

Research Problem Review 78-1

①  
mc

LEVEL 4

**ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARMY'S RECENTLY TESTED  
"DIRECT LOGISTIC SUPPORT" CONCEPT AND  
THE ASSOCIATED MAXIM "TELL IT LIKE IT IS!"**

AD A 076708

FORT HOOD FIELD UNIT

DDC  
RECEIVED  
NOV 16 1979  
A



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

February 1978

79 11 15 248

DDC FILE COPY

# U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the  
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

J. E. UHLANER  
Technical Director

W. C. MAUS  
COL, GS  
Commander

---

## NOTICES

**DISTRIBUTION:** Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-P, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

**FINAL DISPOSITION:** This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

**NOTE:** The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.



16 Army Project Number  
2Q263743A775

Human Performance  
in Field Assessment

14 ARI- Research Problem Review-78-1

6 ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARMY'S RECENTLY TESTED 'DIRECT LOGISTIC SUPPORT'  
CONCEPT AND THE ASSOCIATED MAXIM 'TELL IT LIKE IT IS';

10 R. L. Palmer

11 Feb 78

12 113

FORT HOOD FIELD UNIT  
George M. Gividen, Chief

Submitted by:  
Joseph Zeidner, Director  
ORGANIZATIONS & SYSTEMS  
RESEARCH LABORATORY

Approved by:  
J. E. Uhlaner  
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel  
Department of the Army  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Research Problem Reviews are special reports to military management. They are usually prepared to meet requirements for research results bearing on specific management problems. A limited distribution is made--primarily to the operating agencies directly involved.

408 010

LA

## CONTENTS

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
A	

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	i
BRIEF	ii
INTRODUCTION	01
PURPOSE	04
METHOD	
General	05
Questionnaire Construction and Administration	06
Sample Characteristics	07
Data Analysis	10
RESULTS	
General Considerations	11
Presentation of Findings	13
Summary of Respondent Attitudes	24
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	26
REFERENCES	35
TABLES 01-39 (questionnaire items and results)	36
TABLE 40 (verbal summary of results)	86
TABLE 41 (numerical summary of results)	91
APPENDIX A: DLS Implementation Questionnaire Contents	A-01
APPENDIX B: Report of Follow-Up Administration of DLS Implementation Questionnaire to MRC Representatives	B-01
APPENDIX C: Complete Transcript of Respondent Comments Obtained on First and Second Administrations of the DLS Implementation Questionnaire (available, if not attached, from ARI files, upon request)	C-01

## FOREWORD

---

The Fort Hood Field Unit of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) provides frequent evaluation support to Headquarters, TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity (TCATA). The ARI study described in this report was conducted in conjunction with a TCATA evaluation (TCATA Test FM 360B) of the DA DCSLOG "Direct Logistic Support" (DLS) concept, which was implemented for evaluation purposes at III Corps and Fort Hood, Fort Hood, Texas.

This study was concerned with attitudes toward selected aspects of the DLS concept. Subjects were personnel intimately connected with the implementation of DLS--personnel of the III Corps DARCOM Logistic Assistance Activity (DLAA), the 1st Cavalry Division DLAA, and the 2d Armored Division DLAA, and their customers. The intent was to determine whether the attitudes of these personnel would be compatible with the implementation of DLS concepts. (A complete transcript of the respondents' comments is provided in Appendix C, which, if not attached, is available from ARI files, upon request.)

This project is responsive to the objectives of RDTE Project 6.37.43.A775.



J. E. UHLANER  
Technical Director



# ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARMY'S RECENTLY TESTED "DIRECT LOGISTIC SUPPORT" CONCEPT AND THE ASSOCIATED MAXIM "TELL IT LIKE IT IS"

## BRIEF

### REQUIREMENT

*This report describes a study.*  
To assess the attitudes of DARCOM Logistic Assistance Activity (DLAA) personnel and their customers (users) toward selected aspects of the DA DCSLOG concept "Direct Logistic Support" (DLS) and the probable impact of those attitudes on the implementation of DLS concepts.

Of particular importance was the determination of whether or not DLAA personnel would be able to "tell it like it is" about logistic deficiencies of user units (as prescribed by DLS) and still be able to maintain the necessary rapport and spirit of cooperation with the user that is necessary for delivering effective technical logistic support to the field.

### PROCEDURE

A questionnaire designed to assess respondent attitudes and to collect respondent comments and suggestions was administered to DLAA personnel and their customers during a pilot implementation of DLS that took place at Fort Hood, Texas during the spring and summer of 1977. Items on the questionnaire dealt with a variety of inter-related issues concerning specific aspects of DLS and their effects on DLAA and user personnel and the working relation between them. Among the topics covered were training, communications, the DLAA assessment mission, customer relations, job satisfaction and security, and unit readiness.

The respondents' attitudes on each topic were assessed with 7-point bipolar response scales. Data obtained for each questionnaire item were summarized and described, both numerically and verbally, for each of three respondent groups: the first consisting of Logistics Management Specialists (LMS), Logistics NCOs, and DLAA chiefs (the "LMS group"); the second of equipment specialists from the several DARCOM Material Readiness Commands (primarily Field Maintenance Technicians) ("MRC reps"); the third of a representative cross-section of DLAA customers ("users"), including unit commanders; executive



officers; maintenance, materiel, and supply supervisors and technicians; and others. The data were also summarized for all DLAA personnel as a whole and for the entire subject sample as a whole. In addition, all respondents' comments were transcribed and organized as Appendix C to this report. (Appendix C, if not attached, is available from ARI files, upon request.)

## FINDINGS

- The LMS group and the users were roughly equivalent in terms of their overall favorableness toward DLS. For both groups the percent of questionnaire responses favorable to DLS was 45. The percents of neutral and negative responses were about 25 and 30, respectively. It was concluded that while many individuals within both of these groups exhibited much concern about particular aspects of DLS, their responses as a whole were not necessarily incompatible with the implementation of DLS concepts.

- The MRC reps were considerably less favorable toward DLS than the other two groups: 24 percent of their responses were positive; 30 percent were neutral; and 46 percent were negative. The views of the MRC reps were considered incompatible with successful implementation of DLS concepts.

- Less than 10 percent of the DLAA personnel felt they would be able to "tell it like it is" and continue to maintain satisfactory working relations with their customers.

- Both the LMS group and the MRC reps expressed some unwillingness to "tell it like it is."

- From the user's perspective (which was not as informed as that of the DLAA personnel) the DLAA-user working relations would not be seriously jeopardized by DLS concept implementation.

- DLS concepts have not had a chance to operate in normal, nontest circumstances. It is recommended that an opportunity for a nontest trial period be created and that selected DLS concepts be partially reevaluated at the end of such a period with emphasis on DLAA-user input and attention to problem areas exposed in this report.

## UTILIZATION OF FINDINGS

The findings in this report have been presented to the DLS concept proponent (DA DCSLOG) and other interested parties involved in refining the Army's logistic assistance program. They are intended to aid in the achievement of significant Army-wide improvements in logistic assistance.

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARMY'S RECENTLY TESTED "DIRECT LOGISTIC SUPPORT"  
CONCEPT AND THE ASSOCIATED MAXIM "TELL IT LIKE IT IS"

---

The Army Staff is currently attempting to improve logistic support (advice, assistance, and training) for the Army's equipment and weapon systems. A major component of this effort was "Direct Logistic Support" (DLS), a concept developed by the Department of the Army Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DA DCSLOG).

DLS responded to a problem encountered subsequent to the 1962 Army Reorganization, which effectively eliminated the technical command channels that had existed between the field and the Army Materiel Command (AMC) Commodity Commands (now Department of the Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command [DARCOM] Materiel Readiness Commands [MRC]). The loss of these technical channels--through which technical assistance in maintaining logistic readiness was provided to users--created a situation in which there was no satisfactory mechanism by which the Army Staff could collect, process, and disseminate sufficient information related to logistic support problems, including underlying deficiencies in the areas of personnel, training, doctrine, and funding.

The DLS concept addressed this problem by proposing the establishment of technical communication channels to provide for the free flow of logistic information throughout all Army echelons from DA Staff to user, with particular emphasis on communication between the user and the MRCs.

Furthermore, the DLS concept consolidated all DARCOM assistance programs and assistance personnel under field-level "DARCOM Logistic Assistance Activities" (DLAA), each designed for, dedicated to, and located (at the installation) with a particular user division or corps. The DLAA is thus to provide commanders with a centralized source of technical logistic support.<sup>1</sup>

Prior to the advent of DLS notions, the customary role of DARCOM logistic assistance personnel (Logistics Management Specialists [LMS] and MRC technical representatives [Field Maintenance Technicians (FMT) and other equipment or supply specialists]) was to assist user organizations in solving their equipment or weapon system problems in the traditional logistic areas of maintenance, supply, transportation, and services. Under the new concept, however, the role of the assistance personnel (particularly that of the MRC representatives, hereinafter referred to as "MRC reps") would be expanded to include "assessment" and "reporting" activities as well as the traditional assistance functions. That is, DLAA personnel would be tasked to actively search out and report logistic deficiencies and to discover, if possible, the "root causes" or "probable causes" of the problems; which might lead them into the broader, more fundamental areas of personnel, training, doctrine, and funding.

---

<sup>1</sup>A complete description and discussion of DLS concepts can be found in Direct Logistic Support (DLS) Report and Concept Implementation Plan (Goodwin, Dolphi, Bodnar, & Brown, 1976).

Additionally, the "visibility" of logistic problems would be maintained until they were resolved; and the problems would be elevated through technical channels or chain of command as high as were required to provide satisfactory resolution, although DLS does emphasize the desirability of resolving issues as "close to home" as possible.

Another important aspect of DLS is the pervading maxim "Tell it like it is" which exerts all personnel concerned with logistic problems (from user level to DA) to portray an accurate picture of the real situation. Thus devotion to a spirit of honesty and openness is considered fundamental to the successful implementation of DLS concepts. But here may exist also a fundamental and perhaps fatal weakness in the DLS notion as it is currently described. DLS, as presented, takes little pains to assure the user that "telling it like it is" will not occasion retributive action from higher authority; and it is reasonable, therefore, to expect that some degree of apprehension will be experienced at the user level. Unless the user understands that unwarranted "negative" reactions will not result from his "telling it like it is," he may resist exposing or accurately portraying logistic problems within his jurisdiction.

DLAA personnel, on the other hand, may experience a related concern. Because they are charged with "telling it like it is" about the logistic readiness of user units, they may expect



diminished rapport with user personnel and consequent damage to their primary mission, which is to assist. Hence DLAA personnel--especially the MRC reps, who spend much time in face-to-face contact with users--might wish to resist the assimilation of assessment and reporting functions into their job roles, and they might in fact encounter problems with user rapport if assessment activities are engaged in, or engaged in improperly.

#### PURPOSE

The present study was designed to explore the attitudes of DLAA and user personnel toward the aforementioned issues and other closely related topics. Three specific questions were central to the study:

1. What will DLAA personnel think about having to assess as well as assist their supported user units? That is, will they feel that they can successfully maintain the necessary rapport with users while "telling it like it is" at the same time?
2. How will user personnel within the supported units feel toward the activities of DLAA personnel in the light of DLS? Will their feelings negatively affect DLAA-user working relations?
3. Will the attitudes of DLAA or user personnel be compatible with the successful implementation of DLS concepts as they are currently conceived?

Answers to these questions will be useful to the proponents of the DLS concept in deciding what (if any) modifications in the concept or the method of its implementation are necessary to the successful

achievement of the goals of DLS, the most basic of which is, of course, increased readiness of the Army-in-the-field.

## METHOD

### GENERAL

The Army Research Institute (ARI) research discussed in this report was done in conjunction with a pilot implementation of DLS at Fort Hood, Texas which took place during the spring and summer of 1977. A comprehensive subjective evaluation of the DLS concept was conducted by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Combined Arms Test Activity's (TCATA) Combined Arms Test Directorate (TCATA Test FM 360B) during the implementation period. The present ARI study was conducted at the request of TCATA and supports Objective 6 of the TCATA evaluation plan: "To evaluate DLAA mission performance with special consideration to the command and staff relationships set forth in the DLAA charter" (Klement, Blankenship, & Chapman, 1977).

The data required for answering the questions posed in this study were obtained by means of a self-administered questionnaire developed by ARI and completed by logistic assistance personnel of the three DLAA's established at Fort Hood (III Corps DLAA, 1st Cavalry Division DLAA, and 2d Armored Division DLAA) and by personnel of representative user units. The questionnaire administration took place during June and July 1977.

## QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION AND ADMINISTRATION

Questionnaire items were derived from analyses of information from the following sources:

1. DLS reference documents including, most notably, the following:

- (a) Direct Logistic Support (DLS) Report and Concept Implementation Plan (Goodwin, Dolphi, Bodnar, & Brown, 1976)
- (b) Memorandum to DCSLOG (Subject: "Observations Concerning the Direct Logistic Support Concept") from Chief, USAMC Logistic Assistance Office--FORSCOM, 5 January 1977
- (c) Restructured General Support/Direct Logistic Support (RGS/DLS) Evaluation--Fort Hood Phase--FM 360: Combined Test Design Plan/Detailed Plan for Execution (Klement, 1977)
- (d) Direct Logistic Support: Pilot Implementation Plan, Fort Hood, Texas, revised (DLS Task Group, 1977).

2. DLS steering committee meetings, April and May 1977. (The purpose of the DLS steering committee was to oversee the pilot implementation of DLS at Fort Hood and to make such changes in or refinements of the DLS concept as deemed necessary. The committee was chaired by a representative from DA DCSLOG; members were from Communications Command [USACC], DARCOM, Defense Logistic Agency [DLA], Forces Command [FORSCOM], General Services Administration [GSA], Logistic Evaluation Agency [LEA], Military Personnel Center [MILPERCEN], TRADOC, and TCATA.)

3. Periodic orientation visits to the three Fort Hood DLAA's and TCATA Combined Arms Test Directorate.

4. Observations of DLAA-user interface in the field.

Four forms of the questionnaire were constructed.<sup>2</sup> Forms A, B, and C, for DLAA personnel, were administered, respectively, to (a) MRC reps, (b) LMSs and Logistics NCOs, and (c) DLAA chiefs. Form D was administered to all user personnel.

Twenty-five of the questionnaire items were common to Forms A, B, and C (with the exception of a slight wording change for one item). Form C contained only these 25 items. Form B had a total of 26 items, and Form A had 27. Form D, for users, was generally similar to the other forms, except that it was reworded to conform to the user's perspective. Form D had a total of 19 items, 16 of which were exact duplications of, approximate duplications of, or closely related to items on the other three forms. All items consisted of one or more multiple choice questions that, with one exception, were followed by 7-alternative bipolar response scales. The exception was a question with a 10-alternative response on a unipolar scale. The respondent's task was to check the most preferred of the listed alternatives and to enter (in spaces provided for the purpose) any comments he wished to make.

---

<sup>2</sup>The questionnaire items are shown, exactly as they appeared in the questionnaires, in Tables 01 through 39. Copies of the intact forms will be made available, as authorized, upon request.



Each questionnaire was prefaced by a set of instructions that provided DLS background information (Form D only), stated the purpose of the questionnaire, assured the respondents that their identities would not be revealed, and gave specific instructions for completing the questionnaire. The last page of each questionnaire requested the respondent to provide certain biographic and demographic information.<sup>3</sup> Copies of these sections of the questionnaires are provided in Appendix A.

The questionnaires were delivered to the respondents at their duty locations in return envelopes that also contained explanatory cover letters soliciting the respondents' cooperation and assuring the privacy of their responses (see Appendix A).

#### SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Questionnaires (Forms A, B, and C) were distributed to 64 professional DLAA personnel composed of 3 DLAA chiefs, 10 LMSs, 3 Logistics NCOs, and 48 MRC reps. Twelve (75%) of the 16 persons in the first three categories of DLAA personnel and 36 (also 75%) of the 48 MRC reps returned completed or partly completed questionnaires.

Approximately 250 questionnaires (Form D) were distributed to various user units. It is likely, however, that some of them were

---

<sup>3</sup> Unforeseen time constraints for the study precluded the analysis of these data.

not delivered to specific individuals for completion; therefore, the number of user personnel afforded an opportunity to complete the questionnaire was probably somewhat less than 250. User respondents were typically unit commanders; executive officers; maintenance, materiel, or supply supervisors or technicians; or other unit personnel connected in some way with maintenance or supply. The rank of the officer respondent was usually 03, 04, or 05. Enlisted personnel were ordinarily NCOs (E6 or E7) or Warrant Officers (W1 thru W4). Completed or partly completed user questionnaires were returned by 216 respondents. This represents a return rate of at least 86 percent. However, 45 of the user questionnaires were received too late to be analyzed for this report; therefore, the number of user questionnaires upon which this report is based is 171.

The number of user organizations from which one or more of the 171 questionnaires were obtained was 37. These organizations represented a large majority of the user units with which DLAA personnel had had some significant contact in the recent past. The units were selected on the basis of information obtained from key DLAA personnel and TCATA test personnel. The 37 organizations constituted a cross-section of units served by each of the three Fort Hood DLAA's.

## DATA ANALYSIS

The questionnaire data were partitioned into the following five data categories:

1. LMSs (plus NCOs and DLAA chiefs)
2. MRC reps
3. DLAA personnel (consists of categories 1 and 2 combined)
4. Users
5. Overall (consists of categories 3 and 4 combined)

The first category contained all data obtained with the questionnaire forms B and C. The purpose of combining the data from Form C (DLAA chiefs) and Form B (LMSs and NCOs) was to preserve the anonymity of the individuals responding to Form C. (There being three DLAAAs at Fort Hood, there were, of course, only three DLAA chiefs in the sample.)

For each questionnaire item the following descriptive statistics were computed for the particular data categories applicable to the item:

1. The percentage of respondents answering the item who chose each of the possible response alternatives.
2. The average (mean) response for the item, based on a 7-point response scale ranging from +3 to -3. (For one item, based on a 10-point scale.)
3. The number of respondents answering the item.

4. The percentage of responses to the item that fell on the positive side of the response scale and can therefore be usually interpreted as favorable toward DLS or some aspect thereof.

5. The percentage of responses to the item that fell on the negative side of the scale and can therefore be usually interpreted as opposed to DLS or some aspect thereof.

6. An index of variability, which measures on a scale of 0 to 100 the degree to which the respondents answering the item disagreed among themselves. The smaller the number, the less the average (mean) disagreement among the respondents. (The amount of disagreement between any two respondents was defined as the difference between their responses on the numerical response scale.)<sup>4</sup>

## RESULTS

### GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The results of the data analysis for each questionnaire item are presented in Tables 01 through 39. In each case the table title indicates the questionnaire form or forms on which the item appeared as well as the serial order of the item on those forms. Thus, for example, the heading for Table 01 ("Results for Item A-01/B-01/C-01")

---

<sup>4</sup>This variability index was less time consuming to compute than the customary "standard deviation" but equally suitable considering its descriptive purpose in this report. It was computed by taking the ratio of the mean-absolute-deviation-from-the-mean,  $\sum |X - M| \div n$ , to the maximum possible deviation. The latter was 3, or approximately 3, for each questionnaire item (except item A-12/B-11/C-11, for which it was 45); therefore the variability index was computed as  $\sum |X - M| \div 3n$ .



indicates that the item portrayed in the table appeared in Forms A, B, and C of the questionnaire and was the first item in each. The item did not appear on Form D. In each of the results tables the questionnaire item has been reproduced with the results pertaining to the item presented below it.<sup>5</sup> In examining the results it is important to recall: (a) that the column heading "LMS group" refers not only to LMSs but to DLAA chiefs and NCOs as well; (b) that the column heading "DLAA" refers to the "MRC reps" and "LMS group" combined; and (c) that the column heading "Overall" refers to "Users" and "DLAA" combined. Special notes pertaining to certain tables are given at the end of those tables.

Most of the questionnaire items generated many written comments. These subjective respondent comments provide a valuable adjunct to the systematically obtained item responses; they contain much information that should be useful to the reader who wishes to "get behind the scenes," so-to-speak, for particular questionnaire items. A complete transcript of all respondent comments is presented in Appendix C.<sup>6</sup> The comments are organized for each item according to respondent category (LMS group, MRC reps, Users) and the response alternatives checked for that item.

---

<sup>5</sup>Slight numerical inconsistencies, due to rounding errors, may be observed in some of the tables.

<sup>6</sup>Appendix C may not be attached. It will be made available, as authorized, upon request.

The reader of the comments should take special cognizance of the fact that no particular comment necessarily represents the attitudes of the majority of the respondents. The comments associated with any item should always be considered in light of the objectively obtained data for that item, because those data do represent all respondents.

#### PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The following discussion points out the more important aspects of the findings. Two cautions are worth noting: (a) Because the significance of differences between or among groups was not crucial to achieving the objectives of this study, significance tests were not performed. Therefore, the reader should avoid inferring significant differences between or among groups for individual questionnaire items, especially where the observed difference is small and the variability index is relatively large. (b) The number of respondents in the LMS group was quite small for each item (a maximum of 12). Thus, while the LMS group (which, it is important to recall, included NCOs and DLAA chiefs) represented about 75 percent of the total population of such individuals at Fort Hood during the implementation period, and may therefore adequately reflect that population, it would not necessarily be representative of other installations. The same cautionary statement applies to the other data categories (MRC reps, DLAA, Users, Overall) but to a lesser degree because of the larger number of respondents involved.

Table 01. As a group, DLAA personnel felt that the training of MRC representatives had been less than slightly adequate, although considerable disagreement was evident, especially among individuals within the LMS group.

Table 02. There may be some disagreement between the LMS group and MRC reps here. More than half of the latter felt that the elevation of adverse information would be less free under DLS. The LMS group felt it would stay about the same. Of course, the DLS concept prescribes a free flow of information.

Table 03. The predominant feature here is that 57 percent of the MRC reps reported that their involvement in assessment activities through June 1977 (the period during which the questionnaire was administered to DLAA personnel) was not greater than before DLS. Eleven percent reported it was less.

Table 04. Apparently the MRC reps had felt more user resistance than the LMSs, NCOs, and DLAA chiefs. In general, 74 percent of the DLAA responses indicated that the users had not welcomed the new assessment role of the DLAA.

Table 05. The users themselves varied considerably in their estimations of user resistance to DLAA assessment activities, but on the whole were slightly positive.

---

Insert Tables 01-05 about here

---

Table 06. There was considerable agreement among DLAA personnel that the civilian status of most DLAA personnel would have little effect on user resistance to DLAA assessment. The users appeared to be somewhat less optimistic and exhibited less consensus of opinion. Their average response was very slightly negative.

Table 07. There was a wide range of opinion among both DLAA and user personnel about whether or not DLS would cause logistical problems to be elevated higher than necessary. The LMS group tended to say no; the MRC reps, yes. Over all, 31 percent of the respondents said no.

Table 08. DLS prescribes that logistical problems be elevated only as high as necessary. Over 70 percent of the DLAA personnel seem to have agreed with that prescription. User opinions were varied.

Table 09. There was a notable degree of polarization of opinion among the LMS group concerning the likelihood that, under DLS, "command solutions" would be attempted for technical problems previously identified as "command nonresolvable." The MRC reps tended to feel that such inappropriate actions would be slightly common.

Table 10. On the average, the user was slightly negative on the topic of inappropriate command solutions for technical problems, but such actions were predicted to be "very common" by more than 25 percent of the users.

---

Insert Tables 06-10 about here

---



Table 11. The LMS group appeared to be basically neutral in their stance regarding the effect of DLS on "customer relations" between the user and the MRC reps. The MRC reps presented a different picture: 9 percent predicted that DLS would improve relations; however, 74 percent predicted some degree of worsening, while 44 percent felt that relations would worsen greatly.

Table 12. Users were quite varied in their opinions about the effect of DLS on relations between users and MRC reps, but on the average they were very slightly positive.

Table 13. The preponderance of feeling toward the willingness of the MRC rep to "tell it like it is" under DLS was very negative. Over 80 percent of all the responses indicated that unwillingness would be to some degree usual--a finding borne out in both the LMS group and the MRC reps. Furthermore, 50 percent of the MRC reps and 58 percent of the LMS group felt that unwillingness would be "very usual."

Table 14. Over 75 percent of the DLAA personnel felt that it would be to some degree common for the careers of user personnel to be negatively affected if the DLAA's "tell it like it is" as DLS prescribes. Furthermore, one-third felt that it would be "very common." The users themselves seemed to express somewhat less apprehension, although more than half also gave negative responses.

