

NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furrished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

FSTI	WHITE SECTION (
10 C	DULL SECTION 🗌
	a) 🖸
9) AUX	: ? .'
95.723,41	194/ATERNALINT CODE
#123.	AYAIL, DESPAT SPECIA
1	li

C&MS 4308

Security Classification	
DOCUMEN	NT CONTROL DATA - R & D
(Security classification of title, body of abstract an	d indexing annotation must be ontered when the overall report is classified)
Air Force Human Resources Laboratory	20, REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
Personnel Research Division	2b. GROUP
Lackianu Ard, 10230	
IMPACT OF AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE ON A	FROTC OFFICER PROCUREMENT
DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates	
AUTHOR(S) (First name, middlo initial, last name)	
William E. Alley	
C. Byron Farmer	
REPORT DATE	78, TOTAL N). OF PAGES 76, NO. OF REFS
December 1971	!1 8
R. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	98. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(5)
b. PROJECT NO. 7719	AFHRL-TR-71-46
e. Task 771902	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(5) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)
d. Work Unit No. 77190205	
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	· .
I. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY
	Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
	Lackland AFB, Texas 78236
3. ABSTRACT	
As the armed forces consider the feasibility determine the impact of such a move on officer ac surveyed and categorized into groups based on dra absence of the draft. Results indicate that AFROT	v of implementing an all-volunteer force, it becomes necessary to cessions. A representative sample of AFROTC advanced cadets were ift vulnerability and expressed attitude toward officer training in the 'C cadet enrollments are motivated to some extent by draft pressure. otivated cadets, statistically significant differences were found on
demographic, aptitudinal, and attitudinal variables.	
D FORM 1473	Incluseified

27727

1-1

. .

Set & case, Also

. محمد تر در

ې د د مسوو د و درس

V***????

ي يكري يكن و منطق تقديم أوريد فد -5-888-87.2V

~~

1. 1. 1. 1. 2. 2. 1. H. H. H. H.

interesting the marked by the second

. Z. 194 a this and a state at a start of the second of the second of the second to be second by the second s

2

•

:

14	KEY WORDS		LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
			ROLE	WT	ROLE	W۳	ROLE	w
all volunteer force draft motivated self motivated officer procurement Air Force Reserve C	officer Training Corps. (AFROTC)						• ~	
	0 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	*						
	· 	-						
· ·								
							~	
			-			-		
							-	

<u>--</u>

.

· .._

المتحد المتحد المتحد المتحد والمتحد والمتحد والمحاص والمحمد المحاج

December 1971

IMPACT OF AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE ON AFROTC OFFICER PROCUREMENT

By

Nancy Guinn William E. Alley C. Byron Farmer, Sgt, USAF

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

PERSONNEL RESEARCH DIVISION AIR FORCE HUMAN RESOURCES LABORATORY AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND Lackland Air Force Base, Texas

FOREWORD

This work was conducted under Project 7719, Air Force Personnel System Development on Selection, Assignment, Evaluation, Quality Control, Retention, Promotion, and Utilization; Task 771902, Research on Prediction and Assessment of Adaptability to Air Force Life.

ii

This report has been reviewed and is approved.

George K. Patterson, Colonel, USAF Commander

and the state of the

ABSTRACT

As the armed forces consider the feasibility of implementing an all-volunteer force, it becomes necessary to determine the impact of such a move on officer accessions. A representative sample of AFROTC advanced cadets were surveyed and categorized into groups based on draft vulnerability and expressed attitude toward officer training in the absence of the draft. Results indicate that AFROTC cadet enrollments are motivated to some extent by draft pressure. In comparisons made between self- and draft-motivated cadets, statistically significant differences were found on demographic, aptitudinal, and attitudinal variables.

SUMMARY

Guinn, Nancy, Alley, W.E., & Farmer, C.B. Impact of an all-volunteer force on AFROTC officer procurement. AFHRL-TR-71-46. Lackland AFB, Tex.: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, December 1971.

Problem

The Air Force Officer Training Corps (AFROTC) has for many years served as one of the major sources for officer procurement. Since the program's inception, cadet accessions to advanced AFROTC training have been maintained exclusively with volunteer applicants without use of direct conscription. It is recognized, however, that a certain proportion of AFROTC cadets may be influenced to seek commissions in the Air Force because of the draft. In view of current proposals to establish an all-volunteer armed force, it becomes necessary for planning purposes to determine the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of young men who might be expected to apply for commissions under these circumstances. The purpose of this study is to examine the implications of the all-volunteer force concept on present and future AFROTC accessions.

Approach

Biographical survey forms and attitude questionnaires were completed by 3,201 advanced cadets from a representative sample of non-compulsory AFROTC detachments. Air Force Officer Qualifying Test (AFOQT) scores for all respondents were provided by detachment personnel. Subjects were categorized according to draft vulnerability based on their draft lottery number and self-expressed intent to enter training in the absence of the draft. Draft-motivated cadets were defined as those with 1 gh draft vulnerability who indicated that they probably or definitely would not have entered an AFROTC program in the absence of the draft. Self-motivated cadets (true volunteers) were defined as those with low draft vulnerability who stated that they probably or definitely would have entered a training program without the draft. Comparisons between these two groups were made on various demographic, aptitudinal, and attitudinal variables.

Results and Conclusions

Data from this study indicate that a certain proportion of advanced AFROTC enrollments may be considered draft-induced. However, the amount of draft motivation evidenced varied among subgroups of cadets categorized as potential rated and non-rated personnel.

Comparisons between self- and draft-motivated cadets reveal that self-motivated cadets indicated "desire to become a pilot or navigator" as their most important reason for entering officer training, while draft-motivated cadets selected "to avoid draft pressure." In academic background, a larger proportion of self-motivated cadets indicated business, biological, and social science majors; for draft-motivated cadets a larger proportion of engineering, professional, and physical science majors; for draft-motivated cadets a self-motivated cadets indicated a larger percentage of military careerists as the major wage earner in their family. Upon graduation from college, the self-motivated cadets anticipated a lower civilian earning capacity than that of the draft-motivated group, although a sizable proportion of the self-motivated group estimated their earning capacity above that of the 1971 military pay bill. The aptitude test performance of the self-motivated group was significantly lower than their draft-motivated cohorts. While 38 percent of the self-motivated cadets indicated probable or definite intent to make the Air Force a career, 50 percent expressed uncertainty as to their career decisions. A comparison of the projected retention of self-motivated cadets with the actual retention of a group of AFROTC officers indicates no measurable increase in retainability under zero-draft conditions.

