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This market research study was requested because the US Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) is interested in determining how the propensity to enlist in the Army varies over a 12-month period. Moreover, USAREC also wants to know more about high quality prospects. Specifically, USAREC wants to be able to identify and quantify among high quality prospects with a low propensity to contact an Army recruiting office (1) that segment of such prospects who are most susceptible to a favorable change in attitude, and (2) the characteristics/perceptions that differentiate this segment from those prospects with a high propensity to contact an Army recruiting office.
A total of 1,649 males between the ages of 17 and 22 were interviewed over a 12-month period. There were six independent waves of interviews. Controls were used to ensure that one-third of each wave included 20-year-olds to 22-year-olds who had no more than two years of college, and that approximately 10% of the interviews were with black prospects.

Intercept interviews were conducted at malls in 12 geographically dispersed markets, with an average of 275 interviews for each of the six waves. The interviews were conducted in the following cities:

Bridgeport, CT  Cleveland, OH  Houston, TX  
Boston, MA  Kansas City, KS  Denver, CO  
Syracuse, NY  Charleston, SC  Tucson, AZ  
Chicago, IL  Knoxville, TN  Los Angeles, CA

The dates of the six waves were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td>July 2, 3, 8</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>August 12, 13, 14</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>October 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4</td>
<td>December 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 5</td>
<td>April 21, 22, 23</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 6</td>
<td>June 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following shows the media schedule for the US Army advertising campaigns during this 12-month study period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 1985</td>
<td>End of Phase 1 of the &quot;New GI Bill&quot; Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 1985</td>
<td>End of Phase 2 TV commercials of the campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 1985</td>
<td>End of Phase 2 of the campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1985</td>
<td>2-month post-measurement of joint services campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 1986</td>
<td>2-month post-measurement of &quot;Operation Bold Bridge&quot; (2-year offer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1986</td>
<td>1-month transition to campaign emphasizing skill training, teamwork, and loyalty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS/IMPLICATIONS

Changes in Propensity Over Time

The propensity to enlist in the Army varied over the 12-month study period. The changes from July '85 to December '85 were not large enough to be statistically significant; if a regression line were fitted to the four 1985 observations, it would be horizontal, showing no change. However, the two measures taken in 1986 were significantly lower than the highs of 1985, and when all six measures are taken into account, there was a significant downward trend in this measure (propensity to enlist) over the 12-months.

Over the same 12-month period, the propensity to contact an Army recruiting office varied in almost the same way as the propensity to enlist, except the former had more staying power. The significant decline in the propensity to contact an Army recruiting office did not occur until June '86, two months after the decline in the propensity to enlist. This lag could be the result of the lesser commitment which this measure entails on the part of prospects.
The explanation for these changes could be seasonal rather than some other factor, such as advertising. However, the following findings suggest that both season and advertising might be affecting the two propensities:

1. The propensity to enlist was lowest in the first half of the calendar year and highest in the second half.

2. The three highest propensity scores for contacting an Army recruiting office coincided with the three highest top-of-mind awareness scores of Army TV advertising. The top-of-mind awareness score among prospects still in high school was at its lowest point in June '86, the same time both propensities were at their lowest levels.

3. The two highest propensity to enlist scores occurred right after the last "New GI Bill" TV commercials (August '85) and after two months of the joint services TV campaign (December '85). The lowest scores came after the campaign stressing the time commitment for the education benefit (April '86) and after one month of the campaign stressing training and loyalty (June '86).
4. Prospect perceptions of the Army experience changed in 1986 on several key service attributes, and all were unfavorable. One change related to the education benefit - there was less agreement on a three-year enlistment being worth the college benefit. The other changes related to self-development and training, which were more important than the education benefit to many prospects.

Increasing the Propensity to Contact a Recruiting Office Among High Quality Prospects

The size of the high quality segment was 71.5% of all male prospects. Of this segment, 15.2% had a high propensity to contact an Army recruiting office. The opportunity for increasing this high propensity is favorable, i.e.:

- 20.7% of all high quality male prospects are prime prospects for conversion from a low propensity to a high propensity, leaving a hard-core low propensity group of 64.1%.
- 4.7% of all high quality male prospects are potential defectors, i.e., likely to switch from a high propensity to a low propensity, leaving a hard-core high propensity group of 10.5%.

- The interaction of these segments among high quality prospects places the potential of a high propensity to contact a recruiting office in the range of 10.5% to 35.9%.

Factors that Will Affect Conversion

Although the Prime Prospect Group (20.7%) was similar in many ways to the Hard-Core High Propensity Group, there were key differences. For example:

- A greater proportion of the Prime Prospect Group was white (non-Hispanic).

