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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM

A 1973 BYU thesis dealt with the problem of relative credibility of formal and informal information sources among soldiers in U.S. Army basic training. The study was designed to test the hypotheses that there would be significantly more acceptance of, or belief in, statements from unofficial (informal) information sources by soldiers in basic training than would be found for official (formal) sources; that a reverse trend would be found for acceptance or belief in official sources; and that these differences and trends would be more pronounced among trainees in later stages than among those in earlier stages of basic training.

To test the hypotheses, two Army basic training companies were selected at random from those meeting certain criteria at the Fort Ord, California Army training center. To be eligible for selection companies had to be about to enter the second or seventh week of training on a certain date in May, 1973. About four

---

companies out of the twenty or so at the center met one or other of the criteria.

Q-sort and questionnaire methodology were selected to collect the data. Q-sort was chosen because of its self-referent nature and because of its small-sample based philosophy. The questionnaire was used to collect demographics and certain information for profiling respondents and their source patterns.

The 1973 study failed to find sufficient significance in the data to validate the hypotheses. Therefore, the hypotheses were rejected.

However, findings did identify a number of trends. It was found that:

1. Little difference existed between broad source categories of official and unofficial sources, but when the specific variables face-to-face (official), media (official), peer group (unofficial), and non-peer group (unofficial) were added, a difference was seen.

2. Time tended to show a change in communications orientation. It was found that peer group and face-to-face sources increased in acceptability or believability over time.

3. Grapevine patterns were found to exist.

4. Official media sources got little use.

Certain factors appeared to have hindered Kallunki's 1973 effort to validate his hypotheses. The question arises: Did the exclusive, spartan, and
extremely regimented and protected environment of basic training provide a reliable population for predictions about the Army population as a whole? And it is suspected that the study was inconclusive because it sampled populations with too short a time span between them.

That post-basic training Army service differs drastically from basic training is indicated by this statement from an Army psychiatrist:

I am reminded of numerous Army studies which have shown that many soldiers' morale is highest during basic training. Closer scrutiny reveals that high morale was directly related to the extremely structured environments. . . . With the first permanent duty station . . . the bottom fell out of morale.2

Replication of this study would seem justified because, in addition to the reason cited above, Kallunki provided adequate justification for the original study on the grounds of actual and recognized need on the part of the Army, and on the basis that benefit can accrue to the general study of source credibility.

The United States Army has gone through a very trying period of adjustment during the eight years since the 1973 study. It has been credited with defeat in the Vietnam War which many of its leaders feel

was the fault of civilian leaders. The Army has shifted from reliance on conscription which ended in 1972 to an all-volunteer force, and in the process shifted from a primarily white, male organization toward one manned by sharply increasing numbers of females and minorities. In the process commanders have had to become more like managers than leaders. Down to the battalion, commanders find time previously used for communication increasingly used up with the details such as management by objective and results, zero balance budgets and organizational effectiveness. By this is meant the leaders have necessarily had to increasingly develop managerial skills at the expense of command. Traditionally, Army leaders at Battalion and company levels have been face-to-face, people-oriented commanders. Changes seem to have been made at the expense of internal communication. In the opinion of many career soldiers, communication has been replaced with buzz words such as "zero defects," "no more zero defects," and "tell it like it is." And in the ranks, soldiers have increasingly expressed feelings of alienation from the Army which claims to "take care of its own," as they hear reports of high ranking Army leaders backing the nation's leaders in efforts to eliminate benefits the soldiers thought were guaranteed
in exchange for service in the Armed Forces of the United States. 3

The Army, with over a million members in uniform has placed heavy emphasis on its channels of communication. Still, many of its leaders feel much that is wrong with the Army can be traced to communication failure.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to determine whether the Army's communication efforts are properly directed and to what degree the channels of communication it utilizes, official and unofficial, are accepted by the soldiers during their first three years of service, and whether the soldiers' information source orientation changes over time. It also seeks to identify which sources of information these soldiers rely on and tend to tune into, to the end that Army leaders can take a new look at communication channels as a possible solution to some of their problems.

To shed some light on these areas, the author replicated as closely as practical the 1973 study mentioned on Page One. It intended to determine changes between the 1973 responses by basic trainees and those of soldiers with less than three years service in 1981, and

3Account should be taken of new directions relative to soldiers' benefits recently being pushed by the new Reagan administration.
see what current usage is, and perhaps suggest some ways to enhance communication through available channels.

In order to develop a research design to study the problem the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Significantly more acceptance will be found for statements from unofficial than for statements from official information sources among soldiers during their first three years of U.S. Army service.

2. Significantly more acceptance will be found for statements from unofficial than for statements from official information sources among soldiers in later stages than among those in earlier stages of the first three years of U.S. Army service.

The Army has relied heavily on face-to-face communication between commanders and subordinates and has placed considerable stress on media and public relations-type activity to reach its internal audiences. It is proposed that this study is needed to test source credibility to the soldier because research literature is lacking on which to base the assumptions the Army has made about the channels it has emphasized for communication with the soldier. It is assumed that better understanding of the sources most acceptable to the young soldier would be useful to leaders in helping the soldier develop a positive attitude.

An expert in the field of management reported finding that the new employee forms attitudes toward his
job, the boss and his company much earlier than many managers think. And during these first impressionable days—or even hours—communications may make all the difference in getting off to a good start. It is assumed the author of this quote meant to suggest that how representatives of an organization communicate to the new employee affects how he or she perceives the organization and how he or she responds to its policies, management and goals.

Kallunki provided the above quote to help justify his study with basic trainees, who are, in a sense, new Army employees. The same justification would appear to apply to soldiers at their first permanent duty station. Recall the sharp drop in morale reported earlier as soldiers leave basic training and experience the "real" Army. It would seem that soldiers arriving at their first duty station would find conditions so changed from what they experienced in basic training that earlier conceptions and attitudes would be shaken and as amenable to change as when they left civilian life for basic training.

---


5 Kallunki, op. cit.

6 Jeffers, op. cit.
Discussion of the Problem

One might expect that in a society such as exists in the United States, at least two formidable communications problems would prevail. On the one hand is the problem of effectively and repeatedly convincing civilians of the need for adequate numbers of armed forces properly equipped. The other problem would be one of continuously insuring effective communication within and between the armed forces.

That both of these problems have been recognized by the Army is obvious from a review of official documents on the subjects. This study will not be concerned with Army communications with civilians. During World War II, and since, the Army has commissioned scores of research studies dealing with communication. An example of the Army's attention to communication within and among its internal audiences was indicated in research for the Army in the early 1940's by Carl Hovland, then a Lieutenant Colonel, doing work concerned with influencing the morale of soldiers and with changing attitudes of civilians toward various aspects of the war effort. 7 Another example of the Army's interest can be found among the volumes produced for it since World War II by a company called

Human Research Organization, a private research organization located near the Pentagon.\(^8\)

Scott M. Cutlip and Allen Center said:

The task of communications has become increasingly difficult. The armed forces face this task to no less an extent as was foreseen by the first Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, who said, 'I know of no task that is more complex... than that of engendering in a democracy an appreciation of the role of the armed forces.'\(^9\)

It is assumed Secretary Forrestal meant to imply that the task of engendering appreciation for the role of the armed forces was complex both within the armed forces and among the civilian population.

That the Army is vitally interested in understanding and applying effective communication knowledge and skills is strongly indicated by its official documents. An Army regulation explains the concern and directs commanders:

The Department of the Army, just as any organization, must strive to build and maintain a climate in which it has the support and confidence of its members. The Army's Command Information Program... plays a major role in this effort... Command Information is... a leadership and management tool designed

---

\(^8\)Kallunki, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

to help the commander communicate with all internal audiences.10

About the importance of Command Information the regulation states:

The primary objective is to help foster and maintain within the Total Army Force a climate of understanding in which each member will be motivated to perform to the best of his ability.11

That the Army is open to innovative approaches appears obvious from these instructions to company level commanders:

To be successful, the program should be personalized to promote mutual confidence between the commander and his soldiers and among the soldiers themselves. The commander can best earn this confidence by . . . energetically encouraging a free flow of information.12

The regulation appears to encourage use of both formal and informal information channels:

All means of communication, especially the normal chain of command and Command Information media . . . should be utilized to facilitate the flow of information. Information from the commander may be transmitted formally or informally, by direct or indirect means.13

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
The official Army documents quoted above would seem to suggest a very strong interest by the Army in developing every channel of communication available in order to reach and motivate the soldiers, and gain or improve their confidence in the Army's leaders.

To emphasize the importance of communication to Army leaders an official training document quoted Lieutenant General Sir Frederick Morgan about policy in a British headquarters during World War II, "Right down to the cook, they were told what had happened, what was happening, along with their part in it and what was proposed to do next." 14

That keeping the soldier informed "right down to the cook" affects their performance was exemplified by the experience of a battalion commander. The commander reported that among training companies at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, during 1964-66, it was found that companies who announced in advance that awards would be presented for high scores obtained consistently better scores than did those companies that did not provide this information beforehand. 15

The studies by Hovland for the U.S. Army and his later research with Walter Weiss and others at Yale


15 Kallunki, op. cit., p. 9.
clearly established source credibility as an important factor in persuasion. This study will not deal with the elements of credibility outlined by the Yale approach, because the Yale approach deals with elements in the source approach; and this study focuses on elements of acceptance and attitude in the target.

According to James C. McCroskey and others:

One of the communication variables which has not been explored adequately in the organizational context is source credibility. An extensive body of literature has been developed over the past two decades indicating that source credibility may be the single most important variable in persuasive effects.

The Army needs research findings on source credibility and acceptability within its ranks on which to base its assumptions and improve communications. The need also exists within the Army for more research aimed at its specific communication needs. Colonel D. M. Malone, writing for Army Review, a professional monthly magazine for career soldiers, reported on movements in the Army which he participated in and observed:

Beginning in 1971, the War College cranked in ten 15-hour in a block units of instruction

16 Zimbardo, op. cit.

called 'Human Dimensions of Military Professionalism.' It had some pretty good practical ethical stuff in it, which was new, but it had some other things that were new, too: soft skills--communications, group dynamics, counseling. 'All that behavioral junk,' as the old colonels called it. What they didn't know was that ethics is a thing of effect, not fact, and those soft skills that were being developed were the ones our Army would need to work the realm of ethics. 18

Malone here pointed out a need for communication skills if the Army is to initiate some of its goals in the area of ethics.

There is a need to understand the influence of source credibility on the channels of communication in the Army--in order that institutional concerns may be conveyed, information and instruction given effectively, and feedback obtained; and that acceptance may be enhanced on the part of the soldier so that the quality of the Army Total Force and the retention of recruits may be improved.

As an example of the need to improve retention of recruits consider that during fiscal year 1981 to 25 May 1981, the Army recruited 78,921 people. In fiscal year 1981 as of 30 April the Army had lost 62,077 of soldiers who failed to complete the first six months of service. An additional 65,023 soldiers failed to complete an initial three-year enlistment term during the same period. These

loss figures equal 161 percent of enlistments during fiscal year 1981.19 It is hoped this study will suggest ways of improving retentions efforts through better utilization and understanding of the Army's communication channels.

Definition of Terms

a. Acceptance will used synonymously with belief in the sixty Q-statements, as reflected by the order in which the respondents sort the decks.

b. The term official will refer to statements from superiors to subordinates, face-to-face, and to statements from official and official-appearing media.