This summary was prepared by Nancy Guinn and W.E. Ailey, Personnel Systems Branch, Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	Page 1
II.	Method	1
Ш.	Results and Discussion	3
	Draft Motivation among AFROTC Cadets	3 5
IV.	General Conclusions	8
Refe	rences	9
Арре	endix	11

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Distribution of Total Sample and Various Subgroups for Categories of	Page
-	Attitudes Toward Voluntary Military Service by Draft Lottery Sequence	2
2	Comparison of Self-Motivated and Draft-Motivated Cadet Samples and Total Sample Across Survey Items	4
3	Distribution of Career Intent Responses for 1964 and 1971 AFROTC Cadet Samples	6
4	Percentage Distributions, Means, and Standard Deviations of AFOQT Officer Quality Composite Scores for Self-Motivated and Draft-Motivated Cadet Samples, Total Sample, and 1971 AFROTC Graduates	7
5	Percentage Distributions, Means, and Standard Deviations of AFOQT Quantitative and Verbal Composite Scores for Self-Motivated and Draft-Motivated Cadet Samples and Total Sample	. 7
6	Number of Survey Respondents by AFRATE Detachment	11 -

IMPACT OF AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE ON AFROTC OFFICER PROCUREMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

For the past 23 years, the armed services of the United States have relied on a military draft system to obtain sufficient manpower to provide for national defense and security. In recent years interest has focused on the feasibility of eliminating the draft and moving toward a completely volunteer force. However, some concern and a great deal of speculation have arisen regarding the effects of such a move on the quality and quantity of personnel who would most likely fill the ranks of the armed forces in the absence of the draft.

The feasibility of converting to an all-volunteer manpower procurement system has been the topic for intensive research during recent years, and various attempts have been made to project reasonable estimates of the quantity and quality of the probable volunteer force (Fechter, 1967: Hause & Fisher, 1968; Cook, 1970; Cook & White. 1970; Rhode, Gelke, & Cook, 1970; Gates Commission Report, 1970). For the most part, Air Force research related to a zero-draft concept has been primarily concerned with the impact of proposed changes on the Air Force's capability to recruit and maintain a viable enlisted force (Valentine & Vitola, 1970; Vitola & Valentine, 1971). However, little is known about potential problems that may arise in the area of officer procurement.

The Air Force currently relies on two sources for the majority of its newly commissioned officers: the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and Officer Training School (OTS). It is generally recognized that a certain proportion of officer cadets entering these programs are motivated to do so in order to avoid the draft. However, the extent to which this occurs is, as yet, undetermined.

This study was designed to estimate the effect of the draft on non-compulsory AFROTC enrollment and the extent to which AFROTC cadets might choose to enter officer training in the absence of the draft. Additional comparisons were made between draft- and self-motivated cadets on the basis of aptitude, attitude, and demographic characteristics. Although a full evaluation of a voluntary military system must await the actual removal of the draft, the data presented suggest general trends, and they should provide a useful basis for assessing the probable impact of zerodraft conditions on officer supply from one of the Air Force's major input sources.

H. METHOD

· ; •

Biographical survey forms and attitude surveys were sent to a representative sample of AFROTC detachments¹ to be administered to cadets enrolled in the advanced AFROTC program during the spring semester of 1971. A total of 3,201 completed surveys were returned for analysis. Table 6 in the appendix lists the number of respondents surveyed by detachment. The survey sample is considered representative of all advanced AFROTC cadets enrolled in non-compulsory programs.

Each cadet completed a biographical survey form and an Officer Attitude Survey, PA 7011. The surveys contained no name identification, and there was a clear statement that responses were to be kept strictly confidential and used for research purposes only. Detachment personnel were requested to transcribe the respondent's Air Force Officer Qualifying Test (AFOQT) scores from official records to his individual survey form.

In the analyses comparisons were made between groups of advanced AI ROTC cadets categorized in terms of their attitude toward entering the Air Force in the absence of the draft and their draft vulnerability based on assigned draft lottery number. Classification of cadets by attitude toward voluntary military service was based on a survey question in which respondents were asked whether or not they would have entered an officer training program in the absence of the draft. Draft vulnerability for each cadet was derived from his ordinal position in the draft lottery sequence. Subjects receiving numbers 1 through 122 were identified as the high vulnerability group; those with numbers 123 through 244 as the medium vulnerability group; and those with numbers 245 through 366 were identified as the low vulnerability group.

In order to make comparisons more meaningful, two primary, interest groups, defined as self-motivated and draft-motivated cadets, were formed. Self-motivated cadets (true volunteers) were defined as those cadets who stated that they

R.

ł

¹Detachments located at institutions with compulsory AFROTC programs were not included in the survey.

