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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The United States Army has historically led the way within the Department of Defense in areas of equal opportunity, with regard to recruiting, retention, and promotion. Dr. Charles C. Moskos, one of the preeminent military sociologists in the country stated, "Of the four services . . . to recruit large numbers of blacks. . . . The Army has always been at the forefront" (Moskos 1986, 64). The Army has progressed significantly in the area of equal opportunity for all soldiers in the fifty-one years the United States Army has been a racially integrated force. The appointments of Clifford L. Alexander Jr. and Togo D. West as Secretaries of the Army and the selection of General Colin Powell as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stand as notable accomplishments of blacks over the last half-century of racial desegregation in the Army.

The underrepresentation of black officers in the Army's combat arms career management fields, especially Infantry may lead some to believe that the opportunity to excel in those fields may not be as "equal" as those of nonminority officers. Blacks comprise 29.5 percent of the Army but only account for 11.3 percent of the officer corps (DEOMI 1999,
1). However, in the Infantry career management field, blacks comprise only 7.2 percent of the officers in the branch. Table 5 in Appendix A depicts the distribution of the Army officer corps by grade and racial and ethnic category.

The underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry is very evident in the Infantry officer accessions racial and ethnic demographics in fiscal year 1999. The Army accessed only fourteen black infantry officers in 1999, which represents 3 percent of the officers commissioned in the branch during the year. The United States Military Academy commissioned only one black infantry officer in 1999.

Could the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry be a function of low numbers of black lieutenants being accessed into the Army? Could low accessions lead to socialization issues within the ranks of young black infantry officers, due to the lack of black mentors and role models within their branch? Could a low initial number of black infantry officer accessions result in long-range implications of fewer black officers available for selection to senior leadership positions within the U.S. Army? This thesis will pose questions and look for possible solutions to these issues.
Problem Statement

The problem is the underrepresentation of black officers in the Army’s second largest career management field that produces nearly twice as many general officers than any other branch. It is critical to the readiness of the Army to have senior leaders who can identify with the diverse and complex cultural issues confronting all of its soldiers. The underrepresentation of black officers in the combat arms branches, especially Infantry, may result in the culturally diverse ranks of soldiers being led and commanded almost exclusively by white officers.

Research Question

The purpose of this research is to answer the question: Why are there so few black infantry officers in the U.S. Army?

In addition to the primary research question, the study will attempt to answer the following subordinate questions:

1. Why do black officers join the Army?

2. Why do black officers select combat service and combat service support branches more frequently than combat arms?

3. Are there barriers to minority participation in combat arms branches?
4. Does a lack of black role models impact branch selection for black officers?

5. What is the impact of a shortage of black officers in combat arms, specifically Infantry on the Army of the twenty-first century?

6. How does the Army increase the number of black officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies?

Background

The background for research of this topic originates from the author's personal experience as a black infantry officer. Three past events sparked the desire to undertake this thesis: The first event occurred while I was a senior at West Point, when the cadets who selected Infantry as their basic branch assembled for the first time. Only seven of the 233 future infantry officers assembled were black. The second event occurred during a division review in the 25th Infantry Division (Light) in Hawaii, when I realized I was the only black officer in command of an infantry rifle company in the division. The third event occurred following an address by General (Retired) William J. Livsey to the officers of the 25th Infantry Division (Light), when he asked me, "Where are the black infantry officers in our
Army?" He then asked a series of questions about my reasons for selecting Infantry as my branch and my thoughts on his perception that the relatively small number black officers in the Infantry is a problem. Figure 4, Appendix A depicts the active component Army Infantry officer inventory categorized by racial and ethnic category and source of commission.

The purpose of this thesis is to gain a better understanding of the reasons why there are so few black infantry officers, and to formulate possible solutions to the problem. The development of a solution to this issue will increase the combat readiness of the Army by improving understanding and communication through the development of an Infantry officer corps that is representative of the soldiers they lead.

Assumptions

The study employs the following assumptions:

1. The underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry is a problem.

2. The majority of the Army's senior leaders emerge from combat arms branches.
3. The underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry limits the advancement of blacks to senior level leadership in the Army.

4. There will be no significant change in current Army policies that access officers into the Army.

**Definition of Terms**

**African-American:** An American citizen descended from Africans and identifies with that racial and ethnic group. Used interchangeably in this study with black.

**Black:** Persons having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa or other areas. For the purposes of this thesis, the author uses the term black instead of African-American as the primary means of identification of this racial and ethnic category in accordance with the Department of Defense standard racial and ethnic designation categories (DA PAM 600-26 1990, 1.6).

**Combat Arms:** Term refers to units and soldiers who close with and destroy enemy forces and provide firepower and destructive capabilities on the battlefield. The included branches and functions are: Air Defense Artillery, Armor/Cavalry, Aviation, Corps of Engineers, Field Artillery, Infantry, and Special Forces (FM 101-5-1 1997, 1-30).
**Combat Service:** Term refers to units and soldiers who provide critical combat functions in conjunction with combat arms units and soldiers to secure victory on the battlefield. The included branches and functions are: Chemical Corps, Military Intelligence, Military Police Corps, Signal Corps, civil affairs and psychological operations (FM 101-5-1 1997, 1-32).

**Combat Service Support:** Term refers to essential capabilities, functions, activities, and tasks necessary to sustain all elements of operating forces in theater at all levels of war. . .also includes all those activities in stability and support operations that sustain all operating forces. The included branches and functions are: Quartermaster Corps, Transportation Corps, Adjutant General Corps, Ordnance Corps, Finance Corps, Chaplain Corps, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Acquisition Corps and the Medical Corps (FM 101-5-1 1997, 1-31).

**Commissioning Sources:** Refers to all sources of commission for Army officers, including Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), the United States Military Academy (USMA) at West Point, Officer Candidate School (OCS) and direct commissions into the Army.

**Company Grade Officer:** An Army officer in the rank of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, or captain.
**Direct Commission:** An Army program that commissions officers in the Army active or reserve component without a formalized military education, training and development process such as USMA, ROTC or OCS. The Army usually directly commissions individuals with advanced degrees and specialized skills, such as medical specialists, lawyers, and others. Approximately 16 percent of all active component Army officers receive direct commissions.

**Hispanic:** Refers to persons of Latin American decent, who identifies with that racial and ethnic group.

**Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU):** Refers to those colleges and universities established specifically for black citizens of the United States, mainly during the period of segregated education. These institutions currently train larger numbers of black professionals that the nation's other institutions of higher education (Knowles 1977, 464).

**Field Grade Officer:** An Army officer in the rank of major, lieutenant colonel or colonel.

**Majority:** Refers to the white racial and ethnic category in the United States.

**Mentoring:** (in America's Army) is the proactive development of each subordinate through observing, assessing, coaching, teaching, developmental counseling and
evaluating, that results in people being treated with fairness and equal opportunity (FM 22-100 1999, 5-16).

**Minority:** Refers to racial and ethnic groups in the United States other than white.

**Noncombat arms:** Refers to career management fields and branches of the Army other than combat arms.

**Officer Candidate School (OCS):** Officer Candidate School was established in 1941 to provide infantry officers for World War II. Today, OCS consists of a demanding fourteen-week course where enlisted soldiers are commissioned as second lieutenants for all sixteen branches of the Army. Nearly 9 percent of all active component Army officers are OCS graduates.

**Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC):** A four year program of classroom instruction, military training and practical leadership experience that commissions officers into both the reserve and active components of the Army. Fifty-nine percent of all active component Army officers are ROTC graduates.

**The ROCKS Incorporated:** The ROCKS, Inc. is a non-profit organization comprised of active duty, reserve, retired and former commissioned officers of the U.S. Armed Forces, widows and widowers of deceased members, and other uniformed services. The organization provides professional and social
interaction and professional development to strengthen the officer corps. The ROCKS "Leadership Outreach" program provides the opportunity for members to visit historically black colleges and universities to provide professional career development guidance to ROTC cadets (The ROCKS Inc., 2000).

Senior Level Officer or Senior Leaders: Refers to officers in the rank of colonel and general officers, responsible for the strategic direction of the Army.

Table of Organization and Equipment (TOE): Refers to Army units who plan, resource, and execute combat missions.

Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA): Refers to Army units who perform system support, noncombat functions.

United States Military Academy (USMA): The United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, is a four year undergraduate military institution founded in 1802, which produced many of the most influential military leaders in American history. USMA educates, trains and develops cadets to become active component Army second lieutenants. Approximately 16 percent of all active component Army officers are USMA graduates.

White: Persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa or Middle East (DA PAM 600-26 1990, 1.6).
Limitations

The primary limitation to the study is the lack of available scholarship on the thesis topic. Other studies identify the underrepresentation of blacks in combat arms branches, but do not directly address the Infantry. The U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, the RAND Corporation, U.S. Army War College and U.S. Army Command and General Staff College students have researched the problem while studying other issues, but not as an isolated topic. Time is another significant limitation. The length of the CGSC academic year limits research time to only eight months. Data sources for this thesis include information provided by official Department of Defense studies, publications, and surveys of CGSOC students and general officers. Officer Personnel Management Directorate, U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM); the US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences; the Office of Infantry Proponency, U.S. Army Infantry Center, Fort Benning, Georgia; the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army for Personnel; the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI); Defense Manpower Data Center; the United States Military Academy Institutional Research and Analysis Office of Policy,
Planning and Analysis; and U.S. Army Cadet Command also provide data for the study.

