



Ministry
of Defence



Report on Inappropriate Behaviours

15 July 2019

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	6
Part 1 – Behaviours in Defence – our current approach.....	7
How much do we know about Inappropriate Behaviours in Defence?	7
Management information.....	7
Armed Forces Continuous Attitude Survey.....	8
Civil Service People Survey and the Civil Service Bullying Harassment and Misconduct Review (the ‘Sue Owen Review’).....	8
Service Complaints Ombudsman Annual Report 2018	8
Sexual offences in the Service Justice System.....	8
Single Service surveys	9
Management of surveys	9
What do others think about Inappropriate Behaviours in Defence?	9
Inappropriate behaviours in Defence still exist.....	10
Is our policy fit?.....	10
What do others think of our policy?	11
Does our governance work?.....	11
What do others think of our governance?.....	12
Does our training work?	13
What do others think of our training?	15
Behaviours in Defence – more to do.....	15
Part 2 – Getting ahead of Inappropriate Behaviours	18
Prepare the workforce – set the tone	18
Prevention	18
Calling time on Inappropriate Behaviours.....	21
Part 3 – Dealing with Inappropriate Behaviour when it does occur.....	23
Build trust and confidence in the complaints system	23
Reporting.....	24
Support	25
Centralised oversight and governance - a stronger approach.....	26
A Defence Authority responsible for cultures and Inappropriate Behaviours	26
Review of the Service Complaints process.....	27
Dealing with the aftermath - a stronger approach	29
Conclusion	31
Annex A - Values and Standards.....	33
Annex B - Summary of Recommendations and Observations.....	34
Annex C - Report on Inappropriate Behaviours - Methodology and Stakeholder Engagement	36
Annex D - Glossary	39



Executive Summary

On 10 April 2019 in response to repeated instances of inappropriate and allegedly unlawful behaviour by serving members of the UK Armed Forces, the Secretary of State for Defence commissioned an urgent report into inappropriate behaviours in the Armed Forces.¹ The report, due in mid-May 2019, was expected to: understand the current evidence regarding inappropriate behaviour across the Services; make recommendations on what can be done to ensure and reassure the Armed Forces are an inclusive and modern employer; and identify areas for further action, including potential improvements to controls, processes or policy.

There are nearly 250,000 people in Defence, military and civil service, and the overwhelming majority serve with great pride collectively protecting the UK 24/7. The UK Armed Forces are a formidable fighting force and the commitment of all military and the civilians that support them is rightly celebrated. In bleak contrast, however, inappropriate behaviour persists which harms people, the teams they serve in and, ultimately, operational output. There is no single comprehensive picture of inappropriate behaviours in Defence, however the data that does exist points to an unacceptable level of inappropriate behaviour and a sub-optimal system for dealing with it when it does occur. Such behaviour – and its consequences for the people affected by it – damages the UK Armed Forces' hard-won reputation for courage, determination and professionalism, and almost certainly has an impact on attracting, recruiting and retaining the talent that our Armed Forces and Civil Service need. Culture and performance is not a trade-off; tackling inappropriate behaviour is performance-enhancing for Defence, as well as the right thing to do.

Tackling inappropriate behaviours is recognised at the highest levels in Defence, and this report confirmed that policies, governance and training programmes to address the problem are energised across the Naval Service, Army, Royal Air Force and Civil Service. There are further opportunities to share good practice and learn from others – internally as well as our international allies and other external organisations – and we make a number of observations and recommendations in that regard. Ultimately, however, it is about the **determination of leaders to change the culture**; everything else hangs off that:

We must do more to stop instances of inappropriate behaviour occurring. This is principally a chain of command issue for the Naval Service, Army and Royal Air Force, and for Civil Service line management. It is about leadership at every level in the organisation, setting the culture and standards, and ensuring people meet those standards consistently. It is also about effective and resourced training, and a focused system of governance which we recommend should include centralised assurance and the compilation of a single set of data and statistics relating to inappropriate behaviour.

We have to do better when instances of inappropriate behaviour have occurred or are alleged to have occurred. Our own surveys and external stakeholders highlight repeatedly the shortcomings of the current system for raising complaints about inappropriate behaviour, with complainants citing a fear of retribution or lack of faith that anything would be done. The Service Complaints Ombudsman judges our Service Complaints system is neither efficient, effective or fair. Furthermore, the disproportionate overrepresentation of women and ethnic minorities – and a lack of data on other minority groups – in the Service Complaints system is of widespread concern. There is a pressing need to reform the Service Complaints system including: anonymous reporting of inappropriate behaviours; a helpline; a parallel channel for raising Service Complaints outwith the chain of command; and a dedicated central Service Complaints team equipped to deal with the most complex allegations of bullying, harassment including sexual harassment, and discrimination.

We should establish a Defence Authority working to the Chief of Defence People as Senior Responsible Owner on behalf of the Chief of the Defence Staff and Permanent

¹ <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2019-04-10/debates/19041011000007/ArmedForcesStandardsAndValues>

Secretary. The Authority would *inter alia* be responsible for: pan-Defence policy and governance; holding all management information on inappropriate behaviours; conducting assurance activity across the Armed Forces; sharing leading practice across Defence; and housing the central Service Complaints team, operating in support of and with respect to the single Services' chain of command.

Evidence reflected in this report indicates a significant number of our people have experienced bullying, discrimination and harassment, including sexual, but have not felt able or been able to come forward to report it; we recommend consideration of a **call for evidence** from people affected, coincident with the establishment of the Defence Authority.

This report makes 36 recommendations. Some are about improving the complaints system and processes, and the majority are about preventing instances of inappropriate behaviour occurring in the first place. Encouraging and enabling more complaints – and dealing with them better – should lead to greater trust in the organisation and help signal the leadership's determination to stamp out inappropriate behaviour. Ultimately, however, the challenge of inappropriate behaviour can only be addressed through a determined effort across the whole force to change the culture, driven persistently from the top and at every level of leadership and line management below that. It requires **authentic leadership; relentless engagement; and consistent communication**, with everybody playing their part.

The Secretary of State demanded an urgent report which, by its very nature, did not permit the time to conduct deep evidence gathering or expert analysis of the situation. It is acknowledged and accepted that in the future more detailed work and analysis recommended in this report may reinforce or reveal contrasting interpretations of the evidence. The report does, however, offer clear signposting of where further work is now required. Some recommendations should have an immediate impact but, to change embedded cultures and behaviours, a much longer view is necessary; experience among allied armed forces is of a five- to ten-year programme of concerted activity to make a measurable difference and we should be prepared for the same.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M Wigston', written in a cursive style.

Air Chief Marshal M Wigston CBE

15 July 2019

Introduction

Military tasks are often delivered in demanding, hostile and unforgiving circumstances where behaviours and standards are essential to winning outcomes. At a fundamental level it is about individuals doing the right thing, in the most testing circumstances, when nobody is looking.

Defence needs high quality people with the necessary skills, knowledge and experience, who are valued, respected, invested in and feel supported. A trusted employer, Defence is expected to operate at a higher standard than other parts of the community. The behaviour of people in Defence not only reflects a legislative commitment to standards in the Armed Forces Acts and Queen's Regulations, but also to a core set of values and standards² appropriate to each of the Armed Forces. Each Service, including the Civil Service, operates according to an ethos and culture appropriate to their operating environment.

The UK Armed Forces are a formidable fighting force and the commitment of all military and the civilians that support them is rightly celebrated. In contrast, however, an unacceptable level of inappropriate behaviour persists which harms people, the teams they serve in and, ultimately, operational output. It also damages the UK Armed Forces' hard-won reputation for courage, determination and professionalism, and almost certainly has an impact on attracting, recruiting and retaining the talent that our Armed Forces and Civil Service need. There is a Defence-wide need to align efforts to address inappropriate behaviours, recognising different approaches will be required appropriate to each of the Services.

For the purpose of this report we defined inappropriate behaviours as those which: **breach laws, norms of behaviour or core values and standards, including sexual offences and bullying, harassment and discrimination, that harm or risk harming individuals, teams and operational effectiveness, and that bring or risk bringing the reputation of individuals, units, the Service or Defence into disrepute.**

The Armed Forces and Civil Service operate to different terms and conditions of service, however Defence people exist within a shared culture and environment. The report focuses on the Armed Forces, regular and reserve, however it identifies opportunities to work better as a whole force, including the MOD Civil Service, wherever we can. The need to adopt a whole force approach is reinforced by the lessons of others, in particular the Canadian Armed Forces who went through an extensive process of review in 2015.

This report comprises three sections: Part 1 assesses the current situation; Part 2 considers what more could be done to stop inappropriate behaviours occurring; and Part 3 makes recommendations on what more could be done to deal with inappropriate behaviours when they have happened. A key recommendation of Part 3 is the establishment of a new Defence Authority responsible for cultures and inappropriate behaviours, external to the single Services' chain of command and responsible to a Defence Senior Responsible Owner, emulating the successful models of the Canadian Armed Forces, Australian Defence Force and United States military.



² Annex A summarises the values and standards of the respective Services.

Part 1 – Behaviours in Defence – our current approach

This part summarises what we know about inappropriate behaviours in Defence, and where that information is held. Information on instances of inappropriate behaviours is disparate and we judge incomplete. However, trends and consistent themes are evident. We were able to take a more definitive view of policies, governance and training related to inappropriate behaviours, with the added perspective of over 40 external stakeholder organisations. Given its necessary focus, Part 1 sets a sobering tone which does **not** reflect the behaviour of the overwhelming majority of people in Defence who serve the UK with courage, determination, professionalism and great pride.

How much do we know about Inappropriate Behaviours in Defence?

Achieving an overview of the extent to which inappropriate behaviour takes place within Defence is complicated by the absence of any single point of reference. Existing information is disparate and disconnected with a focus on only the most serious of offences. The principal internal sources of information are continuous attitude surveys, the Service Complaints Ombudsman, the Service Justice System, and Service surveys.

Management information

To build a comprehensive picture of the behaviours and culture of any organisation³, it is necessary to have a single repository where all key data is collated, monitored, tracked and analysed. The resulting intelligence can then be used to inform the chain of command to address issues at the earliest opportunity by enabling resources to be directed to specific hot-spots – situations with a high risk of victimisation for example – or to specific types of behaviour.