Draft Group Definite Volunteer Probable Volunteer Probable Volunteer Probable Volunteer Definite Volunteer Total Group N Col % N	Distribution for Attitude Catego						tegory								
Variation N Cot % N Co	Draft		Definite Volunteer		Pro V∋li	Probable Volunteer Und		Pro N Sindecided Volu		ibabi3 De Ion- N unteer Vol		finite Ion- unteer	To Gre	Total Group	
All AFROTC Cadet Respondents High N 267 33 365 37 177 41 295 41 127 50 1,231 38 Medium N 257 32 34 556 36 267 38 80 32 114 24 70 100 Low N 238 35 37 177 41 295 41 127 50 1,231 38 Low N 813 100 996 100 430 100 70 100 252 100 3,01 100 Row 7: 23 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 48 474 38 Medium N 146 31 183 34 63 35 36 92 26 376 30 Low N 186 38 125 27 31 3	Group		N	Col %	N	Col %	N	Col %	N	Col %	N	C 01 %	N	Col %	
High N 267 33 365 37 177 41 295 41 127 50 1,231 38 Medium N 227 30 34 24 36 70 100 38 Low N 237 32 354 35 156 36 36 32 1.114 35 Low N 813 100 996 100 40 100 71 100 252 100 32.01 100 Total N 813 100 996 100 430 100 710 100 252 100 3.201 100 Medium N 145 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 74 48 474 38 Medium N 146 31 182 40 58 36 9 26 400 32 100 Low N 146 31 188 33 46 34 58 36 9						FROTC	Cadet	Respond	ents						
Row 7: 22 30 14 $\sqrt{24}$ $10/b$ 100 Medium N 257 32 354 35 166 36 267 38 80 32 1.114 35 Low N 289 35 277 28 97 23 148 21 45 18 856 27 Total N 813 100 996 100 430 100 710 100 252 100 3.201 100 Row 7: 31 38 12 $\sqrt{5}$ 44 17 64 47 38 Medium N 145 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 b 48 474 38 Low N 146 31 143 34 46 34 58 36 9 26 476 30 Low N 138 125 <td>High</td> <td>N</td> <td>267</td> <td>33</td> <td>365</td> <td>37</td> <td>177</td> <td>41</td> <td>295</td> <td>41</td> <td>127</td> <td>50</td> <td>1,231</td> <td>38</td>	High	N	267	33	365	37	177	41	295	41	127	50	1,231	38	
Medium N 257 32 354 35 156 36 267 38 80 32 1.114 35 Low N 289 35 277 28 97 23 148 21 45 18 856 27 Row 7 34 33 11 17 5 100 100 100 252 100 3.201 100 Row 7 25 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 6 48 474 38 Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 36 9 26 407 32 Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 36 9 26 407 32 Low N 178 38 125 13 13 100 153 100 35 </td <td></td> <td>Row 1</td> <td>22</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> <td>•</td> <td>14</td> <td></td> <td>24</td> <td></td> <td>10/</td> <td>Ъ</td> <td>100</td> <td></td>		Row 1	22		30	•	14		24		10/	Ъ	100		
Row 77 23 32 14 24 7 100 Low N 289 35 277 28 97 23 148 21 45 18 856 27 Total N 813 100 996 100 430 100 710 100 252 100 3.201 100 Row 77 21 38 12 $\sqrt{15}$ 44 17 6 8 474 38 Medium N 145 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 6 8 474 38 Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 36 9 26 407 32 Low N 146 31 138 12 13 33 20 9 26 37 100 135 100 135 100 1257 <td< td=""><td>Medium</td><td>N</td><td>257</td><td>32</td><td>354</td><td>35</td><td>156</td><td>36</td><td>267</td><td>38</td><td>80</td><td>32</td><td>1,114</td><td>35</td></td<>	Medium	N	257	32	354	35	156	36	267	38	80	32	1,114	35	
Low N 289 35 277 28 97 23 148 21 14 17 1 100 Total N 813 100 996 100 430 100 710 100 252 100 3.201 100 Row '7 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 48 474 38 Medium N 145 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 48 474 38 Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 69 26 407 32 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 3100 1.257 100 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 160 163 100 35 100 1.257 100		Row 17	23		32		14		24		7		100	~~	
Row 7: 23 11 17 17 17 100 1	Low	N Baw ('	289	35	277	c 28	97	23	148	21	45	18	100	27	
Norm A13 100 950 100 430 100 100 120 100 120 100 120 100 100 120 100 120 100 120 100 120 <th< td=""><td>1</td><td>NOW (7</td><td>234</td><td>100</td><td></td><td>100</td><td>420</td><td>100</td><td>710</td><td>100</td><td>252</td><td>100</td><td>3 201</td><td>100</td></th<>	1	NOW (7	234	100		100	420	100	710	100	252	100	3 201	100	
Potential AFROTC Pilots High N 145 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 48 474 38 Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 36 9 26 407 32 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 100 135 100 1.257 100 Row '7 36 37 14 49 22 2 2 40 67 56 35 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 41 20 </td <td>rotar</td> <td>Row %</td> <td>25</td> <td>100</td> <td>31</td> <td>100</td> <td>14</td> <td>100</td> <td>22</td> <td>100</td> <td>8</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> <td></td>	rotar	Row %	25	100	31	100	14	100	22	100	8	100	100		
High N 145 31 182 40 58 43 72 44 17 48 474 38 Medium N 146 31 138 12 15 44 17 48 474 38 Low N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 36 9 26 407 32 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 100 163 100 35 100 163 100 35 100 163 100 35 100 163 100 35 21 37 13 52 13 3 100 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 36 0 61 39 33 41 26 Medium N 14 28					P	otential	AFRO	TC Pilots	i						
Row 7: 31 38 12 15 14 12 15 14 100 Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 58 36 9 26 407 32 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Row 7: 37 36 11 13 3 100 1257 100 Row 7: 36 37 14 9 4 9 4 9 4 0 100 12 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 31 26 Low N 16 32 15 26 4	Hish	N	145	31	182	40	58	43	72	44	17	. 48	474	38	
Medium N 146 31 148 33 46 34 $\overline{58}$ 36 9 26 407 32 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 100 13 100 13 3 100 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 100 135 100 1257 100 Row '7 36 37 14 9 2 2 2 6 7 56 35 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 610 39 Medium N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 52 100	114.0	Row 3	31		38	10	12	••	<u>\15</u>		4/	Ь	100	-	
Row 7: 36 37 11 14 2 100 Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 33 20 9 26 376 30 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 100 163 100 35 100 1.257 100 Row 7: 37 36 11 13 3 100 1.257 100 Row 7: 36 11 13 3 100 1.257 100 Potential AFROTC Navigators N 14 29 2 4/b 67 56 35 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 61 39 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 100 150 100 Low N 50	Medium	N	146	31	148	33	46	34	58	36	9	26	407	32	
Low N 178 38 125 27 31 23 32 20 9 26 376 30 Total N 469 100 455 100 135 100 163 100 35 100 1.257 100 Row 7 37 36 11 13 3 100 1.257 100 Potential AFROTC Navigators N 14 9 47 100 1.257 100 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 100 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 100 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 52 13 34 41 27 43 44 40 36 13 34 41 <		Row 77	36		37		11		14		2	•	100	10	
N 469 100 455 100 135 100 163 100 35 100 1.257 100 Potential AFROTC Navigators High N 20 40 21 37 8 32 5 22 2 67 56 35 Medium N 20 40 21 37 8 32 5 22 2 67 56 35 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 61 39 Low N 16 32 15 21 21 0 100 Low N 50 100 57 100 25 100 23 100 3 100 158 100 Row '7 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Row '7 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Medium N	Low	N David (1	178	38	125	_د 27	31	23	33	20		26	376	.90	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		KOW 14	4/	100	3.5/	100	176	100	143	100	25	100	1 357	100	
Potential AFROTC Navigators High N 20 40 21 37 8 32 5 22 2 67 56 35 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 61 39 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Row 77 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Row 77 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Row 77 13 21 17 33 41 97 43 48 47 297 40 Medium N 35 31	lotal	_N Row ≅	469	100	455	100	11	100	13	100	3	100	100	100	
High N 20 40 21 37 8 32 5 22 2 67 56 35 Medium N 14 28 21 37 14 9 4/b 100 100 Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 61 39 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Low N 50 100 57 100 23 100 3 100 158 100 Total N 50 100 57 100 25 100 23 100 3 100 158 100 Row (1 32 36 16 14 2 100 100 158 100 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35					Pot	ential Ai	FROTC	* Navigat	ors						
