the initiation rituals are, the stronger the eventual devotion to the group is
389 (Winslow, 1999). Public denigration of outsiders and those who show weakness
390 reconfirms military values, increases the desire to belong to the exclusive in-group,
391 or rather, the fear of belonging to the out-group. Hence, staff members often tolerate
392 or even promote such group rituals, since they are regarded as functional for military
393 effectiveness and cohesion (Zedlacher, 2013).
394   The harsh training methods, monitoring experiences and rituals foster peer loyalty
395 and the notion of "companions in fate" (e.g. King, 2006; Pershing, 2001;
396 cf. Zedlacher, 2013). Alcohol is a crucial tool for male bonding and is also viewed
397 as a means to relax after intensive training and surveillance in national armies:

After a week's work, we get together and have a beer call. That's where we can really talk, we always have something to say to one another. It's a place where we can really relax, because no matter how you look at it, the friction builds up in this work. Here, we can say anything and not worry about who's listening, we don't have to be in uniform, that's good. (Canadian Airborne soldier, as cited in Winslow, 1999, p. 438)

Social cohesion has been found to be the result of such stern socialization processes as described above rather than naturally developed in elite military units (King, 2006). Several studies of a variety of national armies show that task cohesion is also positively related to military performance, but social cohesion is not (MacCoun, Kier, & Belkinn, 2005; Kier, 1998; King, 2006).

There are costs to such intense cohesion when too close bonds in a subculture or unit outweigh organizational goals. For example, Pershing's (2002) study of the US naval academy found that midshipmen share a tight bond because of exposure to excessive monitoring and regulations. An informal code of silence forbids them to report severe predatory bullying of their peers, despite the official duty for all navy men to report violations of honour (Pershing, 2002; cf. Zedlacher, 2013). Those who exert the official rules too wilfully are regarded as connivers and "honor-nazis" (Pershing, 2002). In highly cohesive groups, peers would ignore or deny even severe misconduct to not to betray the fellow soldier (cf. Winslow, 1999). Thus, peer challenge of aggressive practices and treatment is neutralized.

3.3 Predominance of (Hyper-)Masculine Values

For centuries, military organizations have been male-only societies. Violence, warfare and guns have been associated with men, whereas women have mostly been portrayed as the weak victim or as war trophy, which can be violated (cf. Baaz & Stern, 2009; Zedlacher, 2013). Female soldiers who engage in violent behaviours generate substantial public interest (for example in the torture scandal in Abu Graib) as they violate traditional gender roles (cf. Gabbert, 2007). Also, homosexuals have been described as "effeminate" and as potential risk for security (cf. Sinclair, 2009).

To understand the effect of masculinity on systemic (sexual) violence in the military, the concept of *hegemonic masculinity* is useful. This term denotes the normative embodiment of the ideal man (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). It points to the (white) male, heterosexual dominance, which is implicitly considered legitimate in most societal and organizational contexts. The concept works through the distinction from women and femininity, and the constant competition between men over "manhood" (cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014). The persistent ideal image of a male soldier reflects this hegemonic masculinity and is associated with a strong physical body through (self-) discipline and endurance, capable of exerting physical dominance and sexual violence. The male penis functions not (only) as instrument of sexual desire, but also represents hegemonial masculine power. The war customs of raping female captives, severing or publicly displaying the penis of enemies, or teasing and forcing lower ranked soldiers to touch one's

439 penis are a way to exerting control over someone's body and to prove the other's lack
440 of (male) power (Kwon, Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2007; Raasch, 2004).

441   The hegemony of masculine values and the control of the soldiers' bodies are
442 inscribed into the organization of military systems. Admission and promotion
443 criteria in national armies are still highly related to physical performance
444 (cf. Cnossen, 1999)—despite a new, less physically oriented art of warfare. Many
445 armies have introduced gender-normed physical training standards with lower
446 admission criteria for women (cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014). This
447 has been highly disputed, since through such a distinction the salience of physical
448 fitness is re-emphasized and cements the hierarchical gender order in the military
449 (Apelt, Dittmer, & Mangold, 2005). If physical fitness is considered as essential for
450 combat effectiveness, women who underwent easier performance tests are very
451 likely not to be regarded as equal fellows and trustworthy comrades (cf. Cohn,
452 2000; Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014). Feelings of injustice, alleged
453 female privilege and threats to operational effectiveness and prestige are triggers
454 for male backlash and aggression against female soldiers (Zedlacher, 2013). This is
455 demonstrated by a quote from a male officer of the Austrian Armed Forces, who
456 recounts a special treatment of women in training and routine marches:

457   Well, they were attended to (. . .) they did not have to carry so much, rather the load was
458   distributed among men; and then there was the topic of the different sports limits. 'Why is
459   she allowed to run less kilometres than me?' And that led to a bad tension right away (. . .).
460   (Josef, male officer in the Austrian Armed Forces, as cited in Zedlacher, 2013, p. 171 f.
461   translated by authors)

462   Several well-known military rituals are highly gendered. For example, hazing
463 rituals as described before are also masculinity tests. Those who fail receive nick-
464 names such as "wimp", "wussy", "skirt" or "pussy" (e.g. Cohn, 1993; Kimmel,
465 2000), since failure is equated with femininity or homosexuality. Also, punishment
466 duties like kitchen service or cleaning are stereotypically female tasks. Soldiers also
467 show that they are manlier than others by demonstrating drinking skills, physical
468 fitness, technological expertise and exclusion of others (e.g. Cohn, 1993; Higate,
469 2003; King, 2006; Winslow, 1999). In interviews with male soldiers, Green, Emslie,
470 O'Neill, Hunt and Walker (2010) found that the need to suppress emotions and hide
471 weakness fosters work-related distress. Soldiers buffer distress through homophile
472 tight bonds and friendships in the military, however at the same time they risk being
473 ridiculed as homosexuals.
474   Especially in traditionally male-dominated and highly cohesive subunits, the
475 so-called hypermasculine behaviour, i.e. exaggerated masculinity concomitant
476 with bragging about sexual experiences and even dehumanization, violation and
477 sexual objectification of women, can develop (for empirical evidence see e.g. Rosen,
478 Knudson, & Fancher, 2003). Hypermasculinity may involve sexual assaults
479 because of a feeling of entitlement to regular sex. Women soldiers have been
480 found to feel forced to engage in sexual relationships with their male colleagues

481 (Castro, Kintzle, Schuyler, Lucas, & Warner, 2015). The strong bonds between male
482 soldiers in a male-only unit makes them prone to induce, perpetuate and cover up
483 violence and even rape against women (cf. Castro, Kintzle, Schuyler, Lucas, &
484 Warner, 2015; Harrison, 2003; Kwon, Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2007; Morris, 1996). Very
485 often severe alcohol abuse plays a key role in assaults against female soldiers
486 (Castro, Kintzle, Schuyler, Lucas, & Warner, 2015). Also, male-to-male violence
487 is condoned in such settings, as Kwon, Lee, Kim, & Kim, (2007) reveal in a study
488 from the South Korean Army: Physical violence and sexualized behaviours like
489 forced hugging or touching the penises of recruits often occur in public. Male
490 perpetrators, who usually contest homosexual desires, concede that these behaviours
491 are a means to control the body of subordinates and reaffirm the hierarchical order
492 (Kwon, Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2007).