**Delimitations**

The researcher limited this thesis to the problem of underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry. Though the problem applies to the other combat arms branches, the study focuses only on infantry officers. The researcher limited data collection to secondary sources, surveys and interviews of Army officers. Time and resource constraints limit the survey population to Army officers stationed in the United States. The survey population is limited to black, active component Army officers assigned as students in the U.S. Army Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC) Class 1999-2000; black Army officers in the U.S. Army School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), Advanced Military Studies Program; and black, active duty infantry general officers.

**Significance of the Study**

The purpose of conducting this research is to benefit the Army by increasing awareness of the underrepresentation black officers in the combat arms branches, specifically the Infantry. The goal of this study is to identify reasons
black infantry officers are underrepresented and offer solutions that will eventually change the demographics of the branch to be more representative of the officer corps, and the infantry noncommissioned officers and enlisted demographics. The intent of this study is to bring the issue to the attention of officers and mentors throughout the Army, thus sparking creative solutions throughout the officer corps to positively affect minority officer recruitment and retention in the combat arms branches. This research requires follow up study in order to influence change within the officer corps.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of the literature review is to provide a framework for the research of the underrepresentation of blacks in the Infantry. A review of relevant books, studies and articles establishes groundwork for the conduct of research. This literature review is organized into three areas:

1. A review of the contributions of blacks in Army history.

2. An examination of opportunities for black officers in the Army today.

3. The migration of black officers to support specialties.

The History of Blacks in the Army

A review of the historical contributions of blacks is critical to the examination of current underrepresentation of blacks in the Infantry. Blacks fought with distinction in every major conflict involving Americans, dating back to the colonial period. The recurring historical theme of blacks in the military is one of blacks striving to overcome tremendous obstacles for the right to fight for their country. However, blacks were generally forced into
noncombat roles until the military was racially integrated in 1948.

The Colonial and Revolutionary War Period. Free blacks initially served in the British and French colonial militias, but served mainly as cooks, laborers, and musicians. In the French colony of Louisiana, black slaves and free blacks defended the colony against Indian attacks. In 1736, a black company of soldiers commanded by free black officers fought with the Spanish against the Natchez Indians in the first documented account of black officers serving in a colonial militia in North America (Donaldson 1991, 6).

Crispus Attucks, a black runaway slave from the Massachusetts colony, was one of the first people to fight and die for American Independence in 1770 in the Boston Massacre. Blacks were also within the ranks of militiamen who fired “the shot[s] heard around the world” at Lexington and Concord on 9 April 1775 (Lanning 1997, 8).

General George Washington, initially resisted allowing blacks to serve in the Continental Army. Washington’s adjutant general issued orders to recruiters on 9 July 1775, not to enlist “any deserters from the British Army, nor any stroller, Negro, or vagabond” in the Continental Army (Lanning 1997, 9). In contrast, the British Army welcomed blacks into their ranks. John Murray, the Earl of Dunmore and governor of Colonial Virginia declared on 7 November 1775:
I do hereby declare all indentured servants, Negroes, or others (appertaining to the rebels) free, that are able and willing to bear arms, they joining His Majesty's troops, as soon as may be, for the more speedily reducing this Colony to proper dignity. (Lanning 1997, 11)

Three hundred escaped slaves joined Dunmore's Ethiopian Regiment within a month. They were followed by more than 30,000 slaves in the next few months who escaped the bonds of slavery, seeking freedom and the right to bear arms, denied them by their American masters.

In response to increasing casualties, desertions, and recruiting requirements, General Washington authorized the enlistment of free blacks in December 1775, but did not lift the ban on slaves in the Continental Army. Many slaves managed to enlist because unit commanders chose not to argue over their "slave" or "free" status. Some slaves also served in the Continental Army as "substitutes" for their masters (DEOMI 1998, 14). Blacks accounted for 5000 of the 300,000 soldiers in the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War.

Post Revolutionary War. Following the Revolutionary War, blacks were excluded from military service. The Militia Act passed by Congress in 1792 restricted military service to "free able-bodied white male citizens." Congress established the United States Marine Corps in 1798 with rules that stated, "no Negro, mulatto or Indian" was to be enlisted (DEOMI 1998, 15).
Blacks saw extensive duty at sea during the War of 1812, but were largely excluded from service in American land forces.

The Civil War. President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, signed on 22 September 1862 authorized the participation of blacks in "the Armed Services of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places to man vessels of all sorts in said service" (DEOMI 1998, 16). In 1863 the War Department established the Bureau of Colored Troops to recruit blacks for the newly formed United States Colored Troops (USCT) which was commanded by white officers. Over 180,000 blacks served in the Union Army, making up 166 all-black regiments while another 200,000 black civilians were employed by the Union Army as laborers, cooks, teamsters and servants. Only seventy-five blacks served as officers in the Union Army during the Civil War (Donaldson 1991, 46).

The Confederate Army employed slaves as laborers throughout the Civil War. However, prior to the end of the war, the Confederacy implemented a desperate plan to employ slaves as soldiers. Major General Patrick R. Cleburne urged Confederate President Jefferson Davis to enlist slaves in the Confederate army and award them freedom following the war. Davis initially resisted the idea, but later appealed
to Congress to enlist slaves in the Confederate army. The Confederate Congress also resisted the idea, until General Robert E. Lee pledged his support for the enlistment of slaves. General Lee called the enlistment of slaves in the Confederate army, "not only expedient, but necessary" in a letter to Congressman Ethelbert Barksdale. The Confederate Congress passed the bill authorizing President Davis to call as many as 300,000 slaves into military service in March 1864. However, very few of these companies were actually formed and none saw combat in the war (Rollins 1994, 163).

The Frontier West and Spanish American War. Congress passed an act in 1866, forming four all-black regiments from the disbanded USCT in the postwar peacetime army needed to settle to the West. The black infantry regiments, the 24th and 25th Infantry Regiments and black cavalry regiments, the 9th and 10th Cavalry Regiments served with distinction throughout the western United States from the Canadian to the Mexican border. Native Americans called the soldiers of the 9th and 10th Cavalry Regiments "Buffalo Soldiers" for their appearance and bravery.

During the Spanish-American War, the 10th Cavalry was credited with saving the lives of the First Volunteer Cavalry Regiment (Rough Riders). The Rough Riders, and their flamboyant executive officer, Theodore Roosevelt, were
pinned down by heavily fortified Spanish positions at Las Guasimas in the first battle of the war. The 10th Cavalry reinforced the Rough Riders and overran the Spanish positions, carrying the U.S. forces to victory (Lanning 1997, 88).

The United States Military Academy at West Point admitted its first black cadet, James Webster Smith in 1870. Henry Ossian Flipper became the first black USMA graduate in 1877. He was one of twelve Blacks admitted to West Point between 1870 and 1889, at time when many blacks in America were largely denied educational opportunities of any kind (Johnson 1997, 44).

**World War I.** In World War I, the Army deployed over 380,000 black soldiers to Europe, 42,000 of them in combat units. The majority of blacks served as laborers in engineer, quartermaster, and service battalions (Moskos and Butler 1996, 26). Over 1,200 blacks (less than 1 percent of all officers) served as commissioned officers during World War I (DEOMI 1998, 19).

**World War II.** Benjamin O. Davis became the first Black officer to achieve the rank of brigadier general on 25 October 1940, and was the only black among 776 general officers to serve during World War II (Donaldson 1991, 122). Black soldiers served in segregated units that saw little combat during World War II. Civil rights organizations in the United States clamored for "the right to fight" for
black units. Despite pressure from black and liberal white
groups around the country, black combat units were used
frequently for heavy labor instead of combat missions.

Army Desegregation and Equal Opportunity. President
Harry S. Truman ended segregation in the United States armed
forces on 26 July 1948, by issuing Executive Order 9981,
which stated:

It is essential that there be maintained in the armed
service of the United States the highest standards of
democracy for all those who serve in our country’s
defense. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the
President that there shall be equality of treatment and
opportunity for all persons in the armed forces without
regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.
(National Archives and Records Administration 1948,
4313)

Executive Order 9981 also established a Presidential
Committee headed by Charles Fahy to examine racial policies
and the qualifications of blacks to serve in all military
occupations. The Fahy Committee found that full utilization
of blacks in all occupations and the integration of all
units would improve military efficiency (DEOMI 1998, 20).
In accordance with the Fahy Committee findings, the Army
enacted Special Regulation 600-629-1, which required that
“Negro manpower . . . be utilized in accordance with [its]
skills and qualifications” (Bowers 1996, 38).

