

2017

U.S. Army Drill Sergeants' Response to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Recruits

Marin Vesselinov Nikolov
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Marin Nikolov

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Benedict DeDominicis, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Gary Kelsey, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. John Walker, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

U.S. Army Drill Sergeants' Response to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault of Gay,
Lesbian, and Bisexual Recruits

by

Marin Nikolov

MS, University of Phoenix, 2013

BS, Old Dominion University, 2009

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2017

Abstract

Even with the repeal of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT) policy, the U.S. Army has seen increased cases of sexual harassment; sexual assault; and discrimination of gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) service members by other service members. Despite this trend, few studies have explored the experiences of victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits before, during, and after the repeal of the DADT policy. Using the bystander effect as the theoretical construct, the purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore the experiences and interactions with a sample of 11 drill sergeants (DSs) who witnessed GLB discrimination in order to gain insight on strategies to prevent sexual harassment and discrimination against GLB recruits. Interview data were inductively coded and subjected to a thematic analysis procedure. Key findings indicate that participants perceived a general support for GLB inclusion into the basic combat training environment, and participants were unaware of the high number of discharges of service members from the U.S. Army during the implementation of the DADT policy. Another important finding is that participants were supportive of GLB scenario-based training. Finally, the bystander effect was found to be the main reason participants failed to intervene when instances of discriminatory or abusive behavior was observed. Implications for positive social change can be realized in the U.S. Army through promoting awareness of GLB discrimination, its impact, and how DSs can lead the effort in preventing this sort of behavior against the GLB recruits. A key recommendation is for the U.S. Army to explore implementing scenario-based training for all recruits as part of this effort.

U.S. Army Drill Sergeants' Response to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault of Gay,
Lesbian, and Bisexual Recruits

by

Marin Nikolov

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2017

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank faculty member Dr. Dedominicis, who is well-versed on issues of U.S. military studies and, in particular, the implications of gender and racial integration within the armed forces. He shared with me his vast knowledge of research tools and strategies. I would also like to thank Dr. Kelsey for his expert guidance in methodology with qualitative studies and his support throughout my dissertation process. His invaluable insight allowed me to navigate a process which would have been more difficult to complete had he not acted as my second committee member.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background.....	3
The Adoption of DADT.....	11
Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.....	14
Discrimination.....	17
Problem Statement.....	24
Research Questions.....	30
Theoretical Framework.....	30
Nature of the Study.....	33
Definitions.....	36
Assumptions.....	41
Limitations.....	42
Significance.....	42
Summary.....	45
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	47
Literature Search Strategy.....	48
The Drill Sergeant.....	49
The Drill Sergeant Creed:.....	49
Selection.....	50
Drill Sergeants and Platoon Sergeants.....	52
Army Regulations 350-16 and 614-200.....	53

Organizing Gender and Sexuality Within the Ranks	54
Executive Order	55
Desexualization of the U.S. Military	57
Gay Warfighter	58
Tolerance.....	59
Sexual Identity	66
Coming Out.....	68
Predator	75
U.S. Military Culture	77
Policy.....	81
Psychiatric Screening.....	83
Army Regulation 635-200-Homosexuality.....	85
Army Regulation 600-200	87
Reporting.....	87
Title 10—654	89
Separation	90
Honorable.....	91
General Discharge.....	91
Under Other Than Honorable Conditions.....	92
Leading to the Repeal	92
Compatibility	93
Unit Effectiveness.....	94

Family Readiness	96
Family Values	97
Referral and Retention	97
Unconstitutional	98
Crittenden Report.....	99
PERSEC	100
Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.....	100
Psychiatry.....	102
Defense of Marriage Act.....	103
Programs	105
Reported Cases.....	107
Training.....	108
Unity.....	114
Effects of the Repeal.....	118
Continued Discrimination.....	119
Sexual Stigma	120
Added Assistance.....	122
Response to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault.....	122
Drill Sergeant Response.....	124
Lack of Action/ Lack of Response.....	125
Drill Sergeant Training	127
Further Research	129

Summary	129
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	131
Introduction.....	131
Research Design and Rationale	132
Central Phenomenon.....	133
Phenomenology and Social Change.....	134
Context of Study	134
Role of the Researcher	135
Bias.....	139
Ethics.....	140
Participant Access.....	141
Recruitment Criteria.....	142
Interview Questions	143
Trustworthiness.....	144
Credibility	144
Confirmability/Reflexivity.....	145
Summary.....	145
Chapter 4: Results.....	147
Participants' Experiences of the Bystander Effect.....	149
Direct Interaction.....	150
Awareness Training	151
Themes	151

Strategies Used.....	152
Summary.....	153
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	154
Implications for Social Change.....	154
Recommendations.....	154
GLB Scenario-Based Training.....	155
Reflection.....	157
Conclusion.....	159
References.....	161
Appendix A: Memorandum Authorizing Women to Serve in Most or All Combat	
Roles.....	200
Appendix B: Pentagon/RAND Survey.....	202
Appendix C: Recruitment Criteria.....	207
Appendix D: Interview Questions.....	209
Appendix E: Participant Questions and Answers.....	214

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Under the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue, Don't Harass (DADT) policy (1993-2011), the U.S. military required service members to remain in the closet. To remain in the closet was to keep quiet about same-sex interest for relationships, same-sex sexual acts, or one's gay, lesbian, or bisexual (GLB) status. Soldiers who came out of the closet, or who were discovered to be gay, or who were engaged in same-sex acts, to include intercourse, or who were attempting such acts were investigated and discharged from the U.S. military. DADT proponents said that repeal of the policy would threaten unit cohesion and battleground effectiveness (Rich, Schutten, & Rogers, 2012). However, according to a survey by the Department of Defense ([DOD], 2010), 70% of the service member participants said that ending the policy would not negatively affect unit readiness. Policy advocates also said that closeting was necessary because openly gay soldiers posed a threat to the image of the soldier as an impenetrable predator (Rich et al., 2012).

According to researchers, the DADT policy contributed to the marginalization of queer soldiers who were required to remain quiet about their GLB status (Bergstrom-Lynch, 2012). The RAND Corporation was paid by the Pentagon to survey U.S. military service members and U.S. military family members on the effects a supposed repeal would have on their career and families. DADT was repealed in 2011 when President Obama and senior leaders in the U.S. military witnessed a shift in U.S. military belief and tolerance that open service by gay soldiers would not harm unit cohesion or the U.S. military's mission readiness at home and abroad.

Despite the high rates of discrimination experienced by GLB soldiers in basic training, drill sergeants (DSs) and drill sergeant leaders (DSLs) are doing little to address and prevent prejudicial treatment, sexual harassment, and sexual assault of these recruits. In fact, some DSs contribute to the name-calling, negative rhetoric, and stigmatization of GLB soldiers (Zuniga, 1993). In addition, some GLB recruits may endure mistreatment by heterosexual as well as other GLB recruits.

In this study, I conducted in-depth interviews with frontline DSs and DSLs to learn more about their experiences with DADT and harassment of GLB recruits. Extensive research has been done on sexual harassment in the U.S. military but a gap in literature exists with respective research focused on GLB recruits. I also wanted to gain insight into how DSs personally addressed and prevented sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits within the basic combat training (BCT) sites. I chose BCT sites as these are the locations where DSs fulfill their role as trainers of recruits and are primary locations of training and interaction with the recruits who are assigned to them. BCT sites are also the location(s) where recruits share shooting ranges, obstacle courses, barracks, showers, and dining facilities.

In Chapter 1, I include an overview of the study. The gap in literature is documented as well as justification for why the study was needed. In the problem statement, I provided evidence as to why the issue is current, relevant, and significant. In Chapter 1, I also identified the theoretical framework used in the study and how the theory related to my approach and research questions. Within the nature of the study, I provided a concise rationale for the design I used and a brief summary as to how data

were collected and analyzed. I also provided definitions of key concepts, constructs, and terminology used in the study. With the study assumptions, I clarified the aspects of the study which were critical to the meaningfulness of the study. Within the scope and delimitations, I specified aspects of the research problem as well as issues of content validity and reflexivity. I also considered the limitations of my research. Within the significance of this study, I identified the potential contributions of the study. I also considered potential implications for social change arising from my research. Finally, I provided a summary of the main points of the chapter and a transition to Chapter 2.

Background

Homosexuality was known to have existed during General George Washington's time, and a level of tolerance toward gay soldiers was allowed amongst the U.S. military branches (Pelts, Rolbiecki, & Albright, 2014). "Homosexuality" as a term was not even part of the lexicon until the 1800s, and according to Cianni (2012), prior to then, "sodomite" may have been the most common word used to describe this sort of sexual orientation. It was only following World War I (WWI) (1914-1918) that new U.S. military laws and policies incriminating acts of homosexual conduct started shaping a negative response towards the acceptance of gay soldiers serving in the U.S. military. Following World War II (WWII) (1939-1945), more policies seeking to identify and remove GLB individuals from the service were implemented through respective branch laws, and later the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)—military legal authority—was created (Pelts et al., 2014). One of the main reasons given for excluding GLB service members from the U.S. military was that allowing them to remain in the service

would harm unit morale and cohesion. Another reason for exclusion was that GLB soldiers would hurt the military's effort to retain and recruit of soldiers. According to RAND's 2010 study, some of the participants in the focus group claimed that recruitment would be hampered and the prestige of the U.S. military diminished if openly gay men were allowed in the service. However, some participants also stated that there would be many gay men who would enlist if DADT were repealed, a finding which discredited accusations that allowing gay soldiers to serve openly would hinder recruitment and retention (RAND, 2010). The RAND Corporation also collected historical information on gender and racial integration, and interviewed military and civilian personnel from other nations that had already integrated gay and lesbian soldiers into their services. After 1947, soldiers who were found to be gay were denied most benefits which were automatically assigned to heterosexual couples. They also received a *blue discharge* (used solely for soldiers identified as GLB) and continued to be discriminated against even when seeking employment in the civilian sector after their discharge. According to Cianni (2012), gay soldiers were also not allowed any benefits, such as those assigned under the GI Bill for education or by the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) for medical benefits. These soldiers also had difficulty finding work because employers were aware of their sexual identity, which held negative connotations. The *blue discharge* was rescinded in 1947 from the U.S. military as grounds for discharge after the U.S. military received criticism for discrimination from Congress (Segal, 1999).

In 1948, President Truman enforced a shift in policy with Executive Order 9981 in which he mandated the racial integration of the armed forces (Segal, 1999), at a time

when 80% of service members opposed the idea. A published report by USA Today (2011) found that even though today's troops are more accepting of change and more tolerant of service by openly gay soldiers, there were lawmakers who were preventing the move for reasons that are comprised largely of politics or prejudice. On January 29, 1993, the Clinton administration was able to suspend the discriminatory policy which forbade all gay soldiers from military service. President Clinton intended to formulate a new policy that would be more tolerant of sexual minorities in the U.S. military. He also sought to preserve U.S. military effectiveness, which was achieved through a compromise and ended with the enactment of the DADT policy (Shilts, 1993).

In 1991, when Clinton was campaigning for the presidency, he advocated for an end to sexual discrimination within the country's armed forces. He promised to lift the ban which prevented suspected and known gay individuals from joining the U.S. military by enacting a proposition and issuing an executive order. Clinton sought to allow for the full acceptance and open service of GLB service members in the U.S. military without regard to their sexual orientation. He ordered the removal of the UCMJ action against same-sex acts and partnerships. He and Congress reached a compromise in the form of the DADT policy. U.S. military recruitment applications would no longer inquire about applicants' sexual orientations, which would allow gay men and women to join as long as they were not openly gay.

Clinton was able to reach this compromise in part because congressional leaders could no longer effectively argue that gay soldiers posed a threat or security risk to the military, or that they were cowardly or mentally ill as had long been alleged (Brown &

Ayres, 2004). According to Herek (1993), the reaction of the U.S. public, especially the U.S. military, was unprecedented. Active duty (AD) U.S. military officers and top-level civilian leaders denounced the proposition. Also, for the first time in U.S. history, U.S. military officers vowed that they would not recognize Clinton's authority as commander-in-chief (Herek, 1993).

According to Saldin (2011), President Clinton's initiative failed when Congress preempted him by passing the Military Personnel Eligibility Act, which maintained the ban against open service by gay soldiers. The compromise between the Clinton administration and Congress led to the initiation of DADT. The DADT policy authorized GLB soldiers to serve as long as they did not openly identify as gay and did not engage in homosexual acts. Homosexual acts were still prohibited and those engaged in such acts were to be removed from the service.

If a member married or attempted to marry a person of the same sex, or if the service member engaged in, or solicited another to engage in homosexual acts, an investigation was to be initiated and the service member would potentially have been discharged (Nguyen, n.d.). However, within the U.S. Code (U.S.C.) 654 (b) (1), the U.S. military was allowed to retain some service members who were involved in same-sex relationships. GLBs were allowed to stay in the U.S. military if proved that their same-sex acts at that time was not customary or a regularity in occurrence (Nguyen, n.d.). GLBs were viewed as a threat to unit cohesion because of their same-sex relationship tendencies which would result, as authorized by the commander, in their removal from the unit and possible discharge from the U.S. military (Nguyen, n.d.).

When joining the U.S. military, many homosexual applicants left the box on the application inquiring same-sex relationships or tendencies unchecked so that they could enlist into the service before the initiation of DADT on February 28, 1994. According to Holleran (2014), GLB applicants would leave “the ‘gay box’ unchecked in the recruitment questionnaire so they would not be outed and marked ‘damaged goods’” (p. 30). Those who checked the box would not proceed to the next hiring phase.

As the U.S. prepared for WWII, homosexuality became viewed as an indicator for psychopathy. During WWII, psychological pathology and the study of homosexuality began to develop, and an ideology emerged which categorized homosexual behaviors as the result of mental illness. Because of this belief that servicemen who deviated from heterosexual behavior were mentally ill, their removal from the service was seen as necessary during the troop drawdown after the war. Instead of the U.S. military categorizing homosexuality as a criminal offense, they focused on removing the homosexual servicemen from their ranks because of the rationale that the homosexual is suffering from a medical condition (Herek, 2012). This was a ploy to eliminate gay soldiers from the U.S. military as their actions—sodomy according to the UCMJ—were viewed as abnormal and were illegal under UCMJ laws. Gay draftees were prohibited from enlisting unless there was a dire need to recruit for war. According to Herek (2012), during the troop drawdown after WWII, antihomosexual policies were strictly enforced. GLBs were discharged involuntarily during the Vietnam War. Johnson (2013) declared in *The Journal of Gender, Race & Justice* that the government blatantly endorsed homophobia through the imposition of criminal sanctions. Prior to the 1969 Stonewall

riots—an angry rebellion by the GLB community in New York City against police mistreatment—every state outlawed sodomy between consenting adults (Johnson, 2013). Many states authorized the psychiatric commitment of GLB individuals for an indeterminate period. The U.S. military’s effort to cut down the force by targeting gay soldiers was in keeping with the prevailing governmental treatment of gay people (Johnson, 2013). Police would regularly seek, target, and raid gay bars. They would publish the names of suspected or known gay patrons in the local paper, effectively outing GLB individuals to their friends, family, and coworkers (Johnson, 2013) and, in some cases, outing service members to their command. It was only after the 1980s that advocates for GLB civil rights sought to fight the uphill battle of changing military policies associated with the nonacceptance and removal of draftees, recruits, and tenured soldiers, to include high ranking officers. Sodomy laws were used to criminalize homosexual acts between two consenting individuals. Those admitted into the Army during times of increased need for strength and recruitment were forced into secrecy about their sexual orientation. Homosexuality fell under the definition of sodomy in 1917; when it was claimed to have been committed as part of an assault, one could, under the constraints of the UCMJ, be charged with a military crime. In 1920, sodomy was revised to include consensual sodomy (Bailey, 2013). In 1949, the DOD implemented further military personnel regulations on homosexuality such that GLBs would not be allowed to serve in any branch of the armed services. GLB soldiers would not be able to service in any capacity. Immediate discharge was to be pursued of known gays from the armed forces; this discharge would be automatic (DOD, 2010). Revisions of Article 93

in 1959 and 1975 included that the actions of homosexual acts and sodomy, and sexual perversion or other aberrant sexual tendencies, would be a cause for immediate separation from service (DOD, 2010).

The DADT policy was put in place to ensure that there was a policy that would bring about unit cohesion, good order, and discipline with the support of enlisted and officer GLBs. However the inclusion of gay soldiers in the U.S. military would require they remain quiet about their same-sex relationships or lifestyles. The gay box which was in place within the recruitment application was removed by the DOD when DADT was put in place, allowing for homosexual soldiers to serve as long as they did not serve as openly gay individuals. The policy was viewed as reinforcing homophobic attitudes and behaviors and was detrimental to the goals of indiscriminant inclusion and U.S. military effectiveness (Reinke & Smith, 2011).

According to Wilder and Wilder (2012), the DADT policy prohibited disclosing sexual orientation, albeit only that of GLBs during their service in the U.S. military. The supposed rationale for this policy was based upon the belief that the disclosure of a GLB orientation would threaten unit cohesion. This threat would not be in line with the expectations of acting in ways that support what was considered high morale, good order, and discipline. During the 17 years that it was implemented, the DADT policy also resulted in unforeseen discrimination, hazing, sexual harassment, sexual assault, and death by suicide or attack on GLB service members (Wilder & Wilder, 2012).

Young heterosexual males make up the majority of service members and are also the largest perpetrators of hate crimes based on sexual orientation (Bosson, Weaver,

Caswell, & Burnaford, 2012). This may be in part due to the views heterosexual males have of gay and bisexual men. Worthen (2013) claims that heterosexuals may have negative attitudes toward gay soldiers because the gay lifestyle is commonly stereotyped as causing and transmitting HIV and AIDS. Bisexuals are blamed by heterosexuals for transmitting HIV from the gay population to the heterosexual population.

GLB recruits still experience institutional discrimination that, although ostensibly eradicated after the repeal of DADT, continues to exist within the service. In addition to experiencing discrimination at the institutional levels, many GLB individuals who join the U.S. military will feel stigmatized and experience verbal or physical harassment tied to their sexual identity (Wilder & Wilder, 2012). According to Bowling, Firestone, and Harris (2005), even when DADT was in place, more than 39% of service members reported witnessing harassment of GLB service members by other service members. Moreover, the U.S. military continues to have a serious problem with antigay violence, to include serious crimes against GLB soldiers. A March 2000 Pentagon study revealed that 5% of service members had witnessed a violent, antigay beating during the previous year (Belkin, 2005).

The DOD aimed to establish fair treatment of and respect for all soldiers, no matter their sexual orientation. The DOD finally felt that this respect was necessary in order to maintain the order and discipline that are in line with the values of the military (DOD, 2011). On the one year anniversary of the repeal of DADT, President Obama stated that he has seen the nation's national security strengthened because gay and lesbian soldiers can continue to contribute their talent and skills, unifying the country. Obama

asserted that institutions and the nation as a whole will be strengthened because gay and lesbian soldiers can serve openly and they can now be honest with their families and loved ones (Tungol, 2012).

The Adoption of DADT

Some U.S. military leaders felt that service members should not be allowed to serve as openly gay, while the White House felt that gay soldiers should be allowed to serve as openly gay. According to Priest (1999), under the DADT policy, those discharged were those who came out or were openly gay. They would receive an administrative discharge with no bad conduct stigma attached to that form of discharge, unlike the dishonorable discharge. If a service member stated that he or she was gay, an investigation would be initiated to validate the claim of homosexuality and a separation from the service would occur.

Although DADT was meant to protect GLB service members and allowed them to serve in the U.S. military, albeit discretely, the policy had an almost reverse effect. Ferguson (2010) documented that service members were prohibited from being asked, pursued, or harassed. This resulted in the unintended backlash of the policy when, as the result of the pursuing and harassing of GLBs, thousands of GLBs were discharged. For this reason, this policy was considered to be a failed one. While DADT sought to protect GLBs, it undermined those it was meant to protect, as more service members were discharged under DADT than during prior years (Rivera, 1999). DADT also prohibited efforts to discover a service member's sexual identity by other service members, potentially allowing the service member to be homosexual without reprisal. Other

service members were prohibited to “pursue” and “harass,” actions which could lead to the eventual outing of the homosexual service member. Yet, so great was the intolerance created by the policy, and so constricting was it to homosexual service during its 17 years of enforcement, that between 1993 and 2011, more than 14,500 men and women were discharged under DADT. This number included approximately 800 troops with skills deemed mission critical, such as pilots, combat engineers, and linguists, with a cost of over half a billion dollars to taxpayers (Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, n.d.). Those numbers are also supported by the Center for American Progress in that within that same period, the Pentagon discharged 14,346 qualified service members on the basis of only their sexual orientation. That figure does not include the more than 4,000 men and women who stood firm in refusing to re-enlist each year because of the discriminatory policy and the thousands more who refused to join (Service Legal Defense Network, n.d.). According to Wang and Schwarz (2010), a 2007 survey reported that an estimated 12% of GLB employees left their most recent job because of discrimination. The U.S. military was included in this percentage as many refused to reenlist. If the service member was not discharged for his or her GLB status, he or she was discriminated against and harassed until he or she quit. Gates and Rodgers (2014) found that DADT resulted in the loss of critical personnel and continuous systematic discrimination against thousands of GLBs. These numbers were also supported by Endicott (2010): in fiscal year 2009, DADT resulted in the discharged 428 service members, bringing the official 17-year discharge numbers up to 13,425. These numbers now brought the 17-year total number of discharges to at least 14,055. One former DS, Ben Shalom—second of only

the first two females who had completed the Army drill sergeant school (DSS) at the time—recalled that she was barred by the Army to re-enlist after she professed her open homosexual identity as a lesbian (Mercury, 1989). The drill sergeant program (DSP) at the DSS was initiated in 1964, and the first set of drill sergeant candidates (DSCs) graduated from the program in that year. The first female DSs graduated 7 years later in 1971 (Kim, 2009).

In arguing for the repeal of DADT, U.S. military service members contended that this new generation is more open to and accepting of GLB service members. DADT was just as flawed a policy as all the constricting and restrictive antigay policies since the DOD first sought to eliminate and remove all GLBs from its ranks. DADT just added to the list of the failed policies of “policing the legality and normalcy of service members’ sexual lives, a contentious process for U.S. military courts throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s that resulted in the inconsistent enforcement of the homosexual exclusion policy” (Buford, 2013, p. 250). Walton (2010) reported that Jarrod Chlapowski, an openly gay soldier in the Army during the constraints of openly gay service-ship under the DADT policy, left the U.S. military after his 5-year Army tour. While he was accepted and supported for his openness by his unit, he knew that his status as openly gay would be cause for later dismissal by other units. Chlapowski knew that he needed to protect himself by going back in the closet. According to Bowling et al. (2005), the policy required that gay soldiers not come out of the closet as there was an active pursuit of identifying individuals because of a suspicion of homosexuality.

Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell

Chlapowski, now a public policy advocate for the Human Rights Coalition, who advocated for the repeal prior to its removal in 2011, explained that it is normal to be GLB (Walton, 2010). He asserted that those who wanted to know if it was a problem to have GLB people serving in the U.S. military should ask the younger generation, the junior enlisted men, not the generals of a previous generation (Walton, 2010). Leaders in this new generation are more concerned about the equal treatment of service members and are more mindful of the constricting tenets of the DADT policy and its impact on the lives of closeted GLB service members. DADT turned its back on the principle that any person, no matter his or her sexual orientation, who is willing and able to do a job should be given an unrestricted and fair opportunity to do so, stated the president and CEO of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (Targeted News Service, 2010). GLB soldiers have already demonstrated on a daily basis and over the years of the U.S. military's existence that the early rationales for exclusion—emotional instability, security risks, and ineffectiveness—have proved to be fallible and without any merit. Under DADT, these men and women could only show that closeted gay soldiers could serve effectively; remaining in the closet would somehow prove that they would be more capable than openly serving GLBs (Brown & Ayres, 2004).

DADT, signed into law by the Clinton administration after its failure to allow GLBs to serve openly in the U.S. military (U.S. Naval Institute, 2015), was a policy which ended the former requirement of the U.S. military to, without cause, inquire about an applicant's sexual orientation. According to Ratliff (1996), conservatives in Congress

sought to keep GLBs out of the U.S. military. They claimed that GLBs would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion. The policy itself did not necessarily allow or require that a service member be discharged for their legitimate or illegitimate claim that they identified themselves as GLB. By its definition, homosexuality was evidence enough that a service member would engage in prohibited homosexual conduct (Ratliff, 1996). This policy later became unnecessary as the question arose of whether a GLB service member really inhibited cohesion amongst the ranks; the threat against unit cohesion was proven unverifiable by the conservatives who supported DADT for that reason. Bailey (2013), in the “Politics of Dancing,” stated that “key conservative players in these policy debates traded in moral absolutes for public attitudes, which are notoriously changeable. These players traded in biblical authority (faith-based and unverifiable) for a testable proposition about unit cohesion” (p. 90).

After September 11, 2001, the call for a more socially accepting, tolerant U.S. military became prominent. Conservative right-wing leaders were pressured to see that the policies adopted were protective of the personal freedoms of those in the military. While the U.S. military as an institution was not taking the lead in ensuring gay rights to its members, citizens and soldiers were. Citizens and soldiers maintained an internal friendship with the many GLB service members and called for the removal of DADT (Cianni, 2012). Religious conservatives and political advocates for the policy noted the diminishing public support for DADT. They shifted to using its repeal as a bargaining

tool and used political mobilization and fundraising initiatives to seek its removal in response to shifting public opinion.

Even as a political agenda to sway voters and gain support for his legislation, policies, and executive orders, President Obama saw the repeal of DADT as a way to advocate change to a more civil rights-protecting and just institution. In Buford's (2013) excerpt in the *Journal of Homosexuality*, she found that even before the gay liberation movement went after politicians to question the legitimacy of excluding gay soldiers from the military, this was seen a civil rights violation. According to Bailey (2013), DADT was a convoluted and ultimately failed policy that left GLBs subject to discharge if their GLB status was discovered. This was because of efforts to delegitimize President Clinton and his administration's goals to keep gay soldiers in the service, which in essence created a harsher policy resulting from the collision of gay civil rights claims and the right's religious opposition to homosexuality.

This study is important because of the continued sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of the GLB community in the BCTs. DSs, who expected to promote a culture and environment conducive to learning, training, and soldier support, are instead inciting inflammatory and derogatory language. Some DSs, whether intentionally or not, use(d) their "role model" position to increase discrimination and hatred toward GLB recruits. Do DSs use inflammatory, demeaning, and berating language because of the history of responding to homosexuality in the U.S. military and its banning of this sexual minority with the imposition of punitive policies? Or was it because DADT kept DSs from promoting awareness and strategies to address and prevent

sexual harassment and sexual assault of gays in the service? Within this study, I not only addressed those issues but also recommended further research into the topic and provided support for establishing a GLB scenario-based training within the DSP.

Discrimination

The name-calling, discrimination, hazing, and harassment of those who are openly gay or suspected of being gay have historically been linked with a perceived deficit of masculinity. Kaplan (2001) associated this supposed inability to execute tasks with fervor and testosterone-driven hyper-masculinity as a basis to mark gay men as queens and fairies. In his article in *Constellations*, he states that gay men continue to live in the shadow of the accusations of effeminacy. Gay soldiers live under this presupposition because male homosexuality was historically defined in the nineteenth century as a sexual inversion. In a study conducted by Boris (2010), she ascribed a tendency of hostility towards the GLB community in large part to men who often feel the need to boost their standing in society by overemphasizing their masculinity. Raja and Stokes conducted a study in 1988 in which they sought to identify contemporary shifts in attitudes toward GLBs. They revisited past studies of homophobia and created what is known as a Modern Homophobia Scale using a sample of 322 undergraduate students (Worthen, 2012). Raja and Stokes wanted to tackle modern-day homophobic prejudices, which, within both the public and military setting, tend to be covert rather than overt homophobic attitudes. Raja and Stokes went so far as to question the sensibility of requiring gays to register with the police department where they resided (Black & Stevenson, 1984).

In a study performed by Ragins and Cornwell (2001), it was found that in workplaces that fostered mentorship and policies that protect against GLB discrimination, there was a lesser rate of discrimination against this population. Examples of organizational indicators for supportive cultures include policies which prohibit and exclude this form of discrimination from their organization, policies which offer same-sex domestic partner benefits, and diversity training (Friskopp & Silverstein, 1996; Mickens, 1994). For public and private organizations, the study predicted that gay employees who perceived more workplace discrimination also received significantly fewer promotions and less compensation for the same work performed as their heterosexual coworkers (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). When it came to which group received the most workplace discrimination—whether hiring males over females, whites over blacks, or heterosexuals over homosexuals—Crow, Fok, and Hartman (1998) found that gays were targeted with the highest amount of discrimination. A Gallup Poll also supported the notion that heterosexism may be more pervasive and difficult to eradicate than racism and sexism, revealing that 6 out of 10 Americans believed that homosexuality was immoral (Newport, 1998). This discrimination can be related back to similar practices supported by the DADT policy; gay supervisors and gay coworkers could be targeted for discrimination in the U.S. military, which was openly hostile to gay employees (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Working within the framework of sexual stigma theory, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that gay employees were less likely to disclose their sexual orientation if they observed or experienced sexual orientation discrimination at work. I personally saw this within the U.S. military—units who supported openly

serving GLBs did not seem to show any discrimination or signs of negative stigma against the GLB service member. However, some GLB soldiers had to weigh the benefits of disclosing their sexual orientation for fear of possible career obstruction, and the development of infringements (Croteau, 1996).

When I was a DS, it was common to hear profane language against GLB recruits, such as “faggot” or “peter puffer.” It was also common to hear crude and discriminatory jokes about GLBs. According to a study performed by Tejeda (2006), reports suggest that 80% of U.S. military respondents, both homosexual and heterosexual, heard offensive jokes and derogatory remarks about GLB individuals. According to a report issued by Gates (2011), gay, lesbian, bisexual, transsexual, and questionable (GLBTQ) participants in a study reported daily heterosexist experiences. These experiences would include daily harassment and assault and would include comments such as that gay males are “effeminate” or lesbians are “butch.” The ruling in the court case *Rene v. MGM Grand Hotel, Inc.* found that harassment could have its basis in claims that a gay man is not acting as a man ought to (Berkley & Watt, 2006). Other actions against GLBs that I have witnessed in BCT environment included various other demeaning jokes that came from both DSs and recruits. Some of these jokes involved the continuous stereotyping of GLB recruits or promoting overt physical acts against the population, to include violence and hostility toward them (Gates, 2011). In *Rene v. MGM Grand Hotel, Inc.*, a same-sex harassment claim, the plaintiff, a gay man who worked for the MGM Grand Hotel in Las Vegas, sued the hotel for harassment by coworkers who blew kisses at him and called him “sweetheart” and “doll” (Berkley & Watt, 2006). This is similar to the same kinds of

pranks and jokes that I saw perpetrated by both straight and gay service members. These acts, like those described by Berkley and Watt (2006), included crude jokes, sexually-oriented gifts, caressing, hugging, grabbing, and poking at the crotch and anus through the clothing because a target was gay. Most times, same-sex harassers downplay their actions against GLBs as horseplay rather than assault (Kleiman, Kass, Wackerfuss, & Benek-Rivera, 2007). This type of behavior has also been seen in the military as the macho-male mentality may have sometime overridden the effeminate behaviors and a level of expectation that males should be tough and strong.

Many recruits felt that type of behavior by DSs was acceptable and should be allowed and tolerated, since it is “normal” for the BCT environment. Acts and expressions mimicking sexual intercourse and inappropriate touching amongst the straight recruits were witnessed and sometimes perpetrated by DSs. Mimicking same-sex sexual contact by straight men seemed normal and a way of male bonding and team-building. According to a service member interviewed by Cianni (2012), he recalled the antigay behaviors by heterosexuals in boot camp as tolerable because this was boot camp and guys would joke and poke fun at gay soldiers. This was no big deal, recounted the recruit, because the drill instructor was in charge and allowed that behavior. However, these acts were not always welcomed by all recruits and DSs (Cianni, 2012).

According to McVeigh (2011), after the repeal of DADT, President Obama voiced during a speech that all service members should treat each other with dignity and respect, no matter the other’s sexual orientation. Harassment based on sexual orientation would not be tolerated. He then signed Executive Order 13 in July 2014, which instituted

further protections for employees of the federal government and its contractors (Herz, 2014). More than 14,500 U.S. service members had been discharged under DADT, but the Pentagon now allows the recruitment of openly GLB people. The DOD, according to McVeigh (2011), is also committed to ensuring that service members, regardless of their sexual orientation, inhabit an environment that is free of personal, social, or institutional conflicts. The DOD also sought to remove other inhibitions that prevent GLBs from rising to the highest level of responsibility.

There have been several filings of discrimination and court proceedings against the DADT policy for violating basic human rights. In one such case, former Navy Lieutenant Thomasson declared that this policy was unjust in its attempt to limit one's equal protection rights, including his Fifth Amendment right to equal protection and his First Amendment right to free speech (Ratliff, 1996). GLB soldiers have always served in the U.S. military—mostly closeted so as to not reveal their sexual orientation or preference—while indiscriminately supporting the military and the country they swore to defend. GLB service members were committed to defending their country and constitution despite DADT and the suffering experienced by those who were able to at least manage their secrecy (King, 2009).

“Ick” was a term used by the Pentagon to describe the distasteful and disgusted attitudes towards GLBs by other federal workers and service members (Bailey, 2013). The original call for the DADT policy was made by the religious right and conservative officials, who wanted to implement the policy because of the perceived need to maintain a moral and faith-based strong front within the military. They believed that an inevitable

“ick” factor would exist against those service members known to be GLB. According to Bailey (2013), the Pentagon held prayer breakfasts and bible studies, specifically discussing the immorality of homosexuality, in which the “ick” factor was the term used to describe the disgust felt towards gay soldiers. After the repeal of DADT, this new generation of inclusion and tolerance supported the removal of the “ick” factor. “Ick” was defined by Goldich and Webb (2010) of the U.S. Naval Institute as the feeling of a lack of privacy and the fear that a GLB recruit is in the same shower, is a bunk mate, or is training alongside the straight recruit. They assert that the “ick” prejudice should be discontinued, that the straight and masculine superiority thought process be removed, and that all members of the service should be more accepting of GLBs (Goldich & Webb, 2010). GLBs have been and continue to be present in sleeping and working spaces, open showers, and latrines. “The problem for people who cannot get past the ‘ick’ factor lies not in homosexuals' presence per se, but in knowing that they are present.” People need to get over the “ick” factor and accept the reality that they work, eat, and sleep alongside GLB soldiers. In the meantime, the challenge for GLB soldiers in the U.S. military is that the “ick” factor remains (Goldich & Webb, 2010). According to Proado (2011), the real challenge will be for GLB service members to learn how to confront the inevitability of discrimination.

Those hate crimes committed against sexual minority groups, which include GLBs, may be the least recognized (Reasons & Houghsons, 2000). Many soldiers who were discharged under the constraints of DADT viewed the policy itself as a hate crime, since it incited discrimination and violence against gay soldiers. Discharged Army

Lieutenant Dan Choi is one such former service member who suffered because of the repercussions of the DADT policy. He asserted that repealing DADT was the right thing for the country to do, especially given the 1.3-billion tax dollars that were spent to kick people out. Leaders, according to Choi, were not doing their due diligence to repeal the policy despite it eating away at the morale, cohesion, freedom of expression, and happiness of all those who were still getting discharged at the time of their speaking out (Fenoglio, 2010).

This study is of great importance, not only because with it I can fill a gap in literature, but because through the phenomenological method, I can assist scholars, researchers, and readers alike to understand some of the eyewitness accounts of the problems that continue to exist within the BCTs. Through this study, scholars, researchers, and readers can gain an understanding of the impact that the DADT policy had on GLBs in the Army and how DSs responded to recruits who were caught committing same-sex sexual acts or those who were outed. Some DSs, who are sworn to train recruits with the utmost professional intent and are to prepare recruits to become soldiers, are not being proactive in preventing this type of abuse against the GLB recruits in the BCT environment. By identifying the strategies used by DSs and DSLs and the recommendation of a GLB scenario-based curriculum within the DSS, the U.S. military may become more tolerant and accepting of all service members, regardless of their sexual orientation.

Problem Statement

Even with the repeal of DADT, the Army continues to see increased cases of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB service members by other service members. This current, relevant, and significant issue is described by the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Raymond Odierno, as a “cancer within the force” (Spincic, 2014, p. 53). According to the Department of the Army ([DOA], 2013), programs such as the Army’s Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) program and the I. A.M. Strong campaign have been created to increase awareness and prevention of sexual harassment and sexual assault of service members. However, the desired result of successfully preventing such acts continues to be elusive (Doe, 2015). My focus with this study was on the experiences of Army DSs and DSLs, their response or lack of response to sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLB recruits solely because of their sexual orientation, and the strategies they have used or would use to prevent such incidents.

Currently 66,000 gay and lesbian soldiers serve in the armed forces, and 2.8% of those serving on active duty (AD), or in the National Guard (NG) are either gay or lesbian (Mattox, Kauth, Sandfort, Matza, Sullivan, & Shipherd, 2013). These numbers may be even higher, stated Burke (2010) in the *American Psychologist*. Burke estimated that in the U.S., there are currently 71,000-78,000 GLB service members on AD or in the NG or reserve. This accounts for 3.7% of U.S. military personnel, which is within the range of the estimated rates of GLB individuals in the general population. According to research conducted by the University of California, Los Angeles, there were more than

65,000 gay service members, accounting for about 2% of all personnel, prior to the repeal of DADT (Saldin, 2011). According to Gonsiorek and Weinrich (1991), gays and lesbians, at 4-17% of the workforce, make up a larger group than many other minorities, yet there is very little research on GLB issues in the workplace, particularly those in the U.S. military. This may be the reason U.S. military programs related to the issue of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination fail to address the GLB community. With these high numbers of GLB service members, and with the repeal of the DADT policy, DSs and DSLs in the Army have a duty of ensuring that their BCT environment is one free of hazing, discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual assault of GLBs. Grevatt (2002) reported being the target of harassment—having pornographic pictures taped to her locker, hearing threatening comments, and receiving a handmade chopping block along with an article about homosexual beheadings in the Middle East. Other harassment directed towards Grevatt included being called names such as “dyke repellant,” as well as physical assault which occurred daily for 6 months (Grevatt, 2000).