493 Female soldiers in male-dominated branches are highly visible and thus at risk to
494 be stereotyped. Therefore, they often assimilate into the existing (hyper-)masculine
495 culture and are likely to strive for high physical fitness and assertiveness to be
496 regarded a full member of the group (e.g. Cnossen, 1999; Zedlacher, 2013). King
497 (2006) found that women in the British Army are only accepted as fellow soldiers,
498 when they participate in drinking rituals and severe alcohol abuse. Similarly, a recent
499 study from the South African army reveals that female soldiers feel they must "hide"
500 their femininity and sexuality and are not respected in the army as much as male
501 soldiers (Heinecken, 2016). A Russian soldier describes the pressure like this:

502 In order to show what you're capable of, that you are suitable, that you are no worse than
503 your competitor, a woman has to invest much more. But not by charming the supervisor, but
504 through work related issues or skills (. . .). (Russian female soldier in Eifler, 2001, p. 128,
505 translated by authors)

506 Often, women who occupy masculine functions in male-dominated combat-
507 related units and academies tell misogynistic jokes or discriminate against other
508 "weaker" women to prove that they are loyal to the male group and equal to their
509 male peers (e.g. Sasson-Levy, 2003). These coping strategies do not challenge the
510 overall masculine culture of the army. At the same time, female soldiers risk being
511 denigrated because of a masculine demeanour. For example, in the US army, a make-
512 up requirement was imposed on female soldiers (Williams, 2006). In the Russian
513 military, beauty contests of female soldiers reconfirm gender stereotypes and put
514 women in sexualized positions (Eifler, 2001). Balancing these contradictory gender
515 expectations proves a dilemma for female soldiers and a constant, often unconscious
516 stressor at work.

517 To sum up, organizational characteristics like rigid chain of commands, social
518 cohesion and training for physical dominance have been considered functional for
519 military performance in wartime and combat, and have thus become institutional-
520 ized. Each of the features essentially builds on the claim that *homogeneity* is crucial
521 for performance. Consequently, (violent) exclusion of "weaker" members and
522 minorities is condoned or even promoted.

4 Prevalence Studies of Workplace Bullying and Harassment in Military Organizations

4.1 Workplace Bullying in National Armies

Workplace bullying is often characterized by subtle, covert negative actions (e.g. withholding information, spreading rumours behind one's back, etc.). If these behaviours are repeated over time, they make targets feel increasingly powerless and unable to defend. Exposure to bullying is considered slightly higher for women than for men (Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2011). However, women tend to rate many bullying behaviours as more severe than men, and they often feel more harmed by social exclusion and manipulation (Escartin, Salin, & Rodriguez-Caballeira, 2013; Salin, 2003; cf. Zedlacher, 2013).   [AU10]

In the European tradition, two types of workplace bullying are distinguished. *Dispute-related bullying* is a result of a normal work conflict that escalates because of tit-for-tat actions by both conflict parties. However, Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf and Cooper (2011) contend that within male-dominated organizations such as the military, *predatory bullying* is common. Predatory bullying denotes a form of bullying where the reason or trigger for escalation is not an unsolved interpersonal conflict or a provocation, but rather the mechanisms described before. Here bullying serves as a mechanism to socialize into or to sanction the violation of a hypermasculine military culture (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; cf. Zedlacher, 2013).   [AU11]

This conceptualization suggests that predatory bullying is a (group) phenomenon of its own and more related to the original definition of *mobbing* as social exclusion of a single *deviant* co-worker. Predatory bullying also overlaps with hazing, since public denigration is usually characteristic for hazing rituals. However, bullying and hazing are—theoretically—distinct phenomena: Hazing implies that a cohort mistreats another cohort, e.g. the new members (cf. Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001), even if the ritual is only performed against one member. The feeling of being singled-out is pervasive in bullying cases and contributes to the feeling of victimization. In contrast, hazing eventually increases social identification with the group. Moreover, hazing is ritualistic, i.e. the same behaviours are performed to newcomers with minor change, while bullying usually has no predefined procedure and end (Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001). Bullying research is characterized by placing the experiences of bullying targets central (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011). Therefore, the question arises if and why empirically targets of bullying *perceive* a difference between hazing rituals and workplace bullying. Ostvik & Rudmin (2001) find that soldiers, who are asked about their experiences with bullying, often confound bullying with hazing. A study of bullying during socialization within UK police forces shows that new members perceive the experienced bullying acts as a "harmless" ritual, if, and only if they have eventually made it into the group (Miller & Rayner, 2012).

The literature review suggests that collective predatory bullying dynamics is especially prevalent in elite academies and combat-oriented units (e.g. Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001; Pershing, 2003, 2006; Winslow, 1999). Ostvik & Rudmin (2001) cite

566 various severe incidences of public hazing (in the Philippines, the former Czecho-
567 slovakian Republic, etc.), which sometimes result in death or suicide. In 2006, a
568 young recruit in the Russian army lost his arms and legs from a collective hazing
569 ritual. He was beaten, tied between the two chairs and made to squat. The Russian
570 army tried to hide the scandal, before it became public. Then the case was treated as a
571 single unfortunate exception (Lowry, 2008). In 2011, the Australia Armed Forces
572 announced an external review of allegations of abuse ("Report on Abuse in
573 Defence", 2014). In the so-called "Piper Report" an external law firm collected
574 more than 2240 allegations, which have occurred during the last decades. Almost
575 half of incidences were about physical abuse, but between 2000 and 2011
576 reports of covert bullying behaviours have also increased ("Report on Abuse in
577 Defence", 2014).

578   Few studies of military organizations measure the distinct phenomenon of work-
579 place bullying with established instruments. A rate of 3–4% of severe bullying,
580 i.e. long-term exposure to bullying at a weekly basis or more, is considered average
581 in European organizations (Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2011). In the
582 study on bullying and hazing in the Norwegian army (n = 696), the bullying rate was
583 12% (Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001). However, exposure to bullying was measured only
584 with a self-labelling method ("Have you been bullied") without a definition of
585 bullying. As such, bullying might even be underreported, since identifying oneself
586 as a victim is hardly desirable within this organizational context of the military. Fifty-
587 three percent of respondents reported witnessing bullying in the Norwegian army.
588 Respondents are exposed to a variety of bullying behaviours, including both phys-
589 ical and psychological assaults, person- and work-related bullying. Young soldiers
590 were more likely to report having been bullied. Mageroy, Lau, Riise and Moen
591 (2009) measured bullying in 97 Norwegian Navy departments (n = 1604) with a
592 self-labelling method including definition. Two and half percent of respondents
593 reported being bullied and 9% witnessed bullying. The results also indicate that
594 a lack of fair leadership, innovative climate and unfair treatment as well as a low
595 mean age accounted for the occurrence of bullying at the departmental level.