The 24th and 25th Infantry Regiments deactivated during
the Korean War on 1 October 1951, and 22 December 1952
respectively (Lanning 1997, 235). For the remainder of the
war, U.S. soldiers fought in integrated units. Blacks
comprised 13 percent of the Army enlisted force by the end of the war (DEOMI 1998, 20).

With the full integration of the military, the armed forces leaped to the forefront among major institutions in American society by providing opportunities for minorities and leading American society in its acceptance of equal opportunities. The Department of Defense continued the trend of leadership in areas of racial equity by implementing policies to eliminate off post discrimination against servicemen in 1961 (DEOMI 1998, 21).

In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Executive Order 11246, officially sanctioned affirmative actions to insure the equality of employment without regard to race, religion, national origin, or sex. The executive order prompted the Army, through the United States Military Academy, to pioneer an effort to actively recruit and enroll larger numbers of minority cadets in the mid-1960s (Toomer 1997, 4).

The Vietnam War. Blacks entered the military in disproportionately high numbers during the Vietnam War and reenlisted at a greater rate than whites (45.7 percent to 17.1 percent respectively). A disproportionate number of black soldiers served in infantry units, and suffered a higher percentage of casualties than their white counterparts. Twenty percent of the battlefield casualties between 1965-1967 were black. Army leadership recognized the disparity and transferred many blacks to support
specialties. The result was a decrease in black casualties to 13 percent in 1967 and a subsequent decrease every year afterwards (DEOMI 1998, 21).

Despite the Army's equal opportunity successes and progressive policies, the black officer population lagged behind their enlisted counterparts, comprising only 3 percent of the officer corps. As late as 1968, only one in a hundred plebes entering West Point were black (Moskos and Butler 1996, 33).

The All-Volunteer Army. The Army became an all-volunteer force following the Vietnam War, providing a drastic pay increase and equal pay for equal work. Black membership in the Army rose from 12 percent in 1968 to 32 percent in 1979 (DEOMI 1998, 23). The percentage of black officers increased from 3.3 percent in 1964 to 6.1 percent in 1977 as a result of the increased opportunities afforded minorities by the all-volunteer Army (U.S. Department of Defense 1997, 14).

The Army increased the number of blacks in the officer corps by establishing Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) units at many historically black colleges and universities. ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities provided the main source of federal governmental subsidy for higher education for black men prior to the development of federal aid programs for college students (Moskos and Butler 1996, 37). ROTC programs across
the country commission the majority of Army officers and are an outstanding example of equal opportunity success in the Army. Noted military sociologists, Dr. Charles C. Moskos and Dr. John Sibley Butler stated in their book, *All That We Can Be: Black Leadership and Racial Integration the Army Way*:

The growth of the black officer corps since 1970 is due largely to the expansion of the ROTC at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) the Pentagon's response to the abolition of ROTC at many predominantly white institutions during the Vietnam War. Twenty-one HBCUs, located in the south and border states, today turn out about half of all the black Army ROTC commissions. (Moskos and Butler 1996, 46)

The Army operates the largest ROTC program at historically black colleges and universities, accounting for over two-thirds of the total black enrollment in ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities for all services. Army ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities account for 46 percent of all black Army officers commissioned through ROTC (U.S. Department of Defense 2, 32).
The all-volunteer Army provided outstanding economic and education opportunities for blacks and produced the first large cohort of black leaders in both the enlisted and officer ranks. Dr. Moskos observed, the military became the only institution in America in which whites are routinely commanded, directed, and managed by blacks (Newman 1998, 26).

Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Blacks only accounted for 12 percent of the U.S. population in 1991, but comprised 26 percent of the deployed forces during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm to liberate Kuwait that year. The prospect of a disproportionate number of black casualties distressed many black civic leaders in the United States. Fortunately, the war ended successfully after less than five days of combat, at a cost of 182
American lives. Blacks accounted for 15 percent (twenty-eight blacks KIA) of the U.S. soldiers killed in combat during the war (Lanning 1997, 285). One of the most noteworthy story lines of the war was the emergence of General Colin Powell into national prominence. General Powell, the first black officer, first ROTC graduate, and youngest Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, led the American armed forces through one of the most successful military operations in history.

**Opportunities for Blacks in Today’s Army**

In 1996, Congress mandated the Department of Defense to conduct an equal opportunity survey, *The Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey*, to gain a better understanding of the status of equal opportunity in the U.S. military. The survey results found the state of race relations in the military had improved in many areas, but were lacking in others. For instance the survey found that 74 percent of black Army personnel surveyed had experienced an offensive encounter of a racial and ethnic nature with another member of the armed forces. However, the survey also found that 46 percent of the personnel surveyed believed that race relations in the military have improved over the last five years, while only 13 percent responded that race relations have declined over the same period. The survey also concluded that black servicemen believe the opportunities
for education and training are far greater in the military than in the civilian community. The equal opportunity survey is indicative of the belief among many in the military that race relations in the armed forces are good, but not perfect (U.S. Department of Defense 1 1997, xvii).

The Army Personnel Survey Office (APSO) of the U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI) conducts the Sample Survey of Military Personnel (SSMP) semi-annually to provide survey data to Army leadership on the attitudes and behaviors of Army soldiers on a variety of issues. The SSMP randomly samples 10 percent of the officer corps and 2 to 3 percent of the enlisted force. The SSMP regularly uses racial and ethnic demographics based questions to identify differences among subgroups of officers and enlisted soldiers. Recent survey results show more similarities than differences among racial and ethnic groups. There were statistically significantly differences on less than 45 percent of the 160 survey questions (APSO 2 1999, 1). The most recently completed SSMP, the Fall 1998 SSMP, identified no statistically significant differences between responses among white, black, and Hispanic officers on 60 percent of the survey questions. The finding from the Fall 1998 SSMP that is most significant to this study, identified that black officers were more likely than white officers to report they joined the Army for the educational benefits (APSO 2 1999, 7).
Army Leadership and Equal Opportunity. Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-26, *The Army Affirmative Action Plan*, (AAP) presents goals and objectives of the Department of the Army in support of the Army Equal Opportunity Program. The AAP also directs Army policy that supports the equal opportunity and treatment of all soldiers regardless of race, color, gender, religion, or national origin (DA PAM 600-26 1990, 1). The AAP establishes goals for the Army to ensure “commissioning rates for qualified applicants or cadets in all [racial and ethnic categories] should be comparable to the overall commissioning rate” for each commissioning source (DA PAM 600-26 1990, 4). The AAP also requires the commissioning sources to maintain and review commissioning data for disparities by racial and ethnic category and gender. The commissioning sources report the results annually to the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army for Personnel for review. However, the AAP does not set branch accession goals based on racial and ethnic category or gender.

Many Army leaders point out increased opportunities for advancement in the military, but also express concern for the Army’s continued vigilance to ensure the Army remains a leader in equal opportunity. Major General (Retired) Charles A. Hines, best known for drafting much of the Army’s current equal opportunity policy, and policy that integrated women into the Army stated:
The Army leads the nation in its programs and policies to help everyone rise to their full potential. However, the system is not perfect. Army leadership must continually work to ensure that racism and gender biases are addressed appropriately and aggressively. The current situation in the Army is not bleak, but leadership must remain focused in these areas. (Lansing 1997, 18)

General (Retired) Colin Powell called the Army’s racial integration “a tremendous success,” during an interview with Army Times. When asked about the current state of racial relations in the Army among its soldiers, he went on to add, “I don’t think they think about [racism]. I think young troops today see themselves as equals” (Galvin 1998, 13).

The Migration of Blacks to Support Specialties

Though the Army has been proactive in its approach to racial and cultural issues, one area of concern among many is the migration of blacks from the combat arms military occupational specialties to combat service and combat service support specialties. Military sociologists David R. Segal and Naomi Verdugo, who studied the demographic trends and personnel policies in relation to racial composition of the Army, stated:

What occurred between 1980 and 1990 was a shift among black soldiers from combat to noncombat units. No doubt much of this shift can be explained by the interaction between the structure of educational benefits in the army and differential motivations for enlistment by mental aptitude category and by race... Black enlistees are more likely than whites to score in the average mental aptitude categories, and join the army to learn skills that are transferable to the civilian labor force. However, blacks are also more
army to learn skills that are transferable to the civilian labor force. However, blacks are also more likely than whites to seek to stay in the army for a career because they feel the army is a more color-blind employer than they are likely to find in the civilian world. (Segal and Verdugo 1994, 628)

The migration of blacks from combat arms branches to combat service and combat service support branches is particularly notable in the officer ranks. It is critical to ascertain the reasons why black officers enter the Army in order to determine the reasons why many select service in noncombat arms branches instead of combat arms. The preponderance of opinions conclude that minority officers join the Army in order to gain marketable skills. Many of the jobs in the combat service and combat service support branches correspond directly to jobs in the civilian community. Major General (Retired) Hines, formerly responsible for the officer personnel management of the Army remarked:

Over the past ten years [1987-1997], minority cadets (especially blacks) commissioned through ROTC, tended to migrate away from the combat arms and into the combat service support arms. . . Minority cadets, especially blacks, join the ROTC to gain a skill for future employment. The combat service support branches as in finance, quartermaster, and adjutant general, translate into the civilian world. Civilian skills are the attraction for minority cadets. (Lansing 1997, 15)

of black officers to select combat arms specialties. The article stated:

The Army’s influential leaders tend to come from the combat branches and black soldiers may be selecting themselves out of future Army leadership. . . . Without a critical mass of black officers, younger black troops may either leave the Army or avoid combat units. Ultimately, de facto segregation could occur. (Newman 1998, 27)

General (Retired) Johnny Wilson, the only Black four-star general in the Army at the time, stated in the article: “We can’t [have] units that are mostly white or mostly black. That would be like going back to 1947” (Newman 1998, 27).