Row 7 36 37 14 $\sqrt{9}$ 4 $\sqrt{9}$ 4 $\sqrt{9}$ 4 $\sqrt{9}$ 4 $\sqrt{9}$	High	N	20	40	21	37	- 8	32	5	22	2	67	56	35	
Medium N 14 28 21 37 13 52 13 56 0 0 61 39 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Row '7 J9 37 100 25 100 23 100 3 100 Total N 50 100 57 100 25 100 23 100 3 100 Row '7 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Row '7 13 21 17 33 48 47 297 40 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row '7 13 27 29 24 52 <th< td=""><td></td><td>Row 7</td><td>36</td><td></td><td>37</td><td></td><td>14</td><td>•</td><td>12_</td><td></td><td>4/</td><td>Ъ</td><td>100</td><td></td></th<>		Row 7	36		37		14	•	12_		4/	Ъ	100		
Row (?) 23 35 21 21 0 100 Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 26 Row (?) 39 37 10 12 2 100 158 100 Total N 50 100 57 100 25 100 23 100 3 100 158 100 Row (?) 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Medium N 40 36 63 33 49 41 97 43 48 47 297 40 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row (?) 13 29 16 30 12 100 100 100 100 I.ow N 37 33 266 16 30 13 100 100 <th< td=""><td>Medium</td><td>N</td><td>14</td><td>28</td><td>21</td><td>37</td><td>13</td><td>52</td><td>13</td><td>56</td><td>Q</td><td>0</td><td>61</td><td>39</td></th<>	Medium	N	14	28	21	37	13	52	13	56	Q	0	61	39	
Low N 16 32 15 26 4 16 5 22 1 33 41 20 Row '7 39 37/ 10 12 2 100 33 41 20 Total N 50 100 57 100 25 100 23 100 3 100 158 100 Potential AFROTC Non-Rated S&E Officers High N 40 36 63 33 49 41 97 43 48 47 297 40 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row '7 13 29 16 30 12 100 100 12 100 Low N 37 33 53 27 29 24 52 23 20 101 100 Medium N 62 34 99 34 62 41 21 10<		Row 2	23		35	• •	21		21		0		100	24	
Row 7. 39 37 10 12 12 12 10 10 Total N 50 100 57 100 25 100 23 100 158 100 Row 7. 32 36 16 14 2 100 158 100 Potential AFROTC Non-Rated S&E Officers High N 40 36 63 33 49 41 97 43 48 47 297 40 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row 7. 13 29 16 30 12 100 100 12 100 Low N 37 33 53 27 29 24 52 23 20 191 25 Row 7. 19 $28/c$ 15 27 111 100 100 <t< td=""><td>Low</td><td>N Durin C</td><td>16</td><td>32</td><td>15</td><td>26</td><td>4</td><td>16</td><td></td><td>22</td><td>1</td><td>5.5</td><td>41</td><td>20</td></t<>	Low	N Durin C	16	32	15	26	4	16		22	1	5.5	41	20	
N S0 100 37 100 23 100 23 100 3 100 133 100 Row '' 32 36 16 14 2 100	T 1	KOW 57	(39	100	<u></u>	100	10	100	14	100	- 2	100	100	100	
Potential AFROTC Non-Rated S&E Officers High N 40 36 63 33 49 41 97 43 48 47 297 40 Row '' 13 21 17 33 16/b 100 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row '' 13 29 16 30 12 100 100 100 15 100 100 100 15 100 100 15 100 100 100 15 100 100 15 100 100 100 15 100 100 100 15 100 100 100 15 100	10131	N Row 11	32	100	36	100	25 16	100	14	100	2	100	100	100	
High N 40 36 63 33 49 41 97 43 48 47 297 40 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row 13 29 16 30 12 100 100 12 100 Low N 37 33 53 27 29 24 52 23 20 191 25 Row 19 28/° 15 27 11 100 100 754 100 Fotential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers 30 13 100 100 754 100 Row 15 25 15 30 13 100 100 754 100 Row 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Medium N 62 34 99 34 62 41		Kow .		Po	tential /	AFROTO	Non-R	Rated S&	E Offic	ers	-				
Inight N 40 36 63 33 47 41 77 43 46 47 277 40 Row '' 13 21 17 33 16 100 100 100 Medium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row '' 13 29 16 30 12 100 </td <td>L P Looke</td> <td>N7</td> <td>40</td> <td>24</td> <td>£)</td> <td>33</td> <td>40</td> <td>41</td> <td>07</td> <td>12</td> <td>.19</td> <td>47</td> <td>207</td> <td>40</td>	L P Looke	N 7	40	24	£)	33	40	41	07	12	.19	47	207	40	
Mcdium N 35 31 77 40 42 35 79 35 33 33 266 35 Row 13 29 16 30 12 100 100 Low N 37 33 53 27 29 24 52 23 20 20 191 25 Row 19 28/° 15 27 11 100 100 754 100 Fotal N 412 100 193 100 120 100 228 100 101 100 754 100 Row 15 26 16 30 13 100 100 754 100 Row 15 25 15 30 13 100 754 100 Row 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 <t< td=""><td>ngn</td><td>Row 1</td><td>40</td><td>00.</td><td>21</td><td>33</td><td>17</td><td>41</td><td>133</td><td>43</td><td>16/</td><td>Ъ 77</td><td>100</td><td></td></t<>	ngn	Row 1	40	00.	21	33	17	41	133	43	16/	Ъ 77	100		
Row (*) 13 29 16 30 12 100 Low N 37 33 53 27 29 24 52 23 20 20 191 25 Row (*) 19 28/c 15 27 11 100 Fotal N 412 100 193 100 120 100 228 100 101 100 754 100 Fotal N 412 100 193 100 120 100 228 100 101 100 754 100 Row (*) 15 26 16 30 13 100 100 754 100 Potential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers 30 13 100 100 754 100 Medium N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38	Medium	N	35	31	77	40	42	35	79	35	33	33	266	35	
N 37 33 53 27 29 24 52 23 20 20 191 25 Row '/ 19 28/c 15 27 11 100 Fotal N 412 100 193 100 120 100 228 100 101 100 754 100 Row '/ 15 26 16 30 13 100 754 100 Potential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers 90 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 High N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row '7 28 32		Row C	13		29		16		30		12		100	•••	
Row 7 19 $28/c$ 15 27 11 100 N 412 100 193 100 120 100 228 100 101 100 754 100 Row 7 15 26 16 30 13 100 754 100 Potential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers High N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Medium N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 7 182 100 29	Low	N	37	33	53	27	29	24	52	23	20	20	191	25	
Total N 412 100 193 100 120 100 228 100 101 100 754 100 Row 77 15 26 16 30 13 100 754 100 Potential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers Potential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers 13 100 High N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Row 71 15 25 15 30 15/b 100 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 77 182 100 29 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100 Row 77 18 28 14 29 11 100		Row 17	19		28/°		15	2	27		. 11		100		
Potential AFROTC Non-Rated, Non-S&E Officers High N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 High N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 High N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 7 24 33/5 13 24 6 100 100 Fotal N 182 100 29 100 150 100 29 11 100 1,00 Row 77 18 28 14 29 11 100 1,00 </td <td>Total</td> <td>N Row C</td> <td>112</td> <td>100</td> <td>193</td> <td>100</td> <td>120</td> <td>100</td> <td>228</td> <td>100</td> <td>101</td> <td>100</td> <td>754</td> <td>100</td>	Total	N Row C	112	100	193	100	120	100	228	100	101	100	754	100	
High N 62 34 99 34 62 41 121 41 60 53 404 39 Row 11 15 25 15 30 15/b 100 100 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 7 24 33/c 13 24 4 6 100 100 Fotal N 182 100 29 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100 Row 7 18 28 14 29 11 100 1,00		Row 1		Poten	tial AFI	ROTC N	un-Rate	ed. Non-S	AE OF	licers	••		100		
Row 11 15 25 15 30 15/b 100 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 7 24 33/5 13 24 4 6 100 Fotal N 182 100 291 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100	High	N	62	34	99	34	62	41	121	41	60	53	404	39	
Medium N 62 34 108 37 55 37 117 40 38 34 380 37 Row '' 16 28 15 31 10 100 100 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row '7 24 33/5 13 24 4 6 100 Fotal N 182 100 291 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100 Row '7 18 28 14 29 11 100 100		Row %	15	• •	-25	•	15	1 - A	130	ţ.	15/	b	100		
Row 7 16 28 15 31 10 100 Low N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 7 24 33/5 13 24 6 100 Fotal N 182 100 291 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100 Row 7 18 28 14 29 11 100 100	Medium	N	62	34	108	37	\$5	37	117	40	38	34	380	37	
N 58 32 84 29 33 22 58 19 15 13 248 24 Row 7 24 33/5 13 24 36 100 100 Fotal N 182 100 291 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100 Row 7 18 28 14 29 11 100		Row 1	16		28		15		31		10	· .	100	. .	
N 182 100 15 24 36 100 Fotal N 182 100 291 100 150 100 296 100 113 100 1,032 100 Row 7 18 28 14 29 11 100	Low	N Bow (*	58	32	84	29	33	22	58	19	15	13	248	24	
$\frac{1000}{100} = \frac{100}{100} = \frac{100}{27} = \frac{100}{100} = $	Tatal	N	192	100		100	160	100	24	100	0	100	100	100	
	1003	Row C	182	100	271	100	130	100	290	100	113	100	1002	100	