596   Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch's, (2014) study of different units of the
597 Austrian Armed Forces also found a higher risk for younger soldiers and a rate of
598 6.5% of severe bullying measured with the *Leymann Inventory of Psychological*
599 *Terror* (LIPT; Leymann, 1996). All reported bullying cases were collective phenom-
600 ena with at least two perpetrators, which points to predatory bullying/mobbing.
601 Academies and schools as training centres were highly affected by incidents of
602 severe bullying, followed by combat units and, to a much lesser degree, support-
603 units. Moreover, women were 2.5 times more likely to experience severe bullying
604 acts than male soldiers. Male soldiers and female victims of bullying have been
605 found to be more likely to conduct aggressive acts against female soldiers (Koeszegi,
606 Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014; Zedlacher, 2013). In contrast to the propositions of
607 predatory bullying (cf. Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011), most of the reported
608 bullying behaviours (n = 254) were not overt and not physical (e.g. "Innuendos
609 without direct communication", "assignment of meaningless tasks", "spreading
610 rumours" and "constant criticism of one's work"). The least cited acts were

611 "violent threats and violence". Few incidences of sexual harassment and only one
612 sexual assault were reported (cf. Zedlacher, 2013).

613 4.2 Sexual Harassment and Assaults in National Armies

614 You all know that we are looking at allegations that Marines, specifically female Marines,
615 have been subjected to cyberbullying and non-consensual sharing of images, disrespectful
616 comments made about them presumably by other marines. These allegations are in contrast
617 to everything we stand for as Marine corps, as Marines; discipline, honour, professionalism,
618 and respect and trust amongst each other; for those Marines that are watching this or
619 listening or who may have been involved in this: (...), you are not helping the marine
620 corps. (...) you know that we claim that being a Marine is a special title and something that
621 you earn (...). that there is no honour in denigrating a fellow Marine in a way, shape or form.
622 (Marines General Robert Nueller at a press conference, cf. Starr & Almasy, 2017)

623   Schneider, Pryor and Fitzgerald (2011) distinguish between two forms of sexual
624 harassment: (1) Unwelcome sex- or gender-related behaviour that creates a hostile
625 work environment (unwanted attention like uninvited requests for dates, secret
626 filming, gender harassment like misogynistic jokes) and (2) *Quid pro Quo* harass-
627 ment, i.e. promising employing benefits depending on sexual favours. *Sexual assault*
628 denotes unwanted sexual contact and can range from touching and attempts to
629 commit a sexual action to rape (Castro, Kintzle, Schuyler, Lucas, & Warner, 2015;
630 Cotter, 2016; Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014). *Gender discrimination* refers to   AU12
631 incidences in which a person is unequally treated based on his/her gender category
632 membership in a manner that affects his/her employment conditions (Morral, Gore,
633 & Schell, 2014).
634   While workplace bullying is often (falsely) characterized as gender-neutral,
635 sexual misconduct carries a clear gender component (cf. Zedlacher, 2013). Like
636 workplace bullying, women tend to perceive a broader range of sexual behaviours as
637 harassing than men (Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001). While sexual harassment
638 can be constituted by one act, measurement usually considers the type/severity
639 of behaviour and whether the behaviour occurred repeatedly (e.g. Morral, Gore,
640 & Schell, 2014).
641   Sexual misconduct is more frequently surveyed in (western) military organiza-
642 tions than workplace bullying. Especially in the US, many surveys and reviews on
643 the relationship between military culture, environmental factors and health correlates
644 exist (e.g. Sadler, Booth, Cook, & Doebbeling, 2003; Turchik & Wilson, 2010, to
645 name just a few). Often studies from the (US) military are restricted to one group
646 of soldiers, e.g. reservists (e.g. Firestone & Harris, 2009; Street, Stafford, Mahan,
647 & Hendricks, 2008). Also, we did not find representative studies on the prevalence
648 of harassment against LGBTQ people.
649   In the following we review recent large-sale studies from various national armies.
650 However, since terminology and measurement of negative sexual experiences in
651 military organizations is not consistent across studies, the comparison of results must
652 be treated with care. In the US, a large-scale study (n = 560,000) by the *National*

653 *Defense Research Institute* (Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014) on sexual harassment,
654 assault and gender discrimination was conducted among active force members and
655 reservists. In the Canadian Armed Forces, a survey on *sexual misconduct* including
656 most of above behaviours was distributed among active force members in 2016
657 (n = 43.000).
658   Twenty-six percent of female and 7% of male active duty members of the US
659 Airforce, Army, Navy and Marines report having experienced sexual harassment or
660 gender discrimination in the prior year, more than half of them on a regular basis.
661 Most of the reports by female victims point to persistent, i.e. repeated exposure, and
662 do not point at sexual coercion, but to a (sexually) hostile work environment
663 (Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014): The most frequently reported behaviours were
664 sexual jokes, trying to establish romantic relationships, sexual comments about
665 one's appearance, suggesting that one does not act like a man/woman. In Canada,
666 17% of regular force members were exposed to sexual harassment or discrimination,
667 with women being twice as likely as men to report harassment (Cotter, 2016).
668 (Repeated) sexual jokes were also the most frequently reported form of harassment
669 in the Canadian survey, and Quid pro Quo harassment was considered rare in both
670 studies. Moreover, in both studies more than half of respondents reported that their
671 supervisor or unit leader was one of the people who engaged in the harassment
672 (Cotter, 2016; Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014).
673   Reports of sexual harassment and assaults in the US sample correlate with each
674 other, which confirm other studies (e.g. Harris, McDonald, & Sparks, 2017). The
675 rates for sexual assaults in US army were 1% for men and 4.9% for women, which is
676 very similar to the rates in the Canadian Armed Forces (1% for men, 4.8% for
677 women). In the US sample, male victims were often sexually assaulted by two or
678 more offenders at work. However, men more than women defined the experiences as
679 a means of hazing and denigration rather than behaviour with sexual intent (Morral,
680 Gore, & Schell, 2014). Assaults against female US soldiers were often related to
681 alcohol abuse. Significantly more assaults against women were reported in the US
682 Marine Corps and Navy than in other branches. The US Airforce disclosed low rates
683 of assaults. Junior enlisted members in the US army have the highest risk of sexual
684 harassment and assaults. Also in Canada, younger regular force members, especially
685 young female soldiers, reported more assaults and harassment (Cotter, 2016). Among
686 US reservists, rates of harassment and assaults against men and women were signif-
687 icantly lower than for active duty members (Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014).
688   A recent survey study of Harris, McDonald and Sparks (2017) among US soldiers
689 shows that a sexist environment (measured at the organizational level from an
690 independent sample) in a unit is related to exposure to sexual harassment and assault.
691 This points to the existence of sexist subcultures prone to the acceptance of even
692 severe violations. In this study, the experiences of harassment and assaults were
693 independent of race, gender or unit cohesion, but related to a general tolerance of
694 sexist comments in the department. In contrast, Buchanan, Settles and Woods'
695 (2008) study of 7000 female US soldiers found that white women reported higher
696 rates of gender harassment, and black women reported higher rates of unwanted
697 sexual attention and sexual coercion.

