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INTRODUCTION

When I was deployed to Afghanistan, I was a squad leader in charge of eleven soldiers. Keeping them safe was always at the forefront of my mind, before, during, and after missions. Planning and executing missions that consisted of training Afghani National Police, Afghani Army, and meeting with mayors, town elders, and other key individuals was a constant mission during the deployment.

I received a new soldier into my squad five months before the tour ended. I was informed that soldier X and her leadership “had issues.” I did not pry into the issues and treated her the same as I treated all my new soldiers entering my squad. I treated her with respect and dignity, and because of that, we built a good relationship.

When the tour ended, the mission focus changed to bringing soldiers back home to their families and integrating back to the norm. A few weeks after coming back to the United States, I was informed that soldier X was sexually assaulted during the first half of the deployment to Afghanistan.

As a leader, I felt like I had failed soldier X. Anger and disappointment started to boil up. I felt disappointment in myself for not catching the signs that pointed to soldier X being sexually assaulted and anger at the company’s higher leadership for not informing her new leaders, me being one of them, about the incident. As the weeks had passed, soldier X went to court and the soldier that sexually assaulted her received 8 years in prison.

Sexual assault and sexual harassment are becoming more intolerable within the United States Army because of the creation of the Army’s Sexual Harassment and Assault Response Prevention (SHARP) Program. The SHARP Program was created in 2008 and there has been an increase in reporting each year; however, the SHARP Program has dictated to Army leaders to
create a memorandum/policy letter that addresses their units on the definition of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA), the complaint procedures, and the creation of a safe environment.

With the guidance of what should be included in the SHARP Program memorandum, many Army leaders copy the information from the regulation and paste it to their correspondence. This places protection on the leader in case a tragic event happens during their command, for example, SH/SA. This creates an issue because it focuses on saving the leader’s credibility and face instead of creating an environment that protects the soldiers’ wellbeing. The copy-paste method has many negative and positive implications on the unit as a whole, since it does not address the main issues of lack of authorial voice and writing the memoranda to a general audience.

The story about my soldier happened in 2009 and SH/SA are still common for both men and women in the armed forces in 2019. More than 10 years later, there has been minimal progress with SH/SA prevention in the military. Since the military started tracking the incidents of Sexual Assault in 2007, there has been an increase in reporting. According to a chart provided by Brook (2019) based on the numbers provided by the Department of Defense 2018 Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military shows the increase of reports of Sexual Assault within the military from 2,223 in 2007 to 6,053 in 2018. The numbers have nearly tripled since the collection of the data, and in the past three years, the numbers have “increased by 38% from 2016 to 2018” (Brook, 2019). The increase of reporting suggests that military members are more aware of Sexual Assault, but leader’s actions to stop SH/SA should not stop at writing a memorandum that promises to create a safe and healthy working environment. Leaders should not just focus on awareness and training, but leaders need to ensure that all soldiers understand
the implications of the regulations and laws by creating correspondence that relays that message. If the leader is just writing and following a template, the status quo will remain. The increasing numbers of SH/SA in the military should be an alarm and the SHARP Program and the memorandum have the power to start creating change if used properly; however, nothing will change if there is a lack of commitment by Army leaders. Change can begin by writing a memorandum with an emphasis on change and authority.

Recently, with the slow progress of change in the military and the increasing numbers of SH/SA, many military members are starting the conversation of harassment and assault with the #MeToo Movement. The #MeToo Movement is pushing the dialogue forward by starting a “conversation about sexual violence” (metoomvmt.org, 2019) and with the increase in numbers of Sexual Assault in the military, military leaders need to step out of their comfort zone and take a look at the effects that the programs about SH/SA have on the military as a whole. In the Army, they have created the Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program which is directed to remove SH/SA in the workplace and create a safe environment. Commanders need to write a memorandum that discusses his/her commitment to the program, provide definitions, and reporting procedures. This creates positive and negative implications on the workplace environment, which creates the research questions that I want to address in this paper. These questions include: What is the relationship between the SHARP Program and the reported incidents of SH/SA? What positive and negative effects does copy-pasting have on the creation of a safe environment in the Army, with specific relation to sexual harassment? What is the relationship between a generalized audience and a copy-paste memorandum? How do the two ideas, generalized audience and a copy-pasted memorandum, work together to create a safe and cohesive environment within the Army?
The Army’s SHARP Program

Before I begin to analyze the Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program’s memorandum, the clarification of the background information, description, and the goals and purpose of the program need to be discussed.

The Army created the SHARP Program in response to growing concerns of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA) within its ranks. In 2004, the Acting Secretary of the Army created the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program to investigate concerns and allegations about SA and the Prevention of Sexual Harassment (POSH) to stop concerns of SH. However, it was established that sexual harassment is a “potential precursor to sexual assault” (G-1 Personnel of the United States Army, 2011, paragraph 2-3). With the combination of SAPR and POSH comes the birth of SHARP in 2008.

The Army SHARP Program has several key tasks, as it:

- Promotes cultural change across the Army with a vision toward a culture of discipline and respect in which Soldiers intervene in sexual harassment and sexual assault to protect one another
- Includes a comprehensive effort to educate leaders and Soldiers about sexual harassment and sexual assault
- Employs a concrete training program that teaches Soldiers to be alert to serial offender tactics, to intervene to stop incidents and disrupt offenders, and where and how to seek help
- Provides commanders with the essential resources, education and training they need to succeed in bringing an end to sexual harassment and sexual assault in the Army (sexualassault.army.mil, 2019).
However, the main purpose of SHARP Program is for the “commanders [to] have the ultimate responsibility for command climate and culture, safety, prevention and response efforts, accountability, assessment, and safe reporting” (sexualassault.army.mil, 2019).

The goal and the purpose of the Army’s SHARP Program is to “[e]nhance Army readiness through the prevention of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and associated retaliatory behaviors while providing comprehensive response capabilities” (Army SHARP, 2019). The Army regulation requires leaders to have and create a memorandum condemning and advocating for a safe and healthy environment free from SH/SA. The commanders of these units are required to publish a policy stating their commitment to the SHARP Program, definitions of SH/SA, the complaint process, and reporting procedures.

Terms

The definitions of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA) need to be established before moving on in this discussion. I will be comparing the Army’s and different agencies in the government’s definitions of SH/SA. The definitions of sexual harassment are provided in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army’s Definition of Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Title IX’s Definition of Sexual Harassment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sexual harassment is a form of gender discrimination that involves unwelcomed sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature between the same or opposite genders when—</td>
<td>Sexual harassment is unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature. Sexual harassment can include unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature. Sexual harassment of a student can deny or limit, on the basis of sex, the student's ability to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of a person’s job, pay, or career.

(2) Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct by a person is used as a basis for career or employment decisions affecting that person.

(3) Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

b. Any person in a supervisory or command position who uses or condones implicit or explicit sexual behavior to control, influence, or affect the career, pay, or job of a Soldier or civilian employee is engaging in sexual harassment. Similarly, any Soldier or civilian employee who makes deliberate or repeated unwelcome verbal comments, gestures, or physical contact of a sexual nature is engaging in sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment of students is, therefore, a form of sex discrimination prohibited by Title IX under the circumstances described in this guidance.
Chart 1: These definitions were taken from Army Regulation 600-20 and the Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance: Harassment of Students by School Employees, Other Students, or Third Parties Title IX.

The comparison of the term shows that the Army’s and Title IX’s definitions are aligned with one another. The common words in the definition of Sexual Harassment between the two agencies are “unwelcomed” advances in “sexual nature” that prevent students or employees from performing at the highest potential.

In continuation, the definitions of sexual assault are provided in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army’s Definition of Sexual Assault</th>
<th>National Institute of Justice’s Definition of Sexual Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sexual assault is a crime defined as intentional sexual contact, characterized by use of force, physical threat or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent. Sexual assault includes rape, nonconsensual sodomy (oral or anal sex), indecent assault (unwanted, inappropriate sexual contact or fondling), or attempts to commit these acts. Sexual assault can occur without regard to gender or spousal relationship or age of victim. “Consent” will not be deemed or construed to mean the | Sexual assault covers a wide range of unwanted behaviors—up to but not including penetration—that are attempted or completed against a victim's will or when a victim cannot consent because of age, disability, or the influence of alcohol or drugs. Sexual assault may involve actual or threatened physical force, use of weapons, coercion, intimidation, or pressure and may include—

- Intentional touching of the victim's genitals, anus, groin, or breasts.
- Voyeurism. |
failure by the victim to offer physical resistance. Consent is not given when a person uses force, threat of force, or coercion or when the victim is asleep, incapacitated, or unconscious.

- Exposure to exhibitionism.
- Undesired exposure to pornography.
- Public display of images that were taken in a private context or when the victim was unaware.

Chart 2: The definition of Sexual Assault was taken from Army Regulation 600-20 and the National Institute of Justice.

The Sexual Assault definitions show a slight difference in wording but have the same meaning by using keywords and phrases, which defines the term as using force to have sexual contact with consent.

The intent to show the SH/SA definitions is to provide a comparison between the Army’s and other government agencies’ definitions to illustrate the changes in wording needed to improve the SHARP Program memoranda to benefit the military members. Since the Army and other government agency use similar wording when defining SH/SA, this shows the consistency of the definitions and the use of copy-paste when creating memoranda; however, the use of copy-paste highlights the need for leaders to incorporate their voice and commitment to stopping this type of violence, voice, authority, and commitment.

Literature Review

For the argument of this paper, I will be using copy-paste as a catch-all for boilerplates, from one source and transfers it to another piece of writing with or without citation. Louch (2016) uses templates and boilerplates as interchangeable terms since they both can reuse phrases with “little to no changes” (p. 14) to written correspondence. Crook uses Howard’s
(1992) definition of patchwriting as “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitute” (p. 2). All four terms are linked by one key idea, transferring another’s work and reusing the information to convey similar ideas. However, these terms align with plagiarism, but they do not have malice intent to steal intellectual property.

Within the academic world, the use of plagiarism is looked down on with such disdain that students get expelled or scholars lose credibility if they do not give credit where it is due. However, within the technical communication discipline, the use of copy-paste is necessary when dealing with clients and other professionals in the production of written material. With the use of copy-paste, it may be considered as “plagiarism in academia” but it is “not always plagiarism in the technical world simply due to the nature of the work” (Louch, p. 14). In the technical communication discipline, there are both positive and negative implication and aspects that come with the use of copy-pasting data from one source to another.