The RAND Corporation conducted a study for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), Barriers to Minority Participation in Special Operations Forces, that parallels the issue of underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry by examining the lack of minority representation in special operations forces (SOF). USSOCOM commissioned the study as a result of congressional concerns regarding the “significant underrepresentation of minorities in certain areas of SOF” (Harrell, and others 1999, 1). The study examined the extent and reasons for minority underrepresentation and provided recommendations for improving minority representation in SOF.

Barriers to Minority Participation in Special Operations Forces examined the reasons officers join the
military and concluded that minority officers and majority officers entered the military primarily for either for the college education opportunities or for an exciting job (Harrell and others 1999, 50). Minority officers participating in the study did not place a higher priority on military specialties with skills transferable to civilian jobs than their majority counterparts. In contrast, the study’s focus group data suggested both minority and majority officers believed their education and leadership experience was more important than service in a specialty with transferable civilian job skills (Harrell and others 1999, 50).

Barriers to Minority Participation in Special Operations Forces subsequently cites the results of the Youth Attitude Tracking Study (YATS) as evidence of relatively lower interest in combat related occupations by minorities. The YATS is administered annually by the Department of Defense to measure youth interest in military service. The 1996 YATS indicated that among high quality males, 53 percent of blacks mentioned that experience that prepares them for future civilian employment was extremely important, comparatively only 31.8 percent of whites reported similarly (Harrell and others 1999, 78).

The study also examines the significance of the influence of role models and mentors in SOF. Special operations forces, similarly to the Infantry, suffer from a
Colonel (Promotable) Remo Butler identified the importance of minority role models and mentors in his U.S. Army War College Strategic Study, "Why Black Officers Fail:"

While in a perfect world mentoring should transcend race, the reality doesn't match the ideal. A black mentor who understands the black culture and who has also been successful in the military environment that predominantly reflects the culture of the white majority can usually relate best to the young black officer. It is critical for young black officers to find a good mentor. Regrettably, young black officers too often fail to get attached to a mentor early on; they tend to seek assistance only during crises. (Butler 1995, 63)

Another consideration is the changing demographics of the United States, with respect to the number of black males eligible to join the Army as officers. A study conducted by Robert C. Pittard focused specifically on the changing demographics of the black American male population and the impact on the officer corps. He based his analysis on the socioeconomic trends that will most likely lead to the reduction in the number of black males qualified to become Army officers.

A closely related problem is the percentage of black male officers in the combat arms branches: infantry, armor, field artillery, air defense artillery, aviation, and combat engineers. Females are generally denied access to these branches; therefore a decrease in the percentage of black male officers would have a significant impact on black soldiers serving in combat units. (Pittard 1991, 10)

The Department of Defense conducted a study, Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers, which
significant impact on black soldiers serving in combat units. (Pittard 1991, 10)

The Department of Defense conducted a study, Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers, which accompanied the Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey, and assessed the equal opportunity climate for minority and women officers in the military. Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers compared equal opportunity data collected in 1997 to similar data collected in 1977. The study identified successes in minority representation in the Army, which increased from 6.1 percent to 11.2 percent, and female representation, which increased from 6.7 percent to 14.2 percent (U.S. Department of Defense 2 1997, vi). The services recognize the need for diversity in the force, and achieved the increases without setting DOD-wide goals for minority or female commissioning. The Army also boasts a higher percentage of black officer candidates, 9.9 percent, than the proportion of black college graduates between twenty-one and thirty-five years old nation-wide, 7.2 percent (U.S. Department of Defense 2 1997, 21).

Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers also identified the issue of underrepresentation of minorities in combat arms specialties:

Women and minorities tend to be concentrated in administration and supply areas, and underrepresented in tactical operations, the area that yields two-thirds of the general and flag officers of the Services. (U.S. Department of Defense 2 1997, viii)
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The study also identified the underrepresentation of blacks commissioned through USMA and ROTC scholarship programs (U.S. Department of Defense 2 1997, vi). Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers concluded that black officers are disadvantaged through the assignment process. A disproportionate number of black officers are selected for recruiting, ROTC, and equal opportunity assignments, with the intention of boosting minority recruitment. Assignments in recruiting, ROTC, and equal opportunity pull black officers away from operational and career enhancing assignments, possibly hindering their career progression. Some black officers surveyed perceived problems building competitive performance records, which are reviewed by promotion and selection boards. However, nearly all officers surveyed believed the promotion board process to be fair (U.S. Department of Defense 2 1997, viii).

A recently completed master’s degree thesis by Major Nero Borders, entitled “African Americans and Army Aviation” studies the underrepresentation of black officers in Army Aviation. Major Borders’ study identifies Aviation branch as the third largest commissioned branch of the Army, which possesses the fourth lowest population of black officers of any branch. Only 5.2 percent of Army aviators are black (Borders 2000, 2). “African Americans and Army Aviation”
analyzes past and current Army policies that affect the commissioning process for black aviators. The study also provides recommendations to correct ethnic imbalances in the commissioning process for Army Aviation.

Summary

The available literature provides perspective on the contributions of black soldiers throughout American history. Historically blacks have fought for the right to fight in the service of their country. However, in recent years the propensity of blacks to serve in Army combat specialties has declined. The literature review provides existing research on the lack of minority representation in the combat arms branches. The existing studies examine the underrepresentation of minorities in the combat arms, but do not isolate the issue to focus on the Infantry. This thesis will fill in the gaps in current research by analyzing the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter provides an in-depth overview of the research methods used for the collection and analysis of data for this study. The research methodology for this thesis consists of three areas:

1. Personnel Data Collection
2. Secondary Research
3. Primary Research

Personnel Data Collection

Personnel data collection is critical to the analysis of the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry. The study requires the analysis of many demographic categories of Army personnel, and trends that relate to the lack of ethnic diversity in the Infantry officer corps.

Department of Defense and Army Data. The Department of Defense and Department of the Army possess vast personnel data resources that provide useful data for the research of underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry.

The Officer Personnel Management Directorate (OPMD) of the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM) is
responsible for the professional development, distribution, and assignment of all active component Army officers. OPMD provides categorical data and statistical information, which meet the demographic requirements of this study. They also provide promotion data for Army officer promotion boards. Accessions Branch OPMD maintains all personnel data on active component Army officer accessions, and provides accessions information from all commissioning sources, categorized by branch. Infantry Branch OPMD provides data on the Infantry officer inventory by racial and ethnic category and grade in the Army. Infantry Branch also provides selection data for the Command and General Staff College, Senior Service College, battalion and brigade command boards for infantry officers.

The Office of Infantry Proponency, U.S. Army Infantry Center, monitors demographic trends and aggregate career progression for the Infantry enlisted and officer ranks. The Office of Infantry Proponency provides historical and current infantry brigade and battalion command demographics data, as well as accessions and training information.

The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute provides historical demographic information on blacks throughout military history, as well as historical and
current demographic data on minority representation in the Army.

The Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army for Personnel provides current and historical demographic data on Army personnel and points of contact for personnel proponents throughout the Army.

The Defense Manpower Data Center provides current and historical demographic data for all grades, racial and ethnic categories, and branches of the Army.

The U.S. Military Academy's Institutional Research and Analysis Department provides historical and current information on racial and ethnic demographics of USMA cadets, as well as commissioning data on USMA graduates by branch.

U.S. Army Cadet Command provides historical and current information on racial and ethnic demographics of ROTC scholarship and non-scholarship cadets, ROTC graduates, as well as demographic information on ROTC commissioning by branch.

Secondary Research

This study benefits from the existence of closely related studies. Two recently released studies commissioned by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for
Personnel and Readiness provide essential information for this study. The first study, Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey provides critical information categorized by racial and ethnic group, on the perceptions of soldiers with regard to equal opportunity in the Army. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness developed the second study, Career Progression of Minority and Women Officers, to parallel the Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey and examine similar issues in the officer ranks regarding equal opportunity.