(1). Official media will include those sources for which the soldier can be held accountable for being aware of and for complying with. These include the bulletin board on which is posted such items as duty rosters and orders, published orders and manuals which spell out official expectations, and official sections of the Weekly Bulletin, a publication for dissemination of information with the authority of orders.

(2). Official-appearing media will include those media sources for which one cannot be held accountable for awareness and compliance with content, but which appear to be identified in the minds of soldiers as

19Statistics provided by Department of the Army, Directorate of Personnel, Washington, D.C., by interview on 28 May 1981.
speaking for the Army. These sources, found to be easily accessible to the soldier, include Panorama, the Fort Ord post newspaper; the Army Times, a weekly newspaper circulated Army (world) wide; the unofficial portion of the Weekly Bulletin, where announcements of a non-directive nature are publicized; "Bucky Bayonet," a spy-of-the-post type editorial in the Panorama; Troop Scoop, a single-sheet periodical utilized by the command information office to publicize command-interest items like rape and crime prevention, and Soldiers, an official magazine produced for the soldier which contains directive and non-directive information, but for which the soldier could not be held accountable in and of itself.

c. Unofficial sources will include statements from peers of the respondents and non-peers.

(1). Peers include all soldiers with less than three years of Army service.

(2). Non-peer includes all others, including superiors, habitually found in the soldier's environment. An example of how superiors would be seen as non-peer unofficial sources would be any statements in the Q-deck from superiors which were not directed to the soldier. An example of a non-peer statement would be an official commenting to the press that the young soldier will perform well if he has good leadership. Another example would be the post barber saying, "today's soldier is less neat than he used to be."
d. Total Army Force is an official term applied to "Military members . . . (Active Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve units), and Department of the Army civilian employees." 20

The Sample Subjects

Subjects for this study will include all enlisted soldiers with no more than three years active service in the Army. The three-year cut-off point was selected because that is the point at which soldiers usually complete their first obligated enlistment tour and must decide whether to continue on in the Army or return to civilian life. It also appeared to be a natural dividing point between soldiers and non-commissioned officers, the Army's "middle managers." And it was felt that to attempt to study believability of sources among those beyond these natural dividing lines would introduce too many variables for adequate anticipation and control.

In order to obtain a sample of the respondents that would tend to reflect the general population of the Army, subjects will be taken from both combat and support units.

The study will be conducted at Fort Ord, California. That site was selected because it was the location of the study being replicated and because the author was able to establish contacts there in sufficient

20Army Regulation 360-81, op. cit.
time to collect the data within the time-bounds permitted for completing his thesis.

To attempt to control for self-selection or self-exclusion, agreement was made with the Army that all soldiers meeting the three-year service criteria within a single, randomly selected, infantry company would be made available for the study at one time. The Army also agreed to provide between fifty and sixty subjects from a support battalion, these to come by commander-designation from five companies within that battalion.

A concern about the mode of selection for the support subjects is that commanders might tend to send those least desirable in their units to get them off their hands. On the other hand, realizing that the subjects might reflect on their units, the commanders may tend to send their more desirable members. It is hoped these and other commander considerations will mediate to provide a representative sample of support people.

It is expected that the infantry subjects will be all male and the support sample will be about ten percent female because infantry soldiers by law must be male, and females make up about ten percent of the Army enlisted population. The subjects will be from all parts of the United States and some of its territories.

\[21\] Army Statistics, op. cit.
And education levels will be less than high school-based on median scores.

Support personnel are expected to reflect higher education levels and job satisfaction because higher education was one of the criteria for getting a non-combat assignment and their typical day included recognizable production such as number of trucks repaired, cakes baked, forms completed, as opposed to the infantry which had the lowest educational requirements and where the typical day consisted of repetitious training for war. On the other hand, the infantry respondents may be expected to reflect more peer and face-to-face source acceptance because they tend to function in units with close relationships as opposed to the support respondents who tend to function based on some familiar task.

Delimitations

A comprehensive study of source credibility would cover those elements in the source which make it credible or uncredible to the receiver, channels of delivery characteristics, and elements in the receiver that influence source credibility. This study will be limited to testing the degree of acceptance or believability of official and unofficial sources by the respondents to determine changes from the findings of the original study and to see what current channel usage is.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The U.S. Army has passed through extensive organizational and role definition change during the past nine years. The concern has arisen that the Army’s communication efforts as directed toward the available information channels for reaching its internal audiences may have failed to keep up with the changes and that the assumptions for source utilization may have been based on inadequate research.

In order to study the acceptability by the soldier of the sources the Army uses to reach him, the author’s review of the literature began with the search for an applicable definition of communication and proceeded to a search for literature bearing on the study of communication in the Army.

Searching for a single definition of the word "communication" and for the ultimate communication theory appeared to be fruitless. Kenneth K. Sereno and C. David Mortensen in 1970 suggested:

A communication theory does not yet exist, at least not in any singular sense; what current literature affords is rather a core of theories
related to particular phases of communicative behavior.  

These opinions were in a sense echoed in 1978 by Stephen W. Littlejohn:

"The search for the ultimate theory of communication is not particularly useful--because communication is not a single, unified act but a process... the word communication is abstract, and like all words it possesses multiple meaning."  

Littlejohn added that communication is a:

"complex process of psychological and social events involving symbolic interaction. These events occur within and between people in interpersonal, group, organizational, and mass contexts... involve in varying combinations coding, meaning, thinking, information, and persuasion."  

William Stephenson would add the pleasure factor or play theory to Littlejohn's definition of communication.

The multitheoretical approach to communication seems acceptable, and will be quite applicable to this

---


3 Ibid., p. 377.

This chapter reviews literature on the importance of communication research and reports on selected literature bearing on those orientations, contexts, and processes of interest to the focus of this study.

The Importance of Communication Research

Melvin DeFleur said of the study of communication:

No student of human nature, whatever his disciplinary identification... can study human behavior without recognizing at the outset that Man's communication processes are as vital to him as a human being as are his biological processes.5

Researchers at Brigham Young University reported evidence that:

Communication is the central feature of all human relationships; without it, organized social activities are impossible... Whenever the task must be performed by a number of people rather than a single individual, diffusion of information among the group members is essential to coordinated effort.6


Channels of diffusion and coordinated effort were key interests of this study because along with the efforts to gather data to test source credibility, this study will look for indicators of opinion leader's and diffusion patterns in the lower ranks of the Army. The comment above about the necessity of diffusion for group effort is particularly applicable to an organization whose sole product is based on the assumption of coordinated force--the Army.

Study Related Literature

The literature review failed to produce material directly related to the study of source effectiveness in the context of this study. In this section literature indirectly related to some aspects of the study will be reviewed briefly. Inasmuch as the study design will involve channels of information, source effectiveness, and diffusion in organizational, group, interpersonal, and mass contexts: these communication subjects were reviewed in varying degrees.

Communication channels. The literature review of communication channels led to the Westley and MacLean model of communication. 7 This early model (1957)

represented the communication process with five elements represented as X's, A, C, and B. The X's represented the sensory field, the A identified the communication source, C the channel through which the A message passed and was processed before being passed on to B. B represented the receiver of mass messages. (See Figure 1 at page 24.)

This model was particularly important to media theory because of its introduction of the channel (C) role. It was also compatible with the two-step-flow theory--the concept introduced by Paul Lazarsfeld and others which found that information flows to key individuals in a group or community who process it and pass it on to others. This model and the two-step-flow concept relate to this study because one area of interest will be "who says what, to whom, and with what effect," at least so far as source acceptability is affected.

Another point of reference is that the Army, with a population of more than a million people scattered over every continent, has relied heavily on mediated channels to get information out. How effectively the

---


mediated channels are received and the patterns by which information coming through the channels is passed on have been of vital interest and concern to the Army.

Figure 1. Westley and MacLean's model. The message C transmits to B (X") represent his selections from both messages to him from A (X') and C's selections and abstractions from Xs in his own sensory field (X3c, X4) which may or may not be Xs in A's field. Feedback not only moves from B to A (fBA) and from B to C (fBC) but also from C to A (fCA). Clearly, in the mass communication situation, a large number of Cs receive from a very large number of As and transmit to a vastly larger number of Bs, who simultaneously receive from other Cs.


Organizational communication review. This led to two civilian sources particularly interesting to this study. The first, a paper by Howard H. Greenbaum, provided this definition of organizational communication:
Organizational communication includes all verbal and non-verbal stimuli affecting individual behavior and can be defined in terms of purpose, operational procedures, and structural elements. 10 The fundamental element is the organization unit.

The definition fit well with this study which will sample members of relatively small units of a vast organization.

Berleson and Steiner provided a list of organizational attributes, all of which seem to fit well with the U.S. Army. The attributes they listed and defined are: (1) formality (a set of goals, policies, rules, regulations, etc.), (2) hierarchy (rank or status structure), (3) many people (enough so that close personal relations among all are impossible), and (4) long life (the organization usually lasts longer than a human life span). 11 These attributes appear to fit well with the units sampled.

Source credibility. The literature examined included research on motivation and attitude change by Hovland during World War II because acceptability or believability of the source bore a close relation to


elements of source credibility in the channel of information.

Another researcher in 1975 reported that high message-orientation increased people's susceptibility to manipulations\textsuperscript{12} and that physical presence of a source affects subjects with high message orientation positively and those with low message orientation minimally.\textsuperscript{13} This might lead one to expect that official face-to-face sources in the Army would be both highly accepted and strongly rejected, depending on the orientation of the soldier toward the predominant subjects discussed between them.

Interpersonal communication. Literature of note discussed the believability of face-to-face news diffusion processes relative to media. Interestingly, and perhaps boding ill for the hypotheses of this study, a 1979 study of the rate and amount of the spread of good news reported finding media sources significantly more believed than face-to-face sources.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 472.

Diffusion of innovations and news. It appeared from a review of the literature to be of interest in all communication contexts. Diffusion was defined as a group process, compared to learning, which is an individual process.\(^{15}\)

Walter Gantz and Sarah Trenholm reported a lack of study of the function of diffusion in communication and listed a variety of need states their findings identified as influencing people to pass on news.\(^{16}\)

Grapevine and Rumor as information channels was treated quite well by Kallunki in the original study. While these topics are related, they will not be reviewed, nor a focus of this study--having been well reviewed in the study being replicated. Suggested sources for reviewing the grapevine in authoritarian organizations would include Gordon W. Allport and Leo Postman's 1940's research\(^{17}\) and Ralph D. Barney's unpublished paper which was prepared in 1969.\(^{18}\)


Summary

This chapter has reviewed the literature and reported briefly on research related to the communication problem of information source acceptability or believability in the Army.

The review failed to produce material directly related to sources of information in the Army, but several studies were found and commented on which had indirect application to the study at hand and which suggested that the eclectic approach of this study is appropriate, considering the multi-faceted nature of the communication context being looked at.

The literature reviewed included Westley and MacLean’s early 1957 model which introduced the channel role concept in mass communication. Application of mass communication to the study was based on the Army’s heavy reliance in the past on media as a means of getting information to the soldier. Also included were literature on organizational communication which suggested the need for more research on source credibility in authoritarian organizations and interpersonal communication literature that discussed the believability of face-to-face news diffusion processes.