Table 1. Distribution of Total Sample and Various Subgroups for Categories of Attitudes Toward Voluntary Military Service by Draft Lottery Sequence

^aDraft vulnerability groups are based on draft lottery numbers:

High vulnerability __numbers 1-122

Medium vulnerability - numbers 123-244

Low vulnerability numbers 245-366

^bThose cadets in brackets are defined as draft-motivated group.

⁴Those cadets in brackets are defined as self-motivated group.

2

definitely or probably would have entered officer training in an all-volunteer situation and had little or no draft vulnerability. Included in the draft-motivated group were cadets who stated that they definitely or probably would not have entered officer training in a zero-draft environment and had high draft vulnerability. The significance of group differences between self- and draft-motivated cadets was determined by computing chi square analyses or t-tests where appropriate.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Draft Motivation Among AFROTC Cadets

The first question to be addressed by the study is whether or not significant... proportions of AFROTC cadets are draft-induced to enter the training program. If there is no evidence of perceived draft pressure, the impact of an allvolunteer force on AFROTC officer procurement would be minimal or non-existent; and no problem in obtaining a sufficient number of junior officers from this source would be anticipated

Table 1 catego izes the total sample and various subgroups of advanced AFROTC cadets utilizing the dual criterion of draft vulnerability and expressed intent toward entering military service in the absence of the draft. It should be noted that while both juniors and seniors were aware of their draft vulnerability at the time of the survey, only juniors had received their lottery number prior to entering advanced AFROTC training. However, since the distributions for these two groups were so similar with regard to both expressed attitude and vulnerability composition based on lottery numbers, they were combined to reflect the characteristics and attitudes of the advanced cadet population.

From the Total column of Table 1 for the total AFROTC cadet sample, it appears that actual or perceived draft pressure does play a significant role in motivating AFROTC enrollment. Disregarding draft vulnerability category, the total row figures show that 30 percent of all AFROTC cadets indicated they definitely or probably would not have entered military service under zero-draft conditions, and 56 percent expressed definite or probable intent toward true volunteerism.

In addition to the overall indication of draft pressure among advanced AFROTC cadets, a further breakdown of the total sample was made based on anticipated assignment for their first tour

of active duty, presence or absence of specific AFOOT aptitude composite scores, and college major. A potential pilot subgroup was composed of cadets who indicated that they believed their first active duty assignment would be pilot training and had an AFOOT pilot aptitude score recorded or their survey form. A navigator subgroup was identified by those who indicated that they were scheduled for navigator training and had an AFOOT navigator aptitude score recorded. The remaining cadets, classified as potential non-rated personnel, were further subdivided on the basis of college major. Those with engineering and physical science majors were identified as potential candidates for Scientific and Engineering (S&E) assignments; the remainder of the non-rated personnel were identified as potential non-rated. non-S&E personnel.

Compared with the total sample, a much smaller percentage of potential pilots indicated draft motivation while a much greater percentage indicated true volunteerism. Overall, only 16 percent of the pilot subgroup indicated that they were probably or definitely draft-motivated, while 73 percent of this group indicated that they could be considered true volunteers. These same trendwere evidenced for the navigator group although the small number of potential navigators makes definitive comparisons impossible.

For the two non-rated subgroups shown in Table I, it appears that in both non-rated subgroups, a much larger percentage indicated draft motivation and less true volunteerism than was evidenced either among the potential rated personnel or in the total group Compared to all other groups, the non-rated S&E group had the largest percentage (43 percent) indicating draft motivation and the smallest percentage (41 percent) indicating that they could be considered true volunteers. In the non-rated, non-S&E group, 40 percent indicated they probably or definitely were not volunteers while 46 percent, could be considered true volunteers. 1

In comparing the number and percentage of those cadets expressing a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward voluntary military service, it appears that those selected for one of the rated officer training programs evidenced a higher degree of true volunteerism. However, it should be realized that the numbers of volunteers and nonvolunteers in each subgroup were based on current AFROTC enfollments where limitations on maximum enrollment, particularly for the nonrated subgroups, may have excluded potential