Herek (2000) distinguishes between homophobia and heterosexism. He defines homophobia as the term used to describe individual antigay attitudes and behaviors. Heterosexism, on the other hand, refers to the patterns of institutionalized oppression and societal ideologies of nonheterosexual people (Herek, 2000). As a result of both heterosexism and homophobia, there are many career disadvantages of being GLB. The GLB population suffers material and psychological damages because of a negative work culture. This is influenced both by GLB’s coworkers and by the organization as a whole, especially when that organization is lacking in concrete equality standards capable of

protecting sexual minorities (Burke, 2010). Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* defines equality as a virtue in which human beings are to be treated equally, in accordance with the principles of justice; no race or recognized group should be denied this attribute (Rawls, 1971). Feminist theorist Nussbaum concluded in her work that the equality of persons gives them a fair claim to certain types of treatment at the hands of society and politics. Equality and fair treatment should be indiscriminant of a GLB individual's sexual identity, and should allow for the respect and promotion of freedom of choice, respect, and promotion of the equal worth of persons as choosers (Nussbaum, 1999).

Although federal law calls for the acceptance of transgendered people to serve in the military, at the time of this study, no training or directives have been issued to the military branches to begin accepting anyone but straight and GLB people. For this reason, the role and treatment of transgendered individuals falls outside the scope of this study. Even with the repeal of DADT, according to Grindley (2012), the comprehensive Employment Nondiscrimination Act, which sought to protect all GLBs, no matter their place of employment or jurisdiction, has also failed to become law. The Federal Nondiscrimination Act was also passed but failed to fully protect GLBTQ workers against workplace discrimination (Gates, 2011). The DOD made some policy revisions which would allow transsexual people to serve openly, but because of all the political and bureaucratic constraints and the estimated time it would take to make the full transition within all the branches, no branch has yet followed through with the requirement (Ford, 2014). Furthermore, the specific political workings associated with the military's failure to accept transgendered people are unknown.

There is research focusing on cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault within the ranks of all DOD military branches, but few studies address the prevalent cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits before, during, and after the repeal of the DADT policy. Part of this may be because previous studies on minorities in the workplace focused mainly on gender or race; if studies took sexual orientation into account, they were limited in scope (Ward & Winstanley, 2005). Some of that may be because of DADT and related policies in place prior to 2011. Not only has sexuality been an under-researched area with diversity at the workplace, but it is also one of the most difficult to study because GLB people had to play an active role in the acknowledgement of their identity by coming out to the researchers and colleagues (Ward & Winstanley, 2005), a step which would have been accompanied by the possibility of discharge from the U.S. military.

There is even less research focusing on the role of the DOA and its DSs in addressing and preventing cases of discrimination against GLBs after the repeal of DADT. DSs and DSLs are not providing the support system required to proactively prevent the sexual harassment and sexual assault of the GLB recruit population. With the lack of oversight and soldier-leader inclusion training which allows for GLB scenario-based training, SHARP and I. A.M. Strong do little to prevent the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB soldiers. For this reason, there needs to be a study focusing on the DS's role in fostering a culture within their BCT which would allow for the acceptance and fair treatment of all recruits by adding effective scenario-based training to instill tolerance and support for GLB soldiers.

In addition to focusing on the DS's response to addressing and preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault, there will also be a need to direct attention to those who train DSs, i.e., DSLs, at the DSS. The DSP should add training within its curricula to promote GLB awareness training. DSLs, who work at the DSS, play a vital role in educating, training, and mentoring future DSs. Their ability to share their experiences as former DSs who worked with recruits provides crucial support in mentoring and counseling the "new Army" DS. The new Army DS is one who possesses fewer tyrannical, battle-hardened yelling and cursing attributes, and instead plays the role of leader, mentor, and counselor (Go Army, 2016). The BCT environment is distinct in its setting and requirements, and requires a rapid culture change. Prior to enlisting, recruits were representatives of the cultures within their communities; during BCT, they must become part of the communal, hierarchical culture of the U.S. military (Foran & Adler, 2013).

According to Burke (2011), even though the U.S. military has begun addressing disparities in rates of sexual harassment among service members, there has been less attention devoted to sexual orientation as one of the significant risk factors for this victimization. U.S. military leaders have also done little to address this issue. The Army defines *sexual harassment* through SHARP as gender discrimination which involves any and all unwelcomed sexual advances and requests for sexual favors (DOA, 2016). Sexual harassment also includes any verbal or physical conduct regarded as sexual in nature between the same or opposite genders (DOA, 2016). DOA (2015) defines *sexual assault* as physical, intentional sexual contact in which there is the use of force and

threats of physical harm or violence. Included in the definition is the intimidation or abuse of authority or acts including rape, forcible sodomy or wrongful and inappropriate sexual contact (DOA, 2015).

The Army has to abide by the tenets of SHARP, I. A.M. Strong, and the overarching Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) DOD program. However, the Army continues to see victimization of recruits by other recruits because of their sexual orientation. Though sexual harassment and sexual assault of heterosexuals in the military is also an issue, I focused on a lesser studied and addressed issue, which is still growing (Burke, 2011). This victimization continues to be seen within the BCT environment either because the recruit is serving as an openly gay service member or because they were “outed” by other recruits. Prior to its repeal, DADT and SHARP also sought to remove those same service members from the U.S. military. In essence, the removal of DADT as a U.S. military policy confirmed existing evidence which indicated that allowing GLBs to serve openly is not likely to pose any significant risk to unit cohesion and discipline within the U.S. military (Turchik & Wilson, 2010). Some Army DSs who witnessed SHARP-related incidents against GLB recruits were not proactively engaged in addressing and preventing such instances. The bystander theory supported the study in that some DSs did not respond to instances of SHARP against GLB recruits because they did not feel the situations warranted a response or did not interpret such incidents as emergencies. In other instances, the DS was the cause of the incidents in the BCT. In this study, I aimed to find that disconnect and made recommendations to add further research on the topic. Also of importance was the identification of the training

DS's received, and the strategies they used or would have used to address and prevent the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits.

Research Questions

To gain a better understanding of the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits in BCT environments, I posed three research questions (RQs):

RQ1: What strategies are DSs implementing to prevent the sexual harassment and sexual assault of their GLB recruits?

RQ2: When some DSs do not intervene or implement strategies to prevent the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits in the BCT environment, do they contend with the bystander effect?

RQ3: What training can be implemented to increase awareness among DSs of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits while also promoting a rapid response to and prevention of future incidents?

Theoretical Framework

In this study, I focused on the bystander effect theory as it applies to Army DSs, who, in my experience, sometimes turned a blind eye to the mistreatment of known or suspected GLB recruits—both prior to and after the repeal of the DADT policy. The bystander effect theory explains that when one sees something bad happening to another human being, they are less likely to respond and aid the victim if they feel that someone else will intervene. This theory is relevant to the DS' lack of response that I have witnessed in that their willingness to intervene may be hindered by the simple presence of

others (Casey & Ohler, 2012). In a study done on bullying and the negative effects of the lack of response, it was found that people witnessing the incident often had the capability of intervening to stop the bully from continuing the physical or verbal acts of aggression (Cowie, 2000; Smith, Twemlow, & Hoover, 1998). They could also, on the other hand, encourage the bully to continue, or they could passively witness the bullying without reacting. (Cowie, 2000; Smith et al., 1998). Latane and Darley (1969) proposed a five-stage model that has become prominently used to describe appropriate responses in emergency and rule-breaking situations. This framework may be applied to the DS response to the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLBs. Latane and Darley's model includes stages which the DS must traverse in order to take action. The first stage includes *noticing* the troubling situation; realizing that there is an issue. The second stage is *interpreting* the situation as problematic; knowing that the situation or incident is indeed a problem. The third stage is assuming personal *responsibility* for addressing the problem; the person witnessing the incident must be able to know that they would be assuming the responsibility when responding. Fourth is *identifying* an accessible course of action. The fifth stage is *implementing* that action; responding to and taking action to stop and prevent the action(s) (Casey & Ohler, 2012). The bystander effect is then applied and relevant to my witnessed DS lack of response with the bystander effect where action at all stages of intervention and response may be by the simple presence of others, leaving either another to respond, or no action be taken (Casey & Ohler, 2012). According to Leone, Parrott, Swartout, and Tharp (2016), the five stages a bystander or the DS must go through to intervene: the bystander must notice the event of the GLB

person being sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, or discriminated against because of his or her sexual orientation. The bystander must be able to interpret the incident as an emergency. He or she must develop a feeling of personal emergency. He or she must be able to decide how to help, and then choose to act (Leone et al., 2016).

The focus for the study also included analyzing aspects of DS training, directives, and programs issued by the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)—responsible for all Army training and doctrine—and how they do or do not create a culture of acceptance and inclusion of all soldiers within their training curriculum. The main focus of this study was on how the participants of this study responded when they witnessed the harassment of a GLB recruit, why they responded the way they did, and which strategies they used to prevent this form of harassment. The ability of DSs to respond to, address, and prevent sexual harassment and sexual assault depends on how motivated they were to eliminate this behavior.

Baston (1994) described the bystander effect as “...that the presence of other bystanders inhibits responding through (a) pluralistic ignorance (‘no one else is reacting; it must not be an emergency after all’) and (b) diffusion of responsibility (‘something should be done, but why me?’ or ‘I am sure someone else has already called’)” (para. 7). Darley and Latane (1968) assert that “when only one bystander is present in an emergency, if help is to come, it must come from him. Although he may choose to ignore it (out of concern for his personal safety, or desires ‘not to get involved’),” any pressure to intervene focuses uniquely on him” (pgs. 377-378). When DSs take action to address and prevent the harassment of GLBs, it may be seen as an unnecessary response

by either their coworkers or by straight recruits. Sometimes being seen as a supporter of GLBs may also make DSs seem weaker or be suspected of being GLB themselves. In Carlson's (2008) study on the bystander effect and bullying, he found that the majority of participants in the study reported that they did not want to look weak in front of other men and therefore did not respond to cases of bullying. In addition, Darley and Latane found that when there are multiple witnesses present, the pressure to intervene does not focus on any one particular observer; instead, the responsibility is shared by all who are observing the incident, so no one helps.

The intent of this specific study was to see if there has been any change in addressing, intervening in, and preventing future cases of discrimination of GLBs through added training within the DS curricula. A recommendation for GLB scenario-based training within the DSP was made since the results of this study supported it. Some DSs are becoming more involved in speaking out when witnessing sexual harassment and sexual assault and some are mere witnesses. The bystander effect was evident as the reason some of the DS participants in the study did not respond to the harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits.

Nature of the Study

In this phenomenological study, I centered on key informant interviews of veteran, nonretired Army DSs and DSLs. I also centered my attention on Fort Jackson, South Carolina, as it hosts the Army DSS where DSs and DSLs receive their training. The 108th Training Command, headquartered in Charlotte, North Carolina, and TRADOC located at Fort Eustis, Virginia, regulate the training of the DSs, the DSS, and the DSP.

TRADOC is the location where all training standard operating procedures (SOPs) are created and regulated. According to DS and Command Sergeant Major Johnson (2014), TRADOC is the Army's primary institutional domain for training and leader development. Since DSs are Noncommissioned Officers (NCOs), their trainers are other NCOs; officers cannot be in the DSP neither as DSs, nor as their trainers (DSLs). The DS is first and foremost a soldier, and then an NCO of which they are, according to Johnson (2014), the best, most competent, most creative, most agile, and most ready to serve in the most demanding leadership positions in the Army. DSs undergo 8 weeks of intense training in basic and advanced skills in leadership, soldier and culture training, Army policies, and interpersonal skills enhancement to appropriately respond to a variety of soldier-military issues.

The DSs interviewed in this study had either first-hand experience with recruitment-GLB sexual harassment and sexual assault within their BCT, heard that it has happened in other units, or could speak of their reaction if they were to encounter such incidents while they filled the role of DS. The DS's behavior was the dependent variable, namely his or her response—or lack thereof—to the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLBs. The independent variable was the rescinding of DADT. The use of a phenomenological approach allowed for a shift in focus from studying the problem to documenting the experiences of DSs while they were “on the trail,”—which refers to their time working in the field under the title of DS or DSL.

In this study, I identified the actions the DSs took to combat the bystander effect. I wanted to find out how the DSs who responded to prevent SHARP-related incidents

against GLB recruits did so and or how they could have if they did not respond.

According to Englander (2012), the interviewer should ask the participant for information about a time the participant had a physical reaction or response to a situation. It is important to ask for specific information regarding the incident, since the meaning of a phenomenon must be connected to a specific context in which the phenomenon was experienced. Conducting this as a qualitative phenomenological study with unstructured interviews allowed for a free-flow of ideas and the open sharing of the participants' experiences. This design had strong philosophical underpinnings and was used to capture the experience of several (11) individuals who have experienced a specific phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009). Creswell (2007) views phenomenology as the discussion of the basic ideas and lived experiences of individuals. The ability to capture real-time feelings and personal attitudes without the constrictions of structured requirements allowed the participant to express his or her true feelings. It also allowed me as the researcher to gauge the direction of the interviews to best satisfy the goals of the study. In Rockwell's praise for Clark Moustakas' best personification of the phenomenological method, she painted the following portrait of what the researcher seeks through this method of study:

Laying out the transcripts, like dinner party guests around the edge of my ottoman, I observe them all, as witnesses of human experience, a particular experience, each from their respective perches. They sit still, stacks of white sheets with black markings, waiting for my Heisenbergian observations, making the experience so. It is no mistake that the scientist, through analysis, makes his

or her mark by bringing the data to life. As though: the experience has been analyzed, therefore it is. (Rockwell, 2013, p. 90)

Part of this study was satisfied with a heuristic approach. With the investigation of the participants' human experience through an internal search, this approach welcomed "aha" moments. The Greek word *heuriskein* means to discover and find the nature and meaning of an experience (Moustakas, 1990). The process of discovery will lead researchers to new meanings regarding human phenomenon (Moustakas, 1990) and brought me the realizations about my own experiences as a former DSL. Moustakas (1990) also used the heuristic approach to challenge, confront, and sometimes doubt his understanding of a particular issue; when he persisted and confronted the issue in a disciplined and devoted manner, he was able to deepen his knowledge. Heuristic approaches can result in conditions, qualities, and relationships that may not otherwise result (Moustakas, 1990).

Definitions

Armed forces: U.S. military service members who are AD, or for this study, who are Army reservists (USAR), or Army NG, or whose status is considered Inactive Ready Reserve (IRR), which is a term that is used to identify those on standby (Rubicon Planning, 2011). Those in the IRR may have been either on an AD position and transferred to IRR or were in the USAR—those serving one weekend per month—who transferred to the IRR. Armed forces service members may come from the Marines, Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard (Rubicon Planning, 2011). While the GLB issue is prevalent amongst all branches, my focus with this study was on the Army.

Bullying: a subtype of aggressive behavior involving a peer-to-peer physical or verbal altercation, in which an individual or a group of individuals repeatedly attacks, humiliates, or excludes a relatively powerless person (Salmivalli, 2009).

Closeted: or being in the closet is to live in a state of secrecy, pretending to be heterosexual, or maintaining a level of cautious privacy regarding one's sexual orientation (United States Office of Personnel Management, 2015).

Consent: the freely given or expressed agreement between competent persons to engage in sexual activity. Consent can include words or overt acts indicating a freely given agreement to a sexual encounter by a competent person. An expression of lack of consent through words or conduct (namely when one is intoxicated or drugged) means there is no consent. When the service member does not exhibit verbal or physical resistance or submission resulting from the accused's use of force, threat of force, or inducing of fear, he or she may consent (DOA, 2016).

Drill sergeant: Army DSs—those on AD and in the USAR who served in the DS capacity at any time pre-, during, and post-DADT. The Army's DSs are selected by their assigned DS unit and are sent to the DSS. DSs on AD are assigned to the BCT sites on active status, and USAR DSs report to the BCTs either during their individual annual training (AT) or can go on AD orders to serve for an extended period of time. Each year, these DSs train new U.S. military personnel—approximately 72,000—to adapt both behaviorally and psychologically to the requirements of the Army (Foran & Adler, 2013). TRADOC refers to DSs as DSs/Advanced Individual Training Platoon Sergeants (AITPSGs) since the roles within the regulation are sometimes interchangeable in

responsibility and training. In this study, I referred to DSs/AITPSGs as DSs and AITPSGs respectively.

Gay: the sexual orientation of man-on-man sexual interest or sexual actions with a same-sex partner.

GLB: the acronym used to identify the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population. The *T* in GLBT includes transsexuals/transgendered, and although Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel declared that transsexuals are allowed to serve in the U.S. military, the Army, at the time of this study, had not made progress with the inclusion of transsexuals.

Homosexual: a sexual identity in which people find themselves more attracted to the same sex than to the opposite sex (Morrow & Battles, 2015).

Heterosexism: valuing heterosexuality as superior to be more natural and normal than GLB sexual orientations (Morin, 1977). Heterosexism focuses on heterosexual privilege and draws attention to the constancy of the experience and not just episodic violence and harassment (Herek & Berrill, 1992).

Lesbian: a woman who is attracted to or is involved in a same-sex relationship with another woman. *Gay* has also been used to define lesbians.

LGBTQ: commonly used as an acronym to identify people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, and or questioning (LGBTQ). According to Texas Tech University (2015), transgendered people can be "...straight, gay, lesbian or bisexual. Q stands for questioning—someone who is questioning their sexual or gender orientation. Sometimes, the Q stands for 'queer,' a term reclaimed by some LGBTs for political reasons" (para. 1).

I. A.M. Strong: the Army's campaign to combat sexual harassment and sexual assault. Soldiers are required to *intervene* when they witness sexual harassment and sexual assault, *act* in stopping and preventing such behaviors, and *motivate* one another to foster an environment free of such behaviors (DOA, 2016).

Military spouse: After the repeal of DOMA, according to DOD (2013), it is the policy of the department to use the words "spouse" and "marriage," who, without regard to sexual orientation, and all married couples, irrespective of sexual orientation, and their dependents, will be afforded the same benefits.

Out: the status of being openly gay in presence and action, or an openly expressed relationship between members of the same sex.

Reservist: any member of the armed forces who is not considered AD. Drilling reservists are required to report to duty one weekend per month, and then the AT which is normally a 2-week unit training period. All branches have service members serving in the reserves. The three components are ready reserve, standby reserve, and retired reserve (Rubicon Planning, 2011).

SAPR: the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program of the DOD. SAPR was initiated in October 2005 as the DOD policy against sexual harassment and sexual assault of service members and also required the military to initiate and maintain a victim advocacy program. DOD Directive 6495.01 covers the policy more formally.

SAPRO: Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office. This office maintains a comprehensive policy to ensure the safety, dignity, and well-being of all service members. Their mission is to ensure that employed military and civilian workers are

committed to maintaining a workplace environment free of sexual assault. The SAPRO requires leaders and subordinates to support this mission and be accountable for their actions (Misso, 2014). Misso (2014) continues that even though there were an estimated 26,000 incidents of unwanted sexual contact in 2012, only 3,374 were reported.

Service member: considered man or woman currently serving under AD, reserves, NG, or IRR status.

Sex-based discrimination: gender discrimination and sexual orientation discrimination. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2016) defines this form of discrimination as one that involves treating someone unfavorably solely because of their sex.

Sexual orientation: direction of an individual's attraction, which for this study did not include possible correlation concerning the desire to cross-dress or to assume the identity of the opposite gender through sex reassignment (transgender) surgery (Leonard, 1993).

Sexual stigma: for this study, it is the stigma assigned to the GLB population. Herek (2004) states that sexual stigma consists of negative attitudes towards the target and the inferior status of the sexual minority. When homosexuality is viewed as unfavorable, homosexual service members become devalued, disempowered, and discriminated against.

Sexual violence: also referred to as sexual assault, is, according to DOD Directive 6495.01 (2012), the intentional sexual contact which may include the use of force, threats, intimidation, or abuse of authority when the victim does not or cannot consent

(see *consent*). This includes a broad category of sexual offenses consisting of rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, forcible sodomy, and any attempts to commit these offenses.

SHARP: program initiated by the Army with a mission to reduce and eliminate sexual offenses through cultural change, prevention, intervention, investigation, accountability, advocacy/response, assessment, and training (DOA, 2016). It is an effort by the Army to instill discipline and respect in each soldier to intervene and protect one another against sexual harassment and sexual assault. New recruits receive this training within the first week of BCT (DOA, 2016).

Transsexual: as defined by Glaad Media (2015), as an individual who, with or without gender-reassignment surgery, lives full-time in a gender role consistent with his or her inner identity rather than his or her biological sex.

Veteran: for the purposes of this study, any former Army AD, USAR, NG, or IRR service member. Veterans are those who have served an aggregate 180 days of AD at any point in their U.S. military career and have been separated from their military contract with no further obligation for service.

Assumptions

The study was based on three assumptions. First, the study assumed that the DSS does not facilitate enough personalized training focusing on the various cultures, lifestyles, and learning styles of recruits within the BCTs. Second, it assumed that DSLs at the DSS are not proactive enough in their training programs to ensure that DSCs are fully prepared to take on a leading role within their BCTs to prevent SHARP-related

incidents against GLBs. Third, it assumed that some DSs who witness SHARP-related incidents against GLB recruits did not proactively intervene, nor do they hold all of the perpetrators accountable for their actions. This either occurred because of the bystander effect, or because of lack of oversight, lack of specific training, or personal bias against GLBs. For those who did address the mistreatment of GLB recruits, the research questions were aimed to find out which strategies they personally implemented to ensure the fair treatment of all recruits.

Limitations

As a former DSL, I recognize that this study faced innate limitations, in part because of the sensitive nature of personal identities in cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault. One limitation was that participants would not fully share in-depth recollections of their past experiences, because of the personal nature of the topic. Another limitation was that participants did not agree with the repeal of DADT, or with the new open-mindedness of U.S. military culture. Participants may have had certain constraints in sharing their experiences based on their personal views of the military or of the sexual harassment issue that has been so rampant in the Army. A third limitation was restricted access to information from the DOA and the office of the secretary of defense, as this study focused on the organization and its personnel.

Significance

The intent of this study was to fill in the gap in the existing literature and explore DSs role in addressing and preventing continued sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits. With this study, I offered an original contribution to this area of research

which will hopefully lead to future research on this important topic. Creating a positive ideology of appropriate responses that are proactive in addressing and preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault should be the focus of DSs. Enforcing a culture accepting of the GLB recruits by heterosexuals and by other GLBs should promote teamwork and unified partnerships within the BCTs. This will rely on the DSs' role in counseling and mentoring recruits on how to work with suspected or known GLB recruits, as was recommended at the end of this study. If DSs recognize the prevalence of GLB-targeted harassment and become aware of its impact, they will hopefully assist in reducing instances of sexual harassment, sexual assault, hazing, and mistreatment of GLB recruits.

This research supports professional practices in its transparent and practical application recommendations within the current BCT environment. DSs are to promote an equally-accessible, values-based training culture for all soldiers, no matter their sexual orientation. DSs are to foster a culture that is accepting of all recruits based on their individual performance and teamwork instead of their sexual preference. The "warrior" mentality enforced by the Army includes all recruits at their BCT training, including those soldiers who identify themselves as GLB without special accommodations.

My motivation in conducting this study was to effect social change. As a former DS (2008-2011) and DSL in the Army, I witnessed the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits. This was of major concern to me within my BCTs. Under the current SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs alone, there is insufficient support to mentor, coach, and instill a sense of equality within the BCT environment, particularly within the constraints of the DS training curricula. The DOD's SAPR and the DOA's

SHARP address the need to promote a sexual harassment- and sexual assault-free culture, but they fail to directly focus that same attention on the GLB recruit population. The findings of this study allowed for a realization by the participants that a problem exists and a need for change encouraged. Additionally, the study offered future researchers and scholars information about the culture shift which occurred pre-, during, and post-DADT.

Since most recruits I have trained joined the U.S. military between the ages 18-24, I addressed the issue of harassment within schools. A majority of these basic trainees take advantage of what the Army refers to as “split training option,” where high school or college students can enlist in the AR or the NG. Those individuals go to BCT during their summer break, return to school, and then complete their Advanced Individual Training (AIT) the following summer. Within today’s generational environment, according to Endicott (2010), nearly 9 out of 10 GLB students (86.2%) experience harassment at school because of their sexual orientation. These numbers are similar to those in the BCTs where the participants served in the role of coach and mentor. 60.8% of GLB students feel unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation. “No student [recruit] should be subjected to the ridicule and physical violence that GLB students [recruits] so often experience in school [BCT]” (Endicott, 2010). Pejorative words used in the school environment are also used in BCT, both by fellow recruits and by DSs: “fag,” “dyke,” “queer,” “lezzie,” “peter-puffer,” and “homo” are common. These terms sometimes go unchallenged by administrators, unlike other terms which have been used against racial minorities or females in the past (Morrow, 2004). The culture in the school environment transfers to military boot camp, as I witnessed in the BCT environment.

Marrow (2004) asserts that obvious antiGLB harassment often goes unaddressed and unreported by teachers and administrators who fear for their own job security if they were to become identified as GLBT-affirmative.

In a recent study conducted by NG, Schweitzer, and Lyons (2012), in a General Social Survey (GSS), it was found that the GLB population is still a stigmatized group, is vulnerable to employment discrimination, and until recently, received little legal protection. GLB individuals continue to cope with discrimination and harassment, and they engage in identity management to conceal their sexual identity. According to Gates (2011), in the workplace, GLB individuals experience overt stigmatization, such as homophobic or heterosexist jokes, verbal harassment, and physical violence. GLB individuals may be the only group who face legalized discrimination in the workplace; they are subjected to negative stereotypes, lower pay rates, and lack of same-sex partner benefits (Ng et al., 2012). The same issues apply within the BCT environment, which pose a continued risk to unit cohesion.

Summary

The DADT policy caused grounds for unwarranted discrimination within the Army BCT environment. Wilder and Wilder (2012) put it best, stating that the DADT policy, during the 17 years that it was implemented, resulted in unforeseen levels of discrimination, hazing, sexual harassment, and sexual assault, as well as cases of death by suicide or attack on GLB service members. This study aimed to analyze the lack of appropriate response by DSs to the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits

within that environment. I also applied similarities between students and recruits as similar discriminations faced in grade-school are apparent in the BCTs.

In Chapter 2, I examined existing literature and overarching information on the history of homosexuality in the U.S. military, the DOD's response, the prevalent gap in literature, and DS training. I delved into the DS selection, recruitment, and training processes. I also analyzed the role of the DADT policy and how, through it, the military was prevented from recruiting and retaining openly serving GLBs. Even though the policy was repealed, it is imperative that scholars and readers get a deeper understanding of the policy and the constraints that it had not only on GLBs, but also the trainers. DADT placed restrictions which not only mandated the discharge of openly gay service members, but also prevented DSs from showing support for GLB tolerance.

In Chapter 2, I list some of the library databases, search engines, and key terms used in my research. The bystander effect, a theory of cognitive psychology, is discussed as it pertains to response or lack of response by Army DSs. Additionally, in the literature review, I incorporate studies related to the construct of interest and methodology consistent with the scope of the study. In the literature review, I describe synthesized studies which are related to the research questions and explain why a particular approach was selected. Finally, in Chapter 2, I describe what is known, as well as what is not known in the discipline, and how the present study fills at least one of the gaps in literature, which will allow for the extension of knowledge within the discipline.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

My goal in composing this literature review was to collect, analyze, and synthesize existing literature on the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits. Also of importance was a review of some of the U.S. military's reasons for the past segregation of males and females, and the desexualization (gender-based barriers) of the workplace. In this review, I also discuss the DOD's SAPR program and the Army policies on sexual harassment and sexual assault (SHARP and the I. A.M. Strong). A discussion of these programs was relevant to the scenario-based training recommended later in the study. In this review, I also highlight the strengths of and challenges to these programs and identify strategies already in place to train DSs to quickly identify, address, and prevent mistreatment of GLBs either by heterosexual or other GLB recruits.

The literature review includes a comprehensive historical overview of hostility toward gay soldiers in the U.S. military. I also discuss the attitudes of DOD leaders toward homosexuality. I begin the literature review with an introduction to the DS selection process. I then review gender integration, the history of homosexuality, and the federal and U.S. military attempts to eradicate gay soldiers from the U.S. military. In the third portion of the literature review, I discuss constitutional perspectives on allowing gay soldiers to serve in the U.S. military and the benefits that GLBs were denied that heterosexual service members received prior to the repeal of DOMA's Section 3. I conclude the chapter by describing the training currently given to DSCs at the DSS.

Literature Search Strategy

I used several key words and thematic approaches to locate relevant literature. These terms include *gay and lesbian soldiers in the military, homosexuals in the armed services, GLB soldier studies, racial and gender integration in the military, history of sexual orientation in the military, homosexual stigmas, gay soldiers in other countries, and discrimination against gay soldiers in the U.S. military*. To find research on policies and programs addressing gay soldiers and sexual harassment, I used key words including *SHARP, I. A.M. Strong, SAPR, constitutionality of gay soldiers in the U.S. military, federal regulation on gay soldiers, gay benefits in the government, DADT, and discrimination policies on gay soldiers in the U.S. military*. In respect to the role of the Army DS, I used search phrases such as *Army DS training, DS selection, DS and gays, DS and discrimination of GLBs, and Army train the trainer*.

Databases and journals used to support the research include *SAGE Publications, Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, ProQuest, the American Psychological Association, PsychARTICLES, and Academic Search Premier*. Additionally, I used the *Journal of Homosexuality*, dissertations and theses at Walden University, and the database of the DOD. I also accessed the databases of the DOA, the U.S. Supreme Court, the *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, and the Truman Library.

In the following sections, I discuss DSs and DS training. DSCs at the DSS recite the Drill Sergeant Creed daily as a reminder of their responsibilities and commitment to professionally train soldiers (GoArmy, 2016). These literature review passages follow the order they do in order to lay the foundation for my research for this study. I also

discuss the DS selection process, recruitment, responsibilities, and requirements for becoming a DS.

The Drill Sergeant

The DS is the Army's forefront leader who is trained to turn civilians into soldiers. They are selected to represent the Army in their training and leadership styles and are the disciplined face of the largest branch in the U.S. military. DSs instill pride in all they train and maintain a sense of pride and *esprit de corps* about their workmanship. Before they begin their training for the day at the DSS, they recite the Drill Sergeant Creed:

The Drill Sergeant Creed:

I am a drill sergeant.

I will assist each individual in their efforts to become a highly motivated, well disciplined, physically and mentally fit soldier, capable of defeating any enemy on today's modern battlefield.

I will instill pride in all I train, pride in self, in the Army, and in country.

I will insist that each soldier meets and maintains the Army's standards of military bearing and courtesy, consistent with the highest traditions of the U.S. Army.

I will lead by example, never requiring a soldier to attempt any task I would not do myself.

But first, last, and always, I am an American soldier, sworn to defend the constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic.

I am a drill sergeant. (U.S. Army, 2013)

Selection

From physical readiness, uniform policies, leadership training, to weapons qualification, evaluations, and soldiering skills, DSs have a multitude of responsibilities. As the primary enforcers, disciplinarians, mentors, and coaches for the BCT recruits, much is expected of this elite group. The training they undergo at the DSS is intense, and there are many who do not earn the right to proudly wear the hat of the DS—a symbol of their role and power—and the DS identification badge. According to GoArmy (2016), becoming a DS is considered to be one of the highest honors which an NCO in the Army may possess. A former Marine Corps recruit recalled that her drill instructor (the Marine Corps version of the Army DS) was admirable, disciplined, represented the best of the best, and exemplified what she wanted to be one day (Snyder, 1995). The recruit reinforced her memory that she had the utmost respect for DSs as they are one of a kind, the cream of the crop. DS work is challenging and demanding of all candidates both at the DSS and while on the “trail” (Snyder, 1995). Only those who are selected by their command and are considered to be the most qualified NCOs will attend the DSS, where they are trained to fill the role of utmost importance (Snyder, 1995). Those selected to attend the DSS and become DSs are selected either by their unit, or they volunteer and are then chosen—or not—to become part of the top 10%, the Army elite. According to Army Regulation (AR) 614-200, DSs are the first representatives of the Army during the formative weeks of a recruit’s training; therefore, only the most professionally qualified will be granted the selective role. The selection process is tough and weeds out many

prospective candidates. Those who do not make it through the selection process either lack the required motivation, fail the Army standard for physical fitness, or have U.S. military or civilian infractions on their record.

Those selected must then undergo background screening and receive recommendations from senior officers within their assigned unit. These NCOs, as established by Command Sergeant Major Johnson (2014), have already been screened prior to being selected, have no character violations in their past, and possess the character expected of leaders. Prospective candidates must also undergo various assessments by other U.S. military agencies to ensure they have the physical, mental, and psychological competencies that the Army requires of the DS (Gregory, 2004).

According to the AR 614-200, commanders (lieutenant colonel or higher) must personally interview the soldier and ensure that the soldier meets all of the prerequisites before attending the DSS. Commanders must consider the soldier as a whole before either selecting or rejecting the prospective candidate for the DS position (DOA, 2009). Aspiring DSCs must be physically and mentally tough. They must not only be agile in the field and under physical pressure, but also be able to mentor and coach recruits. DSs must manage their challenging careers, which often require a demanding 24/7 workload, while attending to their personal lives. Those who are selected to become DSs must have an essentially clean criminal and civil record. According to the DOA's (2009) AR 600-14, in order to be selected, those aspiring to be DSs cannot have any drug offenses on their record. They cannot have larceny convictions, traffic violations with six or more points assessed, or any other generally unfavorable information on their civilian or U.S.

military records within 3 years of their applying for the DSS. According to Army General Martin Dempsey, the selection process seeks to identify men and women with not only the right skills, but the right character, discipline, and military history (Kim, 2009). Those who successfully become DSs will be responsible for molding young men and women into soldiers in just 10 weeks (Kim, 2009).

According to Command Sergeant Major Thomas (2004), before becoming an Army at war, the most sought-after job in the Army was that of the DS. Many service members dreamed of being selected and successfully taking on the challenge of the DSS. As recalled by Staff Sergeant Williams, a former DS, the first sergeant—first line supervisor—always chose the soldier with the DS patch—issued to those who complete the DSS—to conduct training for the unit (Gregory, 2004). Mistakes may be made while at the DSS; however, a certain standard must be met. Successful completion of the program earns one the DS patch and the infamous DS campaign hat.

Drill Sergeants and Platoon Sergeants

AR 350-16 covers the Army's DSP and AITPSG programs. Since 2013, AR 350-16 had the term "Drill Sergeant/Advanced Individual Training Platoon Sergeant" (DS/AITPSGs). As outlined in the *Definitions* section of Chapter 1, I referred to DS and the AITPSG as just DS and AITPSGs; the two roles are not interchangeable in this study. AITPSGs are not included in this study since they are not BCT DSs nor are they DSLs at the DSS. The scope and responsibilities of both positions differ in the intensity and duration of the training they receive at the DSS.

AIT is a designated training location where a soldier will report to upon completion of BCT, except for those soldiers who go the one station unit training (OSUT) route; soldiers go this route depending on their military occupational specialty (MOS). DSs fill their role during the BCT and AIT phases of a soldier's initial entry training (IET), while an AITPSG fills the DS role during AIT and during the additional IET phases that some soldiers go through after the completion of BCT. An exception to this would be in OSUT units where the soldier goes through BCT and AIT at the same time as part of their IET. While individually assigned platoon sergeants (PSGs) maintain active roles within units beyond BCT and OSUT, the DS and the AITPSGs are the sole leaders within the IET who give recruits and soldiers personal attention during training.

Army Regulations 350-16 and 614-200

AR 350-16 of the TRADOC, regarded as the bible of DSP, outlines the mission of the DSS. The purpose of AR 350-16 is to establish "...objectives, policies, and responsibilities for training and use of personnel in DS positions, DSC, AITPSG, and AIT Platoon Sergeant Candidate (PSC) status for the active Army (AA), the USAR, and NG" (DOA, 2013, p.10). AR 350-16 applies to AITPSGs as well as DSs, but for this study and its focus, I did not discuss the PSGs/AITPSGs, nor the candidates of the PSG program (AITPSGP). AR 350-16 establishes the practices and requirements for all training at the DSS, Drill Sergeant Leaders Candidate (DSLCL) course, and AITPSG and AITPSGC courses. According to the DOA (2011), AR 350-16 outlines the selection process, criteria, reasons for dismissal from the program, and failure to meet entry requirements. Dismissal may also include failing to meet expectations of proper

appearance, military courtesy, bearing and conduct, or violations of the UCMJ.

Prospective DSCs may also be removed from the program if they lack proper motivation or fail to meet the DSS requirements. The Human Resources Command (HRC) has the authority to control the placement and removal of prospective or current DSCs, DSs, DSLCs, and DSLs, at the request of the commandant (the senior-most enlisted NCO at the DSS).

Organizing Gender and Sexuality Within the Ranks

Historically, organizations as large as the U.S. military have focused on creating an organizational structure in line with the beliefs, political positions, and values of their leaders. The U.S. military structures organized differences between the male and female soldier population, not just for reason of separation by gender and race but also for the marginalization of a separation as women and minorities. These separations were an implication of a less than subtle means to differentiate women and minorities from the generally white male prowess. This marginalization has been evident in the past when senior leaders and past presidents used their authority to promote societal change. They initiated action and regulations within the U.S. military as a way to use the armed forces, in that social change within the forces could cascade and lead to changes in the public and private sectors. These requirements also specified the intent of government offices to allow women in the U.S. military, though they were not allowed to serve in 52 MOSs, most of which were combat arms. This recently changed to allow all women in the U.S. military to serve in any MOS, to include formerly all-male combat roles (Appendix A). In *Sex Roles* (1980), since the 1942 legislation permanently authorizing women in the

Army, considerable progress has been made toward U.S. military sex integration (Larwood, Glasser, & McDonald, 1980).

Executive Order

According to the Truman Library, the July 26, 1948 Executive Order No. 9981 stated that the policy of the president was that there shall be an equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons serving in the U.S. military without regard to their race, color, religion, or where they come from. This order caused protest and resistance to the restructuring of the U.S. military but eventually resulted in the desegregation and required tolerance and acceptance of blacks in the armed forces. The eventual welcome of desegregation within the U.S. military proved its necessity as the need to survive during the Korean War became clear. The U.S. military branches did not fully become integrated until the Korean War, when heavy casualties due to combat injuries forced units formerly practicing segregation to unify for survival (Truman Library, n.d.).

Federal protections for GLB workers in the U.S. were not really spun into an idea until the 1970s, 5 years after Stonewall riots. The passage of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 also increased public awareness of the issue of discrimination but failed to address worker protections for sexual orientation and sexual identity (Gates, 2011). Some states have included GLBs as a protected class but discrimination is frequent and continuous (Gates, 2011). In 1993, 31 of the 50 largest cities by population had laws banning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Most of the protections were only applicable to private sector employers, although 10 states at that time prohibited sexual orientation discrimination within the state executive branch (Leonard, 1993). If

the addition of sexual orientation and sexual identity to the Civil Rights Act had been successful, it would have been a significant achievement for GLB rights. By placing sexual orientation under the definitions covered within the protections of the Civil Rights Act, GLBs would have been granted the same protections, the same as any other protected class, i.e., protection based on race, color, religion, etc. (Gates, 2011).