---

Insert Tables 11-14 about here

---

Table 15. On the average, DLAA personnel felt that user "personality factors" (i.e. problems with user personnel themselves, as opposed to equipment, procedures, etc.) played a significant role in almost half of the problems dealt with; but the estimates varied considerably from as high as 95 percent to as low as 15 percent.

Table 16. As to whether DLAA personnel would be more or less willing to "tell it like it is" about user problems involving "personalities," there was considerable variability of opinion. Perhaps the most desirable response alternative from the perspective of DLS is "about the same" (alternative "d"). Half of the LMS-group responses were on the "more willing" side; half the MRC-rep responses were on the "less willing" side.

Table 17. When DLAA personnel were asked how much the DLS "system" tends to reward or punish five categories of individuals, their responses indicated that DLAA chiefs would fare the best, the average response being +0.5, which implies "rewards very slightly." LMSs would be neither rewarded nor punished according to 49 percent of the respondents. (About a third of the LMS group--which, as it will be recalled once again, contained the NCOs and DLAA chiefs--felt that LMSs would be punished; about a third of the MRC reps thought LMSs would be rewarded.) The MRC-rep and lower-ranking-user-personnel categories fared equally poorly: Only 7 percent of the respondents felt that those categories would be rewarded to any degree; slightly

---

Insert Tables 15-17 about here

---

more than 50 percent felt they would be punished to some degree. (It is perhaps noteworthy that not one of the 11 respondents in the LMS group felt that the "system" would reward the MRC reps.) The user unit commanders were expected to be the most punished of the five categories of individuals: The average response was -1.3 (somewhat more negative than "punished slightly"), with 72 percent of the respondents predicting some degree of punishment for unit commanders. A final point: The most predominant response for each category of individual, with the exception of DLAA chiefs, was "neither rewards nor punishes."

Table 18. This item gives the user's perception of the extent to which the DLS "system" tends to reward or punish three categories of individuals. The users appear to have had a more positive attitude than indicated for DLAA personnel in the table just discussed. On the average, users tended to view both unit commanders and lower ranking user personnel as being "very slightly rewarded" and DLAA personnel as being "slightly rewarded." Regarding the latter, 61 percent of the users felt that DLAA personnel would be rewarded to some extent, while 8 percent felt they would be punished.

Table 19. Both the LMS group (50%) and the MRC reps (71%) tended to judge that users would be less likely to "tell it like

---

Insert Tables 18 and 19 about here

---

it is" under DLS than prior to DLS, but the average response for the MRC reps was somewhat more negative than for the LMS group. When the LMS group and the MRC reps judged DLAA personnel, their responses were again negative, but only very slightly. Perhaps the most pertinent fact in this table is that 66 percent of all DLAA personnel felt that users would be less inclined to "tell it like it is" under DLS.

Table 20. On the average, user respondents felt that users would be very slightly more likely to "tell it like it is" under DLS than prior to DLS, although there was considerable latitude of opinion. The pre-dominant response (36%) was that DLS would make no difference.

Table 21. This item shows that the attitudes of the LMS group toward success in "telling it like it is" up to the time of the questionnaire administration tended to be positive. Not one of the 12 respondents in this group checked a negative alternative. The MRC reps were not positive: 29 percent said they had "usually not" or "very seldom" been able to "tell it like it is." By far the most frequent response of the MRC reps was "sometimes."

Table 22. Regarding the adequacy of "unit readiness reports" as indicators of readiness status, the LMS group appeared to be slightly positive and the MRC reps very slightly negative. The

---

Insert Tables 20-22 about here

---



MRC reps appeared to exhibit less agreement among themselves on this topic than the LMSs.

Table 23. User judgment regarding the adequacy of "unit readiness reports" was strikingly similar to the judgment of the MRC reps in the table last discussed. There was considerable variability in their opinions, and they were very slightly negative on the average. Of considerable interest is the fact that 37 percent of the user respondents felt that readiness reports were "moderately inadequate" or "very inadequate."

Table 24. One of the nine LMS-group respondents who answered this item felt that he might be less effective under DLS in contributing to user unit readiness. Six felt they might be more effective.

Table 25. The MRC reps appeared decidedly more pessimistic about their being able to contribute to user readiness under DLS than the LMS group just discussed. The average response was "slightly less effective," but 46 percent felt they would be "moderately less effective" or "much less effective."

Table 26. The effectiveness of DLSS chiefs in contributing to user readiness under DLS was expected by 42 percent of the LMS group (which contained DLAA chief responses) to be somewhat more effective than prior to DLS. Only 8 percent (one respondent) responded

---

Insert Tables 23-26 about here

---

negatively. On the average, the MRC reps felt DLS would produce little or no change in DLAA chief effectiveness; however, more than one-third responded negatively.

Table 27. DLAA personnel as a whole were seen by the LMS group as having a moderately positive effect on user readiness. Furthermore, their responses were highly interconsistent, ranging only from "very positive" to "slightly positive." The MRC reps, while somewhat less positive were also predominantly positive in judging the DLAA effect on unit readiness.

Table 28. User perception of the effect of the DLAA on unit readiness was very much like the DLAA perception just described: 72 percent of the user respondents checked positive response alternatives; only 7 percent were negative. The average response was "slightly positive."

Table 29. The average attitude of the user toward the impact of DLS on unit readiness was slightly positive. Ten percent of the user responses were negative.

Table 30. There appeared to be considerable agreement among DLAA and user alike that unit readiness will be positively affected by the reporting of adverse logistical information by DLAA personnel. The overall percents for negative and positive responses were 11 and 61, respectively. Interestingly, the users appeared to anticipate a slightly more positive effect than the DLAA personnel.

---

Insert Tables 27-30 about here

---

Table 31. The attitude of DLAA personnel toward the effect of DLS implementation on job satisfaction for DLAA chiefs was varied. About 50 percent indicated they believed some increase had occurred, while 25 percent indicated a decrease. Perception of change in job satisfaction for LMSs was also varied, and, on the average, "no change" was indicated in the responses of both the LMS group and the MRC reps. Job satisfaction for MRC reps (as a group) was perceived by both the LMS group and the MRC reps themselves as having decreased: 50 percent of the LMS group and 84 percent of the MRC reps registered negative responses. When individuals were asked to judge change in job satisfaction for themselves ("Yourself") rather than for the aforementioned groups, the results were corroborative: The LMS group (representing DLAA chiefs as well as LMSs and NCOs) produced an average response of "no change," and the MRC reps were again predominantly negative.

Table 32. DLAA personnel attitudes regarding anticipated "long run" job satisfaction for DLAA chiefs and LMSs appeared, on the whole, somewhat more positive than their attitudes regarding job satisfaction "up to the present time," although MRC reps envisioned little change for LMSs. The future satisfaction of MRC reps was also envisioned as becoming more positive--by the LMS group, but not by the MRC reps

---

Insert Tables 31 and 32 about here

---

themselves. The average response of MRC reps for MRC reps as a group was "slightly less." When they judged for themselves ("Yourself") as individuals it was between "slightly" and "somewhat" less. Nine percent of the MRC reps thought their job satisfaction would increase over time.

Table 33. The most common response (58%) of both DLAA and user personnel regarding the effect of "telling it like it is" upon job security was that job security would not change. However, the average response of MRC reps was negative, and no MRC rep felt his job security would increase.

Table 34. When asked to estimate the amount of success they would have in "'telling it like it is' one day and providing assistance the next," 72 percent of all DLAA responses were negative. Forty-two percent of the LMS group and 62 percent of the MRC reps thought they would be "moderately" or "very" unsuccessful.

Table 35. The overall impact of DLS on Army readiness was anticipated by the LMS group and the users to be slightly positive. Not one of the LMS group thought readiness would decrease, and only 6 percent of the users thought it would decrease. The average and most frequent (55%) MRC-rep response was "no change." Eight percent of all respondents were negative; 58 percent were positive.

Table 36. The general feeling of the LMS group toward the DLS concept was "moderately positive." None of their responses was

---

Insert Tables 33-36 about here

---



negative. The user was on the average "slightly positive." Sixteen percent of their responses were negative. In contrast, the MRC reps tended to be negative toward the DLS concept: 21 percent gave positive responses; 55 percent gave negative responses.

Table 37. The first question on Form D of the questionnaire asked users how often they used DLAA services. Thirty-three percent of the respondents answered "usually not," "very seldom," or "never." Twenty-eight percent said "sometimes." The remaining 39 percent responded "usually," "very often," or "extremely often."

Table 38. The user was, on the average, slightly favorable toward the idea of combining the responsibilities for assisting, evaluating, and reporting within MRC representatives. However, opinions among the user ranged widely.

Table 39. The overall attitude of the user toward DLAA personnel was "slightly positive." The most predominant response (27%), however, was "very positive."

---

Insert Tables 37-39 about here

---

#### SUMMARY OF RESPONDENT ATTITUDES

The findings presented in the foregoing 39 tables are summarized in Table 40, which briefly states the topic of each of the questionnaire items and describes the average attitudes of the respondent

groups that replied to the item. Where respondent groups did not differ in average response by .5 or more they are combined. Thus, in Table 40 "DLAA" indicates that the mean responses of the LMS group and the MRC reps were less than .5 scale points apart.

It is to be emphasized that the summary in Table 40 is based upon the attitudes (perceptions) of the respondents and, as such, may not always correspond to actual states of affairs.

---

Insert Table 40 about here

---

One way of attempting to grasp the overall picture portrayed by the findings is to ask, What are the percentages of positive, neutral, and negative mean responses given by the three categories of respondents over all questionnaire items? These percentages are shown in Table 41. Three important features of the table stand out: (a)

---

Insert Table 41 about here

---

The users and the LMS group (LMSs, NCOs, and DLAA chiefs) were quite similar in terms of overall percentages of positive, neutral, and negative mean responses; (b) The percentage of positive mean responses for both the users and the LMS group was considerably larger than that for the MRC reps, and the percentage of negative mean responses for the MRC reps was considerably higher than those for the users and the LMS group; (c) None of the three categories of respondents gave as many as 50 percent positive mean responses.

## DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first of the three major questions addressed by this study dealt with the views of DLAA personnel concerning their ability to successfully combine assessment with assistance. Evidently there was a considerable amount of concern in this regard among the DLAA personnel. When asked directly how successful they would be in combining assessment with assistance (questionnaire item A-25/B-24/C-23), less than 10 percent responded that they would have more than borderline success and 75 percent felt they would be unsuccessful. Respondents' comments on this item indicated that at least four interrelated factors may be involved here: the degree to which DLAA personnel are able to approach the user with "tact and diplomacy"; the "personality" of the user; user fear of potential retribution; and loss of DLAA-user rapport.

Related questionnaire items illucidated the matter further. While the LMS group were apparently not overly concerned about negative effects in the area of "customer relations," the MRC reps appeared quite concerned; and both groups were apprehensive about damage to user careers, especially the careers of unit commanders. Furthermore, MRC reps experienced a loss of job satisfaction and anticipated a continuing lower degree of job satisfaction and a loss of job security.

Presumably because of these (and other factors evident in the questionnaire items and associated comments of the respondents), DLAA personnel expressed some unwillingness to actually "tell it like it is" and predicted that users also would be so disinclined-- although it must be noted that the users themselves indicated no greater tendency to avoid "telling it like it is" under DLS than under the previous system, and perhaps slightly less.

The LMS group, in spite of the concern they exhibited, did not appear to view the situation as hopeless. In fact, they viewed the DLS concept itself with some favor (Item B-26). Their comments indicated that their reservations were not so much with the basic concept itself as with the difficulty of translating a desirable theoretical notion into a workable, real-world system. The concept, according to the LMS group, has potential, but also "growing pains"; and their endorsement of the concept is conditional: DLS will work-- if the DLAA's are permitted to work out some of the problems themselves (via experience versus having "solutions" imposed by fiat); if DLS is not permitted to deviate from its original intent; if "true cooperation from everyone involved" exists; if the users are made to realize that in spite of the "tell-it-like-it-is" spirit of DLS, DLAA personnel are still on their side; and so on.

The MRC reps presented a different picture. Only about one-fifth of them viewed the DLS concept itself with favor (Item A-27),



and even then their favor was tendered with reservations (as was the case with the LMS group). The comments of the MRC reps revealed much concern over such matters as: a so-called "spy spector" created by the "tell-it-like-it-is" aspect of DLS; the redistribution of MRC reps in seemingly nonconstructive ways; the increased load of paper work considered unnecessary; confusion about who the MRC rep's boss was supposed to be; an apparent considerable decrease in requests for assistance (denied in some quarters); the fact that neither they nor their customers were invited to provide presumably valuable input to the development of the DLS concept; their impression that the evaluation taking place during the pilot implementation was failing to reveal significant negative factors about the implementation (i.e. that things were not being "told as they were"), and so on.