- A majority of the Prime Prospect Group out of high school had full-time jobs.

- Significantly fewer of the Prime Prospect Group were likely to believe that three years of service were worth the education benefit.
The opportunity for promotion and advancement was a more important career goal to the Prime Prospect Group; challenging work and adventure were less important.

But the similarities between the two groups can be used to advantage:

- Both groups had the highest proportion of prospects under 19 and still in high school.

- Both groups had the highest proportion of Hispanics.

- Both groups looked for the same things in job satisfaction, but for the three exceptions mentioned earlier.

- Almost one-half of the Prime Prospect Group expressed only a moderately negative attitude toward contact ("probably would not").

The Potential Defector Group differed from the Hard-Core High Propensity Group, and many of the differences pose serious problems in minimizing attrition. For example:

- There was a much higher proportion of whites (non-Hispanics) and few minorities in the Potential Defector Group.
• The Potential Defector Group had a higher proportion of 19-year olds and older who were out of high school and had some college education.

• The Potential Defector Group had a significantly less favorable perception of the Army experience on all attributes, with the lowest score being on the Army offering the best education benefit.

• The Potential Defector Group was less likely to believe that Army TV commercials are informative.

• With regard to job satisfaction, the opportunity for promotion and advancement, having good supervisors, and job security, these factors were more important to the Potential Defector Group than travel, adventure, variety of duties, and having good people to work with.

• The propensity to enlist is significantly lower for the Potential Defector Group.
However, there were similarities between the Potential Defector Group and the Hard-Core High Propensity Group that can be built on. These included:

- Believability of Army advertising was the same for both groups.

- Regarding job satisfaction, both groups attached the same importance to having a good income, having a valuable skill or trade, retirement benefits, money for education, having the respect of others, challenging work, opportunity for self-improvement, and freedom to express one's opinion.

- Both groups had the same intensity on propensity to contact an Army recruiting office, i.e., same size of "definitely" and "probably will" groupings.
FINDINGS

SECTION 1 - VARIATION OVER TIME IN THE PROPENSITY TO ENLIST/CONTACT AN ARMY RECRUITING OFFICE

Propensity to Enlist
During the 12-month measurement period from July 1985 to June 1986, there was a significant unfavorable long-term trend on the measure of propensity to enlist. The highest scores ("definitely would" and "probably would" percentages combined) for this measure were in August '85 and December '85. These dates coincided with the end of Phase 2 TV commercials for the "New GI Bill" campaign and the 2-month post measurement of the joint services campaign. The two lowest points occurred in 1986, causing the unfavorable tilt of the regression line from a horizontal position in 1985 (figure 1).

On a wave-to-wave basis, the only significant change occurred in April '86. The 6-point decline from the preceding wave is significant at the .95 confidence level. Figure 2 shows that the nature of this shift was a "loss" in the less intense favorable propensity group ("probably would" enlist) with the compensating "gain" being in the more intense unfavorable propensity group ("definitely would not" enlist).
Figure 1. Likelihood of enlisting in the US Army among all male prospects (favorable intent)
Figure 2. Likelihood of enlisting in the US Army among all male prospects
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Propensity to Contact an Army Recruiting Office

Over the same 12-month period, a similar downward trend occurred on the propensity to contact an Army recruiting office. Unlike the propensity to enlist, the first significant change was with the last (sixth) wave (June '86), but it was large enough to tilt the regression line from a slightly favorable upward direction to an unfavorable direction (figure 3).

The unfavorable shift in June '86 was across all intensity groups except for the "definitely would not" contact group, where there was a compensating increase (figure 4).
Figure 3. Likelihood of contacting a US Army recruiting office among all male prospects

(favorable intent)
Figure 4. Likelihood of contacting an Army recruiting office among all male prospects
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Per cent of Total Male Prospects
Perceptions of the Army Experience

There were several significant unfavorable changes in prospect perceptions of the Army experience since the beginning of 1986 (figure 5). Two of these changes related to self-development/training and one related to the basic concept of the 1985 education benefit:

- challenges both the mind and body
- develop leadership skills
- worth three years to pay for college

Since the last wave (June '86), there were three more significant declines, with two again relating to self-development/training and one to the education benefit:

- great value in career development
- learn management skills
- Army has the best education benefit