Congressional representatives Bella Abzug and Edward Koch sought to promote support for a ban on discrimination based on sexual orientation, marital status, and gender in public accommodation, housing, and employment through the Equality Act of 1974. This bill failed to pass because it did not receive enough support in Congress (Gates & Rodgers, 2014). Abzug then reintroduced various forms of the bill, one being the Civil Rights Amendment of 1975 which would have added protections based on sexual or affectional preference to civil rights laws (Gates & Rodgers, 2014). Abzug managed to gain some support from co-sponsors for antidiscrimination bills during 1976 and 1977, but national measures for GLB protections in employment were ultimately not successful (National GLB Taskforce, 2009).

Executive orders continued to not only require changes in policy and regulation within the U.S. military, but also served as a political podium to advance further societal change. According to the RAND Corporation, in 1998 President Clinton issued an executive order that required a prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation for civilian employees in federal agencies. The RAND Corporation was contracted by the DOD to perform a parallel study on the topic of homosexuality in the U.S. military. They collected historical information on gender and racial integration, and interviewed

U.S. military and civilian personnel from other nations that had already integrated GLBs into their military services. There were also 24 states in the U.S. that had also enacted similar prohibitions applicable to state organizations after the executive order was issued (RAND, 1998). Some states enacted their own policies to allow gay soldiers in the workplace and protected their right to serve openly without reprisal, sexual harassment, or sexual assault. Employers reported that having GLBs among their ranks has had no effect on their organization's performance. It was a focus on a common task and completing a mission that brought coworkers together despite personal beliefs (DOD, 2010). In another study conducted by the Pentagon prior to the repeal, according to Dart (2010), of the 400,000 participants who took the survey, the U.S. military found that 46.1% of the respondents claimed that troop readiness would not see a negative impact by allowing open gay service. The remaining 53.9% either did not respond or predicted a negative impact as a result of allowing open GLB service in the military.

Desexualization of the U.S. Military

The U.S. military and "...feminist organizational scholars have questioned and discounted how organizations project images of gender neutrality while at the same time promoting masculinized values over feminized values and identities" (Rich et al., 2012). Segregation and the ideology that such policies would allow males, females, and minorities to maintain individual sexualities amongst themselves, was, according to scholars, to allow for a desexualization of the organization. However, the U.S. military was never desexualized, but rather the idealization of heterosexual masculinity. As Acker (1990) notes in advancing a theory of organizations as inescapably gendered, for

organizations that try to control sexuality, procreation and emotions disrupt the ideal functioning of that organization. Therefore, the Army has controlled segregating women with women, away from men, and required heterosexuality, given the potential for homosexual desire and actions that would interfere with disciplinary order in all-male organizations (Acker, 1990; Burrell, 1984). So, then is the question of compatibility and of gay military personnel and its infringement on the values of the U.S. military.

According to Estrada, Dirosa, and Decostanza (2013), when it comes to the compatibility of gay soldiers and military service, issues arise that involve the personal privacy and billeting of service personnel, and conflict with military and family values.

Gay Warfighter

Senator John McCain proclaimed his distaste of gays and distrust of repealing the DADT policy. His endeavor to prevent it from getting repealed and attempting to gain support from congressmen to uphold the policy's appeal displayed a fervent rejection of equality within the U.S. military. While he focused on the repeal as more harming to the combat military units, he generalized homosexual behavior as one which would lead to negative results within the units and their necessary cohesion to win on the battlefield. McLean and Singer (2010) contended that openly gay soldiers would damage U.S. military readiness and unit morale when the force was already taxed. Another fear was that if repealed, the "gay warfighter" and an open military would create an overwhelming display of rainbow decor, an increase in incidents of homosexual rape, and violent confrontations between gay and straight soldiers (McLean & Singer, 2010). This was the opposite of what happened once the repeal of DADT was implemented.

Tolerance

To the senior leaders who felt the U.S. military would suffer greatly with an openly serving military, some the openly gay warfighters gained support from their units for their openness and lessened the ridicule and closeted fears they would have innately dealt with on a daily basis. Findings in the DOD repeal report (2010) show that stereotyped perceptions are more widespread among those answering survey questions about a perceived gay service member who is open about his or her sexual orientation, compared to the perception of a gay service member who people already know and work with. For commands that typically deploy and are combat-ready, Senator McCain supported an ideology that gay soldiers are not and do not fit the warfighter image (DOD, 2010). Senator McCain leaned on a stance that a gay man does not resemble the image of a good and capable warfighter (DOD, 2010). Senator McCain's position was inconsistent with most attitudes; this newer, younger generation is more tolerant with one's sexual orientation than those of the past. However, even though he was aware of the changing attitudes toward a more accepting military, and although he served alongside known gay soldiers, McCain's position did not change. His support for keeping openly gay service members out of the U.S. military continued even though leaders in the U.S. military saw a need for a change towards more accepting armed forces in which anyone can openly serve.

In the Pentagon's survey on the issue of DADT and service members' positions about their level of tolerance for serving with gay soldiers, USA TODAY (2011) reported that 69% of service members know of at least one gay service member they have worked

with, and do not care about the gay service member's sexual orientation. 92% of those who said they have served with a gay service member saw no hindrance to unit performance or readiness based solely on the gay service member's sexual orientation (USA Today, 2011). The findings are quite contrary to McCain's individualized concern as a former service member. In the DOD's (2010) comprehensive review on the issues of the repeal, it was found that for GLB soldiers who wish to serve openly, there is a new tolerance for those GLB soldiers who fulfill their duty as soldiers. Within their study, as one of the participants surveyed put it, and as is the general attitude towards GLB personnel in the U.S. military: "We have a gay guy. He is big, he is mean, and he kills lots of bad guys. No one cared that he was gay" (DOD, 2010, p. 126). In other words, performance is what matters, but the performance standard remains rooted in hegemonic hyper-masculinity (Rich et al., 2012). Epstein (2000) argued that much of the generalizations on acceptance and the attitudes toward homosexuality in the U.S. can be attributed to political activism, and the increased visibility of homosexual, lesbian, and transgendered groups. Bowling et al. (2005) expanded on the notion that a political process, active in making people aware of GLBs' struggle for civil rights, may increase awareness by heterosexuals so that they may become more aware of the amount of sexual minorities they actually come into contact with on a daily basis. Another item of mention is that the U.S. lagged behind almost all of its allies in allowing GLB service members to serve in the military. According to the DOD (2010), from an international perspective, the U.S. lagged as the 36th country to allow GLB military service and falls behind as the 26th of the 28 NATO member states to do the same. Allies of the U.S. have allowed gay

soldiers to serve openly, including Israel, Germany, Spain, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Brazil, Norway, and Japan. The U.S. allies claimed that homosexuality has no negative impact on their military (Wolinsky & Sherrill, 1993). None of the 23 foreign militaries that allow GLBs to serve openly reported deterioration in unit cohesion (Kier, 1998). One of America's closest military allies, Britain, is active in recruiting GLB men and women for service in the Royal Navy (Lyall, 2005).

Israel recently allowed females to serve in formerly prohibited occupational specialty roles, particularly combat and aviation roles. Israel has also allowed those considered to be homosexual minorities to serve in the military since 1993. Reuven Gal, the director of the Israeli Institute for Military Studies, affirmed the findings of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and RAND studies: According to military reports, gay soldiers have not hindered military readiness (Belkin & Levitt, 2001). Israel, a country that has seen five major wars since it became a country in 1948, and is a security-conscious country where the military is an ever-needed force in the survival of the country, has a military in which sexual minority service has not resulted in a compromised effectiveness in combat (Belvin & Levitt, 2001).

While the root of the problem may have been to prevent openly gay people from serving in the U.S. military, it was found by the RAND Corporation study in 2010 that the majority of officials, commanders, and service members reported that the policy change had not degraded unit performance in combat. Rather, some U.S. military commanders claimed that unit effectiveness was more prevalent since gay soldiers could be open and therefore were able to devote themselves to their jobs (Bernard, Hosek &

Vaiana 2015). Gay soldiers who were closeted were more focused on hiding their sexual orientation and were not be able to focus on their job and performance. None of the allied militaries reported that open service by gay soldiers affected their unit's performance. Additionally, none of the countries provided special accommodations for privacy or special training on sexual orientation (Bernard et al., 2015).

Private organizations. Prior to the repeal of DOMA, the federal government lagged far behind private organizations by discriminating against GLBs in not granting them equitable treatment and benefits. Even prior to the rescinding of DOMA, according to Tannenwald (2008), a majority of America's Fortune 500 companies implemented institutional changes to be more inclusive of GLB employees. Most of these companies also offered health and other benefits for same-sex domestic partners. Towards the end of 2010, the federal government also sought to implement these changes, as most of the Fortune 500 companies saw their initiative to be a business necessity as the motivating force behind their GLB-friendly policies. Prior to 2008, many companies did not include GLBs in their affirmative action policies, and the federal government was even slower to pursue that change until the initiation of the repeal of prohibitions on open GLB service. In fact, according to Tannenwald (2008), it was only in 2008 that many employers began to develop powerful affirmative action programs aimed at the recruitment and retention of GLB employees. Even with the initiation of the inclusion of GLBs into federal service, federal employment discrimination legislation did not include sexual orientation as a protected class (Tannenwald, 2008).

In 2006, there were 50 Fortune 500 companies that attended the Reaching Out conference—a significant recruiting and networking event that was exclusively open to GLB Master’s of Business Administration students. These companies attended the conference so that they could learn about the programs, recruiting efforts, and business practices that were newly extended to prospective GLB employees (Tannenwald, 2008). Also, in October 2006, McKinsey and Company, which is known to be an elite consulting firm, made headlines at Yale University when it was recognized for hosting a lavish dinner for GLB recruits (Tannenwald, 2008). This effort was claimed to be, according to Tannenwald (2008), demonstrative of the beginning of GLB affirmative action efforts in corporate America. Corporate America began to demonstrate a newfound promotion of GLB tolerance and acceptance. Heller Ehrman LLP has been recognized for employing GLBs in their practice (Tannenwald, 2008). In addition to training their senior staff, other organizations implemented diversity workshops promoting GLB employment and support. GLB workgroups and heterosexual-homosexual team events increase awareness and proclivity for inclusion (Button, 2001).

Recently, the Human Rights Campaign (2012) reported that as of 2012, there were 400 Fortune 500 companies that offered employment-based protection and those that did not risk the loss of employed personnel. According to Wang and Schwarz (2010), companies that support GLBs through employment and nondiscriminatory practices saw higher profits and increased stock market performance. Those that did not offer same-sex partner benefits, training, and inclusion of sexual minorities saw lower profits. Tejada (2006) asserted in his study that in 1974 IBM became the first company

to adopt and enact a nondiscrimination policy that was inclusive of sexual orientation protection. GLB inclusion policies allow for the establishment of an ethos and culture within the organization that focuses on nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The company created a gay-friendly environment that prohibits and prevents sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB people and is supportive of sexually diverse lifestyles (Tejeda, 2006). Schein (1992) pointed out in *Organizational Culture and Leadership* that policies that promote and protect sexual awareness and diversity are presumed to catalyze an organizational culture that denounces discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. This culture promotes a climate inclusive of the gay employee and his or her partner and might include same-sex partner benefits (Schein, 1992). 3M, a company revered with regards to human values, also created a large impact in globalizing the need for big corporations to adopt and promote policies against discrimination based on sexual orientation. 3M provides GLB-related assistance and advice within human resources to ensure its success (Mickens, 1994). Other companies, such as AT&T, Digital Equipment Company, and other large firms are also known for their long-standing, gay-inclusive recruitment, retention, and other diversity programs (Mickens, 1994).

At the executive level, various organizations have implemented focus groups and training initiatives to promote sexual minority and diversity training in order to educate all levels of management and leadership on the importance of tolerance and acceptance of GLB workers. According to Gates and Rodgers (2014), managers and leaders should be engaged and should require their staff to be engaged and trained in responding

appropriately when dealing with discrimination against GLB workers. GLB workers can feel more welcomed and appreciated in organizations that offer diversity training, are accepting of their sexual orientation, and prevent discrimination based on GLB identification. According to Ashkanasy and Hartel (2002), management practices and policies that foster openness in the more contemporary workforce allow employees' attitudes, values, emotions, and behaviors to be freely expressed. A policy against discrimination that is clearly stated is one of the main ways GLB workers can gain the trust of their employers (Mickens, 1997). This globalized and strategic orientation toward incorporating programs and policies aimed at a more diverse workforce is crucial for diversity to produce a productive workforce (Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002).

Since sexual minorities represent 10% of the workforce, in order to attract and maintain the best talent available within their workforce, organizations need to examine policies and practices towards their GLB employees (Kaplan & Lucas, 1994). According to Trau and Hartel (2007), a proactive stance can be ensured by providing training and awareness in dealing with sexual orientation issues. This will mitigate or reduce incidents of workplace conflicts that have sometimes been the cause of lower productivity. Thus, organizations need to provide for and ensure an inclusive and positive working environment for all employees, GLB or not. This goal cannot be achieved simply through written policies rather by educating both sexual minorities and those who are not considered to be sexual minorities, i.e., heterosexuals. "Leadership from the pinnacles of the leadership structure within their organization must ensure a long-term commitment towards sexual diversity" (Trau & Hartel, 2007, p. 207). As

companies have done, and as the military can do, according to Mickens (1994), companies can show they are supportive and responsive to the needs of their GLB employees and make diversity training and programs mandatory for their management.

Sexual Identity

The term sexuality is considered to be an umbrella term used to describe the quality of being sexual (Morrow & Battles, 2015). When negating or prescribing reasons for homo-hetero behavior, theorists argue whether the homo-hetero identity is due to natural occurrence or formed throughout a person's life. According to Malinowitz (1995), theorists of sexuality have questioned classification systems that prescribe identities, predominantly the double-standard thinking that has produced the homo-hetero opposition. Some argue that gay soldiers are made while heterosexuals are the norm in existence (Malinowitz, 1995). The removal of gay soldiers in the U.S. military was evident when some leaders pursued and promoted the removal of gay soldiers from the service because of a mental illness. Supporting research in some GLB studies (influenced by postmodern theory) bring to question this dichotomy by showing in their work how all identities are constructed. In the complex negotiation of sexual identity, thought processes, actions and interactions, constructions of choice, rights, and personality get shaped from varied vantage points in both social and individual contexts (Berry, 2012). According to Morrow and Battles (2015), many people use language of sexuality on a daily basis in different conversations without stopping to think of the implications and meaning of the words they use. Not only does the language people use reflect historical and cultural understandings of the implications of sexuality, but it also

limits their imaginations of other ways to comprehend sexual identities (Morrow & Battles, 2015). This changed when television shows and commercials that were not present prior to 1993—such as *Will and Grace*, *Dawson's Creek*, and gay-themed Miller Lite commercials—aired, promoting a normalcy of gays interacting and being included in society (Hull, 2003). Some people who justify their discrimination against GLBs do so because of their biblical interpretations or stereotypes, believing that GLB people are mentally ill, perverts, and child molesters (Levine & Leonard, 1984).

Work adjustment. Regarding work adjustment and anticipating workplace discrimination, GLB recruits who foresaw possible discrimination would potentially have strategies to cope with encountered discrimination (Chung, 2001). There are five identity management strategies GLB employees would use at the workplace. One strategy is *acting* as if he or she is engaged in a heterosexual relationship to make others believe that the GLB is heterosexual. Second is *passing* or fabricating information so that the GLB individual would seem heterosexual. A third strategy is *covering* in the sense of omitting information or censoring information to seem as if he or she is heterosexual. A fourth strategy is being *implicitly* out and honest when asked if the he or she is a homosexual, or labeling himself or herself as GLB. An advantage of being implicitly out is that the GLB would be open and honest in sharing information about his or her sexual identity only when it was necessary. Being implicit would provide a safe space that would protect the GLB from full disclosure or when fearing potential discrimination or job loss. Fifth, is being *explicitly* out or openly identifying himself or herself as GLB (Chung, 2001).

Typically when recruits enlist, or when a soldier is assigned to a new unit, it is automatically assumed that the soldier is a heterosexual. According to Armstrong (1997), one way that heterosexuality receives "...affirmation is through implicit, unspoken recognition of itself as a normative category of identification. Most of the colloquial language used to discuss sexuality is hegemonic and affirms heterosexuality over homosexuality" (p. 326). When the civilian enlists, the recruit joins the ranks within the BCT, or a soldier reports to his duty station after the completion of BCT, he is automatically assumed to be heterosexual unless overtly expressive as gay.

Coming Out

One issue that came up in conversation and debate in the U.S. military was the threat of a mass coming out—a metaphor used, according to Bergstrom-Lynch (2012), to describe a path to liberation from secrecy and personal shame and a way to start living one's life more openly. Bergstrom-Lynch (2012) asserted that through the coming out process, the individual (GLB) expresses, through public announcement, his or her sexual orientation. However, the discrimination, physical, emotional, and mental abuse continue against the GLB community, especially those who are expressive of their sexual orientation—effeminate gay or lesbian soldiers who act "manly" (butch).

There have been considerable effects from the ban on gay soldiers in the U.S. military over the years. These effects have included continuous discrimination and physical abuse against GLB service members. One of the main means of discrimination against GLBs by the U.S. military is discharge from service for no reason other than sexual orientation, which led to the loss of qualified and valuable personnel (Cianni,

2012). The Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences studied the GLB issue when focusing on the lift of the ban and concluded in a report released in 1994 that, like some key leaders within the government, the military anticipated damage to readiness, yet it never materialized after the ban was lifted. Since the removal of the policy, recruitment, retention, cohesion, and morale have not been negatively impacted (Pinch, 1994). In the DOD repeal report (2010), it was reported that with a repeal of DADT, the “coming out” would not pose a threat and will not harm the U.S. military’s reputation nor unit cohesion. Most gay service members would continue to be selective and discreet about whom they interact and with whom they share their sexual orientation, solely because of their desire to fit in, co-exist, and succeed in the U.S. military environment.

In the survey conducted by the RAND Corporation, gay respondents stated that if DADT was not repealed many of them would not have stayed in the service. Half of those who responded in the survey stated that they would not stay in the military unless DADT was repealed (Bernard et al., 2015). Most GLB enlisted service members who took part in the survey also claimed that they were selective with who they shared their sexual orientation. They also stated that they would pretend to be heterosexual.

Challenges. As DSs are increasingly presented with civilian recruits who now, more than ever, can enter the Army serving as openly GLBs, they are challenged with the responsibility to create a culture that is both tolerant and accepting of these orientations. While GLB acceptance is more widespread now with the newer generation recruits, DSs, some coming from the “old Army,” may be slower to adapt to this changing culture.

Most “old Army” DSs did not tolerate GLBs and commonly used derogatory terms and name-calling to describe those suspected of being homosexual. Straight males who were perceived to be weak or effeminate were also ridiculed. Zuniga (1993) recalled that his DS was “tyrannical” and would constantly target weaker males, shouting out names such as “grandma,” “fags,” claiming that the Army was “this man’s Army,” and singling out weaklings due to some undefinable characteristics that the DS directly attributed to homosexuality. The straight recruit was later discharged prior to his graduation for something the U.S. military commonly refers to as “failure to adapt,” where the service member is discharged if he or she cannot meet a graduation requirement or cannot conform to the U.S. military lifestyle (Zuniga, 1993).

According to Allsep (2013), masculinity in the historical arena of physical activity and agility in combat privileged the warfighter image over the feminine so that the identity of the warrior was strictly one of a masculine and aggressive front (noted earlier as “warrior”) in almost all cultures. DSs expect a similar warfighter capability, and anyone appearing feminine might lack such possessed ability. Furthermore, masculinity has always been maintained as the identity of the warriors. Women and femininity, to include effeminate heterosexual males, have been considered an aberration and antithetical to what was known to be the present facade of a warrior. Femininity may continue to cause friction amongst the homosexual and heterosexual identities, so the DSs must foster an environment of discipline, and require a culture respective of the Army values. A man can prove his masculinity and strength by engaging in aggressive or

violent acts against others, especially against those regarded as feminine (Zurbriggen, 2010).

Heterosexual recruits may become engaged in violent acts as a sign of overpowering, ridiculing, or hazing to intimidate recruits who possess feminine traits. In RAND's 2010 study, some of the participants felt that there were challenges both for the culture after the repeal of the DADT policy in that discrimination of GLB soldiers will initially increase as a result of the allowed openness. Most of the prevalent concerns about openly gay men were that they might begin to act in a stereotypically female manner—that they would become dainty or feminine. However, the Army did not receive overwhelming complaints about this scenario after the repeal of the DADT policy. DSs did not report an influx of effeminate soldiers entering the Army after the repeal of the DADT policy.

Soldiers who come out face not only familial backlash due to cultural and religious ideals but also experience it in recruitment, training, unit events, and throughout their career in the U.S. military. The internal struggle to “act heterosexual” and “act masculine” is a personal attempt to fit in and be accepted. At the time of its enactment, DADT allowed GLBs to be in the service as long as they remained “closeted,” but many could not express their personal feelings related to their GLB status. During the implementation of the DADT policy GLB soldiers could not be seen with their same-sex partner, or act in an effeminate manner so to not be “found out,” “outed,” or face the possibility of removal from the service. For some, the coming out occurred after being suspected or discovered by chance and most have never spoken directly about their

sexual orientation (Priola, Lasio, Simone, & Serri, 2014). For those who were out but their commands were more accepting of GLB soldiers, silence by the command may have been explained and justified as a sign of respect and as motivated by the irrelevance of sexuality in the workplace (Priola et al., 2014).

According to Wilder and Wilder (2012), sometimes the coming out process can be influenced or directed by a person's spiritual beliefs as well as their cultural, racial, ethnic, and religious affiliation. The psychological adjustment a soldier makes in order to fit in and not be identified as GLB can cause additional stress on the GLB person and may lead to increased stigmatization and discrimination. Smart and Wegner (2000) stated that GLB soldiers who keep quiet about their sexuality may experience additional hardship because policies restricted them from expressing their sexuality. This required them to exert significant amounts of energy that may have had an impact on their functioning and well-being. Zuniga, a former Army sergeant, and his friend Marc, witnessed during their BCT, that his friend at the time, underwent an extensive investigation in which he, like thousands of other gay soldiers, was discharged and branded with a mark on his papers that would stigmatize him forever (Zuniga, 1993).

The GLB warfighter is someone who a DS turns from a civilian into a soldier who can take care of his battle-buddies to his left and right on the battlefield and who lives up to the Army values. A GLB warfighter is no different in capabilities, values, work ethic, or physical and mental strength than anyone else in the Army. The GLB warfighter can sustain the Army's mission just as well as any other soldier. DSs train recruits to be tough, take on the challenges of the Army, and be able to defend themselves, fight, and

protect their fellow servicemen. GLBs were not seen as those who could fit the mold of a warfighter.

In some instances, the work ethic is better amongst lesbians than their heterosexual battle buddies (RAND, 2010). RAND reported from their survey that some participants thought lesbians were a better fit for the military and that lesbians were thought to be more masculine than straight women. RAND also found that lesbians were able to display better military bearing, were more disciplined, and were more competent in meeting higher physical fitness standards than some of the heterosexual females in the U.S. military. Lesbians were also seen by some as less prone to sexual harassment by men and less likely to become pregnant (RAND, 2010).

While I was a DS, we would use the term “new Army DS.” The “new Army DS” is used to describe those DSs from the Y generation who became DSs after the initiation of the repeal of DADT. In my experience, I noticed that most “new Army DSs” were more tolerant and accepting of GLB soldiers after the repeal of DADT. SAPR, SHARP, and the I. A.M. Strong programs were already in place for these DSs. With new policies regarding harassment and hazing, DSs are instructed at the DSS to act professionally and not curse or use derogatory language when addressing or instructing recruits. DSs cannot use derogatory and discriminatory phrases and terms, such as “faggot,” “Peter-puffer,” “queer,” among many others that I heard. DSs are required to promote a positive culture in which all soldiers can work together and rely on each other for physical, emotional, and spiritual support. According to the U.S. Army (n.d.), in the Army DSP, DSs are to be able to administer a positive experience when training the young soldiers who begin their

journey in the Army. The skills and Army values instilled in the recruits will be with them for the rest of their lives.

Recommended coming out. One way to alleviate GLB-related tension in some U.S. military units is to promote GLBs, on their own ability and with the assistance of the organization, to come out about their sexual orientation. The most important change workplaces can consider is improving the climate for GLB workers to come out at work and not hide for fear of resentment (Martinez & Hebl, 2010). Part of the reason that less than 20% of gay men and lesbians are identifiable is because they do not fit the stereotypes commonly held about that population (Lee, 1977). Coming out will increase the numbers of known GLBs and may initiate further organizational support. Martinez and Hebl's (2010) argument is that coming out may (a) increase GLB visibility within an organization; this will allow those who were closeted to be relieved by not having to hide anymore. Another reason to come out is that this will (b) relieve GLB employees' intrapersonal tensions. Coming out will lead to stress relief and this experience will enhance intergroup interactions within the workplace (Martinez & Hebl, 2010). Those who do not come out may also experience known negative effects on mental health, that are normally associated with being closeted or those who harbor a secret identity (Fassinger, 1996; Smart & Wegner, 2000). In their study, Brooks and Edwards (2009) found that GLB employees noted that what they wanted from a workplace are elements of inclusion, safety, and equity. When working together in unison, organizations and their GLB employees can effect change, paving the way for other organizations (Brooks

& Edwards, 2009). Coming out is an ongoing process that may never end as employers, family, relatives, and friends may not be accepting of the GLB member (Anson, 2013).

Predator

There were some within the ranks who opposed revoking the ban on allowing gay soldiers to join and openly serve and considered GLB service members to be a threat or even considered them to be “predators.” When I was a DS, I had recruits complain of certain “meat-gazers” in the shower. This term is typically used when a gay male looks at another male in the shower with more than the intent of normal eye-to-eye conversational contact. Meat-gazers tend to look at another person showering with either obvious or discreet homosexual intent (DOD, 2010). While the U.S. military manages the presence of homosocial or erotic slippage in a multitude of ways (Britton & Williams, 1995; Flood, 2008), the DOD repeal report did not address the presence of homoeroticism among heterosexual soldiers, but only in terms of some gay men who were deemed to be predators.

In Britton and Williams’ (1995) study on the predatory and prey relationships where the gay male is the predator and the prey is the straight male, and their review on masculinity, the soldier was defined by a hyper-masculine ideal and seen as a dominating predator. Reversal “...of the predator/prey relationship (the soldiers’ loss of predator status and transformation into prey) can be understood as a reversal of the objectifying gaze, a fear of seduction, and, most viscerally, a fear of being penetrated” (Britton & Williams, 1995, p. 57). Heterosexual men feared that if they “dropped the soap” in the

shower, the propensity of a gay male would be to penetrate him (Britton & Williams, 1995).

The “don’t drop the soap” variance is not supported nor has it been reported as an indication that a threat between homosexual and heterosexual males exists. In fact, the DOD’s 2010 report showed evidence that there are actually fewer problems with actual gay service members in comparison to imagined gay service members and what they considered the original threat (Rich et al., 2012). Cases of GLB sexual harassment and sexual assault against the heterosexual recruit population are low; heterosexual sexual harassment and sexual assault of a GLB by heterosexual soldiers occurs more frequently. Within the BCT environment I noticed that there were very few instances of GLB recruit sexual harassment and sexual assault against the heterosexual recruits. Most accusations were “he-said-she-said” and proved to be false. Dropping the soap is a false pretense of supposed meat-gazing incidents and accusatory eyeing of other males in the shower, and limited substantiations of what really took place in the shower (Britton & Williams, 1995).

DOD’s 2010 report lists statistics of the experiences of other militaries around the world with statements of openly gay service members serving in combat units without added chastisement because of their known sexual orientation. Accompanying the rationale for the repeal of the DADT policy was that the report offered further support that hegemonic hetero-masculinity remained the underlying warrant for the need of the repeal of DADT (Rich et al., 2012). What seems to be the more viable threat amongst the service members is the lack of masculinity and increased femininity by the gay male

soldiers. These soldiers can be “out” and serving and can now have a same-sex partner in marriage. Since the heterosexual population feels their masculinity gives them the upper hand in strength and dominance to overpower the weaker feminine male soldier, most masculine heterosexual males do not worry that they will be otherwise sexually assaulted by a GLB soldier.

DS role. DSs serve as the mentors for recruits within the Army during the BCT phases. While chaplains, other NCO leaders, and officers support recruits during their IET, the DS serves as the primary leader and mentor for the recruits. As aforementioned, some GLB recruits are seen by other recruits as predators in the BCT environment. Recruits will have to live and work together, share showers, and eat at the same dining facilities (DFAC), so GLB recruit presence should not affect recruit-recruit interaction. GLBs pose no real threat to the acculturation and soldier-making process and the predator threat has been disproven as inhibitive of soldier-making. DSs should promote the tolerance and acceptance of GLBs and encourage partnerships between recruits who are not tolerant of GLBs with team-building exercises such as confidence courses and team-building events.

U.S. Military Culture

DSs continue to inhibit the openness and tolerance that the president and what the DOD vowed to promote within the U.S. military—acceptance and tolerance. A culture once plaguing and threatening the existence of those who were found to be GLB still exists. Leaders continue to invite and incite cruel verbal and physical abuse against gay soldiers. According to one recruit, they were continuously called faggots up to 50 times

per day. “‘You think that is yelling? That is sweet faggot.’ ‘Yeah, you would think that is a pushup, faggot,’ etc. Any time we f--k something up, the DS's tell us ‘you stupid f---g thing. That is more wrong than two boys f-----g’” (Bennett-Smith, 2013, para. 4). Verbal abuse was used to refer to recruits as sissies, pussies, and girls, and for a while this was time-honored stratagem for drill instructors in all the branches of the U.S. military (Shilts, 1993).

While some outside organizations sought to eliminate discriminatory behavior by their senior-level management, the U.S. military has lacked a stringent approach. Priola et al. (2013) found that insofar as some cooperatives’ ethos of inclusion and discriminatory practices were a focus of change such as silence, there are still gossip and derogatory comments that occur. What is considered common and described as normal is that this behavior is still perpetrated by some DSs. This has been distinguishably witnessed within the BCT experience, revealing a deeply rooted heterosexist culture, demeaning of femininity and GLBs. The solution to this ambiguity is the denial of both the importance of sexual orientation in the workplace and the discrimination that GLB employees are subjected to (Priola et al., 2013).

In an interview conducted by Vincent Cianni with a service member who was discharged for being outed as a homosexual, the service member relived some of the experiences he had during his time in the Army. According to Cianni (2012), the service member recalled that he and fellow recruits were forced to simulate gay sex on camera multiple times. These acts were incited and supported by the DSs and included being hosed down, being tied to a chair, called names, further harassed, and left in a dog kennel

with feces, along with being forced to eat dog food (Cianni, 2012). While I was on the trail, there were DSs who not only perpetuated continued harassment and name-calling of GLB recruits but also forced them to perform sexual acts mimicking animals having sex. One common example and one I have seen several times on display in front of all recruits is when one recruit was instructed to perform a physical fitness exercise prescribed in the Army physical fitness training manual (Field Manual TC 3-22) while the other recruit did another manual exercise, simulating having sex. While the exercises were authorized in the sense of physical training and meant only to properly train recruits during their physical training (PT) or physical readiness training (PRT) sessions, the manner in which the recruits were told to stand and execute the exercise was uncalled-for and derogatory. The interviewee in Cianni's correspondence stated that he did not report any of the incidents for the sole reason that if he were to report cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault directed towards him, it would threaten his career. In an Army video that the Pentagon released as a training tool for SHARP, a trainee claimed that she would not report an incident of sexual harassment against her by her DS. If she reported the incident, the DS could ruin her career and if she did not give in, the harassment would continue; this is one of the main reasons soldiers do not report cases of sexual harassment (Vistica, 1996).

The toxic training environment that some DSs promote in discriminating, harassing, and sexual assaulting, to include hazing, before, during, and after the repeal of the DADT policy, continues to be retrograde to promoting equality within the ranks. According to Rau (2008), the ongoing climate of fear and suspicion of harassment and

sexual assault is constantly aggravated by poor leadership. Many younger staff increasingly find this behavior to be unsupported and not within regard to the U.S. Constitution (Rau, 2008). Leaders should take a proactive stance in ensuring a positive culture and working climate within their organizations. They can do this by providing and requiring a discrimination- and bias-free environment in which all those representing the unit feel a sense of worth and are protected against those who compromise that guarantee.

DSs, DSLs, and instructors whom the Army depends on to train recruits to be “warriors” and leaders on the battlefield, watch out for their fellow soldiers, and promote a diverse culture. They can do that by teaching the Army values—loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, integrity, and personal courage. There are some DSs who create a training environment that is the opposite of what Secretary of Defense Ash Carter envisioned in his address during the DOD GLBT pride month, in June 2015 about equality of all service members. According to Carter, following years of GLB service members having to hide who they were and the military inhibiting GLB support, the military would now require tolerance, acceptance, and programs for GLB service members, to include a right to the same fair treatment as any other service member (Druzin, 2015). Though this may have been the stance of the DOD secretary, this view was not have been shared by all soldiers in the Army.

Some GLB recruits feel that they are discriminated against and considered outcasts by their fellow recruits. While many in the newer generation of soldiers are more tolerant of GLBs, the jokes, sexual harassment, sexual assault, discrimination, and

hazing continue. DSs are required to promote a culture of equality and compliance with SAPR, SHARP, and I. A.M. Strong but some are not doing that. Some DSs have mocked the programs and their intent. According to DS (1996), friend, foe—and all that is good and known about the Army—the DS is the squared-away, and tough U.S. military icon, and an unforgettable face to the trainee. DSs are regarded as the best the Army provides, leaders who turn recruits into soldiers. However, when recruits see DSs making fun of, harassing, or assaulting those who are serving openly, suspected to be GLB, or an effeminate heterosexual male they discount the Army programs emplaced to prevent that sort of behavior.

Policy

Policing and preventing the intimacy or supposed sexual intentions of suspected gay soldiers in the U.S. military was part of a drive to eliminate those individuals from an armed force that prides itself on its ability to defend the country from enemies at home and abroad with a hyper-masculine approach. As if those who considered themselves GLB as incapable of maintaining a warfighter discipline, past policies sought to undermine that demeanor and pushed for GLB removal from the service. After 1920, the way the U.S. military discharged those who were found to be homosexual was through administrative separation and court-martial (Eskridge, 1997). According to Eskridge, before the Stonewall riots (1969), gay soldiers were removed from the military and this was as a result of military investigations and dragnets, where people known or suspected of being gay were hunted down, interrogated, and removed from the services. Policies

were enforced to ensure the U.S. military's posture of masculinity was maintained and the GLB and effeminate service members were removed.

In October 1949, the DOD issued a memorandum that standardized policies across services that required that all gay soldiers should not be allowed to serve in the armed forces, in any capacity. This mandate also specified that there was to be a prompt separation of known gay soldiers. RAND (2010) found in their study that Executive Order 10450 required that "sexual perversion" was cause for immediate dismissal from federal jobs. Myths that associated the GLB federal employees as security risks led to the questioning of thousands of federal employees; nearly 100 federal employees who were perceived to be homosexual were removed from civil service (Escoffier, 1985). Some of those discriminately removed lost their families, careers, and some also committed suicide. In one case, an employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), who was also a U.S. military veteran, was discharged from his federal civilian position. NASA claimed that his homosexual conduct led to his arrest, that his behavior was found to be immoral and unacceptable and these traits made him unsuitable for further government employment (Leonard, 1993). In the *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, Gates and Rogers (2014) affirmed that GLBs were considered to be deviants. During the 1950s, Senator Joseph McCarthy prompted widespread fear about communists and other social deviants including GLB individuals. These deviants working in the federal government had to be removed from service (Gates & Rogers, 2014). In 1959, the DOD issued Directive 1332.14, *administrative discharges*, which defined and listed homosexual acts and sodomy as "sexual perversion" and

resulted in the automatic discharge of gays from the military. This directive referenced homosexual acts and other aberrant sexual tendencies, defining them to mean the same, were grounds for dismissal (RAND, 2010).

The U.S. military knew that gay soldiers served within their ranks long before the establishment of DADT. Policies were a way for the religious and conservative right to take control of the military in promoting good order and discipline. The DADT policy was seen as a new way to ease the constricting policies that banned sexual identity and behavior of its military service members. In removing the stigma of allowing gay soldiers to infiltrate the service, and as a way to remove soldiers seen as less fit for service during drawdowns, policies mandated the discharge of thousands of qualified soldiers. In the *Journal of Policy History*, Bailey (2013) asserted that the first man to be discharged from the U.S. military for being gay was during the American Revolution. The U.S. military did not uniformly ban homosexuality until 1949, when the newly created DOD issued a blanket regulation disallowing and removing gay soldiers from serving in any branch of the military (Bailey, 2013). Those already in service were targeted and weeded out in effort to systematically remove gay soldiers.

Psychiatric Screening

U.S. military policies also stemmed from the country's early military endeavors and missions, focusing on a smaller, smarter force. These policies also were discriminatory in that GLBs could not physically, mentally, or emotionally meet those criteria and needed to be removed. According to Blackwell, Ricks, and Dziegielewski (2004), in 1941 the Army and the Selective Service both included "homosexual

proclivities” in their discriminatory policies of disqualifying deviations. They sought to find reasons for removing GLBs from the military by claiming mental instability and disorder may cause the service member to act or think in an abnormal state. The War Department and the psychiatric community defined homosexuality as a mental illness and described gay soldiers as individuals who were comprised of three personality disorders (Kaiser, 1997). The three disorders defining gay soldiers by the psychiatrists were psychopathy and sexual perversion, paranoid personalities suffering from homosexual panic, and schizoid personalities deeming them unfit for service (Kaiser, 1997).

As troop drawdowns were inevitable due to financial and post-wartime restrictions, the focus on U.S. military policy was a target. Homosexual Americans were allowed to serve, but those serving openly or who were found to have been engaged in homosexual acts would be separated from the military. Psychiatric screening of recruits became part of the Army’s regulation in an effort to screen out obvious and suspected gay soldiers. Those considered homosexual or found to be such were considered abnormal due to a medical rationale. In 1981, the DOD formulated a new policy (Directive 1332.14) that also declared that homosexuality would not be accepted in the military (DOD, 1982). According to the GAO (2008), U.S. military officials and policies charged that gay soldiers in the U.S. military and these supposed psychiatric disorders of those whom are homosexual would be a financial burden for the government. In their report (1992) the GAO listed reasons for keeping out gay soldiers: (1) sodomy defined homosexuality as a criminal offense, and (2) homosexuality was defined by psychologists as a mental disorder. It was the determination of the secretary of defense and Congress

that allowing gay soldiers in the armed forces would jeopardize morale and discipline (Wolisnky & Sherrill, 1993).

