



U.S. Army Audit Agency



Research on Soldiers' Harmful Behaviors

[This page intentionally left blank]



Executive Summary

Report A-2023-0018-FIZ

30 January 2023



Research of Soldiers' Harmful Behaviors

What We Audited

This audit was internally generated under the authority of The Auditor General based on discussions with personnel from the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1. They expressed a concern that the Army was funding research projects and studies on Soldiers' harmful behaviors that weren't providing valuable information or actionable recommendations. These behaviors result in self-directed harm or prohibited abusive or harmful acts toward others. We initiated the audit to determine if the Army implemented results from research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors.

What We Found

The Army often didn't implement results from research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Army organizations that funded the research didn't transition that research into actionable policies and practices. For 47 Army-sponsored research reports we reviewed published between FY 19 and FY 22, 42 (about 89 percent) didn't have any actionable recommendations or only recommended more research. The remaining 5 reports had a total of 10 recommendations, but responsible stakeholders hadn't taken actions to implement them. These conditions occurred because the Army didn't centralize governance over research of harmful behaviors. Our results echo findings previously identified by the Army.

Impact

Without stronger governance, the Army will continue to lack full awareness of its research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors and assurance it's realizing the value of investing in that research. Further, the Army will be less able to become a learning organization with respect to preventing harmful behaviors as established in the Army Integrated Prevention Strategy.

Point of Contact

For questions about this report, please contact Felix Strelsky, Deputy Auditor General, Forces and Infrastructure Audits, at 703.223.4682 or felix.r.strelsky.civ@army.mil.

Recommendation

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

Recommendation 1: In coordination with the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, designate an office to oversee research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. At a minimum, this office should:

- Prepare, distribute, periodically update, and monitor implementation of a plan to research these behaviors. The plan should include how research will align with senior leader priorities and Army resources.
- Develop clear guidelines for stakeholders to follow when initiating research projects and assessing the relevance of research results. These procedures should include instructions on:
 - Identifying up front whether projects will be foundational or applied research.
 - Developing plans to implement actionable research recommendations.
- Establish a centralized repository for research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors that will allow stakeholders to share and access information on planned, ongoing, and completed research.

Official Army Position and Command Comments

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) provided the official Army position and concurred with the recommendation.

Annex C has the official Army position and verbatim command comments.

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary.....	i
Recommendation.....	ii
Official Army Position and Command Comments.....	ii
Research on Soldiers’ Harmful Behaviors.....	2
Objective.....	2
Conclusion.....	2
Results and Recommendation.....	3
Annex A: Supplemental Information.....	8
Scope and Methodology.....	8
Report Distribution.....	11
Annex B: Background.....	12
Responsibilities.....	12
Annex C: Official Army Position and Verbatim Comments by Command.....	14

Research on Soldiers' Harmful Behaviors

Objective

To determine if the Army implemented results from research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors.

Conclusion

The Army often didn't implement results from research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Though several Army organizations funded research on these behaviors, they didn't transition that research into actionable policies and practices.

We reviewed 47 Army-sponsored research reports published from FY 19 to FY 22. Of these:

- 42 (about 89 percent) either didn't have actionable recommendations or only recommended more research. We defined an actionable recommendation as one that identifies specific changes to policies, practices, or systems to address Soldiers' harmful behaviors.
- 5 had a total of 10 actionable recommendations, but Army stakeholders hadn't taken action to implement any of them.

Army researchers considered most of these research projects and studies to be foundational or basic research¹ meant to increase general knowledge. Consequently, the researchers didn't expect the projects and studies to produce results with specific applications and actionable recommendations.

These conditions primarily occurred because the Army didn't centralize governance of research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. In a 2010 report, the Army reported the need to improve research governance.² However, the report's recommended governance model wasn't implemented. That model sought to ensure research into these behaviors was coordinated, transitional, and implemented as relevant results.

¹ According to DoDI 3210.1 (Administration and Support of Basic Research by the Department of Defense), 16 September 2005 (Change 1, 15 October 2018), basic research is systematic study directed toward greater understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind.

² Army Health Promotion, Risk Reduction, Suicide Prevention Report 2010, July 2010.