Crook (2016) describes the content of copy-pasting as “patchwriting” and focusing on graduate students learning English or second language learners, with this in mind, the concept can apply to the copying from the Army regulation to a memorandum. One key issue with copy-pasting is the lack of “authorial voice” making the stance/argument weaker since the author utilizes other’s voices; however, a benefit for copy-pasting is the narrowing of the information to a consumable amount for the reader in a short amount of time (Crook, 2016).

However, with the constant use of copy-paste in documents, it creates a growing problem. Inkster (1994) explains with the use of copy-pasting in written documents, the memorandum is written for an audience that is too board and becomes unhelpful when creating a safe and cohesive work environment, and he continues to state that the “presence of a real
audience is an important element in a fruitful technical writing problem” (p. 213). This raises a concern when the document deals with difficult and important issues, such as Sexual Harassment or Sexual Assault (SH/SA) within the Army. The use of copy-pasted information dilutes or obscures a target audience that creates the specificity and impact of a message much like combating SH/SA in the workplace to create a safe and cohesive environment. Since there is a lack of an audience, it creates a lack of social justice because the victim’s voice is muted, and it exemplifies the writer’s in trying to create a “safe environment” (Army Regulation 600-20).

The use of copy-paste in memoranda creates general statements that create a crisis in technical communication and the execution of the policy creates the organization’s culture and soldier’s behavior. Dunn and Eble (2015) quote Seeger and Ulmer’s definition of a crisis as “an event that ‘represent[s] a fundamental threat to the very stability of a system, a questioning of core assumptions and beliefs, and risk to high priority goals, including organizational image, legitimacy, profitability and ultimately survival’” (Dunn and Eble, p. 718). The crisis within the SHARP program memorandum is not about the sexual harassment or the sexual assault victims, but rather the high priority goal of saving the “organization’s image” (Dunn and Eble, p. 719). To reiterate, the purpose of the SHARP Program memorandum is the create a safe and cohesive work environment free from SH/SA, and the memoranda should not protect the leader’s credibility. The company commanders or the writers of the memorandum place more emphasis on “strategies to avoid damage to the organizational reputation” (Dunn and Eble, 718), which means that the memorandum does not hold any weight when it comes to creating a “safe environment” (AR 600-20). These strategies that Dunn and Eble discuss exemplify the “notions of power, truth and knowledge, and…how texts work to oppress people within social communities” (p. 719). Dunn and Eble describe the need for social justice when analyzing
technical communication by focusing the oppressive nature correspondences have with a community. I will be able to point out the issues that copy-pasting has on technical writing by analyzing the Army’s SHARP Program memoranda.

Jones (2016) continues with this argument by stating that scholars need to “examine the design and dissemination of communication critically with a focus on understanding how oppressive conditions can be rearticulated and reinforced” (p. 5). Jones refers to the design and dissemination of written communication as a whole by looking into the audience of the memorandum. She is suggesting that there needs to be an investigation of the implications of copy-pasting and how that has positive or negative effects on the work environment. The use of copy-paste has negative effects because it leads to the oppressive nature of the memorandum by the lack of authorial voice and the memoranda being written to generally. Since copy-paste is easily accessible to many individuals, this raises many questions within the technical and professional communication field—what are the effects of templates, boilerplates, and copy-paste memoranda within an organization, but more specifically within the United States Army’s Sexual Harassment and Assault Response Prevention (SHARP) Program Policy Letter/Memorandum?

The Army is one of the biggest corporations in the United States and within its ranks is the constant usage of copy-paste with technical correspondence such as the memorandum. SH/SA has been an ongoing issue in the Army for a long time and a way for the leadership to combat this issue is with the creation of the SHARP Program. The Army has dictated that commanders of a unit must create a memorandum/policy letter that addresses issues of SH/SA (AR 600-20 7-2b). The Army’s definition of a safe environment is dictated through Army Regulations to “creat[e] and [maintain] an environment conducive to maximum productivity and
respect for human dignity” (AR 600-20, 7-3a). Since the information is dictated by this regulation, commanders and leaders often use copy-paste method when creating written correspondence, which develops a problem and contradicts the essence of the memorandum—the creation of a safe environment. This is contradictory since the author of the Army SHARP Program memoranda is trying to assert an authoritative voice within the memorandum but falls short because they are trying to impose another’s voice. The author is trying to reinforce the Army’s standard, however, copy-pasting the information lacks the voice needed, which goes back to the commander not being able to create a safe environment and the authority to mandate action because of the constant use of copy-paste within a memorandum.

When Army leaders use copy-paste to create their correspondence, it contributes to a sense of an oppressive environment where the status quo is maintained. Jones (2016) describes oppression as “encompass[ing] those who are disenfranchised, marginalized, othered, and silenced in systemic ways” (p. 6). Individuals who have been sexually harassed or assaulted within the Army fall into this category because of the SHARP Program’s memorandum. The memorandum is a systemic document that gives a voice to the victim but is unable to create a “safe environment” free from SH/SA because it is simply there to protect the commander’s or the writer’s face or credibility. The voice that is given to the victim starts the healing process, but the memorandum creates a cycle that is doomed to repeat itself unless the use of copy-paste is minimized, or the writer focuses on their specific audience.

With the use of rhetorical analysis through the social justice lens and grounded theory, the analysis of the SHARP Program memorandum will help the field of technical communication identify the oppressive nature that written correspondence has on a culture. Colton and Holmes (2018) adds to the conversation by discussing that social justice “strives to recognize injustices
within institutional contexts in order to call for the revision or reimagination” and they point out that it is the “duty of technical communicators to call attention to injustices and advocate for the system to adjust according” (p. 5), which points to the need to incorporate social justice into the writing of technical communication. Colton and Holmes call for an active method in social justice, which “provides a better language for articulating and hopefully encouraging [technical communication social justice] practices” (p. 12). There is a need to analyze the implications of copy-pasting within the technical communication genre. Jones (2016) states that “[Technical Professional Communicators need] to address issues of power and agency as they manifest in communicative practices and texts” (p. 2). Technical communicators need to understand the impact that copy-pasting has on their writing, specifically on serious incidents such as SH/SA.

The SHARP Program memorandum falls into the technical communication genre and according to Britton (1965), technical communication has “one meaning” and it must be “sharp, clear, precise” (p. 114) and that is where the problem lies. The meaning of the memoranda becomes muddled because of the constant use of templates, boilerplates, and copy-paste, which leads me to ask the question: What are the effects of templates, boilerplate, and copy-paste in a memorandum about the Army’s Sexual Harassment and Assault Response Prevention (SHARP) Program?

Memorandum

To conduct this research, I will be analyzing the policy letters on the Army’s Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program. Based on Army Regulation (AR) 25-50 1-13, the Army uses the “term ‘form letter’ as a generic term that encompasses memorandums and letters. Form letters save time and money and often provide a higher level of quality than composed letters.” The policy letters and memoranda that I have
selected for this project all focus on the Army’s SHARP Program. I refer to the policy letters as memoranda because it is an interchangeable term within the Army according to AR 25-50.

The Army’s and other organizations’ use of memoranda is similar because it is targeted towards individuals within that organization. Purdue University Online Writing Lab (2019) defines memoranda as “brief printed documents traditionally used for routine, day-to-day communication within organizations” (paragraph 1). Organizations need to create memoranda to ensure a high productivity rate of the company or inform individuals about a topic that needs to be addressed, such as inappropriate behavior or SH/SA. To further define the purpose of a memorandum, Purdue University Online Writing Lab uses Johnson-Sheehan’s explanation that memoranda, “are written to people inside [a] company or organization. They are used to convey decisions, meeting agendas, policies, internal reports, and short proposals” (paragraph 1). The purpose of a memorandum is to inform a specific audience (a company or business) about information dealing with the issues such as addressing a problem, making a request, or providing feedback.

Within the Army, the purpose of the memorandum is very similar, and the Army created AR 25-50 to give details on how to write and the purpose of the correspondence. According to AR 25-50 1-7b, “The memorandum will be used for correspondence within a department or agency, as well as for routine correspondence to Federal Government agencies outside the Department of Defense (DOD).” This definition goes back to Purdue University’s definition and purpose of the memorandum, which is a memorandum is for a specific audience within an organization. An organization uses this mode of communication to distribute information that would be beneficial to the organization’s ability to function.
AR 25-50 1-44a states the purpose of creating memorandum is to ensure that the correspondence is effective “writing [that] transmits a clear message in a single, rapid reading and is generally free of errors in grammar, mechanics, and usage.” This supports Britton’s (1965) description of technical writing as having one meaning, and AR 25-50 continues to point out how to write a memorandum by stating in 1-44b, that “Good Army writing is concise, organized, and right to the point. Two essential requirements include putting the main point at the beginning of the correspondence and using the active voice.” The Army is teaching the authors of these documents to write properly, focusing on the brief content of the idea.

This information may be repetitive, however, I want to point out the similarities between common technical communication genres and memorandum writing within the Army. Within both types of writing, the authors have to use “sharp, clear, precise” (Britton, 1965) words to have their idea understood and for the sake of time and money. Memoranda have to be upfront with the information since the correspondence focuses on the improvement of the productivity of the organization. The authors are writing for a specific audience—the individuals within the organization. The structure of the memorandum is upfront; the key details are stated at the beginning of the memorandum and the supporting details follow. These are the similarities between technical communication and Army Writing memoranda.

Even though there are many similarities between the two, there is one key difference between the two genres and that is the formatting of the memorandum. The Army has dictated the spacing, the inclusion of the references, and the distribution of the memorandum be included in the correspondence. Outside the Army, the writer adds a space between the paragraphs, but the Army has dictated the numbers of spaces between the paragraphs.

Significance
The major implication that my research will have is starting the conversation within the field of Rhetoric and Writing Studies and technical communication about the negative and positive impact of copy-paste documentation when it deals with a complicated and challenging topic such as SH/SA. This will assist rhetoricians and writers alike when it comes to creating documentation that is too general to help and the focus should be towards a specific audience's needs.

The application of this research could assist the military when it comes to writing memoranda. This would help increase the reporting and minimize the incidents that deal with SH/SA within the military. The results will help the military address an audience that is more specific than general when it comes to sensitive topics, such as SH/SA. Also, the results from this study will start a conversation about changing the practice of copy-pasting information, which will warn leaders about the use of copy-pasting on the serious subject when writing memoranda are imperfect due to the lack of audience-centered writing.