The need for additional study of communication source acceptance in the Army environment would appear to be supported by the apparent shortage of such studies in the literature. Replication of the 1973 study
discussed on Page One, would seem justified because it found mathematically significant trends worthy of further attention. These findings included a trend toward change in communication orientation over time, the presence of elements in the sample who indicated non-typical acceptance of authority of a face-to-face nature, a tendency toward increased acceptance of personalized sources both official and unofficial, the existence and development of diffusion patterns over time, and a low degree of utilization of media sources.

It is expected this study will provide significant data to sustain the hypotheses about the relative acceptability of official and unofficial information sources among soldiers in the U.S. Army, or at least, to provide suggestions for further explorations.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

In studying the problem of relative acceptability of official (formal) and unofficial (informal) information sources among soldiers during the first three years of post-basic training U.S. Army service, a sample of eighty-five soldiers was taken from a randomly-selected infantry company and from a multi-companied support unit at Fort Ord, California, during the two-day period 27-28 April 1981.

Place and Time

The dates for the survey were dictated by the Army. The location, Fort Ord, California, was selected because it was the site of the study being replicated, and because the author was able to make contacts and arrangements there that made it possible to complete the data gathering at the earliest date. The 7th Infantry Division at Fort Ord differs from other combat divisions in the Army in that it is the only light infantry unit of similar size--meaning it has no tanks. It is expected that a demographic profile based on sex, Army occupation, race and education, of the respondents selected from the Fort Ord division will reflect that they are a fair
representation of comparative members through the Army, in order that generalizations about the Army can be made based on findings in the sample.

**Selection of the Subjects**

The Army was requested to provide all the personnel with fewer than three years service in a randomly selected infantry company and a support company for the study. The rationale for choosing the respondents from both infantry and support units was that it would provide a cross-section sample of soldiers with less than three years service that would reflect the complexities found in most of the Army population. It was recognized that this sample would miss certain highly technical elements of the population, such as intelligence personnel. However, those elements missed would tend to be non-typical of the soldiers and problem at the focus of this study because their occupations take them out of the mainstream of Army activity.

Whole unit availability was requested in order to help preclude self-selectivity. Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael warned that a pitfall of self-selection is "the likelihood that volunteers differ from non-volunteers, compromising the interpretation and
generalization of the results. The units sampled seemed to meet these criteria.

The Army provided an infantry company for the study based on availability from training away from the post. No support company commander was willing to or, reportedly, able to break loose all the soldiers meeting the sample criteria at one time; so each of five maintenance companies in a battalion were tasked to provide like numbers of test subjects, with the goal of insuring fifty subjects for the sample.

Forty-five infantry company soldiers including one clerk and forty-seven support soldiers appeared for the survey. Eighty-five soldiers completed the survey. Of the six who failed to complete the survey, four asked to be excused for medical appointments, one gave duty as an excuse, and one offered no excuse. One other soldier took with him from the survey location significant portions of his Q-deck statements. It was decided by the author that the partial deck would not be used as there was no way of knowing the self-referent believability of the missing statements in comparison to those remaining.

Having the support subjects designated from larger populations in five companies may have resulted

----

in the least productive soldiers being sent. It could just as easily have resulted in some or all of the units sending their "best" in order to make a better impression on the results.

It is expected the self-referent nature of the survey will reflect similarities between the two groups that will indicate little in validity has been lost. By this expectation, it is meant that the subsequent profile of the respondents will be close enough to the general profile of the sampled population that generalizations will not be seriously compromised by this necessary acceptance of command-designated respondents. This expectation is based on the assumption that the five respective commanders and first sergeants will, because of the complexities of their individual motives, send comparatively equal numbers of both "ideal" and "dud" soldiers to be study subjects.

Instruments

To measure attitudes concerning credibility of information sources, a projective method of measurement of attitudes was needed. Due to its self-referent nature and for purposes of replication, the Q-sort (a tool of Q-methodology) described by William Stephenson and others was used.²

A Q-deck of sixty statements of a self-referent nature concerning topics found to be of high interest among elements in the respondents' environment were selected from a total of one-hundred and twenty gathered during the week prior to the survey as being most representative of the hypotheses being tested. (See Appendix A for a list of statements.)

The author's rationale for selecting the sixty statements used in the Q-deck as opposed to the sixty statements collected but not used was to avoid extensive duplication of specific topics and to structure the deck to provide a deck with a mixture of positive or pro, neutral or non-emotional, and negative or con statements. Also involved in the selection of the sixty Q-statements was the need to insure that the deck had approximately the same amount of statements from official and unofficial sources and sub-sources face-to-face, media, peer and non-peer. This practice of structured Q-sets or decks was recommended by Phillip Emmert and William D. Brooks as being "especially advantageous to the testing of theory. Since the instrument is constructed to embody the theory, the sorting of items by known types of individuals can test the hypothesis."

---

Twenty-nine of the selected statements were from official sources of information readily available to soldiers to be sampled. These statements were divided into two subcategories: (1) Face-to-face word-of-mouth sources, and (2) Official and official-appearing media sources.

Face-to-face statements were collected by listening to company commanders, first-sergeants and other non-commissioned officers talking to soldiers individually and in formations, and by interviewing these leaders about official matters conveyed to the soldiers during the week preceding the survey. Official media statements were collected from bulletin boards, the official section of the Weekly Bulletin, which contains directive information, from Soldiers, the official Army magazine, The Fort Ord Panorama, a post newspaper, Troop Scoop, a one-sheet item used for periodical support of command interest items, such as rape and accident prevention, and from Army Times, a world-wide circulation newspaper for Army audiences.

The remaining thirty-one statements of the Q-deck were collected from unofficial sources. These statements were divided into two subcategories: (1) sources within the peer group, and (2) sources outside the peer group of soldiers with less than three years of service. Peer group statements were collected by the author from conversations struck up with individual
soldiers. Only individuals in uniform were approached for casual conversation so that one's rank could be quickly ascertained in order to narrow the field in choosing those with fewer than three years of service. The individual interview technique was adopted only after more subtle methods of "listening in" or conversations failed. Attempts to listen in on peer group conversations included standing in movie lines and lobbies, waiting around hospital and dispensary waiting rooms, and listening in dining facilities, dayrooms and cafeterias.

It was found by the researcher that every time soldiers were found waiting in quiet atmospheres, they were silent; and every time they were surrounded by loud music, they appeared to be engaged in conversation. Statements from unofficial sources outside the subjects' peer group were collected by focused interviews with middle-level leaders, medics, clerks, food service personnel and civilians closely associated with the soldiers' environment.

The statements were collected between 20 and 25 April, 1981.

As was done in the 1973 study and suggested by Emmert and Brooks, statements selected for inclusion in the Q-sets were: (1) very pro (19 each), (2) very
con (23 each), or (3) ambiguous or neutral (18 each). The statements covered separate topics based on formal and informal sources. The topics were:

1. Quality of the soldier.
2. Educational opportunities.
3. Economic concerns.
4. Rumor about moving the division.
5. Recruiting.
7. Rules (swimming, walking, marking property).
8. The Foxhole, a service club for enlisted people.
9. Media ("Bucky Bayonet" and "KFO Radio").
10. Veterans.
11. Women in the Army.
12. Seeing the chaplain.
13. Army concern for the soldier.
14. Uniform changes.
15. Leadership quality and problems.
16. Benefits (hotel in Hawaii, etc.)
17. All-volunteer Army (quality).
18. Race.

Ibid., p. 169.
These topics were the ones that arose most frequently in response to non-directive inquiries from the author, such as "how are recreation facilities and cost of living here?" or "How is security and the crime rate?" They also represent the topics most frequently brought up by leaders and others being interviewed and those having apparent wide attention in the media.

This wide variety of topics would appear to meet the criteria suggested by L. J. Cronbach:

First, statements, while logically bearing on the same domain, should represent a large number of continua. . . . Second, statements being compared should have about the same average degree of desirability over the entire population . . . . Third, each statement should have substantial variance, in that different persons put it in different places.5

Because this is a study of source acceptability rather than of the message itself, statements were also considered as to their exclusive nature. For this reason, the number of more negative or con statements is larger among both categories of informal statements. It was expected that peer group statements would be generally negative when focused toward the environment. This was found to be the case. Something else found, but not expected, was that many leaders were also quite

negative when talking about rather than to the soldiers concerning the quality of the soldier, quality of the all-volunteer Army, training opportunity, and quality of life in the Army.

A thirty-eight item questionnaire was prepared, in part at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, and in part at the data collection site, Ford Ord, California. Four individuals, a chaplain, a lieutenant Colonel, a pilot, and a peer soldier examined the questionnaire items. Their comments were that it appeared comprehensible but that the soldiers would have trouble reading items consisting of more than single phrases.

Consequently, the questionnaire was organized with the more complex questions, those asking for written responses as opposed to those asking respondents to check the best answer, placed at the end. This arrangement was used on the assumption that it would be less threatening if, in fact, the respondents had difficulty reading the more complex items.6

The guidelines recommended by Kenneth D. Bailey were violated somewhat by placing potentially sensitive items about religion, parents' income and politics near the front.7 This was felt justified because the respondents typically find similar demographic items high on the myriads of forms they complete in the

6 Ibid. 7 Ibid.
Army. The final questionnaire contained thirty-eight items.

Questionnaire Item Two, designed to elicit data to identify the respondents' length of time in the Army, was included to provide data for testing the hypothesis that more significant acceptance of or belief in unofficial information sources would be found among soldiers in later stages than among those in earlier stages of the first three years of post-basic training Army service. Items One and Three through Thirty were intended to elicit demographic data for profiling the sample for comparison to the 1973 sample and the present Army population of soldiers with less than three years service. These items were also intended for factor analysis to help identify elements in the sample. Items Thirty-one through Thirty-eight were intended to collect data to help identify channel usage and information diffusion patterns, and to identify the most and least trusted people in the respondents' environment.

Local printers could not assure delivery of the questionnaire and Q-deck instruments in time for the unalterable survey schedule unless they were allowed to begin printing at a time which precluded further pre-testing on representative subjects. Thus, adequate field-testing prior to the survey was omitted. However, field testing was conducted after the fact, but prior to the actual survey, in order to look for inadequacies
in the instruments and to determine if they would have the potential of providing data for testing the hypotheses.

Weaknesses were noted in both the questionnaire and Q-deck. Changes were made to simplify twelve Q-deck statements by removing apparent ambiguities, and inconsistencies, and changes were made in questionnaire items to elicit more specific data and remove apparently confusing constructions. Items changed for the questionnaire included asking for specific year of age rather than how respondents' ages fitted into year groupings, simpler breakdown of religious preference, rearranging response categories for parents' education and number of children so that subsequent mean and median scores would be more meaningful, and rephrasing Item Thirty-two so that it called for name rather than list and people rather than sources (of most trusted individuals). By reproducing the Q-deck changes on a Xerox, it was possible to change the twelve Q-deck statements just prior to the survey. However, the questionnaire changes were readied too late for substitution.

The changes in the Q-deck apparently made it easier to sort. The unchanged items for age, religious preference, parents' income, number of children, and trusted persons, in the questionnaire weakened certain demographic results, but did not appear to be critical
so far as testing the hypotheses was concerned because these items were not intended to provide data to test the hypotheses. The hypotheses rely on time-in-service as the independent variable and source of statement as dependent variables.

Collecting the Data

The Q-sort decks and questionnaires were administered to the soldiers in two groups on separate days. The first group included all the subjects from the infantry company and the second group included all the designated representatives from five companies in a maintenance battalion.

In case of both groups, the soldiers were gathered in their respective battalion classroom.