Annual statistical data and courts martial outcomes from cases in the Service Justice System, the Service Complaints system and surveys, as well as reports from the single Services, demonstrate a significant effort to capture available information. We observe that the convergence of data and information within each Service lacks depth and there is no coherent analysis at MOD-level. Serious cases within the Service Justice System and the Service Complaints system capture broad headline data sets, such as gender, age, type of offence or complaint, but this is superficial and at present there is insufficient metadata captured to provide an appropriate level of insight, nor is there a consistent approach across minority groups. Furthermore, we do not automatically receive comprehensive data or information on cases dealt with in the Civil Courts, so cannot describe the full scale of the issue within Defence at the most serious level; this would require a change to primary legislation. We judge that better and more coherent data would provide actionable information for the chain of command at all levels – and centrally for Defence – to identify where additional training, support and intervention is most needed.

Recommendation 1.1: Defence must improve the level of detail and metadata captured on serious unacceptable behaviour as well as instances of lower severity, to provide a single comprehensive picture of inappropriate behaviours across the organisation.

Recommendation 1.2: Defence should consider amending primary legislation to require the sharing of information from the civilian Criminal Justice System.

³ See Canada / Australia / United States' Armed Forces, in addition to the private sector.

Recommendation 1.3: Defence should develop performance measures relating to inappropriate behaviours for use at Defence Board, Executive Committee and Performance and Risk Reviews.

Armed Forces Continuous Attitude Survey

The Armed Forces Continuous Attitude Survey 2018⁴, while finding most people believe they are treated fairly at work, also reported that those who consider they have experienced unfair treatment lack faith in the complaints system. Of the survey respondents, 12% reported having been subject to bullying, harassment or discrimination in the preceding 12 months, but only 6% of those experiencing these behaviours made a formal complaint. The top three reasons were: 63% did not believe anything would be done; 50% believed it might adversely affect their career; and 30% did not want to use the complaint procedure. This data demonstrates a lack of trust in the formal complaints process.

Civil Service People Survey and the Civil Service Bullying Harassment and Misconduct Review (the ‘Sue Owen Review’)

In the 2018 People Survey, 12% of respondents reported they had experienced bullying or harassment at work and 13% that they had been subject to discrimination. The number who went on to report it, however, was notably higher than for the Armed Forces; 41% said they had reported bullying and harassment, and 21% said they had reported discrimination. In 2018, a survey⁵ was carried out across the Civil Service by Sue Owen, Permanent Secretary at the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. Some 73% of respondents reported that they have experienced bullying, harassment, discrimination and/or misconduct at some point during their Civil Service career; only 37% of respondents said they felt it was safe to speak up and raise a complaint.

Service Complaints Ombudsman Annual Report 2018

In her Annual Report 2018, the Service Complaints Ombudsman reported that 25% of Service Complaints concerned bullying, harassment and discrimination. The Ombudsman also highlighted that, for the third consecutive year, female and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) people were overrepresented in the Service Complaints system. While making up only 11% of the Armed Forces, female personnel made 23% of admissible Service Complaints in 2018, 43% of which concerned bullying, harassment and discrimination; the equivalent figure for male personnel is 20%. Likewise, BAME personnel make up 7% of the Armed Forces, however they made 13% of the admissible Service Complaints in 2018, 39% of which concerned bullying, harassment and discrimination; the equivalent figure for white personnel is 24%. This matches the Civil Service People Surveys 2017 and 2018, the MOD Culture and Gender Survey, and the Army’s Sexual Harassment Survey 2018 which support the view that female and BAME personnel are overrepresented in either having been subjected to, or complained about, bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Sexual offences in the Service Justice System

Robust statistical analysis exists in the annual statistics⁶ on sexual offences in the Service Justice System. A marked increase in the number of sexual offence cases investigated by the Service Police has been demonstrated year on year. This increase indicates an elevation in reporting and investigation of alleged sexual offences by the Service Police. In 2018 the Service Police conducted 153 investigations into offences contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and 21 defendants were found guilty at Court Martial of 30 charges contrary to the Act.

⁴ 2018 AFCAS published on publishing.service.gov.uk.

⁵ The Sue Owen Review <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bullying-harassment-and-misconduct-review>.

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/sexual-offences-in-the-service-justice-system-2018>

Analysis of the statistics for personnel convicted in 2018 shows they were overwhelmingly male, of Junior Non-Commissioned Officer (JNCO) rank or below, and of a broad age range with a slight spike in those aged 21-30. Victims of offences contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 in 2018 were 82.1% female, almost always JNCO or below or civilian, and almost always below the age of 30. Of note, the Army Speak Out Report 2017 provided detailed analysis of the callers to its confidential helpline. It identified a similar trend across all types of bullying harassment and discrimination incidents, where 37% of 'Speak Out' cases were from female Army personnel – who make up 9.3% of the Army as a whole – and 42% were from JNCO or junior ranks.

Single Service surveys

The Royal Navy conducted a sexual harassment survey in 2015, as did the Army. The Army repeated the survey in 2018, informed by an independent advisory group and published their findings and action plan online. Both Services recognised the continuing need to take and implement action to sustain cultural change. The Army plans to repeat the survey and develop further actions in 2021. We judge the surveys provided an important and unique insight into sexual harassment in the Army and Royal Navy. We recommend commissioning a Defence-wide general harassment survey in place of the next Army survey in 2021.

Recommendation 1.4: Defence should conduct a harassment survey in 2021 building on the Army Sexual Harassment Survey 2018, informed by an independent advisory group. In line with recommendation 3.1, Defence should consider a 'call for evidence' on inappropriate behaviours in conjunction with this survey, in order to provide supporting detail to the survey.

Army sexual harassment survey 2018. Key findings noted that of people who had made a formal complaint after experiencing upsetting behaviour of a sexual nature, 70% were dissatisfied with the outcome of the investigation, how the outcome of the investigation was communicated and the follow-up action taken against those responsible. Furthermore, 75% said they had experienced negative consequences as a result of making a complaint, of which 98% felt uncomfortable at work, 93% thought about leaving the Army, and 91% felt humiliated. The report also found that amongst those people who did not make a formal complaint after experiencing this behaviour, 42% said it was because they did not believe anything would be done if a complaint was made.

Management of surveys

There is an array of Defence-level surveys including the annual People Survey; and the Armed Forces, Reserves and Families' Continuous Attitude Surveys. We observed that questions on bullying, harassment and discrimination are not sufficiently focused or consistent to provide a Defence-wide picture of inappropriate behaviours and their consequences.

Recommendation 1.5: Defence should better coordinate and focus the bullying, harassment and discrimination elements of continuous attitude surveys to improve understanding, reduce duplication and streamline data analysis. Use of contemporary, on-line survey formats should also be considered.

What do others think about Inappropriate Behaviours in Defence?

In seeking outside views on inappropriate behaviours in Defence, we placed emphasis on stakeholder organisations with an existing connection including: The Service Complaints Ombudsman, Armed Forces charities, non-military charities, victim support groups, welfare services, Service families' federations, 'whistle-blowing' and civil society organisations. Members of internal Defence diversity networks were also canvassed. Across more than 40 engagements, there was overwhelming support for the seriousness with which Defence was approaching this issue.

Inappropriate behaviours in Defence still exist

The majority of stakeholder organisations we approached considered there had been a step-change improvement in the Armed Forces and how they deal with inappropriate behaviour. The overwhelming view was that good behaviours are the norm, Service people can in large part be trusted to behave appropriately, and that Defence is making significant efforts to improve the situation further still. But our stakeholders also recognise that inappropriate behaviours occur in wider society and, as the Armed Forces draw people from society, this remains a universal challenge across all sectors.

Our new generation, which includes a greater proportion of BAME, women and other underrepresented groups, has grown up in a more open and permissive society prior to joining, yet are led by a cohort described by one external organisation as a 'pack mentality of white middle-aged men, especially in positions of influence' whose behaviours are shaped by the Armed Forces of 20 years ago. Behaviours towards their subordinates are rarely considered to be malicious, rather perpetuated by a lack of understanding and education. Use of language can be inappropriate and offensive, simply through a lack of understanding of how it may be perceived by a minority group. Similarly, microaggressions take place daily, passing unrecognised by those who have committed them. Stonewall's Workplace Equality Index, for example, places all three uniformed Services within the top 100 employers in the UK, yet also highlights that 26-36% of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Service people have experienced negative comments or conduct from colleagues at work because of their sexual orientation.

Many victim support groups consider the Armed Forces' culture exacerbates the opportunity for inappropriate behaviours to occur. They consider instances are commonplace, with conscious and sub-conscious behaviour, microaggression, psychological bullying and intimidation, including through social media and on-line behaviours, taking place at all levels, with junior ranks, women and BAME personnel the most likely victims of this behaviour.

Society is changing in other ways too, becoming much less tolerant of inappropriate behaviours in any environment, sexual harassment especially; #MeToo is a notable recent example. It was widely perceived amongst the stakeholder organisations, including the Service Complaints Ombudsman and in discussions with the private sector, that the Armed Forces lag behind wider society in dealing with these issues. This is exacerbated by the expectation that the Armed Forces should have higher standards than the society they serve.



Is our policy fit?

There is a considerable amount of policy linked to behaviour at the Defence, Civil Service and the single Service level. Of the six relevant Joint Service Publications (JSP), JSP 763 (MOD Bullying and Harassment Complaints Procedures) dated July 2013 urgently needs updating. This work is due to be completed by September 2019 but we would question whether sufficient governance and resource has been invested to deliver against this timeframe. Each of the single Services have additional policies that amplify policy on behaviours. Like JSPs, the majority of these policies are

up to date and have been exposed to external scrutiny; where this is not the case, updates should be completed as a matter of priority⁷. The Civil Service misconduct, grievance, bullying and harassment policies and guidance are currently in the process of being updated to reflect the recommendations of the Sue Owen Review. New guidance on sexual harassment is also being introduced for reporters, respondents, managers and witnesses.

Recommendation 1.6: Revise JSP 763 as a policy priority.

What do others think of our policy?

While Defence's policy towards inappropriate behaviour is perceived to be largely fit for purpose and strongly supported by the senior leadership, external stakeholders consider our implementation of this policy to be poor, especially with regards to zero tolerance. In discussions with external stakeholders and members of our own diversity networks, there is a perceived disconnect across the rank structure, with attitudes and behaviours not necessarily reflecting Defence intent. They told us that this is due to a combination of lack of policy awareness, sub-optimal training, and the suggestion that a generation of Service personnel are not used to having people from other diversity groups serving alongside them.