Without centralized governance, the Army didn't have a unified plan for researching Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Additionally, research organizations didn't:

- Use standard procedures to ensure uniformity and consistency in initiating and tracking research projects and studies, establishing expectations for practical application, and developing implementation plans.
- Have forums or repositories to share information with other stakeholders on planned, ongoing, and completed research.

Without stronger governance, the Army will continue to lack full awareness of its research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors and assurance it's realizing the value of investing in that research. Further, the Army will be less able to implement the goal of becoming a learning organization as established in the Army Integrated Prevention Strategy.³

Results and Recommendation

Most Army-funded research reports about Soldiers' harmful behaviors we reviewed didn't have actionable results. Further, sponsoring organizations didn't take action to implement the actionable recommendations in the few reports that did have them.

We reviewed 47 Army-sponsored research reports published between FY 19 and FY 22 on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Harmful behaviors affecting Soldiers include self-directed harm and prohibited abuse or harm described in DoD Instruction 6400.09.⁴ Harmful behaviors result in readiness-detracting outcomes and include suicide; sexual assault; harassment; domestic abuse; and substance use, misuse, and abuse.

This table shows five Army organizations that sponsored the research we reviewed:

³ Although this strategy wasn't finalized at the time of this audit, we analyzed the draft version dated 21 July 2022. The draft strategy acknowledges that current research efforts are often fragmented and not pushed to organizations or leaders who can affect change.

⁴ According to DoDI 6400.09 (DoD Policy on Integrated Primary Prevention of Self-Directed Harm and Prohibited Abuse or Harm), 11 September 2020, self-directed harm is behavior directed toward oneself that deliberately results in injury or the potential for injury to oneself. It defines prohibited abuse or harm as behaviors characterized by the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against a person or group that results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation.

Research Reports on Soldiers' Harmful Behaviors, FYs 19–22		
Army Research Sponsor	Harmful Behaviors Addressed*	Reports
Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (STARRS)**	Suicide and substance use, misuse, and abuse	28
Army Public Health Center	Suicide; domestic abuse; sexual assault and harassment; and substance use, misuse, and abuse	7
Army Resilience Directorate	Suicide; domestic abuse; sexual assault and harassment; and substance use, misuse, and abuse	6
U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences	Harassment (bullying); suicide; sexual assault and harassment; and substance use, misuse, and abuse	4
U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command***	Suicide and substance use, misuse, and abuse	2
	Total	47

*Some reports may have primarily focused on other topics (such as leadership), but they also had analysis of one or more harmful behaviors.

**The Army's participation in STARRS is managed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

*** We only reviewed nonclinical research projects funded internally by the Army.

Of these 47 reports, 42 (about 89 percent) didn't have any actionable recommendations or only recommended more research. We defined an actionable recommendation as one that identifies specific changes to policies, practices, or systems to address Soldiers' harmful behaviors. An example of an actionable recommendation was for the Army "to use routinely collected survey data to more rapidly identify units with high risk of sexual assault and sexual harassment." In contrast, an example of a nonactionable recommendation was for the Army "to allow more flexibility across institutions in prevention efforts."

Army researchers considered most of the research projects and studies we reviewed to be foundational (or basic) research meant to increase general knowledge. Consequently, they didn't expect the projects and studies to produce results with specific applications and actionable recommendations.

Our results were similar to those in a 2018 report on the use of research findings.⁵ For 157 research studies reviewed for that report, 115 had findings calling for no action and 37 recommended further study. Only a handful had actionable recommendations.

Only 5 of the 47 reports we reviewed had actionable recommendations. However, none of the 10 actionable recommendations in those 5 reports was directed to a specific organization. Therefore, no organization could be held accountable for implementing the recommendations. When we followed up with research personnel about the implementation status of each of the 10 recommendations, we learned the organizations hadn't taken direct action to implement any of them. Personnel explained that most of the recommendations weren't implemented because they required additional personnel or resources the Army didn't have or required action by non-Army organizations.

Similarly, the 2018 report stated: "A common problem with research is that it's very difficult to ensure those most likely to value and use the results are informed about them."