The researcher was wearing civilian attire and introduced himself as mister and explained that the subjects were asked to assist with research as part of a graduate study program by completing a card-sorting exercise and filling out a questionnaire.

It was explained that a means would be needed to keep the two parts of the exercise together, thus identifying numbers would be assigned each of them. The subjects were assured that no person other than the researcher would ever see their individual responses, except that professors on the researcher's graduate committee might wish to check them or contact some
randomly-selected respondents to confirm that the data was gathered in the way reported.

At that point, the groups were asked if they consented to complete the exercises. All present in both groups agreed to the conditions. However, six subjects requested to leave during the questionnaire phase of administration, and one carried away part of the Q-deck. Four of the departees gave medical appointments as an excuse, one mentioned duty, another person gave no explanation. Fear of loss of anonymity, boredom, hostility, or even difficulty with reading and understanding the questions could have been factors in the four departures.

Each subject was given a deck of 60 identical, preshuffled statements held intact by a rubber band. They were asked to first separate the statements into three piles according to their belief in the statement: I believe to the left, I am not sure or no opinion in the middle, and I do not believe to the right. They were instructed to base their sorting on the basis of what they had heard, read or discussed since entering the Army. The subjects were asked to not discuss the statements as it was essential that they be sorted based on each individual's position rather than by any degree of consensus. It was noted that on a few occasions when individuals began to share opinions on particular statements that peers took it on themselves to demand
compliance. This was interpreted as acceptance and positive involvement in the activity.

Upon completion of the first step of the Q-sort they were asked to rank order the believed and disbelieved piles from most-believed to least-believed or most-disbelieved. Visual note was made that very few cards were placed in the middle or no opinion category. The three separate piles were then stacked by the researcher and the subjects were asked to reband them and place them in a shirt pocket for the time being. (This seemed the surest means of matching decks of each individual with his or her questionnaire.)

Each individual then completed the questionnaire. (See Appendix B.) The questionnaire was identified by the individual's name or, if preferred, by a number assigned by the researcher.

After completion of the questionnaire, each subject was asked to remove the Q-decks from his or her shirt pocket and place it on the questionnaire and leave both for the researcher to gather up.

Handling the Data

The results from twenty-seven of the questionnaire items were selected for factor analysis along with the sixty statements of the Q-deck. Selected questionnaire items were added because they were expected to assist in identifying factors. This number was added because
it was the maximum allowed by the Statistical Analysis System for this procedure. 8

1. Sex.
2. Time in service.
4. Marital status.
5. Age.
7. Number of children.
8. Region of country considered home.
9. Racial group.
11. Political preference.
12. Recalled average annual income of parents.
13. Father's education level.
14. Mother's education level.
15. Subject's civilian occupation.
17. Primary military job.
18. Civilian reading habits.
19. Present reading habits.
20. Leisure time site preferred.
21. Newspapers in home when entered the Army.
22. Magazines in the home when entered the Army.

---

23. Newspapers regularly read.
25. Television in room.
27. Books read during past year.

The findings were analyzed utilizing the Statistical Analysis System, an analysis system used by Brigham Young University Statistics Department. The eighty-seven variables were analyzed by varimax rotation, frequency distributions were determined for each factor, and the factors were cross-tabulated on the basis of time in the Army and by type of Army primary job, infantry, clerical, or support. Other items from the questionnaire were computed by hand. The forced sort method of handling the sorted Q-decks was used. Forcing was accomplished by assigning each card a value from one to nine depending on where individual subjects placed it in the deck.

The forced sort created an equal appearing interval scale, a common practice with Q-decks.

The forced sort is recommended by Stephenson and others\(^9\) because it leaves the experimenter in charge.

---

of the shape and scatter of the distribution curve, a common practice in Q-technique.

Summary

This chapter outlined the methodology designed to test the hypotheses that significantly more acceptance would be found for statements from unofficial sources than for statements from official sources among soldiers during their first three years of Army service, and that the significance level would be found to be significantly greater for acceptance of statements from unofficial sources than for statements from official sources among soldiers in later stages than among those in earlier stages of the first three years of Army service.

The manner and rationale for selection of survey location, sample and methodology have been presented. The instruments, Q-sort and questionnaire, have been explained and the procedures for collecting and handling the data have been outlined. Only the Q-sort technique and factor analysis phases of Q-methodology have been applied to this study. The study has been based on Q-theory because the methodology is more than Q-sort technique. It is "a profound way of approaching nature... a basic theory placing subjectivity--a

person's own reflections on matter--at the hub of all else."\textsuperscript{11} Application of the procedures, analysis of variance, frequency distribution, factor analysis and cross-tabulations, to this study were explained and referenced.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

Data was collected by Q-sort and questionnaire on 27 and 28 April 1981, at Fort Ord, California, to test the hypotheses that significantly more acceptance would be found for statements from unofficial information sources than for official information sources among soldiers during their first three years of U.S. Army enlisted service, and that the significance would be more pronounced the more time soldiers in the less-than-three years’ service had in the Army. Data was also gathered for making comparisons between this study and a 1973 study¹ to see what changes have occurred in source acceptance, what current channel usage is, and to test the validity of this study for making generalizations about the Army population.

The data was processed by frequency distribution, analysis of variance, factor analysis and cross-tabulations.

Frequency Distribution was the procedure used to see how the respondents sorted the Q-deck according to time in the service, and to provide a profile of the respondents. Frequency data was also used to check for the influences of Army occupation, education level, race, reading habits, sex, and geographic roots.

Profile of the Respondents

Frequency distributions, summarized in Table 1, reveal a composite of the respondents as follows:

1. Eighty-eight percent of the sampled respondents were male.
2. The composite was single by 76.4 percent, and 70.5 percent had no children.
3. He had about eleven and one-half months' service based on the mean of categories.
4. Fifty-one percent were White, and 37.65 percent were Black, and came from the eastern United States, accounting for 57.6 percent of the sample.
5. He averaged part-way through the eleventh grade in education.

The sample of eighty-five soldiers ranged in rank from private (E2) to Corporal/Specialist 4 (E4). One respondent had less than six months and seven had

---

### Table 1

A Comparison of Demographic Information from the 1981 Study Sample, the 1981 Army Profile, and a 1973 Army Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1981 Sample</th>
<th>Army Profile</th>
<th>1973 Fort Ord Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18.5 years</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>20.73 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37.65%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>50.58%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using 1981 study figures as observed frequencies and the 1981 Army profile as expected frequencies, chi squares were: Sex = $X^2 = 16$, df = 1, p = n.s.; Race = $X^2 = 2.58$, df = 1, p = n.s.; Education = $X^2 = 15.62$, df = 4, p = > .05.

\(^a\)Kallunki, op. cit., p. 32.

\(^b\)Statistics in this column provided by Department of the Army, Directorate of Personnel (DCSPER), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

\(^c\)As of 30 September 1980.

\(^d\)As of 31 October 1980.

\(^e\)As of 31 March 1981.
less than six months and seven had more than two years of service. More than half the sample completed high school (55.3 percent of the total) but very few had college experience (10.1 percent of the total).

The Composite's parents earned between sixteen and twenty-four thousand per year when he entered the Army (28.2 percent of sample's parents) and had just over a high school level education (fathers, 27.0 and mothers, 35.2 percent of totals). Protestant was the predominant religion (for 56.4 percent of the sample) and Democrat was the most frequent political party preference reported (31.8 percent of the sample).

Before entering the Army 38.2 percent of the sample worked as a laborer and 27.1 percent attended school. The sample was 44.7 percent infantry and the remainder were support personnel.

The composite saw himself as an "average" reader both in civilian and Army life (58.8 and 57.6 percent of the sample responses). Newspapers and magazines were regularly available in his civilian home (81.2 and 76.4 percent of the sample so reported). He regularly read newspapers (70.6 percent of the sample), magazines (87.1 percent), and ten or more books per year (30.6 percent of sample) while in the Army at the time of the study. Both television (62.4 percent) and a stereo (72.9 percent) were found in his barracks room.
He most trusted a non-commissioned officer in his company (23.5 percent of responses) and somewhat trusted the soldiers in his company (10.6 percent of responses). Least trusted by him was an NCO in his company (16.5 percent of responses) as well as a soldier (peer) outside his company (10.6 percent of responses).

Tests of Sample Validity

Chi square tests compared the study sample with a current Army profile of soldiers with less than three years' service to see how well this study's sample matches the Army population.3 (See Table 1 at page 51.)

1. Sex. No significant difference was found between the 1981 Army profile and the study sample.

2. Race. No significant differences were found between the 1981 study sample and the current Army profile.

3. Education. Significant difference was found between the 1981 study sample and the current Army profile. It was noted that the Army profile showed 16 percent had less than a high school level education compared to the study sample's 34.1 percent. The Army showed the high school level at 73.1 compared to the 1981 study showing of 55.3 percent. And in the "some college" category, the Army had 9.2 to the study's 8.2.

---

3 Ibid., p. 135.
The study showed 2.4 percent with college degrees to the Army's 1.7 percent.

To check for changes between 1973 and 1981, chi square tests were made between observed and expected frequencies on race and education. There was no significant findings based on education. Significance at the 0.010 level was found for race. It was noted that blacks increased from 12.7 percent for the 1973 Fort Ord profile to 37.7 percent in the 1981 study, while whites decreased from 77.3 percent in 1973 to 55.2 percent in 1981.

A Finding Compared to an Expectation, Education Levels

It was expected that educational levels would have dropped significantly between the 1973 study and this study because of lowered enlistment standards to meet the pressures of all-volunteer recruitment. The data revealed less than expected changes. For the 1973 and 1981 samples, there was no significant difference between any of the education level comparisons. The high school level between 1973 and 1981 increased by 4.8 percent, the less than high school

---

level increased by 1.7 percent, and college study decreased by 4.5 percent.

**Other Comparisons**

A change was noted in racial mix as described in the sample validity section and summarized in Table 1, page 51. A 64.6 percent gap existed between whites and blacks in the 1973 study. In 1981 the sample gap between blacks and whites had shrunk to 12.93 percent.

**Breakdown of Sample by Time-in-Service and by Source Acceptance**

Thirty-four respondents had less than one-year service. This group, summarized in Figure 1, page 56, accepted official face-to-face statements sources by 32.4 percent compared to non-acceptance by 5.9 percent. It rejected official media statements by 23.5 percent to 2.94 percent. Peer statements were rejected 14.7 to 11.76 percent, and non-peer statements were accepted 8.82 to 5.88 percent.

Fifty-one respondents had at least one but less than three years of service. This group rejected official face-to-face 18.9 to 15.9 percent. It rejected media 29.54 to 2.72 percent. Peer was accepted 31.81 to 9.1 percent. Non-peer was accepted 11.36 to 6.9 percent.
level increased by 1.7 percent, and college study decreased by 4.5 percent.
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Figure 1. A Bar Graph Representation of the Relative Acceptance and Non-Acceptance of the Sixty Q-Statements Sorted According to Source, as Accounted For By Time-in-Service.
Respondents with at least two years but less than three years of service. This group constituted only seven subjects. Though their number failed to provide significant expected frequencies, they did tend to provide some indication of linear tendencies toward acceptance of unofficial sources. This category was added to the more than one year category and is part of the 51 soldier sample in this category.