Does our governance work?

Senior Responsible Owner. Within MOD Head Office, we engaged functional staffs aligned to Service Justice, Service Complaints, and the management of Civil Servants. It has been difficult to identify clearly the point of convergence and ownership of Defence cultures and behaviours, or any organisation able to systematically track and analyse behavioural trends and advise senior leadership. It is recognised that Service Chiefs exercise Full Command over their respective Services and have ownership and responsibility for their Services. The absence of a Defence-level Senior Responsible Owner should, however, be addressed.

Recommendation 1.7: Establish a MOD focal point – a Senior Responsible Owner – to own, track and inform Defence culture and behaviours.

Executive Boards. At a senior level in Defence, executive Boards have engaged on topics linked to behaviours and standards in Defence as the need has arisen. Recent examples include consideration by the MOD Executive Committee of the Sue Owen Review into bullying and harassment and the Defence Diversity and Inclusion Strategy published last year. The Navy and Royal Air Force Boards have engaged periodically on culture and behaviours, whereas the Army have considered similar issues more extensively; notably in connection with their Sexual Harassment Survey 2018. This is clear evidence of senior level engagement across Defence, but it has been largely reactive and responsive. Looking ahead, we would recommend that Defence adopts a more pro-active stance, placing culture and behaviours as a standing item on senior level Defence and single Service boards, with a single executive owner held to account by non-executive directors or audit committees.

Recommendation 1.8: Defence and single Service Boards should include culture and behaviours as a standing agenda item, with a single executive owner held to account by non-executive directors or audit committees.

⁷ RAF AP1 'Ethos, Core Values and Standards (of the Royal Air Force)' reviewed 2008.

Climate assessments. A proactive process for assessing the Command climate and behaviours is now well-established across all three Services. The Army has developed and matured a tiered process, including the completion of focus-group based analysis within units, led by trained facilitators. The Naval Service conduct a similar advisory process as do the Royal Air Force. This approach, utilising focus groups, by trained facilitators, is seen as leading practice and is utilised by other nations and organisations including the United States military. Such data, although confidential, can be analysed centrally and utilised as a tool to understand behavioural themes.

Recommendation 1.9: Climate assessments and advisory visits should be sustained and exploited across Defence.

Values and standards. Each Service has established and operates a core set of values and standards. These values and standards, developed over time and from extensive operational testing, reflect the unique culture, ethos and operating environments of the respective Armed Forces and Civil Service. Values and standards for the Royal Navy, Royal Marines, Army and Royal Air Force are well established, comprehensively communicated and understood. The governance surrounding the Civil Service Code is less well recognised, as noted in the Sue Owen Review, which observed that in some workplaces, ‘staff are looking for a more explicit articulation of the behaviours they should expect to see.’ Communication of the Civil Service Code must therefore be amplified and include military line managers of civilians.

Recommendation 1.10: Single Service values and standards should be sustained but communication of the Civil Service Code should be amplified.

What do others think of our governance?

The chain of command and how it deals with Inappropriate Behaviour. There is a notable perception among external stakeholders that trust in the system is not as strong as it used to be; over half of the external stakeholders consulted, without prompting, alluded to this sentiment. Some of them consider that units are sweeping issues under the carpet through a ‘protect the cap badge’ mentality, and for presentational reasons up the organisational chain of command. Support organisations suggest more requests for help are being lodged externally rather than through internal support channels, partly due to the association of these organisations with the chain of command, but also as a last resort when the chain of command has failed them. In many cases it was reported to us that victims are afraid to report an issue as they do not believe they will be understood or taken seriously. Cultural differentials play strongly into this space; the chain of command is not normally culturally representative of those under their command, and so people fear – or experience – unconscious bias through issues being considered in a manner which lacks empathy or understanding of the significance of a situation to the person.



Confidence in the system – the willingness to come forward. We heard repeated suggestions of Service people not reporting inappropriate or unacceptable behaviour because of a fear of the consequences of doing so. Similarly, military culture and a rigid hierarchy inhibits bystander intervention and the ability of lower ranks to challenge the behaviours of their seniors. Such fears include the impact on their career prospects; being perceived as a trouble-maker; the issue being placed on their career record; potential consequences on career and home life; the potential that stepping forward would aggravate the situation; a fear of not fitting in; segregation and no longer being treated as a member of the group; not being believed; their concern not being taken seriously; and the chain of command at every level lacking the time to do anything with the issue. Many simply consider that reporting inappropriate behaviour to their chain of command would get them nowhere, a pattern which the Service Complaints Ombudsman has also recognised. The net result suggests a sense of helplessness among some of our people, who either keep quiet or turn to a fully anonymous external service for help.

The Service Complaints system. The 2018 report from the Service Complaints Ombudsman noted the majority of users who did make a Service Complaint were dissatisfied with the time taken to resolve the complaint, and three-quarters considered they had suffered negative consequences as a result of pursuing a formal complaint. Across the Services, only 50% of Service Complaints were closed within the 24-week target, falling significantly short of the 90% target; on average it is currently taking 53 weeks to resolve a bullying, harassment or discrimination Service Complaint.

External stakeholders told us our people have lost faith in the Service Complaints system. It is perceived to lack independence from the chain of command at every level, and many of our stakeholders question its ability to be impartial or for people to use it without attracting negative consequences. The Service Complaints Ombudsman has noted in successive annual reports, ‘...the lack of confidence in the system also continues to be a key issue...and one which requires considerable focus and attention if we are ever to achieve an efficient, effective and fair system.’

The view of the external stakeholder community as reported to us is consistent and clear - the creation of a complaints organisation which allows for anonymous reporting and support for people affected, and external to the Armed Forces would allow people the freedom to make a complaint without the fear of reprisal. We return to this point in Part 3 of the Report.

Observation 1.1: External stakeholders highlight shortcomings in how Defence deals with instances of inappropriate behaviour, the efficacy of the current Service Complaints system especially.

Does our training work?

Mandated training – Armed Forces. All Services deliver mandated training on diversity, inclusion and values; it is often delivered within a tight timescale and can, in some areas, focus on compliance rather than behaviours and cultural change. Senior Officers (1* and above, OF5 by exception) must attend a one-day course every three years. Feedback from the Defence Academy indicates that the Senior Officer courses are often under subscribed, due to frequent last-minute drop outs and pressure on diaries.

Recommendation 1.11: Mandated diversity, inclusion and values training must be prioritised, irrespective of rank.

Additional training – Armed Forces. In addition to mandated training, the Armed Forces deliver sessions on behaviours, ethics, culture and inclusion within their command courses, usually during leadership modules. In the best cases, the training becomes more interactive with scenario-based role-play, which carries more impact and is much better received than formal presentations or online training. The Naval Service training approach already reflects significantly greater emphasis on cultural change rather than compliance; the Royal Air Force have similarly implemented behaviours and perceptions workshops for military and civilian personnel. Army analysis also recognises the value of peer-based discursive learning; subject-specific training interventions include: sexual behaviours training by military police; and novel approaches such as ‘Dilemma’⁸ and ‘Respect for Others’ scenario-based training delivered in partnership with trained facilitators. Immersive training approaches such as these are engaging, effective and recognised leading practice. All indications are positive, however there is no established pan-Defence process for measuring the impact of these programmes. There is also a pressing need for training interventions aimed specifically to address the overrepresentation of minority groups, women and junior ranks in the complaints process.



Recommendation 1.12: Maximise use of immersive values-based training across Defence.

Recommendation 1.13: Defence should investigate causes of overrepresentation of minority groups, women and junior ranks in the complaints process and implement the necessary training interventions as part of an overarching strategy to address the issue.

Recommendation 1.14: Defence should develop a process for measuring the impact of culture and behaviours training programmes.

Civilian behaviours training. Relevant mandatory training for civil servants comprises e-learning on ‘Unconscious Bias’ and ‘Equality and Diversity Essentials’. Civil servants within military units are invited to attend military behaviours training but this is largely discretionary. In contrast to their military colleagues, collective and group-based training opportunities for civil servants are limited. In the spirit of a whole force approach, military opportunities should be inclusive where possible to their civil service colleagues.

Recommendation 1.15: Increase group-based training opportunities for civil servants, especially in military events appropriate to the whole force.

Specialist D&I training. JSP 763 directs that every unit should have at least one trained Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Advisor (EDIA) whose prime role is to advise the Commanding Officer on Equality Legislation, provide a route to the informal resolution of complaints, and advise Service personnel on how to submit a Service Complaint. Due to the deployed nature of maritime operations the Royal Navy requires every platform and unit to have at least two EDIAs, which enables better cultural understanding and a more comprehensive level of support to the chain of command. Currently all EDIAs must complete a four-day course run by the Intrinsic Leadership and Behaviours Team at the Defence Leadership Centre. The course is always oversubscribed, and military units frequently complain of an inability to get people trained. In parallel, there is an emerging programme to train ‘Speak Safe’ volunteers, who operate in support of the Civil Service. Their remit and training overlaps with that of the EDIA. There is an opportunity to adopt a more effective whole force approach through revision of the existing EDIA and Speak Safe programmes, to include both military and civil servants.

Recommendation 1.16: Defence should investigate the synergy between EDIA and Speak Safe approaches to share best practice and ensure we are making best use of the available resources.

Recommendation 1.17: The resource and priority afforded to Intrinsic Leadership and Behaviours at the Defence Leadership Centre should be adjusted to meet the demands of the three Services and the Civil Service.

What do others think of our training?

External stakeholders told us that leadership plays a central role. Leaders at every level should champion education activities where we reflect on our behaviours and understand the impact of them. They also highlight the perception that the quality of training and level of understanding is low at the tactical level. One of the flagship Service charities notes: “A centrally produced power point slide pack, sent out to be delivered as mandatory training will not fix this...what may work is discussion, where we confront our behaviours and understand the impact.” The Royal Navy have already addressed this in their training delivery and are in the process of extending this to include the Royal Fleet Auxiliary. The Royal Air Force training also reflects greater education and influence.

Some charities and victim support groups suggested that Defence lacks the skills and specialist knowledge to address this training challenge internally. There was a view we should use specialist external consultancy support, not just in developing policy but also in practice. Many of the private sector organisations we spoke to had used external specialists successfully, and for the same reasons. Widening the training to include spouses and partners was also highlighted as an effective way to address the potential for inappropriate behaviours and abuse in a domestic environment.