Army Regulation 635-200-Homosexuality

Homosexuality is incompatible with military service. Military members who engage in homosexual conduct or who, by their statements, demonstrate a tendency to engage in homosexual conduct, seriously impair the accomplishment of the military mission. The presence of such members adversely affects the ability of the armed forces to maintain discipline, good order, and morale; to foster mutual trust, and confidence among members; to ensure the integrity of the system of rank and command; to facilitate assignment and worldwide deployment of members who frequently must live and work under close conditions affording minimal privacy; to recruit and retain members of the armed forces; to maintain the public acceptability of military service; and to prevent breaches of security. (DOA, 1982)

In the 1982 AR 635-200, gay soldiers were deemed a threat to the branch's good order, discipline, and sustainability. This former policy defined that it is not necessarily just the act that is classified homosexual but even the desire to engage in or intend to engage in homosexual acts (AR 635-200, 15-2a). Service members who-so-much utter their homosexual ways, whether they were homosexual or not, would, by their commanders, be investigated as to the validity of the claim. Commanders had full authority to either approve separation or retention of GLB service members. However, for service members who completed 18 years or more of federal active service, removal from service would

have to come from the DOA headquarters. Commanders, specified in paragraph AR 635-200, 1-21—*Authority to order discharge or release from AD prior to expiration of term of service*—were authorized to order separation for homosexuality. This AR is important to mention as it was a directive issued to remove those found committing homosexual acts, or who declared their status as GLB.

DADT was meant to protect service members who identified themselves as gay as long as they were not out. GLBs would not be discharged simply on suspicion, and they would not be asked if they were gay, nor harassed, nor pursued in an effort to identify them as GLB. However, according to Cianni (2012), little is known if the DADT policy actually protected service members from being pursued or harassed even if suspected of being GLB. More is known on how DADT made the lives of GLB soldiers worse. Investigations could only occur based only on credible information by a reliable person, namely a commander, chaplain, or medical professional. Under this policy, because gay soldiers were not to talk about their sexual orientation, straight soldiers would sometimes increase the tension by tormenting and harassing GLBs into identifying and resulting in the outing of the suspected GLB soldier (Cianni, 2012).

Among the many ARs affected by the repeal of DADT, others included:

- AR 135-175, Officer Separations (28 February 1987) (RAR, 27 April 2010)
- AR 135-178, Enlisted Administrative Separations (12 March 2007) (RAR, 27 April 2010)
- AR 600-8-24, Officer Transfers and Discharges (12 April 2006) (RAR, 27 April 2010)

- AR 635-200, Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations (6 June 2010) (RAR, 27 April 2010)

Army Regulation 600-200

Applicable to today's effort to rid the Army of sexual harassment and sexual assault, ARs define sexual harassment and sexual assault, reporting requirements, and the leader's role in promoting a sexual harassment-free environment. Indicative of its efforts to squash the growing concerns of sexual harassment, AR 600-200 outlines its policy on this conduct. Within this policy, sexual harassment is unacceptable and will not be tolerated by the Army (Gervais, 2008). Many of today's policies resulted from the growing cases of senior leadership's inappropriate conduct with junior enlisted soldiers. Such interaction is a violation of the DOD and DOA's fraternization policies. Leaders in the Army are to be committed to creating and maintaining an environment that focuses on human dignity and respect. According to Gervais (2008), sexual harassment destroys teamwork and negatively affects combat readiness, teamwork, and cohesion. As conduct unbecoming of any recruit or soldier, sexual assault and sexual harassment against any other soldier undermines teamwork. The Army can only rely on accomplishing its mission when the environment is free of sexual harassment for all personnel (Gervais, 2014).

Reporting

The DOD established two methods for reporting sexual assaults. Although reporting sexual harassment and sexual assault is similar in all U.S. military branches, in the Army, soldiers who have been victimized can do so via *restricted* and *unrestricted*

reports. According to the GAO (2008), since 2005, AD service members may report sexual assault via these two types of reports. *Restricted* reports allow victims of sexual assault to report sexual assault incidents only to specific individuals and receive medical care and victim advocacy services without criminal investigation initiation. *Unrestricted* reporting entails notification of the chain of command of the service member issue and may also trigger a criminal investigation. This reporting process is meant for a soldier to bring up the alleged sexual assault without unit or command ridicule—less the case for those who chose to submit an unrestricted report. Unrestricted reporting, since it will require notification of the chain of command may result in added discrimination and, though not the intent of this reporting method, negative reaction from the person being investigated. In a study conducted by the GAO (2008), it was reported that there were factors that would deter service members from reporting a sexual assault. Some service members would not report harassment or assault because of the belief that nothing would be done or that they would be reprimanded, skipped for promotion, or out of fear of ostracism, harassment, or ridicule. There were also concerns that reporting an incident would hurt unit morale and that a report made using the restricted reporting option would not remain confidential. Restricted reporting only allows the victim's advocate, medical care officers, and representatives from the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) to know the details of the investigation.

GLB soldiers can now be relinquished of the fervent scare of reporting sexual harassment and sexual assault. Pre-DADT, and during DADT, GLB soldiers who were sexually harassed or sexually assaulted would fear reporting anti-gay actions against

them for fear that they would be automatically discharged. Although the reporting allows for a restricted report to be filed where only the victim's advocate and the CID investigator would know the details in the case, the soldier could still be discharged if he or she came out about their status as GLB. Post-DADT, soldiers who are sexually harassed or sexually assaulted for being GLB can report to their higher in an unrestricted report to chaplains, senior leaders, nurses, or their chain of command without fear of reprisal, or discrimination. The reporting processes are the same, but the soldier would not be discharged based solely on their GLB status.

Title 10—654

Title 10's U.S. Code 654 (U.S.C. 654), while it was enacted, clearly identified homosexuality and how it does not belong in the U.S. military. Service members were to be separated from the armed forces if one of the following regulation infractions was met:

That the member has engaged in, attempted to engage in, or solicited another to engage in a homosexual act or acts unless it can be proven otherwise that for the service member: (A) such conduct is a departure from the member's usual and customary behavior; (B) such conduct, under all the circumstances, is unlikely to recur; (C) such conduct was not accomplished by use of force, coercion, or intimidation; (D) under the particular circumstances of the case, the member's continued presence in the armed forces is consistent with the interests of the armed forces in proper discipline, good order, and morale; and (E) the member does not have a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts. (Government Publication Office, 2010, p. 340)

Separation

Under the precept of maintaining order and discipline, the Army maintains several forms of discharges to remove those suspected, convicted, or found to be in conflict with Army policy for conduct unbecoming of its mission and values. Since the early 1980s, tens of thousands have been removed on the basis of homosexuality, with the numbers increasing during the implementation of the DADT policy. According to the DOD (2010), more than 32,000 AD service members were separated solely on the basis of homosexuality or homosexual conduct under the DADT policy and its predecessor policies. Of these, and prior to the repeal of the DADT policy, more than 13,000 were removed since the law was put in place in 1993. Depending on the record and performance of the soldiers, they were normally discharged under the following conditions, although an honorable discharge had to be fought for by the command element since most soldiers were only authorized to be receive an under other than honorable, or general discharge.

If the soldier was caught performing homosexual acts, they would normally receive a discharge under other than honorable. Common, however, was the issued “discharges without honor” to any homosexual on the premise that homosexuality constituted an undesirable trait of character (RAND, 2010). After October 31, 1945, those who were inadaptable because of homosexual tendencies, as defined by the U.S. military’s definition of *sodomy*, but who had not committed any sexual offense while in the service, and whose record of service was honorable, would be discharged honorably (RAND, 2010). Respective of the times prior to WWI and WWII, *blue discharge* was

commonly used as a discharge based on reasons of homosexuality. Soldiers would be separated under the *Articles of War* and would receive this type of discharge since they were regarded as undesirables, whose service was considered under other than honorable, and were conspicuously printed on blue paper (Religious Tolerance, 2010).

Honorable

Generally, when separated with an honorable discharge, the service member met the requirements within his or her enlistment contract for the Army AD, USAR, or NG. Service members who had been disciplined before their end of time in service (ETS) were not necessarily denied an honorable discharge even if they had convictions under the UCMJ. This form of discharge from the service was issued when the quality of the member's service met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of their assigned duties for Army personnel, or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate (AR 635-200, 3-7.1, 1982). Service members normally disqualified for this type of discharge may have been granted an honorable discharge if their time and service was honest and faithful and outweighed the negative, or disciplined time in service. The form used by the Army when issuing this type of discharge is DOD's DD Form 214.

General Discharge

Under AR 635-200, 3-7.2*b*, general discharge is used when a service member is discharged from the Army under other or administrative conditions. When authorized, this discharge is issued to service members whose military record is satisfactory but not meritorious to be an honorable discharge (DOA, 1982). In other words, the soldier did

not fulfill his contract, i.e., he or she did something wrong, but not serious enough to be stigmatized more harshly with a dishonorable discharge. Those discharged during and because of the DADT policy would receive this or an under other than honorable discharge.

Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

Under AR 635-200, 3-7.2c, when a service member is separated from the Army under other than honorable conditions, he or she is separated because either because of his or her behavior, discipline, actions, or failure to meet or concur with the DOA's expectations. This type of discharge may be given when it is proven to be due to some sort of misconduct, fraudulent entry, homosexuality, security reasons, or for the good of the service (DOA, 1982). Service members found to be homosexual and processed for separation were issued this form of discharge as it was because of their homosexual lifestyle and considered a significant departure from the conduct expected of the service members in the Army. Homosexuality, according to leaders in the military at the time, was incompatible with military service and those who by statement or acts engaged in such conduct were claimed to cause impairment to the accomplishment of the military's mission at home and abroad.

Leading to the Repeal

Surveys were conducted by independent and public organizations to determine the relativity of repealing or continuing the DADT policy. Some of the questions in these surveys asked about the general attitude of those surveyed in allowing gay soldiers to serve openly, and others gauged on the religious and partisan differences over gay

soldiers in the U.S. military. These surveys also focused on how heterosexual families would be impacted if they lived on base or shared community base housing with someone who was homosexual. The RAND Corporation and the Pentagon both conducted surveys of the DADT policy with U.S. military and nonmilitary personnel over the course of the 17 years that the policy was in effect. There was a general striation of similar and mixed opinions as to the repeal and unit cohesion during and after the repeal. The Pew Research Center conducted a 4-day national survey in which they asked the various opinions of 1,255 adults and their views of the policy and what its repeal would mean to those who took the survey. The findings showed that there was greater support for allowing GLBs to serve openly today than there was in the 1990s (Pew Research Center, 2010).

Compatibility

The Pentagon spent about \$4.5 million on a survey (Appendix B) given to 400,000 service members. Some of the questions on the survey focused on marital status, housing, family perceptions of military service, career intentions, and whether the participant socializes with members of their unit (O'Keefe, 2010). The participation pool consisted of AD, USAR, and military spouses. Of those surveyed, 70% believed that serving with openly gay service members would not hinder or harm their unit's ability to work together. These figures are the same for the general public who also favor letting gay soldiers serve openly in the armed services (USA Today, 2011). The Pentagon sought to determine the consensus on how repealing the policy might impact the military's ability to enforce its personal conduct policy and maintain order and discipline.

Some of the particular questions asked on the survey also focused on personal interactions with GLB colleagues, including if the participants shared a room, berthed or fielded a tent with a service member they believed to be homosexual. Additionally, some of the questions were on sharing bath facilities with an open-bay shower that was also used by a service member they believed to be homosexual (O’Keefe, 2010).

Unit Effectiveness

Of the 115,000 service members who responded to the survey, some gave mixed responses as to its validity and fullness in the report on the real issues. The survey failed to ask whether the ban on service by GLB service members should be repealed and whether the respondent identified himself or herself as gay. The survey purportedly also contained questions which critics felt were a misrepresentation of “homosexuality—which was not defined by the UCMJ—as a neutral factor and privacy questions only offer accommodation answers” (Maginnis, 2011, p. 2). The research instruments also lacked scientific rigor and random sampling. As a result of the skewed, inappropriately represented style and questioning, and because of the lack of appropriate instruments used, the Family Research Council (FRC) claimed the survey was suspect (Maginnis, 2011). The FRC is a nonprofit organization that uses its focus on faith, family, and freedom to influence public policy in the Capitol. Their vision is to promote a culture in which human life is valued, families flourish, and religious liberties are afforded to all people indiscriminately. FRC’s mission is to, through a Christian worldview, advance faith, family, and freedom in public policy (Family Research Council, 2016).

Generally, GLB service members have been accepted as fellow service members, inculcated into the soldierization of the BCT environment, and felt welcomed within the individual unit. Most branches reported that there was little to no effect on unit effectiveness when working alongside and requiring the same individual performance by GLBs. In his study, Priola et al. (2014) found that some of his participants denied working alongside gay soldiers. However, as the interviews continued, they explained their reticence by suggesting that the sexual orientation of these colleagues was discovered by chance. Most of the GLBs have never spoken directly about their sexual orientation, whether or not there was speculation of being gay, similar to what the DADT policy allowed as long as the discovery or conversation was not there (Priola et al., 2014). According to Hartman (1993), the social reality is that many people think that they do not have gay coworkers, though they actually may. This ignorance may lead to an inevitable breeding ground for discrimination and stereotypes.

When the DOD reviewed results of a survey issued to the services before the repeal, they found that the relationships and tolerance by heterosexual service members of GLB service members were better than responses showed in a similar 1993 RAND survey. Responses on the 2010 survey showed that relationships between homosexual and heterosexual service members were either “very good” or “good” by a large majority (77.4% to 77.8% for leader, coworker, and subordinate alike) (Westat, 2010). A majority (57.3% to 58.6%) of service members claimed that a leader, coworker, or subordinate who they may have thought to be GLB affected unit performance, “not at all” (Westat, 2010). The responses on the survey did not reflect a negative connotation to allowing

GLBs to serve. The lack of support in responses on the survey as to a negative affect showed an overall positive experience with GLB interaction by the majority of the participants.

Family Readiness

Family readiness is the inculcation of service members and their families into programs provided by the military to integrate them into the military culture. On family readiness, the survey released by the Pentagon revealed a limited effect if the repeal was to take place. According to the reported results of the survey issued by the Pentagon, 61% of the spouse respondents rated their family as “ready” or “very ready,” with only 6% specifying their family as “unready” or “very unready” for the repeal (DOD, 2010, p. 114). Moreover, 78% of spouses said that repeal would have no effect on or would improve their family readiness. Only 8% said the repeal of DADT would reduce their family readiness (DOD, 2010).

Most familial activities are sponsored by the DOD’s MWR program that sponsors programs for soldiers, their families, and the communities in which they reside and serve. Leaders in the military know that the MWR is an important way for families to spend time together and for soldiers to relax and enjoy a peace of mind away from the daily hustle and bustle of military life (Army MWR, 2015). The mission of the MWR is one that will have a positive impact in the community and will provide services that reduce stress, build skills and self-confidence for soldiers and their families (ArmyMWR, 2015). The Family Readiness Group (FRG) is also a unit-sponsored initiative to include families in the life-cycle of unit readiness, before and after deployments. According to results

reported in the DOD survey, 72% of the spouses of the service members said that the repeal would either have no effect on their attendance at military social events or that they would attend more often (DOD, 2010).

Family Values

With family values and acceptance of gay soldiers in the U.S. military, there is not a profound delineation from the survey response of military personnel and their spouses (Westat, 2010). Families of military members share similar support for allowing gay soldiers to serve openly. Evidence from recent surveys levels of military spouses suggests that if the ban on open service of gay soldiers was no longer perpetuated, 77.2% believe this would not affect family readiness (Westat, 2010). With deployment support activities, 76.4% of those surveyed believed that removal of the ban on gay soldiers would not affect deployment support activities (Westat, 2010). Westat (2010) also reported that 44% of service members and 63% of spouses indicated that if they lived on base with a GLB service member who lived with his or her same-sex partner they would associate with the GLB member just like any other neighbor.

Referral and Retention

The perceived effect of the repeal of the DADT policy when it comes to retention, referral, and recruitment showed limited negative consequences. In an organization that prides itself on its values, referral and retention has not negatively impacted the military following the open service by GLB service members. According to Westat (2010), 72.3% of those who participated in the survey said the repeal of DADT would have no

effect on their willingness to recommend others to the military. 62.5% of those surveyed said they had at least one acquaintance they believed to be gay or lesbian.

Unconstitutional

Aside from the right-wing merits of what was thought to be a policy that brought about order and discipline, in line with the global U.S. military mission, the DADT policy led to an internal mission that sought to keep out openly gay service members. On September 9, 2010, the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California ruled that the DADT policy was unconstitutional. In *Log Cabin Republicans v. United States*, it was found that DADT-related policies violated service members' rights to free speech and due process guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments respectively (Burrelli, 2010).

With the establishment of the UCMJ, the Court of Military Appeals (CMA)—a postwar supreme appellate authority that was created in 1951—was tasked with enforcing the UCMJ. The CMA served as a frontline authority in the creation, and later the repeal, of DADT (Bufford, 2013). What led to the examination of the legality of enforcing antihomosexual regulation was the precept that homosexuality had little to do with a service member's job performance. The CMA also recognized gay service members as legitimate members of the military and were afforded the same legal rights to due process (Bufford, 2013). Gay service members are entitled the same rights as their straight counterparts without prejudice or discrimination. Those service members would have the same rights as any straight service member, the same rights to impartial trials, and protection from double jeopardy, and undue command influence. They would be entitled

to protection from entrapment at courts-martial for same-sex sodomy during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. The CMA established a powerful precedent of sexual nondiscrimination in the U.S. military justice system that resulted in the retention of countless allegedly gay service members (Buford, 2013). This opened legal access to question the tenets of the military's values and the discrimination of gay service members, whose lives were monitored and regulated by the policies. The victories in the court room were not made public because their precedents of legal protection challenged the legitimacy of the military's exclusionary logic. Conservative leaders did not want a display of the confirmation that the process that many service members, spouses, and civilians already acknowledged. The service personnel's sexual relationships and preferences had no bearing on their job performance or troop morale (Buford, 2013).

Crittenden Report

What called into question the military's intent to remove service members who were capable of performing their assigned tasks but discriminated against regulations, was the release of the 1956 Crittenden Report. This report was released by the Navy, ultimately challenging the exclusion logic of the Navy regulation SECNAV 1620.1. The Crittenden Report affirmed that GLB service members were just as able to perform their jobs just as well as straight service members (Gibson, 1978). To prevent unrest and any potential upheavals within the U.S. military over the irrationality of the service-wide exclusion policy, the Navy hid the report for 32 years. However, the report was ordered by a federal court to be released to the public in 1989, generating a public discussion of the military's exclusion regulations that, in turn, resulted in the creation of the DADT

policy (D'Amico, 1996). According to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (n.d.), intelligence officers sometimes considered relations between straight service members to be more of a security threat than same-sex conduct.

PERSEC

The DOD commissioned its own report that, among other focuses, sought to study conditions on homosexuality. The DOD's Personnel Security Research and Education Center (PERSEC) prepared two reports. One report confirmed the Crittenden findings—that there existed no data that supported the ban on gay service members. The report challenged the rationale that gay soldiers were unsuitable for service (Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, n.d.). The findings upset the Pentagon, as it again, questioned the legality, and ethical position of excluding gay soldiers from the U.S. military. The second PERSEC report related the findings and the discrimination against gay soldiers similar to that when African-Americans were integrated into the military. The researchers noted similar failed predictions about racial integration and how that would disrupt troop morale and discipline (Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, n.d.).

Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell

Upon the effective date of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010, homosexual conduct will no longer be a basis for denial of entry into the Army or separation from the Army, and separation program designator codes for separations for homosexual conduct will be eliminated. Army activities will eliminate any references to these codes in policy documents. (Army Publishing Directorate, 2011)

The repeal of DADT and all DOD policies regarding homosexuality, the entrance and retention of service members showed a new chapter in the DOD and DOA's level of tolerance in allowing a diverse service that includes all sexual orientations. The president, secretary of defense, and the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff certified to Congress that the DOD was ready to rid the military of all policies inhibiting GLB service members from joining the military ranks. According to Wallenberg, Anspach, and Leon (2011) policy research found that the DADT policy was not only unnecessary, but harmful to the U.S. military. This policy not only led to increased discrimination of GLBs but undermined cohesion and trust, forced highly qualified military personnel to be discharged, and wasted millions of taxpayer dollars to defend and enforce the policy (Wallenberg et al., 2011). Most importantly, this policy inhibited the personal welfare of GLBs by placing limits on GLB troops' access to support services for themselves and their families (Wallenberg et al., 2011).

In the 2010 RAND Corporation survey, statistics showed that 91% of the GLB respondents checked that the failed policy put gay service members at risk of undue harassment and manipulation. Service members also reported that the policy had a negative impact on their GLBs' personal (86%) and unit (76%) relationships (Burke, 2011). DADT may have been a way for GLBs to get in and stay in the service but the level of intolerance, discrimination, and rejection by fellow soldiers remained high. 72% claimed on the survey that they experienced stress and anxiety in their daily lives because of DADT (Burke, 2011). 29% indicated that they have been teased or mocked and 7% indicated previous threats or injuries by other service members because of their GLB

orientation (Burke, 2011). RAND (2010) reported in their updated study (2010) to the 1993 study that participants' attitudes changed between the implementation of the policy in 1993 and a call for its repeal in 2010. In one of the focus groups, a participant reported that the DADT policy should be changed since it resulted in the loss of very qualified service members who performed exceptionally well at their duties. DADT also made it hard for GLBs to report any harassment against them since speaking about their GLB orientation was grounds for discharge (RAND, 2010).

Those previously discharged because of their GLB orientation, whether declared or discovered, may, if otherwise qualified based on normal recruitment criteria, re-enter the military in the same manner as any other service member. Factors that reflected negatively on the service member's record that are ancillary to the discharge because of homosexual conduct were to be considered on a case-by-case basis (Army Publishing Directorate, 2011). For those who were discharged prior to the repeal of DADT, there were lawsuits against the DOD to seek compensation but no specific action has been taken to fairly compensate the GLB service members who were separated.

Psychiatry

While the U.S. military was searching for a reason to discharge those who openly declared their GLB sexuality, married or attempted to marry another of the same sex, or were engaged in a homosexual acts, it was no longer able to use the reliance on the reason of discharge as due to a mental illness. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) removed homosexuality as a diagnosis. This meant that the services could no longer claim a psychiatric rationale for their exclusion and removal of GLB

service members. Several years later, the APA issued a statement calling for the end of discrimination in the workplace based on sexual identity, (Barber, 2012). Evidence petitioned by psychoanalysts who issued their findings to the APA board of trustees revealed that there was no significant difference in pathology between gay and heterosexual subjects. Psychologist Evelyn Hooker found that the tests used to identify gay soldiers were considered to be useless since gay subjects did not show any more pathology in the instrumentation than heterosexual subjects (Barber, 2012).

Defense of Marriage Act

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down Section 3 of the 1996 DOMA. Section 3 defined that a spouse was to be assigned to a person of the opposite sex who was then, either the husband or the wife in that prescribed union (Government Printing Office, 1996). Within Section 3 the federal government was to indiscriminately deny more than 1,000 federal benefits and protections to legally married same-sex couples but were guaranteed to married heterosexual couples (Miller & Cray, 2013). DOMA included provisions that forbade benefits to GLB soldiers in the Army through the DVA. Soldiers would not be authorized to allow their same-sex partner any medical, dental, or housing benefits. Miller and Cray (2013) documented that all service members who were married before the Supreme Court ruling—2013 Section 3 repeal—were allowed all previously denied benefits retroactive to June 26, 2013.

June 26, 2013 marked the end of Section 3 after the ruling between *Windsor v. United States* that defined marriage between couples, no matter their sex, to be legal across the country. This law was signed into law by President Bill Clinton in 1996,

which, according to the Freedom to Marry Organization (2015), resulted in the unfair and unequal treatment of legally married same-sex couples. The provisions in the DOMA policy denied GLB service members the 1,138 protections that marriage triggers at the military and federal level. Prior to the repeal of DOMA, Freedom to Marry stated that next in the works was the full overturning of DOMA, as it was seen as a law that still discriminates on federal marriage (Freedom to Marry, 2015). The ruling in *Windsor v. United States* still allowed states to choose who they want to marry or how those states chose to recognize the marriages. The ruling required that the federal government would no longer be able to deny married couples federal programs and legal protection (Freedom to Marry Organization, 2015). To broaden the requirement of ceasing federal and state questions as to its constitutionality, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down DOMA in June 2013 (Miller & Chamberlain, 2013). Army soldiers who chose to marry a same-sex partner were able to do so and received all the same benefits that the federal government already gave to heterosexual couples. In the study *The Sound of Silence*, one of the participant interviewees claimed that:

Why should I be interested that he is married to a man? He went to get married in France . . . or in Spain . . . and then? Why should I be interested? I am married to my wife and I do not worry about what others think; therefore, I cannot understand why he should be worried about what I think . . . he went to Spain to get married with a handsome guy, and then? I got married to a woman. (Priola et al., 2013, p. 495)

Programs

Sometimes political leaders and the president may use executive orders to promote societal change, as Truman did to show distaste for gay soldiers in the U.S. military. Many senior public officials, to include Senator John McCain, did a complete turn-around to a more tolerant U.S. military (Bailey, Lee & Williams, 2013). This resulted in the need for programs to promote and educate service members on the awareness and acceptance of all service members. In a Gallup Poll conducted prior to the repeal of DADT, it was found that a majority of Americans were more willing to support open GLBs who served in the U.S. military (Bailey et al., 2013). As a large organization, the Army sought to promote its own programs to end sexual harassment and sexual assault. The Army also focused on disciplining soldiers who did not comply with these initiatives. While these programs—SHARP and I. A.M. Strong—may not directly connect to the GLB community, they are meant to be applied to all soldiers. Some of the participants in the RAND 2010 study recommended directed training to GLB awareness and tolerance, even adding special classes for GLB service members. Some of the participants in the study stated that training of tolerance should be directed more so towards the service members who have served for a while. There was also a recommendation that GLB service members may need additional or specialized classes (e.g., on safe sex) (RAND, 2010).

Scenario-based training promotes cognizance of and responses of real-world, real-life situations. The Army uses the scenario-based training within the DSS, BCTs, and many other NCO academies to lessen the “death by PowerPoint”—termed to mean long,

drawn-out, boring slide-shows. Scenario-based training engages the audience with a hands-on approach through role-play. Units enact their own scenarios based on previous incidents of sexual harassment and sexual assault, and re-enact how a situation starts, when it may go wrong, and action that should have been taken to address and prevent the incident(s). Training trainers—Drill Sergeants and NCOs—who conduct scenario-based training have only gone so far as to occur at the DSS and some advanced and senior leadership courses. However, GLB emphasis has been missing from the DSP curricula. Training that includes reporting procedures, chain of command responsibilities in addressing and preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault has been emphasized for the straight service members.

Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention and I. A.M. Strong

After many high-profile cases of sexual assault in the military surfaced in 2004, Congress initiated requirements that the DOD establish, implement, and maintain a sexual assault response and prevention program. With the passing of legislation, DOD was required to establish cross-organizational definitions of sexual harassment and sexual assault. It also required that the Army implement a program that not only focused on addressing and preventing related issues but also implement a victim's advocacy program. DOD initiated the SAPR program in 2005. SAPR also increased the reporting requirements of crimes against individuals and improved response capabilities for victims (GAO, 2012). With the requirement to establish such programs, the Army initiated the SHARP and the I. A.M. Strong program. This was also in part due to the statement issued by the Command Sergeant Major of the Army Gene McKinney who barked

sternly in an Army-issued video that he expects that the Army be free of sexual harassment and that America's Army is not a place for sexual harassment (Thompson, 1997).

DOD Directive 6495.01, which was issued in October 2005, is a comprehensive directive that focuses on the policies associated with sexual assault and its prevention. Directive 6495.02, issued in 2006, offers ways to implement the policy. Each U.S. military service branch provides sexual assault response guidance as well as standard operating and reporting procedures for responding to alleged sexual assault incidents (GAO, 2012). Sexual Assault Response Coordinators (SARCs) implement the SAPR program at military installations. Victim advocates, SJAs, medical and mental health providers, CID and law enforcement personnel, and chaplains also respond to the needs of the victim (GAO, 2012). Article 120 of the UCMJ is the U.S. military's legal authority that covers rape and sexual assault. When it comes to sexual assault, there is usually more than one charge because more than one criminal act is usually perpetrated (Mattson, 2013).

Reported Cases

Those who report sexual assault to the first-line responders (sexual assault nurse examiners) are offered emergency contraception and other medical services. According to Jennifer Mattson (2013), the medical professionals take a verbal account from the victim and perform a physical exam used to collect evidence to investigate any medical issues that may have happened during a sexual assault. A head-to-toe examination and a verbal recollection by the victim are collected, and the articles of the victim are sent in to

the CID for forensic processing. A special victim prosecutor stated in an interview with the *NCO Journal* that the Army unmistakably takes the prosecution of sexual assault cases seriously (Mattson, 2013). Only a colonel or above can say that there is not enough evidence to move a case forward (Mattson, 2013).

Training

There is currently no training of DSCs by the leadership within the DSP on the abuse and discrimination of GLB recruits. Even more, recruits are not directed to do more than just receive the SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training upon their initial week of BCT. According to the Training, Analysis, and Evaluation Group ([TAEG], 1984) at an initial program at McClellan, Alabama within a BCT, there was a presentation and one-hour training during the BCT. It was given in the form of a structured lesson and did little to prepare recruits in responding sufficiently when witnessing a sexual assault case (Thompson, 1984). The training was more for self-defense and what to do and how to respond when a possible rape may occur. This training was a focused, individualized training and was not an overall attempt by the Army to implement it within all BCTs.

Current studies support added training within the private and public sectors by adding GLB awareness, inclusion, same-sex benefits, and familial and community support from the organizations for the GLB employee population. While the federal sector has afforded same-sex benefits extended to federal and military employees and contractors who work for the federal government, the Army has not begun training to incorporate GLB tolerance, acceptance, and inclusion into their training curriculum.

Studies, therefore, do not exist for this specific requirement within the military but do exist in the private sector.

DS training. Within an initiative to promote a sexual harassment- and sexual assault-free environment, DSs are expected to lead the campaign in recognizing the importance of addressing and preventing instances of harassment and sexual assault. Sergeant First Class Brian Harrison was a SARC for the 3rd Infantry Division who deployed with the unit to a combat zone. Harrison stated in his interview with Mattson (2013), that NCOs are the backbone and cornerstone in requiring and ensuring the prevention of sexual harassment and sexual assault. He also stated that NCOs are to set the standard, maintain the Army values, and instill those values in our soldiers (Mattson, 2013). NCOs [DSs] are required to make on-the-spot corrections, to see something and say something, and ensure all recruits treat each other with all the Army values. DSs are to embark on a culture that should stand for and empower soldiers through the SHARP and I. A.M. Strong and to take action in prevention of SHARP-related incidents against GLB recruits.

Policies endorsed by the Army and the DOD are in themselves not enough for effective deterrents of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLBs. The Army implemented various scenario-based real-life training to raise awareness of situations that have been reported. Training of leaders is essential in promoting this format of “training the trainer.” According to Major General Patrick C. Camembert (Retired), leaders are to be peacekeepers who will maintain the will to take action against sexual violence. Leaders use scenario-based training to provide a better and more realistic training for

soldiers (U.S. Army War College, 2014). As this type of training may initially seem cumbersome and uneventful, organizations, according to Mickens (1994), should implement a plan and program with experienced diversity trainers. The current scenario-based training does not incorporate GLB-related issues of discrimination. Recommended by Mickens (1994), diversity and sexual orientation training should be brought on by an understanding about the myths and misunderstanding of GLB experiences and others should be aware of peoples' feelings and alter their behavior in the interests of working more effectively with all people.

According to the Defense Research, Surveys, and Statistics Center (RSSC) (2014), in their study on effectiveness of SAPR training, recruits in BCTs who received SAPR training described the sexual assault training as mostly boring PowerPoint presentations. The recruits claimed that the presentations were dull, there were few discussions, and the training was repetitive. In the 2010 study conducted by the RAND Corporation, participants claimed that SAPR training was impersonal and was only a check-in-the-box requirement. Furthermore, the participants claimed that SAPR training is designed so that leadership can protect themselves with little to no regard as to the content and realization to its necessity. Other participants claimed that the training is repetitive and boring (RAND, 2010). Recruits will not absorb any of the training because it is repetitive in content and training modes, and a constant click of the button, slide after slide, with minimal information retention, and essentially results in untrained soldiers (RAND, 2010). All soldiers are required to participate in a 3-hour classroom-facilitated discussion using a slide presentation and two training videos: "Soldier Training" and

"Orientation Training." There is also a requirement to take a portion online via self-study called "Standing Strong" (DOA, 2016, para. 10).

Leaders can take the training given to them and can use it, along with understanding the applicable Army policies and SOPs to promote a culture free of sexual harassment and sexual assault, discrimination, and hazing of GLB recruits. Promoting this type of training and culture will allow those who intervene to answer: What am I authorized to do? What am I going to do? What is wise to do? Scenario-based training can prevent instances of sexual harassment and sexual assault as recruits see something and say something, allowing them to take appropriate action when confronted with real-world situations (U.S. Army War College, 2014). Additionally, scenario-based training helps units respond to cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault effectively. Scenario-based training will allow the audience to think through problems and work through responses before challenges occur. Scenario-based training can help participants and audience identify preventive measures that can preclude respective cases from occurring (U.S. Army War College, 2014).

While the Army has added scenario-based training to its SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs, what is less enforced and required is a facilitator who is familiar with the topic. Increased training of the trainer should be an overarching initiative for the Army to focus on a trainer model since the DS is the first and last person a recruit will see during their 56 days—for recruits doing the split option IET—at BCT. The DSS is the ideal location to train these NCOs because it hosts the training of the Army's senior NCO leaders who train and mold civilians to soldiers.

Effectiveness. While the U.S. military has not introduced training for antisexual harassment and antisexual assault of GLB recruits, other organizations have. According to Wayne Besen with the Human Rights Campaign—the nation's largest GLB political organization—more than 102 cities and counties provide legal protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation (InfoWorld, 2016). Training should include a proactive engagement by leaders and trainees and should focus on an awareness of common anti-gay behaviors so that those receiving the training would recognize discriminating behaviors against gay soldiers (InfoWorld, 2016). According to Loden (President of Loden Associates, a private consultancy firm in California), effective diversity-awareness training has to be broad enough to include sexual orientation. This is largely in part due to a certainty that there are still a lot of people in the world who think they do not know a gay person, and yet they work next to one each day (InfoWorld, 2016). Increasing awareness and training in the area of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of gay soldiers will allow for a renewed view of a need to include GLBs in programs and benefits that were disallowed before (InfoWorld, 2016).

To make training effective some companies initiated speaking bureaus in which department staff members and leadership can provide awareness training and answer questions. GLBs can dispel myths about how gay soldiers are weak or cannot perform tasks and let other employees know that they do exist in the unit ranks. This type of direct interaction also lets their coworkers realize that sexual orientation has nothing to do with the quality of an employee's work and allows others to engage in dialogue about the concept of sexual identity (Prati & Pietrantoni, 2014). Staff members within some of

the private firms have been made aware, through company-level training, that anti-gay humor is not acceptable as it can be offensive to coworkers who identify as GLB. Referring to "sexual orientation" instead of what some term and equate to be "sexual preference," indicates a difference in definition since it implies a choice; this can increase the comfort level of GLB employees and harbors a safer working environment (InfoWorld, 2016).

Another aspect of effective training is ensuring that training matches words and words match training. According to Fayetteville State University's (FSU's) Lenning, the overall sentiment at FSU is that the school is a community that promotes and celebrates diversity and demands inclusivity of minorities and LGBTs. "But prior to the past year or so, our actions did not match those words or our values" (Jenkins, 2013, para. 4). The university also created a LGBT center where heterosexuals and LGBTs can come together and feel welcomed, share thoughts, feelings, and community support through the school's program and staff. They went so far as to provide faculty and staff, students, and campus police Safe Zone training which is centered on diversity and inclusivity of LGBTs. Those who went through the training have a visible symbol or sign on their office doors to show their support and commitment to fight and remove all homophobia and heterosexism at FSU (Jenkins, 2013). The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, and Methodist University have similar programs. Other colleges and universities have also begun to act on affirmative action initiatives when recruiting LGBT students. For example, Middlebury College, according to Tannenwald (2008), gives gay prospective students an advantage in the recruiting and admissions process, as is

Claremont McKenna College. Well before the repeal of DADT and DOMA and other discriminatory policies against LGBTs, major corporate employers, in their events and efforts have illustrated an initiative that is symbolic of the advent of LGBT affirmative action (Tannenwald, 2008).

Unity

According to Hill (2011), to make certain that the Army remains strong, as is their motto; we must ensure that the Army remains an inclusive organization where every soldier feels enabled and free to feel as if he or she can fully contribute to its collective success. The Army remains strong because of the harmonization of individual gifts and capabilities that makes it stronger, more vibrant, and more effective through the inclusion of anyone, without regard to their sexual orientation. Commanders and leaders appointed or selected by the Army and the chains of commands within the organization are to promote a unified approach to ensure soldiers and leaders enforce an equal opportunity culture. These leaders, in accordance with the Army's equal opportunity initiative, should correct inappropriate behavior that becomes predatory and creates a harmful training environment. According to Bernard et al. (2015), essential to preventing a harmful environment is the call for a change in the military's code of professional conduct. Within this change, there should be an enforcement of a standard where all are treated with respect. Leaders should know and execute their duties knowing that behaviors may sometimes need to be corrected. Good leaders are not the ones who disrespect, or maintain a negative image and posture. Leaders should not be involved in name-calling, and belittling of others, and should not be involved in inciting sexual

harassment, sexual assault, discrimination, ridicule, and mockery of GLBs (Hill, 2003). While that behavior seemed normal and funny to some prior to the repeal, the culture in today's Army requires the prohibition of homophobic slurs.

As a soldier looks to his left or right on the battlefield for support from fellow soldiers he or she can know that the soldier to either side of him or her will also receive support. Unification and teamwork are stressed by the DSs and DSLs at the BCTs. All soldiers will be different in one way or another; different in their beliefs, religion, ethnic background, interests, and at times, different in their sexual orientation. According to Hill (2011), we must seek to commemorate and allow for difference rather than criticizing or containing them; we must allow room for the synchronization and synergization of all differences. Commanders and leaders live by the "golden rule" within their commands to set the example. Teambuilding and a positive training environment will allow DSs and DSLs the ability to witness and potentially prevent instances of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLBs and will be able to those sorts of issues within the training environment. In his second inauguration speech, President Barack Obama stated that the journey is not complete until all gay soldiers were treated the same under the law (Thompson, 2013). In his remarks on the repeal of the DADT policy, in 2010, President Barack Obama stated that he wanted to show an appreciation and gratitude for all who identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. He wanted to show appreciation for the GLBTs who were unjustifiably required to hang up their uniforms as a result of the DADT policy, and for GLBTs who never stopped fighting for this country, and for those who marched and fought for change (Obama, 2010). In

essence, promoting a culture of unity and tolerance of openly gay service personnel will lead to positive unit and organizational effects. According to Estrada, Dirosa, and Decostanza (2013), “Unit cohesion is thought to result from controlled, interactive forces that lead to solidarity within military units [which] direct soldiers toward common goals” (p. 345).