Frequency Distributions on The Q-Statements

The statements were collected from four sources as described on page 34. The official statements, face-to-face, media--official and unofficial statements, peer, and non-peer were so defined and sampled so that the respondents' sortings would provide self-referent indications of their relative orientations toward the various sources as a means to test the hypotheses.5

The Q-statements are in Appendix A.

The sorted Q-decks were forced by the researcher into value rankings from one to nine with the number five representing neutral or no opinion. The two most-believed statements in each deck were valued one; the next five most-believed statements were assigned the number two; the next six became three; the next nine

became four; sixteen cards in the center became five; and then downward to a value of nine for the last two (least-believed) cards.

After forcing, the decks were restacked from one to sixty as identified by their original number, and placed on computer cards in "fixed field" format with one variable (statement) to a column. Frequency distribution, as summarized in Table Two on page 59, for the total sample showed a median of 4.937.

The sample median rating for the twenty-nine official statements was slightly nearer neutral at 4.970. The two official statement subgroups obtained the highest and lowest respective ratings in the study. Face-to-face obtained a median score of 4.754 and media received a negative (non-accepted) score of 5.172.

The average median score for the thirty-one unofficial statements was 4.906 with the subgroups obtaining 4.859 for peer group and 4.940 for non-peer group statements. This was to be expected because the forced sort dictated a normative distribution curve as appears on Figure 2, page 60.

The frequency distributions reflected a slight tendency to accept both official and unofficial

---

6 The median score is used as a measure of central tendency on the Q-deck statements because distribution on one or more of the measurements was extremely skewed, thus tending to pull the mean score away from the point where the scores cluster making it less descriptive.
information sources, with a narrow edge of .06 percent shown in favor of unofficial sources.

Table 2

Average of Mean Responses to Sixty Statements Divided into Group and Subgroup Sources of Information (1 = High Acceptability and 9 = high Rejection)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Group (29 Statements)</th>
<th>Unofficial Group (31 Statements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Sub-Group</td>
<td>Media Sub-Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Sub-Group Mean</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Sub-Group Mean</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Sub-Group</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Sub-Group Mean</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Peer Sub-Group</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean = 5.08</td>
<td>Group Mean = 4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Mean = 4.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((t\text{ for official and unofficial group } = 1.209, \text{ df } = 83, \text{ } p > .010)\)\(^b\)

\(^a\)From frequency tables produced by SAS.

\(^b\)See Appendix D for t-test results.

Eleven (61 percent) of the eighteen non-peer group statements and six (46.15 percent) peer group statements were placed in the most-believed category.

Twelve (41.37 percent) of the twenty-nine official statements were placed in the most-believed category.
Figure 2. A Representation of the Cumulative Values Given Each of Sixty Q-Statements When Forced into Value on a One-to-Nine Scale According to Their Sorting by Eighty-five Respondents.\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a}Mean score range obtained by statements obtaining each value.

\textsuperscript{b}From Frequency Distributions.
The most believed official statements were:
sub-category face-to-face--13, 18, 26, 29, 38, 39, 45,
49 and 56, and sub-category media--21, 35 and 44.

Median scores for the groups and sub-groups
of sources were: official (29 statements) 4.97 and
unofficial (31 statements) 4.90, placing both categories
of sources in the believed category. However, when the
categories official and unofficial were broken down into
sub-cATEGORIES of face-to-face, media, peer and non-peer,
the findings were mixed and ranged further from the
center because the sub-group mean scores for face-to-face
and media ranged from accepted to rejected. In
descending order of acceptance, the sub-group mean scores
were: face-to-face--4.89, peer--4.89, non-peer--4.93,
and media--5.28.

One-tailed t-test of the mean scores of official
(5.08) and unofficial (4.91), shown in Table 2, at page
59, yielded a significant difference greater than .010.

T-tests of official and unofficial sources over-
time yielded no significant differences. These t-tests
are summarized in Appendix D.

Analysis of Variance

Analysis of variance to compare the between-group
variances to the within-group variance were run to test
the null hypotheses\textsuperscript{7} that no higher significant level of acceptance would be found for unofficial statements than would be found for official statements among soldiers in their first three years of U.S. Army'\textquoteleft enlisted service, and that no significance in this direction would be found based on how long the soldier had been in the Army. Findings were:

1. There was a significant difference in responses according to whether statements were from unofficial or official sources. Official source, face-to-face and unofficial sources peer group and non-peer group showed slight acceptance with differences between them ranging only .036 on mean scores. Media was significantly different from the other sources with a mean score of 5.28 on the non-acceptance side.

2. There was no significant difference in responses according to how long the respondents had been in the Army.

Analysis of variance was also run on the statement sub-groups, face-to-face, media, peer and non-peer, by the independent variables sex, education, race and reading habits to seek clarification of tendencies indicated by examination of frequencies and cross-tabulations toward acceptance of personalized

\textsuperscript{7}Isaac, op. cit., p. 116.
information sources and media statement rejection. For these procedures summarized in Table 3, below, the five most extremely rated accepted statements and three most extreme non-accepted statements were used. These extreme statements will be described and commented on later in this chapter.

Table 3

Levels of Degree of Difference of Source Groups by Sex, Time-in-Service, Race, Newspaper Reading and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Face-to-Face (M=4.89)</th>
<th>Media (M=5.28)</th>
<th>Peer (M=4.89)</th>
<th>Non-Peer (M=4.93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>F=.024</td>
<td>F=6.60</td>
<td>F=.01</td>
<td>F=2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = n.s.</td>
<td>p&gt;.0120</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-in-Service</strong></td>
<td>F=.92</td>
<td>F=1.14</td>
<td>F=1.01</td>
<td>F=.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p = n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>F=1.04</td>
<td>F=1.54</td>
<td>F=1.57</td>
<td>F=.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspaper Reading</strong></td>
<td>F=.28</td>
<td>F=1.48</td>
<td>F=1.01</td>
<td>F=.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habits</strong></td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>F=.33</td>
<td>F=1.90</td>
<td>F=.25</td>
<td>F=.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p&gt;.090</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
<td>p=n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sex by Media showed significance > .012)

aThis table represents the degrees of difference found by the analysis of Variance procedure.
Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis Findings

Demographic Items One through Twenty-seven and the sixty Q-statements were processed by the SAS system for factor analysis. The procedure provided five factors shown in Table 4, pp. 65-66, with somewhat strong loadings of plus or minus .3 or stronger to make them appear worthy of labeling and comment.

The five factors generally described, by varying degrees, five types of respondents who tended to pull away from the mold or norm in the sample, and were labeled as follows:

Factor one: "alienated from peers". This factor was identified by positive loadings for Army occupation (.50853), education (.33031), and parents' income (.32298). These loadings suggest that as Army occupation moves from combat toward support, and as education level rises, the respondents tend to have less trust in their peers.

This factor had statement loadings as follows: They loaded negatively "not moving to Erwin" (-.41710), "weapon responsibility" (-.41500), "that KFO Radio is OK" (-.43851), "that young soldiers will function well

---

Table 4
Rotated Factor Matrix Loadings Indicating Factor Relationships of Reactions of Information Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Distrustful of Peers</th>
<th>Pro-Chain of Command</th>
<th>Media Oriented Secure</th>
<th>(System) Army Oriented</th>
<th>Non-peer Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official Loadings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No to Erwin</td>
<td>-.41710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Recruiter OK</td>
<td>.32187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. No Swim</td>
<td>-.37402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Crime Same</td>
<td>-.41500</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Weapon Care</td>
<td>-.41500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. General Praise</td>
<td>-.44346</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Rights</td>
<td>-.44346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. KF0 OK</td>
<td>-.43815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Army Cares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Rank Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.33371</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Bucky Bayonet/Facts</td>
<td>-.52591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Soldier OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Unit Cares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Money Manage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. 15's Forgiven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Stereo Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. AER Helps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Help with Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unofficial Loadings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Barrack Rats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.45943</td>
<td>-.38262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Distrustful of Peers</td>
<td>Pro-Chain of Command</td>
<td>Media Oriented Secure</td>
<td>(System) Army Oriented</td>
<td>Non-peer Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unofficial Loadings (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PX Prices</td>
<td>.30596</td>
<td>.39219</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Move to Erwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Joined for Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rape Danger</td>
<td>-.50236</td>
<td>-.39527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. &quot;Fox&quot; No Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Robbery Fear</td>
<td>-.52412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Few on Food Stamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Leaders Listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Crime Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Easy on Female</td>
<td>.31930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Leaders Tied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Soldier Dumb</td>
<td>.42366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Cannot Walk</td>
<td>.46801</td>
<td>-.31863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.47422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Race Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Area Expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Be Heard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with good leadership" (-.52591), and "my unit will help with ed" (-.37580).

These loadings indicate that acceptance of these statements decreases as respondents identify with this factor based on education and Army job. Positive loadings were found for "today's soldier is not smart enough" (.42366) for "Article 15's are forgiven" (.40892), and "recruiters can be trusted" (.32187). These three loadings compliment the negative loading on "soldier is not smart," and indicate a factor tendency to be pro-Army authority.

This factor indicates that as education level rises among support soldiers, they tend to believe leaders, trust recruiters and strongly mistrust peer capabilities possibly because of decreased identification with less educated peers. It tends to be oriented toward official sources of information.

**Factor two: pro-chain of command.** This factor loaded strong on demographics, number of children (.44483), hometown population (.49511), and religious preference (.48474). It also loaded stronger for magazines in home (.47157), and newspapers in home (.46321). However, the "reading habits" items' value ratings were not progressive, compromising the loading indications. It also loaded somewhat strong on four demographics: stereo in room (.36245), civilian
occupation (.35307), choice of leisure site away from the post (.32955), and race.

These loadings indicated that the more one's number of children increase, the larger one's hometown population, and as one's race tended to move from Black toward White and other, the more one would have the following tendencies: To believe the unit will help one get more education (.36710), and to disbelieve that PX raises prices ahead of pay raises (-.30596), that one "cannot walk alone" (-.31863) and that NCO's can wear shoulderboards (-.33371).

This factor tended to trust officials and disbelieve peers, and reflected non-awareness of widely-publicized media content.

Factor three, media oriented. This factor lacked adequate demographic indicators. It loaded high only on region of country (.47745), suggesting that as respondents tended to move from east to west, reliance on media increased. This factor loaded strong on media statements, "crime about the same" (.40886), and a "general praises the soldiers" (.47301). It had negative loadings for peer, "one is likely to get robbed" (-.52412) and for non-peer, "crime is up" (-.41810) and "women are likely to get raped" (-.50236): suggesting that as respondents moved West they had more
media acceptance and seemed to feel more secure from violence and crime. It seemed aware of media content.

**Factor four: system-oriented.** This factor loaded on political party (.30640), "stereos are a problem" (.51833), "Army takes care of the soldier" (-.58543), "AER helps" (.35948), the "Foxhole is no good" (.31197), and "soldiers will be listened to" (.32496). These loadings indicate that as one moves away from the democratic party toward no political preference, he will be more conservative in his recreation and more trusting of the Army. Negative loadings for "recruiters must trick" (-.45943), "few are on food stamps" (-.37123) and "women stand a good chance of getting raped" (-.37123) indicate that as respondents matched this element, they tended to trust recruiters, believe many in the Army are on food stamps and that women are safe. This factor indicated an element strongly oriented toward acceptance of the Army's official sources.