698   There is evidence of sexual harassment in other national armies. For example, in a
699 study in the Swedish military (n = 324), 84% of women reported experiencing
700 unwanted sex-related behaviours in the past 24 months (Estrada & Berggren, 2009).
701 This study revealed very different results, when women where asked directly
702 whether they were exposed to sexual harassment; in this case, "only" 31% reported
703 exposure. The "Piper Report" of the Australian Defence Forces reveals that 38% of
704 all 2240 cases received by the taskforce were about sexual abuse ("Report on Abuse
705 in Defence", 2014). Typically, there was a single perpetrator and women were more
706 affected by the assaults. Also, qualitative studies of national armies, e.g. Russia and
707 Israel (Eifler, 2001; Sasson-Levy, 2003), show that female soldiers suffer from
708 misogynistic jokes, denigrating glances, but sometimes also from open sexual
709 assaults to reaffirm the traditional gender order.

710   To sum up, sexual harassment and assaults have been considered a major problem
711 in the military context and have—so far—received more research attention than
712 workplace bullying. For the US army, various scholars (e.g. Firestone & Harris,
713 2003; Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014) contend that overall, incidences of sexual
714 harassment have decreased over the last years. In-depth results indicate that the
715 awareness for the damaging effect of covert and private bullying behaviours has
716 increased. However, victims of both phenomena still face a culture of denial in
717 most national armies, which is the major obstacle for effective prevention and
718 intervention.

5   Tackling Workplace Bullying and Harassment in Military Organizations

5.1   Empirical Evidence on Reactions to Workplace Bullying

722 In the representative study of the US military (Morral, Gore, & Schell, 2014), only
723 14% of victims of sexual assaults in the active component report to have filed an
724 official report. Of those who reported the problem to superiors, 41% were unsatisfied
725 with the actions taken. In the Canadian survey, 23% of victims of sexual assaults
726 reported the incidence to an authority, most often their military supervisor. Less than
727 7% reported their victimization to the military police or the *Canadian Forces*
728 *National Investigation Service* (Cotter, 2016). Moreover, only 5% of victims of
729 "less severe" forms of sexual misconduct (e.g. unwanted touching) reported the
730 misconduct. Thus, it can be assumed that there are high numbers of unreported
731 experiences of workplace bullying and sexual harassment. Reasons for not disclos-
732 ing sexual harassment and gender discrimination include trivialization, especially of
733 "minor" incidents, as well as worries about retaliation and stigma in a culture where
734 unit loyalty and endurance are regarded as essential and where commanders often
735 promote hypermasculine behaviour (cf. Firestone & Harris, 2003; Morral, Gore, &
736 Schell, 2014).

737   Related to this, the inertia of military systems prevents victims of harassment or
738 assaults from reporting their experiences. For example, in the South African Forces

739 only 26% of female victims of sexual harassment reported the incidents (Heinecken,
740 2016). The reasons for not reporting were that victims felt no action would be taken
741 (17%), or that the complaint would take a long time to process (49%). These
742 obstacles for effective formal grievances have also been found in studies of sexual
743 harassment in the US and Canadian Defence Forces (e.g. Cotter, 2016; Firestone &
744 Harris, 2003; Pershing, 2003). In the review report from the Australian Defence
745 Forces, only one quarter of victims, who had filed a formal suit, were satisfied with
746 the official defence management by army officials (Rumble, McKean, & Pearce,
747 2011). If complaints are raised only informally and discussed off the record with the
748 supervisor, it is easier for management to keep the problem quiet. Moreover,
749 ignorance, trivialization or denial of the incidences can lead to feelings of "second-
750 ary victimization", i.e. additional trauma for the victims of bullying and harassment
751 because they are not believed, ignored or blamed for what has happened.

752   Another challenge is the trivialization of "minor incidences" by the targets
753 themselves. The high value of endurance and the acceptance of a (sexually) hostile
754 environment might contribute to the normalization of sexual assaults in the unit.
755 Women as minority members might condone the assaults to not cause "gender
756 trouble" or be ridiculed as "hypersensitive"; they might even act aggressively against
757 other women who feel threatened by hostile comments (e.g. Koeszegi, Zedlacher,
758 & Hudribusch, 2014; Sasson-Levy, 2003). The study of sexual violence in the South
759 Korean Army showed that also men tend to trivialize the incidence (Kwon, Lee,
760 Kim, & Kim, 2007).

761 ## 5.2   Recommendations for Prevention and Intervention
762 ##   in National Armies

763 There are only few studies on the effectiveness of prevention and intervention tools
764 in military environments (e.g. Firestone & Harris, 2003). Therefore, we have
765 additionally interviewed practitioners from the Austrian Armed Forces about their
766 experiences and recommendations.

767   Our analysis suggests that, first and foremost, a profound change of cultural
768 values is needed to effectively reduce systematic bullying and harassment. Obsolete
769 beliefs about military effectiveness must be revised. Modern warfare, peace missions
770 and "civilian" functions require a broader range of skills than physical dominance
771 and high role-commitment. For example, soldiers engaging in peacekeeping mis-
772 sions need to possess stereotypically feminine skills like language and cross-cultural
773 skills as well as strategic thinking (cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014).
774 For soldiers on deployment in Kongo or Afghanistan, "culturally-sensitive" interac-
775 tion with civilians is crucial to receive information on planned terror attacks,
776 government opponents, etc. (cf. Tomforde, 2010). Female soldiers are crucial, not
777 least for interaction with female victims of violence. These new requirements for
778 soldiers need to be incorporated into admission and performance criteria. This
779 measure will over time potentially change the ideal image of soldiers and eventually
780 reduce hypermasculine dynamics and harassment against members perceived to be

781 weak by those standards. It can also attract more women to the military and increase
782 their acceptance since the new criteria carry less gender bias. Moreover, rather than
783 having gender-normed physical admission or training standard which undermine a
784 gender hierarchy, some national armies have levelled the standards for physical
785 performance for all genders (cf. Koeszegi, Zedlacher, & Hudribusch, 2014;
786 Zedlacher, 2013). However, downward-levelling might induce severe organizational
787 resistance since many soldiers will assume that operational performance and prestige
788 will decrease. As such, comprehensive information and communication is essential.
789 The US army has recently published "gender-neutral" fitness criteria for each of the
790 specific branches. Combat functions have the highest physical demands and fitness
791 criteria, whereas fitness limits for cyber functions are lower (Vergun, 2017).

792   Another persistent belief is the importance of social cohesion and male bonding.
793 Supervisors need to be made aware that there is no causal link between social
794 cohesion and military performance. Soldiers do not necessarily have to like each
795 and be alike to perform well. Apart from that, bonding often happens through
796 common stress and common experiences independent of race, gender and sexual
797 orientation (MacCoun, Kier, & Belkin, 2005). To foster cohesion, Albuquerque and
798 Paes-Machado (2004) recommend promoting positive celebrations and ceremonies
799 as a future substitute for institutionalized hazing rituals. In this context, leaders and
800 commanders need to be made aware, that the traditional affiliation to one small
801 military unit is still important in combat positions, but less so in peacekeeping
802 missions. These requirements for the post-modern military will potentially facilitate
803 the full inclusion of women and LGBTQ people. Rather than presuming a tension
804 between operational effectiveness and diversity, leaders and soldiers need to be made
805 aware and educated that it is harassment rather than a heterogeneous work force that
806 eventually destroys cohesion and productivity.