Other stakeholders that would find this information applicable to their discipline include military science, business, and social sciences. Military science would be interested in this project because of the applications of the results by improving the SHARP program within the military and within the UTEP ROTC program. The business program would be able to analyze the results and apply the implication of a copy-paste memorandum and the need to focus on the audience. Social science, specifically psychology and sociology, would be interested in reading this project since it will investigate the social implications of a memorandum. Within the field of Rhetorical and Writing Studies, the group that would be interested would be the technical writers. Technical writers would be interested in reading this project because it analyzes the
rhetorical aspects of memoranda. Also, the connections to social justice by the effects of the oppressive nature of copy-pasting words and phrases a written correspondence has on a culture.

Furthermore, I would create the implications that would arise with the continuation of the use of copy-paste with incidents of SH/SA and how rhetoricians can use this information to further technical writing.

With my experience with the Army as a leader, I want to investigate the effects that copy-paste memoranda have on the creation of a safe environment within the Army. This analysis lends itself to the question of how effective is the use of boilerplates, templates, patchwriting, and copy-pasting have serious incidents such as sexual harassment and sexual assault? Within this research, I want to use grounded theory and rhetorical analysis to define the problem that arises from the use of copy-pasting and place a social justice in the forefront to identify a possible solution to this ever-growing crisis.
METHODOLOGY

I collected 10 of the Army’s Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program memoranda through a Google search. This search led to a saturation of data and from it I found similarities of the negative and positive aspects of the use of copy-pasting. To explain saturation, Aldiabat and Le Navenec (2018) uses data saturation for “qualitative data analysis in which the researcher has continued sampling and analyzing data until no new data appears and all concepts of the theory are well-developed…and their linkage to other concepts are clearly described” (247). This leads to the purpose of using saturation as Charmaz (2005) describes because it “justif[ies] small samples of data—very small samples with thin data” (528). I used saturation to justify the collection and analysis of 10 SHARP Program memoranda, which leads to the negative and positive effects of copy-pasting information and the need to incorporate social justice into technical communication.

Along with this research, I gathered the Army Regulations (AR), All Army Actions (ALARACT) memoranda, and guidebooks that relate to the SHARP Program. The memoranda that I collected were written between 2015 to 2019 and from various locations around the world, Korea, North Carolina, and Kentucky, just to name a few. With the collected memorandum, AR, and guidebooks, I will be able to identify copy-pasted information to create the SHARP Program memorandum.

With the data that I have collected, I used the methods of Rhetorical Analysis and Grounded Theory (GT) to analyze the data collected and will investigate the information through a social justice theory. The use of the rhetorical analysis and the lens of social justice will show the implications of the use of copy-pasting in written correspondence of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA).
There is a need to bring both a GT and rhetorical analysis to define the need for social justice with technical communication, but more specifically the implication of the use of copy-paste to a memorandum of the SHARP Program within the Army. Rhetorical analysis is the basis for many articles and research since it allows researchers to analyze the author’s purpose, goals, technique, and style to persuade the audience to think a certain way. Cyphert (2010) describes business writing analysis having an “obvious goal…to simply understand the influence of business rhetoric in human affairs and…in contemporary economic, social, and political processes” (p. 348). The analysis of communication looks into how the message “influences” the reader to think a certain way and how this affects individuals. The analysis used in this research will break down how copy-pasting effects how an individual looks at the memorandum and determine if the use of copy-pasting is beneficial to an organization.

Martin continues Cyphert’s argument by focusing on rhetorical analysis of political speeches. The analysis of political speeches relates to the SHARP Program memorandum since the memorandum is political in nature because it is created in the military. With the rising numbers of SH/SA, the #MeTooMovement is leading to more analysis of instances of narratives of SH/SA and the discussion around of SH/SA is discussed, how it is presented, and how the discussion is being molded. The discussions and presentations of narratives of SH/SA of the #MeTooMovement can be analyzed with the use of Martin’s method of rhetorical analysis in political speeches: the rhetorical context, rhetorical argument, and rhetorical effects (2015, p. 34). Martin defines the rhetorical context as “the immediate conditions giving rise to a speech occasion.” The #MeTooMovement gives rise to the immediate discussion of the instances of SH/SA, which creates an environment for change. And within the context of the research the memorandum needs create a safe environment daily. However, the audience is too broad for the
correspondence to work because the author/speaker cannot change the message and it needs to be altered to a “specific audience” (Martin, 2015, p. 34). For example, copying and pasting the definitions of SH/SA and the policies into the SHARP memorandum, which shows the use of general language not focused on the audience.

The second aspect of rhetorical analysis Martin uses is the rhetorical argument, and he explains the usage of this by focusing on “the situation configured in the language of the speech itself, where constraints and opportunity are discursively re-imagined” (Martin, 2015, p. 35). The authors of the memorandum shape the “argument for an audience” (Martin, 2015, p. 35) by framing the situation and the exigency. The authors of the memorandum reframe the argument by pointing out the issue of SH/SA, however, copy-pasting of the information dulls the argument by removing the author’s voice within the memorandum which lowers the level of exigency. This is shown in the memorandum’s policy section because the authors copy-paste the information without adding their authority.

Martin uses the rhetorical effect as the third element for the rhetorical analysis of political speeches. Rhetorical effects can be assessed “if [the correspondence] appear to have enabled a speaker to enhance his or her capacity to act and speak in certain ways and constrain others to follow likewise” (Martin, 2015, p. 35). The use of this analysis will point out the contradiction because the authors of the memorandum use the copy-paste method. The use of copy-paste does not enhance the speaker’s voice because they borrow others to command and create a safe environment, however, this does help with the reporting of SH/SA. The comparing of the statistics of the SH/SA and the SHARP Program will be used to discuss the effectiveness of the SHARP Program memorandum.
Rhetorical context, argument, effect, and exigency changes over time but the memorandum change every 18-24 months if the command does not just copy-paste the whole correspondence. The conversation needs to move forward with the numbers of sexual assault reports nearly tripling since 2007-2,223 to 2018-6,053 (Brooks, 2019). The growing number SH/SA shows an exigency that needs to be addressed, however, the use of the copy-paste and not changing the information on the memorandum removes all elements of exigency within the memorandum and renders it void. The exigency of creating a safe work environment free from SH/SA becomes void because the purpose of copy-paste is to save the leader’s credibility. The use shows that the author is just writing for compliance instead of trying to create change. The authors need to show their commitment by incorporating their voice in the document.

The use of rhetorical analysis with political speeches is explained further by Price-Thomas and Turnbull (2018) in their explanation of the audience. They state, “persuasion takes place increasingly with regards to multiple audiences simultaneously” (Price-Thomas and Turnbull, 2018, p. 211). Prince-Thomas and Turnbull address that political actors or politicians need to reach a wide array of people within a short period of time, which relates to the use of memoranda within the Army. However, the use of copy-paste is present in the memorandum, which the author of the memorandum does not target the audience but regurgitate the directed information. With an audience too broad, the author of the memorandum cannot inform everyone, and it is important to reach a broad, diverse audience that includes historically marginalized individuals, and to consider the effects rhetorical of the texts (like memoranda) on these populations.

With the authors’ use of copy-paste, the memoranda continue to marginalize individuals by reestablishing systematic oppression by using repetitive words and phrases that do not meet
the goal of creating a safe and cohesive work environment. The authors are just copy-pasting the information and they create a problem, which continues to marginalize people by the lack of authority to establish a healthy work environment. The use of copy-pasting shows that the authors create systemic oppression within their memorandum because they are just writing in compliance with the requirements and focusing on the protection of their credibility. The authors are not concerned with the protection of the soldiers, but instead, they are focused on saving their creditability and face, which leads to the need for social justice. Therefore, rhetorical analysis needs to be used to point out the effects of copy-paste on issues like SH/SA.

Rohland further explains rhetorical analysis as a method that encompasses “break[ing] an author’s message into pieces, identifies the appeals and strategies the author uses to communicate his or her message in each piece, and determines whether the author’s overall approach is successful” (p. 2). With the use of rhetorical analysis, the evaluation of the SHARP Program memorandum will breakdown if the effectiveness of copy-pasting in the Army by comparing the statistics to the development of the SHARP Program and determine the rhetorical impact of this approach on a wide range of audiences. The SHARP Program memorandum uses published documents, such as regulations and manuals, to protect the commander of the unit and to create an illusion of a “safe environment,” but it is not beneficial to the unit as a whole. The context of the memorandum on focused is the protection of the commander’s and the military’s reputation, which creates an imbalance of power. There is a constant use copy-paste in many corporations or organizations when creating written correspondence and the need to use both rhetorical analysis and grounded theory to analyze the implication within the technical communication genre.
Alammar, et.al., (2019) uses Glaser and Strauss to describe the basis of GT as the “discovery of theory from data—systematically obtained and analyzed in social research”, and they further explain that the analysis “evolves through a process as a result of interplay between data collection and data analysis, continues in an ongoing cycle based on the concepts derived from the data” (p. 229). However, for this research, I will be utilizing only the coding structure of GT. Otherwise, I will contradict the principles of GT which could cause a misrepresentation of the analysis and coding of the data. With a constrained sample size that is limited to 10 SHARP Program memoranda, I wanted to ensure that I do not misrepresent the use of GT within this research.

GT has four main stages that develop through “data by forging for information, collecting evidence, and forming scheme that leads to hypotheses” (Chandrasegaran, et al, 2017, p. 202). The four stages consist of open coding, axial coding, selective coding, and forming theory. With the use of GT, an open code will be used to analyze the memoranda based on the information that is copy-pasted from regulations, guidebooks, and the author’s voice. According to Charmaz (2006), open coding is defined as “what is happening in the data and begin to grapple with what it means” (p. 46) and how codes apply to the implications of the use of copy-paste within the technical communication. The data collected will show both the positive and negative impact that copy-pasting has on written correspondence.

The next stage of GT is axial coding “where casual and semantic relationship are determined between concepts, and conceptual labels are in turn created to describe them” (Chandrasegaran, et al, 2017, p. 202). The identification and labeling of copy-paste within the memorandum is the way I will use axial coding in this research. This will show the need to use
rhetorical analysis to show the relationship between the copy-paste and the author’s words to determine the implication it has on the creation of a safe environment.