**Factor five, labeled non-peer-oriented.** Strong loadings on demographics, "race" (.35896), "age" (-.41052), "rank" (.38263), and "Army occupation" (.33442) indicated that one who tended to be white or other, young, of higher rank and in a support job would be somewhat non-peer-oriented as reflected by loadings for statements, "leaders' hands are tied" (.40525) and "area is too expensive" (.36641). This element
was loaded negative on the media statement, "Bucky Bayonet is OK" (-.31218). It also tended to reject "racial tensions are low" (-.47422); suggesting mistrust of "Bucky Bayonet" and a feeling of racial tension in this type respondent. This was the weakest of the five factors.

Cross-Tabulations

Cross-tabulations by time-in-service vs. the statement sub-groups face-to-face, media, peer and non-peer were used to provide chi-square tests of the hypotheses. In preparing for this procedure, the sixty Q-statements were stacked to create four variables, each containing all the statements from one of the statement sub-groups. It was found that several cells in every cross-tabulation table had unacceptable theoretical frequencies. The tables for time-in-service by the four sub-groups were collapsed to 2x3 tables with the following results. (See Appendix C, page for these tables.)

1. Time-in-service by official face-to-face showed no significant relationship between time-in-service and acceptance or rejection of this sub-group.

\(^9\)Isaac, op. cit., p. 121.


\(^{11}\)Isaac, op. cit., p. 135.
2. Time-in-service by official media was found to be significant at probability = 0.020. This finding complimented tendencies noted in analysis of variance and frequencies.

3. Time-in-service by peer (unofficial), though collapsed as far as it could be and still have potential utility for this study, continued to have cells with expected frequencies less than five. A compromised probability = 0.05 was found. (See Table 5, below.

Table 5
Cross-Tabulation by Time-in-Service of Percentage of Individuals Placing Official and Unofficial Statements in the Twenty-Nine "Believed" Category of Sixty Q-Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-in-Service</th>
<th>Official Sources</th>
<th>Unofficial Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (\bar{x})</td>
<td>38.23%</td>
<td>20.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 Year</td>
<td>25.52%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (\bar{x})</td>
<td>13.72%</td>
<td>37.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2\) (Group \(\bar{x}\) matrix) = 3.4, df = 1, \(p = 0.05\)

(This suggests a significant dependency of sources on time-in-service) with dominance by official face-to-face sources.)
The percentage in Table 5 does not equal 100% for the time categories because certain percentages of individuals appeared in the neutral or no opinion category.

4. Time-in-service by non-peer had a significant finding probability = 0.011, but was compromised with four of six cells having expected frequencies less than five.

A cross-tabulation on the "believed" statements by time-in-service collapsed into two statements groups, official and unofficial, provided a 2x2 table and the finding that there was no significant relationship between time-in-service and acceptance of official and unofficial statements. However, the probability level appeared to have mathematical significance in that the chi square equaled 3.4 and probability = 0.05 would have been found with a chi square of 3.84. This finding suggested a trend based on time in service toward acceptance of official face-to-face and unofficial peer statements.

General Search by Cross-Tabulation

Additional cross-tabulations were run to help describe the sample and the tendencies to respond to the statements based on sex, race, education, and Army occupation. The sex by statement sub-groups indicated that males somewhat preferred face-to-face by 22.76
percent compared to rejection by 17.33 percent of males. Males rejected media statements. Females rejected media statements and tended to prefer peer and non-peer statements (they accepted both unofficial sources by 20 percent).

The education by statements sub-groups showed a tendency toward face-to-face, peer and non-peer statements with increase in level of education from less than high school to high school. Only those with less than a high school education showed any acceptance of media statements.

A strong tendency was shown to respond based on race membership to statements about the quality of the soldier. Black and other minorities strongly accepted statements appearing complimentary of the soldier and rejected statements reflecting negatively on the soldier. Whites tended toward neutrality on these statements.

**Extreme Rates Statements**

Eight statements were given extreme ratings, five of which were accepted and three rejected. The extreme statements were:

**Believed.**

Q-2. Recruiters trick people . . .

Q-4. PX prices rise ahead of pay raises

Q-18. Weapon responsibility is the soldier's
Q-38. Young soldier will do well with good leaders.

Q-54. Area is too expensive

Disbelieved or rejected.

Q-11. Recruiters can be trusted

Q-30. The Army takes care of the soldier

Q-40. The young soldier is not smart enough

Believed statement two. This statement was accepted by 75 percent of the more-than-one-year groups and 70 percent of the less-than-one-year group. Seventy-seven percent of high school graduates believed this statement. Blacks accepted it by 72 percent, other minorities accepted by 80 percent but Whites by only 22 percent. Belief in this statement tended to increase with newspaper reading. Eighty percent of regular readers of two or more newspapers, 71 percent of regular readers of one newspaper and 69 percent of non-readers accepted this statement.

Believed statement four. "PX prices rise ahead of pay raises," was most believed by 75 percent of first-year respondents, by 66 percent of those with less than high school (66 percent), by 72 percent of Blacks, and 80 percent of other minorities. Whites accepted it by 53 percent.
Believed statement eighteen. "Weapon responsibility" showed up as a truism or consensus in all cells. Belief in this statement showed linear increase with education level. Less than HS accepted by 66 percent; HS by 77 percent and college by 78 percent. Here, too, the minority element appeared. Minorities, as a group, accepted this statement by 76 percent compared to Whites who accepted it by 65 percent. Reading habits showed no pattern in relation to this statement.

Believed statement thirty-eight. "Young soldiers will do well with good leaders" was rated highest or equal to the highest of all statements by every statistical method used. A linear tendency to accept this statement increased with time in service, first year accepted by 71 percent, second year accepted by 73 percent, and third year accepted by 86 percent. The linear relation also showed up with education, less than HS by 62 percent, HS by 79 percent, and college by 89 percent. Ninety-four percent of Blacks believed this statement compared to 70 percent each for Whites, and other minorities were equal. No pattern appeared based on reading habits, but readers of two or more newspapers stood out by twenty-five percent at 85 percent over all others.

First-year respondents believed it least (at 53 percent). Education, with a range of 57-78 percent, showed no pattern. Race ranged from 56 to 65 percent with no pattern. Reading habits showed no influence on how people rated this statement.

Disbelieved statement eleven. "Recruiters can be trusted" was somewhat disbelieved by 61 percent of first and second-year categories, but disbelieved by just 14 percent by third-year respondents. A clear linear tendency toward disbelief appeared as education increased, less than HS disbelieved by 48 percent; HS by 61 percent; and college by 78 percent. Whites strongly disbelieved by 81 percent, but Blacks and other minorities disbelieved by only somewhat 53 and 50 percent, respectively. Sixty-seven percent of non-readers disbelieved compared to 51 percent and 58 percent of the reading cell frequencies.

Disbelieved statement thirty. "The Army takes care of the soldier," showed a linear pattern toward stronger disbelief for education (less than HS, 51 percent; HS, 64 percent; and college, 67 percent). Minorities disbelieved more than Whites (Black, 59 percent; other, 70 percent; and Whites, 50 percent). Heavy readers disbelieved strongest in the reading cells (73 percent to 51 percent and 54 percent).
Disbelieved statement forty. "The young soldier is not smart enough," seemed the most disbelieved statement in the Q-deck. Time-in-service showed no pattern. Education showed a slight linear tendency (less than HS, 54 percent; HS, 66 percent; and college, 67 percent). Blacks more strongly disbelieved than did Whites and others (69 percent to Whites and others, 60 percent each). Disbelief appeared to increase with the amount of newspaper reading (non-reader, 58 percent; light reader, 60 percent; and heavy reader, 77 percent).

"Extreme" statement topics. The five most and three least-believed statements dealt directly with just three topics (not counting the neutral consensus statement (18) dealing with weapon responsibility). The topics were:

1. Quality of the young soldier (38 and 40)
2. Recruiter credibility (2 and 11)
3. Personal and economic security (4, 30 and 54)

One might assume that the quality of the All-Volunteer Army was an indirect subject because Statement Two was double-barreled; recruiters need to make the All-Volunteer Army appear successful.

Discussion

A recurring trend in the various procedures run on the data was the non-acceptance of media. Items
Twenty-three and Twenty-four of the questionnaire asked for the names of newspapers and magazines read by the respondents. The responses are summarized in Table 6, below. From the total, sample official media sources were named fifteen times, compared to the similar sized 1973 sample of basic trainees who listed these sources one hundred and eight times. This finding complimented the findings discussed earlier of rejection, non-use and unfamiliarity with the official media sources.

Table 6

Comparison of 1981 Study and 1973 Study of Reported Regular Usage of Official Mediaa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Listed by Respondents</th>
<th>1981 Study</th>
<th>1973 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army Times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama (Post Newspaper)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFO/Show Road (Post station)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers Magazine (Official for Soldiers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Bulletin (has Official Section)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe total responses indicate the differences in the reported reading habits (official media) of the two groups. An individual may have reacted to one, all or none of the media. Media available in one study period and not available in the other were included under "Other".
The Possibility of Uncontrolled Variables

The indications of the Q-deck sortings toward topics' consistency (as on recruiting and quality of the soldier) raised the possibility that topic of the statements may have acted as uncontrolled variables influencing how the statements were sorted. For example, seventeen topics were directly dealt with in the Q-deck as shown in Figure 3, pp. 80-81. Examination of the five extremely accepted and three extremely rejected statements, discussed on pages 73-77, revealed that just three topics were involved, not counting the consensus statement about weapons responsibility.

Strong rejection of media statements raised concern about the possibility of another uncontrolled variable. Thirty-two respondents reported use of obviously media-oriented publications. For the most part, these were unofficial media. The respondents reported use of official media only fifteen times compared to the 1973 study which had one-hundred and five reported uses of official media. The question arose, did statements from media sources carry with them some unsuspected identifier such as style which led to their general rejection by the respondents?

Summary

A profile of the sample constructed from frequency distributions was compared to 1981 Army
TOPICS OF STRONGEST OPINION--Figure 3.

Quality of Soldier:  Believe = 38 = Soldier OK with good leaders.
 = 35 = Basic too easy to prepare soldier.
 = 6 = Many joined for job.
 Disbelieve = 40 = Soldier not smart enough.

Quality of Army Life: Belive = 49 = Loud stereos is a problem.
 = 26 = Soldier has right to see I.G./Chaplain.
 Disbelieve = 20 = Foxhole a good place to relax.
 = 48 = Article 15's are "forgiven".

Financial/Economic:  Believe = 45 = Soldier with family can make it with money management.
 = 54 = Area too expensive for E-2-3 to have family.
 = 4 = P.X. & civilian prices rise ahead of pay.
 = 6 = Joined for job (repeat).

Recruiting (AVA):  Believe = 2 = Recruiter must trick to make AVA appear OK.
 Disbelieve = 11 = Recruiters can be trusted.

Security:  Believe = 23 = Robber very likely in certain areas of Seaside.
 Disbelieve = 41 = Post should be closed for safety.

Education:  Believe = 9 = Unit makes it hard for a soldier to get education because of higher I.Q.'s.
 Disbelieve = 60 = Soldiers are given every opportunity for education.
 = 50 = Army does not care to help and improve I.T.

Women in Army:  Believe = 32 = Male leaders often make it easier for women by giving dirty jobs to men.
 = 37 = Women must work harder than men to get ahead.
Figure 3 (Continued)

Leadership Quality:  No Believers
Disbelieve = 48 = Article 15's never are forgiven.
= 27 = Leaders will listen to me.
= 34 = Leaders' hands tied in dealing with discipline.