The U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) conducts semiannual updates to the Under Secretary of the Army, and Standing Committee on Human Resources to provide Army leaders with assessments of various issues regarding soldiers and readiness. The Army Personnel Survey Office of ARI provided the Army Human Relations: Fall 1999 Status Report. The report consists of data from the Sample Survey of Military Personnel (SSMP), the Survey on Officer Careers, special field studies (officer focus groups on emerging issues, October 1998 through April 1999), and soldiers written comments. The report examines racial and ethnic diversity in the Army and equal opportunity issues relevant to the study of the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry.
The SSMP also identified recent historical trends in the equal opportunity climate among Army officers. The significance of the SSMP to this study is the scope of the empirical data gathered in the SSMP. ARI administers the SSMP to a large sample population (10 percent of the officer corps) and utilizes procedures designed so that the survey findings can be generalized to the total active component Army population with minimal error. The SSMP furnishes essential quantitative data for this study, while providing historical information to facilitate the comparison of trends on a wide range of Army issues. The Fall 1998 SSMP surveyed 4,686 active component Army commissioned and warrant officers.

Table 1. Demographic Counts of Officer Responses to the Fall 1998 SSMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black (not Hispanic)</th>
<th>White (not Hispanic)</th>
<th>Other(1)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO1-CW5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2LT-CPT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ-COL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO1-CW5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2LT-CPT</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ-COL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Officers</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A combination of Asian/Pacific Islanders, American Indian/Eskimo/Aleuts, and soldiers that selected "Other" as their race.

Source: Fall 1998 SSMP
The July 1999 ARI survey report, *Changes in Attitudes Toward the Army Among Racial and Gender Groups* also provides essential information for this study. ARI developed *Changes in Attitudes Toward the Army Among Racial and Gender Groups* from data collected in the 1996 and 1998 *Survey on Officer Careers* and the 1990 and 1992 *Longitudinal Research on Officer Careers* (ARI 1999, 1). The survey report provides relevant information on officer branch selection that is categorized by racial and ethnic categories and gender.

Major Nero Borders' study, "African Americans and Army Aviation," examines the issue of underrepresentation of blacks in Army Aviation. "African Americans and Army Aviation" closely parallels this study in its effort to uncover the reasons blacks are underrepresented in a combat arms branch. "African Americans and Army Aviation" is relevant to this study due to the closely related nature of the research, its timeliness and recommendations to change the trend of underrepresentation in a combat arms branch.

The RAND Corporation study, *Barriers to Minority Participation in Special Operations Forces*, examines minority underrepresentation in SOF. The RAND study parallels this study and provides a benchmark for analysis of this study's findings. The RAND study also offers
possible recommendations for solving the problem of underrepresentation.

**Primary Research**

The lack of existing studies on the underrepresentation of blacks in the Infantry requires the researcher to collect, and analyze primary source data on the issue. Extensive quantitative information exists on branch selection trends and the reasons officers join the Army. The purpose of the primary research in this study is to collect qualitative data on the issue, and generate innovative recommendations to increase the ethnic diversity of the Infantry officer corps.

**Qualitative Analysis.** The study employs qualitative research methods to examine the perceptions of Army officers on the issue. Michael Q. Patton, author of *Qualitative Evaluation Methods* describes the purpose of qualitative data in research:

> Qualitative data consists of detailed descriptions of situations, events, people, interactions, and observed behaviors; direct quotations from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs and thoughts. . . . The detailed descriptions, direct quotations and case documentation of qualitative measurement are raw data from the empirical world. The data are collected as open-ended narrative without attempting to fit program activities or people’s experiences into predetermined, standardized categories such as the response choices that comprise typical questionnaires or tests. (Patton 1980, 22)
This study utilizes a questionnaire as a survey instrument, which provides the respondents the opportunity to articulate their thoughts and observations on the issue in their own words. The process affords the researcher the benefit of the respondents' depth and detail on the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry.

General Officer Surveys. The research includes a survey of the five active component, black infantry general officers in order to capture the perceptions of senior Army leaders who have first hand knowledge of the issue of minority underrepresentation in the Infantry. The survey culminates with a request for recommended solutions to the issue. The significance of surveying general officers is their unique perspective as Army senior leaders who originate from the underrepresented officer population under study. General Officer Management Office provides contact information for Army general officers.

The researcher conducts the survey by contacting respondents by telephone and explaining the survey procedures and reasons for the study. The respondents have the option to have their comments attributed in the study or to remain confidential. The researcher intends to provide the study findings to all general officer respondents upon conclusion of the study.

The survey poses the following questions:
1. What are your perceptions of the reasons black officers select combat service and combat service support branches more readily than combat arms branches?

2. What are your perceptions of the impact of the presence of black role models and mentors on branch selection for black officer candidates?

3. What are your perceptions of the impact of the lack of black officers in the combat arms branches, specifically Infantry, in the Army of the twenty-first century?

4. How can the Army increase the accession of black officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies (i.e., without forced branching, setting goals and quotas on branch selection etc.)?

Command and General Staff College Surveys. It is critical to ascertain the reasons Army officers select their basic branches; in order to determine the reasons fewer black officers select combat arms than noncombat arms branches. The CGSC survey has three objectives:

1. To determine black officers’ perceptions of the reasons black officers select noncombat arms branches more readily than combat arms branches.

2. To determine black officers’ perception of the long-term affects of the issue on the Army.
3. To enable the respondents to offer innovative recommendations to reverse the trend of underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry.

The survey population includes every black, active component Army officer assigned as a student in the U.S. Army Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC) Class 1999-2000 or as students in the U.S. Army School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), Advanced Military Studies Program (students in their second year of resident study at Command and General Staff College). The survey population consists of "successful" mid-career active component Army officers. The researcher identifies the survey population as "successful" as characterized by their selection for the CGSOC resident course. Resident CGSOC students represent the top 50 percent of a cohort year group of officers, and is thus not representative of all active component Army officers. The merit of surveying the sample population is in their perspective, given their successful progression thus far in their military careers. Their success in the Army affords the researcher the benefit of their insight on career progression in all branches of the Army. The sample population does not include company grade officers or field grade officers not selected for resident CGSOC attendance in Class 1999-2000 or SAMS students in Class 1999-2000.
The researcher conducts the survey by distributing the questionnaire to all eighty-nine CGSOC students and four SAMS students by electronic mail. A cover letter explaining administrative procedures for the study and a brief statement of the research problem accompany the questionnaire. The cover letter also verifies Command and General Staff College, Development and Assessment Division approval of the research questionnaire, which is required for all studies that include the CGSC student population. The researcher intends to issue several electronic reminders and distribute paper copies of the questionnaire to student distribution boxes, in order to receive a sufficient number of questionnaires from respondents to meet a 95 percent level of confidence for the survey.

The survey respondents provide the following demographic information:

1. Basic branch upon commissioning
2. Detail branch if applicable
3. Transfer branch if applicable
4. Commissioning Source
5. Rank
6. Sex
The survey asks the following questions regarding the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry:

1. What are your perceptions of the reasons black officers select combat service and combat service support branches more readily than combat arms branches?

2. What are your perceptions of the impact of the lack of black officers in the combat arms branches, specifically Infantry, in the Army of the twenty-first century?

3. How can the Army increase the accession of black officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies (i.e., without forced branching, setting goals and quotas on branch selection etc.)?

Summary

The study utilizes the vast personnel resources of the Department of Defense and Department of the Army agencies. The study's research methodology provides extensive quantitative and qualitative data for the analysis of the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry. The study gathers data from officers who have a wealth of experience and have enjoyed a degree of success in the Army. The methodology provides respondents an avenue to offer their opinions and insights on the issue, and allows them to
recommend possible solutions to increase the ethnic
diversity of the Infantry officer corps.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH ANALYSIS

Introduction

Research analysis for this study focuses on the conduct of primary research, and revisits the primary and subordinate questions on underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry. Research analysis for this study consists of two areas:

1. Primary Research

2. Analysis of Primary and Secondary Research Questions

Primary Research

Conduct of the Survey. Primary research for this study consisted of survey input from black infantry general officers and CGSOC and SAMS students. The researcher distributed ninety-three surveys through electronic mail to the survey population. Respondents returned fifty-five surveys by electronic mail. The researcher also distributed thirty-eight paper copies of the survey to student distribution boxes for those respondents who failed to complete the surveys by electronic mail. Seventy-five respondents completed either an electronic or paper form of the survey.
Three of the five general officers surveyed completed surveys electronically. One general officer responded telephonically and one failed to respond. Table 2 depicts survey respondent demographics for CGSOC and SAMS students in the sample population categorized by branch. The survey population consisted of thirty-eight combat arms officers (40.8 percent) and fifty-five officers (59.2 percent) from either combat service or combat service support branches. Ninety-two percent of combat officers responded to the survey, while 73 percent of noncombat arms officers responded to the survey. The survey population consisted of seventy-five men and eighteen women. Eighty-five percent of men and 61 percent of women in the sample population completed surveys. The overall response rate for the survey was 80.6 percent.
Table 2. CGSOC and SAMS Survey Respondent Branch Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Branch</th>
<th>Responded to survey</th>
<th>Failed to respond</th>
<th>Total Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher utilized the following formula to determine the required sample size for the survey: $S = X^2 NP (1-P)/D^2 (N-1) + X^2 P (1-P)$. In the formula, "S" is the required sample size. "X^2" is the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at 95 percent confidence level (3.841). "N" represents the population size. "P" is the assumed population proportion (.50) which provides the maximum sample size. "D" is the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05). The researcher determined
that the study required seventy-five responses \[ 75 = (3.841)^2(93)(.50)(1-.50)/(.05)^2 \quad (93-1) + (3.841)^2(93)(1-.50) \]
in order to meet the desired sample size and sample proportion within .05 of the population proportion with a 95 percent level of confidence. The respondent sample is sufficient to provide a 95 percent level of confidence that responses of the sample population are within \( \pm 5 \) percent of the responses of the survey population (Group IV, 2000).