	Percentage Distribution				Percen	tage Distrib	ution
Survey Item	Self- Motivated N=566	Draft- Motivated N=422	Total Sample N=3,201	Survey Item	Self- Motiv≇ted N≈566	Draft- Motivated N=422	Total Sampie N=3,201
Reason for Entering				Annual Salary of Major V	Vage Earner		
Program				\$3,000 and below	3	1	2
Opportunity to gain				\$ 3,000-6,000	9	10	9
experience in field				\$6.000-10.000	30	28	30
of choice	7	7	9	\$ 10,000-20,000	44	45	44
Unable to obtain type				\$20,000-30,000	10	10	10
of civilian job desired	1	1	0	\$30,000-40,000	2	3	3
Desire to become a				\$40,000-50,000	1	1	J
pilot or navigator	49	11	34	Over \$50,000	1	2	1
Financial reasons:							
pay, allowances,				Principal Job of Major W	age Earner		
fiight pay, fringe	_			Laborer	2	2	3
benefits	5	4	\$	Craftsman, foreman	12	15	13
Prestige and status of		_		Service worker	5	3	4
being an AF officer	2	2	3	Farmer, farm manager	9	8	7
Patriotism: opportunity	′			Operative	1	1	1
to serve country	11	2	7	Sales worker	5	7	6
Opportunity for travel				Clerical work er	3	2	3
and excitement	3	1	3	Manager, official,			
Stability in employmen	t	•		proprietor	25	27	24
and job security	6	3	5	Military service	13	5	31
Opportunity for ad-				Semi-professional	10	10	9
vanced concation,				Protessional, rechnical	9	13	12
teennical or			-	Other or don't know	6	7	7
professional framing	4	8	2				
Avoid draft pressure	0	50	15	Expected Earning Capaci	ity on		
Opportunety to learn a				First Civilian Job		0	
would be whethe				Below \$200	0	0	0
would be valuable	,	· 1		\$200-300	l	0	1
То возата тата	1	1	I	\$300-400	3	1	2
no become more				5400-500	12	3	
indopondont	,	3	,	5500-600	12		
Interest in aviation	3	. 2		5000-700	19	11	10
array page and missile	•			\$700 000	22	21	20
systems	4	2	2	2000-2000	19	· 24	21
Onabity for Cit educa-	4	~	3	5 900-1 (080 Osur \$ 1,000	10	1.7	1.5
tional honofits				Over 31,000	/	17	11
after soparation	0	6	0	Contractor Trans and Milloum	Cambre		
Other	4	1	7	Comment to Chilling On	a Career		
Sector	-	•	,	Mora Docirable	cupation 37	,	17
College Major				handly Decirable	.16	2.1	17
Humanities	6	6	۲	Locs Doeirablo	10	24	740
Line and Applied Arts	2	ů I	í	No Opinion	15	20	17
Biological Sciences	1Ì	, y	9	AO OPIIROI	1.,	20	17
Social Sciences	19	16	18	Expressed Caroor Intent			
Business and Commerce	21	18	21	Definitely yes	10	n	5
Engineering	26	31	27	Probably yes	28	5	19
Physical Sciences	11	12	13	Undecided	50	44	50
Professions	1	5	2	Probably no	10	36	20
Miscellaneous	ż	2	2	Definitely no		15	

Table 2. Comparison of Self-Motivated and Draft-Motivated Cadet Samples and Total Sample Across Survey Items

applicants who could be available for an allvolunteer force. In addition, the relative number of volunteers in the various subgroups may be influenced in the future by the civilian job market. Current trends would indicate that a greater number of individuals with an S&E background might find a career in the military more desirable in the future than they now express.

Comparison of Draft- and Self-Motivated Cadets

Results of chi square analyses indicate that in all but one of the comparisons made, the differences between the two primary interest groups (self- and draft-motivated cadets in the total sample) were statistically significant at or beyond the .01 level of significance. Specific group differences between primary interest groups and between primary interest and the total group are discussed by content area. Comparisons of the groups across various survey items are shown in Table 2.

Reason for entering an AFROTC program, Forty-nine percent of the self-motivated cadets selected "desire to become a pilot or navigator" as their most important reason; 11 percent chose "patriotism: opportunity to serve my country." For the draft-motivated group, over 50 percent selected "to avoid draft pressure" as their most important reason while 11 percent indicated "desire to become a pilot or navigator." For the total group the popularity of becoming a rated officer was similar to that of the self-motivated group. On the other hand, a larger proportion of the total proup ovidenced draft pressure than the self-motivated group but the proportion did not approach that of the draft-motivated. While numbers of self-motivated and total group who entered service in order to qualify for GI educational benefits were negligible, six percent of the draft-motivated indicated that this was their primary motivation. More than likely these are officers who plan to obtain advanced degrees after separation from service.

Academic background. Differences in academic background between the primary interest groups are apparent in Table 2. Although the relative ranking of the three college majors having the largest percentages were the same for the two primary interest groups, significant differences in percentages were found between groups. Selfmotivated cadets showed a tendency to have more business and commerce, biological, and social science majors. The draft-motivated group had proportionately more engineering, professional, and physical science majors. Overall, the selfmotivated group more nearly reflected the percentages in academic categories for the total group than did the draft-motivated. Comparisons between the self-motivated group and the total group indicated only slight differences in the areas of greatest difference between the primary interest groups; however, even these slight differences may reflect some additional difficulty in securing sufficient numbers of personnel for S&E, medical,

and legal specialties in a draft-free environment.

Socioeconomic factors. The results of comparisons between draft- and self-motivated cadets on a number of sociceconomic factors indicate that differences between the groups in average family income were not significant. However, the economic backgrounds of self- and draft-motivated cadets did differ with respect to the occupation of the major wage earner of the family. Thirteen percent of the self-motivated cadets reported that the principal wage earner in their family was in military service as compared with only five percent in the draft-motivated group. The groups also differed noticeably in the relative proportion of cadets coming from families in which the major wage earner engaged in a professional or technical career.

One of the survey items asked respondents to estimate the salary they would expect to receive on their first job provided they could return to civilian status following graduation. In general, draft-motivated cadets had much higher wage earning expectations than did self-motivated cadets although a sizable proportion of the selfmotivated group fell in the higher salary range. The results of these comparisons are particularly noteworthy because they offer fairly definite policy implications. Substantial increases in military pay have been described as a basic step in the transition to an all-volunteer force. Provisions of the 1971 military pay bill adjust the pay of newly commissioned officers to the \$600-700 per month bracket. However, the distribution of salary expectations reveals that 58 percent of the true volunteers believed their earning power exceeds this amount. Such findings suggest that monetary incentives alone may not be completely adequate in motivating a volunteer officer force. The data also seem to emphasize the necessity for exploring a full range of non-monetary incentives which may eventually prove to be as influential as pay (if not more so) while being considerably more economical to implement.

Career intent and retention. One of the most important by-products of the proposed conversion to an all-volunteer force is an anticipated increase in personnel retainability. In theory, a highly retainable self-motivated force would offset, to a degree, the expected decline in the overall number of persons entering the service and, further, would reduce the training costs associated with the relatively high turnover in the current force.