When DADT was sought to be repealed, Robert Gates—former secretary of defense—wanted a better understanding of unit cohesion. He studied the impact of the DADT policy and whether or not it promoted or inhibited cohesion within the U.S. military. According to Spitko (2012), Gates and then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mike Mullen were supporters of the controversial 2010 survey that was initiated and executed by the Pentagon through RAND. The two supported the repeal of the policy and questioned Senator McCain and General Colin Powell, the joint chiefs of staff, about their claim that the repeal of DADT would compromise unit cohesion and disrupt U.S. military retention, recruitment, and discipline. Quite the opposite effect would occur, asserted Spitko (2012), based on the participants’ survey responses regarding retention in the survey which indicated limited retention issues with the proposed repeal. According to the DOD (2010), a review of the surveys issued to service members and their spouses concluded that there would be little impact from a repeal of DADT on recruiting and retention for the officer and enlisted ranks. In RAND’s report to the DOD, their findings also clearly negated any adverse effects of permitting gay soldiers in the military and called for clear standards of conduct for all personnel.

Christian (2010) asserted that it was falsely argued that allowing GLBs to serve openly would disrupt and inhibit the morale and cohesion of the troops, a claim that proved unsupported. On cohesion, Secretary of the Army Alexander Clifford, in his statement in *Gay and Lesbian Times*, declared that those who supported DADT were basically asserting that heterosexuals in the U.S. military are not professional enough to serve openly with GLB. Alexander (2010) asserted that as a former Army officer, he was insulted that he would be treated differently and negatively just because of his sexuality and that his sexual orientation had no detrimental impact on unit cohesion (Alexander, 2010). Christian made several claims against Senator John McCain's statements and partisan politics, along with the changing of the senator's GLB position during his run for president. Christian (2010) stated in his article in *Echo Magazine* that McCain disregarded the GLB community during the February 2nd Senate Armed Services Committee when he changed his political stance on the GLB issue. McCain shifted his position from remarks made during a televised interview 4 years ago when he supported working alongside a known homosexual to promoting policy against the allowance of gay soldiers in the U.S. military.

During his time in the military, McCain served alongside known homosexual service members, and he knew that they have always served in the military. However, his personal bias and prejudice against GLBs who serve clearly indicated his lack of trust in those who serve openly and express their sexual identity. According to Christian (2010), by supporting DADT and using finger-pointing in explaining why he supported the policy, McCain encouraged GLB people to lie about who they were and whom they

love(d). He maintained a position of exclusion of GLBs and encouraged those who were “out” to hide their identities. McCain became more tolerant of DADT and supported the inclusion of gay soldiers in the military as he reassessed the impact of his position on the national electoral performance of the Republican Party and particularly his own aspiration to be elected as president (Rich et al., 2012).

Effects of the Repeal

Clearly, policies have shifted toward a more tolerant Army, however, has there been a positive or negative impact on current service members? Opinions differ as to whether the repeal poses a victory or continued challenge for the military and its effort to maintain a positive training and working environment. According to Johnson, Rosenstein, Burke, and Haldeman (2015), even with the repeal of DADT and a focus on required tolerance, there may still be heightened stressors for GLB service members. The repeal may also lead to a temporary increase in harassment and victimization and create new dilemmas associated with disclosure or concealment. Leaders must take additional steps to ensure a more tolerant Army, even though some senior U.S. military leaders do not perceive the repeal as a positive step for the military, a fact which must be acknowledged. Burke (2011) also stated in the *American Psychologist* that in the military there are sexual stigmas, heterosexisms, and mandated secrecyes about sexual orientation, and within that environment, GLB service members may at times be more prone to sexual victimization.

The repeal of DADT allowed the dismissal of a policy that required commanders and leaders in the army to discharge even senior NCOs and senior officers. According to

Saldin (2011), DADT restricted the recruitment of fully capable citizens to the ranks. Saldin stated in “War and Minority Rights” (2010) that two contributing elements to the repeal were based in its wartime context. On the one hand, the repeal was practical, because “Don’t Ask” deprived our military of needed personnel. In addition, the repeal was moral, because serving and possibly dying for one’s country calls rationales for less than full citizenship into question.

Continued Discrimination

It is estimated that GLB individuals are three to five times more likely, within the course of their service or after they get out, to attempt suicide than their heterosexual counterparts. This increased risk of suicide may be linked to overt and covert GLB discrimination, internalized oppression, being closeted, and a lack of adequate social support through their command channels and through the military (Wilder & Wilder, 2012). Some, due to their discharge from the service and continued discrimination in the public and private sectors, feel they cannot get support from other employers or coworkers.

GLB soldiers continue to feel a level of resentment, discrimination, and a lack of a support system even after the repeal of the DADT policy. It is therefore imperative that as frontline leaders, DSs ensure an environment free of sexual harassment and sexual assault, discrimination, and hazing of GLBs. DSs could have easily provided instruction and oversight that could have prevented the beating of a recruit at a BCT in Kentucky (KY). After the murder of Army Private Barry Winchell, who was beaten to death with a baseball bat by fellow soldiers in KY barracks after months of continued harassment and

victimization of the private, the need for anti- harassment training was brought to light (Brodie, 2000). As those who are the overseers of the maturing of a civilian into a recruit, into a soldier, it is important that DSs eliminate instances of GLB bashing. They must promote a culture in which they are positive role models and exemplifiers of Army values, and in turn require the same of all recruits. For GLB service members, the risk of suicide in the military may have been increased due to a lifetime of experiences as individuals with socially stigmatized sexual orientations (Wilder & Wilder, 2012).

In a study performed by Blosnich, Mays, and Cochran (2014), on suicidality among GLB veterans, they found that 47.0% of GLB veterans indicated they experienced a lifetime of suicidal ideation, which was significantly higher than that among heterosexual veterans (22.1%). In adjusted models, 95% of GLB veterans were reported to have experienced three times the odds of lifetime suicidal ideation than heterosexual veterans. These sexual minority veterans experienced higher levels of discrimination and lower levels of self-worth.

Sexual Stigma

Stigma is assigned to a GLB recruit when they are devalued due to nonconformity to the societal norm—in this case, to heterosexuality. Within the BCT environment, recruits are required to execute all BCT tasks as assigned by TRADOC. When task performance is deemed effeminate, a stigma is applied to the recruit, whether or not the recruit is really GLB. Since homosexuality is viewed as both negative and unfavorable, a stigma is applied which also consists of malevolent stereotypes (Herek, Gillis, & Cogan, 2009). At the societal level, sexual stigma translates into heterosexism, that is, a cultural

belief system reflectant of the dominant heterosexual ideology (Herek, 2008). As a result of sexual stigma, differences in power and status ultimately inform discriminatory policy and institutional practices (e.g., within the U.S. military), so nonheterosexual individuals become further devalued, marginalized, disempowered, or denigrated (Herek, 2009).

DSs trained at the DSS, Fort Jackson, are to mentor and coach those suffering with personal issues that may be exacerbated within the training environment. As recruits go through the BCT, they are sometimes left feeling isolated, with stress increasing as the physical and mental demands increase. The ability to hone a positive training environment is crucial of the DS role. In an environment of masculinity and prowess, there must be sensitivity to the various cultures, backgrounds, religions, personal issues, and struggles of recruits. DSs are typically known to exacerbate some of those personal problems with the name-calling, ridicule, and mocking of recruits.

According to Wilder and Wilder (2012), GLBs who serve will at some point experience discrimination both at the individual and institutional levels. They will also experience rejection and abuse from family, peers, community groups, and religious organizations (Wilder & Wilder, 2012). According to Badgett et al. (2007), approximately 16-43% of GLBs will experience discrimination at their place of employment. Like one former captain in the Marines who was openly gay while serving experienced, GLBs will feel personally conflicted about their sexual orientation, their religion, the U.S. military, and society's homophobic norms (Adams, Alexander, Baillie, Ballard, Cleghorn, & Adams, 2004). The GLB population is also more prone to additional verbal and physical abuse, harassment, and victimization (Wilder & Wilder,

2012). Even less-overt discriminatory instances, such as seemingly benign jokes may be interpreted as a threat and provocation. Wilder and Wilder (2012) continue that the common expression “that is gay” is founded on heterosexist assumptions and GLBs may see it as discriminatory.

Added Assistance

With the repeal of the DADT policy, the effort to address the GLB U.S. military community has been revamped. The Army has increased its support effort to include GLBs into institutional programs that previously excluded them. GLBs may experience the full medical and veterans’ preference benefit that was denied to them prior to the repeal, and may now also include benefits afforded them after the repeal of U.S.C. 654 and DOMA. The repeal also opened the proverbial closet for this population to openly express personal issues related to relationships, suicidal thoughts related to their orientation, and seek psychiatric, spiritual, and mentor support that they could not have before for fear of discharge. Wilder and Wilder (2012) found that the dialogue will change at the institutional level; GLBs and military medical professionals will seek support from each other in requesting military support and offering services that will in turn help reduce the risk of suicide.

Response to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault

While the Pentagon has required SAPR programs, the Army also required the same of unit commanders at all levels within the branch. The SHARP and the I. A.M. Strong programs were a push by the Army to bring awareness to the severity of the problem of sexual harassment and sexual assault amongst the force. However, although

senior leaders argue that it is an all-branch inclusive program, it does not focus on the GLB population. The need to address GLB issues and include them into the overarching program, realizing the importance of this topic, and adding scenario-based training that involves role-play simulating same-sex couple interaction is pertinent to GLB tolerance and inclusion. An Army culture focused on equality, fair treatment, tolerance, and acceptance of all service members, no matter their sexual orientation, may have prevented the Fort Campbell, KY, death of a GLB soldier. Testimony during the trial revealed that the victim was repeatedly harassed, yet the base commanders did nothing to stop the harassment (Bissinger, 2005).

The U.S. military has yet—aside from the recent addition of pride month in June—to afford its GLBs its full support. Other organizations have realized the importance of the inclusion of GLBs into their workforce, while the military has only removed DADT and DOMA, and removed the criminalization of GLBs by the UCMJ. According to Priola et al. (2010), the isolation and rejection of sexuality from one's public and work life highlights the power of the dominant heterocentric culture. Priola et al. (2013) continues that this is especially true in the U.S. military, which limits the possibility of alternative discourses and makes minorities invisible. In his study, Priola et al. (2013) found that one of his participants, Chiara, who is gay, stated that her organization did not plan specific strategies or interventions to manage sexual diversity (Priola et al., 2013). Other organizations that already focus on toleration, inclusion, and support for GLBs are more trusted by their GLB employees. According to Priola et al.

(2013), these organizations are viewed by members as a place where they can express their diversity, receive employee support, and feel included in the organization.

Drill Sergeant Response

DSs have a critical role in recognizing what is important when it comes to training their recruits on military-related tasks. Without regard to gender or race, DSs are training to mold the civilians they receive at the BCTs into soldiers, warriors. Without the diversity it has maintained after the integration of women in combat roles, and African Americans into its culture, the Army would have never met or accomplished its Army values. All Army values work in sync to produce a mighty force that the U.S. prides itself upon. The DSs and DSLs are selected by the Army to be leaders and trainers. They are trained by the best to be the best, and in turn relay that same training and discipline to the recruits. The families and loved ones who give up their sons and daughters to fight in this volunteer force expect the same high standards of professionalism in the DSs.

When DSs fail to act, to defend what is right morally, ethically, and legally, they compromise all that has been entrusted to them to protect. When DSs call recruits derogatory names, incite violence and discrimination, and when they are involved in cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault, they shame themselves and the Army. When they ridicule, mock, and discriminate against minorities and GLBs, they are not in line with the DOD's anti-harassment policies. Part of that may be because of a lack of appropriate training, similar to the challenges faced when integrating female recruits into male BCTs

According to Reed (1997), many DSCs who graduate DSS claim that their training lacked effective techniques to address gender-specific problems. The DSS does not do enough to educate the candidates on what kind of issues they may encounter (Reed, 1997). Harassment in this newly integrated, open GLB service may be attributed to the same lack of training from the DSS and DSP; there is a need for added training with an emphasis on scenario-based training and fewer PowerPoint presentations.

Lack of Action/ Lack of Response

Bystander effect. The bystander effect, a social psychological phenomenon, is part of the psychological, cognitive theory. In this theory, the lack of acting or intervening when an individual witnesses an emergency is due to the presence of others (Psychology Today, 2015). The more people present in an emergency, the less likely it is that any of the individuals will intervene on their own. In addition, accurate perceptions of the event may be negatively affected by the presence of other people involved in or witnessing the event (Hensell, 2009). In another study by Carlson (2008) on the bystander effect and violent bullying, when participants were asked why they did not intervene in a bullying situation, they stated that they felt they should not intervene because the guy might have “deserved it” or “asked for it.”

Some DSs who do not respond to GLBs getting sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, or discriminated against fail to intervene because they feel that other recruits are able to interpret the situation, whether or not they will intervene. One such incident was the aforementioned command’s failure to act prior to deadly beating of a recruit by other recruits. Was the lack of intervention due to the command’s internal prejudices

against GLBs, or was it that they felt others would intervene to prevent the incident? Was the inaction of other recruits or other DSs a contributing reason for their lack of intervention? With this study, I intended to, through unstructured interviews, elicit a response to either support or deny the bystander effect as a reason for inaction, as well as revealing whether personal prejudices against GLBs played a role in the response. I found that DSs would sometimes respond only when harassment turned physical, or as one participant stated during the interview, when the shoving turned to punching. Sometimes the bystander effect hinges on the delegation of personal responsibility to the group as a whole rather than on personal conviction. According to Seager (2013), this effect is one in which the moral actions of a person may depend on the overall response or expectations of a group rather than what that person may see as moral or immoral.

Social psychologists assert that the concept of the bystander effect was popularized after the 1964 murder of Kitty Genovese. Bystanders observed the killing of Kitty, yet none of the 38 bystanders responded. Latané and Darley explained the lack of response—the bystander effect—in that the fewer the number of witnesses, the higher the possibility of a response or intervention by the onlookers, since individuals in a group observe the response of those around them before they determine their action (Psychology Today, 2015). Some DSs do not intervene because of the presence of other DSs or recruits who are not intervening.

Another reason for the bystander effect is pluralistic ignorance. Some of the DSs who fail to intervene when a GLB is being sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, or discriminated against, may be doing so because they feel that it is a norm for a GLB to be

picked on. DSs may not respond to instances of GLB harassment and discrimination due to how they interpret what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Social contexts are found in most aspects of individual's daily lives, and they also exist in the area of helping behaviors (Hart & Miethe, 2008). According to Marsch and Keltner (2006), bystanders may have succumbed to what's known as pluralistic ignorance—the tendency to mistake another's outwardly calm demeanor as a sign that no emergency is actually taking place and no action is necessary. Whether accepting mistreatment of GLBs as a norm during the implementation of DADT, acting on personal prejudices, or lacking direct clarification of GLB protection required by SHARP and I. A.M. Strong, some DSs may not have seen the need for intervention. Therefore, it is important to establish the need for active intervention when dealing with the treatment of GLB recruits; DSs who witnesses an emergency should recognize it as such and should take it upon themselves to intervene (Marsch & Keltner, 2006).

Drill Sergeant Training

The Army DSP, managed and controlled by TRADOC, conducts all DS training at the DSS, Fort Jackson. At the DSS, DSCs are transformed into DSs who, prior to graduation, undergo limited sleep, recitals of various DS modules, written exams, and higher Army physical fitness test standards (70 points in the pushup, sit-up, and 2-mile run events; 300 points total from the three events). DSs are held to a higher standard of *esprit de corps*, and because of the institutional requirements and level of training they undergo, they are known to outperform fellow non-DS soldiers (Kim, 2009). Army leaders have long recognized the leadership experience gained only by serving as a DS.

For a DS, the hours are long, keeping up with the young recruits can be physically and mentally exhausting, and the challenges are great as they transform civilian volunteers into the world's best-trained, the Army soldier (Johnson, 2014).

The DSS provides annual and new unit training of the SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs, along with equal opportunity. The DSS requires that DSs become well trained in these programs, policies, and regulations, and implement them within the BCTs. The program should also implement ways to effectively intervene and mentor both the harasser and the victim. While SHARP and I. A.M. Strong focus on sexual harassment and sexual assault of the general soldier population, adding GLB focus, intervention, and training in which they can respond to GLB-type incidents will equip DSs to ensure compliance by recruits for the fair treatment of other recruits.

The SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs do not directly address the treatment of GLB recruits within their definitions. The need to add scenario-based training with such a focus is crucial to the awareness and programming of acceptance to create an Army tolerant of all soldiers, no matter their sexual orientation. Addressing the bystander effect, implementing proactive awareness and training, adding GLB tolerance into SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs, and enplacing policy to protect this population from harassment may increase tolerance and acceptance of the GLB population. According to Marsch and Keltner (2006), people ought to be aware of subtle pressures that can unexpectedly cause bystander behavior, such as diffusion of responsibility and pluralistic ignorance.

Further Research

Research with the focus on the sexual minority population may give TRADOC and the military an understanding of the prevalence of the issue of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLBs. TRADOC can implement directives and programs to address and prevent such acts against GLBs. Research and initiation of awareness training on tolerance and acceptance will also provide GLBs tools, counseling, and mentorship that they may not otherwise get in the civilian sector. According to Burks (2011), inadequate attention has been assigned to sexual orientation, even though it has been considered a significant risk factor in incidents of sexual assault and harassment. Risk factors can be the cause of higher suicide rates, discrimination, and crimes against the GLB recruit population. When it comes to sexually-based crimes and the military there needs to be an examination of what is already known and what remains unknown about GLB servicemembers. This may reduce incidents of victimization leading up to crimes against the GLB population (Burks, 2011)

Summary

Within the literature review, I focused on Army policies relating to sexual harassment, sexual assault, reporting procedures, impact on military readiness, and the impact that GLBs would have or had on the armed service prior to the repeal. There have been limited studies on the specific impact of the DADT policy and expulsion of GLB individuals from the military. With the available research, I addressed the problem of discrimination against GLBs in the U.S. military, the negative impact federal and military policies had on gay soldiers and the benefits inaccessible by GLBs and their dependents

prior to the repeal of DOMA's Section 3. The Pew Research Center (2010) found that public support for allowing gay soldiers to serve openly is greater today than it was in 1994, after President Clinton implemented the DADT policy. Although there has been limited research on the need for granting access to GLB rights within the military and the importance of open service by GLBs without fear of discrimination and reprimand, there has been no research focused on studying the correlation between the repeal of DADT and the DS response to GLB recruit sexual harassment and sexual assault. There is also no research supporting the training needed to ensure a discrimination-free environment within BCTs. GLB scenario-based training must be in place to promote awareness and tolerance of GLB recruits, both by DSs and BCT recruits. This is one way to advance the social and economic cultural acceptance of this sexual minority within the U.S. military. In Chapter 3, I focus on the use of existential phenomenology to reveal the experiences of the participants and the approach used for the data collection and analysis.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore and document the experiences of Army DSs and DSLs in how they addressed and prevented the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits. Through this study, I also identified strategies DSs used or could have used to prevent instances of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits. I also wanted to explore if adding GLB training for DSCs and DSs would limit the impact of the bystander effect as a way to create a positive training environment without the drawn-out PowerPoints.

I wanted to know if a recommendation of GLB scenario-based training at the DSS and adding GLB scenario-based training within the BCT curricula would mitigate SHARP-related incidents against GLB recruits. Limiting the bystander effect through GLB scenario-based training may have an impact in the prevention of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits. Through scenario-based training in the BCT environment there may be an increase in awareness as to the importance of inclusion of all recruits in all aspects of training, no matter their sexual orientation (U.S. Army War College, 2014). This approach may promote and mandate a “see something, say something” initiative when requiring service members to take appropriate action when confronted with real-world situations (U.S. Army War College, 2014).

In Chapter 3, I focus on the research design and methodology. I cover the phenomenological method, participant selection process, research questions, and data collection and analysis procedures. I also discuss my role as the researcher and issues of

trustworthiness in my data. Lastly, I cover the recruitment criteria and the interview questions.

Research Design and Rationale

RQ1: What strategies are DSs implementing in preventing cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits?

RQ2: When DSs implement strategies to prevent sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits, is there a lack of response or signs of the bystander effect when responding?

RQ3: What program or training do the participants believe can be implemented to increase DS awareness of this issue and promote rapid response and prevention of future sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits?

Phenomenology is used to reveal the true experiences of the participants (Englander, 2012). I chose this design because I was able to begin with a systematic review of the existing literature to show that the topic being studied is significant and unresolved (Daly & Lumley, 2002) and recommendations were made promoting change and further research into the phenomenon. This approach was also selected “to provide for a descriptive methodology of this human science—the ability to seek to explore and describe the phenomena that is being presented and the experience lived in order to find meaning of the phenomena for itself” (Mostert, 2008, para. 12). Moustakas (1994) mentions that the use of existential phenomenology is that with it, the researcher is focused on an individual rather than subject within a research study. Also, through the qualitative existential phenomenological approach, I was able to capture the personal

narrative descriptions and lived experience of the 11 participants. DSs undergo the same training they received when they went through BCT as recruits. They also receive additional training in the areas of leadership skills, mentorship of recruits, customs and courtesies, drill and ceremony, sexual harassment, and sexual assault training (DOA, 2013). Their training gives them the tools necessary to know how to respond when approached with certain situations, whether it is related to training, discipline of soldiers, professionalism, physical fitness, or basic rifle marksmanship. However, missing from their training is how they should respond when presented with GLB-related incidents.

Central Phenomenon

Only through the existential, qualitative, phenomenological method with unstructured interviews, was I able to obtain one-on-one, unaltered and uninhibited personal experiences of the participants and relate their experiences with the phenomenon. The primary target of phenomenological knowledge, according to Moustakas (1994), is the cognizance of meaningful and concrete relationships present in the original description of an experience in the context of a particular situation. As a former DS and DSL who witnessed instances of demeaning and berating behavior by GLB recruits and other DSs, it was important to gain an understanding as to this phenomenon of discrimination and ways to address and prevent it in the future. According to Van Manen (1997) this approach is emphasized in that the researcher must look at a phenomenon that is of relevance to the researcher and connects the researcher to the phenomenon.

Phenomenology and Social Change

A phenomenological study on DS response to addressing and preventing sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLB recruits within the BCT environment was crucial to ensure that the lingering negative effects of the DADT policy do not continue. Though the DADT policy was rescinded, discrimination against GLBs continues. DADT allowed gay soldiers to serve, but in a sense it also caused GLBs to be sought after, to be identified, and potentially discharged from the U.S. military. With this study, my intent was to promote several functions. First, through the research data, I was able to establish a support for including GLB scenario-based training into the existing SHARP and I. A.M. Strong curriculum. Second, I was able to provide a foundation for research into the need for this form of training as a way to promote awareness for the current and relevant issue. Also, I was able to establish that anti-GLB language by Army DSs as incompatible with the anti-harassment intent of SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs.

Context of Study

For this study, the recruitment of veteran, nonretired DSs was used to obtain the participants for the study. Because of political and bureaucratic constraints, current DSs were not used for the study. For the study, the experience of the former DS was used to support the study in how the participant responded or did not respond to addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a recruit who identified himself or herself as GLB. I recruited veteran, nonretired DSs and DSLs, those who were not receiving retirement pay at the time of the study and who were DSs prior to

2015. Participants who were DSs prior to the policy enactment also participated so to offer support to the study and how the Army responded to GLB recruits during the “no-homo era.”

Role of the Researcher

Various levels of experience, attitudes, and opinions informed the design of this study. These influences molded the methodology, research questions, and format. As a former DSL and during the time I spent “on the trail,” I witnessed degrading comments by other DSs. I have seen heterosexual and homosexual recruits berating other homosexual recruits, with either the DS promoting, inciting, or adding to the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of GLB recruits. I also know the history of homosexuality in the military and its effects on those who served and on those who were discharged for nothing more than their GLB status.

Participant selection. DSs and DSLs assisted me with their existing knowledge which helped me answer the three RQs. DSs receive initial and annual training in SHARP and I. A.M. Strong programs, and know how to respond to instances of sexual harassment and sexual assault of recruits. They were recruited and interviewed until the saturation of thorough understanding of the phenomenon—their experience and strategies used to prevent sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits—was met.

According to Sargeant (2012), the researcher recruits participants who can support the study’s research questions, theoretical perspectives, and evidence informing the study.

Observer-participant. As the researcher, I filled the role as an observer-participant. I did not only collect data via the participants’ responses, but was also a

participant in asking questions and inquiring further information to satisfy the interview questions. For some, there were follow-on questions as some of the responses changed the course of the interviews. I knew what my response would be to certain responses by the participants but informing the participants of my role as the researcher and placing myself in the role of participant, unknown to the participant that I was a former DSL, allowed me to fill the role of the observer-participant. Sometimes DS coworkers—“battles”—look out for each other so they would not get into trouble. Informing the participants that I needed their full experience and no “cover-ups” in their responses allowed for the free-flow of information as to their experiences. Social change was also inevitably a focus in this regard, to bring out the issue(s), research the phenomenon, and provide social change alternatives, solutions, and recommendations.

Data collection. Data were collected via the use of Skype transcripts and recorded via smartphone applications to record audio. Since most of the participants do not live within my state, and to minimize cost due to travel and other associated costs, it was determined that this face-to-face via Skype webcam would suffice. I collected the data at a frequency relevant to each interview and saved it with the identification of the person via their pseudonym name so to maintain confidentiality and autonomy. Data were recorded and will be maintained for future reference. The data were not confidential as they were unidentifiable and untraceable to the participants; however, they are secured in a locked storage filing cabinet for a period of 5 years. Data from the interviews may be distributed upon request to whoever asks for it and may also be shared in public places, i.e., briefings and presentations. Official names and personally

identifiable information were not shared. Research data from the literature review and relevant information regarding the topic found within the literature review may be found on the public internet.

Data analysis. Data analysis, often confused with content analysis, is used, according to Sargeant (2012) in qualitative analysis to interpret the data and themes from the study, so as to facilitate an understanding of the phenomenon studied. Content analysis, on the other hand “...is conducted to identify and describe results” (Sargeant, 2012, p. 2). Interpretive analysis (data analysis) may follow three stages when conducted. One stage includes the *deconstruction* or the breaking down of data into smaller sections or components. The second stage is the *interpretation* and making sense of the coded data (tabulation used in my study) and categories within the transcripts. The final stage is *reconstruction* or recreating the codes and themes that show relationships from the interpretation phase in which one or two central concepts appear as overarching, and the others as subthemes or central theme supporters (Sargeant, 2012). I used tabulation to track responses, and emerging themes throughout the interviews.

Quality and rigor. Clarity in describing the research process was crucial to ensuring transparency—a feature used to define rigorous research processes (Saumure & Given, 2008). A more rigorous research process led to trustworthy findings and helped define other features of qualitative research with maximum validity, reliability or dependability, and comparativeness (Saumure & Given, 2008), and as noted in the latter part of the chapter, reflectivity. According to Sargeant (2012), authenticity is achieved

through the quality of data and data collection, and trustworthiness is achieved through the quality of the data analysis.

Follow-up. There was no need to follow-up with participants after their interview. Data collected supported the study in full, and the need to extrapolate extra information was not needed. 11 participants answered all the questions to their best ability, so the need to ask other questions after the interviews would have been redundant and proved irrelevant. With the Facebook request option, I was able to find and recruit many DS participants. I was able to find 11 DSs and DSLs who knew about the DADT policy, GLB recruits, and applicable policies, programs, and behaviors—their own or others—that addressed sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits. However, a strategy to recruit more participants, if needed, would have been to use key informant, and snowball sampling as a forms of recruitment to get more participants for the study, both of which were used to get the 11 who participated. The number of participants was sufficient as the responses to the interview questions led to some similar responses and themes by the participants.

Debrief. Participants were debriefed at the end of the interviews. Once I felt that the interview questions were fully answered, the participants were thanked for their participation in contributing to the study. This, according to Creswell (2013), is an interview protocol that should be included within qualitative research, to acknowledge the time the interviewee spent in contributing to the study. A log was kept to record start and finish times of each participant so to ensure a fair amount of time is spent so that all necessary questions applicable to the study's needs were met. This ensured that the time

for each interview did not exceed the time set at 45 minutes to one hour—none of the interviews exceeded 30 minutes in duration. This, according to Carlson (2008), allows the participants to formulate their answers and still allows for ample clarification time if the participants did not understand the question(s).

Bias

Based on my experience in working and training with DSs, DSLs, and recruits, and for the focus of this study, bias was not hard to deter while focusing on the topic and intent of the study. According to Mehra (2002) the person conducting the research may elicit personal beliefs, behaviors, and values that are reflected not only in the choice of methodology and interpretation of findings, but also in the choice of a research topic. Preventing bias during the study allowed for more breadth and depth into the phenomenon and not a shift into a direction swayed by the researcher. The focus was on the participants and their experience, and interview questions were on the topic and not on my own experiences.

Personal and professional relationships which may sometimes be a way to assert power over the participants was eliminated by their not knowing or discovering my former status as a DS and DSL. While some of the participants knew me from the DSS, a majority of those recruited through Facebook or snowball sampling did not know my status as a former DS and DSL. DS and DSL participants who knew my former role as a DSL did not allow that role to interfere with their full sharing of their experience. I informed the participants of my role, that I am a researcher seeking information related to the research and study. I wanted to identify the unbiased experience and flow of

information by the participants. I did not have to have a personal relationship with the interviewees to get them to talk indiscriminately about this topic, as it may have been sensitive in nature to some. This prevented predictable responses and suppositions as to where I stand on a topic or what I am promoting or recommending. Supervisory or instructor relationships also are included in this category as sometimes knowing my role as a former DSL may have, but did not inhibit the sharing of actual experiences by the participants.

Ethics

In this study, I focused on a qualitative approach and as with any research, ethical considerations may be present. According to Orb, Eisenhauer, and Wynaden (2001), if the research includes people, there must be a requirement that ethical issues may arise or be derived from the interactions within the research or study. My role as a former DSL and researcher did not conflict with veteran, nonretired DSs and DSLs. The sexual harassment issue in the U.S. military has been an issue for many years, and as one who had to prevent such behavior while some of my “battles” encouraged it may be interpreted as a conflict of interest. Researchers should, according to documentation by Orb et al. (2001), consider the potential ethical issues that may arise from the study before and during each phase of the study. To ensure that the research proceeded on ethical approaches, I included informed consent, confidentiality, data generation and analysis, researcher/participant relationships, which were described earlier in the chapter, and reporting of final outcomes to both the participants and parties involved (Orb et al., 2001).

There are three principles of ethics in qualitative research (autonomy; beneficence, and justice). *Autonomy* for this study relied on recognition that between the researcher and participants, there was informed consent, which means, according to Kvale (1996), that there must be a reasonable balance between over-informing the participants about the study and their role in the study, and being uninformed of the same. *Beneficence* for qualitative research requires an oversight of potential consequences and revealing the participants' identities, so to, according to Raudonis (1992), do good and prevent harm to the participants. *Justice* refers to avoiding the exploitation and abuse of the participants; normally this relates to studies in which abuse of participants in medical studies or other vulnerable groups may occur. Justice also includes a role that is negotiated and that will promote a clear understanding of my role as the researcher, and participants, those who are DSs and DSLs in this study.

Participant Access

Informal requests were issued to the participants of the study. Their participation for the study was requested via the recruitment strategy mentioned earlier in the chapter. Creswell (2013) considers this form of recruitment to be appropriate, and Walden University required that the Institutional Review Board—"gatekeepers"—grant me access to the participants. As the researcher, I specified the length of time it would take for each interview and potential impact the participants may experience with the study. The IRB provides protection, via federal regulation, to the participants so to prevent physical, psychological, social, economic, and legal harm (Sieber, 1998).

Those who participated in the study completed a consent form. The participants were aware of the purpose of the study and the benefits for their participation. They were informed that their participation will promote further research into the phenomenon and will either show no need or show support for GLB scenario-based training within the DSS and their BCTs. Participants were made aware that their personal information, i.e., actual name, personal views of the DSP, and the Army response, action, or inaction to preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits, was not be noted or published. While the status of the DS as veteran, nonretired is important as part of the recruitment criteria, other personally identifiable information was not necessary for this study. For the purpose of anonymity during audio and report recordings, pseudonym names, such as Participant 1, Participant 2, etc. were used.

Incentives. All participants were given a \$40 gift card to Starbucks for their time and participation, as jobs and families may have constricted participants' excess time for supporting outside studies. Since I love coffee, what better place to give these participants a gift card for their time than a national coffee chain. As my time is valuable and theirs is as well, they needed to be compensated for their time and participation in the study. Providing rewards, according to Creswell (2013), will be a gesture of gratitude to the participants for their time while the researcher collects the data. However, rewards should not be used to exploit the participants but rather respect and reciprocity for their valuable input and contribution to the study (Creswell, 2013).

Recruitment Criteria

The decision was made to recruit a population, a mix of between 10-15 veteran,

nonretired DSs and DSLs. This allowed for sufficient data gathering, analysis of responses, and offered breadth and depth into the topic. According to Sandelowski (1995), the adequacy of participant numbers requires a thoughtful decision-making process since too few may risk sufficient data to cover depth and breadth of the topic and yet too many may produce superficial volumes of unnecessary data. The quality and credibility of the data obtained is better maintained with a workable number of participants and will lead to information that is meant to be qualitative and appropriate to the satisfactory and full address of all RQs. A criterion for selecting the participants can be seen in Appendix C.

I knew that the participants met the criterion because all DSs and DSLs have gone through the SHARP and I. A.M. Strong program training, or similar training while at the DSS. DSs also receive scenario-based training within the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and equal opportunity training, but none address the GLB service members. DSs are aware of the former DADT policy and requirements imposed by their chain of command and the UCMJ when it came to counseling and documenting soldiers for misconduct, up to and including the separation of the soldier from the Army. DSs go through ethics and trainee abuse training on an annual basis and are required to act in a professional manner at all times. Therefore, all DS and DSL participants were able to meet and fit the mold of the participant requirements complementary to this study.

Interview Questions

Part of the recruitment involved finding 10-15 veteran, nonretired DSs and DSLs who have at one time or another confronted or witnessed SHARP-related incidents

against GLB recruits within their or another BCT. The instrumentation used to collect the data for the interview questions was me, the researcher. None of the questions within the interview were previously published. This allowed me to gain a full understanding of the phenomenon since I, as a former DSL, was the only one who knew which questions needed to be asked. Literature resources were used to compile information for the phenomenon, which helped me develop the interview questions, and established content validity from published scholarly, peer-reviewed articles, and government sources.

In order to recruit the best participants, I established criteria (Appendix C) that participants had to meet. Part of the recruitment criteria for this study required that the participants have either witnessed, prevented, addressed, or either responded to or ignored an instance of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit. If the DS or DSL did not personally witness or respond to a SHARP-related incident against a GLB, he or she was asked to identify what he or she would have done to address a related incident. For this study, the GLB may have been suspected, known, or unknown to be a GLB and actions against the GLB, such as sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination must have taken place. Interview questions for this study appear in Appendix D and the responses in Appendix E.

Trustworthiness

Credibility

Creswell (2013) recommends that researchers spend a prolonged time in the field to promote and develop an in-depth understanding of a case and phenomenon. Researchers who do this are able to convey detail about the issue and people who worked

within the BCT to enhance the credibility of the narrative. DS and DSLs work together, so they see the same issues of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLBs by other recruits or by other DSs within the BCT. Their narratives were recounted as credible—internal validity—or not just by some of the responses. Of course, different scenarios and instances may occur irrespective of the BCT environment

Confirmability/Reflexivity

Bias, values, and personal and professional background may sometimes shape the researcher's interpretation of the study, as is normal and is formed during the study (Creswell, 2013). Explicit identification and reflexivity of these concerns was important in preventing biases throughout the research and allowed me to maintain the focus on the study and my role as the researcher. Past experiences and connections between the researcher and the participants did not influence my interpretations of the responses, and the raw data (Appendix E) shows questions and responses during the interview. The distinguished identification of each role was an element that needed to be clarified upon before the interviews began (Creswell, 2013). Data were not compromised with my own interpretation or when interviewing fellow former DSs and DSLs, the roles and intent of the study were clearly defined.

Summary

In this chapter, I revealed data gathering methodology and data analysis techniques that were used before, during, and after the study. Recruitment and consent by the participants, details about the type and intent of the interviews, data collection methods, and my role as the researcher were defined early in the study and prior to me

conducting the interviews. In Chapter 3, I documented the criteria of how the participants were chosen, contacted, and recruited, justified the rationale for the number of participants, detailed a follow-up plan, addressed ethical dilemmas, and discussed the debriefing of the participants at the conclusion of the study. Content validity was confirmed through peer-reviewed material, government publications, and journal references which strengthened the proposition of the severity of the underlying issue and the need for this research to proliferate.

In Chapter 4, I documented the results of participant interviews. Data were coded—tabulated by hand—of those who favored the GLB scenario-based training at the DSS. Additionally, data analysis revealed general support for the same type of training to become mandatory at the BCTs. I also tabulated themes respective to the participants who witnessed or directly interacted with GLB recruits during their time on the trail.

Chapter 4: Results

DSs and DSLs are the frontline in ensuring recruits within their BCTs treat each other with dignity and respect. While they are placed in the role of the DS, their focus is on molding and shaping future Army soldiers. Some, however, use their position to incite derogatory comments such as “faggot,” “queer,” “granny’s boy,” and “weakling” to verbally attack GLBs and effeminate or weak heterosexual recruits as a way to motivate recruits to perform better. Four of the participant DSs stated that they would use derogatory names to compel their recruits to perform better on physical events such as unit and ability group runs, and obstacle courses.

Though the intent by some DSs may not have been to attack recruits on a personal level, it was sometimes used as a motivational tactic to get the recruits to excel. 4 of the 11 participants found the DADT policy to be nondiscriminatory, with two participants claiming it was only discriminatory on certain points. Those participants stated that DADT was a policy that kept the Army together and kept GLBs’ personal lives out of the Army. One of the participants was also harassed while he was in BCT because of how he talked. He mentioned that because of a slight lisp, one of his DSs ridiculed him. The participant mentioned during the interview that he is gay which may have been the reason his DS discriminated against him when he was going through BCT as a recruit.