Nonresponses and survey distribution means were the primary sampling errors within the survey population. There were eighteen nonresponses to the survey despite four separate electronic mail requests and distribution of paper copies of the survey to the sample population. The sampling error in survey distribution was in the researcher's inability to physically contact the entire survey population. The means of contact consisted of electronic mail, verbal reminders, and individual handwritten notes attached to the surveys addressed to each officer in the sample population who failed to respond to the electronic mail requests. The means of distribution required the sample population to access their CGSC electronic mail account or retrieve surveys from their CGSC distribution box.
Primary and Secondary Research Questions

Analysis of the primary research question, “Why are there so few black infantry officers in the U.S. Army?” requires the examination of secondary research questions from Chapter 1:

1. Why do black officers join the Army?

2. Why do black officers select combat service and combat service support branches more frequently than combat arms?

3. Are there barriers to minority officer participation in combat arms?

4. Does a lack of black role models impact branch selection for black officers?

5. What is the impact of a shortage of black officers in combat arms, specifically Infantry on the Army of the twenty-first century?

6. How does the Army increase the number of black officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies?

Question 1: Why Do Black Officers Join the Army? To properly address the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry, it is critical to identify reasons black officers join the Army. For that reason, the study asks the question, “Why do black officers join the Army?”
The Spring 1999 SSMP identified nineteen likely reasons enlisted soldiers and officers join the Army. Army officers identified, “desire to serve my country, educational benefits, travel, security and stability of a job, and military tradition in family” as the most important reasons to join the Army. Figure 2 from the Spring 1999 SSMP depicts the most influential reasons officers join the Army, categorized by racial and ethnic category.

![Bar chart showing reasons for joining the Army](chart.png)

**Figure 2.** Reasons that Most Influenced All Officers to Join the Army. Source: Spring 1999 SSMP, 29 February 2000.

The Spring 1999 SSMP illustrates that desire to serve the country was more important to black officers than any other reason to join the Army. However, black officers are
less likely (25.2 percent) than white officers (40.1 percent) or Hispanic officers (30.4 percent) to report "desire to serve my country" as the reason that most influenced them to join the Army. Black officers are more likely to report that they joined the Army for job security and job skills than their white or Hispanic counterparts (APSO 3 1999, 2).

Question 2: Why Do Black Officers Select Combat Service and Combat Service Support Branches More Frequently Than Combat Arms? Motivation to join the Army leads to the reasons officers select certain career management field over others. Hence the survey instrument in this study posed the question, "Why do black officers select combat service and combat service support branches more frequently than combat arms?"

Sixty-two percent (forty-seven of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents identified that African-American officers select combat service and combat service support branches more readily than combat arms in order to gain a marketable skill for future civilian employment.

The general officers surveyed, identified the perception of gaining job skills for future civilian employment as a salient factor in branch selection by black officers. One general officer stated:
Cadets at USMA and other commissioning sources generally select their basic branches using a multi-part decision philosophy that gives considerable weight to the following factors:

(a) Recommendations and encouragement they receive from recent graduates who have maintained contact with the alma mater through [fraternity] affiliations or other informal relationships.

(b) Thoughts about life after the Army and the need to be "marketable" for the eventual transition back to the civilian workforce.

(c) Advice and counsel provided by serving senior officer role models (black colonels and generals), retired family members, and/or family friends who understand the dynamics of a career in the military.

Right now, indications are that factors (a) and (b) do not support careers in the combat arms in general; the infantry in particular. If the current trend persists, the majority of those available to provide factor (c) will evaporate.

The survey findings are consistent with the RAND Corporation study, Barriers to Minority Participation in Special Operations Forces, and the Department of Defense Youth Attitude Tracking Study.

The U.S. Military Academy's Institutional Research and Analysis Office of Policy, Planning and Analysis conducted a survey, USMA Branching Survey: Class of 1996, which studied trends in African-American male branch selection. The study identified that African-American male cadets placed a greater importance on preparation for a post-military career (62 percent to 41 percent) and post-graduate civil education
(45 percent to 37 percent) in branch selection than Non-
African-American male cadets (USMA 1996, 7). The branch
selection factors considered significant by African-American
male cadets closely matched the branch selection preferences
of cadets who selected a noncombat arms branch as their
first choice.

In USMA cadet branch preference surveys, African-
American male cadets selected Infantry as fourteen of
sixteen in order of preference in 1997, twelve of sixteen in
male cadets of selected Infantry as six of sixteen in order
of preference in 1997, and five of sixteen in 1998 and 1999
(USMA 2 1999, 6).

Question 3: Are There Barriers to Minority
Participation in Combat Arms? Statistical analysis of the
officer corps illustrates the underrepresentation of black
officers in combat arms branches. The issue solicits the
question, “Are there barriers to minority officer
participation in combat arms?”

The current Army accessions policy commissions 65
percent of active component Army officers from ROTC, 25
percent from USMA and 10 percent from OCS (Cadet Command
1999, 13). In recent years, Infantry accessed approximately
30 percent of its officers from USMA (Table 3). Blacks
comprised only 6.2 percent of USMA graduates over the last
decade. The accession of a larger percentage of infantry
officers than the Army's published goal, from a
commissioning source where blacks are underrepresented,
creates a barrier to black participation in the branch.

Table 3. Infantry Officer Accessions
By Source of Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>USMA</th>
<th>ROTC</th>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>158 (31%)</td>
<td>290 (57%)</td>
<td>64 (13%)</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>148 (30%)</td>
<td>296 (60%)</td>
<td>50 (10%)</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>173 (31%)</td>
<td>328 (58%)</td>
<td>60 (11%)</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>151 (29%)</td>
<td>333 (63%)</td>
<td>43 (8%)</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Question 4: Does A Lack of Black Role Models Impact
Branch Selection for Black Officers? This study identified
a shortage of minority role models in combat arms branches
as well as the presence of minority role models as important
factors in branch selection for minority cadets. Thirty-
seven percent (twenty-six of seventy-five) of survey
respondents perceived a lack of role models in combat arms
branches as the primary reason black officers select combat
service and combat service support branches more readily.
than combat arms. The RAND Corporation study, Barriers to Minority Participation in Special Operations Forces, similarly identified a lack of minority role models in Special Operations Forces as a barrier to minority participation.

The Army identified the importance of role models doctrinally in FM 22-100, Army Leadership:

America's Army is already culturally diverse and is becoming increasingly technologically complex. In this environment, some of your subordinates may seek advice and counsel from informal relationships in addition to their leadership chain. Such relationships can be particularly important for women, minorities, and those in low-density specialties who have relatively few role models nearby. (FM 22-100 1999, 5-17)

USMA assigns thirty-two captains and majors as tactical officers, to teach, coach and mentor groups of approximately one hundred and twenty cadets. Tactical officers are responsible for the military professional development of their cadets and thus act as role models. Currently, USMA does not have a black infantry officer assigned as a tactical officer. The absence of black infantry tactical officers represents a vacuum of role models for black cadets. Table 4 depicts black infantry officer accessions from USMA from FY 1991-1999.
Table 4. USMA Black Infantry Officer Accessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USMA Institutional Research and Analysis, West Point, NY, 30 September 1999.

A shortage of black infantry role models also negatively impacts ROTC accessions into the branch. This study identified the perception that very few high potential infantry officers serve as ROTC instructors. The majority of the black role models in ROTC programs tend to come from noncombat arms branches. The shortage of black infantry role models is a barrier to branch selection, due to a lack of knowledge about career opportunities in the Infantry.

This study also identified a negative perception of combat arms specialties, due to the inability to transfer combat arms skills to civilian jobs.

Forty percent (thirty of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents identified the perception negative
stereotypes in the Infantry. Many survey respondents reported that a lack of ethnic diversity among combat arms officers perpetuates the perception that black officers cannot be successful in combat arms branches. An example of a negative stereotype in the Infantry is the perception of a "good old boy network" which perpetuates the success of junior majority officers but is exclusionary to minority officers because of the perceived commonality between junior and senior majority officers. Colonel (Promotable) Remo Butler discussed the good old boy network in his study, "Why Black Officers Fail":

The Army culture of "taking care of ones buddies" easily translates into "the good old boy" network which excludes most young Black Officers. With no mentors or support system, they have no one to take care of them, and are left out of the network to the detriment of both the Army and the Officer. Every year the Army loses a lot of talent because some Black Officers do not feel that they are part of the team. (Butler 1995, 17)

Survey respondents also identified extensive field duty, physical hardships, lower promotion rates for blacks, and a lack of marketable job skills as negative stereotypes of the Infantry career management field.