In sum, DLAA personnel were not optimistic about the probability of success in attempting to combine assessment with assistance in the manner prescribed by the DLS concept.<sup>7</sup>

The second major question posed in this study asked how DLS would affect the feelings of user unit personnel toward DLAA personnel and if those feelings would have a negative impact on DLAA-user working relations. Interestingly, the user presented a more positive general outlook than the MRC reps, which may to some degree ameliorate the

---

<sup>7</sup>A second administration of the DLS Implementation Questionnaire to MRC representatives was conducted approximately 10 weeks after the data upon which this conclusion is based were collected. The results of that follow-up study, which are reported in Appendix B, did not alter this conclusion.

impression gained from examination of the data from the latter group. Generally speaking, however, the user tended to exhibit many of the same concerns but to a lesser degree. They appeared a little uneasy about such things as: the civilian status of DLAA personnel; problem elevation; inappropriate command action on technical problems; and retributions for "telling it like it is." They were not, as a group, overly concerned with the MRC reps' new assessment role or the working relations between the MRC reps and themselves. Furthermore, they were slightly positive regarding the effect of DLAA personnel and assessments on unit readiness, and regarding the DLS concept.

When queried directly about their attitude toward DLAA personnel (Item D-17), one out of six user respondents replied negatively; four out of six replied positively. Thus, from the user's perspective, the relation between DLAA and user did not seem to be seriously jeopardized by DLS. It is to be noted, however, that the user's perception of DLS is neither as direct nor as comprehensive as that of the DLAA personnel. Therefore, their responses emanated from a different perspective, which might change either positively or negatively with continued operation under DLS concepts.

The third and last major question asked by this study was whether or not the attitudes of either DLAA or user personnel would be compatible with the implementation of current DLS concepts.

It was concluded in this regard that the attitudes of the LMS group and user personnel could not, on the whole, be characterized as incompatible with the implementation of DLS concepts. That conclusion must be immediately qualified, however, by the fact that the opinions within both the LMS and user groups were often quite varied--ranging from extremely positive to extremely negative. Consequently, an approach to DLS concept implementation that does not consider the larger psychological picture" (which includes the fact that more than one-half of the mean responses of DLAA and user personnel on the DLS Implementation Questionnaire were either neutral or negative) could not be recommended.

Insofar as MRC reps are concerned, it is apparent that attitudes at the time of the questionnaire administration were, on the whole, incompatible with successful implementation of DLS concepts. Again, the conclusion is tempered by the fact that responses among the group varied considerably--not all MRC reps were opposed to the DLS concept, nor did all MRC reps indicate an unwillingness to "tell it like it is." Evidently, however, several aspects of DLS were viewed with much disfavor by many of the MRC reps, as becomes quite clear from a reading of the many cogent comments they offered in response to the questionnaire items.

The conclusions just presented should be viewed from the following perspectives:

The DLS Implementation Questionnaire was administered during a period of considerable turmoil for most of the DLAA personnel and during a period when DLS concepts were neither well known nor well understood by many of the user personnel. Such confusion is not conducive to attitudinal stability; therefore, it cannot be concluded that the attitudes exhibited by the respondents during the pilot implementation of DLS precisely predict what they would be after things had "settled down" and personnel involved had been allowed to operate under nontest conditions for a period of time. But it also cannot be concluded that the views of the respondents exhibited during the pilot implementation can be safely ignored. At the barest minimum the present data and the associated respondent comments point to several problem areas likely to be encountered in implementations of DLS concepts as they are currently conceived.

DLS notions are such that the "human factor" plays a very crucial role, and it is improbable that the most basic goal of DLS, which is the true enhancement of Army readiness, could be achieved in the absence of a general endorsement of the concepts involved (as well as of their practical implications) by those who would apply them at the field level, viz. DLAA and user personnel. At present, indications are that DLS concepts are not enthusiastically embraced by the majority of field level personnel.



The overall TCATA evaluation of DLS concepts and their implementation at Fort Hood (TCATA Test FM 360B, in conjunction with which the present study was conducted) concluded that DLS concepts are viable and should receive Army-wide implementation. The present report, while it does not contradict that conclusion, does delineate problem areas not dealt with in detail by the TCATA report, areas which merit further attention as (or if) DLS notions are further implemented.

DLS at Fort Hood has, since the termination of the pilot implementation period, been considerably "wound down." There has been a substantial reduction in the number of DLAA personnel from what was considered minimum during the implementation period. The organizational structure has also undergone significant alterations. Consequently, DLS concepts have not been fully applied under normal, nontest conditions. With the full understanding that successful implementation of such concepts relies on many factors not touched upon in this report (but dealt with in some detail in the TCATA report) it is recommended that DLS concepts be fully reinstated at Fort Hood for a trial period of sufficient duration to allow the "system" adequate time to "settle in." This would not necessarily preclude simultaneous implementation in some degree at other locations. At the end of the trial period, the concepts would be partially reevaluated with emphasis on refinement based on the experiences of DLAA and user personnel during the trial period. DLAA personnel would be required to

present a report at the end of the trial period in which they detail lessons learned and suggest ways to improve the concepts and their application. The report should reflect input from all DLAA personnel and all of their customers.

The results of the present study suggest possible steps that could be taken to optimize the chances of improving attitudes during the trial period. Among the possibilities are these: (a) Both DLAA and user personnel would be assured (not simply informed) that the response from higher authority to reports of logistic deficiencies will be information, guidance, and assistance--not retributive action. (b) Since to many persons it appears to connote "stick your neck out without regard to the possible consequences," the exhortation "tell it like it is" would be either abandoned or adequately defined and explicitly set within a nonpunitive context. (c) The "system" would reward user personnel who bring attention to bear upon significant logistic problems; and the reward would be direct, tangible, and timely.

It is evident from the responses of both DLAA and user personnel to this study that there exists a keen interest in improving the logistic problem solving process. Furthermore, many respondents indicated that DLS-like notions have, with appropriate further refinements, much to offer. It is evident, too, that without such

refinements, implementing the concepts would run the risk of creating a change in logistic support the effect of which might be to lessen rather than enhance Army readiness.

## REFERENCES

---

Goodwin, R. E., Dolphi, E., Bodnar, J., & Brown, L. A. Direct Logistic Support (DLS) Report and Concept Implementation Plan. Washington: HQ DA, DCSLOG, December 1976.

DLS Task Group. Direct Logistic Support: Pilot Implementation Plan, Fort Hood, Texas, revised. Alexandria, VA: HQ DARCOM, March 1977.

Klement, L. M. Restructured General Support/Direct Logistic Support (RGS/DLS) Evaluation--Fort Hood Phase--FM 360: Combined Test Design Plan/Detailed Plan for Execution. Fort Hood, TX: HQ TCATA, February 1977.

Memorandum to DCSLOG (Subject: "Observations Concerning the Direct Logistic Support Concept") from Chief, USAMC Logistic Assistance Office--FORSCOM, 5 January 1977.



TABLE 01. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-01/B-01/C-01

One major objective of DLS is to provide for a continuous monitoring of the effects of personnel, training, doctrine, and funding on logistical problems in the areas of supply, maintenance, transportation, and services.

How adequate or inadequate would you say the past experience and training of FMTs and other MRC representatives have been in preparing them for their part in accomplishing this objective?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very adequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately adequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly adequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Borderline
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly inadequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately inadequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very inadequate

Response scale	Percent giving response <sup>a</sup>				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	17	18	18	--	--
b = +2.0	0	27	20	--	--
c = +1.0	33	21	24	--	--
d = 0.0	8	15	13	--	--
e = -1.0	0	6	4	--	--
f = -2.0	25	3	9	--	--
g = -3.0	17	9	11	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.2	+ 0.9	+ 0.6	--	--
No. of responses:	12	33	45	--	--
% pos. responses:	50	67	62	--	--
% neg. responses:	42	18	24	--	--
Variability index <sup>b</sup> :	62	46	53	--	--

<sup>a</sup>In this table, as in all other results tables: "LMS group" refers to LMSs, DLAA chiefs, and NCOs combined; "DLAA" refers to "MRC reps" and "LMS group" combined; "Overall" refers to "Users" and "DLAA" combined.

<sup>b</sup>In this table, as in all other results tables, "variability index" is the mean-absolute-deviation-from-the-mean (MAD) divided by the maximum possible MAD. Possible range: 0 to 100. The greater the index, the greater the average disagreement among the respondents.

TABLE 02. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-02/B-02/C-02

One objective of the DLS concept is to provide for a free flow of logistical information between the user organization and the MRCs. This channel of communication flows directly through the DLAA.

Do you think that the elevation of "unfavorable" or "negative" information about the user unit to the MRCs via logistics assistance personnel will be freer or less free under DLS than under the previous system?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Much freer
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Somewhat freer
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly freer
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. About the same
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly less free
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Somewhat less free
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Much less free

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	17	3	6	--	--
c = +1.0	17	9	11	--	--
d = 0.0	42	29	32	--	--
e = -1.0	8	14	13	--	--
f = -2.0	17	9	11	--	--
g = -3.0	0	34	26	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.1	- 1.1	- 0.8	--	--
No. of responses:	12	35	47	--	--
% pos. responses:	33	14	19	--	--
% neg. responses:	25	57	49	--	--
Variability index:	31	48	47	--	--

TABLE 03. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-03

As you know, DLS calls for expanding the role of MRC representatives in several ways. One change consists of the introduction of a formal "assessment" or "evaluation" function. Thus, under the DLS concept the FMT or other assistance specialist is tasked not only to assist the user in solving logistical problems but to search out and report such problems as well.

To what extent are you now, during DLS implementation, more involved or less involved in assessment-type activities than previously?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Much more involved
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately more involved
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly more involved
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. No difference
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly less involved
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately less involved
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Much less involved

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	--	14	--	--	--
b = +2.0	--	17	--	--	--
c = +1.0	--	11	--	--	--
d = 0.0	--	46	--	--	--
e = -1.0	--	6	--	--	--
f = -2.0	--	3	--	--	--
g = -3.0	--	3	--	--	--
Mean response:	--	+ 0.7	--	--	--
No. of responses:	--	35	--	--	--
% pos. responses:	--	43	--	--	--
% neg. responses:	--	11	--	--	--
Variability index:	--	39	--	--	--

TABLE 04. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-04/B-03/C-03

DLS requires that logistics assistance personnel now engage more formally in "evaluations" or "assessments" of the logistical problems of user units. While some users may welcome these evaluations, others may for one reason or another resist them.

To what extent would you estimate that users have welcomed or resisted this new "assessment" factor so far during the DLS implementation period?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Have welcomed it greatly
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Have welcomed it moderately
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Have welcomed it slightly
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Have neither welcomed nor resisted it
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Have resisted it slightly
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Have resisted it moderately
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Have resisted it greatly

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	17	3	7	--	--
b = +2.0	17	9	11	--	--
c = +1.0	25	3	9	--	--
d = 0.0	17	41	35	--	--
e = -1.0	17	6	9	--	--
f = -2.0	8	21	17	--	--
g = -3.0	0	18	13	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.8	- 0.7	- 0.3	--	--
No. of responses:	12	34	46	--	--
% pos. responses:	58	15	26	--	--
% neg. responses:	25	44	39	--	--
Variability index:	43	46	47	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-04, shown in Table 05.



TABLE 05. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-04

In your estimation, how much will user units welcome or resist assistance from DARCOM MRC representatives who are now tasked not only to assist but also to assess and report?

- ☐ a. Will welcome much  
☐ b. Will welcome somewhat  
☐ c. Will welcome slightly  
☐ d. Will neither welcome nor resist  
☐ e. Will resist slightly  
☐ f. Will resist somewhat  
☐ g. Will resist much

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	--	--	--	26	--
b = +2.0	--	--	--	21	--
c = +1.0	--	--	--	14	--
d = 0.0	--	--	--	12	--
e = -1.0	--	--	--	8	--
f = -2.0	--	--	--	8	--
g = -3.0	--	--	--	11	--
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 0.8	--
No. of responses:	--	--	--	170	--
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	61	--
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	27	--
Variability index:	--	--	--	58	--

Note. This item is closely related to item A-04/B-03/C-03, shown in Table 04.