Several items in the survey were designed to reflect the attitudes of AFROTC cadets toward a military career. In one item, respondents were asked to compare the desirability of a military

Career Intent Response	1964 Cat N=:	det Sample 3,338	1971 Totsi N=:	Cadet Sample 3,201	1971 Self-Motivated Gadet Sample N=566	
	Response Percent- 299	Proportion in service after 5 years	Response percent- age	Estimated proportion in service after 5 years	Response percant- age	Estimated proportion in service after 5 years"
	A	В	с	D	E	F
Definitely Career	12	.76	5	-	10	-
Probably Career	27	.68	19	•	28	-
Uncertain	45	.59	30	•	50	•
Probably Not Career	15	.49	20	•	10	•
Definitely Not Career	2	.53	5	•	2	•
Total	100	.62	100	.59	100	.62

Table 3. Distribution of Career Intent Responses for 1964 and 1971 AFROTC Cadet Samples

^a1964 proportions for each response category were applied to number in 1971 samples in same response category.

career with a civilian occupation. Seventy-three percent of the self-motivated group considered a military career either equally as desirable or more desirable than a civilian counterpart. In contrast, only 26 percent of the draft-motivated group and 59 percent of the total group held a similar opinion of a military career. A negative view toward military life was expressed by 12 percent of the self-motivated group as compared to 54 percent of the draft-motivated cadets and 26 percent of the total group. These percentages suggest that a majority of potential volunteer AFROTC officers enter the Air Force with a positive outlook toward a military career. One would expect a higher retention rate to be the result of such a favorable attitude.

AFROTC cadets were also asked to indicate their career intent on a five-point continuum ranging from an indication of definite intention to remain on active duty after completion of an initial commitment to definite intention to leave the service. Thirty-eight percent of the selfmotivated cadets indicated that they had definite or probable career intent prior to commissioning while only five percent of the draft-motivated stated a comparable inclination. While 51 percent of the draft-motivated group expressed negative feelings toward an Air Force career, only 12 percent of the self-motivated group were included in this category. However, of greater concern is the 50 percent of the self-motivated group who indicated uncertainty toward a career commitment. These individuals represent a probable loss to the Air Force at the end of their initial tour.

While the proportions of cadets expressing a particular career intent give some indication of probable loss or retention, more definitive information can be obtained by comparing the relationship between career intent and actual career decision. To provide a basis for comparison, the responses of the 1971 AFROTC sample were compared with those of a similar sample taken in 1964. Response distributions for both samples are given in Table 3, together with in versus out-ofservice statistics² for the 1964 sample. The in-out ratios for each level of career intent response were applied to the 1971 total and self-motivated samples of AFROTC cadets in order to project anticipated retention rates under draft and nodraft conditions. These estimates are shown in the last row of Columns D and F of Table 3.

A comparison of the response distributions for the total 1964 and 1971 samples reveals an apparent overall decline in positive career intentions among AFROTC cadets during the sevenyear period. Those indicating definite or probable intent to remain in service decreased from 12 to 5 percent and 27 to 15 percent, respectively. Provided the proportions in service at each response level remain relatively constant, the changes could contribute to a slight (3 percent) decrease in AFROTC officer retention when the 1971 sample completes five years of active duty. Quite unexpectedly, the projected rate for the

6

²Remaining in service as of December 1969.

 Table 4. Percentage Distributions, Means, and

 Standard Deviations of AFOQT Officer Quality

 Composite Scores for Self-Motivated and Draft

 Motivated Cadet Samples, Total Sample,

 and 1971 AFROTC Graduates

Table 5. Percentage Distributions, Means, and Standard Deviations of AFOQT Quantitative and Verbal Composite Scores for Self-Motivated and Draft-Motivated Cadet Samples and Total Sample

	Percontage Distribution						
AFOQT Percentile	Self- Motiva†ad	Draft- Motivated	Total Sample	1971 Graduates			
Below 30 -	~ .7.	2	6	4			
30-39	14	11	12	11			
40-49	. 9	5	8	9			
50-59	10	10	10	10			
60-69	12	8	10	11			
70-79	13	12	13	-13			
80-89	14	17	14	15			
90-99	21	34	27	27			
	100	100	100	100			
V-lid N ^o	564	420	/ 3,188	4,415			
an	63.65	71.54	66 63	67.83			
SD	23.21	22.14	23.36	22.58			

^aScores not available for all subjects.

self-motivated cadets alone appears to b^{+} no higher that that obtained for the 1964 sample. These data lend little support to the assumption that an all-volunteer officer force will necessarily be more career-oriented than is the current mixed force.

Selection test performance. Another important facet to be considered in a draft-free environment is the quality of the true volunteer, that is, to determine whether any change in overall aptitude ievel is to be experienced in a zero-draft 'tuation. Tables 4 and 5 reflect the percentage distributions and descriptive statistics for three AFOOT composites: officer quality, verbal, and quantitative. Overall, significant differences in mean performance between seli- and draft motivated cadets were found in each of the three composites.

Table 4 presents a comparison of officer quality performance between the primary intere t groups and the total group. To provide for additional comparisons, officer quality composite data for all 1971 AFROTC graduetes are included in the table. The percentage of self-motivated cadets in the low and medium-low levels of officer quality score. (below the 50th percentile) was somewhat greater than that of the other groups. Thirty percent of the self-motivated were in this category, compared to 18, 26, and 24 percent for the other groups. For the higher levels of aptitude (80th percentile and above), the reverse was true. Only 35 percent of the self-motivated were included in the upper category, while 41 percent or more of the other

	Percentage Distribution					
AFOQT Percentile	Self- Motivated	Draft- Motivated	Total Sample			
AF	OQT Quantita	tive Composite	2			
Below 30	16	13	16			
30-39	. 12	8	10			
40-49	10	7	8			
50-59	. 6	8	7			
60-69	10 -	6	8			
70.79	14	16	14			
80-89	. 13	12	14			
90-99	19	30	23			
	100	100	100			
Valid N ^a	541	405	3,058			
Mean	59.29	65.61	60.98			
SD	26.92	-27.19	27.40			
	AFOQT Verba	l Composite				
Below 30	16	14	15			
30-39	11	6	10			
40-49	12	. 8	10			
50-59	11	11	10			
60-69	12	13	13			
70 -7 9	17	18	19			
80-89	15	19	16			
90-99	6	11	7			
	100	100	100			
Valid N ^a	541	405	3,058			
Mean	55.02	60.81	57.25			
SD	23.93	22.64	23.69			

^aScores not available for all subjects.

groups we, e included. The 7-percent difference between the self-motivated group and the 1971 accessions at the high-aptitude levels, as well as the overall difference in mean performance between these two groups, tends to suggest some decrement in overall officer quality may be experienced in the all-volunteer situation.