Behaviours in Defence – more to do

To conclude this part of the Report, there is no single comprehensive picture of inappropriate behaviours in Defence. The data that does exist points to an unacceptable level of inappropriate behaviour and a sub-optimal system for dealing with it when it does occur. The challenge of inappropriate behaviour is recognised clearly at the highest levels in Defence, and policies, governance and training programmes to address the problem are in place and energised across the Naval Service, Army, Royal Air Force and Civil Service.

Our policies are fit but, in some cases, need updating. Some aspects of our governance work well, but there is a need for a single point of responsibility, regular senior Board focus on culture and behaviours, and better sharing of good practice across each of the Armed Forces and the Civil Service. Our governance for dealing with instances of inappropriate behaviour and complaints works less well and there is a pressing need to address concerns of efficiency, effectiveness and fairness in the Service Complaints system. Our training too could be improved by better resourcing and, for example, making more use of immersive values-based training across all ranks and grades. Ultimately, we have to do more to stop inappropriate behaviour occurring and, when it does, to improve our response. The next two parts of the report will explore in more detail:

What more we must do to stop instances of inappropriate behaviour occurring. This is principally a chain of command issue for the Naval Service, Army and Royal Air Force, and for Civil Service line management. It is ultimately about leadership at every level in the organisation, setting the culture and standards and ensuring people meet those standards consistently.

How we do better when instances of inappropriate behaviour have occurred or are alleged to have occurred. Our own surveys and external stakeholders highlight repeatedly the inadequacies of the current system for raising complaints about inappropriate behaviour. There is a pressing need to reform the Service Complaints system which could include: anonymous reporting of inappropriate behaviours; a parallel channel for making Service Complaints outwith the chain of command; better support for complainants of inappropriate behaviour; and a dedicated central Service Complaints team equipped to deal with a selection of complaints, including the most complex allegations of bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Defence has progressed but there is more to do – the evidence is clear. Two key themes emerge which we must address:

- **We must work on our culture and behaviours to avoid instances of inappropriate behaviour taking place.**
- **When instances of inappropriate or unacceptable behaviour do occur, we must deal with them better.**



Part 2 – Getting ahead of Inappropriate Behaviours

“We must do more to stop instances of inappropriate behaviour occurring”

This part of the report considers how we should better **prepare** the workforce, setting the tone and giving people the skills they need to **prevent** inappropriate behaviours occurring. It is principally the responsibility of the single Services and Civil Service senior leadership and a significant amount of work is underway already. In compiling the Report, we identified the latest thinking and leading practice from professional bodies, academia and other external organisations including allied Armed Forces. This is about **changing the level of tolerance** and cultural acceptance of inappropriate behaviour across every part of Defence and at every level. It will require concerted effort and persistent attention; success will be measured in years not weeks.

Prepare the workforce – set the tone

“If a team enjoys good leadership, then unacceptable behaviour, such as bullying, harassment and discrimination within the team, will not be tolerated.”⁹ Leadership is the turnkey to set the conditions for improvement in behaviour across Defence. It creates an environment in which our people, military and civilian, have faith in the chain of command at every level, share a clear understanding of what is appropriate behaviour and are empowered to call it out when it is not. Leaders set the tone through role modelling; self-awareness of their own attitudes and biases; and in developing cultural intelligence and understanding of the whole force. Realtime feedback to leaders, especially from those more junior personnel within the organisation, is important and can be enabled through the use of reverse mentoring, 360° reporting and focus groups. For the last two years, the Royal Navy has operated a diversity and inclusion action group and the Royal Air Force has recently established a diversity and inclusion shadow board. Some Army units have, similarly, adopted this approach through the creation of ‘Regimental Inclusion Councils’ as a mechanism to capture behaviours and feedback to the Commanding Officer; this inclusive approach is especially effective in reflecting perspectives from junior cohorts. The initiative complements the Army Empowerment Programme which seeks to delegate authority to more junior levels of Command.

Recommendation 2.1: Services sustain and promote connected leadership in their training and preparation of leaders. Feedback mechanisms such as reverse mentors, focus groups and 360° reporting are leading practice and should be maximised.

Referent Others. Academic research refers to the most visible and influential members of a group or community as ‘Referent Others’; these include leaders, instructors and others in authority. Their behaviour not only has a disproportionate effect on the construction and propagation of the norm but they are also important agents for sustaining the culture of an organisation.^{10 11}

Observation 2.1: The identification, education and preparation of Referent Others, given their contribution to organisational culture, is key.

Prevention

Our Armed Forces understand the risks faced on operations and the individual judgements we ask of our people, even of life and death. The unique nature of military life introduces risks away from the battlefield too, and the risk of inappropriate behaviour is one. Experience points to risk factors that are a recurring feature of instances of unacceptable behaviour, particularly in cases of bullying

⁹ Army Leadership Code 2016.

¹⁰ Deborah A. Prentice. 2018. Intervening to change social norms: when does it work? *Social research* 85 (1) p.120.

¹¹ Michael W. Morris, Ying-yi Hong, Chi-yue Chiu and Zhi Liu. 2015. Normology: Integrating insights about social norms to understand cultural dynamics. *Organisational behaviour and human decision processes*. 129 pp1-13.

and sexual harassment: tight-knit units that perceive themselves as 'elite'; masculine cultures with low gender diversity; rank gradients; age gradients; weak or absent controls, especially after extensive operational periods; and alcohol. Unchecked or unrecognised, the combination of some or all of these risk factors sets the conditions for inappropriate behaviour to occur. To stop this, people in every part of Defence – not just the leaders and line managers – need to recognise the risk and have the good judgement to do something about it. The judgement we expect of our people on the battlefield must be the same level of judgement that we expect of their behaviour in the barrack block or the bar.

Cultures and behaviours training has to bolster that judgement. It has to be relevant for the people involved and offer skills and techniques which people can use to good effect. Current cultures and behaviours training focuses largely on Service values and standards and the Civil Service Code, complemented by diversity and inclusion training. This gives the impression it is done to maintain organisational compliance with the law and with Service values, standards and codes which, in some areas, has developed a 'tick box' attitude.

To change cultures and improve behaviours, training needs to be set in context, be well-timed and personally impactful for the participants, with a clear set of outcomes. Key intervention periods are at career inception and subsequent confirmatory command, management and promotion training courses. Training 'Referent Others' to exhibit new behaviours and implicitly encourage adoption by their peers has proven effective at changing norms and behaviours in some hard-to-reach groups¹²

¹³.

Training must also take a preventative view, to help leaders at every level better understand the early signs and symptoms of a systemic degradation of behaviours.

Recommendation 2.2: All recruits should receive immersive culture and behaviour training at the start of service and continued at regular intervals through their career.

The Army has made use of the Garnett Foundation to facilitate 'Respect for Others' training informed by the chain of command. This is scenario based, interactive and highly regarded, but has been subjected to funding pressures and remains at risk. The Garnett Foundation have also developed innovative training solutions for the Royal Navy and Royal Air Force but requires additional resource to deliver on a wider scale.

Recommendation 2.3: Use of third-party training expertise is considered leading practice and should be resourced and exploited across Defence.

Bystanders. Recent academic research^{14 15 16} refers widely to the role of bystanders in influencing behaviour in groups. Everyone is a bystander; we witness events unfolding around us constantly. Sometimes we recognise events as being problematic and we might decide to intervene – and become an active bystander; or not – and remain a passive bystander. There are many factors which will influence why we decide to intervene or not but when we do decide to intervene, we are sending a clear message to the wrongdoer that their behaviour is unacceptable.

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing"¹⁷

¹² Paluk, Elizabeth Levy and Hana Shepherd. 2012. "The Saliency of Social Referents: A Field Experiment on Collective Norms and Harassment Behaviour in a School Social Network." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 103 (6): 899-915.

¹³ Kashima, Y., Laham, S.M., Dix, J., Levis, B., Wong, D., & Wheeler, M. (2015). Social transmission of cultural practice and implicit attitudes. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*.

¹⁴ Berkowitz, A.D. (2009) *Response ability: A complete guide to bystander intervention*. Beck & Co.

¹⁵ Rachel A. Fenton, Helen L. Mott (2018) *Evaluation of the intervention initiative: A bystander intervention programme to prevent violence against women in universities*.

¹⁶ Australian Human Rights Commission (2012) *Encourage. Support. Act! Bystander approaches to sexual harassment in the work place*.

¹⁷ Attributed to Edmund Burke.

In empowering active bystanders, skills development and the creation of supporting challenge and reporting mechanisms is critical to the success of introducing effective intervention programmes. Several valid and reliable proprietary bystander intervention programmes exist but all such programmes require significant investment in training and education at all levels of the organisation. Bystander education equips people with the knowledge, skills and confidence to intervene; to challenge inappropriate behaviour; to call it out; and to report it. The Defence Academy active bystander intervention programme is judged leading practice in this regard.

Recommendation 2.4: Investigate, develop and implement appropriate bystander training across Defence.

Recruits. Recognising that we recruit from society, establishing the appropriate culture and behaviours of our people on their entry into the Defence community is crucial. We take young people from all parts of society and with diverse backgrounds; not everyone is starting from the same place. The Canadian Armed Forces are considering whether or not to gather additional information on new recruits to have a better idea of the values, attitudes and standards they possess on joining, to assess risk and protective factors and therefore better tailor and focus training. We recommend consideration of the same. Moreover, investment in our instructor cadre sets the conditions for success. They must be hand-picked, providing the very best training experience, and must demonstrate the highest levels of values and standards.

Recommendation 2.5: Consideration should be given to gathering additional values, attitudes and standards information on new recruits to assess the risk and tailor preventative training.

Recommendation 2.6: Single Services must sustain and protect their investment in high quality instructors and instruction at initial training.

In stark contrast to the single Services, MOD civil servants receive minimal induction on joining and little formal instruction in standards and behaviours. The lived experience of the MOD civil servant on arrival is very much dependent on the proactivity of their line manager and does not benefit from any meaningful collective training.

Recommendation 2.7: Induction and collective training opportunities for MOD civil servants must be reviewed, resourced and improved.