807   In Norway, where conscription for both men and women has been recently
808 introduced, soldiers sleep in mixed rooms and relationships are officially allowed.
809 While no evaluations of such measures exist at this point of time, we consider
810 tackling the tabooing of (homo)sexuality in Armed Forces as important for the
811 prevention of harassment and assaults. In this context, the sexist environment in
812 traditional branches and subunits needs to be tackled. In particular, subunits of
813 traditional military units and branches (e.g. the Navy) need to be monitored closely,
814 including the behaviour of the respective supervisor. Women or male members in
815 marginalized positions might feel harmed by specific "cultural" behaviours, but
816 might also fear that other members and organizational officials will not regard the
817 behaviours as harmful. This might be also true for collective ritualistic harassment
818 and hazing. To reduce fear of reporting, we therefore recommend including and
819 labelling hazing rituals as possible incidences of workplace bullying or harassment
820 and present them through *various* channels (e.g. brochures, policy papers and
821 websites). Practitioners of the Austrian Armed Forces claim that targets often
822 confound workplace bullying with negative performance evaluation or "normal"
823 conflicts. To create more awareness for the distinct features of workplace bullying,
824 examples and comparisons of bullying to "normal work situations" should be
825 described during leadership trainings as well as in all written documents.

826 Importantly, also practitioners need to be made aware that men and women might
827 perceive different acts of bullying or sexist remarks as not equally damaging. Typical
828 experiences of female victims also need to be assessed and described in official
829 documents as bullying. Military officials also need to consider that a lot of indirect
830 and subtle behaviours and new forms of cyberbullying like secret filming are part of
831 the bullying experience. These bullying behaviours are (yet) not commonly associ-
832 ated with the military culture, but are—if they are repeated over and over—as
833 harmful as overt bullying and assaults, but harder to detect.

834   As our analysis has shown, a general hostile climate can contribute to severe cases
835 of bullying and assaults. Thus, the persistence of "minor" incidences of bullying and
836 harassment need to be closely monitored, evaluated and tackled. An *external* agency
837 or taskforce, as installed in Australia after allegations of systematic misconduct
838 (cf. "Report on Abuse in Defence", 2014), can guarantee independent evaluation
839 of prevalence and incidence rates and increase legitimacy of results. The detailed
840 measurement procedure of the *National Defense Research Institute* (Morral, Gore,
841 & Schell, 2014) included a pre-definition of the behaviours as crimes under the
842 *Uniform Code of Military Justice* or as violation of *Equal Opportunities* legislation
843 and regulations. As such, findings cannot be easily trivialised, but need then to be
844 tackled by officials.

845   Firestone and Harris (2003) argue that zero-tolerance policies adopted by the
846 military may improve the military image, but do not necessarily reduce the fear of
847 reporting and social ostracism. Rather, it is recommended to display strong public
848 statements by military leaders like Marines General Nueller that bullying and sexual
849 harassment have no place in the military, but all allegations are taken seriously and
850 are thoroughly investigated, and bullying is prevented with policies and procedures
851 along with educational programmes (cf. Firestone & Harris, 2003).

852   Moreover, compulsory briefings on bullying and ongoing (!) leadership trainings
853 are often recommended. Practitioners from the Austrian Armed Forces state that
854 highly experienced military leaders often refuse to seek help from experts and
855 coaches if confronted with bullying cases. For workplace bullying, leaders need to
856 be made awareness of the features, escalation dynamics and negative consequences
857 of late or inadequate intervention (e.g. implementing "soft" mediation in highly
858 escalated stages of bullying). In the case of sexual harassment, increased awareness
859 through anti-sexual harassment policies and trainings might have contributed to a
860 better handling of cases and the slight reduction of victimization rates.

861   For intervention, intervention chain and a clear formal process with roles and
862 responsibilities increase perceptions of procedural justice (Hoel & Einarsen, 2010).   AU13
863 Although procedures for formal complaints are written down in many national
864 armies, official channels are often not trusted. Therefore, Firestone and Harris
865 (2003) recommend individual, informal responses to harassment (e.g. discussing
866 the allegations with the supervisor) to be accompanied or followed by organizational
867 formal complaints. Various organizational contact points, which victims can choose
868 from, should be established (e.g. *Equal Opportunities* Office, health services,
869 call centers). In the Austrian Armed Forces, an anonymous, 24/7 anti-bullying-
870 helpline has been implemented after results of the study of Koeszegi, Zedlacher, &

871 Hudribusch, (2014) were published. To date, an evaluation of the effectiveness of
872 intervention procedures is still in progress. Practitioners report in interviews that the
873 helpline has been considered helpful by targets of bullying. Targets are usually
874 offered further legal or psychological advice by the helpline. They often opt for
875 legal rather than for psychological advice in the first place. If they want to proceed
876 with the allegation, they need to give testimony in front of an internal committee
877 including psychologists and internal legal consultants. Practitioners also report that
878 targets often withdraw their accusations when the problem becomes public,
879 e.g. when their subunit leaders must be informed, or the victims need to collaborate
880 in witness questioning. This reaction is very common for victims, since they fear
881 reprisals, ostracism and victim-blaming. To reduce feelings of secondary victimiza-
882 tion, the Austrian Armed Forces plan to install the so-called *persons of trust* or
883 spokespeople, who also accompany the victims to interrogations by the committee.
884 Also, Austrian practitioners plan to introduce Case Management methodology,
885 which should help comprehensively monitor each bullying case even after the
886 bullying case was "solved".

887   The formalization and evaluation of internal prevention and intervention pro-
888 cedures in military organizations as well as the involvement of all parties in
889 intervention is crucial. However, we also regard the participation of external con-
890 sultants as essential for impartial investigations of allegations.

891 ## 6   Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research

892 This chapter on bullying and harassment in the military forged a bridge between
893 different topics. It covered an outline of the social and gendered structure of
894 postmodern military organizations, a theoretical analysis of systemic violence in
895 military organizations as well as recent empirical findings on the prevalence of
896 workplace bullying and harassment in national armies. Taking a gender or feminist
897 perspective in bullying research proves useful, as it uncovers taken-for-granted
898 social norms, which condone inequality and harassment.

899   Overall, our review suggests that both covert and overt aggressive behaviours are
900 pervasive in military organizations. However, the type of harassment and the risk for
901 increased exposure also depends on the branch, function, subunit, tenure and gender.
902 Higher exposure rates for young soldiers, cadets of (elite) academies and women
903 relates to their weaker position in the military culture. The example of the military
904 shows the decisiveness of the organizational context in bullying incidences. Targets
905 appraise and label their bullying experiences (e.g. in hazing rituals) depending on
906 how they make sense of these behaviours *retrospectively* and whether they eventu-
907 ally are regarded as full members of their working group.