Decentralized governance of research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors hindered the Army's ability to conduct and implement that research. The previously mentioned 2010 report⁶ also stated that research governance needed improvement. That report concluded the lack of centralized governance degraded senior Army leader visibility of planned and ongoing research. This also limited opportunities to transition actionable findings for implementation by proponents of health promotion, risk reduction, and suicide prevention programs. Though the report recommended a governance model to ensure research was coordinated, transitional, and implemented as relevant results, the Army never established this model. When we asked research personnel why this didn't happen, no one could provide a definite explanation.

Our audit results showed these governance issues persisted. Specifically:

- The Army didn't have a unified plan for researching Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Armywide visibility of research projects and studies on harmful behaviors didn't exist. Five different organizations sponsored the 47 research projects and studies we reviewed. None of them was fully aware of the others' planned and ongoing research.
- Sponsoring organizations didn't use standard procedures to ensure Armywide uniformity and consistency in initiating and tracking research projects and studies,

⁵ Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) (Translating Research Findings into Operational Use: Development and Testing of a Review and Translation Process for Results from the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS)), 18 January 2018.

⁶ See footnote 2.

establishing clear expectations for application, and developing implementation plans. For example:

- Each sponsoring organization had unique procedures for identifying research topics and initiating projects and studies. However, no organization had a formal process for evaluating the efficacy of research recommended in published reports. Thirty-seven of the 47 reports we reviewed recommended or had a statement calling for future research.
 - Personnel from sponsoring organizations indicated they tracked the progress of research projects and studies, but they didn't have documentation showing active tracking of three of the five reports with actionable recommendations.
 - Sponsoring organizations didn't always establish clear expectations for research. Two indicated they sometimes used transition agreements with end users of their research to document agreed-upon project expectations. However, the organizations didn't make these agreements mandatory. We didn't identify any transition agreements for the research reports in our review.
 - No sponsoring organization had procedures for developing and tracking plans to implement the actionable recommendations in our review.
- Sponsoring organizations didn't have a repository to share information with other stakeholders on planned, ongoing, and completed research. According to personnel at some of the organizations, some reports were uploaded to the Defense Technical Information Center; another organization's representative said stakeholders had to contact the researchers for the reports.

The need for a governance model becomes even more important as the Army develops and implements its Army Integrated Prevention Strategy.⁷ As drafted, the intent of this strategy is to move the Army toward addressing harmful behaviors in a comprehensive and preventive manner. By contrast, current programs target intervention and response actions in the moments leading up to or after an occurrence of harmful behavior.

In reaching its desired end state, the draft strategy sets a goal for the Army to become a learning organization optimized for prevention. In this environment, research will inform senior leader decisionmaking by providing an understanding of the current environment, identifying impactful points for action, and enabling recommendations for targeted prevention activities. The draft acknowledges that current research efforts are often fragmented and not pushed to organizations or leaders who can affect change.

⁷ See footnote 3.

Establishing a research governance structure will help the Army achieve its goal of becoming a learning organization.

Finally, the Army's 2010 report⁸ observed that HQDA couldn't identify the total resources (facilities, manpower, and funding) expended on research related to health promotion, risk reduction, and suicide prevention. We also couldn't estimate Army resources dedicated to research of Soldiers' harmful behaviors.

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

Recommendation 1: In coordination with the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, designate an office to oversee research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. At a minimum, this office should:

- Prepare, distribute, periodically update, and monitor implementation of a plan to research these behaviors. The plan should include how research will align with senior leader priorities and Army resources.
- Develop clear guidelines for stakeholders to follow when initiating research projects and assessing the relevance of research results. These procedures should include instructions on:
 - Identifying up front whether projects will be foundational or applied research.
 - Developing plans to implement actionable research recommendations.
- Establish a centralized repository for research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors that will allow stakeholders to share and access information on planned, ongoing, and completed research.

Command Comments/Official Army Position: The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) provided the official Army position and agreed with the recommendation. The target implementation date is 30 September 2024.

Annex C has the official Army position and verbatim command comments.

Without stronger governance, the Army will lack full awareness of research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors and assurance it's realizing the value of investing in this research. Further, it will be less able to implement the goal of becoming a learning organization.

⁸ See footnote 2.