Question 5: What is the impact of the lack of black officers in combat arms, specifically Infantry, on future Army leadership? Statistical analysis identified 72.7 percent of Army general officers emerge from the combat arms
branches. Black officers account for 8 percent (twenty-five of three hundred and nine) of Army general officers. One in five (five of twenty-five) black general officers are infantrymen. The Infantry career management field produced 25 percent of currently serving Army general officers. Therefore the study asks, “What is the impact of the lack of black officers in combat arms, specifically Infantry, on future Army leadership?”

Fifty-seven percent (forty-three of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents perceived that underrepresentation of black officers in combat arms will negatively impact the number of black officers selected as general officers in the future. They identified that a shortage of minority representation in the general officer ranks could limit the ability of black officers to influence decisions that affect the Army of the twenty-first century. The respondents also perceived that the scarcity of black senior leadership would lead to a lack of sensitivity to minority issues within the Army, by leaders who are not ethnically or culturally representative of the Army they lead.

The general officers that responded to the survey identified the importance of “growing” future senior leaders for the Army. One general officer remarked, “The combat
arms, especially the Infantry, will lose diversity, talent, and credibility if all soldiers do not have positive successful role models in the combat arms and Infantry. This will result in fewer Black senior leaders, fewer role models, and fewer volunteers [in combat arms and Infantry]."

As discussed earlier, a long-term affect of the issue is a shortage of available role models. Twenty percent (fifteen of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents identified the lack of black role models as the primary impact of underrepresentation of black officers in combat arms in the twenty-first century.

Questions 6: How does the Army increase the number of black officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies? The purpose of the study is to establish and examine the reasons for the underrepresentation black officers in the Infantry. The relevance of the study is the recommendation of possible solutions to the issue. Therefor the study asks, "How does the Army increase the number of black officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies?"

Survey responses from this study offered several suggestions to increase black infantry officers accessions. The most prevalent recommendations involved educating officer candidates on career opportunities in combat arms,
actively recruiting minority cadets by developing outreach programs and marketing strategies for combat arms branches, and assigning high potential black combat arms officers to ROTC programs as role models.

Thirty-seven percent (twenty-seven of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents identified educating and mentoring future officers on the merits of selecting combat arms branches as a method of increasing the number of black infantry officer accessions.

Twenty-five percent (nineteen of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents recommended outreach programs, recruiting drives and visits by black combat arms officers to ROTC programs and USMA to attract black cadets to combat arms branches. Several responses endorsed The ROCKS Incorporated and their outreach program as a model program for minority officer recruitment in combat arms.

Seventeen percent (thirteen of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents recommended that combat arms branches develop marketing and advertising strategies to recruit black cadets into combat arms.

Seventeen percent (thirteen of seventy-five) of CGSOC and SAMS survey respondents recommended increasing the number of black officers in combat arms by assigning black combat arms officers to ROTC assignments to be role models.
for black cadets. However, assigning black infantry officers disproportionately to ROTC assignments is problematic. The Department of Defense study, Career Progression of Minorities and Women Officers concluded:

The services should assess the extent to which the assignment of minorities and women to certain fields (ROTC, recruiting, equal opportunity) [while intending to boost minority recruiting] inadvertently hinders their career progression and availability to serve as peers, mentors and role models for junior officers “in the field.” (U.S. Department of Defense 2, 95)

Conclusion

Research analysis for this study provided the researcher both quantitative and qualitative data to adequately address the primary and secondary research questions. The qualitative data provided easily identifiable response trends of officer perception on the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry. The data indicated that most black officers join the Army and select their basic branch to acquire job skills that they can transfer to civilian jobs following their military service. The data also identified the shortage of black role models as a source of underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry. Recommendations to increase the ethnic diversity of the Infantry identified the need for education of black officer candidates through outreach
programs, recruiting visits and campaigns to market the branch.

Most importantly the data provided stories and experiences in the words of officers who have experienced the accession process and served as role models and mentors in their respective occupational specialties. The assemblage and analysis of those experiences culminate with the formulation of creative and feasible recommendations to improve the ethnic diversity of the Infantry.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Why There Are So Few Black Infantry Officers

The conclusion to this study answers the primary research question, Why are there so few black infantry officers in the U.S. Army? Although many factors contribute to the underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry, the predominant reasons are: a desire to gain a transferable skill for future civilian employment, and a shortage of black infantry role models in the commissioning sources.

The Perception of Gaining Transferable Skills.

Socioeconomic factors attract many black officers to combat service and combat service support branches. Many black officer candidates join the Army to learn a transferable skill for future civilian employment. Both qualitative data gathered in this study and quantitative findings from the Spring 1999 SSMP identified the importance black officers place on learning a "marketable" skill for future civilian employment. A desire to be marketable upon departing the Army, whether they leave after an initial service obligation or upon retirement, is the most significant reason many
black officers select branches other than Infantry upon commissioning.

**Lack of Role Models.** A lack of black infantry role models also negatively impacts infantry accessions. This study identified the perception that few high potential black infantry officers serve as ROTC instructors. This study also found that USMA has not had a black infantry company tactical officer on staff since 1989. Seventeen black company grade tactical officers have served at USMA since 1992. None of the officers were infantrymen.

The majority of black role models in ROTC programs tend to come from noncombat arms branches. The shortage of black infantry role models is a significant barrier to branch selection, due to a lack of knowledge about opportunities in the branch. The lack of knowledge also perpetuates negative stereotypes about service in the Infantry. Several officers surveyed in this study professed a lack of knowledge while in their commissioning sources, that the Army’s senior leadership emerges primarily from combat arms branches.

**Increasing the Black Infantry Officer Population**

Recommendations from this study are a product of collective input from many talented Army officers in the survey population as well as other officers interested in
the study. These officers presented innovative and feasible recommendations to improve the ethnic diversity of the Infantry.

Identify the problem. The first step toward solving the issue is to identify and publicize the lack of diversity in the Infantry as a problem. The Army cannot "hatch" colonels and generals. It must "grow" them. Army leadership must recognize the potential issues associated with the shortage of black officers being accessed into the Infantry, in order to grow a generation of leaders that represents the diversity of the Army at large. The Army cannot afford to wait until the underrepresentation of black infantry officers surfaces in future promotion and selection boards to recognize it has a problem. Consequently, the Army should take steps to stem the tide of underrepresentation of black officers in the Infantry.

Promonency for Change. The U.S. Army Infantry Center at Fort Benning, Georgia should assume proponency for the issue due the impact of the problem on the Infantry. The Infantry Center should work closely with Cadet Command and USMA to develop strategies to increase black infantry officer accessions. The Infantry Center should also coordinate closely with Infantry Branch, PERSCOM to monitor
trends in assignment patterns and career progression for minority infantry officers.

Infantry Branch PERSCOM should monitor the number of black officers assigned to TDA units for company command to ensure an equitable distribution of company grade infantry officers in operational and non-operational assignments. Participants in this study identified a perception that black infantry officers are more likely than their white counterparts to command headquarters companies, which provide service and support functions, instead of rifle or line companies, which perform the tactical warfighting functions in infantry units. The Infantry Center and Infantry Branch, PERSCOM should also work closely with infantry brigade and battalion commanders to monitor how minority officers are managed within units, to ensure minority officers have equal opportunities to command rifle companies and are not overrepresented in headquarters company commands.

Forging the Warrior Spirit. There is a shortage of black infantry role models in ROTC instructor and USMA tactical officer assignments. A lack of role models limits black officer candidates’ exposure to the Infantry. The Infantry Center should sponsor outreach programs to get role models into the commissioning sources to actively recruit
black infantrymen. The program should assemble an ethnically diverse team of infantry company grade, and field grade officers from units throughout the Army to visit USMA and ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities. The Infantry outreach team will serve as a source of information and motivation for minority cadets, and provide a valuable recruiting function for the Infantry.

The Army should implement programs to increase the marketability of combat arms officers. These programs are not specifically targeted for minorities, but will increase their interest in combat arms. A general officer in this study recommended a monetary incentive program for service in combat arms, or “Warrior Incentive Pay Program” that demonstrates the Army’s recognition of the value and importance of officers serving in the front line, combat arms units. There are two versions of the program, which applies to officers serving in authorized billets in infantry battalions and brigades.

The first version of the program pays company grade infantry officers using the 01E-03E pay scale. This program primarily targets accessions and proposes an average pay increase of $500 per month, expiring in the officer’s tenth year of service.
The second version of the program pays infantry officers in all grades, skill qualification proficiency pay (SQPP). Under this proposal, SQPP pays monetary incentives for Special Forces, Ranger, Airborne, Air Assault, Pathfinder, Bradley Leader Course, and Mortar Leader Course qualification. Officers receive additional pay for each skill qualification. SQPP will not only will increase accessions, but will also assist in the subsequent challenge of motivating black officers to attend Special Forces and Ranger training.