Selective coding is the third step of GT and Chandrasegaran, et al. describes it by “identify[ing] a ‘core’ concept around which all or most of the other concepts seems to, or need to be unified” (p. 202). The core concept that I will be focusing on for this project will be the use of copy-paste and the author’s voice within the Army’s SHARP Program memorandum. The selecting of the usage of copy-paste in the memorandum will identify the positives and the negatives. The key codes are the definitions and policy directives within the SHARP Program memorandum. Comparing those codes with the statistics to show the need to use a social justice lens to analyze the impact.

The final step is when the researcher “attempts to explicate the relationships between the selected concept and the remaining concepts, or to the data set” (Chandrasegaran, et al, 2017, p. 202). In this step with the coded memoranda which looked at the copy-pasted information and the SHARP Program memorandum author’s voice, I will compare and contrast the coded information and identify the positive and negative effects of the use of copy-paste in written correspondence. For example, how each of the authors writes the definitions and the definitions and use of copy-paste of the definitions and the policy. The analysis of the data will point to the oppressive nature copy-pasting has on issues such as SH/SA.

The use of copy-paste memoranda creates institutionalized oppression that Charmaz illustrates in her grounded theory definition, which she calls for the need to incorporate social justice into technical communication. Charmaz (2005) states that grounded theory needs social justice incorporated into written correspondence since it “fosters integrating subjective experiences with social conditions” to create “good societies and a better world” meaning the
exploration of tension between “complicity and consciousness, choice and constraint, indifference and compassion, inclusion and exclusion, poverty and privilege, and barriers and opportunities” (p. 510). Memoranda of SH/SA creates multiple tension that distracts from building a cohesive environment because it produces an environment of systemic oppression which silences the production of a safe environment that creates a crisis.

The use of both GT and rhetorical analysis shows that there is a crisis with the use of copy-pasting within technical communication and the need to use the social justice theory to analyze the data to understand the implications. Colton and Holmes (2018) define social justice research as “striv[ing] to recognize injustices within institutional contexts in order to call for the revision or reimagination of those context” (p. 5). The Army has created institutional injustice by creating a memorandum that is not tailored to a specific audience when the author uses copy-paste in serious issues such as SH/SA. The memorandum does create an environment for change for victims to report the incidents of SH/SA, however, it provides more security for the commander/author to protect their reputation and face, but more importantly the credibility of the military. Colton and Holmes point out by stating that copy-pasting “places the locus on the individual to prevent injustice and sees governmental organizations as the locus for creating such injustices” (p. 5). The author of the memorandum is trying to create an environment for change but is unable because of the directive.

Jones (2016) furthers Colton and Holmes’ argument by mentioning the need to move beyond compliance and “consider ways to critique, intervene in, and create communication practices and texts that positively impact the mediated experiences of individuals” (p. 3). This explains the need for social justice when analyzing the use of copy-paste in memorandums by working towards “critically examin[ing] how texts and technologies have an impact on the
human experience” (p. 4). The call for social justice relies on the author not writing for compliance or saving credibility but instead for improvement of the organization.

Since the authors of the SHARP Program memorandum use copy-paste in the correspondence, they use “hegemonic practices and text (like regulatory writing and state laws) can reinforce racial discrimination, subordination, and objectify” (Jones, 2016, p. 5). The use of copy-paste silences and minimizes that change needed to stop SH/SA in a systematic way by creating an oppressive environment, which shows the problem with “privilege and power” of the author, but also “acknowledges that the oppressed can be from any demographic” (p. 6). The analysis of the memoranda will point to helping create a safe work environment, but it is unattainable because the process, definition, and complaint process is copy-pasted, which lacks the commander’s authority. With individuals that have experienced SH/SA, the information should minimize the oppressive nature of the regulation by targeting the specific audience.

In technical communication, the need to incorporate social justice is evident since there is a need to stop or minimally use copy-paste in correspondence dealing with serious topics such as SH/SA. Jones (2016) states that technical communicators need to fight against oppression in written correspondence by mentioning that technical communicators need to “understand that oppression must be addressed collectively by enhancing and supporting the agency of others is foundationally humanistic” (p. 7). With this research, I want to highlight the constant use of copy-pasting in the SHARP Program memoranda and the positive and negative impact it has on the work environment.
METHOD/RESULTS

The use of copy-pasting in memorandum within technical communication is a common practice; however, there is a growing need to analyze the implications of the copy-paste method with serious incidents such as Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA) in the use of memoranda. The use of Grounded Theory (GT) and rhetorical analysis framework will point to technical communicator’s need to place a social justice framework within the writing. GT points out the need for the social justice framework to be incorporated into technical communication. In addition, the rhetorical analysis framework needs to be incorporated into technical communication to help define its need and to address the action required to combat the oppressive nature of copy-pasting.

Through an open and axial coding of the Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Harassment (SHARP) Program, I found that the data collected shows two types of repeating information which has been copy-pasted from Army Regulations (AR) and the SHARP Program Guidebook. Through the use of axial and open coding, the copy-pasted information in the SHARP Program’s information, that I coded, includes policy, definitions, complaint process, and reporting procedures. Army leader’s take information from AR 600-20 Chapter 7, which discusses the Prevention of Sexual Harassment (POSH) Program, and Chapter 8 focuses on the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR). The SHARP Guidebook is based on the Army Regulation 600-20 Chapters 7 and Chapter 8 but broken down with charts and a new campaign to minimize and remove SH/SA within the ranks in the Army. The guidebook is repetitive because that it repeats the information from AR 600-20, such as the definitions, procedures, and responsibilities. The definitions of SH/SA are provided in the chart below based on the Army’s definition:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sexual Harassment    | a. Sexual harassment is a form of gender discrimination that involves unwelcomed sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature between the same or opposite genders when—

(1) Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of a person’s job, pay, or career.

(2) Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct by a person is used as a basis for career or employment decisions affecting that person.

(3) Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

b. Any person in a supervisory or command position who uses or condones implicit or explicit sexual behavior to control, influence, or affect the career, pay, or job of a Soldier or civilian employee is engaging in sexual harassment. Similarly, any Soldier or civilian employee who makes deliberate or repeated unwelcome verbal comments, gestures, or physical contact of a sexual nature is engaging in sexual harassment. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
<th>Sexual assault is a crime defined as intentional sexual contact, characterized by use of force, physical threat or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent. Sexual assault includes rape, nonconsensual sodomy (oral or anal sex), indecent assault (unwanted, inappropriate sexual contact or fondling), or attempts to commit these acts. Sexual assault can occur without regard to gender or spousal relationship or age of victim. “Consent” will not be deemed or construed to mean the failure by the victim to offer physical resistance. Consent is not given when a person uses force, threat of force, or coercion or when the victim is asleep, incapacitated, or unconscious.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Reporting</td>
<td>Restricted reporting allows a Soldier who is a sexual assault victim, on a confidential basis, to disclose the details of their assault to specifically identified individuals and receive medical treatment and counseling, without triggering the official investigative process. Soldiers who are sexually assaulted and desire restricted reporting under this policy should report the assault to the SARC, VA, chaplain, or a healthcare provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Reporting</td>
<td>Unrestricted reporting allows a Soldier who is sexually assaulted and desires medical treatment, counseling, and an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
official investigation of his/her allegation to use current reporting channels (for example, the chain of command or law enforcement), or he/she may report the incident to the SARC or the on-call VA. Upon notification of a reported sexual assault, the SARC will immediately notify a VA. Additionally, with the victim’s consent, the healthcare provider will conduct a forensic examination, which may include the collection of evidence. Details regarding the incident will be limited to only those personnel who have a legitimate need to know. See appendix H for a detailed explanation of restricted and unrestricted reporting.

| Formal Complaint | Allegation of unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment that is submitted in writing to proper authority and processed through official complaint channels. |
| Informal Complaint | Allegations of unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment that do not require written documentation. These complaints may be voiced to the offending party, to someone in a position of authority, or both. The intention is that the offending behavior will cease with no further action required. |

Chart 3: Shows the Army’s definition of terms that have been copy-pasted from the Army Regulation 600-20 to the SHARP Program memorandum.
These definitions are embedded in the SHARP Program memorandum because the authors just copy-paste the information from either the SHARP Program Guidebook or the Army Regulation 600-20. For example, an author of a SHARP memorandum Caslen (2016) defines sexual harassment as “a form of gender discrimination which includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature between the same or opposite genders…” While Mueller (2017) writes “sexual harassment as a form of gender discrimination that includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.” Also, Greenburg writes “Sexual harassment is a form of gender discrimination that involves unwelcomed sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature between the same of opposite genders when submission to, or rejection of, such conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual’s employment…” The purpose of showing the SHARP Program memorandum from different authors is to show the process of coding. There are keywords and phrases that the SHARP Program memorandum that are copy-pasted, such as “gender discrimination that involves unwelcomed sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal of physical conduct of a sexual nature”, which exemplifies the need to use rhetorical analysis and social justice framework.

Through the same approach of axial and open coding, I noticed another copy-pasted information that the authors use is the Army’s SHARP Program policy. The commanders retrieved the information for AR 600-20 Chapter 7, Chapter 8, and the SHARP Guidebook. The chart provided shows the Army’s policy on SH/SA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of Sexual Harassment (POSH)</td>
<td>a. The policy of the Army is that sexual harassment is unacceptable conduct and will not be tolerated. Army leadership at all levels will be committed to creating and maintaining an environment conducive to maximum productivity and respect for human dignity. Sexual harassment destroys teamwork and negatively affects combat readiness. The Army bases its success on mission accomplishment. Successful mission accomplishment can be achieved only in an environment free of sexual harassment for all personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Regulation 600-20</td>
<td>b. The POSH is the responsibility of every Soldier and DA civilian. Leaders set the standard for Soldiers and DA civilians to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR)</td>
<td>a. Sexual assault is a criminal offense that has no place in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devastating the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. Every Soldier who is aware of a sexual assault should immediately (within 24 hours) report incidents. Sexual assault is incompatible with Army values and is punishable under the UCMJ and other Federal and local civilian laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Regulation 600-20</td>
<td>b. The Army will use training, education, and awareness to minimize sexual assault; to promote the sensitive handling of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
victims of sexual assault; to offer victim assistance and counseling; to hold those who commit sexual assault offenses accountable; to provide confidential avenues for reporting, and to reinforce a commitment to Army values.

c. The Army will treat all victims of sexual assault with dignity, fairness, and respect.

d. The Army will treat every reported sexual assault incident seriously by following proper guidelines. The information and circumstances of the allegations will be disclosed on a need-to-know basis only.

e. This policy applies—

(1) Both on and off post and during duty and non-duty hours.