Social media. A widely acknowledged behavioural challenge is the increase in the transmission of social media messages with a sexual content.¹⁸ Whilst efforts should focus on this area, it is recognised that this is part of a broader societal challenge. Although there is an expectation that the more junior cohorts are more familiar with social media and online activity, some focus group feedback has suggested that this cohort, described as 'digital natives', do in fact require some training and education surrounding their conduct online.

Recommendation 2.8: Defence social media policy and training should focus equally on the avoidance of inappropriate behaviours as well as the security implications of online activity.

Transparency of action. Transparency of action needs to be communicated and evident to all Service personnel and civil servants. This should include greater transparency of the consequences for perpetrators, to bring to life the policy of zero-tolerance, energise values and standards and tackle elements of organisational cynicism that action does not get taken. Culture

¹⁸ Army Sexual Harassment Survey report 2018.

and behaviours – and the consequences for victims and/or perpetrators – need to feature as a routine conversation in the work place and throughout training provision; it must be consistent and persistent.

Recommendation 2.9: Communication on behaviours must be consistent and persistent. How we deal with inappropriate behaviour must be transparent, including the appropriate publication of outcomes.

Calling time on Inappropriate Behaviours

In considering what more we could do to prepare the whole force and prevent inappropriate behaviours occurring, it is the determination of leaders to change the culture that is the single most important factor. It must be driven persistently from the top and clearly at every level of leadership and line management below that.

Authentic Leadership, Relentless Engagement, Consistent Communication

Stopping instances of inappropriate behaviours occurring is about changing the culture of the organisation, cultivating an instinctive intolerance of breaches of laws, norms of behaviour or values and standards that do harm to individuals, teams or Defence. Leaders and line managers across Defence have a part to play, setting the tone through their actions, self-awareness of their own attitudes and biases, and seeking out and encouraging feedback from across their areas of responsibility.

This section identified the latest thinking and good practice from professional bodies, academia and other external organisations including allied Armed Forces. We also identified successful initiatives to change cultures and behaviours within Defence which we judge should be adopted universally. To change culture and improve behaviour, training needs to be focused from the outset of people's careers and continued throughout. It has to be appropriate and relevant for the people involved; be set in context; be personally impactful for the participants; and with a clear set of outcomes. It must be skills-based rather than simply awareness based; and should be focused on high risk groups. Bystander training, immersive role-playing training, and social media training are all good examples of programmes we recommend should be implemented across Defence. This will require concerted effort, resource and persistent attention over many years by Defence senior leadership, and leaders and line managers at every level.

In drawing this part to a close, it is again worth recognising that, whilst this report sets a sobering tone, it does not reflect the behaviour of the overwhelming majority of people in Defence who serve the UK with courage, determination, professionalism and great pride, day after day.





Part 3 – Dealing with Inappropriate Behaviour when it does occur

When instances of inappropriate behaviour do occur, we must deal with them better.

This part of the report focuses on how we can improve our response to incidents when they do occur. We judge in particular that we need to **build trust and confidence in the complaints system**, improve **reporting** of inappropriate behaviour, and the **support** to those who are affected.

Furthermore, we conclude a **new governance structure** is required, providing stronger centralised oversight and support; a single point of reference for data on inappropriate behaviour; able to identify and share leading practice across the organisation; and offering an alternative – and potentially anonymous – pathway for raising concerns of inappropriate behaviour or Service Complaints. This is the experience of the Canadian Armed Forces and Australian Defence Force. In this part of the report we will recommend the establishment of a new central organisation: a **Defence Authority responsible for cultures and inappropriate behaviours**. We will also recommend in parallel a **review of the Service Complaints process**.

Build trust and confidence in the complaints system

In gathering evidence for this report, a common theme among organisations who had faced endemic behavioural problems was a very low level of reporting initially, often combined with a perception that all was well. It was only when a significant event prompted further in-depth investigation that the extent of the issue became apparent. The majority of cases found in the evidence we looked at from Australia, Canada¹⁹ and the private sector, pointed to a general lack of confidence to report inappropriate behaviour for several reasons, including:

- Fear of adverse consequences on the complainant's career;
- Fear of not being believed;
- Belief that nothing would be done and a lack of transparency in the outcome of a complaint;
- Inadequate or insufficient consequences or disciplinary action;
- Complaint process not independent of the chain of command or line management;
- Lack of anonymity for the complainant; and
- Amount of time taken to achieve a resolution.

We conclude the number of complaints of inappropriate behaviour is under reported in the Service Complaints system for similar, if not identical reasons.

Observation 3.1: The Service Complaints target is to resolve 90% of all complaints within 24 weeks. In 2018, the Service Complaints Ombudsman reported only 50% of complaints were resolved in 24 weeks. We found the average target in the private sector for resolution of complaints of inappropriate sexual behaviour is 40 to 45 days.



¹⁹ External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces; Deschamps 2015.

Reporting

Observation 3.2: The private sector reports an average number of complaints of inappropriate behaviour equating approximately to 1% of the workforce per year of which 25%-40% is usually reported anonymously. By comparison, the Service Complaints Ombudsman Report in 2018 recorded that the Services received a total of 1,185 complaints of which 763 were deemed admissible and only 190 (25%) were related to bullying, discrimination and harassment. This represents less than 0.1% of the strength of the Services.

The low reporting rate of inappropriate behaviours has been covered widely in academia. Mengeling et al²⁰ identified that 75% of respondents in a study of women in the United States military did not report incidences of sexual harassment or assault and listed the reasons as including not knowing how to report and being too embarrassed. In 2016, the United States Department of Defence estimated that only 7% of those who experienced a sexual assault came forward to report the incident to the military. In 2018, this rate was approximately 30%²¹. Other common reasons included: concerns that reporting would negatively affect their career; nothing would be done; confidentiality would not be kept; because servicewomen blamed themselves; work environment concerns; would be treated differently by leadership; and would be seen as weak. Notably, some did not report because either the person they had to report to was the perpetrator or was a friend of the perpetrator. Although this study focused on women as victims of male-perpetrated inappropriate behaviour, similar issues are reported for male victims. Collectively these weak signals suggest there is a level of unreported behaviours that cannot yet be quantified, and we believe there is a strong case to be made for a Defence 'call for evidence' on inappropriate behaviours.

Recommendation 3.1: In line with recommendation 1.4, Defence should consider a 'call for evidence' on inappropriate behaviours in conjunction with a sexual harassment survey in 2021.

Anonymous reporting. While some people will feel able to report incidents of inappropriate behaviour through their chain of command or line management; many will not. The United States, Australia and New Zealand Armed Forces have utilised a restricted reporting method allowing an individual to seek support for a sexual assault without initiating an investigation, thus remaining anonymous. The United States restricted reporting data is compelling: all victims indicated that they would not have reported if the only means had been through a formal report. In 2017, 24% of those reporting went on to convert to a full report initiating an investigation. Key to this is that the report must be recorded to enable an understanding of the level of incidents.

Internal employee support networks provide valuable assistance but are not the answer. The Army Sexual Harassment Survey 2018 recommended the introduction of a web-based anonymous reporting tool for inappropriate behaviours, so Service personnel can make the Army aware of these behaviours without fear of repercussion. This initiative is not yet resourced.

Recommendation 3.2: Resource, develop and implement an anonymous tool for reporting inappropriate behaviours across Defence.

Communication. Clear and user-friendly guidance must be produced for people to recognise the scope and range of inappropriate behaviour. Effective communication of definitions, policies and guidance helps people understand what inappropriate behaviour is; what Defence's stance is on it; how it can be reported; what the process will involve; and how long it is likely to take. People are less likely to report inappropriate behaviour if they are not clear what it is; where to 'draw the line';

²⁰ Michelle A. Mengeling, Brenda M. Booth, James C. Torner, Anne G. Sadler (2014) Reporting sexual assault in the military – who reports and why most servicewomen don't. *Am J Prev Med* 2014;47(1):17-25.

²¹ Sexual Assault Accountability and Investigation Task Force Report April 30, 2019.

how to raise concerns; or what raising a concern will entail. JSP 763 should remain the cornerstone policy document from which this direction is drawn.

Recommendation 3.3: Implement a clear, simple and enduring communications campaign to articulate the range and scope of inappropriate behaviours, and what to do when instances occur.

Helplines. Individuals need a way of coming forward to report but also to receive advice on what support mechanisms are available and how to address inappropriate behaviours. The Army and Civil Service have effective and well-utilised helplines – Speak Out and Speak Safe – but this facility should be available across Defence to tackle inappropriate behaviours. The Canadian Armed Forces found that the provision of a sexual misconduct helpline run by trained counsellors not only provided victim support but also provided advice and support to the chain of command when assisting complainants. Helpline support should be telephonic, app-based and web-enabled to be accessible to all.

Recommendation 3.4: Establish an inappropriate behaviours helpline for all Defence personnel.

Support

Support to our people is, and remains, a responsibility of leadership at every level facilitated by internal welfare and chaplaincy services, with the right external agencies providing specialist advice and practical support where required. Additionally, there are helplines run by charities and victim support groups. The consequences of inappropriate behaviour can have a profound impact on the mental well-being and physical health of an individual. The impact can be lasting; it is not just about when the incident occurs, but what follows, which can last months or even years. This can be exacerbated by a Service Complaints system which is comprehensive but takes too long. Support to all affected individuals must be provided from the moment an incident is disclosed or reported, and then for as long as is needed. We must also care for the carers.

Where complainants come forward, Assisting Officers are offered to complainant and respondent(s) alike, however their use is not compulsory. Assisting Officers receive no formal training for the role.

Recommendation 3.5: Defence should review and improve the provision of support offered to all parties, including appropriate training for Assisting Officers.

Mediation. Mediation is only currently utilised in small pockets across Defence, with its use being viewed with caution by the Service Complaints Ombudsman. The benefits of certified and professional mediation for individuals and organisations are widely recognised, however, with much useful material produced by the Arbitration, Conciliation Advisory Service and the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development²². In her review, Sue Owen reported that one of several changes respondents to her survey wanted to see was the option of using informal resolution, including mediation, in preference to formal procedures, where that would be more beneficial. Those benefits might include: flexibility to suit particular circumstances; a space for more open and honest discussion; a quicker response to conflict to prevent escalation; less chance of the working relationship breaking down beyond repair; the chance for employers to understand the problem, and make changes that benefit employees and the wider organisation; it can also help to address issues around stress, and help prevent long-term absence. Feedback on the current mediation services is positive:

²² Mediation – an approach to resolving workplace issues (ACAS / CIPD joint publication 2013).