Build a Bridge. The perception exists that ROTC duty is not viewed as a “career enhancing” assignment. The Army must demonstrate the importance of the professional development of officer candidates by assigning high potential officers to ROTC programs as instructors. An Army senior leader who contributed to the study described the process of assigning high potential black infantry officers to USMA and ROTC programs as “building a bridge” for future Army leaders. The Army should “build the bridge” by publicizing ROTC as a career enhancing assignment. Subsequently, Cadet Command should work with PERSCOM to assign high potential officers, regardless of racial and ethnic category, to ROTC duty for two-year assignments. ROTC assignments are currently a minimum of three years in
length, while the majority of other officer assignments are a minimum of two years in length. The assignment of high potential officers, and shorter tours in ROTC coupled with follow on duty in operational assignments will increase the professional appeal of ROTC duty and improve the quality of ROTC cadets accessed into the Army. The assignment of high potential officers to ROTC programs is an investment in the future leaders of the Army.

The Army should assign high potential infantry officers to ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities without regard to race or ethnicity. Currently only six of the twenty-one ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities has white company grade officers assigned to their programs. Cadets at historically black colleges and universities will benefit from an environment, which better prepares them for active duty, and is more ethnically and culturally representative of the Army they will serve. The presence of high potential infantrymen in ROTC programs will boost black infantry accessions and improve the quality of ROTC accessions for all branches. The majority officers assigned to ROTC programs at historically black colleges and universities will benefit from the improvement of their understanding of the complex
cultural issues confronting the Army of the twenty-first century.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

The researcher limited the study to focus on underrepresentation of black officers in Infantry. Recommendations for additional study consist of both qualitative and quantitative studies that expand the issue to include other combat arms branches.

**Lack of Ethnic Diversity in Combat Arms.** An area for further study should include an expanded quantitative study, focused on a lack of ethnic diversity in combat arms branches. Black officers are represented below the active component Army average for black officers in all combat arms branches except Air Defense Artillery. The study should focus on factors contributing to Air Defense Artillery’s success in attracting black officer candidates.

**Black Officer Candidate Branch Selection.** Another area for future research should focus the issue more closely on the branch selection process in commissioning sources. This issue requires a broad quantitative study to determine the predominant factors in branch selection for black officer candidates from ROTC and USMA. Insight into these factors
could lead to inventive solutions to increase ethnic diversity in the combat arms.

Programs to Increase Black Officer Accessions. The Army should conduct additional research on programs to increase minority combat arms accessions. Recommended areas to focus the study should include the role of mentors and role models in the pre-commissioning process and marketing strategies to increase the ethnic diversity of combat arms branches. The research should determine the fiscal and manpower requirements for each program.
APPENDIX A

ARMY OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 5 depicts the Army officer distribution of the Army, categorized by racial and ethnic category. Black officers comprise 11.3 percent of the Army officer corps.

Table 5. Army Officer Distribution by Grade and Racial and Ethnic Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black %</th>
<th>Hispanic %</th>
<th>AA/PI %</th>
<th>AI/AN %</th>
<th>Unk %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black %</th>
<th>Hispanic %</th>
<th>AA/PI %</th>
<th>AI/AN %</th>
<th>Unk %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>3136</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>7337</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>11178</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21651</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black %</th>
<th>Hispanic %</th>
<th>AA/PI %</th>
<th>AI/AN %</th>
<th>Unk %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>16559</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>7197</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29998</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>4472</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Total</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black %</th>
<th>Hispanic %</th>
<th>AA/PI %</th>
<th>AI/AN %</th>
<th>Unk %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51925</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>7661</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: AI = American Indian, AN = Alaskan Native, AA = Asian, PI = Pacific Islander, Unk = Unknown

Source: Defense Manpower Data Center, Washington D.C., 30 September 1999.
Table 6 depicts active component Army officer demographics, categorized by racial and ethnic category, and basic branch of service. Black officers comprise 7.3 percent of infantry officers, 8.2 percent of combat arms officers, and 16.5 percent of combat service and combat service support officers in the U.S. Army.

Table 6. Army Officer Demographics by Basic Branch and Racial and Ethnic Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC BRANCH</th>
<th>AI/AN</th>
<th>AA/PI</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>UNK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>5272</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3909</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2842</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA TOTAL</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>21489</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>2552</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS/CSS TOTAL</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>14676</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: AI = American Indian, AN = Alaskan Native, AA = Asian, PI = Pacific Islander, Unk = Unknown

Figure 3 depicts the current inventory of Army general officers, categorized by basic branch. Infantry officers represent 25.7 percent (83 of 322) of Army general officers.
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Figure 3. Army General Officers by Branch. Source: General Officer Management Office, Washington, D.C., 16 December 1999.
Figure 4 depicts the inventory of infantry officers, categorized by racial and ethnic category and source of commission. Black officers represent 2.9 percent (fifty-eight of 1957) USMA graduates, 9.6 percent of ROTC graduates (358 of 3730), 8 percent (fifty of 625) of OCS graduates and 7.3 percent (466 of 6326) of all officers in the Infantry.

Figure 5 depicts infantry company grade officer racial and ethnic demographics by cohort year group. The Army accessed only fourteen black infantry officers in 1999.

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>FY96</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
<th>FY99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14(9%)</td>
<td>16(8%)</td>
<td>18(7%)</td>
<td>29(9%)</td>
<td>30(7%)</td>
<td>27(6%)</td>
<td>31(6%)</td>
<td>44(9%)</td>
<td>14(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Infantry Company Grade Officer Demographics by Racial and Ethnic Category. Source: Infantry Branch PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA, 8 December 1999.
APPENDIX B

ACCESSIONS DATA

Table 7 depicts United States Military Academy accessions in fiscal year 1999, categorized by basic branch and racial/ethnic category. USMA only commissioned one black graduate in the Class of 1999 into the Infantry.

Table 7. 1999 USMA Accessions by Basic Branch and Racial and Ethnic Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USMA Institutional Research and Analysis, Office of Policy, Planning and Analysis, West Point, NY, 28 September 1999.
APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

This appendix consists of the survey instrument used in this study. The survey consists of a cover letter, respondent demographics information and the survey questions. The cover letter details the purpose of the survey and response procedures for respondents. The cover letter also verifies Command and General Staff College, Development and Assessment Division approval of the research questionnaire, which is required for all studies that include the CGSC student population.
MEMORANDUM FOR Command and General Staff Officer Course Study Participants

SUBJECT: MMAS Study Questionnaire
CGSC/DAD Control Number 062800

1. My name is Major Ron Clark (Staff Group 5C) and I am distributing questionnaires, with CGSC Development and Assessment Division authorization, to all African-American officers in CGSOC Class 99-00, to collect data for Masters of Military Arts and Science (MMAS) research.

2. My MMAS thesis topic is “The Lack of Cultural Diversity in the Infantry: Why are there so few African-American Infantry officers in our Army?” As many of you know, African-American Army officers are underrepresented in the combat arms branches. My thesis examines the issue based on African-American officers comprising 11.2 percent of the officer corps but only 6 percent of the Infantry. Infantry officers comprise 12 percent of the Active Component Army officers in CGSOC Class 99-00, however only 5 of the 94 Infantry officers in the course are African-American.

3. Several recent studies identify the under-representation of African-American officers in the combat arms branches as a problem, but do not specifically address the causes or solutions to the issue. With your assistance, we can gather the necessary data to achieve the goal of recommending viable solutions to the problem.

4. The purpose of the questionnaire is to gather qualitative information from African-American officers for the study. The questionnaire consists of a few demographic questions and three questions regarding the under-representation of African-American officers in combat arms branches.

5. Upon completion, please return the surveys to the designated box in Bell Hall Room 155, U.S. Student Division Operations Office, or e-mail to clarkr3@leavenworth.army.mil.

6. The individual responses on the questionnaire are confidential. However, the study findings will be available to all participants upon request.

7. The point of contact for the questionnaire is the undersigned at 651-5997 or e-mail clarkr3@leavenworth.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

(original signed)
RONALD P. CLARK
Major, Infantry
U.S. Army
MMAS Questionnaire
Demographics

The purpose of the following questions is to determine respondent demographics for the survey.

Please enter your responses in the blanks.

Basic Branch Upon Commissioning

Detail Branch (if applicable)

Branch Transfer (if applicable)

Commissioning Source

Rank

Sex

84
MMAS Research Questionnaire

1. What are your perceptions of the reasons African-American officers select combat service and combat service support branches more readily than combat arms branches?

2. What are your perceptions of the impact of the lack of African-American officers in the combat arms branches, specifically Infantry, in the Army of the 21st Century?

3. How can the Army increase the accession of African-American officers in the Infantry without changing current personnel policies (i.e. without forced branching, setting goals/quotas on branch selection etc.)?
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