(2) To working, living, and recreational environments (including both on- and off-post housing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHARP Guidebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Army’s Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) program exists so that the Army can prevent incidents of sexual harassment and sexual assault before they occur. The SHARP program’s mission is to promote an Army culture and command climate that ensures adherence to the Army Values and ensures that every Army team member will be treated with dignity and respect at all times and in all circumstances. Every Soldier, DA Civilian,
and Family member serves and supports the Army and the Nation; they deserve no less.

Sexual harassment complaints and Prevention of Sexual Harassment (POSH) training for military members were formerly managed by the Equal Opportunity Office. The Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program was managed separately by the Army G-1. Sexual harassment and sexual assault have often been found to be interrelated and to exist along a continuum of sexual violence in which acts of sexual harassment, if unchecked, may lead to acts of sexual assault

Chart 4: Displays the stance and the policy the Army takes when combating SH/SA.

The authors of the SHARP Program combined the three sources, SHARP Guidebook, AR 600-20 Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 to create the vision of the SHARP Program policy for a safe and healthy work environment. For example, Peach (2017) writes “the policy of the Army is that acts of sexual harassment are unacceptable and are not tolerated. Sexual assault is a criminal offense that has no place in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devasting the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. Army leadership at all levels is committed to creating and sustaining an environment conducive to maximum accomplishment.” Hughes (2016) writes “Sexual harassment and sexual assault are unacceptable conduct that is incompatible with the Army Values, Soldier’s Creed, and Warrior Ethos. Sexual harassment and assault destroys cohesion and is detrimental to our mission. Successful mission accomplishment can only be achieved in an
environment that is free of sexual harassment and assault.” And Townsend (2018) writes “Sexual harassment and sexual assault are unacceptable and contradict the values of the Army and our organization. [Townsend] is fully committed to the TRADOC SHARP Program, and ensuring a safe living and working environment for our entire TRADOC team (Soldiers, Civilian employees, and Family members). Ultimately, we must ensure our TRADOC team understands we will not tolerate, condone, or ignore incidents of sexual harassment or sexual assault reports. Sexual harassment and sexual assault destroys teamwork and negatively affects combat readiness and are punishable under UCMJ and federal and civilian laws…” Once again, the purpose of showing the policy in the SHARP Program Guidebook, AR 600-20 Chapter 7 and Chapter 8, along with samples of SHARP Program memoranda policy is to highlight the coding that I conducted and to show the need to use a rhetorical analysis and social justice framework.

These two frameworks, rhetorical analysis, and social justice, work together to make an assertion of that the use of copy-pasting has both negative and positive impact; however, looking specifically at incidents of SH/SA, the copy-paste method has a more negative impact, so it cannot create a safe environment. Using GT and utilizing the frameworks of rhetorical analysis and social justice, key issues that have arisen are missing details of the consequences of the assaulter/predator; the audience is too general; the definition of a safe environment is broad.

With the data collected, I applied a rhetorical analysis framework to analyze the Army’s SHARP Program memoranda and determine the impact copy-pasting has with issues of SH/SA. Rohland (2017) describes rhetorical analysis with an in-depth examination of the purpose, goals, techniques, audience, and author of a text and strives to explain how the author communicates his or her message and whether the approach is successful (1). I analyzed the effectiveness of the memoranda and looked at the reporting numbers of the Army as a whole, since the beginning of
the SHARP Program. Then I analyzed the SHARP Program memoranda/policy letters from various locations of the Army with a focus on “the [Army’s] corporate message rather than on the messenger” (Cyphert, 2010, 350).

The purpose of copy-pasting the definitions is to ensure that every individual understands the term and can apply it into their workplace environment. During the coding process, there are keywords and phrases that these authors copy-pasted from the regulation to their memorandum, such as “gender discrimination,” “unwelcomed sexual advances,” and “requests for sexual behavior.” These terms help solidify the definition, however, the authors just rearranged and/or added words trying to write to their audience, but it just exemplifies that there is an issue—the author loses their authorial voice. They lose their authorial voice because they are using other’s words instead of their own. If the author uses the definition and then define or provide examples of the term, then he or she is trying to write to their audience. This would minimize any confusion and personalize the memorandum instead of making too general.

With the authors combining the three sources of SHARP Program Guidebook, AR 600-20 Chapter 7 and Chapter 8, they add their voice into the correspondence, however, they do not create a safe environment that prevents SH/SA. The key copy-pasted terms that the authors use in their memorandum are “unacceptable,” “incompatible with the Army,” “destroys teamwork,” and “healthy environment” (AR 600-20). The authors are including these terms to show their understanding of the regulation, but they are just writing it in for compliance purposes.

To analyze the lack of authorial voice in the memoranda, I need to analyze the directives in the AR 600-20. AR 600-20 Chapter 7-2b states, “[Commanders] will include the local command’s commitment to the Army’s policy against sexual harassment and will reaffirm that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. The statement will explain how and where to file
complaints and will state that all complainants will be protected from acts or threats of reprisal.” The information is laid out for the commanders to write their unit’s policy on SHARP, however, if they just copy-paste the information, they are writing for compliance instead of creating a safe and healthy environment. If they add examples or punishments, then they will make their policy stronger.

A responsibility that the Army Regulation places on commanders creates systemic oppression when they can “Either resolve the problem [SH] at the lowest possible level or, if necessary, take formal disciplinary or administrative action” (Army Regulation 600-20). This creates systematic oppression since it falls back on the commander’s lap and they could follow along with the punishment of the harasser or let it fall at the wayside.

The analysis of 10 SHARP Program memorandum point to the need that technical writers need to write with a social justice concept. There are both positives and negatives aspects when using copy-pasting within memoranda dealing with serious SH/SA. The next chapter will discuss the analysis of the copy-pasted information within the SHARP Program and the positive and negative implications.
DISCUSSION

The authors of the Sexual Harassment and Assault Response Prevention (SHARP) Program memoranda have information that is copy-pasted from one source and placed into the correspondence and with the growing numbers of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA) cases in the military, this shows a need for leaders to change the practice of copy-pasting for a general audience and tailoring the message to a specific group. Within this section, I will discuss the information that is copy-pasted into the memorandum, the positive and negative impact of copy-pasting, and methods for leaders to create a safe work environment. Furthermore, I will analyze the relationship between copy-pasted information with the audience, the relationship between the SHARP Program and the reported numbers of SH/SA, and how the audience and copy-paste can work together to create a positive environment, while pointing out the need for social justice to be incorporated within the creation of the memorandum. These are suggestions leaders can use; however, the methods need to be tailored for their specific audience.

I gathered 10 Army memoranda about the SHARP Program written between 2015 to 2019, and there are two categories that Army leaders copy-pasted: policy and definitions, which leads to the main issues lack of authorial voice and writing for a general audience. The policy covers the purpose of the SHARP Program and the author’s commitment to creating a healthy work environment, while the definitions defined the key terms of sexual harassment, sexual assault, reporting procedures and complaint process. However, some authors added other terms or removed definitions. For example, the AR 600-20-chapter 7-3 sexual harassment policy states:

“The policy of the Army is that sexual harassment is unacceptable conduct and will not be tolerated. Army leadership at all levels will be committed to creating and maintaining an environment conducive to maximum productivity and respect
for human dignity. Sexual harassment destroys teamwork and negatively affects combat readiness. The Army bases its success on mission accomplishment. Successful mission accomplishment can be achieved only in an environment free of sexual harassment for all personnel.”

The AR 600-20-chapter 8-2 sexual assault policy states:

“Sexual assault is a criminal offense that has no place in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devastating the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. Every Soldier who is aware of a sexual assault should immediately (within 24 hours) report incidents. Sexual assault is incompatible with Army values and is punishable under the UCMJ and other Federal and local civilian laws.”

A combination of AR 600-20 chapters 7 and 8 created the Army’s SHARP Program Guidebook policy for the entire branch, which states:

“Acts of sexual harassment are unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Sexual assault is a criminal offense that has no place in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devastating the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. Army leadership at all levels will be committed to creating and sustaining an environment conducive to maximum productivity and respect for human dignity.

(AR 600-20, Chapters 7 and 8)”

The following policies then copy-pasted the guidebook to create their unit’s policy and Peach’s (2017) SHARP Program policy states:

“The policy of the Army is the acts of sexual harassment are unacceptable and are not tolerated. Sexual assault is a criminal offense that has no place in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devastating the Army’s ability to work effectively
as a team. Army leadership at all levels is committed to creating and sustaining an environment conducive to maximum accomplishment. Successful mission accomplishment can be achieved only in an environment free of sexual harassment for all personnel.”

Lamberti’s (2019) SHARP Program policy states:

“The policy of the Army is that acts of sexual harassment are unacceptable and are not tolerated. Sexual assault is a criminal offense that has not place in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devasting the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. Army leadership at all levels is committed to creating and sustaining an environment conducive to maximum accomplishment. Successful mission accomplishment can be achieved only in an environment free of sexual harassment for all personnel.”

Peach and Lamberti changes a few words and phrases in the policy, however, most of the information is just copy-pasted from the guidebook. The guidebook copy-pasted information from the regulation to create the Army’s overall policy about the SHARP Program, and then commanders copy-paste the information from the guidebook to create their unit policy. With the use of copy-pasted information, there are both positive and negative aspects when the authors create memorandum with copy-pasted information and they both lend to the need to use social justice in technical communication because of the lack of support for the marginalized.

There is a relationship between the use of copy-paste and the author’s ability to appeal to their audience. With the authors’ use of copy-paste, they hinder their ability to relate to the audience because they lack the authorial voice. Even though the author uses copy-pasted information which targets a general audience, the author needs to make it specific to their
audience. This would make the correspondence stronger because it is addressing SH/SA in the unit’s level. If the author continues to use the copy-paste method in memorandums, their message will become lost because they are not appealing to the specificities of the audience. In the following memoranda, the restricted and unrestricted reporting process is copy-pasted from the AR 600-20, which exemplifies the general audience. The SHARP Program Guidebook defines restricted and unrestricted reporting as:

Restricted reporting “The victim can confidentially disclose and report a sexual assault to a SARC, VA, or HCP. The victim can also confidentially communicate with a chaplain. The victim will have access to medical treatment, including emergency care, counseling, and assignment of a SARC and VA, without triggering an official investigation or prosecution of the alleged offender. If the victim chooses to file a restricted report, the installation commander will receive non-identifying information indicating an alleged sexual assault occurred. If the victim files a restricted report, he or she can change to an unrestricted report at any time” (p. 36).