"I wish we had done this about 12 months ago as this could have been sorted out at the time"
– anon.

"I went in to mediation thinking it would be a waste of time but I was pleasantly surprised to see that this is a very effective way of solving issues. I would recommend this across the Army." – Male Sgt in two party mediation with female SSgt Nov 17.

In 2018, 75 mediations were scoped by the Army service with 88% successful outcomes. In the event, only 42 mediations needed to be conducted as the scoping activity resolved the issues. This approach is informing Other Government Departments and should be rolled out across Defence; this could include a central mediation coordination cell managing a pool of pan-Defence volunteers.

Recommendation 3.6: Defence should resource, train and deliver an effective, certified and professional mediation service, recognising and addressing the potential risks of mediation identified by the Service Complaints Ombudsman.

Centralised oversight and governance - a stronger approach

Analysis of the current situation, stakeholder perceptions, and the experiences of other Armed Forces highlights the importance of placing oversight of cultures and behaviours under the responsibility of a single body that sits outside the chain of command but with access across all areas up to and including the most senior levels. This principal focus of this body would be to ensure the highest values and standards are upheld across Defence.

A Defence Authority responsible for cultures and Inappropriate Behaviours

We recommend a new governance structure providing stronger centralised oversight and support; the responsibility for tracking and analysing all related data; the ability to identify and share good practice across the organisation; and offering an alternative – and potentially anonymous – pathway for raising concerns of inappropriate behaviour or Service Complaints. It would also collaborate with internal and external stakeholders and should be held accountable by the Service Complaints Ombudsman as are other areas of Defence. The model for achieving this would be the establishment of a Defence Authority responsible for cultures and inappropriate behaviours.



The Authority should be external to the single Services' chain of command, responsible to a Senior Responsible Owner, and through that office to the Permanent Secretary and the Chief of the Defence Staff. This emulates the successful models of the Canadian Armed Forces, Australian Defence Force and United States military. We can learn from the experiences of the Canadian Armed Forces in particular. They focused initially on the Armed Forces – to the exclusion of civilians – and specifically on instances of inappropriate sexual behaviour. They now intend to expand their programme to include the whole force and inappropriate behaviours beyond sexual harassment in a phased approach.

In order to provide the oversight and governance required, the Authority will need to be fully resourced with suitably qualified and experienced people otherwise it will not make a difference. We estimate around 30-50 people will be required, recognising this will be an additional workforce requirement for Defence. The Authority could be responsible for:

- Governance of Defence cultures and behaviours; ownership of pan-Defence strategy and policy for inappropriate behaviour and oversight of the implementation, including but not limited to JSP 763.
- Ensuring consistency in messaging internally and externally on behaviour, attitude and beliefs, including celebrating positive behaviours; and facilitating sharing of leading practice across the organisation.
- Assuring values and standards are upheld across Defence.
- Recording, analysing and tracking management information, including identifying and advising on trends.
- Setting the Defence training requirement for cultures and behaviours.
- Establishing a Defence Authority Service Complaints team for selected Service Complaints relating to inappropriate behaviour, operating in support of and with respect to the single Services' chain of command.
- Establishing a system for the anonymous reporting of complaints utilising modern reporting methods including a phone-based app, web-based forms, email and telephone.
- Develop and oversee support programmes for victims and other people affected.
- Ensuring a consistent approach pan-Defence to climate assessments, mediation and helplines.
- Reporting annually to the Permanent Secretary, Chief of the Defence Staff and the Chiefs of Staff.
- Overseeing the implementation of those recommendations of the Sue Owen Review with pan-Defence implications.
- Monitoring and reporting on the recommendations of this report.

Able to benchmark and monitor leading practice and lessons from other nations' Armed Forces, academia and the private sector, the Authority would ensure Defence attains and remains at the leading edge of thinking on cultures and behaviours.

Recommendation 3.7: Establish a Defence Authority responsible for cultures and inappropriate behaviours.

Review of the Service Complaints process

Despite concerted efforts by all three Services, the Service Complaints Ombudsman is still unable to report that the process is efficient, effective and/or fair²³. We judge from the data we have seen, that a significant proportion of our people feel the same, especially women, people from BAME groups and junior ranks. Confidence in the complaints process must be improved so Defence people feel able to raise their concerns without fear of retribution. Complaints must be dealt with efficiently, effectively and fairly.

The experiences of the Armed Forces of other nations and organisations from the private sector have been analysed to understand how confidence can be enhanced in the complaints process.

Defence Authority Service Complaints team. Complaints of inappropriate behaviour, including all aspects of bullying, harassment or discrimination, are by their very nature likely to be the most complex and emotive and require the highest levels of investigation and analysis. We recommend centralising elements of the Service Complaints process within the Authority, responsible for dealing with complaints of inappropriate behaviour exceeding a certain threshold.

²³ Service Complaints Ombudsman for the Armed Forces Annual Report 2018.

The complaints that fall to the Authority could be determined in a similar way to that taken by the Service Prosecuting Authority in criminal cases: there will be those matters which should be mandated as automatically Defence Authority cases; those which fall clearly outwith its mandate, dealt with by the chain of command and single Service secretariats; and there will be those where it is not immediately obvious. This latter category should be the subject of a referral to the Authority and an appropriate determination made in consultation with the single Services. The Authority would also be able to take a view on complex cases where the complainant and respondent straddle Service, Civil Service or international boundaries. In that regard we recommend that consideration be given to amending primary legislation to allow civil servants to raise a grievance regarding bullying harassment or discrimination through the Service Complaints system.

Other factors that may influence the decision could include: the preference of the complainant; whether the chain of command is implicated; complaints bridging different chains of command, line management, nationality or terms and conditions of service; or if there is a reputational risk to Defence.

Under this approach, bullying, harassment and discrimination complaints would have bespoke resources allocated and prioritised, and the complainant and respondent supported appropriately. Furthermore, complaints could be made outwith the chain of command with confidence, and anonymous complaints received, and identities protected. The process should also enable bystander reports alone to trigger action. The team would be staffed by people specially trained for these cases, who would also be able to offer specialist advice to the chain of command on matters relating to bullying, harassment and discrimination. It would ensure the recording and transparent reporting of outcomes, and that outcomes are properly communicated to the complainant and respondent.

Recommendation 3.8: Allocate the responsibility for the reporting and handling of all serious behavioural complaints to the Defence Authority, based on an agreed threshold and including anonymous and bystander reporting.

Recommendation 3.9: Consideration be given to amending primary legislation to allow civil servants to raise a grievance through the Service Complaints system.

A two-tier system. Consideration should also be given to a two-tier system. Not all complaints involve the same degree of complexity and, when it comes to handling complaints, one size does not fit all. Improving the timeliness of the resolution of complaints is a key factor in addressing the confidence and satisfaction of the complaints system at all levels. Going forward, Defence could adopt a system where resources are aligned more intelligently to the complexity, sensitivity and gravity of the complaint.

Noting the extensive scope of the current complaints system, combined with the analysis of the last three years' Service Complaints Ombudsman reports – which show that the majority of the complaints relate to career management decisions or pay and allowances – it is apparent that not all complaints demand the full weight of resources required for bullying, harassment and discrimination complaints. The majority could be dealt with in a significantly more streamlined manner as seen in the Royal Air Force approach to the 'fast-track unit' and commented on favourably by the Service Complaints Ombudsman in her 2018 report. This would achieve a quicker resolution for the majority and allow the focus of scarce resources to the more complex cases.

Consideration should therefore be given to implementing a two-tier complaints system, whereby the full scope of the current system is reserved for bullying, harassment and discrimination complaints. For all other Service Complaints, a new streamlined complaints process should be

adopted, based on leading practice from other nations' Armed Forces and the private sector. It would enable the chain of command to resolve issues quickly and at the lowest possible levels, while retaining the necessary means of assurance and transparency of the process. Consideration should also be given to certified and professional mediation as a formal step within the Service Complaints process.

In addition, the Service Complaints Ombudsman has called in her annual reports for certain types of complaints to be dealt with by specially trained staff, who may be able to spot early signs of stress and signpost appropriate levels of support at the earliest possible stage. A two-tier system could address this point too.

Recommendation 3.10: Implement a two-tier complaints system, reserving the full scope of the current system for the most complex cases including bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Dealing with the aftermath - a stronger approach

This section focused on how we should do better when instances of inappropriate behaviour have occurred or are alleged to have occurred. We recommended how we must build trust and confidence in the complaints system, improve reporting of inappropriate behaviour, and the support to all those who are affected.

The evidence presented for this Report highlighted the shortcomings of the current system for raising complaints about inappropriate behaviour, and the widespread lack of trust in the system as a consequence. Data is incomplete but we judge from the evidence seen that bullying, harassment and discrimination is under-reported, potentially to a significant degree. Furthermore, the disproportionate overrepresentation of women and ethnic minorities – and a lack of data on other minority groups – is of widespread concern.

We conclude there is a compelling case for reforming the Service Complaints system and the support arrangements around it, emulating successful models in other Armed Forces. This should include: a centralised victim support centre and helpline; anonymous reporting of inappropriate behaviours; a parallel channel for Service Complaints outwith the direct chain of command; and a dedicated central Service Complaints team equipped to deal with the most complex allegations of bullying, harassment including sexual harassment, and discrimination.

In parallel, we judge there is a pressing need for central oversight of cultures and behaviours across Defence. We recommend the establishment of a Defence Authority, working to the Chief of Defence People as the Senior Responsible Owner on behalf of the Chief of the Defence Staff and Permanent Secretary. The Authority would be responsible for pan-Defence strategy, policy and governance; a single point of reference for all management information on inappropriate behaviours; conducting assurance activity across the Armed Forces; and sharing leading practice across Defence. It would house the central Service Complaints team and related helplines and support services.

We also identified potential enhancements to the Service Complaints system; introducing a two-tier system to streamline the process for more straightforward cases, enabling staff focus and resources to be aligned more intelligently to the complexity, sensitivity and gravity of the complaint.

The recommendations in Part 3 will better enable Defence to deal with the consequences of inappropriate behaviour. Many of the recommendations could be implemented in a matter of weeks and months. We judge that once in place, many of the benefits will be almost immediate.