As a result, not only has there been a failure to build on any of the three education "attributes," but the recent highs in April '86 on two of them are not being maintained and the one relating to the basic concept of the 1985
benefit (worth three years to pay for college) is now at an all-time low (20%). More importantly, the changes in perceptions of the Army related not only to the education benefit, but also to the concept of self-development/training. It cannot be determined from the changes in the Army's image since 1985 which type - education benefit or self-development/training - had the more unfavorable effect on overall propensities to enlist and contact a recruiting office.
Figure 5. Agreement with statements describing Army experience
("agree completely" ratings)

Challenges both mind and body
Work with high-tech equip.
Worth 3 yrs. to pay for college
Experience to be proud of
Develop high moral standards
Broaden civilian opportunities
Advantage over going to coll. from H.S.
Develop self-confidence
Develop into mature, prepared person
Service of great value in career devel.
Develop leadership skills
Army offers more job choices
Army has best educational benefit
Learn management skills

Percent of Total Male Prospects
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Top-of-Mind Awareness of Army TV Commercials

Figure 6 shows that top-of-mind awareness of the Army's TV commercials declined with the last (sixth) wave, but the change was not large enough to be significant (at the .95 confidence level). This latest change interrupted what appeared to be a gradual, but consistent build on this measure that began in December '85. The three highest awareness scores coincided with the three highest scores on the propensity to contact an Army recruiting office (July '85, December '85, April '86). These scores also coincided with the times when TV commercials were on air stressing the education benefit. This was not the case with the propensity to enlist scores, due to the low April '86 score.

Within important market segments (figure 7), the most significant change was the uninterrupted decline in top-of-mind awareness among prospects still in high school that began in October '85 -- a 20-point decline to 39%. The last wave (June '86) also interrupted a continuous build on this measure since December '85 among the older prospects, especially those with some college, that began in October '85.
Figure 6. Top-of-mind awareness of Armed Forces TV advertising among all male prospects
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- Jul '85: 47
- Aug '85: 48
- Oct '85: 52
- Dec '85: 55
- Jun '86: 49

Navy
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Percent of Total Male Prospects
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The decline in awareness among prospects still in high school began when Phases 1 and 2 of the "New GI Bill" campaign were just completed. The build in awareness among older prospects with some college began after two months of the joint services campaign, overcoming a prior decline in October '85. This increase continued during the "Operation Bold Bridge" campaign. Since the end of that campaign, awareness has remained at approximately the same level.
Figure 7. Top-of-mind awareness of Army TV advertising by segment

- Total Male Prospects
- Age: 17 to 19, 20 to 22
- Education: High school grad., No college, Some college

Legend:
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Percent of Total Male Prospects in Segment
Opinion of Army TV Commercials

Prospect ratings on believability and informativeness of the Army's TV commercials were high during the 12-month measurement period (figure 8). Although there was a decline in believability in October '85, opinion subsequently returned to its earlier high by April '86. However, the significant 10-point decline that occurred in June '86 interrupted what was a developing favorable build in opinion. Believability is now back to its previous low of October '85. The three highest believability scores coincided with the three highest scores on propensity to contact an Army recruiting office. Further, all three scores also coincided with times when TV commercials were on the air stressing the education benefit.

The informativeness ratings were high and somewhat more consistent than the believability ratings. A 7-point decline in the June '86 wave, when the informativeness rating was at its lowest level, was not large enough to be significant.
Figure 8. Ratings of US Army TV advertising among all male prospects (top two box ratings)
Association of the "New GI Bill" with the Army

At all times, the "New GI Bill" was associated more with the Army than with the other branches of the Armed Forces (figure 9). This association was strongest in 1986. After an initial 9-point increase in August '85, there was no change until April '86, when there was a significant 17-point increase to 88%. However, the last wave (June '86) showed a significant 6-point decline to 82%. This level was still significantly higher than the 1985 scores.
Figure 9. Awareness of Armed Forces branches that offer "New GI Bill" (among all male prospects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advertising Recall

There were several changes in advertising recall over the 12-month measurement period (figure 10). The overall changes included:

- A significant decline in college benefit mentions after the end of Phases 1 and 2 of the "New GI Bill" campaign, followed by an abrupt increase in April '86 back to the previous high at the end of the "New GI Bill" TV commercials in August '84.

- A similar pattern occurred in self-development mentions, particularly for the slogan "Be all you can be."

- Training benefit mentions were significantly lower in June '86 for the first time since August '85.

- Recall of other benefits was significantly lower in 1986 than in 1985, specifically on "good future/career development" mentions.
Figure 10. Army advertising recall among male prospects recently viewing advertising
(continued on next page)

College benefit mentions (net)
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Develop into man/person

Patriotism/serve country

Percent of Total Male Prospects Aware of Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul '85</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug '85</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct '85</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec '85</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr '86</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. (continued; concluded on next page)

Training Benefits (net)
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- Other Benefits (net)
- Adventure/excitement...
- Great way of life...
- Good future/career devel...
- Good pay/benefits...
- No experience required...

