

12-1-2007

## Jane's Decision: Her Experience as a Plebe: Instructor's Manual

Andra Gumbus  
*Sacred Heart University*

Jill Woodilla  
*Sacred Heart Univeristy*

Christopher C. York  
*Sacred Heart University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj>



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gumbus, Andra; Woodilla, Jill; and York, Christopher C. (2007) "Jane's Decision: Her Experience as a Plebe: Instructor's Manual," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 4 : Iss. 3 , Article 5.  
Available at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol4/iss3/5>

## Jane's Decision: Her Experience as a Plebe

**ANDRA GUMBUS**

Sacred Heart University

**JILL WOODILLA**

Sacred Heart University

**CHRISTOPHER C. YORK**

Sacred Heart University

### INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL

#### **BACKGROUND**

College students face tough choices regarding whistle-blowing, reporting academic dishonesty, breaking campus codes and policies, or dealing with harassment. Based on a survey by the American Association of University Women's Educational Foundation nearly two thirds of male and female college students have been sexually harassed in college. Of the 2,036 students surveyed, roughly 62 % of men and women experienced sexual harassment. Women were found to have more negative behavioral and emotional responses to the harassment (Rainey, 2006).

During the past two and a half decades the media have been filled with news of sexual harassment in the US military and service academies (popularly referred to as "military academies"). The 1991 Tailhook scandal led to the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy, rapes in 1996 severely damaged the reputation of the army (Schmitt, 1997). As recently as 2003 the Air Force Academy was accused of failing to stop rapes and sexual assaults for over a decade and leadership at the highest levels of the Air Force was blamed for creating an environment where sexual assault became part of life at the academy (Graham, 2003).

Cadets enter a service academy expecting to be with the best and the brightest. They expect the best behavior in a safe environment protected by military codes and a strict honor system. The reality is that a large number of women are raped or molested but do not report it for fear of retribution, ridicule, or dismissal. The culture is based on control and command with upperclassmen in control and plebes following all orders. Cadets are controlled by the armed forces that exert pressure to conform to military standards and not report upperclassmen ("Sky was limit," 2003). Superiors often question the woman's conduct if she reports an assault. Was she drinking, was she fraternizing with upperclassmen? The General Accounting Office conducted an investigation at the top three academies of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air

Force that found about three quarters of females experienced harassment at least twice a month ("Female ex-cadet can sue for harassment," 1999).

Strong and talented women are made to feel psychologically helpless (Oprah Winfrey Show, 2003). Over half of the women at the Naval, Air Force, and Army academies reported harassment on campus, but only a third were reported to authorities. Among 262 women surveyed, there were 302 incidents of assault and 94 of alleged rape, mainly by upperclassmen, that occurred between 1999 and 2004. Other cultural factors mentioned in the survey were fear among victims that they would be punished for conduct related to the assault such as drinking, loyalty to classmates, and the fear of retribution from officers. A 2004 study by the American College Health Association found comparable rates of assault among female college students in civil institutions. Academy rules are broken and honor codes are treated with cynicism at campuses both military and civil (De Vise, 2005).

Many top females compete to enter the esteemed spots as plebes and end up leaving during or after the first year based on harassment from a male dominated culture. Some quit when they realize the culture favors men, condones aggressive male behavior, and intimidates women by treating them as unwelcome and unwanted (Shank, 1998). One female cadet, Sharon Fullilove, said, "They tell you to expect getting raped, and if it doesn't happen to you, you're one of the rare ones. They say if you want a chance to stay here, if you want to graduate, you don't tell. You just deal with it" (Janofsky & Schemo, 2003, p. 11). Another cadet stated, "Men totally disrespect females. You hear it all the time, 'Women shouldn't be here. They slow us down. They're bad for morale.' This place is a boys club, and for women, no matter how hard you work, how hard you try, it's never good enough." When asked why women who are attacked do not come forward and report, she replied, "There are too many forces at work against you. They know the minute you're on the stand, you'll be torn to shreds, humiliated, embarrassed, degraded, and made to feel less than a person" (ibid).

The first year is the hardest as upperclassmen exert rank over plebes and command orders with a goal of breaking old habits and creating a commitment to the class. Does this mean that plebes do anything that an upperclassman says to do, including sex? A Pentagon task force found a sexist and hostile culture at the academies. Harassing behavior included jokes, derogatory labels, crude gestures, and propositions for sexual favors. These behaviors persisted beyond the first year throughout a cadet's education at the academy. Military officers who served on the task force said that rarely were allegations prosecuted to the extent of military law ("Military academies are derelict," 2005).

Recommendations for change include better training for officers that emphasizes the value of women in the military and improving training on harassment and counseling services for victims. Others cite the need for more women in leadership positions at the academies and the admission of women as cadets and midshipmen ("Military academies faulted on harassment," 2005). Extreme recommendations to solve the problem have included shutting down all of the service academies and commissioning the military through the ROTC. ("Air Force isn't alone," 2003).

The military has responded with the creation of programs such as the Air Force's Cadets Advocating Sexual Integrity and Education (CASIE), hotlines, sexual assault awareness months,

and other educational programs. The Defense Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies is part of a broader effort that includes committee investigation of West Point and Annapolis to determine how they handle (or mishandle) sexual assault reports. Former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld stated, "Sexual harassment and sexual violence are an anathema to honorable service to our nation" (Davenport, 2004, p. A10).

However, current and former females at the academy report continued hostility toward women where unwanted advances are not punished and the discipline is more severe for the attacked than the attacker (Bruni, 1997). From 1999 to 2003, 99 reports of sexual assault were received on the hotline at the U.S. Air Force Academy, but no cadet was court-martialed. In the 27 years that the U.S. Military Academy has admitted women, one cadet faced court-martial for rape in 1997 as reported in 2003 ("Women at West Point," 2003). The Pentagon has conducted a probe, separate dorms have been created, and lawmakers have requested an independent inquiry into sexual assault at all military academies (Foderaro, 2004).

On June 27, 2006, Representative Christopher Shays chaired the House Sub-Committee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations. This hearing focused on the military academies handling of sexual assault cases which continue to occur. The Political Transcript Wire reported the testimonies of US Naval Academy commanding officers stating that they have worked hard to improve critical areas such as victim support and confidentiality while providing training for all cadets to prevent sexual harassment and assault" ("US Representative Christopher Shays holds a hearing," 2006).

With continued reports of unpunished harassment, intolerance for females, and retaliation against victims the question is not whether females are harassed but why would a woman decide to join this culture and expose herself to potentially traumatic circumstances?

This case, "Jane's decision: Her experience as a plebe," is based on the experience of a first year female cadet at one of the military academies sometime between 2000 and 2005.

### **Objectives of the Case**

1. To increase understanding of organizational issues surrounding students, and how related decisions affect their career, including:
  - Choices surrounding whistle-blowing;
  - Aspects of organizational bullying;
  - Ethical decisions of honoring or breaking codes of conduct;
  - Implications of fraternization.
2. To understand some of the ways in which organizational culture is maintained.

### **Basic Pedagogy**

This case can be used in general management, organizational behavior, business law, and business ethics courses. The case is most appropriate for undergraduate level students in

management or organizational behavior courses, although graduate students can relate to the corporate applications of the key issues in the case. The case can be used at the beginning of the semester to introduce various organizational factors that impact individual decisions. Alternatively it can be used in conjunction with specific topics during the semester, such as corporate culture, whistle-blowing, or codes of conduct. The case can also be used as a capstone summary discussion of topics covered. Instructors who desire a quick approach to teaching the case should focus on the main discussion questions or use the alternative exercise for ranking responsibility for Jane's situation described at the end of the instructor's manual.