908   These observations have implications for future research in the military. Access to
909 military organizations for research on bullying and harassment is difficult. Often
910 researchers are employed by military research departments, which might influence
911 the way they address thorny issues like bullying inside the ranks. Increased collab-
912 oration with practitioners and between members of international associations like the

913 *European Research Group on Military and Society* (ERGOMAS) can help fostering
914 scholarly research on bullying and harassment in different military organizations.
915   It is remarkable that—while sexual harassment in the US army is widespread—
916 the study in the peacekeeping Austrian Armed Forces did not reveal similarly high
917 rates of sexual harassment. Comparative studies across peace-making and peace-
918 keeping armies with the same measurement tools might provide more detailed
919 insights; e.g. to what extent soldiers in peacekeeping armies are exposed to harsh
920 training, hazing rituals and hypermasculine dynamics. In this context, it would be
921 also interesting to assess the impact of national culture on bullying and harassment.
922 For example, in Latin American countries like Costa Rica, workplace bullying is still
923 considered a physical phenomenon (Escartin, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodriguez-
924 Carballeira, 2011). Provided access to military systems, it would be interesting to
925 compare results on factors like leadership style, awareness, prevalence and types of
926 bullying, and integration of ethnic or sexual minorities between different countries;
927 for example by contrasting individualist, "feminine" low power distance cultures
928 like the Scandinavian countries with samples from under-researched armies of high
929 power distance, masculine and collectivist countries in Asia, Africa or Latin America
930 (e.g. China, Japan, or Argentina). Apart from the study by Heinecken (2016), there
931 is—to our best knowledge—a lack of research on workplace bullying and harass-
932 ment within African national armies. Sexual violence by soldiers against civilians
933 during war has been studied (e.g. in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, cf. Baaz
934 & Stern, 2009) and is worth of a detailed analysis in combination with workplace
935 bullying research.
936   Apart from valuable in-depth qualitative studies, quantitative approaches with
937 established instruments can also deliver new insights. The *Negative Acts Question-*
938 *naire* (e.g. Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009) considers the difference between the
939 subjective perception of victimization and objective exposure to negative acts. Also,
940 research on the persistence as well as perceived severity and health effects of
941 different bullying or hazing behaviours (cf. Escartin, Rodriguez-Carballeira, Zapf,
942 Porrùa, & Martin-Pena, 2009; Hoel, Cooper and Faragher, 2004) in the military
943 culture can deliver detailed insights. Likewise, in sexual harassment research, a
944 combination of direct and indirect methods, i.e. self-labelling and behavioural
945 checklists, is recommended to reduce bias (cf. Estrada & Berggren, 2009). Also,
946 measuring behaviours of both workplace bullying and sexual harassment within *one*
947 study could provide interesting insights into overlaps of the two phenomena. More-
948 over, future studies should investigate in detail the retrospective sensemaking pro-
949 cess and the difference between ritualistic hazing and bullying from the perspective
950 of the victims.
951   We also suggest empirically testing whether bullying and/or sexual harassment
952 are related to sexist (sub)units with hypermasculine dynamics where predatory
953 behaviours with multiple perpetrators potentially evolve. In this respect, unit- or
954 departmental level analyses including the impact of leadership behaviour can deliver
955 new insights into triggers and correlates of misconduct. It is also important to further
956 study the situation of ethnic minorities and LGBTQ in national armies—provided
957 that anonymous data collection is possible.

958   Finally, we strongly recommend setting a research focus on the investigation of
959 effective intervention and prevention procedures and its challenges. Including the
960 views and experiences of third parties and practitioners is essential to reduce
961 the existing literature gap.
962   We conclude our analysis with a reference to the title of this book chapter—
963 *Bullying Inc.?* Military organizations indeed *incorporate* traditional structural fea-
964 tures and cultural values, which are a fertile ground for the normalization of bullying
965 and harassment. However, the *overemphasis or misuse* of organizational features,
966 group norms and discretionary powers is why systematic harassment occurs and is
967 promoted. Thus, even in the "violent" military culture, individual perpetrators are to
968 be held fully responsible.

969   7   Cross-Reference

970 ▶ Dark Behaviours and Shadowy Places: Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harass-
971   ment as Linked to Hidden Organizations
972 ▶ Whistleblowing and Workplace Bullying
973 ▶ Workplace Bullying in the Public Sector
974 ▶ Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment in Fire Departments
975 ▶ Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment in the Field of Corrections
976 ▶ Workplace Violence

977 References   AU14

978 Ahrens, J.-R., Apelt, M., & Bender, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Frauen im Militär. Empirische Befunde*
979   *und Perspektiven zur Integration von Frauen in die Streitkräfte*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für
980   Sozialwissenschaften.
981 Apelt, M. (2010). *Forschungsthema Militär: Militärische Organisationen im Spannungsfeld*
982   *von Krieg, Gesellschaft und soldatischen Subjekten*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für
983   Sozialwissenschaften.
984 Apelt, M., Dittmer, C., & Mangold, A. (2005). Die Bundeswehr auf dem Weg zur Gleichstellung
985   der Geschlechter? In J.-R. Ahrens, M. Apelt, & C. Bender (Eds.), *Frauen im Militär. Empirische*
986   *Befunde und Perspektiven zur Integration von Frauen in die Streitkräfte* (pp. 108–133).
987   Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
988 Archer, D. (1999). Exploring "bullying" culture in the para-military organization. *International*
989   *Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 94–105.
990 Ashforth, B., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. *Research in*
991   *Organizational Behavior, 25*, 1–52.
992 Baaz, M. E., & Stern, M. (2009). Why do soldiers rape? Masculinity, violence and sexuality in the
993   armed forces in the Congo (DRC). *International Studies Quarterly, 53*, 495–518.
994 Basham, V. (2009). Operational effectiveness and harassment in the British armed forces. *Armed*
995   *Forces & Society, 35*(4), 728–744.
996 Ben-Ari, E., & Elron, E. (2001). Blue helmets and white armor multi-nationalism and multi-
997   culturism among UN peacekeeping forces. *City & Society, 13*(2), 271–302.

Buchanan, N., Settles, I., & Woods, K. (2008). Comparing sexual harassment subtypes among black and white women by military rank: Double jeopardy, the jezebel, and the cult of true womanhood. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*(4), 437–361.

Burrell, G. (1992). Sex and organizational analysis. In A. Mills (Ed.), *Gendering organizational analysis* (pp. 71–92). Oxford: SAGE.

By the numbers: Women in combat (2017). Available via https://www.idfblog.com/2017/03/07/idf-combat-women-soldiers/. Accessed 18 Aug 2017.

Caforio, G. (Ed.). (2006). *Handbook of the sociology of the military* (pp. 61–68). New York: Springer.

Carreiras, H. (2006). *Gender and the military: Women in the armed forces of western democracies*. New York: Routledge Military Studies.

Castro, A., Kintzle, S., Schuyler, A., Lucas, C., & Warner, C. (2015). Sexual assault in the military. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 17*(7), 54–68.

Cnossen, C. (1999). Frauen in Kampftruppen: Ein Beispiel für "Tokenisierung". In C. Eifler & R. Seifert (Eds.), *Soziale Konstruktionen – Militär und Geschlechterverhältnis* (pp. 232–247). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Cohn, C. (1993). Wars, wimps and women: Talking gender and thinking war. In M. Coke & A. Woollacotte (Eds.), *Gendering war talk* (pp. 225–246). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cohn, C. (2000). 'How can she claim equal rights when she doesn't have to do as many push-ups as I do?' The framing of men's opposition to women's equality in the military. *Men and Masculinities, 3*(131), 130–151.

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

Cooper, C., Hoel, H., & Faragher, B. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 32*(2), 367–387.