When asked if they witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit, 6 of the 11 participants reported that they witnessed SHARP-related incidents against GLB recruits. 5 out of 11 participants knew that sodomy was used to define homosexuality and 10 out of 11 stated that they knew the

UCMJ no longer defined homosexuality in its policies. 10 out of the 11 participants either witnessed or heard of suicides and hazing of GLBs in the Army.

With respect to the discharging of GLB soldiers in the Army, four participants said they had witnessed or participated in the discharge of recruits in the past and two said they had heard of discharges of GLB recruits. Five said they did not know of recruits receiving discharges solely because of their sexual orientation, but that the separation from the military was because of a recruit's performance in BCT. Prior to, and during DADT, most GLB recruits who chose to stay in the U.S. military were in the closet so that they could stay in the Army. Some recruits who were known to be gay by the participants were sometimes able to stay in boot camp if they were able to perform all the Army BCT requirements. 10 of the 11 participants said they were not personally affected by the repeal of the DADT policy. These DSs stated that as long as a soldier was able to meet the demands of BCT, the recruit's sexual orientation had no negative effect on their ability to train the recruit. They also said that if a GLB recruit could shoot straight, run, perform all military physical training, and meet the mental demands of the Army, their GLB status would have no effect on their enlistment status while in BCT.

10 out of the 11 participants stated that they would intervene if GLB SHARP-related incidents became physical. Participant 1 stated that he found the provocation and harassment to be funny. 8 of the 11 said they had either participated in or witnessed other DSs use profane language, name-calling, or overt acts demonstrating male-on-male intercourse as a way to mock recruits.

Participants' Experiences of the Bystander Effect

The bystander theory focuses on the notion that when one observes an emergency or incident that would normally warrant a response, the person who would have the initial reaction of stepping in to prevent the incident from happening or escalating does not do so because someone else may step in to help. Another reason for not intervening is their interpretation of the emergency. When asked if their lack of response to a SHARP-related incident against a GLB recruit was due to their definition of what an emergency was or if the behaviors warranted response, their responses varied. Of the participants who used or witnessed name-calling against GLBs, three of them participants stated that these actions were not berating but was a form of having innocent fun. They would not see “something and say something” unless the incident escalated to the point in which the DS might get into legal trouble if they did not react. These participants did not confront an incident of harassment either because they did not feel the incident was an emergency or because in some cases, the participants were part of the problem. DSs, at most times, would “police each other up” or keep each other from escalating a situation to the point where a recruit would get hurt—verbally or physically—and would use excuses such as “hey battle, you have a phone call.” Participant 9 stated that name-calling and using homophobic language was entertaining. Additionally, with the newer generation, the open service by GLBs and stricter equal opportunity guidelines, DSs are less apt to be as berating and sexually suggestive with their comments. The bystander effect, then, is not a profound reason as to why DSs are not intervening because each DS and their experience elicited different responses for various DS-recruit interactions. The bystander

effect supported varying interpretations of what an emergency is. Participants stated that they would respond when an incident escalated to the point where intervention was required—again, with different response times based on differing interpretations of what constituted an emergency. However, for the purposes of this study the bystander effect was evident in the responses. A DS response at most times would usually only occur after physical recruit-on-recruit pushing and shoving occurred. Also, since DSs would use derogatory language, they would not be able to interpret the situation as harassment, as defined by the DOD and DOA, and therefore the provocation would continue and no intervention would follow since they were the perpetrators of the name-calling.

Direct Interaction

Participant 2 was a DS in the late 70s and 80s. He was not familiar with the DADT policy as it was in effect after his tenure in the military. He stated that he would sometimes be the mentor to GLB recruits. He stated that if a soldier came up to him claiming DS harassment because of the recruit's GLB status, he would only talk to and counsel the soldier and offer other methods to resolving the issues. The participant recalled a situation in which one of his soldiers took over-the-counter medication, over the prescribed amount, to cope with harassment and torment by DSs and recruits. Although the participant did not know if the recruit was really gay or just wanted to get out of the Army, he discharged the recruit. The soldier came back to the participant and asked the participant if he was gay too. The participant also stated that in the 70s and 80s, there was a 50/50 chance that recruits would try to get out the Army, whether or not they were really gay.

Awareness Training

Since GLBs can serve openly, 100% of the participants stated that the military needed a way to add training into their schools to provide for awareness and tolerance of GLBs in the service. Since the repeal of the DADT policy introduced no new training to require the tolerance and acceptance of GLBs, all participants recommended GLB scenario-based training at the DSS. 9 out of 11 participants were for GLB awareness training within the BCT curriculum. Participant 4 supported GLB scenario-based training at the DSS but not at the BCT because in his experience as a DS, any scenario-based training outside the typical PowerPoint training caused an increase in respective incidents. He stated that recruits take the training and twist the training to be the opposite of its intent. All 11 participants knew that GLB harassment still exists in the Army and that there needs to be action taken to ensure DSs are ready to take on these changes while ensuring recruits are trained.

Themes

Performance. Themes that emerged from the interviews included a general support for GLB inclusion into the BCT environment. I also found that all participants were unaware of the high number of discharges of service members from the Army during DADTs (1993-2011). All participants did not care what the recruit(s) did behind closed doors, or who he or she loved. As long as the soldier was able to perform all the requirements of the Army, their personal love lives would not matter in the BCT. Typically, a recruit's sexual orientation or preference did not impact their performance as

a soldier. None of the participants sought to find out who was GLB in their unit, an action they termed “witch hunt.”

For GLB scenario-based training. The main theme I found to be a significant support for this study and RQs was that the training DSs received at the DSS lacked the focus of inclusion of gay soldiers in the military. As mentioned earlier, SHARP and I. A.M. Strong fail to directly offer training specific to responding to instances of harassment against GLB recruits. Offering GLB scenario-based training may prove to be beneficial if the Army is seeking ways to include GLBs into the Army way of life. Starting GLB scenario-based training at the DSS would address that issue and may open the door to ensuring all soldiers receive equitable, effective, GLB inclusionary training.

Strategies Used

All participants stated that they would verbally or physically confront a recruit or DS if a recruit within their BCT was being sexually harassed or sexually assaulted, with one stating he would only intervene if the harassment turned to punches. Participants stated that though their level of intervention was minimal, they would prevent recruits from sexually harassing, sexually assaulting or discriminating against one another. One of the main issues they witnessed was groups within their platoons that would pick on a GLB recruit, but that issue would be quickly resolved when a DS intervened. Strategies used by DSs who would address and prevent an incident before or when it occurred included speaking with the platoon about equal opportunity, and the DSs who did intervene would coach and mentor their recruits on the equitable treatment of their battle buddies. Most times during BCT, recruits were already afraid and challenged within the

BCT environment as the physical and mental challenges were persistent within that environment, so there would be no time for discrimination or hazing. Whenever a DS would speak, recruits would become compliant and any issues would be resolved on the spot, at least until the DS left the area. One participant stated that most of the GLB comments were made in the barracks when recruits were on their personal time after they were released from the day's training.

Summary

In Chapter 4, I focused on the participants' responses to the interview questions. Surprisingly, their responses were generally the same. Even though the participants were DSSs with various trail times between the 1970s and 2013, their experiences led to a call for change at the DSS and within the DSP. Though they have all gone through mandatory SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, 100% of the participants felt that the Army failed to directly address GLB inclusion in the annual harassment training. 11 out of 11 participants agreed that the implementation of GLB scenario-based training at the DSS would prove crucial and beneficial to the Army. Though they would respond to SHARP-related incidents, they would not point a finger at the bystander effect to explain the perceived lack of response but would rather wait for incidents to escalate before they would intervene.

In Chapter 5, I focus on the implications for social change, recommendations for action, reflection, and conclusion of this study.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Implications for Social Change

The challenge for today's Army is the bureaucratic politics it undergoes in order for social change to occur. With the repeal of the DADT policy, a need for GLB soldier inclusion training is past due. One participant during these interviews seemed upset with the Army. He felt that it should not have to take a study like this to make people aware that SHARP against GLB soldiers exists and is not being addressed. Allowing open service did not come with inclusion training, and as a result, the on-going sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLBs continues to hinder the insertion of the equal opportunity piece of the Army's puzzle that tends to be missing. Social change, whether through executive order, internal culture change, or forced change needs to come from the people and leaders within the organization. GLBs have always served, either openly or closeted, and continue to see the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination either against them or other GLBs. Sometimes this discrimination is perpetrated by other GLB soldiers within their ranks. A need for social change in which inclusion of all recruits and soldiers in the Army is paramount if the Army lives by its motto, "An Army of One"—all soldiers, one family.

Recommendations

For GLBs to feel welcomed now that the DOD encourages open-service by GLBs there must be change. There should be cultural awareness and a necessity of treating all recruits and soldiers the same—with the utmost dignity and respect. SHARP and I. A.M. Strong fail to directly address GLB inclusion. Though these two programs do refer to the

equal opportunity and fair treatment of all soldiers, the focus should also be to address GLB soldiers, or all soldiers without regard to sexual orientation as GLB recruits are still sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, and discriminated against, not only by fellow recruits, but also by some of their DSs. Through GLB scenario-based training, the participants in this study were able to support the study in answering the interview questions pertaining to the overarching RQs. They recommend training that could be implemented to prevent the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits. I recommend the following:

GLB Scenario-Based Training

- Train leaders within the Army as to the importance of GLB inclusion and provide support channels for leaders who have questions about GLB soldiers.
- Continue to inculcate pride month across the Army bases and offer additional military and community programs to promote GLB awareness and tolerance.
- Implement policies and procedures as to the requirements of scenario-based training as it relates to GLB soldiers; emplace the right leaders to be role players who can train other leaders as to the expectations and support channels of the training.
- Implement GLB scenario-based training into the DSP and at the DSS, as this is the location where all DSCs in the Army receive their training to become DSs—the first and last person a recruit meets when entering the Army and graduates BCT.

- Require inculcation of GLB scenario-based training into the annual requirement; this can be part of the annual SHARP and I. A.M. Strong, and equal opportunity training.
- Require retraining of any recruit or soldier who is disciplined for respective SHARP incidents against a GLB soldier, to include leaders who fail to act when witnessing such incidents.
- Require further stringent reporting of GLB sexual harassment and sexual assault, with the restricted and unrestricted reporting currently in place.
- Hold leaders accountable for instances of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against any soldier.
- Promote productivity and morale by employees and encourage soldiers to stay with the organization while also promoting shared values, inclusive of all soldiers, no matter their sexual orientation (United States Officer of Personnel Management, 2015).

Role play. Recommendations to inculcating GLB scenario-based training in which all recruits at the BCT gain insight on the inclusion of gay soldiers in today's Army may include some of the following ideas, some of which are currently used by the federal government. During role play, bring up some of the common gay jokes, ones we have all heard in high school, college, television, books, and magazines. Then, bring up those jokes, gestures, comments, and how these forms of discrimination are not acceptable and will not be tolerated in the Army. According to

the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2015), the following guidelines should be adhered to:

- Jokes about the physical attributes, behaviors, mannerisms, or voices of LGBT people should not be told.
- Questions about the private matters of LGBT people, if you would not ask those same questions of straight people, should not be asked.
- Questions as to the authenticity of a person's sexual orientation who tells you that he or she identifies as LGBT should not be asked.
- Terms related to the LGBT community should not be used in a derogatory manner. (p. 32)

One of the participants stated during the interview that GLB scenario-based training will lead to further provocation, ridicule, and discrimination of GLB recruits. He claimed that recruits imitate what they see and will continue to engage in past behaviors. However, recruits must see this role-play, and then see the do's and don'ts and be made aware of the discipline they would receive if discrimination against GLB soldiers was to occur. Participant 1 and Participant 2 stated that scenario-based training allows recruits to see the interaction between the role players and involves them in more engaging and effective learning experiences. It also gives them a visual aid to help them understand and process what they see acted out.

Reflection

With this study, I sought to identify DSs' and DSLs' responses to how they did or would have addressed and prevented the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and

discrimination against GLB recruits within the BCT environment. Their insight during the interviews offered invaluable insight as to their experience, their training, and strategies to combating SHARP-related incidents against gay soldiers in the U.S. military. While this cannot be an all-inclusive study of all the issues within the military regarding GLB soldiers, I sought to identify some of the direct issues that continue to plague today's Army, even 5 years after allowing GLBs to openly serve. DSs and DSLs are professionals in an Army that prides itself on professionalism, subject matter expertise, and impeccable physical and mental stability. DSs and DSLs are trained and able to take a civilian and transform them into today's modern soldier. GLB recruits are part of the Army family, but I have witnessed how the Army responds to gay soldiers, and the leaders who are supposed to mentor and instill the Army values in their soldiers fall short of those values. The Army family is supposed to be a culture-accepting, tolerating organization that promotes the unity of all soldiers, no matter one's creed, religion, race, ethnic background, or sexual orientation. Though the DADT policy failed to promote that unity, it is now up to the trainers of DSs—Army DSLs—to instill that sense of unity, compassion, resilience, and pride to be able to support GLB recruits. I learned through executing these interviews that these DSs and DSLs do care about their recruits.

I also noticed that within the literature review, the DS is seen as an aggressive and demeaning figure. The interviews shone DSs in a different light, and revealed a general position of DSs who would see and say something to address and prevent discrimination against gay soldiers. It may be that generation Y and millennials are more accepting of their gay peers, and may be increasingly welcoming and tolerant of GLBs. While there

are DSs who tolerate trainee abuse with the use of words and actions demonstrating a disregard of equal opportunity of all recruits, 10 of the 11 participants would not tolerate the escalation of verbal attacks on GLB recruits. Also, historically, with the lack of awareness and tolerance training, former DSs were not required to be sensitive to GLB inclusion as the DOD sought to rid its ranks of all GLB service members.

Conclusion

With this study, I was able to answer three fundamental questions: 1) What strategies are DSs implementing to prevent sexual harassment and sexual assault of their GLB recruits? 2) When some DSs do not implement strategies to prevent the sexual harassment and sexual assault of GLB recruits in the BCT environment, do they contend with the bystander effect? 3) What programs and training can be implemented to increase awareness among DSs of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of GLB recruits while also promoting a rapid response to and prevention of future incidents? Through this phenomenological study, these questions were answered and expounded upon. The DS experience is one that only these participants would have. No one in the Army is better suited to train, mentor, and instill the Army values into a civilian-turned-soldier than the Army DS (DOA, 2015).

Too often DSs have been known to be the yelling, screaming, berating, and fist-pounding mad men and women. The Army has worked hard to change that image instead to be that of the DS as a mentor, counselor, and promoter of teamwork and *esprit de corps* through less demeaning and berating means. However, there is one population within its ranks that continues to feel neglected, rejected, sexually harassed, sexual

assaulted, and discriminated against, solely because of whom they love, or their sexual orientation. DSs receive sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination training at the DSS. DSs have not been introduced to GLB training at any formal military school. The Army trains leaders, motivators, instillers of Army values, yet fails to protect one of its most vulnerable populations—the GLB recruits. This training, aided by SHARP and I. A.M. Strong, will hopefully address that need and will promote the overall tolerance and acceptance of GLB soldiers.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139-158. doi:10.1177/089124390004002002
- Adams, P., Alexander, S. E. B., Baillie, P., Ballard, L., Cleghorn, J., & Adams, N. M. (2004). Symposium: Veterans speak out: A collection of essays from the Documenting Courage Project. *Hofstra Labor & Employment Law Journal, 21*(2), 463-482. Retrieved from <http://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1364&context=hlelj>
- Alexander, C. (2010, September 30). Former Secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander. *Gay and Lesbian Times*, (1188), 10. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/pqcentral/docview/392148818/fulltext/14D6B54E822C43D5PQ/6?accountid=14872>
- Allsep, L. M. (2013). The myth of the warrior: Martial masculinity and the end of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. *Journal of Homosexuality, 60*(2/3), 381-400. doi:10.1080/00918369.2013.744928
- Anson, A. J. (2013). Ghosts in the dressing room. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 17*(1), 103-111. doi:10.1080/19359705.2012.716734
- Armstrong, J. (1997). Homophobic slang as coercive discourse among college students. In Liva, A., & Hall, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality*, (326-334). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Army Publishing Directorate. (2011). *Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell* (Army Directive 2011-01). Retrieved from http://www.apd.army.mil/pdf/ADP/AD2011_01.pdf
- ArmyMWR. (2015). *U.S. Army morale, welfare, recreation history*. Retrieved from <http://www.armymwr.com/commander/history.aspx>
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Diversity and emotion: The new frontiers in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Management*, 28(3), 307–338. doi:10.1177/014920630202800304
- Badgett M. V. L., Lau, H., Sears, B., & Ho, D. (2007). *Bias in the workplace: Consistent evidence of sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Badgett-Sears-Lau-Ho-Bias-in-the-Workplace-Jun-2007.pdf>
- Bailey, B. (2013). The politics of dancing. *Journal of Policy History*, 25(1), 89-113. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/docview/1289881431/citation/7A94FA6ECD134D96PQ/1?accountid=14872>
- Bailey, M. B., Lee, K., & Williams, L. R. (2013). Repealing Don't Ask Don't Tell: The impact of stereotypes on attitudes toward gay soldiers in the military. *American Review of Politics*, 34, 85-89. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?siid=2ef563e1-ea59-44b4-b745-e211861ae76d%40sessionmgr4003&vid=0&hid=4209>

- Barber, M. E. (2012). Mental health effects of "Don't Ask Don't Tell." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 16*(4), 346-352. doi:10.1080/19359705.2012.705143
- Baston, C. D. (1994). Looking back at the unresponsive bystander: Camelot or the golden age? *Contemporary Psychology, 39*(10), 941-943. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=0528b951-aac6-4728-93bc-d22f2794748b%40sessionmgr110&vid=0&hid=107&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#db=psyh&AN=2006-06477-001>
- Belkin, A. (2005). Abandoning "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" will decrease antigay violence. *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, 131*(5), 177. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=8a441fffd-7662-4006-af14-f5c6d339de07%40sessionmgr120&vid=0&hid=116&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#AN=16997058&db=mth>
- Belkin, A., & Levitt, M. (2001). Homosexuality and the Israel Defense Forces: Did lifting the gay ban undermine military performance? *Armed Forces & Society, 27*(4), 541-565. Retrieved from http://archive.palmcenter.org/files/Homosexuality%20and%20Israel%20Defense%20Forces_0.pdf
- Bergstrom-Lynch, C. A. (2012). How children rearrange the closet: Disclosure practices of gay, lesbian, and bisexual prospective parents. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 8*(2), 173-195. doi:10.1080/1550428X.2011.623929

- Berkley, R. A., & Watt, A. H. (2006). Impact of same-sex harassment and gender-role stereotypes on Title VII protection for gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, 18(1), 3-19. doi:10.1007/s10672-005-9001-8
- Bernard, R. D., Hosek, S. D., & Vaiana, M. E. (2015). *Gays in the military: Eventually, new facts conquer old taboos*. Retrieved from <http://www.rand.org/pubs/periodicals/rand-review/issues/2011/spring/gays.html>
- Berry, W. F. (2012). Transforming experience: Negotiations of sexual identity in the composing processes of gay men. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 6(2), 62-75. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=b85f4233-7dc0-4a36-a27c-c26d4e54a1e1%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4209>
- Bissinger, B. (2005, May 1). Don't Ask, Don't Kill. *Vanity Fair*. (477), 178. Retrieved from <http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2000/05/kentucky-murder-200005>
- Blackwell, C. W., Ricks, J. L., & Dziegielewski, S. F. (2004). Discrimination of gays and lesbians: A social justice perspective. *Journal of Health and Social Policy*, 19(4), 27-43. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=1cd62a3a-96d8-4d2f-b8f6-8cd5a21b8c88%40sessionmgr115&vid=0&hid=105>

- Blosnich, J. R., Mays, V. M., & Cochran, S. D. (2014). Suicidality among veterans: Implications of sexual minority status. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(Suppl 4), 535-537. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.302100
- Boris, B. M. (2010). Fighting for equal treatment: How the United Auto Workers won domestic partnership benefits and discrimination protection for lesbian, gay, and bisexual members. *Labor Studies Journal, 35*(2), 157-180.
doi:10.1177/0160449X08325994
- Bosson, J. K., Weaver, J. R., Caswell, T. A., & Burnaford, R. M. (2012). Gender threats and men's antigay behaviors: The harmful effects of asserting heterosexuality. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15*(4), 471-486. doi:10.1177/1368430211432893
- Bowling, K. L., Firestone, J. M., & Harris, R. J. (2005). Analyzing questions that cannot be asked of respondents who cannot respond. *Armed Forces and Society, 31*(3), 411-435. doi:10.1177/0095327X0503100305
- Britton, D. M., & Williams, C. L. (1995). Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue: Military policy and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30*, 1-21. doi:10.1300/J082v30n01_01
- Brodie, I. (2000). *U.S. Army's gay-bashers sent back to boot camp*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/pqcentral/docview/318243434/fulltext/5EE980C6A1F54F38PQ/9?accountid=14872>

- Brooks, A. K., & Edwards, K. (2009). Allies in the workplace: Including LGBT in human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*, 136–149. doi:10.1177/1523422308328500
- Brown, J. G., & Ayres, I. (2004). The inclusive command: Voluntary integration of sexual minorities into the U.S. military. *Michigan Law Review, 103*(1), 150-188. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T23401231509&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T23401231516&cisb=22_T23401231515&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=7346&docNo=12
- Buford, K. (2013). From exclusion to acceptance: A case history of homosexuality in the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 60*(2/3), 250-273. doi:10.1080/00918369.2013.744671
- Burks, D. J. (2011). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual victimization in the military: An unintended consequence of Don't Ask, Don't Tell? *American Psychologist, 66*(7), 604-613. doi:10.1037/a0024609
- Burrell, G. (1984). Sex and organization analysis. *Organization Studies, 5*(97), 101. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9a8f25b6-8e06-489d-8147-1fb4e2370ad0%40sessionmgr111&vid=0&hid=110>

- Burrelli, D. F. (2010). Don't Ask, Don't Tell: The law and military policy on same-sex behavior. *CRS Report 40782*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40782.pdf>
- Button, S. B. (2001). Organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity: A cross-level examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 17-28. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.86.1.17
- Carey, M. (1995). Comment: Concerns in the analysis of focus group data. *Qualitative Health Research, 5*(4), 487-495. doi:10.1177/104973239500500409
- Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *Journal of Men's Studies, 16*(1), 3-17. doi:10.3149/jms.1601.3
- Casey, E. A., & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a positive bystander: Male antiviolence allies' experiences of "stepping up." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(1), 62-83. Retrieved from <http://jiv.sagepub.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/content/27/1/62.full.pdf>
- Center for American Progress. (2015). *The repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell—1 year later*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/report/2012/09/20/38764/the-repeal-of-dont-ask-dont-tell-1-year-later>
- Christian, B. (2010). McCain looks foolish on DADT. *Echo Magazine, 21*(11), 18. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?si>

d=d44bdc5a-4e67-436e-87f4-

849c3534f459%40sessionmgr4005&vid=0&hid=4201

- Chung, Y. B. (2001). Work discrimination and coping strategies: Conceptual frameworks for counseling lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Career Development Quarterly*, 50(1), 33. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2001.tb00887.x/epdf
- Cianni, V. (2012). Gays in the military: How America thanked me. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 16(4), 322-333. doi:10.1080/19359705.2012.702028
- Cowie, H. (2000). Bystanding or standing by: Gender issues in coping with bullying in English schools. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26(1), 85–97. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(2000)26:1<85::AID-AB7>3.0.CO;2-5
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. Retrieved from http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1334586.files/2003_Creswell_A%20Framework%20for%20Design.pdf
- Croteau, J. M. (1996). Research on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: An integrative review of methodology and findings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 195-209. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1996.0018
- Crow, S. M., Fok, L. Y., & Hartman, S. J. (1998). Who is at greatest risk of work-related discrimination—women, blacks, or homosexuals? *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, 11(1), 15-26. doi:10.1023/A:1027319915725

- Daily Labor Report. (2007). *Sexual orientation: Employers need understanding of issues on orientation, gender identity* (103 DLR A-13). Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org/resources/diversity-training-on-sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity-issues>
- Daly, J., & Lumley, D. (2002). Bias in qualitative research designs. *Methodological Issues IV*, 26(4), 299-300. Retrieved from http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/pdf/anzjph/editorials_on_methods/bias_qualitative_research_design_aug_2002.pdf
- D'Amico, F. (1996). *Race-ing and gendering the military closet*. In Rimmerman, C. A. (1996). *Gay rights, military wrongs: Political perspectives on lesbians and gays in the military*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibilities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 377-383. doi: 10.1037/h0025589
- Dart, J. (2010). Surveys support openly gays in the military. *The Christian Century*, 127(6), 14. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/read/1G1-247030249/surveys-support-openly-gay-in-the-military>
- Defense Research, Surveys, and Statistics Center. (2014, October 4). *2014 Department of Defense report of focus. Groups on sexual assault prevention and response*. Retrieved from http://www.sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/FY14_POTUS/FY14_DoD_Report_to_POTUS_Annex_3_DMDC.pdf

Department of Defense. (2010, November 30). *Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell*. Retrieved from http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/DADTRReport_FINAL_20101130%28secure-hires%29.pdf

Department of Defense. (2011). *Repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT): Quick reference guide*. Retrieved from http://www.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/Quick_Reference_Guide_Repeal_of_DADT_APPROVED.pdf

Department of Defense. (2011, March 11). *Department of Defense annual report on sexual assault in the military, fiscal year 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.sapr.mil/public/docs/reports/DoD_Fiscal_Year_2010_Annual_Report_on_Sexual_Assault_in_the_Military.pdf

Department of Defense. (2012, January 23). *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program* (DOD Directive 6495.01). Retrieved from, <http://dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/649501p.pdf>

Department of Defense. (2013, February 11). *Extending benefits to same-sex domestic partners of military members* (DOD Memorandum). Retrieved from <http://archive.defense.gov/news/Same-SexBenefitsMemo.pdf>

Department of Defense. (2015, July 7). *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program, annual report on sexual harassment and violence at the military service academies* (DOD Directive 6495.01). Retrieved from <http://dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/649502p.pdf>

- Department of the Army. (n.d.). *U.S. Army drill sergeant*. Retrieved from <http://www.army.mil/drillsergeant/>
- Department of the Army. (1984). *Personnel separations, enlisted separations* (AR 635-200). Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.whs.mil/library/mildoc/AR%20635-200,%201%20October%201982.pdf>
- Department of the Army (2011a). *Enlisted assignments and utilization management* (AR 614-200). Retrieved from http://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/pdf/r614_200.pdf
- Department of the Army. (2011b). *Standards of medical fitness* (AR 20-501). Retrieved from http://www.apd.army.mil/pdf/r40_501.pdf
- Department of the Army. (2013). *Drill sergeant and advanced individual training platoon sergeant programs* (TRADOC Regulation 350-16). Retrieved from <http://www.tradoc.army.mil/tpubs/regs/TR350-16.pdf>
- Department of the Army. (2015a). *SHARP guidebook*. Retrieved from <http://www.eur.army.mil/SHARP/files/SHARPGuidebook.pdf>
- Department of the Army. (2015b). *What is sexual assault?* Retrieved from http://www.sexualassault.army.mil/Template-sexualAssault.cfm?page=what_is_sexual
- Department of the Army. (2015c). *What is sexual harassment?* Retrieved from http://www.sexualassault.army.mil/Template-SexualHarassment.cfm?PAGE=what_is_harassment

- Department of the Army. (2016a). *I. A.M. Strong: What is I. A.M. Strong?* Retrieved from <http://www.sexualassault.army.mil/Template-IamStrong.cfm?page=what-is>
- Department of the Army. (2016b). *SHARP: Prevention and training: Overview*. Retrieved from http://www.sexualassault.army.mil/Template-preventionAndTran.cfm?page=prevention_overview.cfm
- Doe, D. (2015). Army means well, falls short in sexual assault cases. *Army Magazine*, 65(3), 23-24. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=769453f7-2431-4da3-9657-52e9d2189a8d%40sessionmgr111&vid=1&hid=105>
- Drill Sergeant. (1996). *Army Reserve Magazine*, 41(3), 2. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=57977dfa-3de9-4eab-af25-5ee250c73f2c%40sessionmgr110&vid=0&hid=115&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#AN=9064605&db=mth>
- Druzin, H. (2015, June 10). New protection against discrimination of gays, lesbians in military. *Stars and Stripes*. Retrieved from <http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/06/10/new-protection-against-discrimination-of-gays-lesbians-military.html>
- Dyer, K. (1990). *Memorandum from Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Craig Alderman, Jr. to PERSEREC Director (Jan. 18, 1989), in Gays in Uniform: The*

Pentagon's secret reports 101. New York, NY: Alyson Publications. Retrieved from http://sldn.3cdn.net/e807e9d141ebfd7326_lpm6bxv7w.pdf

Endicott, B. (2010). Veterans fight for DADT repeal. *Outlook: Columbus*, 15(1), 14.

Retrieved from

<http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=9&sid=8c532937-2a08-4eb9-aa73-af0401f502ed%40sessionmgr112&hid=116>

Englander, M. (2012). The interview: Data collection in descriptive phenomenological human scientific research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 43(1), 13-

35. Retrieved from

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=d966f71f-d467-4a1b-b9c6-3e2c0ae4b493%40sessionmgr4001&vid=0&hid=4109>

Escoffier, J. (1985). Sexual revolution and the politics of gay identity. *Socialist Review*, 15(4), 126–196. Washington DC: University of California Press. Retrieved from http://www.williamapercy.com/wiki/images/Sexual_Revolution_and_the_Politics.pdf

Eskridge, W. (1997). Challenging the apartheid of the closet: Establishing conditions for lesbian and gay intimacy, nomos, and citizenship. *Hofstra Law Review*, 25, 920.

Retrieved from

http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2511&context=fs_s_papers

- Estrada, A. X., Dirosa, G. A., & Decostanza, A. H. (2013). Gays in the U.S. military: Reviewing the research and conceptualizing a way forward. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(2/3), 327-355. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=56804c50-211f-4793-9140-1e451cc0047e%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4201>
- Family Research Council. (2016). *Vision and mission statements*. Retrieved from <http://www.frc.org/mission-statement>
- Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Notes from the margins: Integrating lesbian experience into the vocational psychology of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 160–175. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001879196900160?via%3Dihub>
- Fenoglio, J. (2010, March 17). Dan Choi: DADT a hate crime. *Windy City Times*. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9fa55c99-9f49-40f7-a64d-908a5dedab12%40sessionmgr4002&vid=0&hid=4201>
- Ferguson, M. (2010). Review of the book unfriendly fire: How the gay ban undermines the military and threatens America. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(1), 191–195. doi:10.1080/00918360903446093

- Flood, M. (2008). Men, sex, and homosociality: How bonds between men shape their sexual relations with women. *Men and Masculinities, 10*(3), 339-359. Retrieved from <http://www.xyonline.net/sites/default/files/Flood,%20Men,%20sex,%20and%20homosociality.pdf>
- Foran, H. M., & Adler, A. B. (2013). Trainee perceptions of drill sergeant qualities during basic combat training. *Military Psychology, 25*(6), 577-587. doi:10.1037/mil0000023
- Ford, Z. (2014, December 1). Why trans people are still banned from the military. *Think Progress*. Retrieved from <http://thinkprogress.org/lgbt/2014/12/01/3597846/transgender-military-technicality/>
- Freedom to Marry Organization. (2015). *The Defense Marriage Act*. Retrieved from <http://www.freedomtomarry.org/states/entry/c/doma>
- Friskopp, A., & Silverstein, S. (1996). *Straight jobs, gay lives: Gay and lesbian professionals, the Harvard Business School, and the American workplace*. New York, NY: Touchstone/Simon & Schuster.
- Gates, T. G. (2011). Why employment discrimination matters: Well-being, and the queer employee. *Workplace Rights, 16*(1), 107-123. doi:10.2190/WR.16.1.g
- Gates, T. G., & Rodgers, C. G. (2014). Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell as a policy window: A case for the passage of the Employment Nondiscrimination Act.

International Journal of Discrimination and the Law, 14(1), 5-18.

doi:10.1177/1358229113500419

General Accountability Office. (1992a, January 28). *Defense force management: DOD's policy on homosexuality* (GAO report). Retrieved from

<http://archive.gao.gov/d33t10/146980.pdf>

General Accounting Office. (1992b, January 28). *Defense force management: Statistics related to DOD's policy on homosexuality* (GAO report). Retrieved from

<http://www.library.vanderbilt.edu/govdb/GAONSAID9298S.pdf>

Gervais, M. (2008). *Violating the sacred trust: Sexual misconduct in initial training*.

Carlisle Barracks, PA: US Army War College. Retrieved from

handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA479653

Gibson, E. L. (1978). *Crittenden Report*. In Gibson, E. L. (1978). *Get off my ship: Ensign Bern v. The U.S. Navy*. New York, NY: Avon.

Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology: A modified Husserlian approach*. University of Michigan, MI: Duquesne University Press.

GLAAD Media. (2015). *GLAAD media reference guide—transgender issues*. Retrieved

from <http://www.glaad.org/reference/transgender>

GoArmy. (2016). *Drill sergeant school*. Retrieved from [http://www.goarmy.com/soldier-](http://www.goarmy.com/soldier-life/being-a-soldier/ongoing-training/specialized-schools/drill-sergeant-school.html)

[life/being-a-soldier/ongoing-training/specialized-schools/drill-sergeant-school.html](http://www.goarmy.com/soldier-life/being-a-soldier/ongoing-training/specialized-schools/drill-sergeant-school.html)

- Goldich, D., & Webb, A. (2010, July). Taking sides: Repealing 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell.' *Proceedings Magazine*, 136(7), 66-67. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/612865830?accountid=14872>
- Gonsiorek, J. C., & Weinrich, J. D. (1991). *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Government Accountability Office. (2008a). *Military personnel: Actions needed to strengthen implementation and oversight of DOD's and the Coast Guard's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-08-1146T>
- Government Accountability Office. (2008b). *Military personnel: The DOD and Coast Guard academies have taken steps to address incidents of sexual harassment and assault, but greater federal oversight is needed* (GAO-08-296). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/280/271245.pdf>
- Government Accountability Office. (2012). *Military personnel: Prior GAO work on DOD's actions to prevent and respond to sexual assault in the military*. Retrieved from the <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-571R>
- Government Printing Office. (1996). *DOMA*. Retrieved from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-104hr3396enr/pdf/BILLS-104hr3396enr.pdf>
- Government Publication Office. (2010). *Title 10—Armed Forces* (U.S.C. 654). Retrieved from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2010-title10/pdf/USCODE-2010-title10-subtitleA-partII-chap37-sec654.pdf>

- Gregory, L. (2004). Back to the basics. *Soldiers*, 59(5), 24-27. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=052da9e5-5a8e-45ff-9499-0ea78d0300ed%40sessionmgr114&vid=0&hid=115>
- Grevatt, M. (2000, November 10). What a difference a fight makes: How we beat Chrysler. *Pride at Work*. Retrieved from <http://www.prideatwork.org/public/documents/press/2000/What%20A%20Difference%20A%20Fight%20Makes%20How%20We%20Beat%20Chrysler.pdf>
- Grindley, L. (2012, April 16). Tammy Baldwin reacts with rally call to Obama's executive order decision. *The Advocate*. Retrieved from <http://www.advocate.com/business/2012/04/16/tammy-baldwin-reacts-rally-cry-obama-executive-order-decision>
- Hart, T. C., & Miethe, T. D. (2008). Exploring bystander presence and intervention in nonfatal violence victimization: When does helping really help? *Violence and Victims*, 23(5), 637-651. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.5.637
- Hartman, A. (1993). Out of the closet: Revolution and backlash. *Social Work*, 38(3), 245-360. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=655fc985-2a7f-421b-9277-7eea7bdc5a31%40sessionmgr4005&vid=0&hid=4212>
- Hensell, C. (2009). *The bystander effect*. Retrieved from http://azrapevention.org/sites/azrapevention.org/files/Bystander_Effect_oct_0.pdf

- Herek, G. M. (2000). *The psychology of sexual prejudice: Current direction in psychological science*. Retrieved from http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/sexual_prejudice_pre.pdf
- Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond homophobia: Thinking about sexual stigma and prejudice in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 1(3), 6–24. doi:10.1525/srsp.2004.1.2.6
- Herek, G. M. (2012). *Lesbians and gay men in the U.S. military: Historical background*. Retrieved from http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/faculty_sites/rainbow/html/military_history.html
- Herek, G. M., & Berrill, K. (1992). *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., & Cogan, J. C. (2009). Internalized stigma among sexual minority adults: Insights from a social psychological perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(2), 32–43. doi:10.1037/a0014672
- Herek, G. M., Jobe, J. B., & Ralph, M. C. (1993). *Out in force: Sexual orientation and the military*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Herz, Z. R. (2014). Price's progress: Sex stereotyping and its potential for antidiscrimination law. *Yale Law Journal*, 124(2), 396-446. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5c5e25de-9887-4707-a2f9-2261016506b1%40sessionmgr102&vid=0&hid=110>

- Hill, R. M. (2011). Soldiers all. *Military Review*, 91(6), 46-48. Retrieved from
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=b114ff8d-d642-4504-acd0-33cdf7152542%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4209>
- Holleran, A. (2014). On being drafted. *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 21(1), 29-30. Retrieved from
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=8f3beb25-7de1-4678-aad7-27b77b40924c%40sessionmgr4002&vid=0&hid=420>
- Hull, A. (2003, December 4). How Don't Tell translates: The military needs linguists, but it does not want this one. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from
http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/lncui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T23400373413&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T23400346283&cisb=22_T23400373416&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=8075&docNo=2
- Human Resources Command. (2015). *Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell*. Retrieved from
<http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/the-repeal-of-dont-ask-dont-tell>
- Human Rights Campaign. (2012). *Statewide laws and employment policies*. Retrieved from
http://www.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/Employment_Laws_and_Policies.pdf
- InfoWorld. (2016). *Sexual orientation issues*. Retrieved from
<http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/lncui2api/results/docview/do>

cview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T23400346279&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T23400346283&cisb=22_T23400346282&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=7996&docNo=3

Jenkins, V. (2013, July 23). Region colleges create programs to make gay students feel included on campus. *The Fayetteville Observer*. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T23400346279&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T23400346283&cisb=22_T23400346282&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=411018&docNo=1

Johnson, I. (2013). Gay and gray: The need for federal regulation of assisted living facilities and the inclusion of LGBT individuals. *The Journal of Gender, Race & Justice*, 16(1), 293. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T23401231509&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T23401231516&cisb=22_T23401231515&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=167227&docNo=14

Johnson, R. E. (2014). Send your best to TRADOC: We'll send them back better than we got them. *Engineer*, 44(3), 10-13. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=06e59c0e-677e-49ae-acdd-49cb90aa8856%40sessionmgr198&vid=0&hid=115>