TABLE 06. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-05/B-04/C-04/D-10

Factors that would tend to produce user resistance to the new "assessment" role of DLAA personnel include not only user anticipations of negative consequences but also certain characteristics of the DLAA.

Do you think the fact that DLAA personnel (especially MRC representatives) are mostly civilian rather than military would tend to increase or decrease whatever reservations the user may feel toward the new assessment activities of the DLAA?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Increase greatly
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Increase moderately
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Increase slightly
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. No effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Decrease slightly
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Decrease moderately
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Decrease greatly

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
g = +3.0	0	6	4	4	4
f = +2.0	8	9	9	7	7
e = +1.0	17	6	9	6	6
d = 0.0	58	66	64	42	47
c = -1.0	8	3	4	17	14
b = -2.0	8	9	9	14	12
a = -3.0	0	3	2	12	10
Mean response:	+ 0.1	+ 0.1	+ 0.1	- 0.5	- 0.4
No. of responses:	12	35	47	169	216
% pos. responses:	25	20	22	16	17
% neg. responses:	17	14	15	42	36
Variability index:	21	25	24	39	37

<sup>a</sup>Please note scale reversal.

TABLE 07. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-06/B-05/C-05/D-05

Two significant aspects of the DLS concept are these: (a) While DLS prescribes that logistical problems be resolved at as low a level as possible within command or technical channels, it also specifies that problems will be elevated as high as necessary for satisfactory resolution; (b) In order to provide for rapid solution of user problems, DLS calls for easy access to higher levels within both command and technical channels.

How likely or unlikely is it, in your estimation, that DLS will tend to create a situation in which logistical problems are frequently elevated higher than necessary for satisfactory resolution?

- ☐ a. Very likely  
☐ b. Moderately likely  
☐ c. Slightly likely  
☐ d. Fifty-fifty  
☐ e. Slightly unlikely  
☐ f. Moderately unlikely  
☐ g. Very unlikely

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
g = +3.0	33	9	16	10	11
f = +2.0	8	0	2	8	7
e = +1.0	33	13	18	11	13
d = 0.0	0	16	11	24	21
c = -1.0	0	16	11	11	11
b = -2.0	0	9	7	17	15
a = -3.0	25	38	34	17	21
Mean response:	+ 0.8	- 1.1	- 0.6	- 0.4	- 0.4
No. of responses:	12	32	44	166	210
% pos. responses:	75	22	36	30	31
% neg. responses:	25	63	52	46	48
Variability index:	62	54	65	53	56

<sup>a</sup>Please note scale reversal.

TABLE 08. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-07/B-06/C-06/D-06

Do you think that the elevation of logistical problems to a level somewhat higher than necessary for satisfactory solution would ordinarily be beneficial or detrimental to the problem resolving process?

- ☐ a. Very beneficial  
☐ b. Somewhat beneficial  
☐ c. Slightly beneficial  
☐ d. Neither beneficial nor detrimental  
☐ e. Slightly detrimental  
☐ f. Somewhat detrimental  
☐ g. Very detrimental

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
g = +3.0	36	24	27	8	12
f = +2.0	27	24	24	17	18
e = +1.0	9	24	20	14	15
d = 0.0	9	12	11	18	17
c = -1.0	9	3	4	14	12
b = -2.0	0	9	7	12	11
a = -3.0	9	6	7	16	14
Mean response:	+ 1.4	+ 1.0	+ 1.1	- 0.2	+ 0.1
No. of responses:	11	34	45	168	213
% pos. responses:	73	71	71	39	46
% neg. responses:	18	18	18	43	38
Variability index:	51	46	48	54	55

<sup>a</sup> Please note scale reversal.



TABLE 09. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-08/B-07/C-07

Under the DLS program, how common or uncommon do you think it may be for logistical problems originally identified as "command nonresolvable" and elevated for solution through technical channels to "slip over" into command channels with the consequence that an inappropriate "command solution" will be attempted rather than a "technical solution"?

- ☐ a. Very common  
☐ b. Somewhat common  
☐ c. Slightly common  
☐ d. Neither common nor uncommon  
☐ e. Slightly uncommon  
☐ f. Somewhat uncommon  
☐ g. Very uncommon

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
g = +3.0	8	6	7	--	--
f = +2.0	42	3	13	--	--
e = +1.0	0	9	7	--	--
d = 0.0	8	27	22	--	--
c = -1.0	8	12	11	--	--
b = -2.0	33	21	24	--	--
a = -3.0	0	21	16	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.3	- 0.8	- 0.5	--	--
No. of responses:	12	33	45	--	--
% pos. responses:	50	18	27	--	--
% neg. responses:	42	55	51	--	--
Variability index:	61	48	53	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-07, shown in Table 10.

<sup>a</sup>Please note scale reversal.

TABLE 10. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-07

If DLAA personnel "tell it like it is" about the logistical problems of the Army units they assist and evaluate, how common or uncommon do you think it might be for commanders to attempt problem resolution through inappropriate command action when the problem should be handled through technical rather than command channels?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very common  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Somewhat common  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly common  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d. Neither common nor uncommon  
 \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly uncommon  
 \_\_\_\_\_ f. Somewhat uncommon  
 \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very uncommon

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall <sup>b</sup>
g = +3.0	--	--	--	7	7
f = +2.0	--	--	--	3	5
e = +1.0	--	--	--	7	7
d = 0.0	--	--	--	16	18
c = -1.0	--	--	--	21	19
b = -2.0	--	--	--	19	20
a = -3.0	--	--	--	27	24
Mean response:	--	--	--	- 1.1	- 0.9
No. of responses:	--	--	--	166	211
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	17	19
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	67	64
Variability index:	--	--	--	46	48

**Note.** This item is closely related to item A-08/B-07/C-07, shown in Table 09.

<sup>a</sup>Please note scale reversal.

<sup>b</sup>Data from DLAA (Table 09) and Users combined.

TABLE 11. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-09/B-08/C-08

Some persons may feel that the implementation of DLS will improve "customer relations" between MRC representatives (FMTs or other assistance specialists) and user-unit personnel. Others may feel that "customer relations" will worsen. Please indicate your own expectation.

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Will improve greatly
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Will improve moderately
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Will improve slightly
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Will stay about the same
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Will worsen slightly
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Will worsen moderately
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Will worsen greatly

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	9	3	4	--	--
b = +2.0	9	3	4	--	--
c = +1.0	9	3	4	--	--
d = 0.0	45	18	24	--	--
e = -1.0	27	18	20	--	--
f = -2.0	0	12	9	--	--
g = -3.0	0	44	33	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.3	- 1.6	- 1.1	--	--
No. of responses:	11	34	45	--	--
% pos. responses:	27	9	13	--	--
% neg. responses:	27	74	62	--	--
Variability index:	31	46	47	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-09, shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-09

Some persons may feel that the implementation of DLS will improve the working relationship between assisted-unit personnel (users) and MRC representatives. Others may feel that the working relationship will worsen. Please indicate your own expectation.

- ☐ a. Will improve greatly  
☐ b. Will improve moderately  
☐ c. Will improve slightly  
☐ d. Will stay about the same  
☐ e. Will worsen slightly  
☐ f. Will worsen moderately  
☐ g. Will worsen greatly

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall <sup>a</sup>
a = +3.0	--	--	--	17	15
b = +2.0	--	--	--	20	16
c = +1.0	--	--	--	8	8
d = 0.0	--	--	--	28	27
e = -1.0	--	--	--	11	13
f = -2.0	--	--	--	8	8
g = -3.0	--	--	--	7	13
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 0.5	+ 0.2
No. of responses:	--	--	--	166	211
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	46	39
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	27	34
Variability index:	--	--	--	51	52

Note. This item is closely related to item A-09/B-08/C-08, shown in Table 11.

<sup>a</sup>Data from DLAA (Table 11) and Users combined.



TABLE 13. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-10/B-09/C-09

How usual or unusual do you think it will be under DLS for the MRC representative to be unwilling to "tell it like it is" for fear of damaging his working relationship with the user unit or somehow hampering the problem solving process?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very usual
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Somewhat usual
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly usual
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Neither usual nor unusual
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly unusual
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Somewhat unusual
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very unusual

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
g = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
f = +2.0	0	0	0	--	--
e = +1.0	0	3	2	--	--
d = 0.0	8	15	13	--	--
c = -1.0	17	9	11	--	--
b = -2.0	17	21	20	--	--
a = -3.0	58	50	52	--	--
Mean response:	- 2.3	- 1.9	- 2.0	--	--
No. of responses:	12	34	46	--	--
% pos. responses:	0	6	4	--	--
% neg. responses:	92	79	83	--	--
Variability index:	29	39	36	--	--

<sup>a</sup> Please note scale reversal.

TABLE 14. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-11/B-10/C-10/D-08

If, as prescribed by the DLS concept, DLAA personnel were really to "tell it like it is" about the logistical problems of the Army units they support, how common or uncommon do you think it might be for careers of field commanders or other user personnel to be jeopardized or otherwise negatively affected as a consequence?

- ☐ a. Very common  
☐ b. Somewhat common  
☐ c. Slightly common  
☐ d. Neither common nor uncommon  
☐ e. Slightly uncommon  
☐ f. Somewhat uncommon  
☐ g. Very uncommon

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
g = +3.0	0	8	6	9	8
f = +2.0	0	6	4	5	5
e = +1.0	8	0	2	6	6
d = 0.0	8	11	10	22	19
c = -1.0	17	14	15	18	17
b = -2.0	42	25	29	21	23
a = -3.0	25	36	33	18	22
Mean response:	- 1.7	- 1.4	- 1.4	- 0.7	- 0.9
No. of responses:	12	36	48	170	218
% pos. responses:	8	14	13	21	19
% neg. responses:	83	75	77	58	62
Variability index:	31	50	46	49	49

<sup>a</sup> Please note scale reversal.

TABLE 15. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-12/B-11/C-11

Sometimes the cause of a logistics problem within a unit may appear to lie within one or more specific individuals who seem either unable or unwilling to take the necessary corrective measures. That is, the person or persons may actually be the problem.

Please give a rough estimate of the percentage of problems you work with in which such "personality" factors seem to play a significant role.

\_\_\_\_\_ a. 90-100%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. 80- 89%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. 70- 79%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d. 60- 69%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ e. 50- 59%

\_\_\_\_\_ f. 40-49%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ g. 30-39%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ h. 20-29%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ i. 10-19%  
 \_\_\_\_\_ j. 0- 9%

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = 95.0	0	6	4	--	--
b = 84.5	25	3	9	--	--
c = 74.5	17	21	20	--	--
d = 64.5	8	3	4	--	--
e = 54.5	17	6	9	--	--
f = 44.5	8	6	7	--	--
g = 34.5	0	9	7	--	--
h = 24.5	0	18	13	--	--
i = 14.5	25	27	27	--	--
j = 4.5	0	0	0	--	--
Mean response:	55.3	43.6	46.7	--	--
No. of responses:	12	33	45	--	--
Variability index:	50	54	56	--	--

TABLE 16. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-13/B-12/C-12

For the type of problem described in the previous item, do you think DLAA personnel would ordinarily be more or less willing to "tell it like it is" than for problems that do not involve "personalities"?

- ☐ a. Much more willing  
☐ b. Somewhat more willing  
☐ c. Slightly more willing  
☐ d. About the same  
☐ e. Slightly less willing  
☐ f. Somewhat less willing  
☐ g. Much less willing

Response scale <sup>a</sup>	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	17	6	9	--	--
b = +2.0	33	12	17	--	--
c = +1.0	0	9	7	--	--
d = 0.0	17	24	22	--	--
e = -1.0	0	18	13	--	--
f = -2.0	25	12	15	--	--
g = -3.0	8	21	17	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.4	- 0.5	- 0.3	--	--
No. of responses:	12	34	46	--	--
% pos. responses:	50	26	33	--	--
% neg. responses:	33	50	46	--	--
Variability index:	64	51	55	--	--

<sup>a</sup> Positive scale values for this item do not necessarily favor DLS. Alternative "d" may in fact be the most favorable.



TABLE 17. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-14/B-13/C-13

The DLS concept has been so constructed that its success or failure in implementation is significantly dependent upon whether or not both user and DLAA "tell it like it is" about user problems. The question arises, How much incentive has been "built into" the DLS concept either for or against "telling it like it is"?

Considering all aspects of "telling it like it is," its long term as well as short term effects on both the DLAA and the user organizations and personnel, please attempt to estimate, for each category of individual below, the extent to which the DLS "system" tends to reward or punish the individual person who "tells it like it is." (Using the following code, circle one letter for each category.)

Rewards greatly-----A  
 Rewards moderately-----B  
 Rewards slightly-----C  
 Neither rewards nor punishes-----D  
 Punishes slightly-----E  
 Punishes moderately-----F  
 Punishes greatly-----G

DLAA chiefs:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
LMSs:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
MRC representatives:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
User unit commanders:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower ranking user personnel:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

(Continued)

TABLE 17 (continued)

## DLAA Chiefs:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	9	27	22	--	--
b = +2.0	9	3	5	--	--
c = +1.0	18	7	10	--	--
d = 0.0	55	40	44	--	--
e = -1.0	0	13	10	--	--
f = -2.0	0	7	5	--	--
g = -3.0	9	3	5	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.4	+ 0.6	+ 0.5	--	--
No. of responses:	11	30	41	--	--
% pos. responses:	36	37	37	--	--
% neg. responses:	9	23	20	--	--
Variability index:	37	48	44	--	--

## LMSs:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	11	8	--	--
b = +2.0	0	4	3	--	--
c = +1.0	18	18	18	--	--
d = 0.0	45	50	49	--	--
e = -1.0	18	7	10	--	--
f = -2.0	9	7	8	--	--
g = -3.0	9	4	5	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.5	+ 0.3	+ 0.1	--	--
No. of responses:	11	28	39	--	--
% pos. responses:	18	32	28	--	--
% neg. responses:	36	18	23	--	--
Variability index:	31	33	30	--	--

(Continued)

TABLE 17 (continued)

## MRC Representatives:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	0	3	2	--	--
c = +1.0	0	3	2	--	--
d = 0.0	55	35	40	--	--
e = -1.0	18	26	24	--	--
f = -2.0	18	13	14	--	--
g = -3.0	9	16	14	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.8	- 0.8	- 0.8	--	--
No. of responses:	11	31	42	--	--
% pos. responses:	0	10	7	--	--
% neg. responses:	45	55	52	--	--
Variability index:	30	37	35	--	--

## User Unit Commanders:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS groups	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	8	3	5	--	--
c = +1.0	0	0	0	--	--
d = 0.0	25	19	21	--	--
e = -1.0	25	23	23	--	--
f = -2.0	25	26	26	--	--
g = -3.0	17	26	23	--	--
Mean response:	- 1.1	- 1.4	- 1.3	--	--
No. of responses:	12	31	43	--	--
% pos. responses:	8	6	7	--	--
% neg. responses:	67	74	72	--	--
Variability index:	37	39	39	--	--

(Continued)

TABLE 17 (continued)

## Lower Ranking User Personnel:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS groups	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	17	0	5	--	--
c = +1.0	0	0	0	--	--
d = 0.0	33	45	42	--	--
e = -1.0	8	29	23	--	--
f = -2.0	8	6	7	--	--
g = -3.0	33	16	21	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.9	- 0.8	- 0.8	--	--
No. of responses:	12	31	43	--	--
% pos. responses:	17	3	7	--	--
% neg. responses:	50	52	51	--	--
Variability index:	53	32	38	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-13, shown in Table 18.



---

TABLE 18. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-13

---

The DLS concept has been so constructed that its success or failure in implementation is significantly dependent upon whether or not both DLAA and user organization "tell it like it is" about user problems. The question arises, How much incentive has been "built into" the DLS concept either for or against "telling it like it is"?

Considering all aspects of "telling it like it is," its long term as well as short term effects on both the DLAA and the user organizations and personnel, please attempt to estimate, for each category of individuals below, the extent to which the DLS "system" tends to reward or punish the individual person who "tells it like it is." (Using the following code, circle one letter for each category.)

Rewards greatly-----A  
 Rewards moderately-----B  
 Rewards slightly-----C  
 Neither rewards nor punishes-----D  
 Punishes slightly-----E  
 Punishes moderately-----F  
 Punishes greatly-----G

User unit commanders:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower ranking user personnel:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
DLAA personnel:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

---

(Continued)

TABLE 18 (continued)

## User Unit Commanders:

Response scale	Percent giving response				Overall <sup>a</sup>
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	
a = +3.0	--	--	--	17	14
b = +2.0	--	--	--	11	10
c = +1.0	--	--	--	18	14
d = 0.0	--	--	--	24	23
e = -1.0	--	--	--	20	20
f = -2.0	--	--	--	9	13
g = -3.0	--	--	--	1	6
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 0.5	+ 0.1
No. of responses:	--	--	--	162	205
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	46	38
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	30	39
Variability index:	--	--	--	45	47

## Lower Ranking User Personnel:

Response scale	Percent giving response				Overall <sup>b</sup>
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	
a = +3.0	--	--	--	19	16
b = +2.0	--	--	--	12	10
c = +1.0	--	--	--	10	8
d = 0.0	--	--	--	36	37
e = -1.0	--	--	--	14	16
f = -2.0	--	--	--	5	5
g = -3.0	--	--	--	5	8
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 0.5	+ 0.2
No. of responses:	--	--	--	163	206
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	41	33
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	24	30
Variability index:	--	--	--	46	45

(Continued)

TABLE 18 (continued)

## DLAA Personnel:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall <sup>c</sup>
a = +3.0	--	--	--	29	25
b = +2.0	--	--	--	17	14
c = +1.0	--	--	--	16	14
d = 0.0	--	--	--	31	34
e = -1.0	--	--	--	4	6
f = -2.0	--	--	--	2	4
g = -3.0	--	--	--	2	3
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 1.2	+ 0.9
No. of responses:	--	--	--	161	201.7
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	61	53
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	8	13
Variability index:	--	--	--	43	45

Note. This item is closely related to item A-14/B-13/C-13, shown in Table 17.

<sup>a</sup>This column combines the data from the previous column and the "DLAA" column from the "User-Unit-Commanders" section of Table 17.

<sup>b</sup>This column combines the data from the previous column and the "DLAA" column from the "Lower-Ranking-User-Personnel" section of Table 17.

<sup>c</sup>This column combines the data from the previous column and the averaged data from the three "DLAA" columns of the first three sections ("DLAA chiefs," "LMSs," and "MRC representatives") of Table 17.

TABLE 19. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-15/B-14/C-14

The DLS concept stresses that the success of the program depends heavily on the willingness of both DLAA and user personnel to "tell it like it is" in connection with logistical problems.

In your opinion will user personnel be more likely or less likely under DLS to "tell it like it is" than under the previous system?

- ☐ a. Much more likely
- ☐ b. Somewhat more likely
- ☐ c. Slightly more likely
- ☐ d. About the same
- ☐ e. Slightly less likely
- ☐ f. Somewhat less likely
- ☐ g. Much less likely

What about DLAA personnel (especially FMTs and other MRC representatives)?

- ☐ a. Much more likely
- ☐ b. Somewhat more likely
- ☐ c. Slightly more likely
- ☐ d. About the same
- ☐ e. Slightly less likely
- ☐ f. Somewhat less likely
- ☐ g. Much less likely

(Continued)



TABLE 19 (continued)

User Personnel:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC rep	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	8	0	2	--	--
c = +1.0	17	3	6	--	--
d = 0.0	25	23	23	--	--
e = -1.0	8	11	11	--	--
f = -2.0	42	17	23	--	--
g = -3.0	0	43	32	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.6	- 1.6	- 1.4	--	--
No. of responses:	12	35	47	--	--
% pos. responses:	25	6	11	--	--
% neg. responses:	50	71	66	--	--
Variability index:	42	44	45	--	--

DLAA Personnel:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	6	4	--	--
b = +2.0	8	3	4	--	--
c = +1.0	25	9	13	--	--
d = 0.0	25	46	40	--	--
e = -1.0	8	9	9	--	--
f = -2.0	33	17	21	--	--
g = -3.0	0	11	9	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.3	- 0.5	- 0.4	--	--
No. of responses:	12	35	47	--	--
% pos. responses:	33	17	21	--	--
% neg. responses:	42	37	38	--	--
Variability index:	41	40	40	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-12, shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-12

The DLS concept stresses that the success of the program depends heavily on the willingness of both DLAA and user personnel to "tell it like it is" in connection with logistical problems.

In your opinion will user personnel be more likely or less likely under DLS to "tell it like it is" than under the previous system?

- ☐ a. Much more likely
- ☐ b. Somewhat more likely
- ☐ c. Slightly more likely
- ☐ d. About the same
- ☐ e. Slightly less likely
- ☐ f. Somewhat less likely
- ☐ g. Much less likely

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall <sup>a</sup>
a = +3.0	--	--	--	13	10
b = +2.0	--	--	--	16	13
c = +1.0	--	--	--	8	8
d = 0.0	--	--	--	36	33
e = -1.0	--	--	--	12	11
f = -2.0	--	--	--	7	10
g = -3.0	--	--	--	8	14
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 0.3	- 0.1
No. of responses:	--	--	--	165	212
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	37	31
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	27	35
Variability index:	--	--	--	45	47

Note. This item is closely related to the first part of item A-15/-B-14/C-14, shown in Table 19.

<sup>a</sup>This column combines the data from the previous column and the "DLAA" column from the first section ("User Personnel") of Table 19.

TABLE 21. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-16/B-15/C-15

What is your impression about how much the DLAA's have been able to "tell it like it is" during DLS implementation up to the present time.

- ☐ a. Always
- ☐ b. Very often
- ☐ c. Usually
- ☐ d. Sometimes
- ☐ e. Usually not
- ☐ f. Very seldom
- ☐ g. Never

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	17	6	9	--	--
c = +1.0	42	6	16	--	--
d = 0.0	42	55	51	--	--
e = -1.0	0	10	7	--	--
f = -2.0	0	19	14	--	--
g = -3.0	0	0	0	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.8	- 0.2	+ 0.1	--	--
No. of responses:	12	31	43	--	--
% pos. responses:	58	16	28	--	--
% neg. responses:	0	29	21	--	--
Variability index:	21	29	27	--	--

TABLE 22. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-17/B-16/C-16

How adequate or inadequate would you expect that the typical "unit readiness report" of DLS user organizations is in conveying a realistic picture of the unit's actual readiness status?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very adequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately adequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly adequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Borderline
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly inadequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately inadequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very inadequate

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS Group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.0	50	14	23	--	--
c = +1.0	8	9	9	--	--
d = 0.0	25	20	21	--	--
e = -1.0	8	14	13	--	--
f = -2.0	8	31	26	--	--
g = -3.0	0	9	6	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.8	- 0.6	- 0.2	--	--
No. of responses:	12	35	47	--	--
% pos. responses:	58	26	34	--	--
% neg. responses:	17	54	45	--	--
Variability index:	40	48	49	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-16, shown in Table 23.



TABLE 23. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-16

Excluding your own unit from consideration, how adequate or inadequate would you expect that the typical "unit readiness report" is in conveying a realistic picture of the unit's actual readiness status?

- ☐ a. Very adequate  
☐ b. Moderately adequate  
☐ c. Slightly adequate  
☐ d. Borderline  
☐ e. Slightly inadequate  
☐ f. Moderately inadequate  
☐ g. Very inadequate

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall <sup>a</sup>
a = +3.0	--	--	--	4	4
b = +2.0	--	--	--	17	18
c = +1.0	--	--	--	9	9
d = 0.0	--	--	--	17	18
e = -1.0	--	--	--	17	16
f = -2.0	--	--	--	17	19
g = -3.0	--	--	--	20	17
Mean response:	--	--	--	- 0.6	- 0.5
No. of responses:	--	--	--	169	216
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	30	31
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	53	51
Variability index:	--	--	--	54	53

Note. This item is closely related to item A-17/B-16/C-16, shown in Table 22.

<sup>a</sup>Data from DLAA (Table 22) and Users combined.

TABLE 24. RESULTS FOR ITEM B-17

In terms of contributing to the real readiness status of user units, how much more or less effective do you think you may be as a logistics management specialist under DLS, as it is presently conceived, than under the previous logistics assistance program?

- ☐ a. Much more effective  
☐ b. Moderately more effective  
☐ c. Slightly more effective  
☐ d. About the same  
☐ e. Slightly less effective  
☐ f. Moderately less effective  
☐ g. Much less effective

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	22	--	--	--	--
b = +2.0	11	--	--	--	--
c = +1.0	33	--	--	--	--
d = 0.0	22	--	--	--	--
e = -1.0	11	--	--	--	--
f = -2.0	0	--	--	--	--
g = -3.0	0	--	--	--	--
Mean response:	+ 1.1	--	--	--	--
No. of responses:	9	--	--	--	--
% pos. responses:	67	--	--	--	--
% neg. responses:	11	--	--	--	--
Variability index:	35	--	--	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to items A-18 and A-19/B-18/C-17, shown in Tables 25 and 26, respectively.

TABLE 25. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-18

In terms of contributing to the real readiness status of user units, how much more or less effective do you think you may be as a MRC representative under DLS, as it is presently conceived, than under the previous logistics assistance program?

- ☐ a. Much more effective  
☐ b. Moderately more effective  
☐ c. Slightly more effective  
☐ d. About the same  
☐ e. Slightly less effective  
☐ f. Moderately less effective  
☐ g. Much less effective

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	--	3	--	--	--
b = +2.0	--	3	--	--	--
c = +1.0	--	6	--	--	--
d = 0.0	--	31	--	--	--
e = -1.0	--	11	--	--	--
f = -2.0	--	26	--	--	--
g = -3.0	--	20	--	--	--
Mean response:	--	- 1.0	--	--	--
No. of responses:	--	35	--	--	--
% pos. responses:	--	11	--	--	--
% neg. responses:	--	57	--	--	--
Variability index:	--	43	--	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to items B-17 and A-19/B-18/C-17, shown in Tables 24 and 26, respectively.

TABLE 26. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-19/B-18/C-17

In terms of contributing to the real readiness status of user units, how much more or less effective do you think DLAA chiefs may be under DLS, as it is presently conceived, than logistics assistance officers were under the previous logistics assistance program?

- ☐ a. Much more effective  
☐ b. Moderately more effective  
☐ c. Slightly more effective  
☐ d. About the same  
☐ e. Slightly less effective  
☐ f. Moderately less effective  
☐ g. Much less effective

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	17	6	9	--	--
b = +2.0	8	6	7	--	--
c = +1.0	17	16	16	--	--
d = 0.0	50	35	40	--	--
e = -1.0	0	19	14	--	--
f = -2.0	8	0	2	--	--
g = -3.0	0	16	12	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.7	- 0.2	0.0	--	--
No. of responses:	12	31	43	--	--
% pos. responses:	42	29	33	--	--
% neg. responses:	8	35	28	--	--
Variability index:	37	41	38	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to items B-17 and A-18, shown in Tables 24 and 25, respectively.



TABLE 27. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-20/B-19/C-18

How positive or negative an effect would you estimate that DLAA personnel have in terms of contributing to the readiness of user organizations?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very positive
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately positive
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly positive
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. No effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly negative
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately negative
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very negative

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	27	18	20	--	--
b = +2.0	55	21	29	--	--
c = +1.0	18	24	22	--	--
d = 0.0	0	29	22	--	--
e = -1.0	0	6	4	--	--
f = -2.0	0	3	2	--	--
g = -3.0	0	0	0	--	--
Mean response:	+ 2.1	+ 1.1	+ 1.3	--	--
No. of responses:	11	34	45	--	--
% pos. responses:	100	62	71	--	--
% neg. responses:	0	9	7	--	--
Variability index:	17	36	36	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item D-02, shown in Table 28.

TABLE 28. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-02

How positive or negative an effect would you estimate that DLAA personnel have in terms of contributing to the readiness of your organization?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very positive  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately positive  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly positive  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d. No effect  
 \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly negative  
 \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately negative  
 \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very negative

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall <sup>a</sup>
a = +3.00	--	--	--	13	14
b = +2.00	--	--	--	24	25
c = +1.00	--	--	--	35	32
d = 0.00	--	--	--	21	21
e = -1.00	--	--	--	2	2
f = -2.00	--	--	--	2	2
g = -3.00	--	--	--	4	3
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 1.0	+ 1.1
No. of responses:	--	--	--	165	210
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	72	71
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	7	7
Variability index:	--	--	--	32	33

Note. This item is closely related to item A-20/B-19/C-18, shown in Table 27.

<sup>a</sup>Data from DLAA (Table 27) and Users combined.

TABLE 29. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-15

To what extent do you think that the implementation of DLS may improve or worsen the real readiness status of your unit?

- ☐ a. Improve greatly  
☐ b. Improve moderately  
☐ c. Improve slightly  
☐ d. Leave about the same  
☐ e. Worsen slightly  
☐ f. Worsen moderately  
☐ g. Worsen greatly

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.0	--	--	--	16	--
b = +2.0	--	--	--	15	--
c = +1.0	--	--	--	24	--
d = 0.0	--	--	--	35	--
e = -1.0	--	--	--	7	--
f = -2.0	--	--	--	2	--
g = -3.0	--	--	--	1	--
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 0.9	--
No. of responses:	--	--	--	166	--
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	55	--
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	10	--
Variability index:	--	--	--	35	--

TABLE 30. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-21/B-20/C-19/D-14

What overall effect do you think that the reporting of adverse logistical information about Army units by DLAA personnel may typically have on unit readiness?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very positive effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately positive effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly positive effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. No effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly negative effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately negative effect
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very negative effect

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	8	6	6	22	18
b = +2.00	25	14	17	19	19
c = +1.00	25	26	26	23	23
d = 0.00	25	46	40	25	28
e = -1.00	8	0	2	6	5
f = -2.00	8	6	6	4	5
g = -3.00	0	3	2	1	1
Mean response:	+ 0.8	+ 0.5	+ 0.6	+ 1.1	+ 1.0
No. of responses:	12	35	47	166	213
% pos. responses:	58	46	49	64	61
% neg. responses:	17	9	11	11	11
Variability index:	38	32	34	39	38



TABLE 31. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-22/B-21/C-20

As near as you can tell, how has the implementation of DLS at Fort Hood affected job satisfaction up to the present time for DLAA chiefs, LMSs, and MRC representatives? (Using the following code, circle one letter for each group as a whole. Then answer for yourself as an individual.)

Much more satisfaction-----A  
 Somewhat more satisfaction-----B  
 Slightly more satisfaction-----C  
 No change in satisfaction-----D  
 Slightly less satisfaction-----E  
 Somewhat less satisfaction-----F  
 Much less satisfaction-----G

DLAA chiefs:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
LMSs:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
MRC representatives:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Yourself:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

(Continued)

TABLE 31 (continued)

## DLAA Chiefs:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	20	12	14	--	--
b = +2.00	30	19	22	--	--
c = +1.00	0	23	17	--	--
d = 0.00	20	23	22	--	--
e = -1.00	10	12	11	--	--
f = -2.00	10	8	8	--	--
g = -3.00	10	4	6	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.6	+ 0.6	+ 0.6	--	--
No. of responses:	10	26	36	--	--
% pos. responses:	50	54	53	--	--
% neg. responses:	30	23	25	--	--
Variability index:	60	43	48	--	--

## LMSs:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	0	8	6	--	--
b = +2.00	10	12	11	--	--
c = +1.00	30	19	22	--	--
d = 0.00	30	19	22	--	--
e = -1.00	10	27	22	--	--
f = -2.00	10	12	11	--	--
g = -3.00	10	4	6	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.1	0.0	0.0	--	--
No. of responses:	10	26	36	--	--
% pos. responses:	40	38	39	--	--
% neg. responses:	30	42	39	--	--
Variability index:	38	43	41	--	--

(Continued)

TABLE 31 (continued)

## MRC Representatives:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	0	3	2	--	--
b = +2.00	0	6	5	--	--
c = +1.00	20	0	5	--	--
d = 0.00	30	6	12	--	--
e = -1.00	0	13	10	--	--
f = -2.00	30	35	34	--	--
g = -3.00	20	35	32	--	--
Mean response:	- 1.0	- 1.7	- 1.5	--	--
No. of responses:	10	31	41	--	--
% pos. responses:	20	10	12	--	--
% neg. responses:	50	84	76	--	--
Variability index:	47	39	43	--	--

## Yourself:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	10	0	2	--	--
b = +2.00	20	0	5	--	--
c = +1.00	10	3	5	--	--
d = 0.00	20	15	16	--	--
e = -1.00	20	21	20	--	--
f = -2.00	10	26	23	--	--
g = -3.00	10	35	30	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.1	- 1.8	- 1.3	--	--
No. of responses:	10	34	44	--	--
% pos. responses:	40	3	11	--	--
% neg. responses:	40	82	73	--	--
Variability index:	51	33	43	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item A-23/B-22/C-21, shown in Table 32.

TABLE 32. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-23/B-22/C-21

How do you think DLS might affect job satisfaction in the long run for DLAA chiefs, LMSs, and MRC representatives? (Using the following code, circle one letter for each group as a whole. Then answer for yourself as an individual.)

Much more satisfaction-----A  
 Somewhat more satisfaction-----B  
 Slightly more satisfaction-----C  
 No change in satisfaction-----D  
 Slightly less satisfaction-----E  
 Somewhat less satisfaction-----F  
 Much less satisfaction-----G

DLAA chiefs:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
LMSs:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
MRC representatives:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Yourself:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

(Continued)



TABLE 32 (continued)

## DLAA Chiefs:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	42	20	27	--	--
b = +2.00	33	16	22	--	--
c = +1.00	8	20	16	--	--
d = 0.00	0	20	14	--	--
e = -1.00	8	16	14	--	--
f = -2.00	8	0	3	--	--
g = -3.00	0	8	5	--	--
Mean response:	+ 1.8	+ 0.7	+ 1.1	--	--
No. of responses:	12	25	37	--	--
% pos. responses:	83	56	62	--	--
% neg. responses:	17	24	22	--	--
Variability index:	40	48	49	--	--

## LMSs:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	17	16	16	--	--
b = +2.00	58	8	24	--	--
c = +1.00	8	16	14	--	--
d = 0.00	0	28	19	--	--
e = -1.00	8	16	14	--	--
f = -2.00	8	4	5	--	--
g = -3.00	0	12	8	--	--
Mean response:	+ 1.5	+ 0.2	+ 0.6	--	--
No. of responses:	12	25	37	--	--
% pos. responses:	83	40	54	--	--
% neg. responses:	17	32	27	--	--
Variability index:	36	48	51	--	--

(Continued)

TABLE 32 (continued)

## MRC Representatives:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	17	4	8	--	--
b = +2.00	17	7	10	--	--
c = +1.00	17	7	10	--	--
d = 0.00	8	18	15	--	--
e = -1.00	8	7	8	--	--
f = -2.00	25	21	22	--	--
g = -3.00	8	36	28	--	--
Mean response:	+ 0.2	- 1.2	- 0.8	--	--
No. of responses:	12	28	40	--	--
% pos. responses:	50	18	28	--	--
% neg. responses:	42	64	58	--	--
Variability index:	61	53	58	--	--

## Yourself:

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	33	3	11	--	--
b = +2.00	50	0	13	--	--
c = +1.00	0	6	4	--	--
d = 0.00	0	21	16	--	--
e = -1.00	8	9	9	--	--
f = -2.00	8	27	22	--	--
g = -3.00	0	33	24	--	--
Mean response:	+ 1.8	- 1.5	- 0.6	--	--
No. of responses:	12	33	45	--	--
% pos. responses:	83	9	29	--	--
% neg. responses:	17	70	56	--	--
Variability index:	36	43	61	--	--

Note. This item is closely related to item A-22/B-21/C-20, shown in Table 31.

TABLE 33. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-24/B-23/C-22/D-11

What do you think about the possible effect of your "telling it like it is" upon the security of your own job position?

- ☐ a. Would probably result in much more job security  
☐ b. Would probably result in moderately more job security  
☐ c. Would probably result in slightly more job security  
☐ d. Would probably result in about the same job security  
☐ e. Would probably result in slightly less job security  
☐ f. Would probably result in moderately less job security  
☐ g. Would probably result in much less job security

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	0	0	0	13	10
b = +2.00	0	0	0	2	1
c = +1.00	8	0	2	4	3
d = 0.00	58	36	42	62	58
e = -1.00	25	24	24	9	12
f = -2.00	0	9	7	3	4
g = -3.00	8	30	24	7	11
Mean response:	- 0.4	- 1.3	- 1.1	+ 0.1	- 0.2
No. of responses:	12	33	45	165	210
% pos. responses:	8	0	2	19	15
% neg. responses:	33	64	56	19	27
Variability index:	24	38	35	30	32

TABLE 34. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-25/B-24/C-23

How successful or unsuccessful would you estimate that DLAA personnel are or will be in "telling it like it is" one day and providing assistance the next?