Annex A: Supplemental Information

Scope and Methodology

We conducted the audit from April through October 2022 under Project A-2022-FIZ-0049.000. This audit was internally generated under the authority of The Auditor General based on discussions with personnel from the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1's Army Resilience Directorate. They expressed a concern the Army was funding research projects and studies on Soldiers' harmful behaviors that weren't providing valuable information or recommendations. We initiated the audit to determine if the Army implemented results from research on these behaviors.

These activities were included in the audit:

- Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1.
 - Army Resilience Directorate.
 - Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.
- U.S. Army Futures Command.
 - Army Medical Research and Development Command.
 - Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.
- U.S. Army Medical Command.
 - Army Public Health Center.

We interviewed key personnel at each Army research-sponsoring organization about their respective processes for overseeing research projects and studies on Soldiers' harmful behaviors and how they reviewed research results and recommendations.

To identify reports for our review, we obtained a list of research projects and studies done in FY 19 to FY 22 related to Soldiers' harmful behaviors from each organization. Specifically, we gathered an inventory of research projects and studies the organizations sponsored during this timeframe. The organizations identified 94 projects and studies they

sponsored from FY 19 to FY 22. We obtained reports for the projects and studies to verify they were completed during the scope of our review and whether they addressed Soldiers' harmful behaviors. After applying those criteria, we identified 47 reports to review.

We conducted this performance audit per generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusion based on our audit objective. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusion based on our audit objective.

AR 11-2⁹ requires all commanders and managers to establish and maintain effective internal controls. We evaluated six internal controls associated with the audit objective and determined controls weren't effective for sharing information, addressing Army priorities, establishing guidelines, overseeing projects, and monitoring Army research projects and studies. These conditions were caused by a lack of an overall research governance structure. Our audit identified deficiencies in internal controls for properly monitoring Army research throughout the duration of the projects and studies. The Army also had no controls in place to make sure actionable recommendations were implemented. The result was that the Army couldn't determine the status of research at any given time. Also, the same lack of oversight prohibited proper monitoring and implementation of a research project's actionable recommendations.

Here's a summary of the internal controls and the recommendation that addresses the deficiencies.

Internal Control Evaluation Matrix				
Internal Control Tested	Control Objective	Internal Control Component	Internal Control Principle	Related Recommendation Number
Did stakeholders have forums (for example, a steering committee) to share information on planned, ongoing, and completed research?	To prevent research studies from different agencies performing the same research that results in the same outcomes.	Information and Communication	Externally communicate the necessary quality information to achieve the entity's objectives.	1
Did sponsoring activities establish performance measures for individual research projects? Did they conduct periodic progress evaluations with researchers?	To prevent funding waste and abuse by researchers. To prevent non-value-added research studies from continuing.	Monitoring	Establish and operate monitoring activities to monitor the internal control system and evaluate the results.	1

⁹ AR 11-2 (Managers' Internal Control Program), 4 January 2010 (Rapid Action Revision, 26 March 2012).

Internal Control Evaluation Matrix				
Internal Control Tested	Control Objective	Internal Control Component	Internal Control Principle	Related Recommendation Number
Did sponsoring activities develop a written outline of expectations for research projects?	To prevent funding waste and abuse by researchers. To prevent non-value-added research studies from continuing. To prevent research studies from delivering recommendations that the Army can't implement.	Monitoring	Establish and operate monitoring activities to monitor the internal control system and evaluate the results.	1
Were procedures in place to ensure research results were disseminated to appropriate decisionmakers (for example, senior leaders)?	To maintain oversight of tracking of receipt and implementation of research studies and project results.	Information and Communication	Internally communicate the necessary quality information to achieve the entity's objectives.	1
Did stakeholders track implementation of research recommendations?	To maintain oversight of tracking of receipt and implementation of research studies and project results.	Control Activities	Implement control activities through policies.	1
Did the Army identify responsible organizations for exercising oversight for research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors?	To maintain oversight of the resources (funds and personnel) dedicated to research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors.	Control Environment	Establish an organizational structure, assign responsibility, and delegate authority to achieve the entity's objectives.	1

We didn't rely on computer-generated data to support our findings and recommendation.

To answer our audit objective, we:

- Obtained and reviewed lists of Army-sponsored research projects and studies related to Soldiers' harmful behaviors done from FY 19 to FY 22.
- Reviewed and analyzed 47 reports on Army-sponsored research on these behaviors published from FYs 19 to FY 22.
- Evaluated processes for how Army organizations initiated, oversaw, and tracked research on these behaviors.
- Coordinated with the organizations to identify whether they implemented results from the research.