Percent of Total Male Prospects Aware of Advertising
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Figure 10. (concluded)

Percent of Total Male Prospects Aware of Advertising
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Awareness of Army's College Benefit

A high proportion of prospects who were aware of the Army TV commercials were also aware of a college benefit throughout the 12-month measurement period (figure 11). Although there was a weakening of this awareness after the "New GI Bill" TV commercials were over, there was an increase in 1986 back to the August '85 high.

There was less of a tendency in 1986 to mention "the College Fund," "benefit pays for college/free college," and "saving dollars for college while in service." But there was a greater tendency in 1986 to mention that the Army gives "$2 for every $1 saved."

The time commitment was mentioned for the first time in 1986, increasing from 9% in April to 15% in June.
Figure 11. Recall of specific education benefits in Army TV commercial among total male prospects
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- Pay for college/free college
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- College Fund
- Pays up to $25,000
- Headstart/gets you ready for coll.

Education/Schooling Mentions (net)
- Get $ toward education
- Pay for education/schooling
- Can save for education
- lime commitment (net)

Percent of Total Male Prospects Aware of Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul '85 (190)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug '85 (224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct '85 (212)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec '85 (209)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr '86 (207)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun '86 (205)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Awareness of the Dollar Amount the Education Benefit Provides

In June '86 there was a significant shift in awareness of the amount the education benefit provides to approximately the correct range. There had been a tendency in 1985 to recall a lesser amount (figure 12).

The majority of prospects always thought the Army's benefits were the same as those of the other branches of the Armed Forces (figure 13). In June '86 this proportion was at its highest level, and it was significantly higher than at the beginning of the 12-month measurement period.

More importantly, among prospects believing the benefit was not the same, there were changes in the ratio of "more to less." During the "New GI Bill" TV commercials in 1985, the ratio was at least 2:1. During the balance of 1985, the ratio was 1:1. In April '86 it was once again 2:1, but by June '86 it was almost back to 1:1.
Figure 12. Belief as to the amount of the education benefit
(among male prospects aware of education benefit)
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Figure 13. Amount Army provides for college education vs. other Armed Forces branches (among male prospects aware of education benefit)
SECTION 3 – BREAKDOWN OF HIGH QUALITY PROSPECT SEGMENT ON PROPENSITY TO CONTACT AN ARMY RECRUITING OFFICE

Size of High Quality Prospect Segment

High quality prospects were defined as those having high school grades of at least half Bs and half Cs, and at least two math courses (figure 14). This group included 71.5% of all male prospects.

Propensity to Contact an Army Recruiting Office

Of this high quality group, 15.2% had a favorable propensity to contact an Army recruiting office (figure 15). (The favorable propensity measure is the combined "definitely would" and "probably would" contact scores.)
Figure 14. Size of High Quality Segment
(grades of at least half Bs and Cs and two math courses in high school)
Figure 15. Propensity of high quality prospect segment to contact an Army recruiting office

- Favorable Attitude: 15.2%
- Unfavorable Attitude: 84.8%
Prime Prospects Analysis

For each high quality prospect having an unfavorable propensity to contact an Army recruiting office, a multivariate analysis provides a probability estimate as to the likelihood of a favorable change in attitude by the prospect toward making contact. This analysis assumes that the more similar a low propensity prospect is to a high propensity prospect, the greater the probability that the former can be converted. This similarity does not focus on one aspect; rather, it encompasses a wide range of descriptors, including demographics, job satisfaction criteria, opinions, perceptions, and behavior.

This same analytic approach is also applied to the high propensity group to identify and quantify those individuals most likely to shift into the low propensity group, i.e., potential defectors.

The net result of these analyses are the following four groups along with their relative sizes (figure 16):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core High Propensity Group</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Defectors</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Prospects For Conversion</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Low Propensity Group</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. Breakdown of high quality prospect segment

- **Prime Prospects**
- **Potential Defectors** 4.7%
- **Hard-Core Favorable** 10.5%
- **Hard-Core Unfavorable** 64.1%
SECTION 4 - CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPENSITY SEGMENTS

Race

The Hard-Core High Propensity Group had a significantly higher proportion of minorities than the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group -- 42.7% vs. 14.3% (figure 17). Race was also a key differentiating factor between the Hard-Core High Propensity Group and Prime Prospects -- 27.4% blacks in the former vs. 13.1% blacks in the latter. However, both of these groups had the highest proportion of Hispanics.