Unrestricted reporting “The victim can disclose, without requesting confidentiality or restricted reporting, that he or she is the victim of a sexual assault to a SARC, VA, HCP, command authorities, or others. The victim will have access to medical treatment and counseling, support, an consideration for protection and expedited (permanent or temporary) transfers. If the victim chooses to file an unrestricted report, the SARC, VA, HCP, chain of command, and law enforcement, will be notified that the crime occurred. An official investigation will be triggered and the alleged offender may be prosecuted. All
unrestricted reports must be referred to CID, regardless of severity, in accordance with DoDI 5505.18. Once the victim files an unrestricted report, he or she cannot change to a restricted report. If at any time a victim declines to participate in an investigation or prosecution, that decision should be honored by commanders, investigators, and all other personnel involved in the case” (p. 35).

Mueller (2017) explain the restricted and unrestricted reporting as:

“Restricted reporting is kept confidential, this allows the victim to receive medical care and behavioral health services without notifying the command or law enforcement. No official investigation is possible if the reporting remains restricted. Only SHARP Specialists (SARCs and VAs), medical and behavioral health are professionals, and Chaplains can be notified, if the victim wishes to keep the sexual assault report restricted.

Unrestricted reporting allows the victim to receive medical and behavioral health care. In addition, the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) will initiate an investigation and the command will be notified. The victim may request an expedited transfer, if it is in his or her best interests. The victim will be able to receive a Sexual Assault Forensics Examination (SAFE) whether the report is restricted or unrestricted. With an unrestricted report, details regarding the incident is limited to only those personnel with legitimate need to know.”

Beagle (2018) explains restricted and unrestricted reporting as:

“Restricted reporting allows a Soldier or Family member of a Soldier (age 18 or older) who is a sexual assault victim to confidentially disclose the details of the assault to designed personnel and to receive medical treatment, counseling,
without triggering the official investigation process. Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC), victim advocate (VA), chaplains, and healthcare providers are considered designated personnel.

Unrestricted reporting allows a Soldier or Family member of a Soldier (age 18 or older) who is a victim of sexual assault to receive medical treatment, counseling, and triggers an official investigation into the sexual assault. Victims may make an unrestricted report to a SARC, VA, chaplain, healthcare provider, law enforcement, or the chain of command. Details regarding the incident will be limited to only those personnel who have a legitimate need to know.”

Townsend (2018) writes:

“Restricted reporting allows a Soldier or Family member who is a victim of sexual assault to disclose the details of their assault to a sexual assault coordinator, victim advocate, chaplain, or healthcare provider and receive medical treatment and counseling on a confidential basis without triggering an official investigation.

Unrestricted reporting allows a Soldier or Family member who is sexually assaulted and desires medical treatment, counseling, and an official investigation to report the assault to the chain of command and other official channels, including the Criminal Investigation Division, IG, or provost marshal. Law enforcement will investigate all unrestricted reports and protect the rights of all parties involved.”

Townsend and Beagle strictly copy-pasted the information from the Army SHARP Program guidebook with minimal changes, while Mueller changed the structure of the restricted and
unrestricted reporting procedures. These authors of the memorandum, just like the others, did minimal to address the reporting procedures to their units. These authors did not mention methods of getting in contact with the SARC, VA, law enforcement, or other agencies, but left the contact information blank. Mueller, Beagle, and Townsend are just writing for compliance by copy-pasting information, which does not address the audience, instead of working towards the purpose of the memoranda—a safe and cohesive work environment free from SH/SA.

The authors need to address their audience, specifically the marginalized individuals because without the author’s support there will be a lack of social justice. To be clearer, a commander of a medical unit will have different jargon or terminology than an individual in charge of an infantry unit. Therefore, this creates an exigency or a problem that needs to be solved sooner than later.

The exigency in the creation of the memorandum is to develop a safe work environment by minimizing SH/SA; however, the growing number of SH/SA cases in the Army shows that it is more evident. According to the numbers provided by Brook’s (2019) report, the number of assaults in 2006 was 2,223 and in 2018 6,053. The numbers of SH/SA have nearly tripled which shows the need to improve and/or change the current program that combats SH/SA. And each year, the numbers have increased pointing to the fact that something has to be changed and that the programs that have been set in place are not working. According to Brook (2019), there has been a 38% increase in sexual assault reports between 2015 to 2018. The Army leaders cannot commit to the creation of a safe environment if they are just copy-pasting the information which invalidates their commitment for an SH/SA free environment. The invalidation of the commander’s commitment highlights the marginalized individuals of SH/SA by just writing for compliance instead of change, which is shown through the growing numbers of sexual assault
each year. This discussion will point out the negative and positive implications of copy-pasting and the importance of adding an authorial voice within the memoranda.

Consistency is a positive aspect of copy-pasting. The consistency of the policy having keywords and phrases gives Soldiers a base for the expectation in various units of the Army. These keywords describe that SH/SA are “unacceptable and contradict the values of the Army” and “degrades mission readiness” (Army Regulation 600-20, Kemper 2015, Caslen 2016, Hughes 2016, Mueller 2017, Peach 2017, LaCamera 2018, Greenberg 2018, Beagle 2018, Townsend 2018, and Lamberti 2019). This copy-pasting of information shows that SH/SA will not be tolerated within the ranks of the Army and most of the authors tailor the message to their specific units. However, these authors lack an authorial voice because they copy-pasted the information from another source. The lack of authorial voice recycles the SH/SA in the workplace in a continuous loop which is shown by the growing numbers of sexual assault nearly tripling since 2006. The authors need to create a subsection which he/she write their personal statement against SH/SA. This would solidify the author’s commitment to creating a healthy work environment.

Another keywords and phrases that is used in the policy letter is the commander’s “commitment” in “creating and sustaining an environment conducive to maximizing accomplishment” by “an environment free from SH/SA for all personnel” (Army Regulation 600-20, Kemper 2015, Caslen 2016, Hughes 2016, Mueller 2017, Peach 2017, LaCamera 2018, Greenberg 2018, Beagle 2018, Townsend 2018, and Lamberti 2019). The use of copy-paste in the memorandum is contradictory to this commitment since the authors are just regurgitating the information with minimal changes. Since the authors are just restating the information, once again, the individuals that have experienced SH/SA become marginalized because of the lack of
support. This use shows the author’s lack of commitment to creating a safe work environment because he/she is just complying with the regulation. For instance, Kemper (2015) states in her policy that she is “fully committed to the Army’s Sexual Harassment/Assault Prevention and Response (SHARP) Program. [Kemper] expect[s] all Soldiers to take personal responsibility in preventing sexual assault” (1). This is contradictory since it is copy-pasted from the regulation and guidebook. Kemper does not commit to creating a safe environment because she is just copy-pasting the information onto her memorandum, which just fulfills the requirements. While Hughes (2016) mentions in his policy,

“I fully expect every Soldier and Civilian on Fort Knox to join me in confronting and eliminating all forms of workplace and discriminatory harassment and sexual assaults. In doing so, we will create and maintain a workplace where everyone is treated professionally and with respect in the accomplishment of our mission” (2).

Hughes shows how the memorandum can be tailored to a community by adding his voice into it. Which shows what leaders need to do to the memorandum to make it more powerful and effective, the authors need to explain how they are going to create a safe and healthy work environment. For example, by having an open-door policy to report instances of SH/SA written into the memorandum, referring to alternative methods of reporting, or having a monthly meeting with random individuals in the unit to discuss the climate of the workplace. This would combat some of the instances of SH/SA within the Army.

While the SHARP policy is mostly edited for an author’s audience, the definitions of SH/SA, reporting procedures, and complaint process are strictly copied from the Army regulation and pasted into the memorandum. These definitions could be seen in table #. By Army regulation, the commanders of units will
Publish and post written command policy statements for the [Prevention of Sexual Harassment]. All statements will be consistent with Army policy. They will include the local command’s commitment to the Army’s policy against sexual harassment and will reaffirm that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. The statement will explain how and where to file complaints and will state that all complainants will be protected from acts or threats of reprisal.

And in continuation, the regulation also states, that commanders will

Post written sexual assault policy statements and victim services resource chart on the unit bulletin boards. Statements must include an overview of the command’s commitment to the SAPR Program; victim’s rights; the definition of sexual assault; available resources to support victims; and specific statements that sexual assault is punishable under the UCMJ and other Federal and local civilian laws and that sexual assault is incompatible with Army values.

These Army leaders are complying with the regulation by regurgitating information to their audience without fully understanding the negative implications. However, they understand the positive effects copy-pasting has—consistency.

Copy-pasting information has two main negative implication when dealing with serious incidents such as SH/SA—the lack of authorial voice and writing to a very general audience—which increases the likelihood of SH/SA happening within units. From my findings, there is a
correlation between the SHARP Program memorandum and the increasing numbers of SH/SA in the military.

The authors of the SHARP Program memorandum copy-paste the definitions, compliant process, and reporting procedures without further explanation. This creates a policy which the commander is just complying with the regulation and highlights the first issue of copy-pasting information. When the author just copy-pastes information, it creates a lack of authorial voice because the authors are not incorporating his/her understanding of the term and on the issues. The authors need to further explain and provide examples on inappropriate behavior, reporting procedures outside of the chain of command, and create a chart that depicts the complaint process. This would incorporate the author’s voice and understanding more into the memorandum and make it more effective to combat SH/SA in the workplace. The author incorporating their voice when further explaining the terms would help individuals that have been SH/SA by breaking down the information into understandable terms. Also, this would show the authors’ commitment to combating SH/SA instead of just copy-pasting the information.

The inappropriate behavior is defined as SH/SA and the definitions can be seen in Chart 1. The Army leaders have copy-pasted the information based the regulation into the memorandum, which they lose their authorial voice. The authorial voice is defined as the style and authority a person has on the text, which is lacking in the memorandum because of the constant use of copy-paste. However, the authors change a few words in between the definitions, but it is still lacking the authorial voice within the document to start creating change. The authors need to create a subsection after the definitions to further the audience’s understanding. This would show that the author’s commitment by taking the first step in creating a safe work environment free from SH/SA instead of just writing for compliance.
Commanders should create charts into the memorandum to help illustrate the complaint and reporting process. These commanders can use the charts in the SHARP Program Guidebook. However, the commanders need to incorporate the chart and their understanding to add their voice into the document (see chart 6 in the conclusion section). These charts will assist individuals to understand the process and the commander’s commitment to remove and/or minimize SH/SA in the work environment. This would also help individuals how have been SH/SA visually see the process and procedures in filing reports and complaints.