The procedures were part of our assessment of the sufficiency and appropriateness of the information used as audit evidence.

Report Distribution

We're sending copies of this report to the:

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1
Commander, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command
Commander, U.S. Army Futures Command
Commander, U.S. Army Medical Command
Director, Army Resilience Directorate
Director, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
Commander, U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command
Commander, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

We'll also make copies available to others upon request.

Annex B: Background

Responsibilities

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) is responsible for developing and overseeing – with the assistance of the Office of the Surgeon General – policies and programs for Army health.

The Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1 is responsible for providing behavioral and social sciences research to support the strategic management of human capital and talent. Within the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1 the:

- Army Resilience Directorate provides policy, resources, and capabilities for individuals and leaders to increase resilience and readiness. It exercises general staff responsibility for both the Army Suicide Prevention Program and the Sexual Harassment/ Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program.
- Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences drives scientific innovation to enable the Army to acquire, develop, employ, and retain professional Soldiers and enhance personnel readiness.

The Surgeon General, who is dual hatted as the Commander of Army Medical Command, provides technical advice and assistance to the Army Secretariat and Army Staff for matters on public health, health readiness of the Force, Warrior transition care, medical Force structure and equipping, Force development, medical research and development, medical training and education, medical evacuation, and military construction of medical facilities.

As part of Army Medical Command, the Army Public Health Center's mission is to enhance Army readiness by identifying and assessing current and emerging health threats, developing and communicating public health solutions, and assuring the quality and effectiveness of the Army's public health enterprise.

Army Training and Doctrine Command recruits, trains, educates, develops, and builds the Army; establishes standards; drives improvement; and leads change to ensure the Army can deter, fight, and win on any battlefield now and into the future. Within this command:

- The Center for the Army Profession and Leadership, a subordinate organization of the U.S. Army Combined Arms Center, conducts studies; develops doctrine; provides assessment programs; and develops products and services that improve

Army leadership, support leader development, and strengthen the profession to achieve positive command climates and mission-ready units.

Army Futures Command leads Army modernization to provide future Warfighters with the concepts, capabilities, and organizational structures needed to dominate a future battlefield. The command oversees:

- Army Medical Research and Development Command. This command is the Army's medical materiel developer with responsibility for medical research, development, and acquisition.
- Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. The institute, which is part of Medical Research and Development Command, provides unique research capabilities and innovative medical solutions to Servicemembers, including protecting against infectious disease threats, promoting psychological resilience, and enhancing neurological functioning.

Annex C: Official Army Position and Verbatim Comments by Command



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS
111 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0111

SAMR

MEMORANDUM FOR The Auditor General, U.S. Army Audit Agency (USAAA), 6000
6th Street, Building 1464, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5609

SUBJECT: Official Army Position and reply to USAAA Draft Report on the Audit of
Research on Soldiers' Harmful Behaviors (Report A-2022-FIZ-0049)

1. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) has reviewed the draft report and concurs with the recommendation of the subject audit.
2. This memo serves as the official Army position of the subject audit. Enclosed is the position on the recommendation, including actions planned and target dates to be included in the final draft report of the audit.
3. Point of contact for this memorandum is (b) (6)
(b) (6)

(b) (6)

AGNES GEREKEN SCHAEFER

Enclosure 1
USAAA Draft Report
A-2022-FIZ-0049
Research on Soldiers' Harmful Behaviors

Objective, Conclusion, Recommendations, and Command Comments

Objective: To determine if the Army implemented results from research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors.

Conclusion: The Army often didn't implement results from research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Though several Army organizations funded research on these behaviors, they didn't transition that research into actionable policies and practices.

We reviewed 47 Army-sponsored research reports published from FY 19 to FY 22. Of these:

- 42 (about 89 percent) either didn't have actionable recommendations or only recommended more research. We defined an actionable recommendation as one that identifies specific changes to policies, practices, or systems to address Soldiers' harmful behaviors.
- 5 had a total of 10 actionable recommendations, but Army stakeholders hadn't taken action to implement any of them.