### **Key Issues**

Organizational culture, bullying, honor codes or ethical codes, whistle-blowing, and fraternizing

### **CASE SYNOPSIS**

#### **Characters**

- Plebes—first year students/cadets/officers in training
- Midshipmen—upperclassmen, but also a general term for students as officers-in-training at a maritime academy
- Regimental officers—student officers who ran the academy
- Academy professors and staff—some were professional officers, others civilians
- Jane's midshipman boyfriend, who was an upperclassman
- Gunnery Sergeant—non-commissioned rank in the US Marine Corps. A professional military person

#### **Academy culture**

- The honor code. Cadets take an oath not to lie, cheat, or steal, and, if they witnessed a possible honor violation, they must personally confront the individual, verbally report the incident, and complete a formal report.
- Fraternization. Any social contact beyond regimental activities with an officer of a different rank or student in a different year is strictly forbidden and is a punishable offense. This rule was generally ignored if the cadets were discrete.
- One's own. Cadets are trained to protect members of their own company and regiment. "Ratting on one's own," is against the unwritten code of the academy.
- The Pick. On the first day that the new plebes arrive on campus, the upperclassmen pick one female whom they think will be the biggest threat to maintaining military discipline. The goal of the senior males is to single out, harass, and challenge this female to the point that she would want to leave the academy. If she made it to the end of the year, they stop harassing her.
- Indoctrination. New students—plebes—spend about six weeks during the summer preceding their first academic semester in a special program run by upper-class leaders. They are introduced to military discipline through strict enforcement of special rules, have extensive physical training, and are lectured and drilled on military customs and culture.

## Details of the case

The case is told in the first person. Jane (a pseudonym) describes her year at the military academy in her own words. She describes events and her reactions to them. This synopsis is written in the third person, following the outline of the case.

### Part A

Introduction Jane decided to apply to a military academy after visiting a family friend at West Point. She applied to several of the academies and at one interview an alumnus told her that it would be difficult being a woman there. Her parents were very proud when she was accepted to one of the maritime academies.

A member of the regiment Jane joined “the regiment” or “corps of cadets” as a “plebe,” eager to accept the ways of military service.

Indoctrination During their first few weeks at the academy, plebes were required to undergo hard physical training, learn to obey random orders without question, and conform to strict military discipline. The regimental training officers wanted to build cohesion, instill absolute obedience, and prevent any problems from escalating up the chain of command.

Upperclassmen advised the plebes not to stand out by being different or excelling at a task or assignment. Jane always strove to be the best. Women also stood out because there were so few of them. Jane was told later that she was chosen by the upperclass midshipmen as “the pick” for her year.

The honor code Each student took an honor oath to obey the honor code. The honor code was not always applied: one student turned in a fellow classmate for cheating on a test and was ostracized by his peers. Upperclassmen routinely passed down questions from previous tests for students to study from.

Cadets were explicitly forbidden from fraternization or any contact with upperclassmen beyond that required for official regimental purposes. However, everyone turned a blind eye to having a boyfriend or girlfriend in an upper class, unless the cadet got in trouble for something else, in which case the fraternization charges would also apply.

Everyday life at the academy Academic classes began at the end of the indoctrination period. Special plebe sessions continued, including extra quizzes or PT sessions for the entire class if someone among the plebes was caught doing something unacceptable.

Cadets went to the medical clinic for physicals and shots and most women were given birth control pills. Cadets could not lock their rooms; however, the women were allowed to lock their doors at night after an attack on a female classmate. The upperclassmen officers had keys and sometimes tried to get into the rooms.

After the indoctrination process cadets did not need to look straight ahead when they entered the mess hall. When Jane walked in she saw all the male midshipmen staring at her. She felt “completely naked” and like a “piece of meat.” She has never forgotten this feeling.

The good times Jane liked the academy and did well academically and within the regiment. She had an upper-class boyfriend, but always met him off-campus. She joined the choir and the softball team.

The event that turned my life upside down When Jane's choir went to the neighboring city cadets wore civilian clothes and went to a restaurant for dinner. The men ordered beer and Jane was given a glass, which she hardly touched because she did not like the taste. On return to campus, while she was changing back into her uniform in the women's bathroom of the chapel, a midshipman came in and started to attack her. She screamed and fought him off, but he pushed her up on the sink and banged her head against the wall. He ran out when he heard people approaching.

Jane did not report the incident because it would be "ratting on her own," but she continued to be bothered by it and told her boyfriend. He was very angry and, without telling her, told her attacker that if ever he went near Jane again he would suffer serious consequences.

That night the Gunnery Sergeant woke Jane demanding an explanation. She told him about the attack, but he only wanted to know about what was going on between her and the upperclassman she was dating.

The aftermath The following morning Jane formally reported her attack; however, no one seemed to care about it. Instead, she was under investigation for fraternization. She was questioned by several officials and relieved of her position on the class ring committee. After word got around that she had reported a classmate and he would be getting in trouble, her name was catcalled with derogatory comments during lunch and her name was scratched into lunch trays with drawings and nasty comments.

Jane's attacker was investigated was given a class two for misconduct while she was still investigated for fraternization.

The Honor Board Jane went before the Honor Board. The charge was fraternization and her attack. At the honor hearing no one spoke in her defense. Her peers all testified against her because she had already turned on one of their own. Many of the officials thought she looked guilty because she did not report the attack immediately.

Jane was charged with a class one punishment for fraternization and also a class two punishment for underage drinking.

The decision After the honor hearing the harassment got worse. Jane lost her friends and her academic work suffered. As she thought about what she should do, Jane reviewed in her mind the amount of support she was receiving and the advice given by family and friends outside the academy.

## **Part B Epilogue**

Jane decided to stay at the academy. However, the harassment from other students became even worse, her academic work suffered, and she feared for her physical safety. She reported her situation to the local civilian police. Soon afterwards she was dismissed from the academy "for academic reasons."

## INTRODUCING THE DISCUSSION

The instructor can assign the case and the first five questions below as preparation for class. In order to accelerate class time students can prepare written responses to discussion questions or students can be assigned to teams to lead the discussion by topic.

In class, after the events of Part A of the case have been summarized by students or the instructor, the instructor can open the discussion with the question, “If you were Jane, what would you do?” Student responses may vary from “She’s hurting, she needs to speak to her priest or chaplain,” to “She needs to follow the advice of the officers who are standing up for her, they know military ways,” to “She needs to request to ‘speak freely’ to the highest ranking person—the Commander of the Academy.” As the instructor probes for the reasons behind these suggestions, students realize that there are many underlying factors. The discussion questions follow.

At the conclusion of class discussion, the instructor distributes or reads aloud Part B and follows this with a discussion of question six below. Additional follow-up activities can be assigned depending on the focus of the class.

An alternative way of introducing the discussion is included at the end of the teaching notes. This approach lends itself to a discussion of gender issues surrounding Jane’s experience.