Cotter, A. (2016). Sexual misconduct in the Canadian armed forces. Available via http://www.statca n.gc.ca/pub/85-603-x/85-603-x2016001-eng.htm. Accessed 10 Oct 2017.

Dandeker, C., & Gow, J. (1999). Military culture and strategic peacekeeping. *Small Wars & Insurgencies, 10*(2), 58–79.

Davies, C. (1989). Goffman's concept of the total institution: Criticisms and revisions. *Human Studies, 12*, 77–95.

Diamond, J. (2017, August 25). Trumps signs directive banning transgender military recruits. Available via http://edition.cnn.com/2017/08/25/politics/trump-transgender-military. Accessed 31 Aug 2017.

Eifler, C. (2001). Bewaffnet und geschminkt: Zur sozialen und kulturellen Konstruktion des weiblichen Soldaten in Russland und in den USA. *L'Homme. Zeitschrift für Feministische Geschichtswissenschaft, 12*(1), 73–97.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (2005). Workplace bullying: Individual pathology or organizational culture? In V. Bowie, S. Fisher, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Workplace violence: Issues, trends, strategies* (pp. 229–247). New York: Routledge.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the negative acts questionnaire-revised. *Work & Stress, 23*(1), 24–44.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (Eds.). (2011a). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (2011b). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 3–40). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Escartin, J., Rodriguez-Carballeira, A., Zapf, D., Porrùa, C., & Martin-Pena, J. (2009). Perceived severity of various bullying behaviours at work and the relevance of exposure to bullying. *Work & Stress, 23*(3), 191–205.

Escartin, J., Zapf, D., Arrieta, C., & Rodriguez-Carballeira, A. (2011). Workers' perception of workplace bullying: A cross-cultural study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(2), 178–205.

Escartin, J., Salin, D., & Rodriguez-Caballeira, A. (2013). Workplace bullying or mobbing: Gender similarities and differences in its perceived severity. *Revista de Psicologia Social, 28*(2), 211–224.

Firestone, J. M., & Harris, R. (2003). Perceptions of effectiveness of responses to sexual harassment in the US military, 1988 and 1995. *Gender, Work & Organization, 10*(1), 42–64.

Firestone, J., & Harris, R. (2009). Sexual harassment in the U.S. military reserve component: A preliminary analysis. *Armed Forces & Society, 36*(1), 86–102.

Franke, V. (2000). Duty, honor, country: The social identity of west point cadets. *Armed Forces & Society, 26*(2), 175–202.

Frauen in der Bundeswehr: Leistung entscheidet, nicht das Geschlecht. (2017). Available via https://www.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/bwde/start/streitkraefte/truppe/frauen. Accessed 18 July 2017.

Gabbert, K. (2007). *Gleichstellung – zu Befehl! Der Wandel der Geschlechterverhältnisse im US-Militär.* Frankfurt/Main: Campus.

Gebauer, M. (2017). Sadistische Rituale bei der Kampfsanitäter-Ausbildung. Available via http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/bundeswehr-sex-rituale-bei-der-kampfretter-ausbild ung-a-1132072.html. Accessed 18 July 2017.

Goffman, E. (1968). *Asylums.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Green, G., Emslie, C., O'Neill, D., Hunt, K., & Walker, S. (2010). Exploring the ambiguities of masculinity in accounts of emotional distress in the military among young ex-servicemen. *Social Science & Medicine, 71,* 1480–1488.

Harris, R., McDonald, D., & Sparks, C. (2017). Sexual harassment in the military: Individual experiences, demographics, and organizational contexts. *Armed, Forces & Society.* Forthcoming.

Harrison, D. (2003). Violence in the military community. In P. Higate (Ed.), *Military masculinities: Identity and the state* (pp. 71–90). Westport/London: Praeger.

Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. (2001). *Gender, sexuality and violence in organizations: The unspoken forces of organization violations.* London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Heinecken, L. (2016). Conceptualizing the tensions by gender integration in the military: The south African case. *Armed Forces and Society, 43*(2), 202–220.

Higate, P. (2003). "Soft clerks" and "hard civvies": Pluralizing military masculinities. In P. Higate (Ed.), *Military masculinities: Identity and the state* (pp. 27–43). Westport/London: Praeger.

Hoel, H., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Shortcomings of anti-bullying regulations: The case of Sweden. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(1), 30–50.

Howes, R., & Stevenson, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Women and the use of military force.* Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Johnson, R. (1990). *Institutional violence: Organizational and psychological issues in the military context.* Washington, DC: American University.

Kier, E. (1998). Homosexuals in the U.S. military: Open integration and combat effectiveness. *International Security, 23*(2), 5–39.

Kimmel, M. (2000). Saving the males: The sociological implications of the Virginia military institute and the citadel. *Gender & Society, 14*(4), 494–516.

Kimmons, S. (2016). More women than expected pursuing combat arms positions. Available via https://www.army.mil/article/179741/higher_than_expected_number_of_women_joining_ combat_arms. Accessed 20 Aug 2017.

King, A. (2006). The word of command: Communication and cohesion in the military. *Armed Forces & Society, 32*(4), 493–512.

AU15

Koeszegi, S., Zedlacher, E., & Hudribusch, R. (2014). The war against the female soldier? – The effects of masculine culture on workplace aggression. *Armed Forces & Society, 40*(2), 226–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X12460019.

Kwon, I., Lee, D.-O., Kim, E., & Kim, H.-Y. (2007). Sexual violence among men in the military in South Korea. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(8), 1024–1042.

Leymann, H. (1996). *Handanleitung für den LIPT-Fragebogen – Leymann inventory of psychological terror.* Tübingen: DGVT-Verlag.

Lowry, A. (2008). Saving private Sychev: Russian masculinities, army hazing, and social norms. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 52*, 73–100.

Lukowiak, K. (2000). *Marijuana time: Join the army, see the world. Meet interesting people and smoke all their dope.* London: Orion.

MacCoun, R., Kier, E., & Belkin, A. (2005). Does social cohesion determine motivation in combat? An old question with and old answer. *Armed Forces & Society, 32*(1), 1–9.

Mageroy, N., Lau, B., Riise, T., & Moen, B. (2009). Association of psychosocial factors and bullying at individual and departmental levels among naval military personnel. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 66*, 343–351.

McCoy, A. (1995). "Same banana": Hazing and honor at the Philippine marine academy. *The Journal of Asian Studies, 54*(3), 689–726.

Miller, H., & Rayner, C. (2012). The form and function of "bullying" behaviours in a strong occupational culture: Bullying in a UK Police Service. *Group and Organization Management, 37*(3), 347–375.

Moore, C., Detert, J., Trevino, L., Baker, V., & Mayer, D. (2012). Why employees do bad things: Moral disengagement and unethical organizational behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 65*(1), 1–48.

Morral, A., Gore, K. & Schell, T. (2014). Sexual assault and sexual harassment in the US military. RAND Cooperation, National Defense Research Institute. Available via https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR870z1.html. Accessed 20 July 2017.

Morris, M. (1996). By forces of arms: Rape, war and military culture. *Duke Law Journal, 45*, 651–781.