Potential Defectors had a higher proportion of white (non-Hispanic) prospects than the Hard-Core High Propensity Group -- 72.7% vs. 57.3%.
Figure 17. Race profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percent of Total Male Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Segments:
- Hard-Core Favorable
- Potential Defectors
- Prime Prospects
- Hard-Core Unfavorable
Age

The Hard-Core High Propensity Group had a significantly greater proportion of prospects under 19 years of age than the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group -- 63.7% vs. 36.9% (figure 18). The Prime Prospect Group, like the Hard-Core High Propensity Group, also had a higher proportion of prospects under 19 years of age -- 61.1% vs. 63.7%. Both groups had a relatively low proportion of 19-year-olds. The Hard-Core High Propensity Group had more 20-year-olds than the Prime Prospect Group, while the latter had somewhat more prospects over 20 years old (16.8% vs. 7.2%).

Potential Defectors had fewer 17-year-olds and 18-year-olds than the Hard-Core High Propensity Group, but more 19-year-olds and more 21-year-olds and 22-year-olds than the Hard-Core High Propensity Group.
Figure 1B. Age profile

Segments

- Hard-Core Favorable
- Potential Defectors
- Prime Prospects
- Hard-Core Unfavorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Hard-Core Favorable</th>
<th>Potential Defectors</th>
<th>Prime Prospects</th>
<th>Hard-Core Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education

The Hard-Core High Propensity Group had significantly more prospects still in high school than the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group -- 54.8% vs. 19.9% (figure 19). Conversely, the latter had a higher proportion of prospects with some college education -- 49.8% vs. 15.3%. Prime Prospects also shared this same characteristic, with 45.5% of them still in high school. It is also important to note that 36.1% of the Prime Prospects not in high school had full-time jobs vs. 20.5% with some college.

In contrast, Potential Defectors had a low proportion of prospects still in high school (25.5%). This group had a high proportion of prospects with some college (32.7%) and was similar to the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group in having a high proportion of prospects with a full-time job -- 49.1% vs. 45.3%.
Figure 19. Education profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Still in high school</th>
<th>Not in high school</th>
<th>Have full-time job</th>
<th>Had some college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Favorable</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Defectors</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Unfavorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Total Male Prospects
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Community Size

The Hard-Core High Propensity Group had a higher proportion of prospects residing in large cities than the Hard Core Low Propensity Group - 27.4% vs. 15% (figure 20). The Prime Prospect Group also had a high proportion of prospects residing in large cities (23.4%). The Potential Defector Group had the highest proportion of prospects residing in medium-size cities -- 27.3% vs. 16.3% and less for the other groups.
Figure 20. Geographic profile

Segments

- Hard-Core Favorable
- Potential Defectors
- Prime Prospects
- Hard-Core Unfavorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hard-Core Favorable</th>
<th>Potential Defectors</th>
<th>Prime Prospects</th>
<th>Hard-Core Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. of large city</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-size city</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. of medium-size city</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city or town</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Propensity to Contact an Army Recruiting Office

There were no significant differences between the Hard-Core High Propensity Group and Potential Defectors as to their intensity of commitment on this measure, i.e., proportion of "definitely would" vs. "probably would" (figure 21). In contrast, there was a significant difference in intensity between the Prime Prospects and the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group. The majority of Prime Prospects was less intense -- 56.6% "probably would nots" vs. 43% "definitely would nots." Within the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group -- "the definitely would nots" were twice the number of the "probably would nots."
Figure 21. Likelihood of contacting an Army recruiting office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>Definitely would</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Probably would not</th>
<th>Definitely would not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Favorable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Defectors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Prospects</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Unfavorable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Total Male Prospects
Propensity to Enlist

The majority (70.4%) of the Hard-Core High Propensity Group were favorably disposed toward enlistment. In contrast, 98.5% of the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group were not favorably disposed toward enlistment, and the majority was strongly opposed to it (figure 22).

A relatively small proportion of the Prime Prospects (14%) had a high propensity to enlist. However, those with a low propensity were just as likely to be "probably will nots" as "definitely will nots," indicating that a significant proportion would be vulnerable to conversion if the right appeals were used.

Potential Defectors were more likely to have a low propensity to enlist than a high one -- 58.2% vs. 38.2%. 
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Figure 22. Likelihood of Enlisting in the US Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>Percent of Total Male Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Favorable</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Defectors</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Prospects</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Unfavorable</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitely will

1.8

2.5

0

Definitely will not

6.5

16.4

43.4

67.8

Percent of Total Male Prospects
Perceptions of the Army Experience

On all 15 attributes used to develop the Army's image, the Hard-Core High Propensity Group had a significantly more favorable image of the Army experience than did the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group (figure 23). On all attributes except one, the Prime Prospect Group had equally as favorable opinions of the Army experience as did the Hard-Core High Propensity Group. The exception with a significantly lower rating was on "worth 3 years of duty to pay for college."