Conclusion

This Report into inappropriate behaviours in Defence makes 36 recommendations on what we should do to stop instances of inappropriate behaviours occurring, and what we should do better when inappropriate behaviours have occurred. Ultimately, the challenge of inappropriate behaviour will only be addressed through a determined effort across the whole force to change the culture, driven persistently from the top and at every level of leadership and line management below that. It requires authentic leadership; relentless engagement; and consistent communication. Everybody has a part to play.

We defined inappropriate behaviours as breaches of laws, norms of behaviour or core values and standards which harm or risk harming individuals, teams or operational effectiveness and that bring or risk bringing the reputation of individuals, units, the Service or Defence into disrepute. We took a consciously broad view of inappropriate behaviours however we focused first and foremost on those that harm individuals. We judge that an unacceptable level of inappropriate behaviour persists in Defence, however we were unable to quantify it precisely. The evidence reflected in this report indicates a significant number of our people have experienced bullying, discrimination and harassment, including sexual, but have not felt able or been able to come forward to report it. This pattern mirrored what we identified in other organisations including the Canadian Armed Forces, the United States military and the Australian Defence Force.

The absence of reporting reflects a deficit of trust in our complaints system. Our own surveys and external stakeholders highlight repeatedly the shortcomings of the current system for raising complaints about inappropriate behaviour, with complainants citing a fear of retribution and low confidence or faith that anything would be done, or done in a timely manner. We also observed a disproportionate over-representation of women and ethnic minorities in the Service Complaints system, and a lack of data on other minority groups.

Our recommendations on what should be done to tackle inappropriate behaviour focused principally on leadership and line management at every level setting the right culture and standards; ensuring people meet those standards consistently; and being alert to when standards might slip. We also made recommendations about effective, targeted and resourced training; a centralised assurance function; the compilation of a single set of data and statistics relating to inappropriate behaviour; regular Board-level focus on culture and behaviours; and better sharing of leading practice across the three Armed Forces and Civil Service.

To do better when instances of inappropriate behaviour have occurred or are alleged to have occurred, we recommended a review of the Service Complaints system to include: a dedicated central Service Complaints team equipped to deal with the most complex allegations of bullying, harassment and discrimination; a helpline for supporting complainants and respondents as well as the chain of command and line management; and a parallel channel for raising Service Complaints outwith the chain of command, including anonymous and bystander reporting. We also recommended consideration of a two-tier process for Service Complaints to streamline the process for more straightforward cases, enabling staff focus and resources to be aligned to the complexity, sensitivity and gravity of the complaint.

We identified a need for central oversight of cultures and inappropriate behaviours across Defence. We recommended the establishment of a Defence Authority responsible for cultures and inappropriate behaviours. Working to the Chief of Defence People as the Senior Responsible Owner, the Authority would be responsible for pan-Defence strategy, policy and governance; a single point of reference for all management information; assurance activity across the Armed Forces; and sharing leading practice across Defence. It would also house the central Service Complaints team and related helplines and support services. The Authority would need to be fully resourced with an estimated 30-50 suitably qualified and experienced people, recognising this will be an additional workforce requirement for Defence.

What does good look like? Tackling inappropriate behaviour is about the determination of leaders to change the culture; everything else hangs off that. Real cultural change comes only when leaders communicate and role model those behaviours relentlessly, where there is a clear understanding of what they mean in practice, and where there are evident consequences for breaching them. Success might ultimately be judged when matters that arise – as they always will – are dealt with by junior leaders or colleagues instinctively and immediately in every part of Defence. An inappropriate comment is made, a corporal tells the perpetrator to apologise, explaining why it caused offence, the apology is made and accepted, and the matter resolved. We are already there in many parts of the organisation but changing embedded cultures and driving out inappropriate behaviour across the whole of Defence will take persistent and concerted effort, at every level of leadership and line management, over an extended period of time.

Finally, we would all recognise that inappropriate behaviour, and the consequences for the people affected by it, damages the United Kingdom Armed Forces' hard-won reputation for courage, determination and professionalism. We should not, however, lose perspective on the behaviour of the overwhelming majority of people in Defence who serve with courage, determination, professionalism and great pride, protecting the UK 24/7.

Annexes:

- A. Values and Standards.
- B. Summary of Recommendations and Observations.
- C. Report on Inappropriate Behaviours - Methodology and Stakeholder Engagement.
- D. Glossary.

Annex A - Values and Standards

Royal Navy	Royal Marines	British Army	Royal Air Force	Civil Service	
RN Ethos	The Commando Spirit	Values and Standards of the British Army	Air Publication 1 – Ethos, Core Values and Standards (of the Royal Air Force) – 2 nd Ed. Revised Jan 08.	The Civil Service Code	
Commitment	Excellence	Values	Courage	Respect	Integrity
Courage	Integrity		Discipline	Integrity	Honesty
Discipline	Self Discipline		Respect for others	Service	Objectivity
Respect for others	Humility		Integrity	Excellence	(Political) Impartiality
Integrity	Courage		Loyalty		
Loyalty	Determination		Selfless commitment		
Royal Fleet Aux	Unselfishness		Lawful		
Professionalism, Integrity, Courage, Teamwork	Cheerfulness	Acceptable behaviour			
		Professional			
<p><u>The Service Test</u></p> <p>“Have the actions or behaviour of an individual adversely impacted or are they likely to impact on the efficiency or operational effectiveness of the [Service]?”</p>					

Annex B - Summary of Recommendations and Observations

Recommendations

1.1	Defence must improve the level of detail and metadata captured on serious unacceptable behaviour as well as instances of lower severity, to provide a single comprehensive picture of inappropriate behaviours across the organisation.
1.2	Defence should consider amending primary legislation to require the sharing of information from the civilian Criminal Justice System.
1.3	Defence should develop performance measures relating to inappropriate behaviours for use at Defence Board, Executive Committee and Performance and Risk Reviews.
1.4	Defence should conduct a harassment survey in 2021 building on the Army Sexual Harassment Survey 2018, informed by an independent advisory group. In line with recommendation 3.1, Defence should consider a 'call for evidence' on inappropriate behaviours in conjunction with this survey, in order to provide supporting detail to the survey.
1.5	Defence should better coordinate and focus the bullying, harassment and discrimination elements of continuous attitude surveys to improve understanding, reduce duplication and streamline data analysis. Use of contemporary, on-line survey formats should also be considered.
1.6	Revise Joint Service Publication (JSP) 763 (MOD Bullying and Harassment Complaints Procedures) as a policy priority.
1.7	Establish a MOD focal point – a Senior Responsible Owner – to own, track and inform Defence culture and behaviours.
1.8	Defence and single Service Boards should include culture and behaviours as a standing agenda item, with a single executive owner held to account by non-executive directors or audit committees.
1.9	Climate assessments and advisory visits should be sustained and exploited across Defence.
1.10	Single Service values and standards should be sustained but communication of the Civil Service Code should be amplified.
1.11	Mandated diversity, inclusion and values training must be prioritised, irrespective of rank.
1.12	Maximise use of immersive values-based training across Defence.
1.13	Defence should investigate causes of overrepresentation of minority groups, women and junior ranks in the complaints process and implement the necessary training interventions as part of an overarching strategy to address the issue.
1.14	Defence should develop a process for measuring the impact of culture and behaviours training programmes.
1.15	Increase group-based training opportunities for civil servants, especially in military events appropriate to the whole force.
1.16	Defence should investigate the synergy between EDIA and Speak Safe approaches to share best practice and ensure we are making best use of the available resources.
1.17	The resource and priority afforded to Intrinsic Leadership and Behaviours at the Defence Leadership Centre should be adjusted to meet the demands of the three Services and the Civil Service.
2.1	Services sustain and promote connected leadership in their training and preparation of leaders. Feedback mechanisms such as reverse mentors, focus groups and 360° reporting are leading practice and should be maximised.
2.2	All recruits should receive immersive culture and behaviour training at the start of service and continued at regular intervals through their career.
2.3	Use of third-party training expertise is considered leading practice and should be resourced and exploited across Defence.
2.4	Investigate, develop and implement appropriate bystander training across Defence.

2.5	Consideration should be given to gathering additional values, attitudes and standards information on new recruits to assess the risk and tailor preventative training.
2.6	Single Services must sustain and protect their investment in high quality instructors and instruction at initial training.
2.7	Induction and collective training opportunities for MOD civil servants must be reviewed, resourced and improved.
2.8	Defence social media policy and training should focus equally on the avoidance of inappropriate behaviours as well as the security implications of online activity.
2.9	Communication on behaviours must be consistent and persistent. How we deal with inappropriate behaviour must be transparent, including the appropriate publication of outcomes.
3.1	In line with recommendation 1.4, Defence should consider a 'call for evidence' on inappropriate behaviours in conjunction with a sexual harassment survey in 2021.
3.2	Resource, develop and implement an anonymous tool for reporting inappropriate behaviours across Defence.
3.3	Implement a clear, simple and enduring communications campaign to articulate the range and scope of inappropriate behaviours, and what to do when instances occur.
3.4	Establish an inappropriate behaviours helpline for all Defence personnel.
3.5	Defence should review and improve the provision of support offered to all parties, including appropriate training for Assisting Officers.
3.6	Defence should resource, train and deliver an effective, certified and professional mediation service, recognising and addressing the potential risks of mediation identified by the Service Complaints Ombudsman.
3.7	Establish a Defence Authority responsible for cultures and inappropriate behaviours.
3.8	Allocate the responsibility for the reporting and handling of all serious behavioural complaints to the Defence Authority, based on an agreed threshold and including anonymous and bystander reporting.
3.9	Consideration be given to amending primary legislation to allow civil servants to raise a grievance through the Service Complaints system.
3.10	Implement a two-tier complaints system, reserving the full scope of the current system for the most complex cases including bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Observations

1.1	External stakeholders highlight shortcomings in how Defence deals with instances of inappropriate behaviour, the efficacy of the current Service Complaints system especially.
2.1	The identification, education and preparation of Referent Others, given their contribution to organisational culture, is key.
3.1	The Service Complaints target is to resolve 90% of all complaints within 24 weeks. In 2018, the Service Complaints Ombudsman reported only 50% of complaints were resolved in 24 weeks. We found the average target in the private sector for resolution of complaints of inappropriate sexual behaviour is 40 to 45 days.
3.2	The private sector reports an average number of complaints of inappropriate behaviour equating approximately to 1% of the workforce per year of which 25%-40% is usually reported anonymously. By comparison, the Service Complaints Ombudsman Report in 2018 recorded that the Services received a total of 1,185 complaints of which 763 were deemed admissible and only 190 (25%) were related to bullying, discrimination and harassment. This represents less than 0.1% of the strength of the Services.