### Questions for Discussion

1. How would you describe the culture of the Academy?
2. In what ways did Jane’s actions follow the academy honor code? In what ways did they not follow it?
3. In your opinion, was Jane “blowing the whistle” when she reported the upperclassman? Why or why not? Was Jane loyal or disloyal when she reported the upperclassman?
4. Which of Jane’s activities would be classified as fraternization according to the military academy rules?
5. Was Jane the target of “bullying,” or *non-purposeful* harassment and threats of bodily or psychological harm explicitly or implicitly condoned by the institution? Defend your answer.
6. If you were the Commanding Officer of the Academy, after learning about Jane’s experience—and recognizing that other women may have had similar experiences—what might you want to change? How would you go about making such changes?

## TEACHING NOTES

### Topic: Organizational Culture

### Questions for discussion



How would you describe the culture of the academy?

- Why did Jane join the academy? Before joining, what information did she have about its culture?
- How did the academy indoctrinate or socialize new students? Use the stages of socialization in your answer.
- In what ways do events in the case sustain or change the culture?

**Additional questions to extend the context of discussion.**

- How is the culture of the military academy similar and/or different from a civilian college campus?
- How does the socialization process for new students at the military academy or your own college or university similar to that in work organizations?

**Additional learning activities**

- In anticipation of the final question about a plan for changes at the Academy, find/read some scholarly or practitioner articles about organizational culture development or change.

**Teaching notes**

Instructors can use the discussion of organizational culture from a management or organizational behavior textbook to help answer the questions. Points that are relevant to this case include the following:

Strong cultures are linked to organizational effectiveness (Denison & Mishra, 1995). In a strong culture the impact on individual behavior is powerful and has an impact on turnover of members. Values and codes of conduct are widely held and shared by large numbers in the organization.

The more members who accept the core values and the greater their commitment to those values is, the stronger the culture is. A strong culture will have a great influence on the behavior of its members because the high degree of sharedness and intensity creates an internal climate of high behavior control. (Robbins & Judge, 2007, p. 575)

Formalization also regulates the individual's behavior with rules and regulations that restrict unacceptable behaviors. A highly formalized institution has greater predictability, orderliness, and consistency. There is probably no stronger culture of embedded behaviors than the service (military) academies that prepare officers for the military. Strong and strict honor codes, policies and procedures, and acceptable behaviors create a disciplined, effective, and enduring culture. The highly formalized system is needed to respond to national and international crises and create a sense of shared direction and identity.

Military organizations take particular pride in maintaining a reputation as a band of warriors who will battle physically beyond normal human endurance to achieve their objective. The broader society endorses this warrior status and allows for a separate legal system under what has

become known as “the military exception.” In the US, the military operates under *The Uniform Code of Military Justice* (United States Code, Title 10, Chapter 47) [http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode10/usc\\_sup\\_01\\_10\\_10\\_A\\_20\\_II\\_30\\_47.html](http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode10/usc_sup_01_10_10_A_20_II_30_47.html). Only a few civilian groups have a legitimate cultural claim to warrior status. Fire fighters, police forces, and EMS personnel are three civilian cultures that might claim “warrior” status.

In all these warrior cultures it has been accepted practice to intentionally place recruits under tremendous physical and emotional pressure during intensive training regimens. The rationale or purpose for trying to “break” each recruit is to assure the group that new members are tough enough to withstand the rigors of any mission and can be counted on to support the members in life or death situations. The culture is based on a “command and control” management philosophy and there is no pretense that the unit functions based on democratic principles. Individualism is stamped out. Often the best and the brightest of recruits are chosen, or “picked,” as the target of intense efforts to “break” them. Jane was the “pick” in this case. Sexual assault and personal property destruction are criminal acts and clearly not acceptable methods of trying to “break” a recruit in any group worthy of the appellation “warrior” as western cultural usage dictates.

### **Organizational socialization**

The socialization process begins on the day of entry and is an important part of molding a recruit to fit the organization and of sustaining the culture. The recruits need to learn the key role behaviors to remain in good standing or are labeled “nonconformists or rebels” which often leads to expulsion. The socialization process impacts the productivity, commitment to the organization and the decision to stay.

Robbins and Judge (2007) define three stages of socialization as pre-arrival, encounter, and metamorphosis. The recruit arrives with a set of values, a defined personality, and past behaviors that will predict future behavior. Recruits also have expectations for their role in the academy and attitudes about the culture. The recruits have an obligation to inform themselves about the academy, and the academy has an obligation to be accurate in describing itself to guarantee a good fit. In the encounter phase the reality of the culture confronts the expectations of the new person. If there is a difference between the two, then the new member must change their expectations to conform. If this is not possible, a misfit occurs. If the person is able to change they enter the metamorphosis phase and adopt the formal culture and “the newcomers’ differences and perspectives will be stripped away and replaced by the standardized and predictable behaviors... creating conformists who maintain traditions and customs” (Robbins & Judge, 2007, p. 585). At the completion of the socialization process the new recruit adopts the norms, rules, procedures, and practices and is indoctrinated into the academy.

### **Suggested articles and activities on organizational culture change**

For instructors who do not have additional materials readily available, these suggestions provide different approaches to thinking about issues of culture and organizational change.

First, three articles:

Clement, R. W. (1994) Culture, leadership and power: The keys to organizational change. *Business Horizons*, 37(1), 33-39. (Article available through *Business Source Elite* database, 6/07)

This easily understood article takes a managerialist perspective to discuss three elements of organizational change: (1) the importance of dealing with organizational culture, (2) the role of leadership, and (3) organizational power and politics.

Fitzgerald, T.H. (1988) Can change in organizational culture really be managed? *Organizational Dynamics*, 17(2), 5-15. (Article available through *Business Source Elite* database, 6/07)

This classic article takes a critical look at the possibility of managing changes in an organizational culture. The author questions whether “culture” can be managed without a better understanding of processes by which underlying values are relinquished and replaced. If it is culture that must be changed, the process must at least start with top management's rethinking of its current values and deciding to be guided by other orientations.

Galbraith, J.R. (2002) Choosing an effective design, Chapter 2 in *Designing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Or

Galbraith, J., Downey D., & Kates A. (2002) Principles of organization design, Chapter 1 in *Designing dynamic organizations: A hands on guide for leaders at all levels*. New York: American Management Association (AMAcorn).

To prevent students considering “culture” in isolation from other variables, they might read about Galbraith's star model that describes the interrelated design levers of strategy, processes, structure, rewards, and people that affect behavior and hence organizational performance and culture.

Second, for instructors who would like to engage students experientially in experiencing clashes between people who may appear to be the same but come from different cultures, the following card game is relatively easy to administer:

BARNGA, A simulation game on cultural clashes, created by Thiagi Thiagarajan, with an improved game design by Sivasailam Thiagarajan and Raja Thiagarajan, is available from Intercultural Press [www.interculturalpress.com/store/pc/home.asp](http://www.interculturalpress.com/store/pc/home.asp)

Participants playing a simple card game experience the shock of realizing that despite their good intentions and the many similarities amongst themselves, people interpret things differently from one another in profound ways, especially people from differing cultures. Players learn that they must understand and reconcile these differences if they want to function effectively in a cross-cultural group.

Extensions of this card game exercise by Mary Shapiro and Cynthia Ingols, both from the Simmons School of Management, were presented in the Experiential Learning Association track at the 2007 Eastern Academy of Meeting in New Brunswick, NJ. For further information

contact the presenters directly (Mary.Shapiro@simmons.edu or Cynthia.Ingols@simmons.edu), or contact the EAM Membership VP Craig Turnwall (Craig.Tunwall@esc.edu) for a copy of the proceedings.

