

**Hazing DEOCS 4.1
Construct Validity Summary**



Hazing DEOCS 4.1 Construct Validity Summary

Content Review

The definition of Hazing was taken directly from the memorandum, *Hazing and Bullying Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces*,” dated 23 December 2015, which replaced the 1997 policy memorandum, “*Hazing*.” The definition of Hazing is as follows:

“Hazing is any conduct through which a military member or members, or a Department of Defense civilian employee or employees, without a proper military or other governmental purpose but with a nexus to military service or Department of Defense civilian employment, physically or psychologically injure or create a risk of physical or psychological injury to one or more military members, Department of Defense civilians, or any other persons for the purpose of: initiation into, admission into, affiliation with, change in status or position within, or as a condition for continued membership in any military or Department of Defense civilian organization.

Hazing includes, but is not limited to, the following when performed without a proper military or other governmental purpose: any form of initiation or congratulatory act that involves physically striking another in any manner or threatening to do the same; pressing any object into another person's skin, regardless of whether it pierces the skin, such as "pinning" or "tacking on" of rank insignia, aviator wings, jump wings, diver insignia, badges, medals, or any other object; oral or written berating of another for the purpose of belittling or humiliating; encouraging another to engage in illegal, harmful, demeaning or dangerous acts; playing abusive or malicious tricks; branding, handcuffing, duct taping, tattooing, shaving, greasing, or painting; subjecting to excessive or abusive use of water; and the forced consumption of food, alcohol, drugs, or any other substance. Hazing can be conducted through the use of electronic devices or communications, and by other means, as well as in person.”

Items were generated based on the above definition of Hazing and piloted ($n = 4,935$). It was decided that the item should use a “select all that apply” scale in order to best reflect the prevalence of specifically-perceived behaviors associated with Hazing. Table 1 displays the original DEOCS 4.0 items for Hazing. Table 2 displays the items that were piloted, statistically evaluated, and finalized for inclusion in DEOCS 4.1.

Table 1.

DEOCS 4.0 items for Hazing

Newcomers are harassed or humiliated prior to being accepted into the organization.

To be accepted in this organization, members must participate in potentially dangerous activities that are not related to the mission.

Newcomers in this organization are pressured to engage in potentially harmful activities that are not related to the mission.

Table 2.
DEOCS 4.1 items for Hazing

Item stem: Individuals in my work environment are pressured to engage in which of the following acts as part of an initiation or admission process (without a proper military or other governmental purpose). Select all that apply:
Physically harmful acts
Psychologically harmful acts
Illegal or dangerous acts
N/A

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 3 displays the demographic characteristics of the sample used to pilot the items. Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20) was used to obtain the reliability for the scale. Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20; Kuder & Richardson, 1937) was used to obtain the reliability for the scale. This test was used instead of traditional reliability because the items measure dichotomous (i.e., coded zero or one) rather than continuous variables. The means for the items ranged from .27 to .29, while there was strong reliability (i.e., KR-20) at .92. We also examined the alphas if item deleted statistic. The three items presented the highest reliability; thus, no items were removed from the analysis. Tables 4 – 6 provide additional information regarding the descriptive statistics and reliability of the Hazing items. Table 7 provides the frequency of responses (i.e., yes and no responses) for the sample.

Table 3.
Sample Demographics of Hazing Items Piloted on DEOCS

	<i>n</i>	%
Branch of Service		
Army	2363	47.8%
Navy	1332	26.9%
Marine Corps	322	6.5%
Air Force	343	6.9%
Coast Guard	15	.3%
National Guard	535	10.8%
DoD/Joint	33	.7%
Component		
Active Duty	3,209	92.6%
Reserve	258	7.4%
Gender		
Male	3,830	77.5%
Female	1,105	22.4%
Seniority		
Junior Enlisted (E1 – E3)	858	21.4%
Non-Commissioned Officer (E4 – E6)	2,260	56.3%
Senior Non-Commissioned Officer (E7 – E9)	419	10.4%
Junior Officer (O1 – O3)	300	7.5%

	<i>n</i>	%
Senior Officer (O4 and above)	174	4.3%

Table 4.
Item Statistics for Hazing

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Physically harmful acts	.29	.46	.90	-1.19
Psychologically harmful acts	.29	.46	.90	-1.18
Illegal or dangerous acts	.27	.44	1.05	-.90
<i>n</i>		4943		

Table 5.
KR-20 Cronbach's Alpha for Hazing

KR-20 Cronbach's Alpha	<i>n</i> of Items
.92	3

Table 6.
KR-20 Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted

	Scale <i>M</i> if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Physically harmful acts	.56	.72	.88
Psychologically harmful acts	.56	.72	.88
Illegal or dangerous acts	.59	.76	.90

Table 7.
Sample Frequencies for 4.1 Hazing

Select all that apply:		
	No	Yes
Physically harmful acts	3,485	1,458
Psychologically harmful acts	3,489	1,454
Illegal or dangerous acts	3,619	1,324
N/A	1,765	3,178

Conclusion

The results from the above analyses suggest that the items adapted from the 23 December 2015 memorandum are considered to be a reliable scale that accurately measures all aspects of Hazing. The final three Hazing climate factor items that were adopted for use in DEOCS 4.1 are located above in Table 2.

References

- Deputy Secretary of Defense (2015). Memorandum for secretaries of the military departments. *Hazing and Bullying Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces*, 2-5.
- Kuder, G. F., & Richardson, M. W. (1937). The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika*, 2, 151–160.