Johnson, W. B., Rosenstein, J. E., Burke, R. A., & Haldeman, D. C. (2015). After Don't Ask Don't Tell: Competent care of lesbian, gay and bisexual military personnel

during the DOD policy transition. *Professional*, 46(2), 107-115.

doi:10.1037/a0033051

Kaiser, C. (1998). *The gay metropolis: The landmark history of gay life in America since World War II*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Kaplan, M. (2001). Constructing queer communities: Marriage, sex, death, and other fantasies. *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical & Democratic Theory*, 8(1), 57-77. doi:10.1111/1467-8675.00215

Kaplan, M. B., & Lucas, J. H. (1994). Unlock the corporate closet. *Training & Development*, 48(1), 34–38. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/magazine/1G1-15087574/unlocking-the-corporate-closet>

Kier, E. (1998). Homosexuals in the U.S. military: Open integration and combat effectiveness. *International Security*, 23(2), 5–39. In Belkin, A., & Embser-Herbert, M. S. (2002). A modest proposal: Privacy as a flawed rationale for the exclusion of gays and lesbians from the U.S. military. *International Security*, 27(2), 178-197. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2539378>

Kim, C. (2009). The drill sergeant of the year competition 2009. *Soldiers*, 64(9), 4-7. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=8596c680-8d77-4b23-a6c1-5cee2b0cdb59%40sessionmgr198&vid=0&hid=115>

- King, S. (2009). Virtually normal Mark Bingham, the war on terror, and the sexual politics of sport. *Journal of Sports and Social Issues*, 33(1), 5-24.
doi:10.1177/0193723508328631
- Kleiman, L. S., Kass, D. S., Wackerfuss, A., & Benek-Rivera, J. (2007). Fighting back: Legal options for same-sex harassment victims. *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*, 12(4), 303-312. doi:10.2190/IE.12.4.c
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Larwood, L., Glasser, E., & McDonald, R. (1980). Attitudes of male and female cadets toward military sex integration. *Sex Roles*, 6(3), 381-390.
doi:10.1007/BF00287359
- Lee, J. A. (1977). Going public: A study in the sociology of homosexual liberation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3(6), 261-263. doi:10.1300/J082v03n01_05
- Leonard, A. S. (1993). Sexual orientation and the workplace: A rapidly developing field. *Labor Law Journal*, 44(9), 574-583. Retrieved from
http://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1132&context=fac_articles_chapters
- Leone, R. M., Parrott, D. J., Swartout, K. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2016). Masculinity and bystander attitudes: Moderating effects of masculine gender role stress. *Psychology of Violence*, 6(1), 82-90. doi:10.1037/a0038926

- Levine, M. P., & Leonard, R. (1984). Discrimination against lesbians in the work force. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 9(4), 700-710.
doi:10.1086/494094
- Lyall, S. (2005, February 22). New course by Royal Navy: A campaign to recruit gays. *New York Times*, A1. Retrieved from
http://www.nytimes.com/2005/02/22/world/europe/new-course-by-royal-navy-a-campaign-to-recruit-gays.html?_r=0
- Maginnis, R. (2011). *Congress should be skeptical of Pentagon's biased and incomplete surveys on homosexuality in the military*. Retrieved from
<http://downloads.frc.org/EF/EF11D16.pdf>
- Malinowitz, H. (1995). *Textual orientations: Lesbian and gay students and the making of discourse communities*. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton Cook.
- Marsch, J., & Keltner, D. (2006). *We are all bystanders*. Retrieved from
http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/we_are_all_bystanders/
- Martinez, L. R., & Hebl, M. R. (2010). Additional agents of change in promoting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered inclusiveness in organizations. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 3(1), 82-85. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2009.01203.x
- Mattocks, K. M., Kauth, M. R., Sandfort, T., Matza, A. R., Sullivan, C. J., & Shipherd, J. C. (2013). Understanding health-care needs of sexual and gender minority veterans: How targeted research and policy can improve health. *LGBT Health*, 1(1), 30-37. doi:10.1089/lgbt.2013.0003

- Mattson, J. (2013, February 5). Preventing and responding to sexual assault. *NCO Journal*, 22(2), 16-18. Retrieved from <http://ncojournal.dodlive.mil/2013/02/05/preventing-and-responding-to-sexual-assault/>
- McDaniel, M. (1989). *Welcome to the Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.dhra.mil/perserec/>
- McLean, C., & Singer, P. W. (2010, June 14). Don't Ask Don't Tell. *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/365597029?accountid=14872>
- McVeigh, K. (2011, September 20). America: Don't Ask, Don't Tell - just be proud. U.S. lifts ban on openly gay troops: Obama welcomes repeal of 18-year military policy of cover-up and discrimination. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/sep/20/us-military-lifts-ban-gay-troops>
- Mehra, B. (2002). Bias in qualitative research: Voices from an online classroom. *The Qualitative Report*, 7(1), 1-19. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR7-1/mehra.html>
- Mercury, H. (1989). *U.S. military's days of change*. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T23301868833&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T23301868809&cisb=22_T23301868835&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=244810&docNo=3
- Mickens, E. (1994). Including sexual orientation in diversity programs and policies. *Employment Relations Today*, 21(3), 263-275. doi:10.1002/ert.3910210303

- Miller, K., & Cray, A. (2013). *The battles that remain: Military service and LGBT equality*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/report/2013/09/20/74883/the-battles-that-remain-military-service-and-lgbt-equality/>
- Miller, M. K., & Chamberlain, J. (2013). How religious characteristics are related to attitudes toward GLB individuals and GLB rights. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 9*(5), 449-473. doi:10.1080/1550428X.2013.825218
- Misso, L. L. (2014). Response: The key to sexual assault prevention. *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, 140*(2), 79. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=a03f94c2-9e24-4121-8abe-7e3edb63a6a6%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4204&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#AN=94422885&db=mth>
- Morin, S. (1977). Heterosexual bias in psychological research on lesbianism and male homosexuality. *American Psychologist, 32*, 629-637. doi:10.1300/J082v13n01_03
- Morrow, D. (2004). Transgender adolescents. Social work practice with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transsexual adolescents. *Families in Society, 85*(1). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/230162051?accountid=14872>
- Morrow, D., & Battles, K. (2015). *Sexual identities and the media: An introduction*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group.

- Mostert, W. (2008). *Phenomenology: Discovering new meanings of pedagogy within the lived experience*. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2002/mos02453.pdf>
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research design: Design, methodology, and applications*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce. (2009, September 28). Taskforce's work to end discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans. *Daily Kos*. Retrieved from <http://www.thetaskforce.org/issues/nondiscrimination/timeline>
- Newport, F. (1998, July 25). Americans more likely to believe sexual orientation due to environment, not genetics. *The Gallup Poll Monthly*, 14-16. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/4186/americans-remain-more-likely-believe-sexual-orientation-due-envi.aspx>
- Ng, S. W., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. T. (2012). Anticipated discrimination and a career choice in nonprofit: A study of early career lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered job seekers. *Review of Personnel Administration*, 32(4), 332-352.
doi:10.1177/0734371X12453055
- Nguyen, H. (n.d.). Irrational prejudice: The military's exclusion of gay, lesbian, and bisexual service members after *Romer v. Evans*. *Hastings. Constitutional Law*

- Quarterly*, 28, 461-504. Retrieved from
<http://www.hastingsconlawquarterly.org/archives/V28/I2/Nguyen.pdf>
- Northeastern University. (n.d.). *Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide: Qualitative research methods overview*. Retrieved from
<http://www.ccs.neu.edu/course/is4800sp12/resources/qualmethods.pdf>
- Nussbaum, M. (1999). *Sex and social justice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Obama, B. H. (2010, December 22). *Remarks on signing the Don't Ask, Don't Tell repeal act of 2010*. *Daily compilation of presidential documents*. Retrieved from
<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2010/12/22/remarks-president-and-vice-president-signing-dont-ask-dont-tell-repeal-a>
- Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army. (2015, December 3). *Full integration of women in the Army* (Army memorandum). Retrieved from
<https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/OSD014303-15.pdf>
- O'Keefe, E. (2010, November 30). Don't Ask, Don't Tell survey released. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://voices.washingtonpost.com/federal-eye/2010/07/a_pentagon_survey_sent_this.html
- Ord, A., Eisenhauer, L., & Wynaden, D. (2001). Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(1), 93-96. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2001.00093.x
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Pelts, M. D., Rolbiecki, A. J., & Albright, D. L. (2014). Wounded bonds: A review of the social work literature on gay, lesbian and bisexual military service members and

veterans. *Journal of Social Work*, 15(2), 207-220.

doi:10.1177/1468017314548120

Pew Research Center. (2010, November 29). Most continue to favor gays serving openly in military. *U.S. Politics & Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2010/11/29/most-continue-to-favor-gays-serving-openly-in-military/>

Pinch, F. C. (1994). *Perspectives on organizational change in the Canadian force*.

Fort Belvoir, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Science.

Prado, R. J. (2011). Beyond Don't Ask, Don't Tell. *Just Out*, 28(21), 12-13. Retrieved from

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=76bcbff6-7e90-42c4-a57a-32ed0b51a1de%40sessionmgr4003&vid=0&hid=4201>

Prati, G., & Pietrantonio, L. (2014). Coming out and job satisfaction: A moderated mediation model. *Career Development Quarterly*, 62(4), 358-371.

doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2014.00088.x

Priest, D. (1999, January 23). Number of recruits discharged for being gay increases for fifth year. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/docview/408430052?accountid=1487>

- Priola, V., Lasio, D., Simine, S. D., & Serri, F. (2014). The sound of silence: Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender discrimination in inclusive organizations. *British Journal of Management*, 25(3), 488-502. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12043
- Psychology Today. (2015). *What is the bystander effect?* New York, NY: Sussex Publishers LLC. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/basics/bystander-effect>
- Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1244-1261. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1244
- Raja, S., & Stokes, J. (1998). Assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: The modern homophobia scale. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity*, 3(2), 113–134. doi:10.1023/A:1023244427281
- RAND Corporation. (2010). *Sexual orientation and U.S. military personnel policy: An update of RAND's 1993 study*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG1056.pdf
- Ratliff, W. L. (1996). Upholding Don't Ask, Don't Tell. *The Yale Law Journal*, 106(2), 531-536. Retrieved from <http://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/to-young-people-a8220dona8217t-ask-dona8217t-tella8221-means-a8220dona8217t-enlista8221>
- Rau, P. (2008). Still serving in silence. *Women: A Cultural Review*, 19(3), 325-327. doi:10.1080/09574040802414022

- Raudonis, B. M. (1992). Ethical considerations in qualitative research with hospice patients. *Qualitative Health Research*, 2(2), 238-249.
doi:10.1177/104973239200200207
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Reasons, C., & Hughson, Q. (2000). Violence against gays and lesbians. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 30(1/2), 137-159. doi:10.1300/J076v30n01_09
- Reed, B. J. (1999). Gender integrated basic training: A theoretical analysis of the continuing debate. *Minerva*, 17(2), 18-32. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/222836201?accountid=14872>
- Reinke, S. J., & Smith, T. G. (n.d.). Out and serving proudly: Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell. *Politics and Policy*, 39(6), 925-948. doi:10.1111/j.1747-1346.2011.00331
- Religious Tolerance. (2010). *History of U.S. military policies towards gays from 1776 to 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_mili3.htm
- Rich, C., Schutten, J. K., & Rogers, R. A. (2012). Don't drop the soap: Organizing sexualities in the repeal of the U.S. military's Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. *Communication Monographs*, 79(3), 269-29. doi:10.1080/03637751.2012.697633
- Rivera, R. R. (1999). Our straight-laced judges: Twenty years later. *Hastings Law Journal*, 50(4), 1179-1198. Retrieved from <http://resolver.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/openurl?genre=article&atitle=Our+straight-laced+judges%3a+twenty+years+later&title=Hastings+Law+Journal&issn=0017>

8322&isbn=&volume=50&issue=4&date=19990401&aulast=Rivera%2c+Rhonda
+R.&spage=1179&pages=&sid=EBSCO%3aedsglt%3aedsgcl.59869306&site=ftf
-live

Rockwell, D. (2013). Through analysis. *Humanistic Psychologist*, 41(1), 90-91.

doi:10.1080/08873267.2012.724273

Rubicon Planning. (2011). *Military terms and definitions*. Retrieved from

<http://www.militaryterms.net/v>

Saldin, R. P. (2011). Strange bedfellows: War and minority rights. *World Affairs*, 173(6),
57-66. Retrieved from

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?si>

d=25f81732-7ef3-449b-bbfd-

d3887be71414%40sessionmgr4001&vid=0&hid=4201

Salmivalli, C. (2009). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent
Behavior*, 15(2), 112-120. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing &
Health*, 18(2), 179-183. doi:10.1002/nur.4770180211

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sargeant, J. (2012). Qualitative research part II: Participants, analysis, and quality
assurance. *Journal of Graduate Medical Evaluation*, 4(1), 1-3.

doi:10.4300/JGME-D-11-00307.1

Saumure, K., & Givens, L. M. (2008). Rigor in qualitative research. In the *Encyclopedia
of Qualitative Research Methods*. doi:10.4135/9781412963909.n186 1

- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Seager, T. (2013). *Introduction to social ethics*. Retrieved from <http://sustainabilityethics.com/tag/bystander-effect/>
- Segal, D. R. (1999). Diversity in the American military. *Sociological Forum*, 14(3), 531-539. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=342194a0-9086-4a80-8a1e-f8387d840073%40sessionmgr111&vid=0&hid=116>
- Service Legal Defense Network. (n.d.). *A guide to Don't Ask, Don't Tell*. Retrieved from http://sldn.3cdn.net/52cda64370ee816e52_zvm6bekat.pdf
- Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. (n.d.). *About Don't Ask Don't Tell*. Retrieved from <http://www.sldn.org/pages/about-dadt>
- Servicemembers Legal Network. (n.d.). *Fact sheet: About Department of Defense-commissioned reports*. Retrieved from http://sldn.3cdn.net/e807e9d141ebfd7326_lpm6bxv7w.pdf
- Shilts, R. (1993). *Conduct unbecoming: Gays and lesbians in the U.S. military*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Sieber, J. E. (1998). Planning ethically responsible research. In Bickman, L., & Rog, D. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of applied social research methods*, 127–156. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Singleton, R. A., & Straits B. C. (2005). *Approaches to social research* (4th ed.). New

York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Smart, L., & Wegner, D. M. (1999). Covering up what cannot be seen: Concealable stigma and mental control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), 474–486. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.474
- Smart, L., & Wegner, D. M. (2000). The hidden costs of hidden stigma. In Heatherton, T. F., Kleck, R. E., Hebl, M. R., & Hull, J. G. (Eds.). (2003). *The Social Psychology of Stigma*. New York, New York: Guilford Press.
- Smith, J. D., Twemlow, S. W., & Hoover, D. W. (1999). Bullies, victims, and bystanders: A method of in school intervention and possible parental contributions. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 30(1), 29–37.
doi:10.1023/A:1022619025074
- Snyder, T. L. (1995). Lessons learned at school pay off. *Marines*, 24(7), 23. Retrieved from
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=ad40d455-5440-44c9-91e4-3eec2fc3798b%40sessionmgr4002&vid=0&hid=4206&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#AN=9509275520&db=mth>
- Spincic, T. B. (2014). Combating sexual assault in the Army. *Army Magazine*, 64(3), 55-56. Retrieved from
http://www1.ausa.org/publications/armymagazine/archive/2014/Documents/03March/SpincicREDUX_March2014.pdf

- Spitko, G. (2012). Symposium: The workplace law agenda of the Obama administration: Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Employment discrimination as a means for social cleansing. *Employee Rights & Employment Policy Journal*, 16(1) 179-209.
Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/facpubs/573/>
- Targeted News Service. (2010). *Civil and human rights coalition: Continuance of DADT an insult to gay and lesbian veterans and service member*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/pqcentral/docview/818572918/fulltext/C8CF7164CB3F45CDPQ/5?accountid=14872>
- Tejeda, M. (2006). Nondiscrimination policies and sexual identity disclosure: Do they make a difference in employee outcomes? *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, 18(1), 45-59. doi:10.1007/s10672-005-9004-5
- Texas Tech University. (2015). *LGBTQ pamphlet*. Retrieved from http://www.depts.ttu.edu/scc/virtual_library/handout_1.php
- Thompson, J. R. (1984). *Proposed recruit training topic: Rape awareness* (Training Analysis and Evaluation Group Tech. Note No. 1-84). Orlando, FL: U.S. Naval Training Equipment Center.
- Thompson, M. (1997, February 17). Sergeants at odds. *Time*, 149(7). Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=888956da-e7eb-4054-a8aa-d6386be94af1%40sessionmgr4001&vid=0&hid=4204&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#AN=9702114219&db=mth>

- Thompson, M. (2013, February 4). The battle of Fort Bragg: Gays in uniform are still fighting for spousal benefits. *Time*, 181(4), 10. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/detail/detail?sid=44a1bf08-0a56-43f1-a4d2-c4acd1e5cc57%40sessionmgr4005&vid=1&hid=4209&bdata=JnNjb3BIPXNpdGU%3d#db=mth&AN=85504533>
- Trau, N. C., & Hartel, E. J. (2007). Contextual factors affecting quality of work life and career attitudes of gay men. *Employee Responsibility and Rights Journal*, 19(3), 207-219. doi:10.1007/s10672-007-9046-y
- Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.
- Truman Library. (n.d.). *This day in Truman history July 26, 1948 President Truman issues Executive Order No. 9981 desegregating the military*. Retrieved from <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/anniversaries/desegblurb.htm>
- Tungol, J. R. (2012, September 20). Don't Ask, Don't Tell one-year repeal anniversary: 25 amazing moments. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/20/dont-ask-dont-tell-repeal-anniversary_n_1891519.html
- Turchik, J. A., & Wilson, S. M. (2010). Sexual assault in the U.S. military: A review of the literature and recommendations for the future. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(4), 267-277. Retrieved from

<http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/science/article/pii/S1359178910000145>

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2015). *Diversity and inclusion:*

Introductory training on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender inclusion in the federal government. Retrieved from

https://hru.gov/Documents/Ambassadors/Introductory_Training_on_LGBT_inclusion_in_the_Federal_Government3.pdf

U.S. Army War College. (2014). *Preparing to prevent: Conflict-related sexual violence mitigation scenario-based training.* Retrieved from

https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/186090/CRSV_Training_Scenarios_Preparing_to_Prevent.pdf

USA Today. (2011, November 30). Our view on gays in the military: Survey provides new fodder for Don't Ask, Don't Tell repeal. *USA Today.* Retrieved from

http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2010-12-01-editorial01_ST_N.htm

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2015). *LGBT program.* Retrieved from

<http://www.diversity.va.gov/programs/lgbt.aspx>

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2016). *Sex-based discrimination.*

Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sex.cfm>

Vistica, G. L., & Brant, M. (1996, November 24). Rape in the ranks. *Newsweek*, 128(22).

Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/rape-ranks-176260>

- Wallenberg, J., Anspach, A., & Leon, A. M. (2011). Student degree program and attitudes toward gays and lesbians in the military: Is there a connection? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58(4), 476-496. doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.555668
- Walton, D. (2010, March 29). Military buddies: It's time to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell. *Lincoln Journal Star*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/247794945?accountid=14872>
- Wang, P., & Schwarz, J. L. (2010). Stock price reactions to GLBT nondiscrimination policies. *Human Resource Management*, 49(2), 195-216. doi:10.1002/hrm.20341
- Ward, J., & Winstanley, D. (2005). Coming out at work: Performativity and the recognition and renegotiation of identity. *The Sociological Review*, 53(3), 447-475. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00561.x
- Westat. (2010). *Support to the DOD comprehensive review working group analyzing the impact of repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Volume 1: Findings from the surveys*. Retrieved from http://www.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/Vol%201%20Findings%20From%20the%20Surveys.pdf
- Wilder, H., & Wilder, J. (2012). In the wake of Don't Ask Don't Tell: Suicide prevention and outreach for lesbian, bisexual, gay service members. *Military Psychology*, 24(6), 624-642. doi:10.1080/08995605.2012.737725
- Wolinsky, M., & Sherrill, K. (1993). *Gays and the military*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Worthen, M. (2013). An argument for separate analyses of attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual men, bisexual women, male to female and female to male transgender individuals. *Sex Roles*, 68(11/12), 703-723. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0155-1

Zuniga, J. (1993). *My life in the military closet*. Retrieved from http://ic.galegroup.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ic/ovic/NewsDetailsPage/NewsDetailsWindow?disableHighlighting=false&displayGroupName=News&currPage=&scanId=&query=&source=&prodId=OVIC&search_within_results=&p=OVIC&mode=view&catId=&u=minn4020&limiter=&display-query=&displayGroups=&contentModules=&action=e&sortBy=&documentId=GALE%7CA296350414&windowstate=normal&activityType=&failOverType=&commentary=

Zurbriggen, E. (2010). Rape, war, and the socialization of masculinity: Why our refusal to give up war ensures that rape cannot be eradicated. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34(4), 538-549. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01603.x

Appendix A: Memorandum Authorizing Women to Serve in Most or All Combat Roles

The following memorandum authorized the full integration of women in the Army on December 4, 2015.

Yesterday the secretary of defense directed the full integration of women in the armed forces following a 30-day review period required by Congress. The purpose of allowing all soldiers, regardless of gender, to serve in any U.S. MOS for which they are qualified is to increase our U.S. military effectiveness. The Army will provide our final, detailed implementation plan to the secretary of defense no later than January 1, 2016. Subject to his approval, we will begin implementing our integration plan to open all MOSs, career fields, and branches for accession by women as soon as practicable, following January 2, 2016, but not later than April 1, 2016. Our best qualified, regardless of gender, will now be afforded the opportunity to serve in any MOS. Our detailed and deliberate implementation plan will maintain the readiness of our force and ensure we remain a standards-based Army. This methodical plan will establish and enforce MOS-specific and gender-neutral standards based on the rigors of ground combat. Done properly, the integration of women into all MOSs will improve combat readiness and make our Army better. Readiness is our top priority. Our Army exists to fight and win the nation's wars. An incremental and phased approach by leaders and soldiers who understand and enforce gender-neutral standards will ensure successful integration of women across the breadth and depth of our formations. We are honored to serve with all of you who have taken an oath to support and defend our Constitution and demonstrate the values that make our nation great. ARMY STRONG!

Eric K. Fanning, Acting Secretary of the Army

Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, 2015

Appendix B: Pentagon/RAND Survey

The following questions were released by the Department of Defense (DOD) in the Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT), November 30, 2010:

Question 34: Do you currently serve with a male or female service member you believe to be homosexual?

Question 35: In your career, have you ever worked in a unit with a leader you believed to be homosexual?

Question 36: In your career, have you ever worked in a unit with a coworker you believed to be homosexual?

Question 37: In your career, have you ever worked in a unit with a subordinate you believed to be homosexual?

Question 38: In the unit where you had a leader you believed to be gay or lesbian, about how many other unit members also believed the leader to be gay or lesbian?

Question 40: Among all the factors that affect how well a unit works together, how much did the unit members’ belief that this leader was gay or lesbian affect the unit’s ability to work together?

Question 46: In the unit where you had a coworker you believed to be gay or lesbian, about how many other unit members also believed the coworker to be gay or lesbian?

Question 48: Among all the factors that affect how well a unit works together, how much did the unit members’ belief that this coworker was gay or lesbian affect the unit’s ability to work together?

Question 54: In the unit where you had a subordinate you believed to be gay or lesbian, about how many other unit members also believed the subordinate to be gay or lesbian?

Question 56: Among all the factors that affect how well a unit works together, how much did the unit members' belief that this subordinate was gay or lesbian affect the unit's ability to work together?

Question 65: Among all the factors that affect a unit's performance in combat, how much did the belief that the service member was gay or lesbian affect the unit's combat performance?

Question 67a: If DADT is repealed, how easy or difficult do you think it will be for leadership as they start implementing the policy to hold service members to the high standards of U.S. military personal conduct regardless of their sexual orientation?

Question 67b: If DADT is repealed, how easy or difficult do you think it will be for leadership as they start implementing the policy to... Treat service members in the same manner regardless of their sexual orientation?

Question 67c: If DADT is repealed, how easy or difficult do you think it will be for leadership as they start implementing the policy to... Provide the same opportunities to all service members regardless of their sexual orientation?

Question 67d: If DADT is repealed, how easy or difficult do you think it will be for leadership as they start implementing the policy to... Make sure all service members are treated with respect by their coworkers?

Question 68a: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect...How service members in your immediate unit work together to get the job done?

Question 68b: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect...How service members in your immediate unit pull together to perform as a team?

Question 68c: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect...How service members in your immediate unit trust each other?

Question 69d: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect the extent to which... Leaders in your immediate unit care about their service members?

Question 70b: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect your immediate unit's effectiveness at completing its mission? When a crisis or negative event happens that affects your immediate unit?

Question 72: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect how often your immediate unit socializes together off-duty?

Question 73: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would your level of morale be affected?

Question 74: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would your job performance be affected?

Question 76: If DADT is repealed, how, if at all, would the way your spouse feels about your military service be affected?

Question 77: If DADT is repealed, how, if at all, would the way your significant other feels about your military service be affected?

Question 82k: Assume DADT is repealed. How important, compared with the repeal, would the following factors be to you in deciding whether to remain in the military?

Question 85: If DADT is repealed and you are working with a service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how would that affect your own ability to fulfill your mission during combat?

Question 88: If DADT is repealed and you are assigned to share a room, berth or field tent with someone you believe to be a gay or lesbian service member, which are you most likely to do?

Question 90: If DADT is repealed and you are assigned to bathroom facilities with an open bay shower that someone you believe to be a gay or lesbian service member also used, which are you most likely to do?

Question 95: If DADT is repealed and a gay or lesbian service member participated in military family programs with a same-sex partner, which are you most likely to do?

Question 96: If DADT is repealed and you had on-base housing and a gay or lesbian service member was living with a same-sex partner on-base, what would you most likely do?

Appendix C: Recruitment Criteria

The participants met at least one of the following recruitment criteria before they were considered eligible to participate in the study:

- Veteran, nonretired DSs and DSLs who have personally experienced or witnessed instances of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination against gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) recruits within their or others' basic combat training (BCT) sites.
- Veteran, nonretired DSs and DSLs, who, if they have not personally experienced or witnessed instances of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLB recruits, how would they instead, respond in addressing and preventing such behavior against this sexual minority if they were to witness it at the time when they were on the trail (actively employed and working as DSs).
- Knowledge and training in the Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) and Intervene, Act, Motivate (I. A.M.) Strong program as is required, an annual command-led training, and other relevant programs and directives applicable to equal opportunity.
- Training and knowledge of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) policy. This policy was briefed to all DSs and DSLs before, during, and at the time of its repeal.
- Aware of the reporting requirements under DADT while it was in effect and its implications towards outed, suspected to be GLB, or soldiers or recruits caught performing homosexual sexual acts that are not in accordance with (IAW) Army policy and regulation prior to its repeal.

- Witnessed instances of sexual misconduct amongst GLBs or such conduct executed by heterosexual or other identified or suspected GLB recruits against other GLB recruits.
- Verbal or physical altercations involving GLBs regarding their sexuality, becoming outed, or being suspected or identified of the recruit's sexual orientation as GLB.
- Counseled, removed from a hostile training environment, reprimanded, or discharged a GLB because of the recruit's known or suspected GLB sexual orientation.
- Witnessed the coming out or identification of a GLB as such.
- Knowledge of recruits receiving court martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), counseled in accordance with the repealed Article 125 of the UCMJ, which, during its applicability, criminalized the intimacy between same-sex couples (Human Resource Command, 2015).

Appendix D: Interview Questions

Questions that the participants answered to support the study:

1. Have you ever witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a gay, lesbian, or bisexual (GLB) recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit? If YES, proceed below to 1.a. If NO, continue to question 2.

1.a. If you witnessed such an incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

YES/NO. If NO, continue to 1.a.1.

1.a.1. If you did not respond by addressing or preventing the incident, was it because there were other drill sergeants (DSs), military leaders, soldiers, or recruits present or did you decide to do nothing because you did not witness a GLB who was sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, or discriminated against due to his or her sexual orientation; you were not able to interpret it as an emergency; you were not able to develop a feeling of personal emergency; you simply decided not to help; or just chose not to act. YES/NO. Provide an explanation in addition to the mentioned reasons.

1.a.2. Did you not respond because of a personal bias against the GLB population whether you promoted or prevented the incident? YES/NO. If NO, provide a reason as to why you did not respond.

2. Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? YES/NO. Did you know that is no longer defined in

the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly? YES/NO

3. Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members with some instances ending in death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)? YES/NO

4. Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members? YES/NO. Continue below.

4. a. If you feel they were discriminatory, why would you or did you think so?

4.b. If you feel they were appropriate and not discriminatory, why would you or did you feel so?

5. Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies due to the requirements of DADT or other military and federal policies prohibiting homosexuality or service if openly GLB? YES/NO. If YES, continue to 5.a./b.

5.a. What type of discharge did the recruit receive?

5.b. Did you believe that the Army justified the discharge and why or why not?

6. DSs have historically been involved in name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and other practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment? YES/NO. If YES, continue to 6.a.

6.a. If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice was berating and unacceptable whether the policies were in effect or not? YES/NO

7. If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence against a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did you or would you verbally or physically confront the situation to address and prevent it from happening? YES/NO. If YES, continue to 7.a.

7.a. Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident, or did they witness the incident and do nothing to prevent it—possible signs of the bystander effect? YES/NO. If YES, continue to 7.a.1.

7.a.1. If yes, provide some detail on how they promoted, incited, encouraged the continued sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of the GLB recruits, or on other hand, how they addressed or prevented the incident(s).

8. Are you aware that under the DADT policy (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay, or found out to be gay, resulting in the removal from military service? YES/NO. If NO, continue below to 8.a./8.b./8.c.

8.a. Did you know that more than 4,000 service members refused to reenlist because of DADT's discriminatory policies (Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, n.d.)? YES/NO

8.b. Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLBs? YES/NO.

Why or why not?

8.c. Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner or ever than it was repealed or put in place? YES/NO. Continue to 8.c.1.

8.c.1. Why or why not do you or do you not support the policy
emplacement or its repeal?

9. You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training—both are annual requirements. Both programs and associated policies fail to directly address the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persist in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT? YES/NO

10. Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend the TRADOC and the Army DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994). YES/NO. Continue below to 10.a.

10.a. Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS? YES/NO. If NO, continue below to 10.a.2./10.a.3.

10.a.1. If you recommend it, why would you think this would be effective, and why?

10.a.2. If you do not think that it will be effective, why would you think so?

10.a.3. If you are indifferent to the recommendation, why do you feel you are indifferent to the proposal?

Appendix E: Participant Questions and Answers

Responses to questions by the participants:

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 1: No, I have not. I was on the trail from 2008 until 2010 and never witnessed it first-hand.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy?

Participant 1: No. I always thought that homosexuality was defined on its own.

Follow on question 2.a: It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 1: Yes. I knew that homosexuality was no longer a term used in the military's policies.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 1: Yes. I have heard this before.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members? YES/NO

Participant 1: No. The policy was not discriminatory because it kept the gay soldier's orientation to himself. Even if I knew a soldier to be gay, DADT kept it under control.

Even though sodomy was discriminatory in defining homosexuality as a wrong in the military, as a whole, I think the DADT policy was appropriate.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it because of the requirements of DADT or other military and federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 1: No. I never witnessed the discharge of a recruit from BCT.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether these actions were intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 1: Yes. DSs have a job. They are DSs because of what they do—they turn civilians into soldiers. Sometimes DSs need to use demonstrations, yell and scream to get privates to do what they are told. Today's Army is soft—less disciplined—so the need to be assertive and aggressive is sometimes necessary in order to make them soldiers. This behavior may sometimes escalate to more verbally abusive tones but as DSs we are required to train soldiers and sometimes that is what is needed.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did verbally or physically confront the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 1: Yes. Fort Knox, KY, was an all-male training site so we would always use certain verbiage that we might not use at the co-ed BCTs [homosexual comments]. The easiest example is during physical training. You have recruits lined up in formation. You have the front rank executing the bend and reach while the second squad does the knees and ankles rotation. We would indiscriminately push the innuendos as far as we could.

Follow on question: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 1: Yes. We all participated and found the jokes to be entertaining more than discriminatory or sexually harassing.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Servicemember's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay, resulting in their ultimate discharge? YES/NO

Participant 1: No. I did not know that.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB soldiers?

Participant 1: No. What one does behind closed doors does not matter to me. If they can shoot straight, run, and fight, their sexual preference has no effect on their soldier status.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner or ever than it was repealed or put in place? YES/NO

Participant 1: Uh, you know I am not so sure about the policy itself. But you know, times change. Should it have been changed [*sodomy* def.]? I would say the definition of sodomy should have been changed. Let's face it, even as a straight man, I enjoy a little fellatio now and again. I do not mind if gays serve. That is not an issue in my mind.

Follow on question 8.c.1: Why do you or do you not support the policy repeal or its emplacement?

Participant 1: I was not for the repeal of the policy. I think that DADT not only protected those with the issue about gay soldiers serving as far as not being able to ask if a recruit was gay or not, but the policy also protected those who were gay in making them keep their sexual orientation to themselves. One could not ask if you were gay and on the other hand the soldier knows that he cannot walk around shaking his hips and talk about his same-sex partner interests.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both programs fail to directly address the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 1: Yes. I am aware the gay soldiers are still harassed in the military and we did not receive any training to address or support gay soldiers or straight soldiers who had issues with gay soldiers.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 1: Yes and yes.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 1: Yes. If you are going to change a policy such as this, you need to make everyone be accepting of gay soldiers, and even though I am not fully comfortable with open service by gay soldiers, scenario-based training is the way to go. No one pays attention to the PowerPoints anyway.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 2: Yes. Um, this was the 70s and 80s. Sometimes, soldiers would identify themselves as gay to try to get a discharge from BCT. Once they did that the DSs would harass them. But, at the same time, we tried to move forward with counseling and tried to get them discharged.

Follow on question: 1.a: If you witnessed such incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

Participant 2: Yes. Sometimes. I had a recruit who took a bunch of Tylenol and tried to commit suicide. They pumped his stomach out. He was gay and he could not stand being in the shower with the other guys. This was the 70s, 50/50 chance he may be gay or he was using that to try and get out of the Army. In this particular case, he did get discharged. While he was waiting to be discharged we put him on details [extra assignments] to keep him occupied and sometimes DSs would mock him. And the one incident in which I intervened, DSs were really giving him a hard time about sucking penises. He looked at me and asked me if I was gay. Back in the 70s, there were quite a bit of gay people who wanted to get out of the Army, like I said, 50/50.

Follow on question: How did you intervene?

Participant 2: I tried to say something nice to the guy. I think there were four of us DSs, and matter of fact, he was turning in his uniforms and getting ready to leave when I tried to help him by changing the subject.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy?

Participant 2: Yes. I knew this already.

Follow on question 2.a: It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 2: Yes, I knew that.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 2: Yes, I read some articles on this.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members? YES/NO.

Continue below.

Participant 2: I do not think the policies were discriminatory. I think it was the first step toward where we are today. Uh, we did ... there were a lot of people who were GLB one way or another, whether or not there were policies against gay service, gays have always served. In 1990, when I was an instructor at the DSS, we had a master sergeant who was arrested downtown when he was caught cross-dressing. This shocked everybody. This guy had apparently been in the closet for many years, until he was arrested. If you do not tell anybody and mind your own business you can probably get away with it anyway.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit(s) either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting service if openly GLB?

Participant 2: Before DADT? Yes. In the late 70s, when we had integrated training, we had many lesbians who would occasionally assault other females who were not lesbian. These occurrences were because of lesbian affairs. The other side of that coin is that when BCT was integrated those were the two major factors...the lesbian issue and fraternization by DSs. I do not know if that has anything to do with your report, but lots of DSs ruined their careers by taking advantage of trainees and some of them were gay. My response to those DSs was I will do everything I can to have you prosecuted.

Follow on question 5.a: What type of discharge did the recruit receive?

Participant 2: I think there was a regulation type of discharge or it might have been under sodomy, I am not sure. I know it was more of an administrative discharge. They could have gotten a trainee discharge. Not any [dishonorable discharges] that I recall.

Follow on question 5.b: Was the Army just in the discharge and why or why not?

Participant 2: Yes. The soldier's platoon-mates had beaten him. I think it was just because in those days, we were not as open as today's generation. People were very guarded against gay and lesbian soldiers in the 70s and 80s.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and

openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 2: Yes. The name-calling for the most part. If you had a weak trainee who could not meet the physical training standard, we used to call wimping out. You queer or something, what's wrong with you boy? That was really common in the 70s, and they cracked down on it in the 80s. Fort Jackson, for several years, would not allow DSs to call recruits names other than their own, so you would have to refer to recruits as trainees. We found derogatory ways of calling them trainees, so then they said you have to call them soldier. So the Army was constantly trying to protect people. But yes, many times, myself included, if someone was weak we call them momma's boy, we ask them if they were gay or if something was wrong with them, in a way to help them try to see that they were weak and needed to work harder to be a better soldier. Calling somebody gay or queer was nothing compared to some of the other language we used back in those days.

Question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 2: Not really. All the DSs were part of the name-calling and it was never an issue. Back then if you spoke up about harassment, you would be seen as weak or gay yourself. I am not gay but you know what I mean.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include the physical violence of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 2: No. I was part of that group that participated. I did the name-calling and other DSs would do the same. The Army was male-oriented in training and thought. Masculinity was what the Army was used to and when women joined the Army and later attempted the Special Forces role, you knew that the Army was changing. I am not sure how I felt about women and integration of blacks in the Army and now gays, but it is what it is and this is something Washington D.C. wanted.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 2: Most of the time, we did nothing. It was a common practice. It is like in the old days, and I'll admit this, sometimes you could take a soldier in your office or outside, grab them by the collar, kind of shake them, and tell them to conform. 99% of the time, that soldier would shape up and do better. I'll never forget one I did that to, he got a "Dear John" letter from his girlfriend and said that he had to go home and I told him that he could not go home. He was in BCT and could not leave. For three nights in a row, he would come to my office and give me this same sad story. Finally, on the third time, I told the soldier, 'I am going to whup your butt.' On graduation day he came up to me with his family, shook my hand and thanked me for giving him the guidance and discipline. DSs, when they saw something like that, would kind of watch and not do anything unless it may have gotten out of hand. Grabbing them by the collar or making them do excessive pushups to let them know who was in charge. If it got to be too excessive, I would step in but never had to. This was a way to motivate and require

soldiers to execute the standards complimenting the warrior mentality. Weak soldiers were weeded out and the crying and complaining was not tolerated, not by me and not by any DS in the 70s and 80s. The Army is soft now and they tolerate more.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Servicemember's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 2: No. I was not aware the number was so high.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLBs?