Annex C - Report on Inappropriate Behaviours - Methodology and Stakeholder Engagement

A team drawn from across Defence was tasked to undertake this review. Research and evidence gathering was undertaken in four areas; this was then distilled and triangulated to gather the deepest possible insights, and to both confirm and inform the validity, credibility and authenticity of our findings and recommendations.

The four areas of research were:

What Defence (the three single Services and the Civil Service) is currently doing with regard to standards of behaviour and values. This included researching current policies and how they are applied, evidence from surveys and climate assessments, management information on incidences of inappropriate behaviour and sanctions resulting from an investigation, and initiatives already underway to address recognised shortfalls in behaviour.

The latest thinking on professional and academic approach to cultures and behaviours. This involved a literature review of seminal and contemporary literature on managerial psychology and sociology, where the subject of research was inappropriate or unethical individual work place behaviour in the context of perceived social norms, organisational culture and cultural/normative change, and also a literature review of seminal and contemporary literature on bystander intervention theory with the intent of identifying its effectiveness in countering inappropriate behaviours. A range of databases were used to source openly available literature and studies which focused on practical steps for organisations to consider in order to address inappropriate behaviour and mechanisms for responding to it. External engagement included academics and an individual currently working in the field of military and public service ethics. Research specifically referenced in this report is as follows:

Deborah A. Prentice. 2018. Intervening to change social norms: when does it work? *Social research* 85 (1) p.120.

Michael W. Morris, Ying-yi Hong, Chi-yue Chiu and Zhi Liu. 2015. Normology: Integrating insights about social norms to understand cultural dynamics. *Organisational behaviour and human decision processes*. 129 pp1-13.

Berkowitz, A.D. (2009) Response ability: A complete guide to bystander intervention. Beck & Co.

Rachel A. Fenton, Helen L. Mott (2018) Evaluation of the intervention initiative: A bystander intervention programme to prevent violence against women in universities.

Australian Human Rights Commission (2012) Encourage. Support. Act! Bystander approaches to sexual harassment in the work place.

Michelle A. Mengeling, Brenda M. Booth, James C. Torner, Anne G. Sadler (2014) Reporting sexual assault in the military – who reports and why most servicewomen don't. *Am J Prev Med* 2014;47(1):17-25.

Mediation – an approach to resolving workplace issues (ACAS / CIPD joint publication 2013).

How the Armed Forces are perceived externally. This involved seeking the views of wider society, so emphasis was placed on individuals and organisations with an existing connection to Defence, notably The Service Complaints Ombudsman, Armed Forces charities, non-military charities, victim support and civil society groups, welfare services, Service families' federations and internal 'whistleblowing' organisations. Members of internal Defence diversity networks were similarly canvassed. The key themes from over 40 engagements is summarised within this report, drawn from the following:

Service Complaints Ombudsman for the Armed Forces

Nicola Williams – Service Complaints Ombudsman

Members of Defence Diversity Networks

Armed Forces Muslim Association (AFMA)
Armed Forces Sikh Association (AFSA)
Armed Forces Hindu Network
Armed Forces Christian Union
Naval Service Commonwealth Network
Compass (Naval Service Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Network)
RAF Freedom Network
RAF BAME Network

Armed Forces' Charities

SSAFA - The Armed Forces Charity
Royal Navy & Royal Marines Charity
The Royal Marines Charity
Aggie Weston's
ABF The Soldiers Charity
Royal Air Force Benevolent Fund
Royal Air Force Association

Non-military Charities, Victim Support and Civil Society Groups

Aurora New Dawn
Business In The Community
Defence Personnel Advice Service
Drinkaware
Forces In Mind Trust
Liberty
Protect (formerly Public Concern at Work)
Rape Crisis England + Wales
Relate
Safelives
Samaritans
Stonewall
The Survivor's Trust
Victim Support

Welfare Services and Families Federations

Royal Navy and Royal Marines Welfare
Naval Families Federation
RAF Community Support
RAF Families Federation

Internal 'Whistleblowing'

Army 'Speak Out' Helpline

Army Unacceptable behaviours team

What other organisations are doing to tackle inappropriate behaviours. Research was conducted across a broad range of sectors to identify leading practice and to draw from the widest sources of experiences in informing our approach going forward.

The Armed Forces of other nations

Australia

Canada

Norway

Sweden

United States of America

Corporate and private sector organisations

Other organisations

The Metropolitan Police Service

The Garnett Foundation

Documentary review / open source material was reviewed on the following:

The Bar Council

The British Broadcasting Corporation

The British Medical Association

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA)

The Football Association

The Good Lad initiative

Google

Hiscox (2018 Workplace Harassment Study)

Lloyds of London (The Bloomberg Report)

National Rugby League

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT)

Rugby Football League

Annex D – Glossary

#MeToo	A movement against sexual harassment and sexual assault. The movement began to spread virally in October 2017 as a hashtag on social media in an attempt to demonstrate the widespread prevalence of sexual assault and harassment, especially in the workplace. It followed sexual-abuse allegations against Harvey Weinstein.
Active Bystander	Someone who not only witnesses a situation, but takes steps to speak up or step in to keep it from escalating or to disrupt a problematic situation.
Army Empowerment Programme	An Army initiative which encourages leaders to empower subordinates to use their initiative and judgment, whilst acting with loyalty and discipline.
Assisting Officer	A person who provides help and support to a complainant or a respondent during the formal complaints process.
BAME	Black, Asian, and minority ethnic (used to refer to members of non-white communities in the UK).
Bullying	Offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient.
Chief of Defence People	Reports to the Chief of Defence Staff and the Permanent Secretary. Sets the people policies and processes to sustain the delivery of Defence outputs through the right mix of sufficient, capable and motivated people.
Chief of Defence Staff	The main military advisor to the government and the main military voice on the Defence Board.
Climate Assessments	A supportive tool – providing a candid assessment and feedback on issues – to advise and inform the chain of command and line management to better understand the lived experience of their people.
Continuous Attitude Surveys	The annual Armed Forces Continuous Attitude Survey (AFCAS) is one of the main ways the Department gathers information on the views and experiences of Armed Forces personnel on a range of issues. A different selection of personnel are chosen to complete the survey each year, to ensure that a representative view of the Armed Forces community is captured.
Digital Native	A person born or brought up during the age of digital technology and so familiar with computers and the Internet from an early age.
Discrimination	Discrimination or victimisation on the grounds of disability, colour, race, ethnic or national origin, nationality, sex, gender re-assignment, status as a married person or civil partner, religion, belief or sexual orientation, and less favourable treatment of part-time employees.
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Advisor	A specialist advisor that has completed the Defence Equality Diversity & Inclusion Advisor (DEDIA) Course.
Full Command	The military authority and responsibility of a commander to issue orders to subordinates. It covers every aspect of military operations and administration and exists only within national services.
Harassment	Unwanted conduct on one or more prohibited grounds which has the purpose or effect of violating the recipient's dignity or of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for the recipient.
Joint Service Publication	A policy document which has Defence-wide applicability.
Mediation	Mediation is a voluntary process aimed at resolving workplace disputes at an early point and without the need of resorting to more formal methods. This is achieved through a trained independent mediator (or mediators) who will work with and encourage all those involved to find mutually beneficial solutions.

Micro-aggressions	A term used for brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioural, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative prejudicial slights and insults toward any individual or group.
MOD Executive Committee (ExCo)	The ExCo considers the major managerial and strategic policy issues impacting MOD, with a focus on delivery.
Naval Service	The Royal Navy, Royal Marines and Royal Fleet Auxiliary.
Permanent Secretary	A Permanent Secretary is the most senior civil servant in a Department. Each supports the government minister at the head of the Department, who is accountable to Parliament for the Department's actions and performance.
Queen's Regulations	The Queen's Regulations lay down the policy and procedure to be observed in the command and administration of the Services. They provide Commanding Officers with direction on the command and administration of their units.
Referent Others	Individuals and groups who serve as models for one's choices. These include leaders, instructors and others in authority. Their behaviour not only has a disproportionate effect on the construction and propagation of the norm but they are also important agents for sustaining the culture of an organisation.
Royal Fleet Auxiliary	A Merchant Navy organisation that is made up of civilian-crewed ships operated by the Ministry of Defence. It provides vital logistical and operational support to the Royal Navy and Royal Marines.
Senior Responsible Owner	The person responsible for ensuring that a programme meets its objectives and delivers the projected benefits.
Service Complaint	A formal complaint made by a Service person in accordance with the Armed Forces Act 2006 and associated legislation.
Service Complaints Ombudsman	The Service Complaints Ombudsman provides independent and impartial scrutiny of the handling of Service Complaints made by members of the UK Armed Forces.
Service Justice System	The Service Justice System provides a legal framework which recognises the environment in which the Armed Forces operate and ensures that Service personnel are subject to a single code that applies wherever in the world they are serving.
Service Prosecuting Authority (SPA)	The SPA reviews cases referred to it by the Service Police or chain of command and then prosecutes appropriate cases at Court Martial or Service Civilian Court.
Sexual Harassment	Unwanted verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature which has the purpose or effect of violating the recipient's dignity or of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for the recipient.
Speak Out Helpline	Army Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination help line.
SpeakSafe	The SpeakSafe Helpline offers MOD civil servants a safe space to discuss issues relating to bullying, harassment and discrimination in the workplace with experienced practitioners, outside of their immediate workplace, who will offer advice and support. The SpeakSafe service is impartial and confidential, allowing callers to remain anonymous, if they wish.
Stonewall Workplace Equality Index	A ranking list of British employers compiled annually by the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender equality charity and training provider Stonewall. It is advertised as "the definitive benchmarking tool for employers to measure their progress on lesbian, gay, bi and trans inclusion in the workplace".
The Garnett Foundation	An organisation which delivers bespoke workplace behavioural and cultural change programmes across the UK and Europe.
Unconscious Bias	Learned stereotypes that are automatic, unintentional, deeply engrained, universal, and able to influence behaviour. Age, gender, gender identity, physical abilities, religion, sexual orientation, weight, and many other characteristics may be subject to unconscious bias.

© Crown Copyright
Published by the Ministry of Defence 2019