Rules:
Believe = 18 = Soldier responsible for weapon.
Disbelieve = 42 = Can't mark personal property with S.S.#.
= 43 = Can't walk alone at night.

Figure 3. Showing by Topics How the Sixty Statements Which Obtained the Highest Ratings were Sorted by Eighty-five Respondents.
statistics on the basis of race, sex, and educational level. The comparison was compatible except for differences in education levels. The profile was compared to a 1973 Fort Ord, California, profile to see what changes have occurred. Frequencies findings indicated continuing tendencies toward all sources except media.

Analysis of variance showed a significant difference in acceptance of official and unofficial information sources by the respondents. It showed no significant differences based on how long the respondents had been in the Army. It was found that the difference on analysis of variance was that face-to-face, peer and non-peer sources were about equally accepted and media sources were clearly rejected.

Varimax Factor rotation provided five factors with sufficient loadings to support comment and labeling. These factors indicated tendencies on the part of respondents based on background identifiers to have identifiable source orientations which tended to pull away from the sample norm.

Other observations included changes noted in the education level and racial mix since 1973, linear tendencies to accept and reject information sources along racial lines and according to newspaper reading habits. A tendency to reject media statements was found by every procedure applied to the data.
The Questionnaire and Q-deck elicited the types of information necessary for testing the hypotheses and provided demographics to compare to the general Army population of enlisted soldiers with less than three years service, to the 1973 profile to see what changes have occurred, and to indicate current channel usage. Weaknesses in the instrument were noted, and the possibility of two uncontrolled variables was raised.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The United States Army as well as all the armed forces, has gone through a period of tremendous change and testing during the past eight to ten years. It has been credited with defeat in Vietnam, shifted from an organization manned mainly by White males to one with drastically increasing percentages of minorities and females. And its leaders have had to become more and more like managers than like commanders, with consequently increasing amounts of time needed for communication with the soldier being consumed by concerns such as management by objective and zero balance budgets. During all this change, increasing expressions of alienation have been heard from the ranks.

Many career soldiers feel that much of what appears wrong with the Army can be traced to failures in its communicative efforts and systems. It has been suggested that as soldiers move from basic training to their first duty station "the bottom drops out of morale," suggesting a failure on the part of the organization to reach them with its acceptance and motivational messages.
Restatement of the Problem

This study is concerned with whether the Army's communication efforts are taking best advantages of the channels of communication available to it, and with what effect the various channels of communication have on the soldier with less than three years of service. The study has sought to identify channels the soldiers most rely on and tune in to. A 1973 study by Q-sort and questionnaire was replicated in order to determine changes and see what current channel usage is.

The Hypotheses

a. Significantly more acceptance will be found for unofficial (informal) than for official (formal) information sources among soldiers in the first three years of U.S. Army enlisted service.

b. Significantly more acceptance will be found for unofficial (informal) than for official (formal) information sources among soldiers in the later stages than among those in the earlier stages of the first three years of Army service.

Delimitations

Communication is a complex process with so many variables that, in the words of William Stephenson, in order to take them all into account, "One might wait
for the millennium before giving birth to a theory of communication. . ."¹

This thesis attempted to isolate and test the degree to which soldiers agree with information coming to them from official and unofficial information sources via the sub-group channels face-to-face (official), media (official), peer group (unofficial), and non-peer group (unofficial). There was no intention to study or evaluate the elements of credibility within those sources.

The design of this study relied heavily on a 1973 study done by Major--now Lieutenant Colonel--Thomas Kallunki for a Brigham Young University Masters thesis.² The data was gathered from eighty-five soldiers with less than three years of service at Fort Ord, California, on 27, 28 April 1981, using a 60 statement Q-deck and questionnaire.

The data was processed by the Statistics Analysis System (SAS), a system used at Brigham Young University, to provide frequencies, analysis of variance, factor analysis and cross-tabulations for interpreting the data.


In addition, some table collapsing, t-test and chi-square tests were performed using a hand computer.

Conclusions

It is concluded that the finding outlined in Chapter 4 of this study do not allow acceptance of the hypotheses. The author believes that source was not significant in determining how the respondents rated the Q-statements.

The significant difference for the statement subgroups, face-to-face, media, peer and non-peer, is explained by the finding that three of the sources clustered according to their mean scores within .04 of each other in the believed category with the non-peer group exactly on the sample mean at 4.93. By comparison, the media category's mean score placed it .24 from the sample mean score and .17 degrees into the rejected category.

Though the hypotheses could not be accepted, findings of linear tendencies based on sex and education and race were noted. Also noted were a significant decrease in official media usage between the 1973 and 1981 study samples, and a tendency to believe all but media source statements with a preference for personalized sources. These findings will be discussed later in the chapter.
Sample validity. The sample appeared to fairly represent soldiers in the Army with less than three years of service on the variables of race and sex. The variable for education reflected a significant difference which can be explained by consideration of the organization type from which the sample was taken and by attrition figures.

Validity for generalizations. The sample appears to be a sufficiently fair representation of the population to allow confidence in generalizations about the Fort Ord soldiers with less than three years and of other units with similar education levels. Further testing of assumptions about education levels in specialized (e.g., Intelligence and such) units as compared to combat divisions is necessary before confidence can be placed in generalizations about tendencies across the Army population of soldiers with less than three years' service.

Generalizations

The following trends are reflected in the data:

1. A linear tendency to show increasing acceptance of personalized information channels (face-to-face and peer group) as time in service increases.
2. A strong tendency to show non-acceptance for media statements regardless of sex, education, Army job or time in the service.

3. There is a tendency for elements within the population to pull away from the norm in acceptance and non-acceptance of information sources based on region of the country from which soldiers come, age, rank, type of Army job, number of children (perhaps, reflecting increased social responsibility), race and reading habits. As an example, as the soldier tends to come from the more western parts of the country, acceptance for the media increases.

4. Official media usage has dramatically decreased from the low usage level reported in the 1973 study. Its usage is almost negligible.

5. Race and minority membership tends to influence acceptance of statements reflecting on the quality of the soldier with a positive linear correlation to minority membership.

6. A linear tendency exists to reject official statements based on education and reading. As education level and reading of newspapers increases, so does rejection.

7. Soldiers with less than one year of service tend to favor face-to-face and non-peer sources, and soldiers with more than one year tend to favor peer and non-peer or unofficial sources.
Weaknesses in the Study

While the instrument and methodology accomplished the purpose of obtaining adequate data to test the hypotheses and give a profile of the sample for validation and comparisons, some weaknesses were noted before, during and after the data was collected.

Discovered too late for substitution in the questionnaire were weaknesses in wording, phrasing and structure of some demographic items. For example, age was called for by three-year categories as opposed to the more meaningful year-of-age, and an item intended to elicit identification of information diffusion patterns asked for a list of rather than the name of key persons and for sources rather than people. Consequently, some hoped-for information was not available. Items 21 (leisure activity), 32 (list... information source), 36 and 37 (topic of conversation with leader) and 38 (last person to pass on important information) were omitted from analysis because they provided little or no meaningful data.

Potentially Uncontrolled Variables

There is concern that the style of media statements may have been transcribed from source to Q-deck resulting in their strong rejection by all categories of respondents. If this occurred, it could have caused false impressions about the relative acceptability of
media sources, though it would not apparently have altered the results sufficiently to permit acceptance of the hypotheses.

Another concern is about the influence of topics in the statements on how the respondents rated them. If the topic variable was as important as suspected, its control could have altered the findings significantly.

**Recommendations for Additional Study**

The following suggestions are provided as research ideas to improve on this study and to further examine the relative acceptability or effectiveness of official and unofficial information sources among soldiers:

1. In order to better control for the potential of topic as a significant variable, the Q-deck of future studies along the lines of this study should perhaps contain less emotionally loaded focus. More time would be necessary in order to collect statements with less emotional importance while retaining interest on the part of most soldiers.

2. To control for the possibility that media statements carried with them unexpected identifiers of style or some other ingredient which tended to cause respondents to reject them, such source statements might be altered from generalities such as "The Army takes care of the soldier" to specifics such as "In order to
replace broken glasses, all the soldier need do is report to the eye clinic."

3. To increase the generalizability of results, a new study would need to sample a broader cross-section of the Army population. It would be advisable to take small subject samples from several Army occupation groups and, perhaps, from several military installation types.

4. Additional study to isolate and identify the variables involved in the strong rejection of official media and the negligible usage of official media by soldiers seem to be of pressing importance.

_Considerations for Army Leaders_

Rejection of the media would appear to be based on the source rather than on the manner in which the statements were transcribed into the Q-deck when the general rejection by all categories of the sample is considered along with a comparison of the reported media usage by 1973 basic trainees and 1981 soldiers. It was noted, and summarized in Table 6, page 70, that the eighty-eight basic trainee respondents reported one-hundred and eight instances of official media usage compared to just fifteen reported instances by the eighty-five post-basic training soldiers.

Some possible reasons for the drastic drop in media usage following basic training include soldiers' tendency to develop interpersonal sources as they enter
ent assignments and to learn from experience to rely on face-to-face and unofficial sources. Another reason for the drop in media usage may be common perception of media sources as command controlled instruments.

Commanders and leaders in the Army might do well to place greater reliance on unofficial sources for getting information to soldiers, and on allowing more time for face-to-face interaction between leaders and subordinates.

Perhaps Army leaders should develop media source credibility in order to justify the resources applied to post newspapers, bulletins, soldiers and other media instruments available to assist in getting information to the soldier. One means of increasing official-appearing media credibility might be to allow it to handle more controversial material. This approach would probably lead toward perceptions by soldiers of the media as other than extensions of the commanders' will.

Summary

This study was concerned with the problem of whether the Army effectively utilizes the channels of communication available to it according to the acceptability of those channels by soldiers with less than three years Army service.
The sample appeared to match a 1981 Army profile sufficiently to justify generalizations about soldiers in similar types of Army units.

The hypotheses that significantly more acceptance would be found for unofficial than for official information sources among soldiers during their first three years of U.S. Army service, and that the significance would be more pronounced among soldiers in later stages than among those in earlier stages of the first three years of U.S. Army service, were not supported by the findings.

Factor analysis identified a tendency for elements within the sample to pull away from the norm in their source orientation based on demographics such as age, family situation, region of the country and education level.

Tendencies were discovered toward acceptance of all information sources except media, with preference shown for personalized sources. These findings suggest possibilities Army leaders might use to enhance communication efforts and indicate means by which future studies in this area might be improved.

Perhaps the most important finding in the study was the general trend to reject media by all categories of the sample.

If the media rejection trend is isolated to the Army, it has serious implications to commanders. If, as
is often the case, the sample mirrored trends in civilian life, the implications become much larger. In either case, it seems apparent that the findings of media rejection and negligible usage by soldiers with 'less than three years' active service need more attention by both commanders in the Army and researchers in the field of communications.
APPENDIX A

STATEMENTS

NOTE: 0 = Peer group statements
* = Non-peer unofficial statements
* = Face-to-face official statements
= Official appearing media statements
P = Positive or pro-statements
N = Neutral statements
C = Negative or con-statements

1. ON Soldiers mainly become barracks rats because they don't have "wheels".

2. OC Recruiters have to trick people into joining the combat arms because the pressure is on them to make the All-Volunteer Army look like it is working.

3. *P My company makes it fairly easy for a soldier to complete high school.