On all 15 attributes, the Potential Defector Group had a significantly less favorable image of the Army experience than did the Hard-Core High Propensity Group. On all but three attributes it was much closer to the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group’s ratings. Of particular importance was how this group shared with the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group the lowest opinion of the Army offering the "best education benefit."
Figure 23. Perceptions of the US Army Experience
(concluded on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Description</th>
<th>Hard-Core Favorable</th>
<th>Potential Defectors</th>
<th>Prime Prospects</th>
<th>Hard-Core Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opply to work with soph. hi-tech equip.</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yrs. act. duty to pay for college</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An experience you can be proud of</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges both mind and body</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. over going right from H.S. to coll.</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature person, prep'd for civ. life</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadens one’s civilian career</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Figure 23. (concluded)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Percent of Total Male Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great value in civilian career deve</strong></td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best opp. to dev. self-confidence</strong></td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop high set of moral standards</strong></td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best opp. to develop leadership skills</strong></td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best education benefit</strong></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greatest number of job choices</strong></td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best opp. to learn mgl. skills</strong></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARMY ADVERTISING STUDY**
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Job Satisfaction Criteria

The Hard-Core High Propensity Group and the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group had different needs in job satisfaction (figure 24). There were five commonalities:

- opportunity for self-improvement
- having good supervisors
- good income
- job security
- having respect of others

Hard-Core High Propensity types were more likely to want excitement and self-improvement, i.e.:

- challenging work
- travel opportunities
- chance for adventure
- variety of duties
- having a valuable skill or trade
- good retirement benefits
- money for education
- having good people to work with

The Hard-Core Low Propensity Group was more likely to look for an opportunity for promotion and advancement.
The Prime Prospects were looking for essentially the same things as the Hard-Core High Propensity Group. Opportunity for promotion and advancement was more important to them, whereas challenging work and a chance for adventure were less important.

The Potential Defectors had approximately the same needs on 8 of the 15 job criteria as the Hard-Core High Propensity Group. Things that were not as important to them included:

- travel opportunities
- chance for adventure
- variety of duties
- having good people to work with

The things that were more important to them included:

- opportunity for promotion and advancement
- good supervisors
- job security
Figure 24. Job satisfaction goals
(concluded on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Have a valuable skill/trade</th>
<th>Good retirement benefits</th>
<th>Money for education</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Good people to work with</th>
<th>Having respect of others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Favorable</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Defectors</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Prospects</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Core Unfavorable</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Total Male Prospects
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Figure 24. (concluded)

Segments

- Hard-Core Favorable
- Potential Defectors
- Prime Prospects
- Hard-Core Unfavorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Percent of Total Male Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>47.6, 45.5, 40.2, 33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp'y for self-improvement</td>
<td>46.8, 47.3, 54.1, 47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel opportunities</td>
<td>42.7, 30.9, 41.8, 26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance for adventure</td>
<td>21.8, 31.6, 40.3, 23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp'y for promot., adv.</td>
<td>40.3, 52.7, 58.2, 54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good supervisors</td>
<td>39.5, 46.3, 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to expr. opinions</td>
<td>36.3, 41.8, 44.7, 44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of duties</td>
<td>14.5, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Opinion of Army TV Commercials

The Hard-Core High Propensity Group was more likely to find Army TV commercials to be believable and informative than the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group (figure 25). The Potential Defectors were just as likely to find the commercials believable, but were somewhat less likely to find them informative. The Prime Prospects were almost as likely as the Hard-Core High Propensity Group to find the commercials believable and informative.
Figure 25. Opinion of US Army TV commercials

- **Believable**
  - Hard-Core Favorable: 72.6%
  - Potential Defectors: 67.2%
  - Prime Prospects: 65.1%
  - Hard-Core Unfavorable: 52%

- **Informative**
  - Hard-Core Favorable: 68.5%
  - Potential Defectors: 54.5%
  - Prime Prospects: 65.1%
  - Hard-Core Unfavorable: 49.1%
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Amount of Education Benefit Offered