Participant 2: Since I left the Army, there's no direct effect. I do not agree with it 100%, but my son is gay, and I have learned that you have to accept them and try to work with them and love them. I do not feel the policy should have been repealed.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 2: No. I supported the policy because that was the first step to allow gay people to be where they are today. If we had not done that, gay soldiers would not be allowed in now. President Clinton made that policy and it opened the door for other, new policies. DADT may not have been the perfect policy but it was a beginning policy for other policies that may be better for the gay and lesbian communities.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination

against the GLB soldier. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 2: I am not sure about the training since I got out of the Army in the early 90s. We always had those annual classes you had to go to in the 70s and 80s. Some were good while others were a fill-in-the-blank. If the issue about gay soldiers is still an issue, then the Army needs to make sure they are training the soldiers about the issue.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 2: Yes. I recommend that this type of training be added to the annual SHARP training.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 2: Yes. Training in person has always been better than the PowerPoints. Scenario-based training would be good but the Army needs to be careful how they go about requiring the training and making sure they have the right people conducting the training.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 3: Yes. There was a soldier in another platoon, he was very flamboyant and this was around DADT, but I think from my experience the soldiers accepted him, some of the alpha-male mentality soldiers would talk about him to other peers, which caused a rift. Some of his peers treated him like an outcast. He shoots 30 out of 40, better than most of his company. This was when I was on the trail in 2009. He was openly gay but no one cared about his orientation.

Follow on question 1.a: If you witnessed such incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

Participant 3: No. I did not have to step in at that particular point because his battle buddies—they put that into effect. Hey! So what if he is gay. As long as he could perform as a soldier on what the Army required of him, no one ever said anything. What made him a soldier was his ability to excel in all the Army required of him physically and mentally. What he does in the bedroom is no one's business. The few who discriminated against him would stop because they saw that he had more friends than they did.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy?

Participant 3: Yes. I knew sodomy was a violation. I did not know it was defined under sodomy.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 3: Yes. I heard about the soldier at Fort Bragg or Fort Campbell who was killed because he was gay.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 3: Yes. It was very discriminatory. Only for the very fact that you cannot be a soldier because you are homosexual or bisexual or transgender or whatever the case may be. Other armies, allies of ours, figured out a way to make it work. I think we got it wrong as a nation, as an Army. I do not know why as a free country, land of the great, what took so long to realize that sexual orientation has no effect on soldierization. We kicked out a lot of great soldiers and I know that we'll never get some of those good people back. We have a long way to go with equality in this country.

Follow on question 4.a: If you feel they were discriminatory, why would you think so?

Participant 3: This policy was very discriminatory because it tried to prevent those they considered a threat from serving. Lawmakers who make the decision in Washington D.C. know nothing about how it is at our level. The bigots who sit behind a desk when so many soldiers give up their lives for the free by the free, except the gay soldiers who those white collars know nothing about. I would give up my life for any soldier I fought with alongside me in combat. Gay or not, that has absolutely nothing to do with who

they are, and the countless of gay soldiers who gave up their lives on the battlefield even though this supposed 'Army family' was about equality and nondiscrimination.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 3: No, I did not participate in kicking out a good soldier but I saw some who got kicked out because of the Army's witch hunt trying to kick out gay soldiers. It was because of the culture of the Army and the resources that we wasted. We wasted those resources going after soldiers.

Follow on question 5.a: What type of discharge did the recruit receive?

Participant 3: I want to say it was a Chapter 15. They are administrative discharges.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 3: Yes. I actually experienced harassment by my DS when I was going through BCT as a recruit. He would pick on me. I remember this to this very day. The DS made a comment because of how I talked. A fellow soldier asked the DS why he made that comment against me. The DS was taken aback by that. He had never been challenged for his name-calling or behavior. He was challenged by that soldier who did

not back down. And if you know DSs, you know that no soldier would ever question them. But it is your duty as a soldier to question something that is not morally or legally right. When I was a DS, all the DSs knew that I was gay and that was never an issue.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 3: Yes I did. But I felt like I have been called names before. Just let me get through these 9-10 weeks. When that soldier stepped in, the DS backed down.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 3: Yes, of course. If I saw something like that, much like I did when I saw a private being made fun of. Privates are going to emulate the behavior of their leader. It was my responsibility to make sure that I was exhibiting positive behavior, the right behavior and part of that is to stop that type of behavior immediately.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 3: Not in my unit when I was a DS, but when I was a private in BCT it would happen.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Servicemember's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge? YES/NO

Participant 3: No. I was not aware of the numbers being so high. That is three brigades of soldiers. That is ridiculous and uncalled for. The Army needs to reevaluate its response to such discrimination.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 3: No. My sexuality does not make me a good soldier. That is just a part of who I am. I elect to not wear my sexuality on my sleeve. I am not flamboyant in my behavior. I conduct myself in a professional military manner all the time. I do think there is still a long ways to go.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 3: Yes. It should never have been in place. Secondly, once it was in place, they should have repealed it. People in the military are scared of change. This is the first huge change since we integrated African Americans and women in combat roles. This policy was a self-inflicted wound that we have inflicted on ourselves as a culture and organization.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination

against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 3: Yes. This policy is made at the top, far above my pay-grade. Congress, the Pentagon, and the president supported this discriminatory policy at its initiation.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 3: Yes. Bring GLB scenario-based training to the BCTs. In the BCTs with the recruits is where you can instill the most change. Training them about the importance of tolerance and acceptance can only be made at that level with the most positive impact.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 3: Yes. Training for this always begins at the DSS. If you are going to train soldiers about change, the DSS is where it must begin so that the DSs can train their recruits and soldiers in their units.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit? If YES, proceed below to 1.a. If no, continue to question 2.

Participant 4: Yes. In one instance I witnessed it. But I was not the SHARP representative, so the private, who was lesbian, was supposedly trying to get a swinger party in the barracks with males and females, up to and including planning the event. Another recruit reported the incident when the lesbian recruit kept taking the towels from other recruits in the showers. Several recruits reported the incident. The incident was reported to the SHARP representative.

Follow up question 1.a: If you witnessed such incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

Participant 4: Yes. I reported the incident up the chain of command. The soldier was moved to another unit.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? YES/NO. It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 4: Yes and yes.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members, some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 4: Yes, I have heard that before.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 4: Yes, No. I am torn because of how my values are. I am not OK with the whole open gay service and that is just how I was raised. We are the land of the prude, so I kind of see what why the Army was antigay for so long. At the same time, we should be able to love who we love without discrimination. Just as I would not grab my wife in public, I would not expect that out of a gay soldier. But what one does in his or her bedroom is not the Army's business.

Follow up question 4.a: If you feel they were discriminatory, why would you think so?

Participant 4: The policy, in my opinion was a good policy because it kept out the flamboyant and openly gay soldiers. It kept order and discipline. It kept the Army from asking a soldier if he was gay or not, and at the same time required those who were gay to keep their business to themselves.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 4: No. I did not personally witness any discharges of gay recruits.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and

openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 4: No.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 4: If it got physical, I would physically intervene. If they were verbally harassing a homosexual soldier, I would stop it by all means necessary, verbally, or physically if I needed to.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 4: No. I did not know the number was that high.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB soldiers? Why or why not? YES/NO

Participant 4: No. I do not care if a soldier is gay or not, even openly. If he can do what is required of him, I could care less.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 4: No. I feel the policy was a good one. It kept order and discipline. I can see where it was discriminatory against gay soldiers since they could not express themselves or bring their partners to the ball or Army events, but at the same time, it kept others from harassing the soldier and kept the soldier quiet about his sexual orientation.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 4: Yes. I do not know to what extent but I have heard cases of this on the trail.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 4: No. Not at the BCT-level. Privates mimic what they see. They will role-play what they see at SHARP if they start including GLB scenarios. I will only be for BCT GLB scenario-based training once the Army has begun to do the training and the people suited to conduct the training are able to execute it without adverse response by the Army before it is brought to the BCTs. Privates make jokes of the scenarios they already see with SHARP training and if GLB training is brought to the BCTs, discrimination against the GLBs might increase.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 4: Yes. At the DSS. DSs are at the forefront of all Army training, they train the future Army soldiers. This type of training should be done at the DSS.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 5: Yes. I think, in the BCT or AIT environment or the training environment in general; people say a lot of colorful comments towards each other. Sometimes the comments are racy and derogatory. DSs have always used colorful, homosexual terms to push recruits to meet physical demands when it came to training. If they saw that a recruit was weak, they would call him a faggot, or mama's boy to get him to push himself.

Follow on question 1.a: If you witnessed such incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

Participant 5: Yes. I always had an open door policy but I did address it as a group. I would inform them of what they are allowed to say and what they are not allowed to say, what I tolerate and what others may tolerate. When I hear other DSs make derogatory comments call the recruits names, I would pull them to the side—on the side of caution for their own career.

Follow on question 1.a.1: If you did not respond to addressing or preventing the incident, was it because there were other DS s, military leaders, soldiers, or recruits present or did you decide to do nothing because you did not notice the event of the GLB being sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, or discriminated against because of his or her sexual orientation; you were not able to interpret it as an emergency; you were not able to develop a feeling of personal emergency; you simply decided not to help; or just chose not to act?

Participant 5: I think most leadership does not respond. Open service by gay soldiers is fairly new, and some of the DSs still have the good ole' boy mentality where they would say whatever they wanted without repercussions.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 5: Yes. I knew that homosexuality was defined under sodomy. No. I did not know that it is no longer defined under UCMJ.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members, some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 5: Yes. I am not sure of how many, but I have heard that it is happened in other BCTs.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members? YES/NO. Continue below.

Participant 5: Yes. The policy was a way for the military to witch hunt for soldiers who they thought were gay. They used the policy as a ploy to not harass and pursue gay soldiers, but then the policy would be used against gay soldiers when the harassers and pursuers did not get in trouble.

Follow on question 4.a: If you feel they were discriminatory, why would you think so?

Participant 5: I feel like what you do behind closed doors has nothing to do with anything else you do in your life. So, if I am a swinger and I have 50 married couple-swing partners, that will not change who I am at work, regardless of whether I am with the wives or the husbands or whatever. So, because somebody chooses to be in a same-sex relationship or whatever relationship, it does not change who they are at work. I had a lieutenant colonel who is retired from the military, he actually works at the Pentagon now, um, who was one of the most amazing officers I ever met, but he had to hide his male relationships even though he was married and had two kids. Now he is able to have his relationship with his boyfriend, but it hindered a lot of the ways he interacted with us and his senior peers because he was constantly trying to hide who he was for fear of repercussions or personal opinions.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 5: Not discharge, but they moved the soldier to another unit. No because of our unit since he did not have any issues with us and the unit did not have any issues with his open service but the command did not. We were all E-5s (sergeants), we all got along, we all knew he was, I mean, his demeanor - it was clear. But it did not affect our relationship - we all hung out with him, we all did everything together. It was something in that senior leadership meeting that was not discussed with us. And one day he was there and the next day he was not.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 5: Yes. At Fort Jackson more than anywhere else. Jackson had more infantry DSs, and I am sure it was not their first time but it was majority of their first time being around females and having to pay attention to what they actually said. A lot of their conversations or the way they addressed certain soldiers or the way they tried to encourage the male soldiers was extremely derogatory. I have not seen [demonstrations of male-on-male sex demonstrations] but I have known DSs who have done it. I do not think that they do it around other female DSs. I think that it is like something that happens in the barracks. I do not know, like guys rough-housing, it is something that they just do.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 5: Yes. It is demeaning, and as a professional organization, it should not be tolerated at any level. That is why you see so many DSs get into trouble.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 5: Yes. I am not as eloquent as other people are with their words. I am pretty blunt and honest, especially with my trainees because they do not know everything, they just hear through the grapevine and that is just biblical. So, I would make an example of certain people who have done things and quote regulations and the UCMJ, but basically using their families as examples. If your brother or sister was this way, and other people treat them the way you are treating that private, you know, kind of like a guilt trip thing.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 5: Yes. I knew there were a lot but did not know how many.

Follow on question 8.a: Did you then know that more than 4,000 service members refused to reenlist because of DADT's discriminatory policies (Servicemember's Legal Defense Network, n.d.)?

Participant 5: Yes. I was not sure of how many, but I had former battle buddies who did not reenlist because of this policy.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 5: No. In the beginning I had mixed feelings about it because I did not think that the military was ready for it, but I do feel like the military as a whole was not ready for females in combat units either. But originally when it happened, I felt there were going to be a lot of people who were going to openly abuse it to be - it is not a fair word

to say - but to be more flamboyant or more. So, I feel like they did well in the military as a whole, the service members as a whole, they did well in not abusing the allowed open service. It is what it is, everybody knows there are people who are doing whatever, and it was not that big of a deal that gay soldiers can serve openly.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 5: No. I do not think it should have ever existed. I do not think there should have ever been a [check-box for homosexuality]. I think DADT brought more attention to it and more people felt like they had to hide from it because now it was an issue, when before you just carried on business as it was. Whether you were honest or not. Like I said, if I was a swinger, it does not change who I was or how I performed. It does not make a difference.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 5: Yes. This issue has been going on since the Army existed. There have always been gay soldiers in the Army and Army never knew how to coach and mentor gay soldiers.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 5: Yes. I do recommend this type of training and it should have been implemented long ago. The Army is afraid of change and so the soldiers suffer when they do not know how to accept the change.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 5: Yes. Definitely at the DSS and also at the NCO academies.

Follow on question 10.a.1: If you recommend it, why would you think this would be effective, and why?

Participant 5: I think, with trainees, all the issues that are dealt with at any level needed to be taught because you do not have any clue how serious some of these things can really affect other people, because you were not given that in high school, you were not given that majority of the time in the home or in your community. So to be aware, to be sensitive, to be understanding, and not opinionated, to be able to see others’ perspectives without jumping to conclusions is good training, because you will encounter it, it is going to happen, and to become uncomfortable causes people to have major reactions that are normally negative. As a DS, you are going to interact with all kinds of people. People who have been abused, people who have been in single family homes, foster care,

whatever, so to come against a kid who is still trying to figure out what he or she is dealing with internally, regardless of what that situation is, you need to have the tools. And it is harder for us because we are trying to be this big mean bear but we have to still be sensitive mom and pop too.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 6: Recruit on recruit? Yes. Maybe some hazing but we usually squashed it out. I have had it maybe, in a good amount of 10 BCT cycles, I have had maybe two instances where it happened—we have intercoms that we can push and we can hear into the barracks room, and you can actually hear the banter that is going on in between the recruits. When I have a new set of soldiers, I let them know right off the bat that I do not care where they came from, what your background was, what they did with their own time. It is not - there's no room for discrimination and hate in the military, so either get out or learn to cope with it.

Follow on question 1.a: If you witnessed such incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

Participant 6: Yes. I addressed the entire platoon, not just one person, because I could hear all the discriminatory chatter over the intercom, I could not pinpoint it down to one individual. But if I did actually see an incident, of course, they will be reprimanded for that.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 6: No. I was not aware of how it was defined. I thought homosexuality was its own definition in the UCMJ. Yes. I am aware that it is no longer defined under the UCMJ.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 6: No. I did not know such cases existed.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 6: Yes it is discriminatory. I was OK [with open service]. It is not... I do not believe that plays a part in how well a soldier performs.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 6: No. I have heard that discharges have occurred in other companies.

Follow on question 5.a: What type of discharge did the recruit receive?

Participant 6: I think the Army was giving out under other than honorable discharges for that.

Follow on question 5.b: Was the Army just in the discharge and why or why not?

Participant 6: No, they were not. The only reason why I would discharge a soldier is because of their inability to perform, but not because of their sexual orientation or their lifestyle. They took away DADT while I was a DS. Yes, there were instances where ones were reprimanded for being homosexual and there were some that were using it to get out. No [the Army was not justified in discharging for that].

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 6: Yes. God yes. My entire career. Up until when they removed DADT and the equal opportunity policies got stricter. DSs would have recruits doing the monkey fucker and then the hip rotation. And that was just... you can only imagine what instances are out there. And as far as verbal - verbal was real, real bad before the repeal. It has gotten a lot better because people learned to shut their mouth and keep most of the comments to themselves, but before 2011, yes it was rampant. And myself included, I've actually had, just because how I was raised and how I was brought up, I have used 'homo' all the time just to call somebody, just by name, just because of where I was raised. And my behavior degraded my image and my actions were offensive against my recruits and the Army.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 6: Yes. If I was still in the Army witnessed it today I would step in. When I did use the derogatory language, it is just one of those things that people think that it is OK, even though you do not want to stand up for it, but you do not want to cause a problem or have any confrontation so you just kind of shrug it off and not say anything

about it. So if somebody is saying it over-abundantly, you just shrug it off, oh yeah, that guy is gay, ha-ha-ha, whatever dude.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 6: Yes.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 6: They would have done nothing if I would not have stepped in, no. What happened, I believe, is I would actually say something, and I would be the first one to say something, but it has been going on for a little bit. I would be the one to say something, and the other DSs would be like ‘oh, ok, that is wrong’ and they would jump in. So they [did not] just stand by but they did not jump in either.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service-member’s Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 6: No. I do not know how true that number rings. I know that there were some who kept their orientation under wraps, and there are some who used the excuse to get out of the Army.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 6: Not at all.

Follow on question 8.c. Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 6: The DADT policy should have never existed.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 6: Yes, I am sure that it continues today.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 6: I think this type of training should make its way into the equal opportunity classes and not be a directly GLB focused training. I think after a few years, the BCTs should become more exposed to the training but until the Army as a whole, has come to accept the necessity of this training and has seen positive results from the training, I would not exactly throw it in the recruits' faces just yet.

Follow on question 10.a. Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 6: At the DSS, definitely since DSs can use some sensitivity training.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 7: No. Not personally, I have not.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 7: Yes. I think I have heard that before.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 7: Yes. I have heard that before but never witnessed or experienced that when I was on the trail from 2010-2012. I still have battle buddy DSs who tell me about this issue existing in some of their BCTs. Thankfully I got out when I did.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 7: Yes, DADT was discriminatory towards GLBs.

Follow on question 4.a: If you feel they were discriminatory, why would you think so?

Participant 7: Yes. If that is their choice, and what they are or who they are, you are saying they can serve, they just cannot say who they are—that they are gay. I mean, to me it is just not right. It does not affect anyone else, so why should it be an issue. So you are just saying that you cannot bring it up but it does not change who the person is or

their performance or anything like that. Soldiers should love who they want without the Army telling them that they cannot date or marry someone of the same sex.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 7: No. I did not personally participate in soldiers getting discharged because they were gay.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 7: No. I have heard of this but never witnessed it, maybe because my trail time was at Fort Jackson, a co-ed base.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 7: Though I did not witness it first hand, I would rid my unit of this behavior. It is unacceptable and unprofessional.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or

recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 7: Yes, absolutely. I mean I would have addressed it whenever, depending on the situation, verbally, physically, or what, how I intervene a situation to prevent it or stop it from occurring. I had not witnessed any of it but if I was faced with such a situation then I would act.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service-member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 7: Yes. I have heard of this before but was not sure of the exact stats.

Follow on question 8.a: Did you then know that more than 4,000 service members refused to reenlist because of DADT's discriminatory policies (Servicemember's Legal Defense Network, n.d.)?

Participant 7: No. I also do not feel that the policy discriminatory.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 7: No. My personal view, not what the Army's is, has always been the same, so regardless of what the Army has done has not changed what my opinion is nor stance with open service.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 7: Yes. I do not know because I do not know what the issues were back then or why they enacted it. I do not agree with the policy based off what I know about all of the reasons as to why the policy was put in place.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 7: None of the training I have ever attended in the Army addressed the equal treatment of gay soldiers. Training covered general acceptance of all but there was never mention of gay or lesbian soldiers. But yes, I know that SHARP against GLBs still continues.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 7: Yes, there needs to be some sort of training to address the inclusion of gay soldiers in the Army.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 7: This training should be implemented, depending on how the scenarios are built and used. Some scenarios do not work, so it would make sense to have this program if the right people conduct the training. It should definitely be implemented at the DSS and NCO academies.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 8: No. I have not witnessed this in the BCTs.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly?

Participant 8: No. I am not familiar with how it was defined and I knew it was used in the military to discharge soldiers who were found to be gay.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 8: Yes. I have heard of a couple cases where soldiers would kill themselves because of comments made because they were gay. There was a case not too long ago at Fort Bragg, I believe, where a soldier was killed because he was gay.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 8: I do not think the policy was discriminatory. The soldier could be gay and this kept other soldiers from harassing him because he or she was gay. And at the same time, protected the gay soldier from being witch hunted.

Follow on question 4.b: If you feel they were appropriate and not discriminatory, why do you think so?

Participant 8: The policy kept the gay soldier safe from being harassed by other soldiers and it was a positive step for gay soldiers to serve in the military.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 8: No. I did not participate, but of course, you do hear it every now and then.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 8: I did not witness this within the BCT when I was on the trail.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 8: This behavior is unacceptable because this behavior is not necessary for the DSs to use to train soldiers. I would stop this type of behavior if I saw it.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 8: If I witness this, I would verbally or physically confront the incident.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 8: Yes. Others were part of the problem. While I did not witness other DSs promoting, inciting or encouraging this sort of behavior against the recruits in my unit, our sister unit had four DSs relieved of duty. The DSs threatened a gay soldier with rape if he did not do all the obstacles on an obstacle course. One DS made the comments and the other three did nothing about it, so they were also removed.

Follow on question 7.a.1: If yes, provide some detail on how they promoted, incited, encouraged continued sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination of the GLB recruits, or, on other hand, how they addressed or prevented the incident(s).

Participant 8: The DSs were relieved and some of our DSs had to go fill in for the other unit. The comments got them in trouble and since the other DSs did not step in, they lost their hat—term refers to being relieved of their duty and losing their title as DSs—too.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 8: No. I did not know the statistics on how many were kicked out.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 8: No. Well, again, I am all about just being a soldier, so if you want to provide that information whatever way, whatever you prefer in your personal life, I mean, that is really on you. That is none of my business. So when you say openly I do not think it is OK to flaunt your sexuality around and be able to talk about it. I mean we should keep it to ourselves and only be a soldier and worry about work on our duty hours.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 8: No. I do not find to the policy to have been discriminatory.

Follow on question 8.c.1: Why or why not do you or do not you support the policy repeal or emplacement?

Participant 8: I feel this policy was a good policy. It kept order and allowed gay soldiers to serve.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 8: Yes. I know it exists. To what level, I am not sure, but I am sure that it still continues.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement

GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 8: Yes. I think this might be a good start at the BCTs.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 8: Yes. I am for scenario-based training and adding on GLB awareness.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit? If YES, proceed below to 1.a. If no, continue to question 2.

Participant 9: Yes. There were instances while I was at Fort Knox in 2009, when the base still hosted the all-male BCT where male recruits would sexually harass and discriminate against male recruits who were gay.

Follow on question 1.a: If you witnessed such incident, did you respond by addressing and preventing the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of this recruit?

Participant 9: Sometimes: Depending on how dire the situation became, I would see the harassment and discrimination but I would not step in unless the issue got out of hand. It all depended on what was happening.

Follow on question 1.a.1: If you did not respond to addressing or preventing the incident, was it because there were other DSs, military leaders, soldiers, or recruits present or did you decide to do nothing because you did not notice the event of the GLB being sexually harassed, sexual assaulted, or discriminated against because of his or her sexual orientation; you were not able to interpret it as an emergency; you were not able to develop a feeling of personal emergency; you simply decided not to help; or just chose not to act.

Participant 9: I did not respond unless I felt the sexual harassment would turn into an assault. There have been instances of recruit on recruit assault in which fellow DSs and I have responded to, and turned over to the military police, but most times, sexual harassment and discrimination were more evident. DSs would sometimes pick on gay

recruits by allowing other recruits to make gay jokes and sometimes DSs and I would make gay jokes, not intending them to be personal but I can see now that these jokes were inappropriate.

Follow on question 1.a.2: Did you not respond because of a personal bias against the GLB population whether you promoted or prevented the incident?

Participant 9: There were times I was biased against gay soldiers. I was an infantry DS, raised in the south, and as a southern Baptist, I was not for the gay lifestyle. That may be the reason I did not always respond when recruits made fun of gay recruits in my unit. I am sure the DS jokes also incited what the Army would now call sexual harassment.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 9: I did not know homosexuality fell under the definition of sodomy, but I knew it is no longer defined by the UCMJ. I got out of the Army right after the repeal of DADT so I am not too familiar with the new policies.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 9: Yes. I had soldiers threaten to kill themselves so we would have them on suicide watch. I read in the paper where soldiers killed themselves because they were harassed because they were gay.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 9: No. DADT kept the Army together. In that, even though gay soldiers could serve they could not be flamboyant and bring their gay partners to family events. This kept personal issues hush as those issues did not matter in the training environment.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 9: I had several recruits discharged, because of homosexual acts in the barracks, or making the training environment hostile because others did not get along with the gay recruit. We tried to send gay soldiers who caused problems to other companies, but normally the discharges came pretty fast after the request and chapter [discharge] packets were submitted.

Follow on question 5.a: What type of discharge did the recruit receive?

Participant 9: Administrative, or under other than honorable. I am not too sure of all the discharges they would get but most the ones I knew about were administrative in nature so to get the recruit out of the military without tarnishing their future nonmilitary jobs.

Follow on question 5.b: Was the Army just in the discharge and why or why not?

Participant 9: Yes. Some of the gay recruits caused the training environment to be hostile. Some recruits get recycled into other units so that they could remain in the Army

but the ones we had, most got separated from the service. The Army as being just? It was a way they kept order and were mission ready for combat.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 9: Yes. Knox was an all-male BCT. We used faggot jokes all the time. We would use recruits to simulate gay sex to make fun of recruits or weak recruits. I thought it was funny as did the other DSs.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 9: No. It was more fun than anything else. Now, with the Army's push for fair treatment, and open gay service, it may be seen as unacceptable, but I am not in any longer so I cannot say.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 9: If the issue became too physical, I would step in. Most of the time there was harassment, and if a gay recruit got beat-up for touching or staring at another recruit, there were times I would not intervene unless there were fists thrown.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 9: We all participated by encouraging the incidents and jokes. We had some DSs who would not get involved, so that may be bystander effect, I do not know, but yeah, DSs have fun and make fun. As long as no one is sent to the hospital, as we learned when I was infantry, it was OK to have some fun.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service-member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 9: No, but I can believe that there were many who got kicked out.

Follow on question 8.a: Did you then know that more than 4,000 service members refused to reenlist because of DADT's discriminatory policies (Servicemember's Legal Defense Network, n.d.)?

Participant 9: No. I have not really paid attention to this and was not ever briefed it during SHARP.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 9: This is a tough question. I have friends who are DSs now and they said they do not have issues with the gay soldiers in the Army, but I would have to get used to this transition as a person. I was raised in the south, and gay was never OK. Gays would

get harassed, sexual assaulted, and if they hit on you, where I come from, they would get shot.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 9: The DADT policy allowed gay soldiers to serve, that as long as they did not cause any issues, I would be OK with the policy. But when other recruits made gay jokes, it was hard not to laugh since we made the same jokes. I could see it as wrong since today's culture is more open about gay soldiers in the military but I would have to see the impact of open service.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 9: I could see that still going on, yes. The Army culture really has not changed before, or after the repeal. I mean, I have not seen anything suggesting gay support on the base, except the briefing we received at the time of the repeal. When I got out of the Army, other DS battle buddies would tell me that the Army has changed and gays are going to infiltrate the military. I guess it is a good thing I got out while I still could.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 9: The Army has shifted gears to open service. If they want everyone, to include us DSs, to have to conform to this new way of thinking and acting, I could see scenario-based training as something that could come down the road. As long as they do not just throw it in everyone's face with this training. Just like when women and blacks were integrated, I think scenarios are the only way you can get support for the transition.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical "death by PowerPoint" presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 9: As I mentioned, as long as it is not shoved down people's throats, start slow, and have the right trainers conducting the training, I could see how this transition could happen smoother to have DSs see this as a way to cut down on the colorful language we always use.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 10: No. I have not personally, but you did always hear cases of such issues going on in the military. How accurate or specifics, I do not know.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 10: I knew gay soldiers could serve openly but did not know the history of how homosexuality was defined.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 10: Yes. I have heard that before.

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members? Continue below.

Participant 10: Yes. I feel the policy discriminated against the gay soldiers in the military. I am not sure why Congress wanted to continue imposing restrictions on gay soldiers. President Clinton tried to allow gay soldiers to openly serve, but you have over-paid white-collars sitting in DC scared of equal opportunity, no matter one's sexual orientation gay was never an issue for me.

Follow on question 4.a: If you feel the policies were discriminatory, why would you think so?

Participant 10: How a soldier chooses to live his or her life was not to be regulated by the government. Who is to tell you who you can or should love? If you could do everything that is required of you as a soldier, why should there be regulations as to how you should live your life in the military. The military, as an organization is far behind many private sector organizations that already allow gays in the companies and even promote diversity within their workforce.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 10: I did not personally participate in the discharge of any of my recruits but know many instances where this has happened within our sister companies.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 10: Yes. This behavior was more prevalent at the all-male BCTs. I did not witness this when I was at Fort Jackson.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 10: This is berating and DSs who are involved in this behavior need to be removed from the BCTs and be retrained on trainee abuse.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 10: I would step in if I witnessed this behavior. As a professional organization, the Army should not be treating their soldiers with prejudice based solely because of the soldier's sexual identification. Just as they added training when integrating African Americans and women, they need to address this same intent on inculcating the gay soldiers in the Army family.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 10: I know there were times when I would hear a faggot joke and DSs would be relieved of their position for trainee abuse and using gay jokes. I remember an incident when some DSs allowed the sexual abuse of a gay recruit. None of them were relieved because the recruits were afraid to say anything, and the other DSs did not tell. The recruit told his first sergeant and the first sergeant threatened him with a discharge for lying.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service-member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 10: No, I did not know that. I knew that soldiers were getting kicked out, and I had a friend who got kicked out and refused to reenlist even though he was offered an upgraded discharge to honorable discharge. He was always mad at the Army because of it. Now, he is a multi-millionaire working for a technology company.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 10: No. I was not affected by the repeal. There was the initial scare in the BCTs that we would see flamboyant recruits joining by the hundreds and that we would not be able to say anything to them no matter how gay they looked, but that issue never came about when I was a DS.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 10: The policy should never have existed.

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 10: Yes. I know that this is still an issue. The repeal did not remove any SHARP incidents against gay recruits. If anything, it allowed DSs and other recruits to increase SHARP jokes against gay soldiers. During DADT, if the soldier came out and said he was gay because of the harassment, CID would initiate an investigation and separate the soldier from the military.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 10: Yes. I am for this type of training. I think it will help BCTs and DSs realize how grave the gay issue still is, and an eye opener for equal opportunity policy-makers how much there is needed, a program that addresses the inclusion of gay soldiers into daily military life

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 10: Absolutely. Because you know for the younger, well, even DSCs, you know, junior soldiers, that may be something they are totally unaware of as being harassing. You know, the assault should be an easy one for anybody. But as far as just general harassment or sexual harassment, some might not even realize that they are crossing that line with the GLB community. I am for GLB scenario-based training at the BCT and DSS.

Question 1: Have you ever witnessed sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination of a GLB recruit by either another GLB recruit or heterosexual recruit?

Participant 11: No. I have not personally witnessed this in the BCTs when I was a DS.

Question 2: Did you know that according to the DOA (2015), homosexuality in the military was historically defined under sodomy? It is no longer defined in the military, as UCMJ and other federal policies no longer prohibit GLBs from serving openly.

Participant 11: Yes, I am aware of both.

Question 3: Did you know that there were instances of suicides, hazing, and beatings of GLB service members some up to and including death just because of their open or discovered sexual orientation (Wilder & Wilder, 2012)?

Participant 11: Yes. I had a soldier who committed suicide because he was gay even though he was not out during DADT. He was teased by his fellow recruits. He showed signs of depression and we didn't know how to help him. He went to see the chaplain but I don't know what happened..

Question 4: Do you feel that the requirements and mandates imposed by DADT at the time it was in effect were discriminatory against the GLB service members?

Participant 11: Not fully. I feel that was a way to let gay soldiers serve in the military but was still discriminatory. But what can you do? The policy allows to you be in the military, you just have to keep your gay status to yourself.

Follow on question 4.a: If you feel they were discriminatory, why would you think so?

Participant 11: The part about it being discriminatory, the best way I can put it is, every time you had a family day, or there was a promotion ceremony, or anything where family

members would come, those individuals never felt comfortable bringing their significant other, or their spouse or whatever. Then it would answer any questions that anybody had, and they could get kicked out. So, here you are, you just got promoted, and you cannot have your husband or wife there. That is pretty shitty. So yes it was discriminatory on that front.

Question 5: Did you personally participate in or witness the discharge of any GLB recruit either before or during the repeal of DADT, or any other applicable homosexual policies albeit it be because of the requirements of DADT or other military or federal policies prohibiting homosexuality and service if openly GLB?

Participant 11: Yes. I have had to discharge of couple of recruits because my command required that they be removed. While they did not pose any real threat to the training environment, the command said that they be separated because of how the recruits marched and acted, they should not be in the Army.

Follow on question 5.a: What type of discharge did the recruits receive?

Participant 11: I think it was one of the administrative discharges they used for trainees.

Follow on question 5.b: Was the Army just in the discharge and why or why not?

Participant 11: No. This is hard to answer. But ultimately, I feel that if you can perform all the requirements of BCT, your sexuality will not matter. There were straight soldiers who misbehaved but the command did not discipline them, yet to kick out soldiers because they are gay is not right. This was a ploy to make the unit look more masculine and not because the soldiers were a real threat. The soldiers got along with their fellow recruits but the command did not want them in the unit.

Question 6: DSs have historically been involved in the name-calling, inciting discriminatory words and practices, to include overt acts of demonstrating male-on-male sex or intercourse of the same with the use of recruits to do the demonstrations, and openly criticizing and demeaning GLBs whether it was intentional or not. Did you witness this in the BCT environment?

Participant 11: I never witnessed people mimicking sex acts. We used to say things all the time like nuts to butt and make your buddy smile and stuff like that when we were stacking on a wall. I do not know if we ever thought of it that way [sexually]. I know I never did, it was literally you all need to step closer, get nuts to butt. It was not like - it had anything to do with sexuality for me. If the recruits took it literally and thought we were being sexual or implying that we would allow it in the literal sense that was not our intention, or at least not mine.

Follow on question 6.a: If you witnessed this behavior, do you feel this practice is berating and unacceptable?—Policies in effect or not.

Participant 11: If DSs mean what they say when making jokes, then yes, I can see it to be unacceptable. We made many jokes, some of them sexual in nature. I never thought that the jokes were derogatory. I can see where a gay soldier can see faggot as a bad reference but that was not the intent when the term was used. It was used to get soldiers to pay attention and do what they were told.

Question 7: If you witnessed the sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination, to include physical violence, of a suspected or known GLB within your unit by a DS or

recruit, did or would you have verbally or physically confront(ed) the situation to address and prevent it from happening?

Participant 11: If a situation got to the point where things got physical, then I would confront it. Most of the time recruits picked on one another. Some picked on the gay soldiers in the platoon. And we let them handle their business internally without stepping in unless it got to the point where the conflict would escalate and disrupt training. These are kids. They do what they do and pick on each other. DSs cannot always be the police and mothers and fathers of these recruits. They come from different backgrounds and they can sometimes resolve their differences if you let them be.

Follow on question 7.a: Did other DSs promote, incite, encourage, or step in to continue or intervene to stop the incident or did they witness the incident and do nothing—possible signs of the bystander effect?

Participant 11: If a situation got out of hand, they would step in to confront the situation from escalating. I guess in a sense, it would be bystander effect. DSs would not step in until the situation got out of hand or escalated to the point where the issues interfered with training.

Question 8: Are you aware that under the DADT (1993-2011), more than 14,500 service members were discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation (Service member's Legal Defense Network, n.d.) whether it was because they were openly gay or found out to be gay and resulted in their ultimate discharge?

Participant 11: I knew that they were kicking soldiers out but I was not sure of how many.

Follow on question 8.b: Has the repeal affected your position of open service by GLB?

Participant 11: Not really. There will always be gay soldiers in the military. Even though I am no longer in the Army, I know that there will be discrimination against GLBs. Unless the Army and military do something about it, there will be no change. SHARP and equal opportunity is for everyone but GLBs have not really been included in that population. Recruits seem more tolerant of gay soldiers, but the jokes, and sexual harassment, and teasing continue.

Follow on question 8.c: Should the president or Pentagon have repealed or not put in place this policy sooner if ever than it was repealed or put in place?

Participant 11: This is how I feel. The DADT policy kept everyone in check. It allowed gay soldiers to serve and their leaders to not ask questions. So, I feel it was a good policy. When it comes to gay soldiers and the policy, in regards to discrimination, I cannot say since I did not spend that much time focusing on that. I could see it discriminatory since gay soldiers had to stay in the closet, but I feel that the policy kept control and order on both sides.

Follow on question 8.c.1: Why or why not do you or do not you support the policy repeal or emplacement?

Participant 11: Again, even though I did not have a direct issue with gay soldiers, I feel the policy was put in place to protect the gay soldiers and people who ask questions. The policy also allowed for what we have now, open service by GLBs. So in a sense, this was a good thing, right?

Question 9: You went through SHARP and I. A.M. Strong training, both of which are part of the annual training requirements with equal opportunity. Both policies and programs fail to directly address sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against the GLB population. Are you aware that GLB sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against this population are prevalent and persistent in the Army before and even after the repeal of DADT?

Participant 11: Yes. We are told this in SHARP and equal opportunity training. But the Army has not done anything to train us in how to prevent it. Since gay soldiers can now date who they want and live on base with their partners, maybe there should be some kind of training for the rest of us who need to get used to seeing more gay soldiers.

Question 10: Since sexual harassment, sexual assault, and discrimination against GLBs exists in such large numbers, would you recommend TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training into the curricula, and ultimately into the BCTs? Scenario-based training will increase awareness and required tolerance of GLBs (Mickens, 1994).

Participant 11: Yes. I can see where this type of training can be good if the Army is serious about inclusion. The gay topic is always an issue, so [I do not know], maybe this can be an eye-opener to all those who pick on gay soldiers and in general for the recruits.

Follow on question 10.a: Scenario-based training has increased awareness in more effective ways than typical “death by PowerPoint” presentations. Would you recommend that TRADOC and the DSS implement GLB scenario-based training within the DSS?

Participant 11: Yes. If you require something of the Army, you must initiate it at the DSS. All Army go through BCT or officer candidate school, unless you come from the

college or some officer program. DSs are everywhere and the training would be best if it started at the DS.