Army researchers considered most of these research projects and studies to be foundational or basic research (according to DoDI 3210.1, Administration and Support of Basic Research by the Department of Defense, 16 September 2005, Change 1, 15 October 2018, basic research is systematic study directed toward greater understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind) meant to increase general knowledge. Consequently, the researchers didn't expect the projects and studies to produce results with specific applications and actionable recommendations.

These conditions primarily occurred because the Army didn't centralize governance of research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. In a 2010 report, the Army reported the need to improve research governance (Army Health Promotion, Risk Reduction, Suicide Prevention Report 2010, July 2010). However, the report's recommended governance model wasn't implemented. That model sought to ensure research into these behaviors was coordinated, transitional, and implemented as relevant results.

Without centralized governance, the Army didn't have a unified plan for researching Soldiers' harmful behaviors. Additionally, research organizations didn't:

- Use standard procedures to ensure uniformity and consistency in initiating and tracking research projects and studies, establishing expectations for practical application, and developing implementation plans.
- Have forums or repositories to share information on planned, ongoing, and completed research with other stakeholders.

Without stronger governance, the Army will continue to lack full awareness of its research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors and assurance it's realizing the value of investing in that research. Further, the Army will be less able to implement the goal of becoming a learning organization as established in the Army Integrated Prevention Strategy (Although this strategy wasn't finalized at the time of this audit, we analyzed the draft version dated 21 July 2022. The draft strategy acknowledges that current research efforts are often fragmented and not pushed to organizations or leaders who can affect change).

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

Recommendation 1: In coordination with the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, designate an office to oversee research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors. At a minimum, this office should:

- Prepare, distribute, periodically update, and monitor implementation of a plan to research these behaviors. The plan should include how research will align with senior leader priorities and Army resources.
- Develop clear guidelines for stakeholders to follow when initiating research projects and assessing the relevance of research results. These procedures should include instructions on:
 - Identifying up front whether projects will be foundational or applied research.
 - Developing plans to implement actionable research recommendations.
- Establish a centralized repository for research on Soldiers' harmful behaviors that will allow stakeholders to share and access information on planned, ongoing, and completed research.

Command Comments/ Official Army Position: ASA(M&RA) concurs with the audit findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the AAA review, which are based on research projects originating within ASA (M&RA), DCS G-1, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, U.S. Army Futures Command, and U.S. Army Medical Command.

ASA(M&RA) will ensure the HQDA organization tasked with oversight of harmful behavior research is also tasked with:

(a) serving as the primary HQDA organization for execution/ sponsorship of harmful behavior research;

(b) oversight of prevention research; and

(c) serving as the primary HQDA organization for execution/sponsorship of prevention research.

This will ensure establishment of a singular authoritative source to serve as the synchronizing force within the harmful behaviors and prevention research space for research planning, project initiation and execution, assessment of research results, and knowledge sharing/dissemination.

ASA(M&RA) will ensure that the HQDA organization tasked with oversight and execution/ sponsorship of harmful behaviors research and prevention research is effectively postured (e.g., sufficient number of scientific subject matter experts on staff, dedicated research budget) to deliver the necessary results identified in the AAA draft report (i.e., stronger governance of harmful behavior research, realization of the value of investing in harmful behavior research, enabling the Army to become a learning organization with respect to preventing harmful behaviors).

The target date for completion of this recommendation is end of 30 September 2024.

ASA(M&RA) recommends AAA conduct an audit of research focused on harmful behaviors not included in this project, including those studies originating in DCS G-9.



Trusted Solutions for Our Army

Our Mission

As an integral part of the Army team, we serve the Army's emerging needs by helping Army leaders assess and mitigate risk and by providing solutions through independent internal auditing services, for the benefit of Army Soldiers, Civilians, and Families.

Additional Copies

We distribute each report in accordance with the requirements of Government Auditing Standards, GAO-21-368G, April 2021. For additional copies of this report or other U.S. Army Audit Agency reports, visit <https://armyeitaas.sharepoint-mil.us/sites/HQDA-AAA-Extranet>. The site is available only to military domains and the U.S. Government Accountability Office. Other activities may request copies of Agency reports by emailing our Audit Coordination and Followup Office at: usarmy.pentagon.hqda-aaa.mbx.aaa-acfo@army.mil.