The second issue that copy-pasting has with memoranda that deal with serious incidents, such as SH/SA, is the correspondence is written for an audience that is too general. Using the copy-pasted information makes the audience too general because the author is not targeting the individuals in their unit, which describes the need for social justice to be incorporated into technical communication. However, the purpose of writing for a general audience is ensuring that everyone understands that message because everyone has the same background, but it loses effectiveness since the information is regurgitated. The author does not input his/her voice into the document. This is an issue because the commander has a commitment in creating a safe work environment free from SH/SA, but they cannot fulfill this commitment because the information is copy-pasted which lacks an authorial voice and does not target their audience.

However, the authors can have the definitions, complaint process, and reporting procedures copy-pasted in the memorandum but they need further explanation of the terms. The authors should incorporate their voice in the definition, reporting, and complaint process section of the memorandum, which would eliminate the problems of lack of authorial voice and addressing a general audience. This would not eliminate SH/SA in the military, but it is a step towards the leadership taking control of the program to create a healthy work environment. This
is one of the first steps towards creating a safe work environment free from SH/SA, and the Army leaders need to move forward to help those individuals who have been SH/SA.

Even though the negative implications of copy-pasting may overlook the positive effects, I could commend that the memorandum has increased reporting which starts the process for social justice. Because copy-pasting only does one thing with respect to creating a safe environment free from SH/SA, and that is consistency. Consistency assists social justice by ensuring that all individuals understand the definitions, process, and procedures. The victims of SH/SA can follow the complaint and reporting process; however, the memorandum is just a piece of paper with definitions, procedures, and process with an empty commitment if the commander does not incorporate his/her voice into the document.
CONCLUSION

This research analyzes the use of copy-paste in memoranda regarding Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault (SH/SA) within the Army Sexual Harassment and Assault Response Prevention (SHARP) Program and the need for social justice to be incorporated in technical communication and writing. In this section, I will make recommendations on how to improve the SHARP Program memorandum by incorporating my analysis to ensure that ethical practices are used.

With the growing numbers of SH/SA cases in the military, leaders need to take a look at the programs and processes that have been in place to combat these incidents and within the Army that is the SHARP Program. In this program, leaders need to create a memorandum that states their commitment to creating a safe work environment free from SH/SA. I conducted an analysis with 10 Army SHARP Program memorandum and came to the conclusion that there are two key issues with the constant use of copy-paste: lack of authorial voice and writing to a very general audience.

The recommendation that I have to combat both of these issues are incorporating the author’s voice more into the document by adding a subsection after the copy-pasted information. By doing so, the author is conveying their understanding of the copy-pasted information while at the same time targeting their unit. For example, the definition of SH/SA is taken from Lamberti’s SHARP Program memorandum:

5. By law, sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual behaviors, and other verbal and physical conduct of a sexual nature which is used as a basis for
career or employment decisions or when it results in a working environment that is hostile, offensive or intimidating, or so negative that it affects a Soldier or employee’s ability to do his or her job. Sexual assault is intentional sexual contact characterized by the use of force, threats, intimidating, or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent. Individuals engaging in or conducting sexual harassment/assault will be disciplined under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ).

a. Sexual Harassment creates a work environment that can be described as hostile or unapproachable, which affects an individual’s ability to complete their daily tasks.

   Sexual harassment has three key parts:
   i. Unwelcome sexual advances are (physical and verbal) actions that an individual reject
   ii. Request for sexual behavior includes physical or verbal actions to gain gratification through monetary or promotional compensation
   iii. Other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature including but not limited to whistling, winking, text messages, emails, photos, etc.

b. Sexual Assault is described as an individual who uses force to manipulate another into sexual contact, groping, or unwanted sexual advances, which includes but not limited to rape, assault, aggravated sexual contact, or abusive sexual contact with an object or body part with the intent to insert it into another person without consent.

c. UCMJ: if you are convicted of sexual assault under UCMJ Article 120, you will likely face:
   i. A possible prison sentence that will range from 7 years to life
ii. A dishonorable discharge and the decimation of your character and reputation, both inside and outside the military

iii. The complete loss of health care benefits, military pension, and pay

iv. Registration as a sexual offender

Chart 5: The used Lamberti’s (2019) policy section in the memorandum illustrates the use of copy-paste within the SHARP Program correspondence and subsection a-c demonstrates the added voice of an author (Manlutac) to further shows his/her commitment to creating an environment free from SH/SA.

I wrote the subsection with my reserve unit as my audience which consists of individuals with high school diploma to master’s Degrees, who have been in the military between 8 to 20 years. This would work for my unit because I am breaking down the terms into smaller chunks, which individuals can digest. Also, further explaining the terms and the implications of sexually assaulting another through the law—UCMJ Article 120. The recommendation that I have with combating the lack of authorial voice and writing to a very general audience is the commandeering knowing his/her unit and writing to them at the end of the copy-pasted information.

The next recommendation that I have for Army leaders is to incorporate charts detailing the report and complaint process for individuals that have been or witnessed SH/SA. The chart provided is taken from the SHARP Program Guidebook. Army leaders should use the information, however, should add their voice at the end of the chart explaining the process. For example, the reports section is taken from Townsend’s SHARP Program memorandum:
4. Reports. There are two types of reporting options for adult victims of sexual assault (Family Advocacy address assault involving minors and intimate partners). The Army’s exception to policy allowing Department of the Army Civilians to receive SHARP services and file both restricted and unrestricted cases in CONUS ended January 2018. Department of the Army Civilians seeking guidance from SHARP personnel will be referred to community-based crisis services and support organizations. Providing such assistance to Department of the Army Civilians will not generate any SHARP reporting until an extension of the exception to policy is signed. The only exception is at the OCONUS location.

   a. Restricted reporting allows a Soldier or Family member who is a victim of Sexual assault to disclose the details of their assault to a sexual assault response coordinator, victim advocate, chaplain, or healthcare provider and receive medical treatment and counseling on a confidential basis without triggering an official investigation.
      
      i. An individual creating a restricted report does not start an investigation, but the individual who has been sexual assaulted to get medical (physical and mental) attention. The restricted report will not initiate an investigation, but this will still inform leadership about the incident.

   b. Unrestricted reporting allows a Soldier or Family member who is sexually assaulted and desires medical treatment, counseling, and an official investigation to report the assault to the chain of command and other official channels, including the Criminal Investigation Division, IG, or provost marshal. Law enforcement will investigate all unrestricted reports and protect the rights of all parties.
i. An individual creating an unrestricted report will initiate an investigation, which will start the process to trial. The individual filing the unrestricted report will also receive medical (physical and mental) attention.

c. The reporting process is as follows:
i. Reporting an incident of sexual assault is a difficult process that takes intestinal fortitude, and the command team is here to assist and guide any individual who has been sexually assaulted. Please contact the me if you have any questions or assistance in navigating the reporting process.

Chart 6: The use of Townsend’s (2018) the use of copy-paste within the SHARP Program memorandum is shown in section 4 and subsection a-b; to illustrate incorporating the author’s voice is shown in subsection 4ai and 4bi, and incorporating charts from the SHARP Program Guidebook in section 4c and further explanation in 4ci. The reporting process flowchart can be seen in APPENDIX A on page 64.

The use of the chart provides individuals with a visual on the process that is taken to report sexual assault. The subsection of the example provided is once again targeted towards a specific
group of people. The Army leaders need to incorporate their understanding of the information and commitment in the creation of a safe work environment to reduce the incidents of SH/SA within the Army.

The final suggestion that I can provide for leaders to use is a checklist that the writer can use to ensure that they incorporate their voice into the SHARP Program memorandum. The checklist can be seen in APPENDIX B on page 66. This checklist is based on Inkster’s (1994) text on writing memoranda in the classroom and the analysis of the SHARP Program memoranda. The checklist goes over how the writer can incorporate his or her voice into the document and writing for a specific audience. These are general guidelines that can be used when the author of the memorandum is utilizing copy-paste within the written correspondence.

APPENDIX C shows a memorandum that I analyzed that uses copy-pasted information that highlights the issues of lack of authorial voice and writing for an audience that is too general, and in APPENDIX D shows the incorporation of the author’s voice and writing for a specific audience, while using the checklist provided in APPENDIX B.

To sum up, the research that I have conducted, there are a few key ideas and applications that Army leaders can take to ensure the wellbeing of all Soldiers in their units. The key ideas with the use of copy-paste are that it: creates a lack of authorial voice; is written to a very general audience; and established consistency. These are some of the positive and negative implications that copy-pasting has on the memorandum, and leaders need to eliminate the negative impact by incorporating their voice into the document, which will create a healthy work environment and show her/his commitment in combating SH/SA.

This analysis is not a critique of the Army’s SHARP Program but an evaluation of how leaders can start improving the climate in which SH/SA is running rampant within the ranks. The
creation of the SHARP Program was the first step in stopping and/or reducing the numbers of SH/SA, the leader’s commitment was next, however, the military has been stuck on this step for a while and something needs to be done in order to reduce the numbers of SH/SA. Copy-pasting the definitions, reporting, and the compliant process is a start, but these leaders need to incorporate their voice and authority into the documents to ensure that the individuals in their units fully understand the implications of SH/SA. Leaders should not sit idly by while soldiers are being mistreated by others who are supposed to help during combat—leaders need to take action to combat the seriousness of sexual harassment and assault.

A way to combat the growing numbers of SH/SA is to start looking into the program in itself, which has been proven ineffective based on the growing numbers of sexual assault reports. This research analyzes the use of copy-paste in the SHARP Program memoranda. This memorandum is the first step that commanders take to ensure that they are committed to creating a safe environment, however, Army leaders need to look at their practice of the copy-paste method in written correspondence dealing with serious incidents, such as the SHARP Program memoranda. These leaders need to understand the implications of the lack of authorial voice and writing for an audience that is too general, which affect the work environment. The military is the biggest employer in the United States and if they cannot write a memorandum that includes the author’s voice and write for a target their audience, then these leaders should not lead Soldiers into combat.