Moskos, C., Williams, J., & Segal, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The postmodern military.* New York: Oxford University Press.

NATO-summary of the national reports. (2015). Available via http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2017_01/20170113_2015_NCGP_National_Reports_Summary.pdf. Accessed 19 Aug 2017.

NATO-Website. (2015). Available via http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/51288.htm. Accessed 23 Oct 2017.

Neuman, J., & Baron, R. (2011). Social antecedents of bullying: A social interactionist perspective. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 201–226). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Nuciari, M. (2006). Models and explanations of military organization: An updated reconsideration. In G. Caforio (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of the military* (pp. 61–68). New York: Springer.

Nueller, R. (2017). Press conference speech. Available via http://edition.cnn.com/2017/03/10/us/military-nude-photos-scandal/index.html. Accessed 20 Aug 2017.

Ostvik, K., & Rudmin, F. (2001). Bullying and hazing among Norwegian army soldiers: Two studies of prevalence, context, and cognition. *Military Psychology, 13*, 17–39.

Pershing, J. (2001). Gender disparities in enforcing the honor concept at the U.S. naval academy. *Armed Forces & Society, 27*(3), 419–442.

Pershing, J. (2002). Whom to betray? Selfregulation of occupational misconduct at the United States naval academy. *Deviant Behavior, 23*(2), 149–175.

Pershing, J. (2003). Why women don't report sexual harassment: A case study of an elite military institution. *Gender Issues, 21*(4), 3–30.

Pershing, J. (2006). Men and women's experiences with hazing in a male-dominated elite military institution. *Men and Masculinities, 8*(4), 470–492.

Raasch, S. (2004). Abschied vom Mythos der friedfertigen und schwachen Frau durch Öffnung der Bundeswehr für Frauen? *Nie wieder, aber immer wieder Krieg, 56*(27), 59–71.

Rastetter, D. (1999). Die Entsexualisierung der Organisation. *Soziale Welt, 50*(2), 169–185.

Report on abuse in defence. (2014). Available via Australian Government. https://www.defence abusetaskforce.gov.au/Reports/.../ReportonabuseinDefence.pdf. Accessed 15 Oct 2017.   AU16

Robinson, V. (1994). Denial and patriarchy: The relationship between patriarchy and the abuse of women. In A. Taylor & J. Beinstein Miller (Eds.), *Conflict and gender* (pp. 25–44). Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Rosen, L., Knudson, K. H., & Fancher, P. (2003). Cohesion and the culture of hypermasculinity in U.S. army units. *Armed Forces & Society, 29*(3), 325–352.

Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D.-H., & Sackett, P. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 914–922.

Rumble, G., McKean M., & Pearce, D. (2011). Report of the review of allegations of sexual and other abuse in defence (Vol. 1). Available via Australian Government. http://www.defence.gov. au/pathwaytochange/Docs/DLAPiper/Volume1.pdf. Accessed 10 Oct 2017.

Sadler, A., Booth, B., Cook, B., & Doebbeling, B. (2003). Factors associated with women's risk of rape in the military. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 43*(3), 262–273.

Salin, D. (2003). The significance of gender in the prevalence, forms and perceptions of workplace bullying. *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier, 5*(3), 30–50.

Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2011). Organisational causes of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 227–244). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Sasson-Levy, O. (2003). Frauen als Grenzgängerinnen im israelischen Militär – Identitätsstrategien und -praktiken weiblicher Soldaten in "männlichen Rollen". In R. Seifert & C. Eifler (Eds.), *Gender und Militär: Internationale Erfahrungen mit Frauen und Männern in Streitkräften* (pp. 74–101). Königstein/Taunus: Helmer.

Schneider, K., Pryor, J., & Fitzgerald, L. (2011). Sexual harassment research in the United States. In *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 245–265). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Segal, M. (1993). Women in the armed forces. In R. Howes & M. Stevenson (Eds.), *Women and the use of military force* (pp. 81–94). Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Segal, M. (1995). Women's military roles cross-nationally: Past, present and future. *Gender & Society, 9*(6), 757–775.

Siebold, G. (2007). The essence of military group cohesion. *Armed Forces & Society, 33*(2), 286–295.

Sinclair, G. (2009). Homosexuality in the military. A review of the literature. *Journal of Homosexuality, 56*(6), 701–718.

So weiblich ist die Bundeswehr. (2016). Available via http://www.spiegel.de/lebenundlernen/job/ frauen-bei-der-bundeswehr-zahlen-und-einsatzgebiete-a-1119728.html. Accessed 10 Aug 2017.

Soeters, J. (1997). Value orientation in military academies. A thirteen country study. *Armed Forces & Society, 24*(1), 7–32.

Soeters, J., Winslow, D., & Weibull, A. (2006). Military culture. In G. Caforio (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of the military* (pp. 237–254). New York: Springer.

Starr, B., & Almasy, S. (2017). Nude photo scandal widens as military looks into more websites. Available via http://edition.cnn.com/2017/03/10/us/military-nude-photos-scandal/index.html. Accessed 10 Aug 2017.

Starr, B, & Cohen, Z. (2017). Senator rips top marine over nude photo scandal. Available via http://edition.cnn.com/2017/03/14/politics/marines-nude-photo-scandal-hearing/index.html. Accessed 19 Aug 2017.

Street, A., Stafford, J., Mahan, C., & Hendricks, A. (2008). Sexual harassment and assault experienced by reservists during military service: Prevalence and health correlates. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development, 45*(3), 409–420.

Tice, J. (2016). Army shrinks to lowest level before World War II. Available via http://www.armytimes.com/news/your-army/2016/05/07/army-shrinks-to-smallest-level-since-before-world-war-ii/. Accessed 31 July 2017.

Titunik, R. (2000). The first wave: Gender integration in military culture. *Armed Forces & Society, 26*(2), 229–257.

Tomforde, M. (2010). Neue Militärkultur(en). In M. Apelt (Ed.), *Forschungsthema Militär: Militärische Organisationen im Spannungsfeld von Krieg, Gesellschaft und soldatischen Subjekten* (pp. 193–219). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Turchik, J., & Wilson, S. (2010). Sexual assault in the military: A review of the literature and recommendations for the future. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*, 267–277.

Vergun, D. (2017). Army implements new fitness standards for recruits and MOS standards. Available via https://www.army.mil/article/180199/army_implements_new_fitness_standards_for_recruits_and_mos_transfers. Accessed 28 Oct 2017.

Williams, K. (2006). *Jung, weiblich, in der Army. Ich war Soldatin im Krieg*. München: Dt. Verlag-Anst.

Winslow, D. (1999). Rite of passage and group bonding in the Canadian airborne. *Armed Forces & Society, 25*(3), 429–457.

Woodward, R. (2003). Locating military masculinities: Space, place, and the formation of gender identity and the British army. In *Military masculinities: Identity and the state* (pp. 43–56). Westport/London: Praeger.

Zapf, D., Escartin, J., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2011). Empirical findings on prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 75–106). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Zedlacher, E. (2013). Work hard, play hard? The relationship between masculine organizational cultures and workplace bullying – A theoretical analysis with empirical investigation in two different organizational cultures. Vienna University of Technology, Vienna (Dissertational Thesis).

Index Terms: