1	AD-AO	73 965	NAV NAV	AL POST AL AVIA	GRADUA	TE SCH	NI PRED	NTEREY	CA	ION AN	DIDENT	IFYING	/6 5/9 RETC	:(U)
		DF AD A073965					All and a second	Control of the second s			A survey of the strength of th		A service of each of the service of	
				A second		The second seco		 Markan Markan Ma				A DECEMPTION OF A DECEMPTION O		
									Description The Analysis of the Analysis of t					
						<text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text>			A start stratement of the first stratement of the stratement of th					
	dinana Managara Managara Managara					Anna anna an Anna Anna an Anna an Ann	And a second sec						a	
	the set of		L REAL	R		0.105 0.105		10000000000000000000000000000000000000			THE T			
			1		energi and an and a second and	Television Professor Television Professor Televisio	The second secon	 Alternative Alternat	- Little Comment - State Comme	876- 878- 878- 878- 878- 888- 885- 117- 117- 117- 117- 117- 117- 117- 11		- BERK - Selector - Selector	- State	END DATE FILMED 10-79 DDC
							3					1		./





	CUMENTATION F	PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER		2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Naval Aviator Ret	ention. Pro	dicting	Mastoria Thegia
Retention and Ide	ntifying Pol	atod	Tune 1979
Variables	merrying ker	acqu	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(.)			6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(+)
Virgil Griffith (ook, Junior		
	NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
Naval Postgraduat	e School	/	
Monterey, Califor	nia 93940	1	
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAM	E AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
Naval Postgraduat	e School		June 1979
Monterey, Califor	nia 93940		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
. MONITORING AGENCY NAME	& ADDRESS/II Allerent	tren Controlling Office)	18. SECURITY CLASS. (of this reart)
		•	Unclassified
			154. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
Approved for publ	ic release; (distribution n Block 30, 11 different fre	unlimited.
Approved for publ Distribution statement S. Supplementary notes	ic release; (distribution	unlimited.
Approved for publ D. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT B. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	ic release; (of the obstract entered in	distribution n Block 20, 11 different fre	e Report)
Approved for publ O DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT S. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Naval Aviator Re	ic release; of for the obstract entered in ree side if necessary and tention	distribution n Block 30, 11 different fre	e Report)
Approved for publ 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Centinue on reve Naval Aviator Re	ic release; o	distribution	unlimited.
Approved for publ O OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT S. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Naval Aviator Re Vaval Aviator Re VThe research of determining the for accurately predictions on the statement the future. Another	ic release; of (of the ebetres: entered in tention tention be olde if necessary and tescribed in easibility of t aviator ret her objective	distribution Dieck 20, 11 different free Identify by block mamber) this thesis we using the Na ention six to was to deter	vas directed toward avy's HRM Survey to b eighteen months in rmine if variables which
Approved for publ Approved for publ OUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Naval Aviator Re AMSTRACT (Continue on rever The research of determining the for accurately predic- the future. Anoth discriminated Car- inderstanding of the develop effective	ic release; of of the ebetree: entered in tention tention easibility of t aviator ret her objective eerists from retention beh action plans	distribution Deck 20, 11 different free Identify by block number) this thesis w using the Na cention six to was to deter Resignees wou avior to enable aimed at sol	vas directed toward avy's HRM Survey to beighteen months in cmine if variables which and provide sufficient ble Navy management to aving aviator retention.

the s

UNCLASSIFIED

FOR UNTY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE THAN DOLE BALLAND

#20 - ABSTRACT - CONTINUED

Problems. Discriminant-function equations, in crossvalidation, correctly classified 90% of the naval aviator sample into groups -- Careerists and Resignees. Additionally, discriminant-function analysis generated discriminating variables which provided insight into career retention behavior. Attitude measures, command climate and general satisfaction, were found to be highly correlated with personnel retention.

Access	on For
NTIS (Galina /
DDC TA	B
Unanno	anced
Justif	ication
Ev	
Distri	rution
Avoi	ability Codes
- I.VC.A.	1. stinuior
	Availand
Dist	specian
1	
11/1	
H	
1	

DD Form 1473 5/N 0102-014-6601

2

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE/When Date Entered)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Naval Aviator Retention: Predicting Retention and Identifying Related Variables

by

Virgil Griffith Cook, Junior Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy B.S., University of Southern Mississippi, 1969

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL June 1979

Author

Approved by:

Chairman, Department of Administrative Sciences

ABSTRACT

The research described in this tehsis was directed toward determining the feasibility of using the Navy's HRM Survey to accurately predict aviator retention six to eighteen months in the future. Another objective was to determine if variables which discriminated Careerists from Resignees would provide sufficient understanding of retention behavior to enable Navy management to develop effective action plans aimed at solving aviator retention problems. Discriminant-function equations, in cross-validation, correctly classified 90% of the naval aviator sample into two groups -- Careerists and Resignees. Additionally, discriminant-function analysis generated discriminating variables which provided insight into career retention behavior. Attitude measures, command climate and general satisfaction, were found to be highly correlated with personnel retention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRO	DUCTION	7
	A. PI	RIOR RESEARCH	8
	B. SY	NOPSIS OF STUDY	14
II.	RESEAR	RCH OBJECTIVES, METHODS, AND PROCEDURES	16
	A. RI	ESEARCH OBJECTIVES	16
	B. MI	ETHOD	17
	C. PI	ROCEDURES	19
III.	RESULT	TS AND DISCUSSION	23
	A. DI	EMOGRAPHY OF SAMPLE	23
	B. DI	ISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS	27
	с. си	ROSS-VALIDATION	34
	D. CI	LASSIFICATION OF AVIATORS APPROACHING EOS -	36
	E. V2	ARIABLES RELATED TO RETENTION	37
IV.	SUMMAR	RY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	42
	A. St	JMMARY	42
	в. со	ONCLUSIONS	44
	C. RE	ECOMMENDATIONS	45
APPEN	DIX A:	List of HRM Questions	49
APPEN	DIX B:	Navy Aviation Career Survey	50
APPEN	DIX C:	Navy Aviation Career, Unit Sample	68
APPEN	DIX D:	Discriminant Score Classification	69
APPEN	DIX E:	Sub-set Discriminant Analysis Results	70
APPEN	DIX F:	Multiple Regression Summary, Computation of "b" Weights	74
APPEN	DIX G:	Classification Results of Aviators 12 Months from EOS	75

5

and the

1 mil

-112-0-2

2.00

APPENDIX	X H: Classification Results of Aviators 13-18 Months from EOS	81
LIST OF	REFERENCES	86
INITIAL	DISTRIBUTION LIST	88

I. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this thesis is to ascertain the feasibility of using the Navy's Human Resources Management survey to predict Naval Aviator retention. Increasing numbers of Naval aviators are resigning from the Navy. A trend of declining pilot retention began to surface in fiscal year 1977 and has steadily increased in magnitude. Resignation requests from pilots reaching their minimum service requirement (MSR) increased from 532 in fiscal year 1977 to 762 in fiscal year 1978. The office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-136d) projects that in fiscal year 1979 more than 850 Navy pilots reaching MSR¹ will resign. So far in fiscal year 1979, resignations by Naval Aviation (pilot) Lieutenant Commanders, who are beyond the MSR point and generally not included when computing retention figures, have increased from 35 in fiscal year 1978 to 76 at the same time (March) in fiscal year 1979, an increase of 100 percent. If aviator retention continues to follow the

¹MSR is the initial service obligation incurred by an officer. Once fixed by commissioning source and initial training, an officer's MSR does not change. Later obligations (augmentation, PG school) have no bearing on MSR. Specifically, retention is the ratio of the number of officers onboard at MSR+2 years to the number onboard at MSR-1 year (MSR-1.5 for aviation officers). For example the MSR for a pilot, regardless of commissioning source, would be 4.5 years after designation as a Naval Aviator.

projected downward trend, and requirements for aviators do not decline, it will threaten the operational readiness of Naval Aviation and, ultimately, National security. An increased understanding of the factors affecting retention and resignations, coupled with a system to monitor retention, is needed to confront successfully the Navy's current aviator retention problems.

A. PRIOR RESEARCH

Problems with aviator retention are not new to the Navy. During the early years of the Vietnam war (1965), the Navy was faced with increasing requirements for pilots and a decrease in retention of pilots [Adams, 1966]. A study was conducted by the Navy Personnel Program Support Activity, Washington, D.C., which asked Navy pilots various questions regarding aspects of Naval services [Adams, 1966]. Four major areas contributing to low retention were identified: family separation, pay and allowances, lack of choice in duty assignment, and excessive administrative duties. The extent of analysis in this study was limited to frequency distributions with no mention of correlations or other statistical measures or tests. Other than this study, very little work has been done dealing specifically with Naval Aviator retention. Since 1966, considerable work concerning personnel turnover of enlisted personnel has been done, and a few studies of officer personnel in various branches of the service have been made. Hand, Griffeth, and Mobley (1977)

recently published an extremely comprehensive review of military attrition and retention studies. This review includes a classification matrix which categorizes studies by the independent and dependent variables used. This matrix provides the reader with a quick overview of seventyeight military enlisted personnel turnover studies performed since 1971. The category headings were:

- Independent Variables: Economic/incentive, organizational practices, climate, job content, attitudes, satisfaction, intentions expectations, demographics, psychological, aptitude, and performance (vertical axis).
- Dependent Variables: Original choice, attrition prior to completion of service obligation, actual reenlistment, intention, completion of enlistment, other forms of withdrawal, and studies related to withdrawal behavior (horizontal axis).

Another recent literature review dealing with civilian turnover studies, done by J. L. Price (1977), codified the turnover literature from a variety of disciplines, e.g. economics, sociology, and psychology. Finally, a computer search through the Defense Documentation Center, Alexandria, Va., using officer personnel, officer retention, pilot retention, and pilots, as search code terminology, was performed by this investigator. This search covered all studies from 1966 to the present which dealt with the aforementioned topic areas. These three summaries provided considerable insight into current knowledge concerning approaches to solving personnel turnover and retention problems. Relevant studies cited in these sources will be referenced in following sections of this report.

The basic criterion of this study is Naval avaiator career intentions; specifically, intention to make a career in the Navy or intention to resign from the Navy. It is generally accepted that an individual's stated intention is a good predictor of actual career choice behavior. Two methods for measuring actual retention have been used in Navy Research. The first is reenlistment rate, which is calculated cross-sectionally for selected groupings of Navy personnel. The second is individual reenlistment behavior -which requires tracking an individual longitudinally. Measuring actual reenlistment on the basis of individual reenlistment decision appears to be the sounder of the two methods.

Several Navy retention studies have used both stated intent to reenlist and actual reenlistment behavior as criteria. Bruni, Jones, and James (1975) in a study of first term enlisted reenlistment behavior found that personnel who reenlisted had higher general satisfaction and perceived their jobs to be more challenging than those who left the Navy. LaRocco, Gunderson, and Pugh (1975) found personal characteristics such as marital status and age, work-related variables such as months at sea, and disciplinary record to be good predictors of reenlistment. In a study to measure retention of enlisted Navy personnel in selected critical specialities, Singer and Morton (1961) found length of duty at sea to be inversely related and pay

grade directly related to reenlistment. Lockman, Stoloff, and Allbritton (1972) in a study of four Navy occupational groups (Electrician, Mechanics, Communicators, Seaman/Fireman), found correlations varying from .36 to .46 between reenlistment intention and actual decision to reenlist. Additionally, they found that reenlistment decisions of those who intend to reenlist could be better predicted (adjusted R = .51) by adding economic, psychological, and personal characteristic variables to the equation. Holoter, Stahle, Conner, and Grace (1974) were able to differentiate between firstterm enlisted personnel who reenlisted and those who left the Navy (N = 452). Using ten combined variables, 91 percent correct association with stay behavior (Phi = .24, P < .001) was obtained for the 43 stayers in the stay group who had not intended to reenlist. For 41 who were undecided regarding reenlisting, a 96 percent correct association with stay behavior and 70 percent correct association with leave behavior (Phi = .78, p < .001) was found. Grace, Holoter, and Soderquist (1976), in a longitudinal study of 898 Navy enlisted personnel designed to compare stated intention to reenlistment behavior, found that 93 percent of first-term personnel who stated they intended to reenlist actually did

¹This sample was drawn from two survey samples. The first sample, 1,711 first term enlisted personnel, included 627 personnel within 6 months of reenlistment decision. The second sample of 2,744, had 1,760 personnel with less than four years remaining. The longitudinal study made no mention of how close personnel were to the decision point.

reenlist. In first-term personnel who stated they intended to leave the Navy, 96 percent actually did leave the Navy. Of those personnel in subsequent tours of enlistment, 100 percent who stated they intend to stay actually did stay, and 80 percent of those who indicated they would leave actually left the Navy. There was no mention of statistical significance in the study.

Aviator and officer retention studies performed since 1966 were reviewed to provide background information for this thesis. Rickus, Booth, and Ambler (1968) compared career (Naval Academy,NROTC) and noncareer (AOC,NAVCAD) Naval Aviator input groups. The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship of certain group retention variables to qualitative performance criteria. Four selection tests, twelve pre-flight training performance grades, and seven grades from the flight portion of training were used as performance criteria. Group retention rate was used as the dependent variable. The results indicated that the performance variables were not useful in differentiating between career and noncareer groups with regard to retention.

In a longitudinal study of 445 Army aviation Warrant Officers, Boyd and Boyles (1968) explored the relationship of career intentions to retention problems. Although there was no mention of correlations in this study, direct questions of career intent had predictive validity (χ^2 p < .05). Of the 328 Warrant Officers who left the Army, 81 percent had indicated a year earlier that they would do so. Of the

117 who remained in the Army, 54 percent had indicated a year earlier that they would stay, and 30 percent had been undecided.

Mitchell and Albright (1971) used expectancy theory to predict the effort, satisfaction, performance, and retention of two squadrons of Naval Aviators. The results provided strong support for the prediction of satisfaction and retention. Only moderate support was generated for the prediction of effort and performance. Furthermore, they found that the choice between staying in or getting out of the Navy was associated with intrinsic satisfaction and satisfaction with the job. The correlation between satisfaction and retention was (r = .65, p < .01).

Zacks (1977) developed a computer model for numerical forecasting of Navy pilot retention. This model suggests a method of predicting pilot retention 6, 12, 18, and 24 months into the future. The model is based on past retention data (1971 to 1975) of pilots from various commissioning sources. There is no reference to factors affecting retention, nor is there any mention of the validity of the predictions. Similarly, Beatty (1977) examined three methods of forecasting officer losses; Maximum Likelihood estimation (MLE), ordinary least squares (OLD), Simple B, and OLD standardization (Beta). This study concentrated on loss rates due to screening for selective admission. Beatty recommends the Beta model for forecasting loss rates.

Of all the studies related to officer retention, Lassiter and Proctor's (1973, 1975, 1976) study bears most substantially on this present investigation. In three phased reports job proficiency and organizational climate were studied in relation to Naval Officer retention in the all-volunteer-force environment. Of particular interest is the prediction model developed in phase two. This model, a discriminant-function-analysis model, was found to improve over chance determination of stayers and leavers, in two major sub groupings comprising the total sample, by 25 and 35 percent, respectively. These results suggest that applied retention research should be pursued in order to address why stayers stay, as the results may be different from those obtained from after-the-fact studies of why leavers leave.

With regard to research on military retention, several conclusions may be drawn. First, a person's stated career intention is a good predictor of actual retention behavior; of attitude measures, measures of command climate and general satisfaction have the greatest correlation with personnel retention. Lastly, using discriminant-function-analysis, predictors may be determined to forecast retention at least one year in the future.

B. SYNOPSIS OF STUDY

A statistical analysis of the Navy's Human Resources Management (HRM) survey data bank was used to assess the

potential of the HRM survey to predict aviator retention. Next, a new survey was designed to ascertain what variables were influencing the retention decisions of Naval Aviators and to identify items and item combinations which could discriminate between the two groups of Naval Aviators -those intending to make a career in the Navy and those intending to resign from the Navy. These discriminating variables and their combinations were then cross-validated to estimate their predictive validity. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences [Nie, et al, 1975] computer programs were used in the analyses of responses to both survey instruments.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, METHODS, AND PROCEDURES

The research objectives determined the approach utilized in this study. The approach combined survey research with multivariate analysis techniques. An effort is made to describe the analytical techniques in the methods and procedures sections. Analyses which require a background of statistical knowledge are relegated to the appendix section.

Attitudes and opinions of respondents indicated on the Navy's Human Resources Management (HRM) survey and the Navy Aviation Career (NAC) survey were the raw data from which discriminating variables were derived to predict Aviator career intention groups. These predictors, in composite predictor form, were tested in cross-validation on random samples of survey respondents.

A. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

A major objective of this study was to determine the feasibility of using the Navy's HRM survey data for accurate prediction of Aviator retention six to eighteen months in the future. Another objective was to determine if discriminating variables would provide sufficient understanding of variables affecting retention to enable Navy management to develop effective action plans aimed at solving the avaitor retention problem.

In order to accomplish these objectives a statistical analysis of the HRM survey was performed to identify those

questions which effectively discriminated between the two groups of Naval Aviators, who stated intentions to make the Navy their career (Careerists) and who stated intentions to resign (Resignees). Next, on the basis of the results of this analysis it was decided to design and administer a new survey to a representative sample of Naval Aviators. This survey measured attitudes of aviators concerning current issues thought to be affecting retention, assessed stated career intentions, and attempted to determine variables directly related to individual career intentions. Additionally the new survey requested sufficient personal information to allow a future longitudinal study comparing career intentions with actual career behavior. Considerable attention was given to insure the confidentiality of survey responses.

B. METHOD

In late 1978, responses to the HRM survey (1977-78 data bank) were used to identify those questions which showed the greatest difference in group means between the Careerists and the Resignees. The Z-score criterion for these questions was statistical significance at the .001 level. Sixteen questions (Appendix A) were identified: questions 4 to 9 (from Command Climate index), questions 40 to 43 (Work Group Coordination index), and questions 53 to 58 (from Satisfaction index). These questions were used to construct the HRM index on the NAC survey to be discussed next.

In response to a request from the Director of Aviation Manpower and Training (OP-059) in January 1979, this investigator, in conjunction with personnel from the Navy Personal Research and Development Center (NPRDC), San Diego, California, developed the Navy Aviation Career (NAC) survey (Appendix B). This survey was designed to obtain a full and accurate picture of the factors affecting career motivation and career development of Naval Aviators. Social security numbers were requested from survey respondents to enable a future longitudinal study of actual career behavior. The survey consisted of questions intended to measure attitude and opinions in nine content areas. For the first area, aviators were asked to list the three most important factors influencing them to continue their career and the three most important factors influencing them not to continue their career. The second area consisted of demographic information and information concerning career intentions. The third and fourth areas consisted of information on the most recent sea tour and shore tour respectively. The fifth area contained information on operational management in the Navy. The sixth area dealt with the comparability of a Navy career with a Civilian career. The seventh area, the HRM area (questions 115 to 131), was untitled on the survey. This area is taken directly from the HRM survey as discussed earlier. The eighth area contained information regarding the attitude of the spouse with regard to the Navy as a The last area asked the respondent to evaluate career.

the influence thirty-eight variables have had on his individual career choice.

After approval of the survey by OP-05 and the Chief of Naval Personnel, the survey was mailed in March 1979 to 2,000 Naval Aviators (pilots and Naval Flight Officers) in randomly selected, representative, squadrons and organizations throughout the Navy (Appendix C). By the second week of May 1979, 1,043 surveys had been received and responses recorded for primary analysis.¹

Many areas of the survey will not be addressed in this study. This study deals only with the objectives discussed earlier, i.e., predicting retention and identifying related variables, and will deal only with those items directly related to the objectives. NPRDC is concurrently studying other facets of the survey for report to OP-05 in late June, 1979.

C. PROCEDURE

Stated career intentions (question 6,NAC) was used as the dependent variable for most of the analyses in this study. The career intention question also provided a means of classifying personnel into the two "experimental" groups:

¹The time factor involved with completing this thesis and a subsequent requirement to report to the sponsor required a cut-off date of 14 May 1979. A total of 1,555 surveys had been received as of 1 June 1979.

Careerists and Resignees. The 1,043 cases in the analysis sample were classified into three groups according to how they responded to the NAC survey career-intention question. Those persons indicating they were at least 75 percent sure they would remain in the Navy were assigned to the Careerists group. Those persons indicating their probability of remaining in the Navy was 35 percent or less were assigned to the Resignees group. Those individuals scoring between 65 and 45 percent were categorized as "undecided". This undecided group was not used for analysis in this investigation. A frequency analysis of the two experimental groups was performed, using key descriptive variables, in an effort to describe a subject representative of each group. Variables which later were identified as predictors of group membership were factor analyzed to provide further descriptive information.

Questions from the NAC survey demographic index (questions 5-17), the HRM index (questions 115-131), and the intention factors index (questions 140-178) were subjected to discriminant analysis. The discriminant analyses used a dependent variable (career intention) and grouped all respondents into groups according to how they responded to the dependent variable. Based on these groupings of known membership, it analyzed each independent variable (each question in the above indices) and determined how effective the variable, in combination with other variables, was at classifying a case into the known groups (group 0 = Careerists,

group 1 = Resignees). Using one of a number of possible tests of statistical significance, those independent variables which, in linear combination, best predict group membership are isolated.¹ These variables are referred to as discriminating variables. Probabilities are computed for cases correctly and incorrectly classified into the two groups when only the discriminating variables are used. These probabilities, when compared to the probabilities of chance classification, give the investigator a good indication of how accurately the discriminating variables predict group membership.

After discriminating variables had been identified in this way, cases were grouped according to how much time an individual had remaining before he was eligible to leave the Navy. Separate discriminant analyses were performed on groups with six months remaining, twelve months remaining, and eighteen months remaining. The purpose of these analyses was to assess the effects of time remaining in the Navy on the correctness of classification into the two criterion groups.

A random sample of NAC survey respondents was used to cross-validate the predictive power of the discriminating variables. Two methods of cross-validation were used.

^LA variable or variate is generally considered a good predictor if it is significant at the .01 level (p < .01) [Amick & Walberg, 1975].

The first method used forty percent of the original sample to compute the discriminant function, then applied the discriminant function to the remaining sixty percent of the cases in the sample to compute an unbiased estimate of classification for each case [Nie, et. al., 1975]. In the second method, the original sample (N = 1,043) was randomly divided into two groups, each containing fifty percent. One group was used to compute regression weights in a multiple regression of the discriminating variables with the career intention variable. These weights were used to compute a weighted score for each case in the remaining fifty-percent group. This weighted score for a case was then correlated with the case's actual career intention in the cross-validation analysis.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research results, along with a discussion of their implications in relation to the objectives stated previously, are presented in this section. After first presenting the demographic make-up of the sample, the findings produced by discriminant-function analysis are described. Next, results of the two cross-validations are detailed. A discriminant analysis of aviators approaching "end of obligated service (EOS)" is presented, followed by an evaluation of twenty-nine discriminating variables and their implications regarding retention.

A. DEMOGRAPHY OF NAC SAMPLE

The demographic make-up of the NAC sample (N = 1,043)is presented in Table 3.1. This table indicates the variety of the sample.

Tables 3.2 and 3.3 represent the demography of the two groups, Careerists and Resignees, used in this study.

The Careerists' mean age is 30 years compared to 27 years for the Resignees. Of those individuals in the age range of 26 to 30 years old, 33 percent were Careerists and 40 percent were Resignees. Of those individuals who fell in the age range of 31 to 35 years old, 70 percent were Careerists and only 14 percent were Resignees. These age differences cannot be separated from differences in military rank.

DEMO	NAC GRAPHY OF TO'	SURVEY FAL SAMPLE	(N=1,043)			
Commissioning Source N(%)	USNA 197(19)	ROTC-Res 33(3)	<u>ROTC-Reg</u> 155(15)	<u>AOC</u> 407 (40)	AVROC 111 (10)	OTHER 140(12)
Rank N(%)	<u>Ens</u> 11(1)	Lt (JG) 104 (10)	<u>Lt</u> 578(56)	<u>LCdr</u> 293(28)	<u>Cdr</u> 52(5)	
Age N(%)	<u>21-25</u> 62(6)	<u>26-30</u> 470 (45)	<u>31-35</u> 374 (36)	<u>36-40</u> 115(11)	<u>41 or ></u> 22(2)	
Marital Status N(%) Designator N(%)	Married 845(81) 1310 602(58)	Single 194(19) <u>1315</u> * 92(9)	• <u>1320</u> • 282 (27)	45(4)	•	•
Current Assignment N	Helo Sq 84	uadrons	<u>VT</u> <u>VF</u> 150 104	<u>VAW</u> 45	<u>VA/VAQ</u> 142	<u>VS/VP</u> 131
N	<u>RAG</u> 195	NPGS 105	Other Squa 37	adrons	Other 50	
When Eligible to Leave NAVY N(%)	<u>0-6</u> 311 (30)	<u>7-12</u> 156 (15)	<u>13-18</u> 148(14)	<u>19-24</u> 103(10)	<u>25-30</u> 78(8)	<pre>>30 months 247(23)</pre>
Career Intention Groups N(%)	<u>Careeri</u> 556(54)	sts	<u>Resignee</u> (255(25)	a)	Undecided 232(21)	
(Missing data on some account for N's < 1,0	variables 43)	TABLE	3.1			

CAREERISTS DEMOGRAPHY OF GROUP (N=556)

12.

and a set of the set of the set of the set of the

RANK	ENS	LT (JG)	II	3	DR	CDR		
N(%)	2(.4)	35 (6)	233(4:	2) 235	(42)	47 (9)		
AGE	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-4	4	1 or >		
N(\$)	17(3)	156(28)	261 (47)	103(1	9) 10	9(3.4)		
MARITAL STATUS	MARRIEL	DNIS	TE					
N(\$)	484 (87)	10([3]					
COMMISSIONING SOURCE	USNA	ROTC-RE	S ROTC-	REG	AOC	AVE	soc o	THEF
N(%)	108 (20)	19(3)	57(1	1)	224 (41)	49	(6) 8	6 (16)
DESIGNATOR	1310	1315	1320	1325				
N(\$)	319 (58)	23(4)	184 (33)	15(3)				
WHEN ELIG. TO LEAVE NAVY	9-0	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-3	~	30 months	
N(\$)	160(29)	72 (13)	63(11)	60 (10)	42 (8)		151 (28)	
CAREER INTENTIONS ON ENTRY IN THE NAVY	For a Career	4 A	repare for (viation	Comm.	Fulfil: Obligat	l	Uncommit	fed
N(%)	233(42)		26(5)		63(1)	203(37	-

TABLE 3.2

25

Sold State

1 A.S.

RESIGNEES

thene

a second

DEMOGRAPHY OF GROUP (N=265)

Anted	SNG	101/11	E	440 I	440		
KANN	ENS	TT (16)	31	TCDK	CUK		
N(8)	2(.8)	33(13)	202 (76)	26 (10)	1(.4)		
AGE	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41 or >		
N (8)	20(7)	186(70)	52(20)	7 (3)	0		
MARITAL STATUS	MARRIED	SINGLE					
N(8)	195(74)	69 (26)					
COMMISSIONING SOURCE	USNA	ROTC-RES	ROTC-RE	IG AOC	AVR	OC OTHI	ER
N(8)	43(17)	10(4)	47(11)	101 (3	9) 43	(16) 17(6	6
DESIGNATOR	1310	1315	1320	1325			
N(\$)	153 (58)	56 (21)	40(15)	12(5)			
WHEN ELIG. TO LEAVE NAVY	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	>30 months	
N(8)	103(39)	51 (19)	46(17)	(7) 61	17(6)	29 (11)	
CAREER INTENTIONS ON ENTRY IN THE NAVY	For a career	Prepa Aviat	re for Commi	n. Fulfi 	11 ation	Uncommitted	
N (8)	108 (41)	16	(9)	21 (8		119 (45)	

TABLE 3.3

26

2.2

10.0

and she was the de provision

It is interesting to note that of 196 U.S. Naval Academy (USNA) graduates in the sample, 55 percent were Careerists and 22 percent were Resignees. Comparison of these figures to the 407 Aviation Officer Candidate (AOC) graduates in the sample shows that the figures are almost identical. Fifty-five (55) percent of the AOC's were Careerists and 25 percent were Resignees. Previous data [Rickus, Booth, and Ambler, 1968] indicated that the retention rates for USNA graduates (70%) were much higher than retention rates for AOC graduates (41%).

Another interesting facet of the demographic data is that only 48 respondents indicated that they had entered the Navy to prepare themselves for a career in commercial aviation. Of these 48 respondents, 26 indicated they were Careerists and only 16 were Resignees; the remaining 6 were undecided. The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-136d), in a report on retention of Naval officers, reported that 32 percent of the aviators resigning in fiscal year 1978 indicated their intention to seek employment in commercial aviation. The decision to enter commercial aviation appears often to be a post-entry decision.

B. DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

A discriminant analysis was performed using 57 questions from the NAC survey as independent variables: questions 10 and 17, questions 115 to 131, and questions 140 to 178. (These questions appear in Appendix B.) Indicated career

intention comprised a two-valued career intention variable (described earlier) which was used as the dependent variable. This and subsequent analyses were limited to 427 respondents to the NAC survey. These respondents were chosen from the original sample of 1,043 based on three criteria: first, a respondent's rank was Lt(JG) through Cdr; second, the respondent fell into one of the two careerintention groups; and, third, the respondent had no missing data.

This analysis used all of the independent variables (57) in linear combination to predict group membership. The result, 83 percent correct classification, indicated the feasibility of using the independent variables to predict group membership. A review of the F-tests in this analysis indicated that a large number of the 57 independent variables were not statistically significant in differentiating power. Including these non-significant variables in a linear prediction equation could confound the interpretation of the analysis.

The SPSS discriminant-analysis subprogram [Nie, et al, 1975] provides two measures for eliminating non-significant variables from the linear prediction equation, eigenvalues and Wilk's Lambda. The eigenvalue is a statistic computed in the process of deriving the discriminant function. The sum of the eigenvalues is a measure of the overall predictive power of the linear prediction equation. The eigenvalue for a single predictor, expressed as a percentage

of the sum of the eigenvalues, indicates the relative contribution of the predictor to the overall prediction.

The second criterion for eliminating non-significant variables is Wilk's Lambda. Lambda is an inverse measure of discriminating power; the larger lambda is, the less information is predictable by the variables. Lambda, which can be transformed into a chi-square statistic to provide a test of statistical significance, was used in this study to prevent the computation of linear prediction equations using variables that were not significant. A significance level of .01 constituted the minimum Wilk's Lambda criterion.

A further aid used in this study to judge the importance of a discriminant function is its associated canonical correlation. The canonical correlation is a measure of association between the single discriminant function value and the dependent variable (career intention). The canonical correlation tells us how closely the function and the "group variable" are related. Stated another way -- it is a measure of the function's ability to discriminate among the two groups.

In an attempt to eliminate the non-significant variables from the first analysis, a second discriminant analysis was performed using Wilk's Lambda as the criterion for statistical significance. Table 3.4 presents a summary of this analysis.

The eigenvalue sum shown in this table indicates that 100 percent of the variance is accounted for. The canonical

ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE

QUESTION NO.	WILK'S LAMBDA	SIGNIF.	LABEL
10	.7179	.00001	Age
151	.6198	.00001	Retirement at 20 years
141	.5585	.00001	Navy life in general
169	.5297	.00001	Squadron flying assign.
172	.5092	.00001	Educ. Opportunity in Navy
170	.4977	.00001	Squadron ground job
165	.4901	.00001	Civilians view Naval avia.
171	.4855	.00001	Civilian job market
147	.4805	.00001	Ldrship & mgt of superiors
115	.4762	.00001	Decsn. made at appro. levels
130	.4722	.00001	Duties help career
156	.4682	.00001	Competition for advancement
174	.4649	.00001	Commissary & Exchange
177	.4613	.00001	Member of Elite Group
144	.4583	.00001	Ship habitability
140	.4551	.00001	Home life in general
175	.4517	.00001	Retirement benefits
120	.4489	.00001	Hard work gets recognition
160	.4458	.00001	Recog. for superior perf.
153	.4430	.01	Operation temp ashore
124	.4410	.01	Good decsn. and prob. solve
17	.4392	.01	When eligible to leave Navy
116	.4376	.01	Info shared within unit
145	.4359	.01	Availability of Govt. house
129	.4345	.01	Pride and Self-worth
118	.4328	.01	Encouraged to contrib. best
154	.4315	.01	Night Carrier Operations
158	.4312	.01	Shore assignments
152	.4300	.01	Rate of promotion

EIGENVALUE	* VARIANCE	CANONICAL CORRELATION	WILK'S LAMBDA
1.3254	100.0	.75496	.43003
CHI-SQUARE	DEGREES OF	FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE	
340.93	28	0.01	

TABLE 3.4

30

and a second sec

correlation (.755) suggests that the discriminant function determined in this analysis does a very good job of discriminating between the two career-intention groups. Lambda, transformed into a chi-square ($\chi^2 = 340.9$) with 28 degrees of freedom, indicates significance at less than the .01 level. The original 57 variables were reduced to 29 variables, each significant at the .01 level or less.

The remaining 29 variables in linear combination with their corresponding coefficients yield the discriminant score. This discriminant score will have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. Thus, any single score represents the number of standard deviations that a case is away from the mean for all cases on the discriminant function. There is a separate standard score for each case on the discriminant functions. By averaging the scores for all the cases within a particular group, we arrive at the group mean on the function. This group mean is referred to as the "group centroid" and is the most typical location of a case from that group in the discriminant function space. Table 3.5 depicts, in histogram form, the two groups in this analysis and their associated group centroids.

Discriminant analysis is considered to be a powerful classification technique. Amick and Walberg (1976) discuss discriminant analysis and its associated classification techniques. According to them, classification means the

· · · · + · · · · +... + 2 ; 11111111111111122122122111112222222 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · -- CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION 1 2 2 2 2 2 222 2 222 222 NNNN N N 111111111111111 111111111111 11111111111111 11111111 1 HISTOGRAM 0 111111 2 CLASSIFICATION OF GROUP CENTROIDS + ... +-...+... **GROUP LABEL** 9-CAREERISTS RESIGEES 00T.... 8 16 32 24 SYMBOL N a H G D EZ CX

SYMBOLS USED IN PLOT.

CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS (GROUP CENTROIDS) FUNCTION GROUP

9

-0.80778 1.63298 CAREERISTS RESIGNEES -N

TABLE 3.5

process of identifying the likely group membership of a case when the only information known is the case's values on the discriminating variables. The SPSS discriminantanalysis subprogram uses a classification equation derived from the pooled within-groups covariance matrix and the centroids for the discriminating variables. The resulting classification coefficients are multiplied by the raw variable values, summed together, and added onto a constant. The equation for each group would appear as

 $c_i = c_{i1}v_1 + c_{i2}v_2 + \dots + c_{ip}v_p + c_{i0}$

where C_i is the classification score for group "i", the c_{ij} 's are the classification coefficients, c_{i0} being the constant, and the V's are the raw scores on the discriminating variables. There is always a separate equation for each group. Appendix IV is an example of the output of discriminant scores provided by the SPSS discriminant-analysis subprogram. This example may help the reader follow the above discussion In this analysis there are two groups with each case having a score for each group. Each case is then classified into the group for which its score is highest. Table 3.6 summarizes the classification results of the 29 discriminating variables.
CLASSIFICATION RESULTS

ACTUAL GROUPS	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP CAREERISTS	MEMBERSHIP RESIGNEES
CAREERISTS	285	256 89.8%	29 10.2%
RESIGNEES	142	14 9.9%	128 90.1%

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 89.93%

TABLE 3.6

C. CROSS-VALIDATION

It was now necessary to assess the validity of the 29 discriminating variables in cross-validation. Two separate cross-validation procedures were used: sub-set discriminant analysis and cross-validation of a multiple-regression equation.

Sub-set discriminant analysis used 40 percent of a sample to compute the classification equations for each group. A discriminant score for each of the remaining 60 percent of the cases was computed using the coefficients generated from the analysis group (40% group). These discriminant scores were then used to classify each case into one of the two "experimental" groups. Table 3.7 presents the classification results of both the analysis group and the crossvalidation group. The degradation of classification from the 40 percent analysis group to the 60 percent crossvalidation group was negligible (.05%), indicating a robust

discriminating function. Appendix E presents a more indepth depiction of the results.

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR CASES SELECTED FOR USE IN ANALYSIS

40 % of ACTUAL GROUP	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP CAREERISTS	MEMBERSHIP RESIGNEES
CAREERISTS	111	96 86.5%	1.5 13.5%
RESIGNEES	60	8 13.3%	52 86.7%

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 86.55%

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR CASES NOT USED IN THE ANALYSIS

60% of ACTUAL GROUP	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP CAREERISTS	MEMBERSHIP RESIGNEES
CAREERISTS	181	154 85.1%	27 14.9%
RESIGNEES	86	9 10.5%	77 89.5%

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 86.52%

TABLE 3.7

A somewhat different, though formally equivalent approach was used for the second cross-validation. On a random sample, constituting fifty percent of the original sample (N = 1,043), career intention (Careerists, Resignees) was regressed with the 29 discriminating variables to produce a

"b weight" for each variable. These "b weights" were then multiplied by the raw scores of each case in the remaining fifty percent sample, summed, and added to a constant, much in the same manner that discriminant analysis produces classification scores, to derive a Y-score for each case. The Y-scores were then correlated with career intention. This procedure resulted in a Pearson's correlation coefficient (r = .51) which was statistically significant at the .0001 level. Thus, the robustness of the discriminating function was further substantiated. Appendix F presents a summary of the Multiple Regression.

D. CLASSIFICATION OF AVIATORS APPROACHING EOS

As previously stated, the 29 discriminating variables were derived from aviators in the grades of Lt(JG) to Cdr. These aviators differed with respect to how far they were from the end of their obligated service (EOS). Seventyfive (75) were within one year of EOS and sixty-six (66) were between 13 and 18 months of their EOS. All 29 discriminating variables were next used in separate analyses of these two groups of aviators. Table 3.8 presents the classification results of these analyses. Prediction of group membership appears best when an aviator is within one year of EOS and begins to deteriorate after that point. A more detailed presentation of the results is contained in Appendices G and H.

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR AVIATORS ONE YEAR FROM MSR

ACTUAL GROUP	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP CAREERISTS	MEMBERSHIP RESIGNEES	
CAREERISTS	30	26 86.7%	4 13.%	
RESIGNEES	45	0 0.0%	45 100.0%	

ACTUAL GROUP	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP CAREERISTS	MEMBERSHIP RESIGNEES
CAREERISTS	32	28 87.5%	4 12.5%
RESIGNEES	34	3 8.8%	31 91.2%

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 89.39%

TABLE 3.8

E. VARIABLES RELATED TO RETENTION

As stated earlier, an objective of this study was to identify variables related to retention behavior. To begin this process, the 29 discriminating variables were subjectively classified into two general areas, command climate and satisfaction. Satisfaction variables were sub-divided into two sets: extrinsic variables and intrinsic variables. For the purpose of this discussion, extrinsic variables are

defined as those "tangible" variables inherent in the Navy system, e.g., job security, policies, benefits, and pay. Intrinsic variables are those "intangible" variables linked with personal satisfaction, e.g., achievement, recognition, personal growth, and work itself (see, for instance, Herzberg, et. al., 1959). Table 3.9 reflects this classification. Two variables, "age" and "when eligible to leave the Navy", were considered biographical in nature and were not subjected to this classification.

In an effort to understand the variables which affect retention, a factor analysis was performed. The target population for this analysis was those aviators approaching EOS -- more specifically, those within 24 months of EOS. There were 673 aviators in this category. Although ten factors were produced, only the first five are presented. The remaining five factors combined accounted for only 18 percent of the variance, where the first five factors accounted for 40.6 percent of the variance. Table 3.10 presents the five factors and their associated eigenvalues and percentages of common variance. Considering the classification (e.g., CC = Command Climate) from Table 3.9 together with the factors in Table 3.10, we can gain some understanding of the general areas associated with retention.

Military retention behavior is often thought of as dichotomous; in this study -- Careerists vs. Resignees. Factors related to retention can also be thought of in this manner. The positive aspect of a factor can be interpreted

TABLE 3.9

COMMAND CLIMATE (CC)

QUESTION

- 115 Decisions are made at the most appropriate level.
- 116 Information is shared, decision makers get information.
- 120 People who work hard receive recognition.
- 124 Command makes good decisions and solves problems.
- 118 Command encourages contribution of best effort.
- 147 Leadership and management of superiors.
- 153 Tempo of operations while ashore.
- 160 Recognition for superior performance.
- 156 Competition for advancement.

SATISFACTION

EXTRINSIC (ES)

NO.

- 151 Retirement at 20 years.
- 175 Retirement benefits.
- 172 Educational opportunity in the Navy.
- 174 Commissary and exchange.
- 144 Ship habitability.
- 145 Availability of government housing.
- 158 Shore assignments.
- 152 Rate of promotion.
- 171 Civilian job market.

INTRINSIC (IS)

- 130 Present duties help career
- 141 Navy life in general
- 140 Impact of career on home life
- 169 Squadron flying assignment
- 170 Squadron ground jobs
- 165 The way civilians view Naval Aviation
- 129 Job give feeling of pride and self-worth
- 177 Member of an elite group
- 154 Night carrier operations

TABLE 3.10

FACTOR	1		
CODE	QUESTION	EIGENVALUE	% VAR.
CC	116-Info. shared	5.27	17.6
CC	124-Good decsn. and prob. solve.		
cc	115-Decsn made at appro. level.		
CC	120-Hard work gets recognition.		
IC	129-Pride and self-worth.		
сс	147-Leadership & management of sup	er.	
FACTOR	2		
ES	151-Retirement at 20 years.	2.31	7.7
ES	175-Retirement benefits.		
ES	174-Commissary & Exchange.		
ES	172-Education opportunity in Navy.		
FACTOR	3		
IS	177-Member of elite group.	1.66	5.5
IS	141-Navy life in general.		
IS	165-Way Civilians view Naval Air.		
IS	169-Squadron flying assignment.		
FACTOR	4		
IS	170-Squadron ground jobs.	1.55	5.2
D	10-Age		
IS	141-Navy life in general.		
FACTOR	-		
TE	160-Saundron fluing assignment	1 30	4 7
15	10-3ge	1.39	4./
D	10-Age		
15	134-Night Carrier operations.		
CC = C	command Climate		
ES = E	xtrinsic/Satisfaction		
IS = I D = D	ntrinsic/Satisfaction		

and and

a transferrence and an and an and a second a second a second

as being associated with "Careerists behavior", the negative aspect with "Resignees behavior". Information of this type, in the hands of an experienced HRM specialist, with the assistance of a concerned Commanding Officer, could be used in an attempt to improve a command's aviator retention. Follow-up studies would, of course, be necessary to determine the effectiveness of any command changes based on such information.

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research described in this thesis was directed toward determining the feasibility of using the Navy's HRM survey to accurately predict aviator retention six to eighteen months in the future. Another objective was to determine if discriminating variables would provide sufficient understanding of variables related to retention behavior to enable Navy management to develop effective action plans aimed at solving aviator retention problems. Results obtained in this research demonstrate that the objectives have been realized. This section will summarize the research findings and provide conclusions and recommendations based on the results.

A. SUMMARY

The importance of the rapid deterioration of naval aviator retention and its associated impact on fleet readiness and national security cannot be overemphasized. Presently, predictions of Navy retention use after-thefact methodology which does not take into consideration societal, economic, and attitudinal changes affecting Navy personnel. The current crisis concerning naval avaiator retention is indicative of the inability of present methods to predict retention. Answers to the retention prediction problem must be generated, and an effective monitoring

system implemented to predict retention and identify factors affecting retention.

Stated career intention appears to be a sound predictor of actual retention behavior, but alone, provides no information which could be translated into action plans to increase personnel retention in the Navy. This thesis suggests and illustrates a method of prediction which develops additional information related to why Navy personnel are making career choices. Used in parallel with stated career intention, as a predictor, an even more optimized prediction equation could be produced. The purpose of this thesis was to begin the process of developing such an effective and informative method of predicting Navy retention.

The review of literature showed that the following expectations motivating this study were reasonable: stated career intention is a good predictor of actual career behavior -- perhaps the best we have today; attitude measures, in particular command climate and general satisfaction measures, have perhaps the next greatest correlation with personnel retention; and discriminantfunction-analysis, based on stated career intention, provides information related to retention intentions along with a good prediction equation.

Items from the Navy's HRM survey, thought to bear heavily on retention, were included on the Navy Aviation Career (NAC) survey. Seven of the fifteen selected HRM

items surfaced as predictors during the analyses in this study. Four other items on the NAC survey (age, when eligible to leave the Navy, leadership and management of supervisors, and recognition for superior performance) appear on the HRM survey in slightly different format. Eleven of the 29 discriminating variables found in this study already exist on the HRM survey. It can be concluded that the HRM survey, with the addition of several new items, would effectively predict the retention behavior of aviators.

The expectation that a discriminant-function-analysis model could be developed which effectively predicted retention intentions at least one year in the future was shown to be correct. With 95 percent correct classification of aviators (EOS-1), coupled with cross-validation significant at the .0001 level, little doubt remains as to the feasibility of this model. Additionally, discriminant analysis provides information which is transformable into action plans which could positively affect aviator retention.

When the 29 discriminating variables were subjectively classified, they appeared to fall into two categories, command climate and general satisfaction. This categorization tends to support earlier research dealing with the relationship of attitude measures to retention.

B. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the results of this research, four basic conclusions were reached.

<u>Conclusion 1</u>: In terms of stated career intentions, discriminant function analysis provides equations which effectively predict retention of Naval Aviators at least one year in the future.

<u>Conclusion 2</u>: Although stated career intentions may be a better predictor of actual retention behavior, discriminant-function-analysis provides insight into relationships which can be transformed into action plans to increase aviator retention.

<u>Conclusion 3</u>: The HRM survey (with existing items supplemented with new questions) can be used to predict retention probabilities and provide constructive information related to career choices.

<u>Conclusion 4</u>: Attitude measures of command climate and general satisfaction are good predictors of retention behavior.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

Time and limitations beyond the control of this investigator prevented a full analysis of the NAC survey items. The concurrent study being performed by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center should shed light on further areas associated with naval aviator retention. Three additional studies of great importance to navy retention in general are recommended by this investigator.

First, the longitudinal study mentioned earlier in this thesis must be carried out. Although several longitudinal studies have been performed which support the expectation that stated career intentions is a good predictor of actual behavior, a corresponding study has never been done on the naval aviator community.

Secondly, in a parallel study, stated career intentions as a predictor should be combined in a discriminant-function predictor equation. Obtaining the optimal retention forecast, with insight into areas affecting retention, should be the goal of this study. It might very well be, that the optimal solution is to use predictor methods in combination. The NAC survey data bank provides an excellent vehicle for this study.

Lastly, the potential of the Navy's HRM survey to predict retention of both officer and enlisted personnel has been demonstrated. Yet this potential has not been investigated beyond the limited depth of this study. A concerted effort to evaluate further the HRM survey's ability to contribute to the solution of the Navy's retention problems is highly recommended. Several reasons support this recommendation:

- The HRM survey has a "stated career intention" question in the demographic section.
- The HRM survey contains questions shown, in other studies, to be predictors of retention intentions.

- HRM centers and detachments are familiar with survey guided development -- a method of developing action plans from survey data.
- 4. The HRM survey is an institutionalized part of the Navy, given to each Navy unit every eighteen months. The inclusion of additional predictor items related to retention would cost virtually nothing.

In view of this third recommendation, three related more specific recommendations are made.

<u>Specific Recommendation A</u>. A discriminant-function analysis should be performed on the HRM survey data to attempt to develop, for both officers and enlisted personnel, discriminant-function models for predicting retention at the unit level.

<u>Specific Recommendation B</u>. Discriminant-function analyses should be conducted for critical enlisted ratings and officer communities. Low retention communities should be investigated first.

Specific Recommendation .C. Task the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, with performing the analyses.

<u>Specific Recommendation D</u>. Task the Navy's Human Resources Management system with implementation of a command retention program. This program should include tailored retention predictions and corrective action planning aimed at improving unit personnel retention.

The value of this study is two-fold. (1) Besides illustrating the use of an accurate method of predicting aviator retention, it provides a means of assessing the self-reported reasons given by aviators regarding their retention decisions. With the reasons identified, the problem of developing corrective action plans is reduced and the probability that these action plans will be effective is greatly enhanced. (2) The fact that some of the HRM items included in the NAC survey contributed significantly to the prediction of retention intentions indicates that the HRM survey, strengthened with supplementary retention questions, probably could be used to predict a units retention and provide valuable information regarding factors affecting the units retention.

No method presently exists in the Navy that provides unit retention probabilities and suggested corrective action plans. Considering that Commanding Officers are now being evaluated on their unit's retention, it only seems reasonable to provide them the means to assess their unit's status regarding retention. The cost of implementing the recommendations of this thesis are less than the cost of replacing one naval aviator.

APPENDIX A

		MEAN	1/(SD)	
UDM	Question	STAY	LEAVE	
A	Question	(N=371)	(N=242)	Z-SCORE
4.	where info. is available.	(.7)	(.8)	13.877
5.	Info. is widely shared, decsn. makers get info.	3.4 (.9)	2.3 (.9)	14.033
6.	People affected by decisions asked for their ideas	3.1 (.9)	2.3 (1.0)	14.818
7.	Motivated to contribute best to command mission	4.3 (.6)	2.7 (1.3)	19.138
8.	Command encourages hard work	3.4 (1.0)	2.2 (1.0)	14.523
9.	Hard work receives recognition	3.2 (.7)	2.3 (1.1)	11.222
40.	Work group plans together	3.9 (.7)	2.9 (1.3)	11.737
41.	Confidence and trust in others	3.8 (.7)	3.1 (1.2)	8.461
42.	Info. on important events is shared.	4.0 (.7)	2.8 (1.0)	15.467
43.	Cmd. makes good decisions and solves problems effectively.	3.7 (.7)	3.0 (1.1)	8.728
53.	Satisfaction with command.	3.7 (1.1)	2.0 (1.2)	19.098
54.	Satisfaction with job.	4.0 (.8)	2.8 (1.4)	13.465
55.	Satisfaction with progress to date.	4.4	2.7 (1.2)	13.465
56.	Satisfied with chances of getting ahead in the future.	4.0 (.9)	2.2 (1.2)	20.964
57.	Job gives pride and self-worth.	3.9 (.7)	2.6 (1.3)	15.259
58.	Duties in command help career.	3.6 (1.1)	2.7 (1.1)	10.385

at the to a stand a stand

in

APPENDIX B

NAVY AVIATION CAREER SURVEY PILOT FORM

The current high rate of pilot resignation threatens the operational readiness of Naval Aviation. The Chief of Naval Operations has directed that this survey be conducted to determine the reasons for this high resignation rate. This questionnaire is being distributed to a sample of Navy Aviators and Flight Officers. Your frank, honest answers on the questionnaire are urged. The information you give will be aggregated with that of other respondents, and the provisions of the Privacy Act will be strictly enforced. Under no circumstances will your individual responses be made available to anyone in your chain of command.



PRIVACY ACT NOTICE

Under the authority of 5 USC 301, information regarding your background, attitudes, experiences, and future intentions in the Navy is requested to provide input to a study of the aviation recention problem. The information provided by you will not become part of your official record, nor will it be used to make decisions about you which will affect your career in any way. It will be used by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center for statistical purposes only. You are not required to provide this information. There will be no adverse consequences should you elect not to provide the requested information or any part of it.

> The anchor design above was prescribed by the Sureau of Construction and Repair in 1916 as the first Navy air insignia.

INSTRUCTIONS

Some of the questions that follow may appear to be personal in nature. They are necessary to obtain a full and accurate picture of the factors affecting career motivation and career development. However, if any question appears unreasonably personal or too intrusive into your privacy, please omit it and continue with the balance of the questionnaire.

The questions are of two types. Some ask you to write in an answer on the questionnaire itself. Others ask you to select one answer from a list of alternatives, and mark the space corresponding to the letter for that answer on the enclosed answer sheet. Recause the answer sheet will be machine scored, please observe these instructions:

- 1. Use a #2 pencil, not pen or ballpoint.
- 2. Fill in the answer space completely.
- 3. Erase cleanly any answer you want to change.
- 4. Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.
- 5. Some sections of the questionnaire may not apply to you. If you skip a section, make sure you also skip the corresponding answer sheet spaces.
- 6. When you have completed the questionnaire, please use the enclosed envelope to return both the questionnaire and the answer sheet to Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.

A. Meere is your current assignment homeported (if deployable) or located (if not deployable)?

B. Where was your assignment previous to your current one homeported (if deployable) or located (if not deployable)?

What do you think are the three most important factors that influence Aviators to continue their Navy careers until retirement?

What do you think are the three most important factors that influence Aviators not to continue their Navy careers until retirement?

The answers to the following questions should be entered on the enclosed answer sheet beginning with question #1.

1. What is your current assignment?

PLEAS LIRE de Monthal

A.	HC	I.	VF	
B.	HM	J.	YP	
c.	HS	K.	QV	
D.	HSL	L.	VR/VC/VRC	
E.	HT	м.	VS	
F.	VA	х.	VT	
G.	VAQ	0.	Staff	
H.	VAW	2.	Washington	Ducy
			-	

Q. Instructor (Not Flight) R. Recruiting S. Ship's Company T. FRS/RAG U. Air Station V. PG School W. Other (Fill In) _____

52

1.04

2. What was your assignment previous to the current one described above?

A.	HC	I.	VF	Q.	Instructor (Not Flight)	
8.	HM	J.	VP	R.	Recruiting	
c.	HS	к.	VQ	S.	Ship's Company	
D.	HSL	L.	VR/VC/VRC	T.	FRS/RAG	
E.	HT	м.	VS	U.	Air Station	
F.	VA	N.	VT	٧.	PG Station	
G.	VAO	0.	Staff	Ψ.	Other (Fill In)	
H.	VAW	P.	Washington Dury			_

٤

3. What type aircraft are you/were you most recently assigned to fly on a regular basis?

A.	A-3	I.	F-8	Q.	RA-5	
в.	A-4	J.	F-14	R.	S-2	
c.	A-6	K.	8-1	s.	S-3A	
D.	EA-6	L.	H-2	Τ.	Other Training A/C - Helo	
Ε.	A-7	М.	H-3	υ.	Other Training A/C - Jet	
7.	C-1/C-2	N.	H-46	٧.	Other Training A/C - Prop	
G.	E-2	0.	H-53	W.	Other (Fill In)	
H.	F-4	P.	P-3			

4. How long has it been since you completed your most recent sea tour?

A.	Not applicable (N/A) no sea tour	G. 25-30 months
B.	N/A-an on sea tour	H. 31-36 monchs
c.	0-6 months	I. 37-42 months
D.	7-12 months	J. 43-48 months
E.	13-18 months	K. More than 48 months
F.	19-24 months	

5. If you have made a career decision either to remain in the Navy or to resign, when did you make this decision?

- A. Not applicable (N/A) have not made this decision
 Before entering the Navy
 C. Before I got my wings

- During my first sea tour
 During my first shore tour
 F. During a subsequent sea tour
 G. During a subsequent shore tour
 H. Other (fill in)

The state of the s

NAVY CAREER INTENTIONS

This item concerns the intensity of your desire for a Navy Aviation career. It consists of (1) a question and (2) a response scale extending continously between two defined extreme values.

Selected areas on the scale are described, both verbally and in terms of probabilities, to provide you with some meaningful reference points. At selected points on the scale, percentages indicate the probability of one voluntarily continuing his active Navy career until retirement. Note, however, you are not necessarily limited to the few points for which descriptions or percentages are provided.

Locate the general area on the scale that seems to correspond best with your current commitment to a Navy career. Read the descriptions of the near points and decide on the exact point on the scale that most closely represents your current level of commitment. Note the letter nearest to that point and fill in the space on the answer sheet corresponding to that letter.

6. QUESTION:

and and the first the demographic second

To what degree are you now <u>certain</u> that you will continue an active Navy career until mandatory retirement?

54

1.00

NAVY CAREER COMPLETNENT SCALE



55

1.34

7. When you entered Naval Aviation, did you intend to make the Navy a career? B. No, I entered to prepare myself for a career in commercial aviation.
C. No, I entered to fulfill my military obligation. D. No, I was not committed either way. 8. What is your rank? D. LCDR A. ENS E. CDR F. CAPT or above B. LTJG C. LT . 9. What is your ethnic identity? E. Oriental F. Other A. Black B. Caucasian C. Hispanic 10. What is your age? G. Over 50 years A. 21-25 B. 26-30 C. 31-35 D. 36-40 E. 41-45 F. 46-50 11. What is your marital status? A. Engaged B. Never married C. No longer married D. Married 12. How many children live with you in your home? G. 6 D. 3 A. 0 E. 4 F. 5 E. 7 B. 1 I. 8 or more C. 2 13. What was your commissioning source? D. AOCS E. AVROC F. Other (fill in) A. USNA B. NROTC (Reserve) C. NROTC (Regular) 14. What is your designator? D. 1325 E. Other (fill in) A. 1310 B. 1315 C. 1320 5

56

T

15. In what year was your designator assigned?

	1978 or 1979	D.	1975	G.	1969-71
	1977	Ε.	1974	H.	1965-68
B.	1076		1972-73	I.	Prior to 1965
6.	7310				

16. Have you requested augmentation?

-

A. N/A, I was commissioned a Regular Officer.

B. No, and do not plan to do so.

C. No, and I am undecided right now.

No, but I plan to do so. D. E. Yes, and was refused. I do not plan to reapply.
F. Yes, and was refused. I plan to reapply.

Yes, and am awaiting the results.

G. H. Yes, and was accepted.

17. How long from now will you be eligible to leave the Navy?

A .	0-6 months	D.	19-24 months	G.	37-42 months
8.	7-12 months	E.	25-30 months	H.	43-48 months
c.	13-18 months	F.	31-36 months	I.	More than 48 months

18. If the Navy offered what you considered to be a substantial career bonus to remain on active duty beyond the expiration of your obligated service, how would it affect your career intentions?

A. It would not affect my intentions, I plan to stay.

B. It would not affect my intentions, I plan to get out.

C. I am undecided about my intentions, but a bonus would have no effect. D. I am undecided about my intentions, but a bonus would have a positive effect.

P. I would stay in for the bonus.

F. I don't know.

19. If, because of budget limits, a career bonus were offered to pilots only and not to NPOs, how do you feel this would affect the Navy aviation community?

- D. Positive effect A. Very negacive effect
 - E. Very positive effect Negative effect

C. No effect

8.

F. Don't know

20. If a career bonus were offered to pilots only, how would this affect your working relationship with NEOs?

6

- A. Very negative effect E. Very positive effect F. Don't know
- B. Negative effect G. Not applicable-I don't work with NFOs
- C. No effect

and share the second and the second second

1 mart

D. Posicive effect

21. What is your flight status in your present assignment?

- A. DIFOPS (Ducy involving flight, operational or training)
- B. DIFDEN (with some flying)
- C. DIFDEN (with no flying)

YOUR MOST RECENT SEA TOUR

The following questions (22-59) apply only to your most recent sea tour. If you have had no sea tour experience skip to Question 60.

22. Is your most recent tour:

- A. Your present assignment
- B. Your immediately previous assignment
- C. An earlier assignment

23. How long have you served on your most recent sea tour?

A.	Less than 6 months	E. 25-30 monchs
3.	7-12 months	F. 31-36 months
c.	13-18 months	G. 37-42 months
D.	19-24 months	H. 43-48 months
		I. More than 48 mont

24. If you are presently on a ses tour, are you deployed now?

A. N/A--- not presently on a sea tour

- B. Yes C. No

25. While deployed on your most recent sea tour, approximately how many hours did/do you work during an average seven-day week?

A. N/A-have not deployed (skip to question 39)

- B. 40 or less
- C. 41-50
- D. 51-60
- E. 61-70
- 2. 71-80
- G. 81-90
- H. . 91-100
- I. More than 100
- 26. While deployed, approximately what percent of the total average work hours you reported in #25 did/do you spend directly related to flying (flying, briefing, debriefing, etc.)?

 - A. None B. 10% or Less
 - C. 11-20%
 - D. 21-30%

 - E. 31-40Z F. 41-60Z
 - G. 61-80Z
 - H. Over 80% of your work hours

Using the scale below, please show how the following factors affected you while deployed on your most recent sea tour.

Nega	tive	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Positive	N/A	
	Å	B	ċ	Ď	Ë	Ŧ	
27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33.	Challe Separa Use of Workin Hours Work p Intere	nge tion from fam: skills and al g environment of work requir ressure sting duties	ily/friends bilicies red	34. Ab1 35. "Ad 36. Opp 37. Att 38. ReL	lity to plan a venture" ortunity to gr ractive libert ationships in	nd schedule ow profession y ports wardroom/res	work activities onally ady room

Using the scale below, please show how the following factors affected you when not deployed during your most recent sea tour.

Ve	ETY E1Ve	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very Positive	N/A
	Å	B	ċ	Ď	E	T
39. 40. 41.	Challe Separa Use of	nge tion from fam skills and a	ily/friends bilities	45. Int 46. Abi	eresting dutie lity to plan a ivities	s and schedule work
42. 43. 44.	Workin Hours Work p	g environment of work requi- ressure	red	47. "Ad 48. Opp	venture" fortunity to gr	ow professionally

Using the following scale, what is your general evaluation of your most recent CO on your most recent sea tour?

Ver	tive Ne	gative	Neutral	Positive	Very Positive	N/A	
	Å	B	ċ	Ď	Ë	7	
49. 50. 51.	Airmanship Management Leadership	abili ry	52. 53. 54.	Interest and Interest in Interest in	involvement in welfare of offi welfare of crew	JO carees cers members'	t development families

Using the scale below, please evaluate the quality of the following squadron functions on your most recent sea tour.

-	of the	Below		lverage	Above	One of the Best	squadron on most recent ses tour)
	Å	B		c	Ď	E	F
55. 56.	Operations Safety	•	57. 58.	Supply Maintenance	59.	Your squadron	overall

8

YOUR MOST RECENT SHORE TOUR

The following questions (60-78) apply only to your most recent Shore Tour. If you have had no shore tour experience, please skip to question 79.

60. Is your most recent shore tour:

- A. Your present assignment
- B. Your immediately previous assignment
 C. An earlier assignment

61. What is/was your flight status on your most recent shore tour?

A. DIFOPS (Duty involving flight, operational or training)
B. DIFDEN (with some flying)

- C. DIFDEN (with no flying)

62. How long have you served on your most recent shore tour?

A.	Less than 6 months	D.	19-24 months	G.	37-42 months
B.	7-12 monchs	E.	25-30 monchs	H.	43-48 months
C.	13-18 months	F.	31-36 monchs	I.	More than 48 months

63. During your most recent shore cour what was your primary assignment?

A.	FRS/RAG	D.	Instructor (other than flight)	G.	Other	(#111	(n)
8.	TRACOM	E.	Washington Duty		-		
C.	Staff	F.	Postgraduate student				

64. On the average, approximately how many hours per week did/do you work on this shore tour?

A.	40 or less	D.	61-70	G.	91-100		
8.	41-50	E.	71-80	H.	More	than	100
C.	51-60	F.	31-90				

65. During your most recent shore tour, approximately what percent of the total work hours you reported in #64 did/do you spend directly related to flying (flying, briefing, debriefing, etc.)?

	None	D.	21-302	G.	51-602	
B.	10% or less	E.	31-402	Н.	Over 6	OZ
c.	11-202	Y.	41-502			

Using the scale below, please show how the following factors affected you on your most recent shore tour.

Nega	cive	Negative	Neutral	I	Positive	Positive	N/A
	Å	B	ċ		Ď	ż	Ť
66.	Challe	age		72.	Interesti	ng duties	
67.	Separa Use of	cion from fam: skills and ab	ily/friends ilities	73.	Ability t activitie	o plan and s	schedule work
69.	Workin	g environment		74.	"Adventur	e"	
70. 71.	Hours Work p	of work requir ressure	ed (75.	Opportuni	ty to grow	professionall

Using the scale below, please evaluate the following aspects of your most recent shore tour.

Highly Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Neutral	Favorable	Highly Favorable	N/A
	B	ċ	D	E	F
76. Location	2	78. Oppor	tunity to fly		•

77. Type of duties

OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

Using the scale below, evaluate how the following factors affect squadron management.

Very	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very Positive	Don't Know
					,
	8	C	D	E	P

79. The sufficiency/management of OPTAR funds to support the mission and flight training requirements of squadrons.

80. Competence of maintenance personnel.

81. The availability of parts and supplies for aircraft maintenance.

82. Unexpected changes in plans or schedules.

83. Fleet exercises and inspections.

84. Frequency of "crisis management" situations.

85. Number of recurring and special reports required.

Using the scale below, evaluate the extent to which the following command levels generate "crisis management" situations.

Very	great	Great	Moderate	Little extent	Very lit extent	tle N/A or don't know
	Å	B	ċ	Ď	Ë	ř
86. 87.	Squadron Air Wing	88. 89.	Cartier (AIRPAC/A)	Group (CTF) IRLANT/CNATRA	90. 91.	Fleet Commander/Higher Command BUPERS

Using the scale below, to what extent do you agree with the following statements about aviation command?

Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly agree	bon't know
A	B	ć	Ď	Ë	F

92. Aviation command is important for a successful career in the Navy.

93. Aviation command is one of my personal goals.

94. COs have sufficient freedom to manage their commands as they see fit.

95. The rewards of aviation command justify the amount of effort and sacrifice required.

In order to maintain your flight proficiency, how adequate is the amount of flight time you ordinarily get in the following situations?

Very	Inadequate	Neither adequate	Adequate	Adequate	N/A
Å	B	ċ	D	E	F

96. While deployed on DIFOPS orders.

97. While on DIFOPS orders, not deployed.

NAVY VS. CIVILIAN CAREER

98. If you were to leave the Navy now, which one of the following civilian occupations would you seek to enter?

A. Don't plan to leave

- 5. Commerical aviation
- C. Law

D. Engineering/Science

- E. Salf employment
- F. Management
- G. Sales

Star Star Star Star Star

- H. Other (fill in)
- I. Don't know

11

Please indicate the relative opportunity of obtaining the following factors in the Navy versus your expectations of obtaining them in a civilian occupation.

Civilian						N	avy	
Subst	antially	Much Better	Better	Cumpara	ble	Better	Much Beccer	Substantially Better
	Å	3	ċ	D		Ē	F	Ġ
99.	Interest	ing and cl	hallenging	work	105.	Job se	curicy	
100.	Ability	to plan we	rk		106.	Family	stability	y
101.	Reasonab	le hours	of work re	quired	107.	Desiral	ble place	to live
102.	Freedom	from work	pressure		108.	Desiral	ble co-wo	rkers
103.	Freedom	from anno	vances		109.	Recogn	ition	
104.	Own init:	lative						

If you resigned from the Navy now, how would you expect your civilian annual pay and benefits to compare with Navy pay and benefits at the same point in time?

Doa't know	· Civ pay \$15K less	Civ pay \$10K less	Civ pay \$5K less	Civ pay Navy pay same	Civ pay \$5K more	Civ pay \$10K more	Civ pay \$15K more	Civ pay \$20K more
Å	B	ć	Ď	E	P	Ġ	Ë	i
110. 111.	In one year In three yea	rs		112. In 113. In	five years ten years			

Using the following scale, please answer items 114 through 131.

Very Little	Little	Some	Great	Very great	
extent	extent	extent	extent	extent	
A	B	C	D	E	

114. Fitness Reports rank you fairly in comparison to your peers

115. Decisions are made in this command at those levels where the most adequate information is available.

116. Information is widely shared in this command so that those who make decisions have access to available know-how.

117. When decisions are being made, to what extent are the people affected asked for their ideas?

118. To what extent do you feel motivated to contribute your best efforts to the command's mission and tasks?

119. To what extent are there things about this command (people, policies or conditions) that encourage you to work hard?

120. To what extent do people who work hard receive recognition from the command?

121. To what extent does your unit plan together and coordinate its efforts?

122. To what extent do you have confidence and trust in the members of your unit?

123. To what extent is information about important events widely exchanged within your unit?

12

į.

Very little	Little	Some	Great	Very great
extent	extent	extent	extent	extent
A	B	C	D	E

124. To what extent does your unit make good decisions and solve problems effectively?

125. All in all, how satisfied are you with this command?

126. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?

- 127. All in all, how satisfied do you feel with the progress you have made in the Navy, up to now?
- 128. How satisfied do you feel with your chances for getting ahead in the Navy in the future?
- 129. Does your assigned work give you pride and feelings of self-worth?
- 130. Do you regard your duties in this command as helping your career?
- 131. To what extent do you feel that you have a personal impact on decisions in this command?

Using the scale below, please indicate how your spouse evaluates the following aspects of your Navy career. If you have no spouse, skip to Question 140.

Very				Very	Don't
Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Positive	Know
			,		
*	B	C	D	E	P

132. Changes in geographical location

133. Family separation

134. Health care benefits

- 135. Commissary and exchange benefits
- 136. Effects on dependents
- 137. How does your spouse feel about your Navy career?
 - A. Competely supportive
 - B. Moderately supportive
 - C. Neutral
 - D. Moderately antagonistic
 - E. Completely antagonistic

138. Row is your spouse employed?

- A. Full time housewife
- B. Neval Officer
- C. Professional
- D. Clerical

der training better the state of the second states

- E. Business/Finance
- F. Teacher
- G. Other (fill in) _

- 139. If your spouse is employed outside the home, to what extent do your PCS moves to different geographical locations cause difficulties with you spouse's employment?
 - A. Not applicable
 - B. Extreme impact
 - C. Considerable impact
 - D. Moderate impact
 - E. Slight impact
 - F. Insignificant impact

64

Items 140-178 deal with a number of factors that may affect your life in naval aviation. Regardless of your decision to remain in or leave the Navy, please indicate how each factor has influenced your Navy career intentions. Use the following scale:

Very Negative Influence on Intentions	Negative Influence	Has No Impact	Positive Influence	Very Positive Influence on Intentions	Not Applicable No Experience With Factor
*	B	C	D	E	T

140. Impact of Navy career on home life.

141. Navy life in general.

142. The personal risks of naval aviation.

143. The sum total of Navy pay and allowances.

144. Shipboard habitability.

145. Availability of government housing for your family.

146. Availability of option to draw BAQ and live ashore.

147. Leadership/management effectiveness of your superiors.

148. Guidance from your superiors in career planning.

149. Present performance evaluation (Fitness Report) system.

150. Job security.

. 151. Opportunity to retire in twenty years.

152. Rate of promotion .

153. Tempo of operations and working hours while on shore.

154. Night carrier operations.

155. Type of aircraft in your most recent operational squadron.

156. Competition within peer groups for advancement.

157. Amount of flight pay.

158. With due regard to the Navy's requirements, your shore tour assignments.

159. Disassociated sea tour.

160. Recognition for superior performance.

161. Fairness of treatment by detailers.

162. Amount of flight time while deployed.

163. Amount of flight time while ashore.

164. Attraction of commercial aviation.

165. The way civilians view naval aviators.

166. "Mickey Mouse" or "Chicken Reg's"

167. Availability of desirable billets.

168. Opportunity to do something important for your country.

169. Challenge of squadron flying assignments.

170. Challenge of squadron "Ground" jobs.

14

Very Negative Influence on Intentions	Negative Influence	Has No Impact	Positive Influence	Very Positive Influence on Intentions	Not Applicable No Experience With Factor
					······
*	8	c	D	E	7
171. Current	civilian job	market.			

172. Educational opportunities in the Navy.

173. Health benefits and care in the Navy.

174. Commissary and exchange benefits.

175. Navy retirement benefits.

176. Superiors' emphasis on noting your mistakes rather than your accomplishments.

177. Membership in an elite group.

178. Time between flying tours.

and been and a line and a start start and a start a

What kind of incentive(s) (e.g., increased ACIP, bonus, opportunities for education) do you personally feel would be most effective in influencing pilots to remain in the Navy?

If this questionnaire has missed anything you feel is important regarding your career intentions or the Navy aviation community in general, please write in your comments below.

As indicated on the first page of this questionnaire, under no circumstances will your individual responses be made available to anyone in your chain of command. Your information will be combined with that of other respondents and user for research purposes only. However, to make it possible for us to obtain follow up information on career decisions of Navy Aviators and Flight Officers, it is essential that we have your Social Security number. We would appreciate it if you would write your SSN below. Also, please be sure to write it in the boxes provided on the front of your answer sheet and fill in the corresponding answer spaces.

SSN

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.

Please be sure to return both this questionnaire and the answer sheet in the enclosed envelope.

16

67

and the same being a serie and an and

APPENDIX C

NAVY AVIATION CAREER SURVEY (Units in Sample)

WEST COAST/PACIFIC

NAS Miramar	NAS Lemoore	NAS Whidbey Is.
RVAW-110	VA-22,94,122,	VA-128,145,196
VAW-113,112,114 VC-7	VA-27,97,127	VAQ-129,131,134
VF-2,51,121,124	NAS Moffett	USS Midway, CV-41
VFP-63	VP-19,9,31,48,	VA-56,93,115
	VP-40,50	VAW-115
NAS North IS		VF-151,161
HC-3	Naval PG School	Ship's company
HS-8,10		
HSL-31,33,35	West Coast CV Ship's company	

EAST COAST/ATLANTIC

and a state and the state of th

NAS Norfolk	NAS Jacksonville	NAS Corpus Christi
HM-12,14,16	HS-1,3,5,9,11,15	VT-27, 28,31*
HC-6	HSL-37	
HSL-32,30,34	VP-5,30,45,46	NAS Whiting
VAQ-33		VT-3*
VAW-121,122,125	NAS Oceana	
VRF-31	VA-35,42,34,85,176	NAS Kingsville
Ship's company,CV	VF-101,171,11,14,33	VT-22,23,21*
	VF-41,43,84,102	
NAS Cecil Field	VC-2	NAS Beeville
VA-46,86,174,15,45,7	2	VT-24,25,26*
VA-81,82,83,87		
VS-24,30,28,32		NAS Pensacola
		VT-4,10,86*
NAS Brunswick		
VP-8,10,23,26		
		(*Instructors only)

The state of the state

IMINANT SCOPES

61/51/90

CASE SURFILE SE UNI	UM VAL	SFL	AL TUAL GROUP	HIGHEST PRUMABILLTY GROUP PIX/G] PIG/X)	CPOUP PIG/XI	DISCRIMIN
NNNNN NNNN NNNN NNNN NNNN AKASAN AKAS	194-19-000000000000000000000000000000000		* * * * -00-000000-0-00-	 * * * *	00-00-01-10-000 00-00-00-00-00 00-000-00	
SYMBOLS USED SYMBOL GROUT	IN PLC	DT S EL				

= PROBABILITY THAT THE CASE BEING CONSIDERED IS SO FAR (X) FROM THE CENTROID IF THE CASE IS IN FACT A GROUP MEMBER. IF THIS VALUE IS SMALL, THIS CASE MIGHT WELL NOT BELONG TO THE GROUP. P (X/G)

CAREERISTS RESIGNEES

-0

= PROBABILITY OF GROUP MEMBERSHIP (G) GIVEN DISCRIMINANT-FUNCTION SCORE (X). P (G/X)

APPENDIX D
APPENDIX E

RESULTS	OF	SUB-SET	DISCRIMINANT	ANALYSIS	FOR
		CROS	S-VALIDATION		
		0S			

IAN AL ANI	ATOR RETEMPTOR 1474, CAUSAL RELATIONSHIPS	06/15/74 PAGE 52	
VA-1 ABLES	THIN-GROUPS COMPELATIONS DETWERD CANONICAL DISCRIMINAN Are Jaulred by The Function With Langest correlation	FUNCTIONS AND DISCRIMENTING VERLARES ND THE HAGNITUDE OF THAT CORPELATION.	
2010-2010-2014 2010-2014-2014 2010-2014-2014 2010-2014-2014 2010-2014-2014 2010-2014-2014 2014 2014-2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014	FUNC 1 FUNC 1	UF GROUP COVARIANCE MATRICES USING MOX'S M NATURAL LUGURITANS OF DETERMINANTS PRINTED ARE TO UVARIANCE MATRICES. Rank LOG DETERMINANT 14-GAGUPS 14	2
CALTHICAL GROUP	DISCULITIVANT FUNCTIONS EVALUATED AT GROUP YEANS IGRUU Func 1 -U.BIUUS 1.52364	CENTROLOS)	

THIS PACE IS BEST QUALITY FRACTICABLE FROM COPY JUNALSHED TO DDC

70

N.867

States and a state of the states

Sa.



St.



7 30.00

the s

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR CASES SELECTED FOR USE IN THE ANALYSIS -

LCTUA	L GROUP	NC. OF CASES	FREDICTED	GROUP MEMBERSHI
GROUP	0	111	96 86.52	15
GROUP	L	66	13.3*	52

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 86.55%

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR CASES NOT SELECTED FOR USE IN THE ANALYSIS -

ACTUAL	GROUP		CISES	PREDICTED	GROUP MEMBERSHIP
620UP	٥		131	154 85.1%	27
GROUP	1	•	86		89.54

PERCENT OF "GRUUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 86.325

CLASSIFICATION PROCESSING SUMMARY

478 CASES WERE PRICESSED. U CASES WERE EXCLUDED FOR MISSING OF CUT-OF-RANGE GROUP CODES. 40 CASES HAD AT LEAST ENE MISSING DISCRIMINATING VARIABLE. 438 CASES WERE USED FOR PRINTED CUTPUT.

..

APPENDIX F

		-	00050000000000000000000000000000000000
ST		13	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
Ξ		e	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
DN			
s s			
RAR			
RE			
			NGED-CURPTON STATES AND STATES AND STATES
•			1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.
*			
•		æ	
-		щ	こちょうしののいちょう しゅうしょうのう ちょうちょう しょうちょう しゅうしょう しゅうしょう しゅうしょう しゅうしょう しゅう ちゅう ちゅう ちょうしょう しょう ちょう しょう ちょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう し
-		MP	10-11-11-10-10-1-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10
		5	\$
z			
a		VGE	
-		HAI	2358-22222 2222222222222222222222222222222
5		2 4	
u.		850	
æ	ų	-	ーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーーー
9	48	AR	20000000000000000000000000000000000000
~	-	the	
	AR	æ	1000,000,000,000,000,000,0000
-	HWN	æ	
-	5	-	2020-2-202020000000-0-0-00000 - 0-00000 - 0-00000000
-		H	12222222222222222222222222222222222222
-		H	
-		Ŧ	· · · ·
3			
-			
•			
: :			SAZ DEC THE ADDE TAVE
			A NHO & TEXTOR AS IT HOUSE
-			
+ -			=
+		116	
+ ENG		1.	ארצים אריבניין ניאירבייניאל
		YAR	

AVIATORS	12 MONTH	IS FRO	OM EC	S			
						SIGNIFICANO 0.0000	
						0.F. 26	,
						CHI-SQUARED 76.826	NALYSIS.
N A L Y S 1 S					5 M	0.2179179	IE REMAINING A
ENTERED.			:		AANT FUNCTIC AFTER	FUNCTION N	E USED IN TH
ISCRIMIN Ance test are	00 100* 0	CE TEST	LA VCE		VICAL DISCRIMIN CANUNICAL 1	CORRELATION : 0.8497541 :	ACTIONISI TO BE
sing the Tolef		IS 0.50000 C THE TULERAN	E TOLERA	0.0	CUMULATIVE	PERCENT 100.00	SCRIMINANT FUI
VARA VARA I VARIABLES PAS	NT FUNCTIONS OF FUNCTIONS OF FUNCTIONS OF FUNCTIONS CANCE OF WILK	R EACH GROUP	TULERANC	0.0	PERCENT OF	VAR1 ANCE 100.00	CANONICAL DI
S DEFINED BY NUMBER THUO: ALL	IMUM TJLERAN L UJSC4 IMINA IMUM NJMBER IMUM SJGNIET	DHING I VA	WIT 11N GROUPS	0.0		E166 1VALUE 2. 59819	ARKS THE 1
MALYSIS	A INI CANUN I CAL MAXI MAXI	PALUA PAL	VARIABLE	111		FINCTION 1.	i •

PRUCED WITHIN-GROUPS CONRELATIONS BETWEEN CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS AND DISCRIMINATING VARIABLES VARIABLES ARE GROUPS OF THAT CORRELATION. CANDAFCAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS (GROUP CENTROIDS) STANDARDIZED CANUNICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS -1.94765 6710.0-FUNC FUNC C-GROUP FINC

TEST OF EQUALITY OF GRULP COVARIANCE MATRICES USING BOX'S M The Manks and Natural Logarithus of Determinants Printed Are Those Of the Group Covariance Matrices. Kank Log Determinant

ER PI NANT	229213	116845	ON SIGNIFICANCE	
LOG DET	-10	-12.	F FREED	
HANK	26	26	DEGREES O	
			4	
BEL .		NCE MATRIX	APPHUX1MATE 0,99197	
GRUUP LA	0	COVARTA	H 5.X0	

SC ORES SCEIMIMANT a 155T 51 = 2ND GROU PROMABILITY HIGHEST GROUP *** *** 000 -00--0-000000---0-00 ACTUAL 00 SEL VAL MUNH SUBFILE SE



3:343



-

79

Section of



ł

with a

The state of the s

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS -

>

CASES PREDICTED GROUP MEMBE	30 86.74 13.34	45 0,01 x0,0 45
ACTUAL GROUP	n ano	1 JND

PERCENT OF "GRUUPEO" CASES COFRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 94.678

CLASSIFICATION PROCESSING SUMMARY

BI CASES WERE PROCESSED D CASES WERE EXCLUDED FOR MISSING OR OUT-OF-RANGE GROUP CODES, C CASES HAD AT LEAST ONE MISSING OR OUTPUT, 15 CASES WERE USED FOR PRINTED OUTPUT,

		APPE	ENDI	X	H						
1 1 1	AVIATORS	BETWEEN	13	ar	nd 1	8	MONT	HS	OF	EOS	
								SIGNIFICANCE	0.0029		
1 1 1								D.F.	56	J	,
	UN GROUPS DEFITED BY YARA ANALYSIS NUMBER 1 DIRECT METHOD: ALL VARJABLES PASSING THE TOLERANCE TEST ARE ENTERED.	MINIMUM TULERANCE LEVEL	PRIOR PROBABILITY FOR EACH GROUP IS 0.50000	THE FOLLUMING I VARIABLES FAILED THE TOLERANCE TEST	VARIABLE VARIANCE TOLERANCE TOLERANCE		CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS	FUNCTION EIGENVALUE VARIANCE PERCENT CORRELATION : FUNCTION WILKS' LAMBDA CHI-SQUARED	1+ 1.04347 100.00 100.00 0.7920528 1 0 0.3726524 50.343	* MARKS THE & CANDNICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION(S) TO BE USED IN THE REMAINING ANALYSIS.	
			3	1							

the s

and the production of the second of the second states and the second sec

ATTALLAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COFFFICIENTS

DI SCRIMINANT

4

FURC 1	HULLO H	ITHIN-SWOUPS CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CANONICAL DISCRIMINA
-2: 4911	VANTARLE	S ARE UNDERED BY THE FUNCTION WITH LARGEST CORRELATION
-0.02674	AND THE	AGNITUDE OF THAT CORRELATION.
-0.04143		FINC 1
-0.20000	1717	-0-102 -0-
0.11304		-0.30717
-0.21242	1217	-0.24632
-0.05470	2517 2517	-0.24201
0.48014	V163	-0.21994
50551.0-	1417	-0.20.467
-0.29611	V123	-0, 20118 -0, 20118
-0.02839	F117	-0.19436
-0.63189	447A	
Arc 10. 0-	2217	-0-01226 0.01226 0.01226
	0717	-0.06103
	5717	
	1111	16100.0

82

CANDNICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS (GROUP CENTROIDS)

-1:31700 FUNC 1

--GROUP

THE RANKS AND NATURAL LOGARITHMS OF DETERMINANTS PRINTED ARE THOSE OF THE GROUP COVARIANCE MATRICES.

FANK LOG DETERMITIANT

GKUUP LABEL

26 26

POOLEU WITHIN-GROUPS COVARIANCE MATRIX

84.5570

-

TEST UF EQUALITY OF GRCUP COVARIANCE MATRICES USING BOX:S M

APPRUXIMATE F DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE 1.1967 351, 0.007

-8.579549 -24.286071



THIS PACE IS BEST QUALITY FRACTICABLE FROM COFY JUNALSHED TO DOG

83

In a matter and she was the der to at many the state



and and the second second



Sa.

and set and the set of

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adams, J.W. Aviation Officer Survey 1966, Report of Findings. Naval Personnel Program Support Activity, May 1966.
- Amick, D.J. and Walberg, H.J. <u>Introductory Multivariate</u> Analysis. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1975.

Beatty, T.M. Forecasting Officer Losses - An Examination of Methods. Air Force Military Personnel Center. September 1977.

- Boyd, H.A. & Boyles, W.R. <u>Statements of Career Intentions:</u> <u>Their Relationship to Military Retention Problems</u> (contract No. DA44-188-ARO-2). George Washington University, May 1968.
- Bruni, JR., Jones, A.P., & James, L.R. Correlates of First Term Reenlistment Behavior Aboard Navy Ships (Tech. Rep. 75-8) Fort Worth, Tex.: Texas Christian University Institute of Behavior Research, 1 May 1975.
- Grace, G.L., Holoter, H.A., & Soderquist, M.I. <u>Career</u> <u>Satisfaction as a Factor Influencing Retention</u> (Tech. Rep. 4, TM-5031/004/00). Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, 14 May 1976.
- Hand, H.H., Griffeth, R.W., Mobley, W.H. <u>Military Enlistment</u>, <u>Reenlistment and Withdrawal: A Critical Review of</u> <u>the Literature</u>. Center for Management and Organizational <u>Research</u>, University of South Carolina, December 1977.
- Herzberg, F. and others, The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- Holoter, H.A., Stehle, G., Conner, L. and Grace, G. <u>Impact of Navy Career Counseling on Personnel Satisfaction</u> and Reenlistment (Tech. Rep. 2, TM-5031/002/00). Santa <u>Monica, Calif.</u>: System Development Corporation, 28 Feb 73.

LaRocco, J.N., Gunderson, E., & Pugh, W.N. <u>Prediction of</u> <u>Reenlistment: A Discriminant Analysis Approach</u> (Rep. No. 75-21). Navy Bureau of Medicine & Surgery, 1975.

- Lassiter, W.E., & Proctor, J.H. <u>Naval Officer Retention</u> <u>in an All Volunteer Force Environment: Job Proficiency</u> <u>and Organizational Climate (Tech Rept 1 Jan-30 Nov</u> 73, NR-048-612). Bethesda, Md.: Data Solutions Corp., Dec. 73.
- Lassiter, W.E., & Proctor, J.H. <u>Naval Officer Retention</u> in an All Volunteer Force Environament: Job Proficiency and Organizational Climate (Tech Rept 1 Dec 73-30 Nov 74, NR-274-220). Bethesda, Md.: Data Solutions Corp., Feb 75.
- Lassiter, W.E., & Proctor, J.H. <u>Naval Officer Retention</u> in an All Volunteer Force Environment: Job Proficiency and Organizational Climate (Final Rept. 1973-1976, NO. 0261-0306). Bethesda, Md.: Data Solutions Corp., Aug 1976.
- Lockman, R.F., Stoloff, P.H., & Allbritton, A.S. <u>Motivational Factors in Accession and Retention Behavior</u> (Res. Contrib. 201). Center for Naval Analysis, Institute for Naval Studies, Jan. 1972.
- Mitchell, T.R. & Albright, D. Expectancy Theory Predictions of Job Satisfaction, Job Effort, Job Performance, and Retention of Naval Aviation Officers (Tech. Rep. 71-17) University of Washington, May 1971.
- NIE, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D.H. <u>Statistical Package for the Social</u> Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Price, J.L. <u>The Measure of Turnover</u>, Ames, Ia.: Iowa Stat Press, 1977.
- Rickus, G.M., Booth, R.F., & Ambler, R.K. Comparison of Career and Noncareer Naval Aviators (Report No. 68-2) Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, 24 July 1968.
- Singer, A., & Morton, A.S. "A Study of Enlisted Navy Retention." <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1961, 22, 19-31.
- Zacks, S. Forecasting the Retention of Navy Pilots (contract No. N00014-75-C-0729). George Washington University, 9 June 1977.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No	. Copies
1.	Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2.	Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	2
3.	Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange US Army Logistic Management Center Ft. Lee, VA 23801	1
4.	LCDR Virgil G. Cook Jr. Air Antisubron Four One (VS41) NAS North Is. San Diego, Calif 92135	2
5.	Department Chairman, Code 54 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
6.	Dr. Ronald A. Weitzman, Code 54Wz Naval Postraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
7.	Richard Elster, Code 54Ea Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
8.	Carson K. Eoyang, Code 54Eg Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
9.	Dr. Bernard D. Rostker Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary (M&RA) Pentagon 4E780 Washington, D.C. 20350	1
10.	Dr. Bob Lockman Center for Naval Analyses 1401 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	1
11.	CDR R.A. Mcgonigal, Code 54Mb Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1

88

1.00

Part and the son

Sin

- 12. Denise Rousseau, Code 54Rs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940
- 13. RADM J.E. Service 1 Director of Aviation Manpower & Training Division Pentagon 4E424 Washington, D.C. 20350

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

- 14. Dr. David Robertson Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, Calif. 92152
- 15. Human Resource Management Officer Naval Education & Training Center Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL 32508
- 16. Assoc. Dir. Org Effectiveness Prog. 1 Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217
- Dr. Bob Penn Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, CA 92152
- 18. Director, HRM Division Bureau of Naval Pers (NMPC 62) Arlington Annex Washington, D.C. 20370
- 19. Assist. Chief of Naval Pers-HRM Bureau of Naval Personnel Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20370
- 20. Military Assist. for Human Resource OAD (E & LS) ODDR & E Pentagon 3D129 Washington, D.C. 20301
- 21. Human Performance Division, Code 4 Naval Medical R&D Command Bethesda, MD 20014
- 22. Air University Library
 LSE 8110
 Maxwell AFB, Al 36112
- 23. Office of Civilian Personnel Personnel Mgt Evaluation Branch (72) Washington, D.C. 20390

24.	Dept. of Behav. Sci. and Leadership U.S. Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, CO 80840	1
25.	Chairman, Behav. Sci. Dept. Naval Command-Management Division U.S. Naval Academy Luce Hall Annapolis, MD 21402	1
26.	Military Chair, HRM Navy War College Providence, RI 02840	1
27.	Library U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD 21402	1
28.	Library Navy War College Providence, RI 02840	1
29.	Bureau of Personnel (PERS-OR) Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20370	1
30.	Commanding Officer HRMC Washington 1300 Wilson Blvd. Rm 1144 Arlington, VA 22209	1
31.	Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Del. Naval Base Charleston, S.C. 29408	1
32.	Director Total Force Management Division RM 1815 Arlington Annex Columbia Pike & Arlington Arlington, VA 20370	l
33.	Human Resources Management Division Bldg. 212, Washington Navy Yard Washington, D.C. 20390	1
34.	Officer in Charge HRMD Defense Race Relations Institute Patrick AFB, FL 32927	1
35.	Commanding Officer Human Resource Management School NAS Memphis Millington, TN 38054	1

march

a state

100 million

and support

36. Commanding Officer HRMC, Norfolk 5621-23 Tidewater Dr. Norfolk, VA 23509 1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

- 37. Commander in Chief U.S. Atlantic Fleet Attn: HRM Officer Norfolk, VA 23511
- 38. Curriculum Group Armed Forces Staff College Norfolk, VA 23511
- 39. Commanding Officer Alcohol Rehabilitation Center NAS, Box 46 Jacksonville, FL 32212
- 40. Commanding Officer Air Antisubron Four One (VS-41) Naval Air Station San Diego, Calif. 92135
- 41. Commander, Submarine Force U.S. Atlantic Fleet Attn: Human Resource Officer Norfolk, VA 23511
- 42. Officer in Charge HRM Deteachment Naval Air Station Alameda, CA 94501
- 43. Officer in Charge HRM Det U.S. Naval Sub Base, New London Groton, CT 06340
- 44. Officer in Charge HRM Det. Na-les Box 41 FPO New York 09540
- 45. Officer in Charge HRM Det., Rota Box 3 FPO New York 09521
- 46. Officer in Charge HRM Det., Subic Bay U.S. Naval Station FPO San Francisco 96651

- 47. Officer in Charge HRM Det., Yokosuka Code 003 FPO Seattle, WA 98762
- 48. Commanding Officer HRM Center, London Box 23 FPO New York 09510
- 49. Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Detachment Mayport, FL 32228

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

- 50. Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet Attn: HRM Officer FPO San Francisco, 96610
- 51. Commander, Naval Air Force U.S. Pacific Fleet Attn: Human Resource Officer NAS North Island San Diego, CA 92135
- 52. Commander, Naval Air Force U.S. Atlantic Fleet Attn: Human Resource Officer Norfolk, VA 23511
- 53. Commander, Naval Surface Force U.S. Atlantic Fleet Attn: Human Resource Officer Norfolk, VA 23511
- 54. Commander, Naval Surface Force U.S. Pacific Fleet Attn: HRM Officer Naval Amphibious Base Coronado, CA 92132
- 55. Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-136D2A) Washington, D.C. 20370
- 56. Officer in Charge HRM Detachment NAS Whidbey Island Oak Harbor, WA 98278
- 57. Commanding Officer Human Resources Management Center Naval Training Center San Diego, CA 92133

58.	Commanding Officer HRMC Pearl Harbor Pearl Harbor, HI 96860	1
59.	Dep. Dir. of Personnel Plans for Human Resources Development Headquarters U.S. Air Force Washington, D.C. 20330	1
60.	Commander Leadership Mgt. Dev. Center Maxwell AFB, AL 36112	1
61.	Library National Defense University Ft. McNair Washington, D.C. 20319	1
62.	Officer in Charge USAF Human Resources Laboratory Brooks AFB, TX 78235	1
63.	School of Logistics and Management AFIT Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1
64.	Director, Human Res. Development HDQRTRS, Dept. of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310	1
65.	Commander, OETC P.O. Box 444 Fort Ord, CA 93941	1
66.	Chief, Org. Effect Office, OCSA Hqtrs. Department of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310	1
67.	Director, Personnel Systems Mgt. U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013	1
68.	Department of Defense Mgt. Studies Indust. College of the Armed Forces Washington, D.C. 20319	1
69.	Dept. of Behv. Sci. and Leadership United States Military Academy West Point, NY 10996	1

and state and she was the de the south and south and south and

10.00

70.	Senior R&D Coordinator U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavior and Social Sciences 500 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, Va 22233	1
71.	Mr. Paul Magnusson Naval Personnel Research & Development Center (Code 307) San Diego, Calif 92152	1
72.	Dr. Bob Holtzbach Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, Calif 92152	1
73.	Dr. John Sheposh Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, Calif 92152	1
74.	Mr. Michael White Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, Calif 92152	1
75.	Head, Human Resource: Branch Headquarters, USMC Washington, D.C. 20380	1
76.	Leadership Department U.S. Coast Guard Academy New London CT 06320	1

the second water and the second of the second second