## **TOPIC: ORGANIZATIONAL BULLYING**

### **Questions for discussion**

- Was Jane the target of “bullying,” or *non-purposeful* harassment and threats of bodily or psychological harm explicitly or implicitly condoned by the institution? Defend your answer.
- Was any of the pressure Jane was under as a result of being “the pick” distinguishable from the pressure she was under because of her complaining about criminal acts she was subjected to? If she was not “the pick” would the pressure brought to bear by members of her group be any less intense?
- Based on what you know about Jane, if she was neither “the pick” nor the victim of criminal acts, would she have survived the first year as a cadet?

### **Additional questions to extend the context of discussion.**

- What is organizational bullying? Can an organization institutionalize bullying as we have defined it? Can individual bullies act out within organizations? If you are “picked,” are you the target of bullying in your organization?

### **Additional learning activities**

- Read a conceptual article on workplace bullying or aggression and discuss how the context of the Academy case relates to the researcher’s model or framework. (See below for article suggestion)
- Search the internet for US laws connected to sexual discrimination and for company practices designed to prevent it.

### **Teaching notes**

Military organizations must instill in their members unquestioned obedience to commands and use rituals of basic training “boot camp” to begin this process. The general training has an explicit purpose and is necessary for the job.

In civilian organizations some managers like to instill a “warrior” mentality in their “troops” and will put new hires through difficult training tasks; however, they are not members of military or paramilitary organizations. They are subject to civilian laws and regulations and the rites of passage from trainee to team member must be bounded by rational job requirements. This means that any sort of harassment or threats of bodily or psychological harm must have a demonstrable connection to the job and should be limited to training scenarios to have any hope of legitimacy. That is, it must have a purpose. We can think of jobs where such personal “attacks” make sense in training venues. For example, a trainee for a customer complaint help desk must be able to

withstand all sorts of verbal assaults from unhappy customers. A FedEx driver must be able to remain calm when encountering a vicious dog or a shotgun waving homeowner. A social worker must be alert to devious psychological manipulation by his or her clients. A soccer player must not let the opposing players “psych” him out to the degree that he fouls out of a championship game. If a trainee cannot cope with these rigors of the job as simulated in intense training sessions, then he or she had best rejoin the pool of job seekers.

There really is no distinction between military and civilian institutionalized “bullying” (Puder-York, 2006). If the harassment or threats of physical or psychological harm are for training purposes only as necessitated by the job, then no bullying has occurred. Harassment or threats outside of the “training safe harbor” or, even inside the safe harbor, but beyond the degree likely to be encountered on the job, are unacceptable. As illegitimate behavior this subjects an employee to disciplinary action and the possibility of a military or civilian criminal complaint.

### **Sources for additional learning activities**

Instructors may use this discussion as a transition to topics of workplace violence and aggression. For further understanding of organizational bullying or the general concept of hostile work behaviors, students can be asked to read:

Salin, D. (2003) Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations* 56 (10), 1213-1232. (Article available through *Proquest ABI-Inform Complete* database, 6/07)

This article summarizes the literature on workplace bullying, including different labels and definitions used in different countries. The proposed model, with three groups of factors associated with bullying, can be applied to Jane's situation. Students will be able to recognize (1) the antecedents or enabling structures and processes, (2) incentives for bullying colleagues as motivating structures and processes, and (3) triggering circumstances or precipitating processes that contributed to Jane's perception of her situation.

While the warrior climate of the Academy and low female/male ratio contributed to a sexually charged atmosphere, Jane does not specifically label her attack as one of sexual harassment. However, class members may wish to extend the discussion of the case to focus on areas of sexual harassment and continue with a discussion of current workplace practices for remedy and prevention.

Students can use an internet search to read the latest information available on the U.S. government website, search national or regional newspapers for news articles about harassment, and review corporate websites for policies and procedures.

Link to Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) information:

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission  
[http://www.eeoc.gov/types/sexual\\_harassment.html](http://www.eeoc.gov/types/sexual_harassment.html) (accessed 6/22/07)

Students might search either a single newspaper such as the *New York Times* ([www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com)), the *Los Angeles Times* ([www.latimes.com](http://www.latimes.com)), or the *Washington Post* ([www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com)). Alternatively, they might use the *LexisNexis* database to find examples from throughout the US and other countries.

Examples of corporate policies and procedures on sexual harassment:

Sexual harassment training

[http://www.business.com/directory/human\\_resources/employee\\_development\\_and\\_training/sexual\\_harassment\\_training/](http://www.business.com/directory/human_resources/employee_development_and_training/sexual_harassment_training/) (accessed 6/23/07)

SHRM (Society for Human Resource Professionals) materials

<http://www.shrm.org/books/investigatingharassment/excerpt.asp> (accessed 6/23/07)

## **TOPIC: HONOR CODES IN THE MILITARY, UNIVERSITIES, AND CORPORATIONS**

### **Questions for discussion**

- In what ways did Jane's actions follow the academy honor code? In what ways did they not follow it?
- What were the differences between the unstated versus the stated codes and the unwritten versus written policies and procedures? How do those who are new to an organization decipher which rules to follow and which they can break?

### **Additional questions to extend the context of discussion.**

- Does your university's honor code have any effect on your behavior?
- Is this honor code compatible with your own framework for making ethical decisions?
- What would have to happen to make you feel you had no choice other than to report a student you saw breaking your school's honor code?
- Is it likely Jane would have found more support for her position inside a corporation? Why or why not?

### **Additional learning activities**

- Find statements of the honor code at two military service academies, and at two civilian colleges in addition to your own institution. What do these statements have in common, and how do they differ?
- Read a research article about honor codes, and list practices that foster academic integrity. Which practices are in place at your school? Which of the practices that are not in place at your school would you like to institute? How would you go about doing this?
- Design an honor code for your class, student club, or school.

## Teaching notes

A fair summation of **military honor codes** for our teaching purposes is that they provide a focal point for one of the ancient traditions of desired warrior behavior—especially among the officer corps. That ancient tradition is the maintenance of honor under all circumstances. Honor means behaving in a manner that will never discredit or harm your nation, its leaders, your military unit, or your comrades in arms. When members of the military who are directed by the code to bear witness against their comrades suspected of a code breach they know that such an act on their part can harm their unit's morale. To “snitch” on a comrade will be viewed as a breach of the *unwritten* code of honor among military men and women and banishment from the group will soon follow *unless*:

- (1) the superior officers have set an example of fair investigation and resolution of prior allegations of code violations;
- (2) the alleged violation is so egregious and destructive of good order and discipline that sentiment among the unit members supports strongly the reporting of the violation, and
- (3) members of the unit involved share a sense that equity will be served by reporting the violation, i.e., the unit does not have a track record of some individuals being favored because of their athletic abilities or “connections.”

The support of the unit is a condition necessary for avoiding outlaw status. In Jane's situation we can see that her unit did not respect the system's ability to deliver either justice or equity. Violations of the Code were rampant among the cadets, but were treated as insignificant or rationalized as “everyone does it.” The hypocrisy was apparent to all and the “Rank has its privileges” philosophy extended—unopposed—to extreme fraternizing between sexes and cadet ranks. Jane's sexual assault was a criminal act, but she was enmeshed in a culture where the act was seen by her comrades as something to be expected. In short, Jane did not have the support of her unit for reporting anything as a violation of the Code. Her isolation could have been anticipated. The Code probably did have a positive effect on the behavior of many of the cadets *as related to their own behavior*. However, the culture was not supportive of risking the individual's career through reporting a comrade's violation of the Code.

The **honor codes of academic institutions** are very similar to those of the military. The student body, however, is not as cohesive a group as a military unit. In short, the pressure to overlook code violations is not as strong unless the “good” and “bad” players are all part of a cohesive subgroup such as a football team, the Honor Society, or even a lunch table group. Thus, while there are fewer barriers to a student reporting a violation, the data suggests that relatively few violations are, in fact, reported. It may be that an additional factor is involved on civilian campuses. Studies show a general collapse of universal standards of acceptable behavior throughout American society (De Vise, 2005). To the student it appears rational to hold oneself accountable only for one's own behavior according to a self-selected standard. Many students, it seems, do not have standards prohibiting cheating, or violating institutional rules. Further, the risk of getting caught or turned in by a fellow student must be low while any psychic pain brought on by guilt must be minimal.

**Corporate Codes of Ethics** Corporate America has a spotty track record of developing and enforcing “Codes of Ethics.” Note that corporations title their Codes using “Ethics” rather than “Honor” and introduce an added element of ambiguity as a result. Webster's dictionary defines

“Honor” as “Esteem paid or due to worth: manifestation of respect; hence, fame; credit; good name” and “Ethics” as “Moral principles, quality, or practice.”

There was little external incentive for management to undertake a serious—and costly—ethics program before the Sarbanes-Oxley Act made an institutionalized Code of Ethics a powerful mitigating factor for a publicly traded corporate defendant charged with intentional crimes involving a breach of trust by an employee. Even now, there is reason to doubt the sincerity of many corporations spurred into action by the Sarbanes-Oxley penalties, but numerous consultants agree on what is required to launch and maintain an effective program. The key components are: CEO and senior management commitment to the principles set forth in the Code; periodic training for all employees, and a system of policy interpretation and case adjudication that is seen by all to be fair and equitable.

### **Internet sources for additional learning activities**

McCabe, D. and Trevino, L.K. (2002 Jan-Feb) Honesty and honor codes. *Academe*, 88(1), 37-41. (Accessible through *Academic Search Premier*, 6/07)

This paper addresses the issues of dishonesty and academic integrity among universities and colleges in the United States. It includes rituals and ceremonies used by schools to generate student commitment to honor codes; key elements of modified honor codes; statistics on the growth in academic dishonesty; dilemma facing students concerning plagiarism. (Publisher's abstract)

Service Academy honor codes;

- US Military Academy (West Point) <http://www.usma.edu/Cpme/> (accessed 6/24/07)
- US Naval Academy <http://www.usna.edu/OfficerDevelopment/honor/honorconcept.html> (accessed 6/24/07)
- US Air Force Academy <http://www.usafa.af.mil/34trw/cwc/cwch.cfm?catName=cwc> (accessed 6/24/07)

Examples of university honor codes or academic honesty policies;

- Harvard University <http://www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=513249> (accessed 6/24/07)
- Williams College Honor System <http://www.williams.edu/resources/honor/> (accessed 6/24/07)
- University of California, Los Angeles <http://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/truebruin.html> (accessed 6/24/07)
- Your university or college honor code or statement of academic integrity

Examples of corporate ethics codes or codes of conduct;

- Johnson and Johnson *Credo*  
[http://www.jnj.com/our\\_company/our\\_credo/index.htm;jsessionid=RQUXI1QGKCKQCQPCCGSU0A](http://www.jnj.com/our_company/our_credo/index.htm;jsessionid=RQUXI1QGKCKQCQPCCGSU0A) (accessed 6/24/07)



- Microsoft Finance *Code of Professional Conduct* as its written code of ethics under Section 406 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002  
<http://www.microsoft.com/msft/governance/financecode.msp> (accessed 6/24/07)
- Wal-Mart *Statement of Ethics* [http://media.corporate-ir.net/media\\_files/IROL/11/112761/corpgov/Ethics%20\\_Current.pdf](http://media.corporate-ir.net/media_files/IROL/11/112761/corpgov/Ethics%20_Current.pdf) (accessed 6/24/07)

Creating a code of ethics for your organization:

- Consultant available on the web. <http://www.ethicsweb.ca/codes/>
- Article written by a Bentley College professor  
[http://ethics.iit.edu/perspective/pers19\\_1fall99\\_5.html](http://ethics.iit.edu/perspective/pers19_1fall99_5.html)

## TOPIC: WHISTLE-BLOWING AND LOYALTY

### Questions for discussion

In your opinion, was Jane “blowing the whistle” when she reported the upperclassman? Why or why not?

- Was her action justifiable—in other words, should she have done it? Defend your answer.
- What different course of action might she have taken?

Was Jane loyal or disloyal when she reported the upperclassman?

### Additional questions to extend the context of discussion

In class we discuss questions to ask ourselves when making a difficult or ethical decision (for example, see Boatright questions below). How would Jane have responded to these questions? Would you respond differently, and why?

### Additional learning activities

- Participate in a role playing exercise about whistle-blowing to experience the intrapersonal conflict associated with the decision to “blow the whistle” and the unexpected outcomes that may occur.

### Teaching Notes

Whistle-blowing is generally defined as the release of information by a member or former member of an organization of illegal or immoral conduct that is not in the public interest (See, for an example, Applebaum, Grewal & Molson, 2006, for an overview of international aspects). “Going public” with the information that is damaging to the organization is violating the obligations of a member of an organization to that organization. The whistle-blower is attempting to gain public attention to a significant problem of substantial importance. Employees are instructed to report instances of improper conduct to their immediate superiors or follow a policy on how to report misconduct internal to the organization. External whistle-blowing occurs when the misconduct is reported outside of organizational channels to an appropriate

authority who can take action to remedy the situation. Whistle-blowers are not required to take action, they do this voluntarily as a moral protest (Boatright, 2007).

The issue of loyalty is critical to this topic. Is blowing the whistle an act of loyalty or disloyalty to the organization? If following orders and not disrupting is loyal, then whistle-blowers are disloyal. However, many who whistle-blow are loyal members of an organization who are committed to seeking genuine change for the greater good. What is best for the organization is not always clear. Whistle-blowers are not disloyal to the organization, but their action violates trust between members or superiors. Hirschman (1970) argues that dissatisfied individuals can exit an organization or they can use their voice to speak up and bring about change. He argues that voice is a more loyal reaction because loyalty keeps people from exiting. Whistle-blowers are often poorly treated in order to get them to leave voluntarily, but unfortunately staying within the organization is the only way to make positive changes. Loyalties can also come into conflict between loyalty to self, to family, to organization, to peers, to the team, or to superiors.

Boatright (2007) lists the following questions to consider before blowing the whistle.

- Is the situation of sufficient moral importance to justify whistle-blowing?
- Do you have all the facts and have you properly understood their significance?
- Have all internal channels and steps short of whistle-blowing been exhausted?
- What is the best way to blow the whistle?
- What is my responsibility in view of my role in the organization?

Whistle-blowers have a difficult role and they must make choices that are not easy. They are often faced with decisions that can risk personal relationships, jobs or, future goals and careers (Newton & Ford, 2006). We are faced with these tough choices in all aspects of life. What behaviors do we not tolerate? Do we tell on a roommate who is cheating? Do we tell on a classmate who copies homework? Do we report a friend who breaks the alcohol and drug policy? Do we tell a friend when her boyfriend is cheating on her? Do we report a work colleague who is stealing office supplies? Do we clock someone into work when they are late? When and how do we make the decision to go to the authorities—at school, at home, at work, in the community? At what point do you decide that you must listen to your conscience as a moral being and act according to your personal integrity? At what point does personal honesty outweigh the negative consequences of telling the truth about inappropriate behavior? At what point does the penalty of blowing the whistle no longer matter? “Whistle-blowing is a painful and desperate course of action. But sometimes, it is heroic and necessary. Most of us will, at some times in our lives, work for a corporation or an institution with flaws. At what point might we feel justified, indeed even compelled, to speak out? Are we ever justified in violating our own sense of loyalty—and other’s expectations of loyalty—to go outside the company?” (Ciulla, Martin, & Solomon 2007, p. 397)

### **Resources for additional learning activity**

Comer, D., and Vega G. (2006) Unsavory problems at Tasty’s: A role-play about whistle-blowing. *Journal of Management Education* 30(1), 251-269. (Available through *Proquest: ABI-Inform Complete* database, 6/07.)

This is a role-play exercise that makes the topic of whistle-blowing personally salient to undergraduates. Students identify with the prospective whistle-blower, whose decision affects several stakeholders. The protagonist merely suspects her manager of stealing, until she hears concrete evidence of his thefts from her assistant manager, who does not want to take action. The exercise helps prepare students to decide how to act if they observe workplace wrongdoing, demonstrates that different ethical frameworks may point to different decisions, promotes examination of possible consequences of whistle-blowing, and highlights how organizational factors affect employees' ethical behavior and the outcomes of their behavior. (Publisher's abstract)

## TOPIC: FRATERNIZATION

### Questions for discussion

Which of Jane's activities would be classified as fraternization according to the military academy rules?

- Why does the military prohibit fraternization?
- Jane seemed surprised that she was penalized for fraternization. What do you think contributed to her view of events? How did others view the same situation?
- Do you agree with the military's need to prohibit fraternization? Why or why not?

### Additional questions to extend the context of discussion

- In your university or college, should there be rules against students fraternizing with one another? Why or why not? If there are rules, how should they be enforced?
- In your university or college, are there rules against professors fraternizing with students? How might you find out if such rules exist? If there are none, should there be? Why or why not?
- In a corporation, should fraternization among employees in different levels of the organization be prohibited, either (a) just in the chain-of-command or (b) company-wide? Why or Why not?

### Additional learning activities

- Find the U.S. military policies on fraternization through the Department of Defense website. How does the domain of these policies differ from what you are able to find out about similar policies that apply in civilian organizations?

### Teaching notes

Are intimate personal relationships between members of an organization who may be of different ranks destructive of the "good order and discipline" required to carry out the organization's mission? The answer to this question for the **military** has always been "Yes." This response is based on the premise that intimate relationships eliminate the minimally necessary emotional distance between warriors required for them to function effectively in life and death situations on the battlefield. In short, if a loved one is wounded, his or her partner may spend more time and

resources tending to them than to other comrades. Also, a senior ranking member of the unit may hesitate to order their lower ranking loved one into harm's way even though the combat situation requires the order. We can see how the pair's conflict of interest in these situations weakens discipline and morale for the whole unit thus endangering everyone, the success of the battle plan and, ultimately, the security of our nation.

In Jane's case the fraternization activity on the campus was apparently well known and therefore the cadets were lulled into believing the culture tolerated fraternization if managed discreetly by the parties involved. It is possible the Administration of the Academy had not invested enough resources in uncovering and punishing the practice. However, when discovered, fraternization was treated as the serious offense it is for the military. Jane was shocked that she was punished for fraternizing with an upperclassman off campus when her claim of sexual assault was treated more lightly. Jane was the recipient of "selective enforcement" of the law. Just as the driver waiting for the trooper to finish writing a citation for speeding feels like the target of unjust police action as hundreds of cars speed by at 80 mph, so Jane happened to find herself caught for fraternization.

In **academic communities**, rules against fraternization are seldom written down as policy, but there are unwritten rules for those in teaching positions warning of (if not prohibiting) intimate relationships between teacher and student. The basis for the warning is the same as in the military. The maintenance of a degree of emotional distance between teacher and student is required for there to be an objective judgment of the student's work and the appearance to other students as well as the reality of no conflict of interest that might give the favored student an unfair advantage in grading.

Most **corporate** policy manuals have some provision prohibiting fraternization between personnel of different ranks working in the same unit. Analogous provisions of the policy manual will prohibit related parties from serving in the chain of command of each other. The basis for these provisions is the same as in the military. The *appearance of a conflict of interest* when close emotional relationships are involved between a supervisor and a worker are destructive of the good order and discipline required to manage a business efficiently and effectively even if there is no real conflict. Some companies prohibit any fraternization or hiring of relatives *company-wide* to avoid any possible appearance of a conflict of interest. The penalty for breaking these rules is termination of employment.

### Internet sources for additional learning activities

Frye, J.L. (1999) Comparison of Department of Defense and Private Sector Fraternization Policies. Master's thesis at Air Force Inst. of Tech., Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

This paper explores how the Department of Defense fraternization policy compares with fraternization policies in use in the private sector. The private sector discourages supervisor-subordinate relationships only and tends to ban such relationships if the two persons are in the same chain of command. On the other hand, the Department of Defense policy bans supervisor-subordinate relationships no matter if the supervisor is an officer or enlisted and regardless of chain of command. Such findings indicate that the

Department of Defense and the private sector do not have similar policies in place to regulate fraternization. (Author abstract)

To purchase:

<http://www.ntis.gov/search/product.asp?ABBR=ADA369437&starDB=GRAHIST>

Lever, J., Zellman G., and Hirschfeld S.J. (2006) Office romance: Are the rules changing? *Across the Board* 42(2), 33-41. (Available through *EBSCO: Business Source Elite* database, 6/07.)

This article describes civilian office romance and fraternization and discusses its implications for managers. Some of the reasons why many companies frown upon office romance include accusations of favoritism or retaliation after breakups lead to wrenching lawsuit, and, in milder cases, flirtation and affairs breed damaging gossip and romantic liaisons can result in the loss of valued employees. (Publisher's abstract)

#### U.S. Military fraternization policies

<http://www.defenselink.mil/> (accessed 6/23/07) The official web site for the Department of Defense and the starting point for finding US military information online.

<http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/fraternization/> (accessed 6/23/07) Fraternization policies for each of the armed services.

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=41879> (accessed 6/23/07) Fraternization policies explained.

## CONCLUDING THE DISCUSSION

### Question for discussion

- If you were the Commanding Officer of the Academy, after learning about Jane's experience—and recognizing that other women may have had similar experiences—what might you want to change? How would you go about making such changes?

### Additional learning activities

- In 2003 a number of women cadets blew the whistle on sexual harassment at the Air Force Academy. Following internal and Congressional investigations many changes were made at this Academy. Search the internet for news reports and official reports and compare the changes made at the Air Force Academy with your suggestions in answer to the above question.

### Teaching note

The instructor should review how the individual decisions and actions within the Academy culture impacted Jane's career in ways she did not expect. Students can be asked at each decision-point what aspects of individual behavior or organizational structure would need to change to ensure a different outcome, and to discuss how such changes might come about. Students should recognize changes that the Commanding Officer of the Academy would need to make, and how difficult it may be for the corps of cadets to institutionalize necessary changes.

## Annotated Bibliography on the Air Force Academy sexual harassment case

Students will be able to find many articles though Google or other search engines. Below are some key documents. The three marked with an asterisk \* are most important.

Fowler, T, et al. (September 2003) Final report of the panel of review sexual misconduct allegations at the U.S. Air Force Academy. (The Fowler Report)  
[http://www.dtic.mil/dtfs/doc\\_research/p18\\_18.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/dtfs/doc_research/p18_18.pdf) (accessed 6/20/07)

Read the Open Letter from the Chairman and the Executive Summary.

Students may also be interested in: "Testimony of the Honorable Tillie K. Fowler before the Senate Armed Services Committee," Wednesday, September 24, 2003.  
<http://armed-services.senate.gov/statement/2003/September/Fowler.pdf> (accessed 6/20/07)

Hoewing, G.L., and Rumburg D. (2005) Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Harassment & Violence at the Military Service Academies.  
<http://worldcat.org/wcpa/oclc/61395108?page=frame&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.defenselink.mil%2Fhome%2Fpdf%2FHigh%255FGPO%255FRRC%255Ftx.pdf&title=&linktype=digitalObject&detail> (accessed 6/2007)

After questions about sexual assault cases at the other academies, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld appointed a task force to make recommendations about how all the military academies address sexual harassment to help the academies prevent incidents and make sure they have the right methods for dealing with sexual assault and violence if it does happen.

\* Kunz, C. L. (2004, March) A time for healing: Air Force Academy leadership and cadets look toward the future *Airman* 48, 22-29 [www.af.mil/news/airman/0304/healing.shtml](http://www.af.mil/news/airman/0304/healing.shtml) (accessed 6/20/07)

This article provides a perspective from inside the Air Force.

Lancaster, A.R., Jones A.M., and Lipari, R.N. (nd) U.S. Department of Defense initiatives related to sexual harassment and sexual assault.  
<http://www.internationalmta.org/Documents/2005/2005105P.pdf> (accessed 6/20/07)

This paper summarizes Department of Defense initiatives since 2003 in response to allegations of sexual assault at the three Military Service Academies. The article also summarizes the new policy in prevention and response to sexual assault that was implemented in 2005.

\* Newman, R. J. (2004, January) Upheaval at the Academy. *Air Force Magazine : Journal of the Air Force Association* 87 (1). [www.afa.org/magazine/Jan2004/0104academy.html](http://www.afa.org/magazine/Jan2004/0104academy.html) (accessed 6/20/07)

Describes events up to 2004, the response of the Air Force, internal review, change of command at the Air Force Academy, outside review under Rep. Tillie K. Fowler, the Agenda for Change, continuing problems.

Polk, S.R. (2004, September) Air Force Inspector General summary report concerning the handling of sexual assault cases at the United States Air Force Academy. [www.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-060726-033.pdf](http://www.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-060726-033.pdf) (accessed 6/20/07)

The Air Force Inspector General subsequently conducted an investigation into the details of the handling of each of 56 individual complaints related to sexual assault at the United States Air Force Academy. Students may be interested in reading about the process, or in the conclusions of the report: Section VI SAF/IGS Findings, Analysis and Conclusion.

Report of the Working Group Concerning Deterrence of and Response to Incidents of Sexual Assault at the Air Force Academy, June 2003. As reported in *U.S. Air Force Policy Letter Digest*. <http://www.af.mil/library/airforcepolicy2/january/september.asp> (accessed 6/20/07)

See the second item in this digest.

\* United States Air Force Academy Agenda for Change  
<http://www.usafa.af.mil/superintendent/pa/agenda.cfm> (accessed 6/20/07)

How the Air Force Academy presents itself to the incoming class of 2011.

## **ALTERNATIVE INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE**

Students should be assigned to read Part A of the case in advance of class and to think about what happened to Jane and how and why they place responsibility for her situation. Thinking about “responsibility” in general terms—what role did individuals in the case or the various organizational issues play in bringing Jane to the point at the end of the case—allows students to explore the different aspects of responsibility without having formal questions.

At the beginning of class, the instructor asks students to suspend judgment and begin by reviewing the facts of the case—the chronological story. As a visual introduction to the rigors of military training, the instructor may show a segment from ABC news ( July 2, 2001 *20/20 Investigative News Report* ) video clip “Boot Camp Nightmare,” available in the video library of ABC News Videos from Pearson Prentice Hall that supports the *Organizational Behavior* text by Stephen Robbins and Timothy Judge (2007).

Next the instructor asks students the preparation question, “What happened to Jane and where do you place responsibility for her situation?” Students individually review the list of people and groups mentioned in the case and write down how and why each is responsible for Jane’s situation. Then they rank the person who they think is the most responsible as number one, the next as number two, and so on.

Name	Reasons	Rank order
Female support		
Midshipman attacker		
Senior cadet hearing officer		
Upperclassman boyfriend		
Jane		
Commanding Officer of the Academy		
Other (name)		

Students then form small groups to discuss rankings and reasons. These can be homogeneous or heterogeneous groups of men and women. They are asked to come to a consensus for a single group ranking and clear explanation of the issue that makes that person responsible. They should discuss how they defined “responsibility” to clarify the reason for the ranking. The instructor summarizes group responses on the board and notes themes in the reasons given.

	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	Reasons or Issues
Female support							
Midshipman attacker							
Senior cadet hearing officer							
Upperclassman Boyfriend							
Jane							
Commanding Officer of the Academy							
Other							

The instructor then facilitates a full class discussion.

Students are likely to have differing opinions about who was most responsible for Jane's situation, and may not be able to resolve these differences in coming up with a group ranking. Rankings may vary in gender groups. The instructor should acknowledge that differences of opinion are to be expected, while the reasons fall into the three “levels of analysis” used when discussing the behaviors of people in organizations:

- Individual responsibility: No one should harm another person (midshipman attacker); we should respect another person's wishes (midshipman boyfriend); a person should know and obey rules and procedures (Jane); the commander should set a zero tolerance policy (commanding officer).
- Group responsibility: Different actions of male and female cadets.
- Organizational responsibility: The rules and procedures, in particular the honor code and fraternization rule.



In trying to come to a consensus, students will realize that no one issue or person was entirely to blame, but that all the decisions and actions interacted in a complex way and lead to the final result.

The various reasons or issues can then be examined one at a time. Here instructors can use the suggested questions for discussion of aspects of organizational culture, socialization, bullying, honor codes, and fraternization.

### Using A Gender Lens

When students discuss the responsibility issue, the instructor can direct attention to gender-related issues in Jane's experience at the military academy, their own experiences on a civilian campus, and what they might expect in the workplace.

#### Discussion starters

- If, as is frequently the case, men place higher responsibility on Jane for her situation than women, the instructor may question whether these attributions may be due to gendered differences in blaming the victim (De Judicibus & McCabe, 2001; Ryel, Greatrix & Enright, 2006) or on women's personal experiences (Mason, Riger & Foley, 2004).
- Jane mentioned "the old boy's club" and the negative reaction of the alumnus to her application to the academy. If they are unaware of the slow progress of the integration of women into the military, they may be interested in the chronology of women in the military in Gruenwald, (8/16/97, Women in the military: Mission in progress. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 55(33), 1962-1966, Accessed through Business Source Elite, July 2007), or the book written by Jeanne Holm, the first woman in the Air Force to reach the rank of brigadier general, *Women in the military, an unfinished revolution*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. published 1992 by Random House Ballantine Books.)
- For a more general discussion or debate, students can be assigned to conduct their own research and take a position on a gender related statement, such as:
  - More women than men are whistle-blowers.
  - Men prefer a hierarchical organizational structure, women prefer a network structure.
  - Because boys and girls are socialized differently, men and women have different expectations for workplace cultures.