4. OC The PX and civilians raise prices just before each pay raise.

5. ON The 7th Infantry Division is moving to Fort Erwin.

6. *N Most people join the Army because they cannot get a job on the outside.

7. OC Lower ranking soldiers should not bring their families here because it costs too much.

8. *N The 7th Infantry Division is definitely not moving to Fort Erwin.

9. *C My unit makes it hard for a soldier to get additional schooling because higher headquarters gives us too much to do.

10. *C Most lower enlisted soldiers will not read "Troop Scoop" unless it is mandatory.

11. *P Recruiters can generally be relied on to treat potential recruits fairly and honestly.

13. **N** Soldiers can be given an Article 15 for swimming near the beaches at Fort Ord.

14. **C** The "Foxhole" is not worth going to because there is too much fighting there.

15. **P** "Bucky Bayonet" is on the side of the soldier and his family.

16. **N** The number of crimes being committed on post is about the same this year as it was last year.

17. **C** The country has done nothing to recognize the contribution of Vietnam veterans.

18. **N** Soldiers are always responsible for their weapon when it is out of the arms room.

19. **N** Many soldiers with families here are on food stamps.

20. **P** The "Foxhole" is a good place for a soldier to relax.

21. **P** The commanding general of American Troops in Germany recently said today's young soldier is fully capable of fighting using our complex weapons and equipment.

22. **P** The number of women in the Army is about right.

23. **C** A soldier is sure to be robbed if he or she walks alone at night in certain areas of Seaside.

24. **P** The Equal Opportunity Office has solved a lot of discrimination problems.

25. **N** Few, if any, soldiers at Fort Ord qualify for food stamps.

26. **N** A soldier has the right to see a chaplain or the IG at any time.

27. **P** I feel a soldier will usually be listened to by leaders in my unit if he or she wishes to give an opinion about how things are done.

28. **C** Crimes on post have increased about 80 percent in the last three months.

29. **P** Fort Ord's Radio Station KFO is a good source of news about things of interest to the soldier.
30. **P** The Army takes care of the soldier.

31. **N** Corporals and sergeants can now wear their rank on shoulder boards when wearing the grey-green shirt.

32. **N** Male Army leaders often make it easier for women by having men do the harder and dirtier jobs.

33. **P** "Bucky Bayonet" can be relied on to tell the facts, regardless of who does not like it.

34. **C** Army leaders usually have their hands tied by the system when they try to deal with disrespect and poor performance.

35. **C** Basic training was too easy to do the job of making soldiers ready for war.

36. **P** Profits from PX sales have been used to help build a vacation hotel in Hawaii just for military personnel and their families.

37. **C** Women soldiers have to work harder than males to get ahead.

38. **P** The young soldier today will perform well if he has good leadership.

39. **P** My unit may not always be successful in its attempts, but it tries to take care of the soldier's problems.

40. **C** The young soldier of today is just not smart enough to fight using our complex weapons and equipment.

41. **C** Fort Ord should be a closed post because people are not safe anymore.

42. **N** It is a violation of the Privacy Act to mark personal property with your social security number.

43. **C** Soldiers are not allowed to walk alone on or off post because of the threat of robbery and attack.

44. **C** The All-Volunteer Army is failing because enlisted standards have been lowered too much.
45. #P Anyone can make it here with a family if they manage their money right.

46. *P Racial tensions are low in my unit.

47. #N The American Heritage celebration last weekend did not replace other ethnic activities throughout the year. This means Martin Luther King activities and the like will still take place.

48. #P Article 15's are not held against a soldier once he finishes his punishment.

49. #C Loud stereos is a problem for a lot of soldiers living in the barracks.

50. @C The Army does not care about helping soldiers improve their GT scores.

51. @N The Fort Ord American Heritage celebrations last weekend will replace special events honoring ethnic groups throughout the year.

52. #P A test re-enlistment program makes it possible for a first-term re-upper to get up to $8,000 in educational benefits which can be used to send a child to school.

53. *C If we went to war, about half the lower ranking soldiers would go to Canada because they know evaders got away with it during the Vietnam War.

54. *C This area is too expensive for privates and E4's to live here with their families.

55. *C The "Foxhole" is taken over by Black soldiers.

56. #P AER assists all active duty and retired soldiers and their families in financial emergencies.

57. @C It is hard to get past the First Sergeant and Company Commander to see the chaplain.

58. @C Leadership is weak because officers and NCO's get promoted too fast.

59. @N I would rather have an officer listen to my opinions about how to do things than have one give me a compliment.

60. #P Soldiers in my unit are given every opportunity to take advantage of educational opportunities.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your sex? ___Male ___Female

2. How long have you been in the Army?
   ____Less than six months  ____18 months to 2 years
   ____Six months but less than ____Two years to
   one year  ____2-1/2 years
   ____One year to 18 months  ____2-1/2 to three years

3. What is your pay grade?
   ____Private E1  ____Private First Class E3
   ____Private E2  ____Specialist 4 or Corporal
   ____E5 or higher

4. What is your marital status?
   ____Single  ____Voluntarily Separated
   ____Married  ____Widow or widower
   ____Divorced  ____Remarried after divorce/widowhood

5. What is your age?
   ____17 to 20 years  ____23 to 26 years
   ____20 to 23 years  ____26 years or older

6. How much civilian education have you completed?
   ____Less than 9 years  ____Some college
   ____Between 9 and 12 ____Associate or technical
   years  ____degree
   ____High School or GED  ____Bachelors degree
   ____Graduate study

7. How many children do you have?
   ____No children  ____Three children
   ____One child  ____Four children
   ____Two children  ____Five or more children

8. What part of the country do you consider yourself to be from?
   ____Northeast  ____Southwest
   ____South East  ____Mountain states
   ____Mid America  ____Alaska or Hawaii
   ____Northwest  ____Other (Specify ________)

9. What racial group do you consider yourself to be a member of?
   ____Black  ____Oriental
   ____White  ____Other (Specify ________)
   ____American Indian
10. What is your religious preference?
   _Catholic
   _Non-Christian
   _Protestant
   _Jewish
   _Other Christian
   _Other (Explain ________)
   (What? ________)
   _No religious preference

11. What do you consider to be your political preference?
   _Democratic
   _Non-political
   _Republican
   _Other (Specify__________)
   _Libertarian

12. To the best of your knowledge, how much money did your parents earn per year at the time you entered the Army?
   _No income
   _At least $16,000.00 but
   _$8,000.00 or less
   _Less than $24,000.00
   _More than $8,000.00 but
   _$16,000.00
   _$24,000.00 but
   _$32,000.00 but
   _Less than $32,000.00 per
   _Do not know

13. What was your father's education level?
   _Less than nine years
   _Some college, but no
   _Between 9 and 12 years
   _High School or GED
   _Graduate
grade
   _Associate or technical
degree

14. What was your mother's education level?
   _Less than 9 years
   _Some college, but no degree
   _Between 9 and 12 years
   _High School or GED
   _Graduate
graduate
   _Associate or technical
degree

15. What was your occupation before entering the Army?
   _Student
   _Salaried, white collar
   _Self-employed, laborer
   _Self-employed, white collar
   _Salaried labor
   _Worked for commission
   _Unemployed
   _Other (Explain__________)

16. What is your primary job in the Army at this time?
   _Combat (infantry, mortar, etc.)
   _Clerical (personnel, finance, etc.)
   _Support (food service, medical, supply, driving)
   _Other (Specify__________)
17. How large, in population was the community you considered home before entering the Army?
   - Less than 10,000
   - 10,000 to 25,000
   - 25,000 to 50,000
   - 50,000 to 100,000
   - More than 100,000

18. How would you describe your reading habits before you entered the Army?
   - Above average
   - Average
   - Below average
   - Non-reader (did not choose to read)

19. How would you describe your reading habits now?
   - Above average
   - Average
   - Below average
   - Non-reader (Do not choose to read)

20. When you have free time, where do you prefer to be?
   - In the barracks
   - Elsewhere on post
   - Somewhere well away from the Monterey area
   - In a community near the post
   - Do not know

21. How many newspapers came regularly into your home during the last six months before you entered the Army?
   - One
   - Two or more
   - None
   - Do not know

22. How many magazines came regularly into your home during the last six months before you entered the Army?
   - One
   - Two or more
   - None

23. How many newspapers do you regularly read?
   - One
   - Two or more
   - None (If any, name one)

24. How many magazines do you regularly read?
   - One
   - Two or more
   - None (If any, name one)

25. Do you have an operational television set in your room?
   - Yes
   - No

26. Do you have an operational stereo in your room?
   - Yes
   - No
27. How many books have you read for pleasure during the past year?
   ___ One  ___ Ten or more
   ___ Two to 4  ___ None
   ___ Five to 10 (if any, give title of last one read ______________________)

28. Which of the following sources do you believe to be most reliable for important information affecting you and your unit?
   ___ An officer in your company
   ___ An NCO in your company
   ___ Someone else in your company
   ___ Bucky Bayonet
   ___ An officer outside of your company
   ___ An NCO outside of your company
   ___ A soldier outside your company
   ___ Other (Specify ______________________)

29. Of all sources mentioned above, or that you can think of at this time, list the one or two you trust the least ______________________
**APPENDIX C**

**REPRODUCTION OF CHI-SQUARE FINDINGS ON THE INFLUENCE OF SEX, RACE AND EDUCATION ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF Q-STATEMENTS**

### SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Army</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = .16, \ df = 1, \ p = \text{No Significance}) \)

### RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Army</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 2.58, \ df = 3, \ p = \text{No Significance}) \)

### EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Army</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 15.62, \ df = 4, \ p = .05) \)
APPENDIX D

T-TESTS FOR DIFFERENCES OF MEANS BETWEEN OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL STATEMENT RATINGS, AND RATINGS OVER TIME

1. OFFICIAL VS. OFFICIAL
   (Less than One Year by More Than One Year)
   \[ t = 0.9325, \text{df} = 83, p = \text{No Significance} \]

2. UNOFFICIAL VS. UNOFFICIAL
   (Less than One Year by More than One Year)
   \[ t = 0.6632, \text{df} = 83, p = \text{No Significance} \]

3. OFFICIAL VS. UNOFFICIAL
   (No Reference to Time)
   \[ t = 0.4911, \text{df} = 83, p = \text{No Significance} \]

A formula for t-test three above provided an example:

\[ t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sum X_2^2}{N_2}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sum X_2^2}{N_2}}} = \frac{5.06 - 4.91}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sum X_2^2}{N_2}}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sum X_2^2}{N_2}} \cdot \frac{86}{111.657 + 91.327} \cdot \frac{83}{111.657 + 91.327} \cdot 0.734 \]

\[ t = 0.3461 \]

\[ t = 0.4911 \]
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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to test the hypotheses that significantly more acceptance would be found for statements from unofficial than for official information sources among soldiers in the first three years of U.S. Army service, and that the significance would be more pronounced over time. Findings did not allow acceptance of the hypotheses.

The following trends were noted: (1) a linear tendency to show increasing acceptance of personalized sources over time; (2) a strong tendency to reject statements from media sources by all categories; (3) a tendency for elements in the group to pull away from the norm based on demographic responses; (4) a tendency for minority members to be more positive about the quality of the soldier; (5) a linear tendency to reject media official statements as education level and newspaper reading habits increase; and (6) soldiers in early stages of service tend to accept face-to-face and non-peer sources, and soldiers in later stages, peer and non-peer sources.
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