For the quantitative comparisons, shown in Table 5, much the same trend appeared although to a lesser extern. Included in the low, mediumlow range of aptitude were 38 percent of the selfmotivated group and only 28 percent of the draftmotivated. The upper aptitude range included 32 percent of the self-motivated group as compared to 42 percent of the draft-motivated. While the differences in primary interest groups were quite distinct, comparison of percentages at the various aptitude levels between self-motivated and total group reflected only a 2-percent difference in the low, medium-low levels and a 5-percent difference at the upper level. Although the mean difference between primary interest groups reached a significant level, the difference in mean performance between the self-motivated and total group was less than 2 percentile points.

Trends for the verbal composite scores, also shown in Table 5, were similar to the quantitative distribution. Thirty-nine percent of the selfmotivated group were included in the Iow, medium-low range of verbal aptitude as compared to 28 percent of the draft-motivated and 35 percent of the total group. At the higher levels of verbal aptitude, 21 percent of the self-motivated were included compared to 30 percent of the draft-motivated and 23 percent of the total group. Comparison of mean performance reflected a significant difference between primarv interest groups, although only a relatively small difference between total group and self-motivated mean performance was indicated.

IV. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions regarding future AFROTC procurement can be drawn from the data obtained in the present study. First, it can be assumed that a certain proportion of AFROTC advanced cadets are draft-motivated. Moreover, the number of true volunteers varies among subgroups of potential rated and non-rated personnel.

Comparisons between self- and draft-motivated cadets reveal important trends and insights into the composition of an all-volunteer officer force which might be useful in volunteer procurement efforts. It appears that the offer of becoming a rated pilot or navigator is an effective motivating device for potential volunteer cadets. Findings regarding their expected earning power in the civilian sector indicate that over half of this truevolunteer group feet that their beginning salary could exceed that amount provided by the new military pay increase. Such information emphasizes the importance of identifying incentive programs other than pay which could be used effectively under zero-draft conditions. Although an increase in personnel retainability has been anticipated as a by-product of an all-volunteer force, 50 percent of the self-motivated group indicated uncertainty concerning their future military career plans. In addition, projected retention of these volunteers, when compared to another AFROTC sample that has already reached the career decision point, suggests that no measurable increase in retainability of volunteer officers will be experienced. These results further underscore the need to develop improved career incentive programs to minimize the loss of qualified officers.

REFERENCES

- Cook, A.A., Jr. The supply of Air Force volunteers. RM-6361-PR. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, September 1970.
- Cook, A.A., Jr., & White, J.P. Estimating the quality of Air Force volunteers. RM-6360-PR. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, September 1970.
- Fechter, A.E. The supply of first-term military officers. Study S-290, AD 662-661, IDA Log No. HQ 67-6607. Atlington, Va.: Institute for Defense Analyses, March 1967.
- Gates, T.S. (Chairman) The report of the President's commission on an all-volunteer armed force. New York: Macmillan Co., 1970.
- Hause, J.C., & Fisher, A.C. The supply of firstterm enlisted manpower in the absence of a draft. Study S-293, AD 691-185, IDA Log No. HQ 67-6911. Atlington, Va.: Institute for Defense Analyses, April 1968.

- Rhode, A.S., Gelke, J.J., & Cook, F.X. Impact of an all volunteer force upon the Navy in the 1971-1973 timeframe. Department of the Navy: Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Systems Analysis and Long Range Objectives Division, December 1970.
- Valentine, L.D., Jr., & Vitola, B.M. Comparison of self-motivated Air Force enlistees with draftmotivated enlistees. AFHRL-TR-70-26, AD-713 608. Lackland AFB, Tex.: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, July 1970.
- Vitola, B.M., & Valentine, L.D., Jr. Assessment of Air Force accessions by draft-vulnerability category. AFHRL-TR-71-10, AD-724 094. Lackland AFB, Tex.:- Personnel Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, March 1971.

APPENDIX

Table 6	Number of Survey	Respondents hv	AFROTC Detechment
I HUIC U.	rumber of Burrey	icoponuento by	

Detachment Location	State	Detachment Number	Number of Cadet Respondent
Bowling Green State University	Ohio	620	. 70
Brigham Young University	Utah -	855	.133
Capital University	Ohio	646	10
Colorado State University	Colorado	090	69
Cornell University	New York	- 520	24
East Carolina University	North Carolina	600	45
Florida State University	Florida	145	69
Fordham University	New York	525	15
Gettysburg College	Pennsylvania	710	18
Grove City College	Pennsylvania	745	81
Illinois Institute of Techology	illinois	195	23
Kansas State University	Kansas	270	130
Louisiana State University	Louisiana	310	87
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Massachusetts	365	27
Miami University	Ohio	640	48
Michigan State University	Michigan	380	. 63
Mississinni State University	Miceiceinni	425	63
New Mexico State University	New Mexico	505	23
North Carolina State University	North Carolina	505	50
North Tayas State University	Tavas	925	39
Ohio State University	Ohio	633	47
Ohio State Onversity Ohio Weslavan University	Ohio	643	21
Oklahoma Stata University	Oldahama	633	21
Oragon State University	Okianoma	670 A95	. 19
Diregon State Oniversity Durdua University	Indiana	220	39
Future University San Eranaiaan Stata Callona	Indiana Coltinanto	220	112
San Francisco State University	Camornia Couth Dahata	080	17
South Dakota State Oniversity .	South Dakota	780	82
Southern Matheriat University	Towns	205	78
Southern Methoust University	Texas Nove Manh	813 515	54
Syracuse Onversity	New TORK	232	27
Low as Adding Oniversity	Texas Obto	803	234
University of Akron		000	54
University of linnois	Hunois	190	59
University of Iowa	Iowa Maria tar	200	75
University of Kenducky	Kentucky	290	37
University of Maryland	Maryland	3.30	32
University of Minnesota	Minnesota	415	45
University of Missouri	Missouri	440	72
University of Neofaska	Nebraska	465	68
University of North Decora	North Dakota	615	49
University of Notre Dame	Indiana	2.25	76
University of Oktanoma	Oklanoma	675	. 90
University of Southwest Louisiana	Louisiana	315	65
University of Southern California	California	060	82
University of Tennessee	Tennessee	800	- 61
University of Virginia	Virginia	890	45
University of Washington	Washington	- 91	66
University of Wisconsin	Wisconsia	925	37
Wichita State University	Kansas	275	- 46
11. A. I.			

and the for the strategic for the

長辺に記憶的にいた。

定時代

⁴13 surveys had incomplete data and were eliminated from survey analysis.

11