The majority of all four groups believed the amount of the educational benefit was the same for all branches of the Armed Forces, with the Hard-Core Low Propensity Group being the most likely to feel this way (figure 26). The Prime Prospects and the Hard-Core High Propensity Group both had a higher proportion of prospects who thought the Army's amount was more rather than less -- almost a 2:1 ratio. The Potential Defectors believed there was a difference; instead of having the same 2:1 ratio, they were somewhat more likely to think the Army's benefit was less rather than more.
Figure 26. Amount of Army education benefits vs. other branches of the Armed Forces

Segments
- Hard-Core Favorable
- Potential Defectors
- Prime Prospects
- Hard-core Unfavorable

| More       | 29  | 12.7 | 25.4 |
| Less       | 14  | 13.7 | 18.2 |
| About the same | 56.5 | 65.5 | 63.5 | 70.5 |
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APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

APRIL, 1986

(OTHER WAVES HAD SLIGHT VARIATIONS)
Hello. I am ___________________ of Crossley Surveys. We are doing a survey about television commercials. (CONTINUE INTERVIEW ONLY WITH MALES.)

1. First, how old are you?

   Under 16 □ 17 □ 18 □ 19 □ 20 □ 21 □ 22 □ 23 and older □  
   [TERMINATE]

2a. Are you still in high school?  
   Yes 1  No 2  

   b. (IF "NO," ASK:) Do you have a high school diploma?  
      Yes 1  No 2  
      [TERMINATE]

   c. Do you have a full-time job?  
      Yes 1  No 2  

3a. Have you been to college at all?  
   Yes 1  No 2  

   b. (IF "YES," ASK:) How many years of college have you had?  
      2 years and less □ 2 □  
      Over 2 years □ 1 □  
      [TERMINATE]

4. ESCORT RESPONDENT TO INTERVIEWING STATION AND ATTACH THIS SCREENER TO HIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

   Respondent's Name: ____________________________
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1. START WITH QUESTION OPPOSITE THE CHECK MARK.

☐ a. Which branches of the armed forces of the United States, if any, have you recently seen advertised on television?

☐ b. Which branches of the armed forces of the United States, if any, have you recently heard advertised on radio?

☐ c. Which branches of the armed forces of the United States, if any, have you recently seen advertised in magazines or newspapers?

☐ d. From which branches of the armed forces of the United States, if any, have you recently received mail?

IF "ARMY" MENTIONED IN Q.1a, SKIP TO Q.3

2. Have you recently seen any advertising for the Army on television?  
Yes  ☑  No  ☐  

3. What did the television commercial tell you about the Army?

(PROBE) What else did the commercial say about the Army?

(PROBE) What did they show in the Army commercial?

(PROBE) What slogan, if any, was used in the commercial?
4. Aside from trying to interest you in joining the Army, in your personal point of view, what was the main idea they were trying to get across to you in the commercial?

5a. Did the television commercial mention any educational benefits?

   Yes 1

   No 2

   SKIP TO Q.6a

   b. Specifically, what did the television commercial say about educational benefits?

   (PROBE) What else did it say about educational benefits?

   IF ANY MENTION OF THE LENGTH OF ARMY SERVICE OR "2" YEARS OR RELATED COMMENTS MADE IN Q.3, 4 OR 5a, b OR c, SKIP TO Q.6b

6a. Did the commercial mention how long a person must serve in the military?

   Yes 1

   No 2

   SKIP TO Q.7

   b. Specifically, what did the commercial say about how long a person must serve.

   c. (PROBE) Anything else about length of time?
7. (SHOW CARD A) Which one of the phrases on this card best describes the Army television commercial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very believable</th>
<th>Believable</th>
<th>Neither believable nor unbelievable</th>
<th>Unbelievable</th>
<th>Very unbelievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. (SHOW CARD B) Which one of the phrases on this card best describes the Army television commercial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very informative</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Neither informative nor uninformative</th>
<th>Uninformative</th>
<th>Very uninformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I am going to mention some slogans used by the military in its advertising. After I read each slogan please tell me whether it is used by ... (READ LIST STARTING WITH BRANCH OPPOSITE THE CHECK MARK.)

- Air Force
- Army
- Marines
- Navy

or by all four active duty services together in the same ad or commercial.

Let's start with ... (READ SLOGAN STARTING WITH THE ONE OPPOSITE THIS CHECK MARK) Is that used by ... (READ BRANCHES OF ARMED FORCES STARTING WITH THE ONE UNDER THE CHECK MARK. ALWAYS READ "ALL FOUR SERVICES IN SAME AD" LAST. NEVER READ "DON'T KNOW.")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slogan</th>
<th>Air Force</th>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Marines</th>
<th>Navy</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It's not just a job.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's an adventure</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The few. The proud.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be all you can be</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We're looking for a few good men</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a great place to start</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim high</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We're not a company we're your country</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. (SHOW CARD C) I am going to read to you some things that contribute to job satisfaction. As I read each one please tell me how important it would be to you using this scale. The more important it is, the higher the number you give it. The less important it is, the lower the number you give it.