#### Suggested follow-up readings about related issues in the work environment:

- Shrank, Robert (1994) Two women, three men on a raft. *Harvard Business Review* 72(3), 86-76. (Accessed through *Business Source Premier*, July 2007)

During an Outward Bound raft trip in 1977 designed to build better teamwork and teach the art and techniques of survival under difficult conditions, only one of the rafts had a mixed crew of men and women. After the raft overturned in the rapids while a woman was at the helm, only men took the helm. After the trip was over, the author realized that the men had unconsciously worked together to hold onto their power building on the women's individual doubts about their own capabilities for leadership. The author draws parallels with gender rivalries that keep women from rising to positions of power within

organizations. The author and three women—including one of the two women on the raft—comment on whether and how circumstances have changed since the article was first published.

- Margretta, Joan. (1997) Will she fit in? *Harvard Business Review*, 75(2), 18-32. (Accessed through *Business Source Premier*, July 2007)

In this fictitious case study, a female partner at a prestigious consulting firm repels unwanted sexual advances from her firm's most important client. Afterwards she is concerned about whether reporting the incident will hurt her career. Three managers, a lawyer, and an expert on gender equity in the workplace offer advice.

Instructors may wish to use one or more of the following resources to guide the discussion:

Ely, R., Fody E., Scully M. and the Center of Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management (Eds). (2003). *Reader in Gender, Work , and Organization*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.

Padavic, I. and Reskin B. (2004). *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Valley Forge Press.

Powell, G. and Graves L. (2003). *Women and men in management* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Valian, V. (1999). *Why so slow? The advancement of women* Boston, MA: The MIT Press (especially Chapter 6, Schemas that explain behavior)

Wilson, F. (2003) *Organizational Behavior and Gender* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Ashgate Publishing Inc.

## REFERENCES

- Air Force isn't alone in sex-assault controversy. (2003, April 6). *Knight Rider Tribune Business News*, p. 1.
- Applebaum, S., Grewal, K., & Mousseau, H. (2006). Whistle-blowing: International implications and critical case incidents. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 10 (1), 7-13.
- Boatright, J. R. (2007). *Ethics and the conduct of business* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bruni, F. (1997, January 26). Air of hesitant relief at West Point after acquittal in a rape case. *New York Times*, pp. 1, 21.
- Ciulla J. Martin, C., & Solomon, R. (2007). *Honest work: A business ethics reader*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Davenport, C. (2004, October 9). Naval Academy policies on sex assault studied. *The Washington Post*, p. A10.
- De Judicibus, M. & McCabe M. (2001). Blaming the target of sexual harassment: impact of gender role, sexist attitudes, and work role. *Sex Roles*, 44 (7/8), 491-507.
- De Vise, D. (2005, March 19). Defense Department surveys academy sex assaults: One woman in seven reports being attacked. *The Washington Post*, p. A1.
- Denison, D. & Mishra A. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6 (2), 204-223.
- Female ex-cadet can sue for harassment: Judge throws out about half of her 34 charges and rules that Citadel and five accused male cadets must be tried separately. (1999, October 20). *Los Angeles Times*, p. 25.
- Foderaro, L. (2004, December 11). Sex charges investigated at West Point. *The New York Times*, p. B5.
- Graham, J. (2003, September 23). Report blames Air Force leadership for sex scandal. *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News*, p. 1.
- Hirshman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Janofsky, M. & Schemo, D. (2003, March 16). Women recount life as cadets: Forced sex, fear and silent rage. *New York Times*, p. 11.
- Mason, G., Riger S. & Foley L. (2004). The impact of past sexual experiences on attributions of responsibility for rape, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(10), 1157-1171.
- Military academies are derelict. (2005, September 23). *Hartford Courant*, p. A8.
- Military academies faulted on harassment. (2005, August 26). *The Washington Post*, p. A11.
- Newton, L. H. & Ford, M. (2006). *Taking sides: Clashing views in business ethics and society*. Dubuque, Iowa: McGraw Hill.
- Oprah Winfrey show: Air Force Academy rape scandal. (2003, December 8). Harpo Productions Inc. Retrieved June 25, 2007 from [http://www.oprah.com/tows/pastshows/200312/tows\\_past\\_20031208.jhtml](http://www.oprah.com/tows/pastshows/200312/tows_past_20031208.jhtml)
- Puder-York, M. with Thompson, A. (2006). *The office survival guide: Surefire techniques for dealing with challenging people and situations*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Rainey, A. (2006, January 25). Sexual harassment pervades college campuses and injures men and women, survey finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A38.
- Robbins, S. & Judge, T. (2007). *Organizational Behavior* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Prentice Hall.
- Ryel, B., S. Greatrix & Enright C. (2006). The case of the guilty victim: The effects of gender of

- victim and gender of perpetrator on attributions of blame and responsibility. *Sex Roles*, 54 (9/10). 639-649.
- Shank, R. (1998). Speech, service and sex: The limits of first amendment protection of sexual expression in the military. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 51 (4), 1094-1146.
- Schmitt, E. (1997, February 6). Sex harassment case polarizes soldiers. *New York Times*, p. A1.
- Sky was limit for cadet, until her harassment complaint: Women say Air Force is indifferent to allegations of rape, other crimes. (2003, March 12). *Los Angeles Times*,
- US Representative Christopher Shays holds a hearing. (2006, June 29) *Political Transcript Wire*, (wire feed, transcript not paginated).
- Women at West Point face tough choices on assaults. (2003, May 22). *New York Times*, p. A16.

Andra Gumbus received her Doctorate in Educational Leadership from the College of Business at the University of Bridgeport. She teaches courses in organizational behavior and business ethics. She has published numerous articles on performance management emphasizing the use of the corporate balanced scorecard. Her research in organizational behavior includes articles on human resources, career development and ethical issues in business. Andra can be reached at [gumbusa@sacredheart.edu](mailto:gumbusa@sacredheart.edu)

Jill Woodilla received her Ph.D. from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. She is Associate Professor of Management at the John F. Welch College of Business, Sacred Heart University. Jill's ironic perspective provides her with a critical view of the multiple realities of any situation. Her current research interests include power relationships in design management and donor decision-making in charitable giving. She has published several articles on organizational discourse, teaching cases on organizational change and hidden disabilities, and co-edited a book on irony and organizations. She can be reached at [woodillaj@sacredheart.edu](mailto:woodillaj@sacredheart.edu)

Chris York is the Acting Director of the MBA Program and Clinical Assistant Professor, Welch College of Business, Sacred Heart University. With over 40 years of management experience, he has served as Secretary of Citibank's Board of Directors; Associate General Counsel of Citicorp; Vice President of Planning & Marketing of AmBase Corporation, and EVP-Management of Project HOPE, the international medical education NGO. He holds an AB degree from Colgate University, an MA degree from the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii, and a JD degree from Emory University Law School. His current research interest is ethical business practices. He can be reached at [yorkc@sacredheart.edu](mailto:yorkc@sacredheart.edu)