Memorandum Work Cited


Townsend, S. 17 September 2018. “TRADOC Policy Letter 4, Equal Opportunity (EO) and Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program” Retrieved from


SOLDIER—SEXUAL ASSAULT REPORTING PROCESS ABBREVIATED FLOW CHART

Unrestricted Report

- Ensure victim safety, seek emergency care
- Preserve evidence
  - Notify Unrestricted Reporting chain (SARC, VA, HCP, Command, Law Enforcement, others)
    - Victim receives medical care and (upon request) Sexual Assault Forensic Exam (SAFE)
      - Civilian medical facilities may automatically notify law enforcement
    - SARC provides information to victim
    - SARC assigns VA to provide assistance to victim

Restricted Report

- Ensure victim safety, seek emergency care
- Preserve evidence
  - Notify Restricted Reporting chain (SARC, VA, HCP)
(RCs only) Initiate LOD investigation

- Victim may consult with legal assistance
- Commander provides support and referrals
  - Commander/victim coordinate for MPO and/or CPO
  - Victim requests expedited transfer as needed
  - Investigation and monthly updates to victim. Commanders flag Soldiers under investigation and suspend their clearance
- Final case disposition determined and follow-up provided to victim

At any time, the victim may switch a Restricted Report to an Unrestricted Report

**Available Resources**

**Medical**
- Care and Treatment
- Sexual Assault Forensic Exam

**Mental Health**
- Counselors, Psychologists, Social workers, Psychiatrists

**Spiritual**
- Chaplains

**Legal**
- Victim Witness Liaison Program (unrestricted only)
- Legal Assistance

**Safety**
- Military Protection Order (the installation commander is the final disapproval authority)
- Expedited Transfer (decision to approve or disapprove must be made in **72 hours**)

(DoDD 6495.01, DoDI 6459.02, AR 600-20)
APPENDIX B

Memorandum Checklist

Incorporating Voice and Writing for an Audience

For a leader to be effective, he or she must reach a wide audience in a short period of time, and a memorandum is one of the easiest ways to accomplish this goal; however, with the constant use of copy-pasting information from one source to another, the author loses their voice and does not have a target audience.

The purpose of this checklist is to ensure that you are writing for a specific audience with minimal use of copy-pasted information. These are suggestions that will help ensure that your audience is forefront in your mind while creating your memorandum.

These suggestions are based on Robert Inkster’s (1994) “Rhetoric of the Classroom: The Exigencies of the Technical Writing Class as Topics for Memos,” along with the analysis of several Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program memoranda.

Incorporating Voice if using Copy-Paste Information, the writer should:

- Create a subsection. After copy-pasting information, the writer needs to explain in their own words on the understanding of the terms and the application to the audience.
- Provide examples. In a subsection, describe examples of the term or
- Provide a graphic. Illustrate the process needed to complete a task with an explanation.
- Paraphrase the information. Instead of copy-pasting the information, the writer can paraphrase the information in their own words.
- Explain ramifications. Writers need to explain the consequences of not following the laws and regulations.
Writing for an Audience:

Be specific. Provide names and phone numbers for resources.

Know your audience. Education level, job titles, experience with the topic, and

Address your audience. Name the unit or individual(s) that you are informing.

Understand the culture. Frame the discussion respectfully not to offend certain

individuals.

Example: stating “destroying the climate of trust” instead of “striking the trust of
the unit” when dealing with Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault.

Minimize the use of jargon and acronyms. Individuals in the unit might not fully
understand the terminology, a further explanation might be needed if jargon and
acronyms are used.
APPENDIX C

This appendix shows an ineffective use of copy-pasting information on memoranda. Kemper’s (2015) “Policy Letter 2 Sexual Harassment/ Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program” will be displayed on the chart below.

1. Reference AR 600-20, Army Command Policy, dtd 6 November 2014.

2. Sexual Assault is incompatible with Army Values and is unacceptable in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devasting the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. I am fully committed to the Army’s Sexual Harassment/ Assault Prevention and Response (SHARP) Program. I expect all Soldiers to take personal responsibility in preventing sexual assault.

3. Sexual assault is defined as intention sexual contact, characterized by the use of force, physical threat or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent. Sexual assault includes, rape, nonconsensual sodomy (oral or anal sex), indecent assault (unwanted, inappropriate sexual contact or fondling), or attempts to commit these acts. Sexual assault is punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and other Federal and local civilian laws.

4. Sexual harassment is defined as a form of sexual discrimination that involves unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of sexual nature:
   a. When submission is made explicitly or implicitly as a term or condition to a person’s job, or career.
   b. When submission is to or rejection of is used as a basis for career or employment decisions.
c. When conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance, creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

5. Sexual harassment and sexual assault undermines unity, threatens mission accomplishment, and will not be tolerated. All leaders will ensure the victim’s right to be treated with care, compassion, and courtesy, with respect for their privacy, and will avoid instances of secondary victimization during medical treatment, investigation, and legal adjudication.

6. Soldiers who are victims of sexual assault have two reporting options from which to choose. These options are unrestricted and restricted.

   a. Restricted Reporting allows the victim to receive medical, counseling and advocacy support services without triggering an official investigation or notification to the chain of command. Using this opinion restricts the reporting to the Area Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC), healthcare provider, Chaplain, or Unit Victim Advocate (UVA). This reporting option can be moved to unrestricted by the victim.

   b. Unrestricted Reporting allows a victim of sexual assault the same services as restricted reporting, but allows for a full investigation. An unrestricted report requires official reporting through law enforcement and chain-of-command channels, which provides the opportunity for criminal prosecution of the offender. Details of the incident will be released only to those personnel who have a legitimate need to know. If this reporting option is used, it cannot be reversed to Restricted Reporting.
7. In addition to creating an environment that encourages reporting, I want to make clear that every Soldier has a duty to intervene in preventing sexual harassment and assault.

8. Point of contact is the NCO Academy SHARP team at XXX-XXX-XXXX, the SHARP Hotline at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or the undersigned.

Kimberly K. Kemper

This memorandum is ineffective due to its constant use of copy-pasted information. Kemper did not add her voice into the memorandum and let the copy-pasting contradict the importance of creating an environment free from Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault.
APPENDIX D

This appendix shows the usage of incorporating the writer’s voice and writing for a specific audience. I used Kemper’s memorandum as the basis of the copy-pasted information while incorporating my voice and images to highlight the consequences.

1. Reference AR 600-20, Army Command Policy, dtd 6 November 2014.

2. Sexual Assault is incompatible with Army Values and is unacceptable in the Army. It degrades mission readiness by devasting the Army’s ability to work effectively as a team. I am fully committed to the Army’s Sexual Harassment/ Assault Prevention and Response (SHARP) Program. I expect all Soldiers to take personal responsibility in preventing sexual assault.
   a. Loyalty, Respect, Duty, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal courage are destroyed on the individual committing these crimes and on the unit.
   b. The unit cannot and will not function if this type of behavior continues, which makes the team ineffective in protecting the community and the defense of the United States.
   c. I encourage all Soldiers, peers, and leaders to create a safe and cohesive work environment by stopping sexual harassment and sexual assault when they see they act by reporting the incident. If you report an incident, you are helping create an environment and culture that follows that values that we live by.

3. Sexual assault is defined as intention sexual contact, characterized by the use of force, physical threat or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent.
   Sexual assault includes, rape, nonconsensual sodomy (oral or anal sex), indecent
assault (unwanted, inappropriate sexual contact or fondling), or attempts to commit these acts. Sexual assault is punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and other Federal and local civilian laws.

a. Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault are both serious crimes and will be treated as such. According to the UCMJ Article 120, a Soldier who commits these crimes will receive imprisonment between 1 to 30 years (depending on the crime committed) with a dishonorable discharge and forfeiture of pay.

4. Sexual harassment is defined as a form of sexual discrimination that involves unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of sexual nature:

a. When submission is made explicitly or implicitly as a term or condition to a person’s job, or career.
   i. If a leader/individual mentions that sexual acts are implied or needed for career advancement or punishment, it is sexual harassment.

b. When submission is to or rejection of is used as a basis for career or employment decisions.
   i. If the leader/individual states that sexual acts are needed to persuade that leader to make a decision on a victim’s career, it is sexual harassment.

c. When conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance, creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.
i. If a leader/individual’s habits are sexual in nature and effects other’s work, it sexual harassment. For example, posting a calendar in women in bikinis create a hostile and offensive work environment because it degrading women.

5. Sexual harassment and sexual assault undermines unity, threatens mission accomplishment, and will not be tolerated. All leaders will ensure the victim’s right to be treated with care, compassion, and courtesy, with respect for their privacy, and will avoid instances of secondary victimization during medical treatment, investigation, and legal adjudication.

a. The leadership’s main goal is to ensure that the victim receives the proper care he/she needs. All leaders need to respect the victim’s privacy and provide him/her with the support they need in this difficult time. The victim will not be coerced to complete a reporting process he/she are not comfortable with.

6. Soldiers who are victims of sexual assault have two reporting options from which to choose. These options are unrestricted and restricted.

a. Restricted Reporting allows the victim to receive medical, counseling and advocacy support services without triggering an official investigation or notification to the chain of command. Using this opinion restricts the reporting to the Area Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC), healthcare provider, Chaplain, or Unit Victim Advocate (UVA). This reporting option can be moved to unrestricted by the victim.
i. The SARC’s duty phone number is XXX-XXX-XXX and the UAV’s duty phone number is XXX-XXX-XXX. These individuals will be available 24/7.

b. Unrestricted Reporting allows a victim of sexual assault the same services as restricted reporting, but allows for a full investigation. An unrestricted report requires official reporting through law enforcement and chain-of-command channels, which provides the opportunity for criminal prosecution of the offender. Details of the incident will be released only to those personnel who have a legitimate need to know. If this reporting option is used, it cannot be reversed to Restricted Reporting.

c. The chart below illustrates the flow process of the reporting procedures.
i. This chart shows the process that an individual can take to report an incident of Sexual Assault. This process maybe confusing and difficult to navigate, however, if you have any questions or “you are asking for a friend” please contact myself, your leadership, or the numbers below for any assistance.

7. In addition to creating an environment that encourages reporting, I want to make clear that every Soldier has a duty to intervene in preventing sexual harassment and assault.

   a. It is EVERYBODY’S responsibility to report an incident of Sexual Harassment or Sexual Assault.

8. Point of contact is the NCO Academy SHARP team at XXX-XXX-XXXX, the SHARP Hotline at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or the undersigned.

Kimberly K. Kemper
In the chart above, I incorporated my voice as the author into the memorandum and I wrote the memorandum for the Soldiers’ in my unit. This makes the memorandum more effective because I am breaking down the copy-pasted information to understandable terms that the Soldiers in my unit can understand.
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