START WITH STATEMENT OPPOSITE THE CHECK MARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Chance for adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Having a variety of duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Opportunity for promotion, advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Good supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Providing money for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Amount of personal freedom in expressing your opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Opportunity for continued self-improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Travel opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Having the respect of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Learning a valuable trade or skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Good income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Good people to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Good benefits or educational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Good treatment benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11. (SHOW CARD D) I am going to read to you a series of statements. As I read each one please tell me how much you either agree or disagree with it using this scale. The more you agree with it, the higher the number you select. The less you agree with it, the lower the number you select.

START WITH THE STATEMENT OPPOSITE THE CHECK MARK.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement -- (STATEMENT). Just give me the number that comes closest to how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Rating Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Army provides the best opportunity to learn management skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience gained in the Army can help broaden one's civilian career opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it requires 3 years of active Army service to get my college education paid for, its well worth it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army service is an experience you can be proud of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army service gives you the opportunity to work with sophisticated, high tech equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army does challenge both the mind and the body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army experience and the education benefit gives you an advantage over going right from high school to college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army helps you develop a high set of moral standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army service would be of great value in your civilian career development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army offers the best opportunity to develop self confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army offers you the greatest number of job choices than the other armed services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army service develops a mature person well prepared for civilian life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army offers the best education benefit of all the armed forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Army offers the best opportunity to develop leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12a. (SHOW CARD E) Which one of the statements on this card best describes the likelihood of your contacting an Army recruiting office in the next few months?

- Definitely will: 4
- Probably will: 3
- Probably will not: 2
- Definitely will not: 1

b. (SHOW CARD E) Which one of the statements on this card best describes the likelihood of your enlisting in the U.S. Army?

- Definitely will: 4
- Probably will: 3
- Probably will not: 2
- Definitely will not: 1
13a. How much money do you think the Army education benefit provides for college? (DO NOT READ LIST)

- Under $5,000: 1
- $5,000 to $9,999: 2
- $10,000 to $14,999: 3
- $15,000 to $19,999: 4
- $20,000 to $24,999: 5
- $25,000 and more: 6
- Don't know: 7

b. Do you think the amount is more, less or about the same as what the Navy, Air Force or Marines offer?

- More: 1
- Less: 2
- About the same: 3

START WITH SERVICE OPPOSITE THE CHECK MARK

c. Which of the following services offer the "G.I. Bill?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Offer</th>
<th>Do Not Offer</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. (SHOW CARD F) Which one of these statements best describes the place where you live?

- In a large city: 1
- In a suburb of a large city: 2
- In a medium sized city: 3
- In a suburb of a medium sized city: 4
- In a small city or town: 5
- In a rural area: 6

15a. (SHOW CARD G) Which one of the statements on this card best describes the grades you made your last year in high school?

- Mostly A: 1
- About half A and half B: 2
- Mostly B: 3
- About half B and half C: 4
- Mostly C: 5
- About half C and half D: 6
- Mostly D: 7
- Mostly below D: 8

b. How many different courses in mathematics have you taken in high school?

16. Do you consider yourself to be ...

(READ LIST)

- White, not Hispanic: 1
- Black, not Hispanic: 2
- Hispanic: 3
- Asian: 4
- Other: 5
CHANGES IN THE PROPENSITY TO ENLIST OVER TIME AMONG QUALITY PROSPECTS
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RECRUITING, PROPENSITY, ENLIST, G.I. BILL, ADVERTISING
PROPENSITY TO MAKE CONTACT.

The propensity to enlist varied significantly over a 12 month measurement period. The lowest measures are in the spring (April and June waves). The explanation most likely is a combination of seasonal factors and the effect of advertising.

The proportion of high quality male prospects most susceptible to a favorable change in propensity to contact an Army recruiting office was 20.7%. Compared to the hardcore high propensity group, this segment (1) had a higher population of white males (non-Hispanic), (2) was less likely to believe the education benefit was worth three years of service, and (3) was more likely to want an opportunity for promotion and advancement as a career goal and less likely to be looking for challenging work and adventure.

The implication from this research is that the potential size of the high propensity group among high quality male prospects is in the range of 10.5% to 35.9%. This takes into account both the proportion susceptible to a favorable change in attitude and the proportion susceptible to an unfavorable change in attitude.