- ☐ a. Very successful  
☐ b. Moderately successful  
☐ c. Slightly successful  
☐ d. Borderline  
☐ e. Slightly unsuccessful  
☐ f. Moderately unsuccessful  
☐ g. Very unsuccessful

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	0	0	0	--	--
b = +2.00	17	0	4	--	--
c = +1.00	0	6	4	--	--
d = 0.00	25	18	20	--	--
e = -1.00	17	15	15	--	--
f = -2.00	25	15	17	--	--
g = -3.00	17	47	39	--	--
Mean response:	- 0.8	- 1.8	- 1.5	--	--
No. of responses:	12	34	46	--	--
% pos. responses:	17	6	9	--	--
% neg. responses:	58	76	72	--	--
Variability index:	45	40	43	--	--



TABLE 35. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-26/B-25/C-24/D-18

What, in your estimation, will be the overall effect of DLS on the readiness of the Army-in-the-field?

- ☐ a. Great increase
- ☐ b. Moderate increase
- ☐ c. Slight increase
- ☐ d. No change
- ☐ e. Slight decrease
- ☐ f. Moderate decrease
- ☐ g. Great decrease

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	17	3	7	15	13
b = +2.00	25	3	9	19	16
c = +1.00	33	18	22	31	29
d = 0.00	25	55	47	30	34
e = -1.00	0	9	7	3	4
f = -2.00	0	9	7	1	2
g = -3.00	0	3	2	2	2
Mean response:	+ 1.3	0.0	+ 0.3	+ 1.0	+ 0.9
No. of responses:	12	33	45	162	207
% pos. responses:	75	24	38	64	58
% neg. responses:	0	21	16	6	8
Variability index:	30	24	32	32	33

TABLE 36. RESULTS FOR ITEM A-27/B-26/C-25/D-19

All things considered, how do you feel about the DLS concept?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Very positive
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Moderately positive
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Slightly positive
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Neutral
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Slightly negative
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Moderately negative
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Very negative

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	58	9	22	22	22
b = +2.00	8	6	7	14	13
c = +1.00	25	6	11	24	21
d = 0.00	8	24	20	25	24
e = -1.00	0	18	13	5	7
f = -2.00	0	18	13	5	6
g = -3.00	0	18	13	6	7
Mean response:	+ 2.2	- 0.6	+ 0.1	+ 0.8	+ 0.7
No. of responses:	12	33	45	171	216
% pos. responses:	92	21	40	60	56
% neg. responses:	0	55	40	16	21
Variability index:	32	50	58	44	49

TABLE 37. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-01

How much would you estimate that your unit typically uses the services of DLAA personnel?

- ☐ a. Extremely often  
☐ b. Very often  
☐ c. Usually  
☐ d. Sometimes  
☐ e. Usually not  
☐ f. Very seldom  
☐ g. Extremely seldom

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	--	--	--	4	--
b = +2.00	--	--	--	20	--
c = +1.00	--	--	--	15	--
d = 0.00	--	--	--	28	--
e = -1.00	--	--	--	8	--
f = -2.00	--	--	--	14	--
g = -3.00	--	--	--	12	--
Mean response:	--	--	--	- 0.0	--
No. of responses:	--	--	--	169	--
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	39	--
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	33	--
Variability index:	--	--	--	46	--

TABLE 38. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-03

Prior to the implementation of DLS, the traditional role of MRC representatives (FMTs, etc.) was to assist the user unit in solving its weapon or equipment system problems in the areas of maintenance, supply, transportation, and services. Under the new DLS concept, however, the MRC representative's role has been expanded to include "assessment" and "reporting" activities in addition to assistance. The MRC representative is now tasked to search out, report, and discover (if possible) the "root causes" of problems no matter where they may lie; which may lead him into the more fundamental areas of personnel, training, doctrine, and funding. Furthermore, under DLS the visibility of the problem is supposed to be maintained until the problem is resolved by elevating it as high as necessary through command or technical channels--although the emphasis is on resolving issues as close to "home" as possible. The ultimate purpose of DLS is, of course, to create a greater degree of readiness of the Army-in-the-field.

To what extent do you consider this change in logistics support a correct or incorrect placement of responsibility? In other words, how much are you in favor of or opposed to the idea of combining the responsibilities for assisting, evaluating, and reporting within the same individual?

- ☐ a. Very much in favor of
- ☐ b. Moderately in favor of
- ☐ c. Slightly in favor of
- ☐ d. Neither favor nor oppose
- ☐ e. Slightly opposed to
- ☐ f. Moderately opposed to
- ☐ g. Very much opposed to

(Continued)



TABLE 38 (continued)

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	--	--	--	37	--
b = +2.00	--	--	--	16	--
c = +1.00	--	--	--	13	--
d = 0.00	--	--	--	12	--
e = -1.00	--	--	--	6	--
f = -2.00	--	--	--	7	--
g = -3.00	--	--	--	10	--
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 1.0	--
No. of responses:	--	--	--	167	--
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	65	--
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	23	--
Variability index:	--	--	--	58	--

TABLE 39. RESULTS FOR ITEM D-17

How would you describe your overall attitude toward DLAA personnel, considering your experience with field maintenance technicians (or other representatives of the DARCOM MRCs), logistics management specialists, and DLAA chiefs?

- ☐ a. Very positive  
☐ b. Moderately positive  
☐ c. Slightly positive  
☐ d. Neutral  
☐ e. Slightly negative  
☐ f. Moderately negative  
☐ g. Very negative

Response scale	Percent giving response				
	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA	Users	Overall
a = +3.00	--	--	--	27	--
b = +2.00	--	--	--	18	--
c = +1.00	--	--	--	20	--
d = 0.00	--	--	--	19	--
e = -1.00	--	--	--	7	--
f = -2.00	--	--	--	5	--
g = -3.00	--	--	--	4	--
Mean response:	--	--	--	+ 1.1	--
No. of responses:	--	--	--	166	--
% pos. responses:	--	--	--	65	--
% neg. responses:	--	--	--	16	--
Variability index:	--	--	--	45	--

TABLE 40: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table	Topic	Respondent category	Average attitude toward topic
01	MRC reps' training for DLS	LMS group: MRC reps:	Borderline Slightly adequate
02	Elevation of adverse information under DLS (vs. previously)	LMS group: MRC reps:	No change Slightly less free
03	MRC reps' involvement in assessment under DLS (vs. previously)	MRC reps:	Slightly more
04 and 05	User resistance to assessments	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Welcome slightly Resist very slightly Welcome slightly
06	User resistance to civilian status of DLAA personnel	DLAA: Users:	No effect Very slightly increase
07	Unnecessary elevation of problems under DLS	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Slightly unlikely Slightly likely Very slightly likely
08	Effect of higher than necessary elevation	DLAA: Users:	Slightly detrimental Neither beneficial nor detrimental
09 and 10	Inappropriate command solutions under DLS	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Very slightly uncommon Slightly common Slightly common
11 and 12	Customer relations under DLS	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Improve very slightly Worsen slightly to moderately Improve very slightly
13	MRC reps' unwillingness to "tell it like it is" under DLS	DLAA:	Somewhat usual

(Continued)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Table	Topic	Respondent category	Average attitude toward topic
14	Damage to user careers under DLS	DLAA: Users:	Slightly to somewhat common Very slightly common
15	Percent of problems involving "personalities"	LMS group: MRC reps:	55 percent 44 percent
16	Willingness of DLAA personnel to "tell it like it is" about "personalities" vs. other problems	LMS group: MRC reps:	Very slightly more Very slightly less
17 and 18	Reward or punishment in DLS system:		
	For DLAA chiefs	DLAA:	Very slight reward
	For LMSs	LMS group: MRC reps:	Very slight punishment Very slight reward
	For MRC reps	DLAA:	Slight punishment
	For user unit commanders	DLAA: Users:	Slight to moderate punishment Very slight reward
	For lower ranking user personnel	DLAA: Users:	Slight punishment Very slight reward
	For DLAA personnel	Users:	Slight reward
19 and 20	Likelihood of "telling it like it is" under DLS (vs. previously)		
	For users	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Very slightly less Slightly to somewhat less Very slightly more
	For DLAA personnel	DLAA:	Very slightly less

(Continued)



TABLE 40 (continued)

Table	Topic	Respondent category	Average attitude toward topic
21	Ability to "tell it like it is" during DLS implementation	LMS group: MRC reps:	Usually Sometimes
22 and 23	Adequacy of unit readiness reports	LMS group: MRC reps:  Users:	Moderately adequate Very slightly inadequate Very slightly inadequate
24, 25, and 26	Contribution to unit readiness under DLS (vs. previously)		
	Of LMSs	LMS group:	Slightly more
	Of MRC reps	MRC reps:	Slightly less
	Of DLAA chiefs	LMS group: MRC reps:	Same to slightly less Same
27 and 28	Effect of DLAA personnel on unit readiness	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Moderately positive Slightly positive Slightly positive
29	Effect of DLS on readiness of respondent's unit	Users:	Improve slightly
30	Effect on unit readiness of adverse DLAA reports	DLAA: Users:	Very slightly positive Slightly positive
31	Effect of DLS on current job satisfaction		
	For DLAA chiefs	DLAA:	Very slightly more
	For LMSs	DLAA:	No change
	For MRC reps	LMS group: MRC reps:	Slightly less Slightly to somewhat less
	For respondent ("Yourself")	LMS group: MRC reps:	No change Somewhat less

(Continued)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Table	Topic	Respondent category	Average attitude toward topic
32	Effect of DLS on long-run job satisfaction		
	For DLAA chiefs	LMS group: MRC reps:	Somewhat more No change to slightly more
	For LMSs	LMS group: MRC reps:	Slightly to somewhat more No change
	For MRC reps	LMS group: MRC reps:	No change Slightly less
	For respondent ("Yourself")	LMS group: MRC reps:	Somewhat more Slightly to somewhat less
33	Effect of "telling it like it is" on job security	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Very slightly less Slightly to moderately less None
34	Success in combining assessment with assistance	LMS group: MRC reps:	Slightly unsuccessful Moderately unsuccessful
35	Overall effect of DLS on Army readiness	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Slight to moderate increase No change Slight increase
36	Respondent's overall feeling toward DLS concept	LMS group: MRC reps: Users:	Moderately positive Neutral to slightly negative Slightly positive
37	Use of DLAA personnel by respondent's unit	Users:	Sometimes

(Continued)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Table	Topic	Respondent category	Average attitude toward topic
38	Combining functions of assisting, evaluating, and reporting in same individual	Users:	Slightly in favor of
39	Overall attitude toward DLAA personnel	Users:	Slightly positive

TABLE 41. PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE, NEUTRAL, AND NEGATIVE MEAN RESPONSES, OVER ALL<sup>a</sup> QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Response type	LMS group	MRC reps	DLAA <sup>b</sup>	Users
Positive	45	24	30	45
Neutral	24	30	29	27
Negative	31	46	42	28

<sup>a</sup>All except the two items in Tables 15 and 16, for which the designations positive, neutral, and negative were not appropriate.

<sup>b</sup>Mean of previous two columns; weighted by mean number of respondents per questionnaire item, which was 11.5 for the LMS group and 32.2 for the MRC reps.



## APPENDIX A

### DLS Implementation Questionnaire Contents

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. ARI cover letter for DLS Implementation Questionnaire.	A-02
2. DLS Implementation Questionnaire cover page.	A-03
3. Directions to DLAA personnel for completing DLS Implementation Questionnaire (Forms A, B, & C).	A-04
4. Directions to DLS user personnel for completing DLS Implementation Questionnaire (Form D).	A-05
5. Sample questionnaire item, showing DLS Implementation Questionnaire format.	A-07
6. Biographic/demographic information request page (last page of all four forms of the DLS Implementation Questionnaire).	A-08



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
FORT HOOD FIELD UNIT  
FORT HOOD, TEXAS 76544

PERI-OH

TO: DARCOM LOGISTIC ASSISTANCE ACTIVITY (DLAA) PERSONNEL AND ASSOCIATED  
PERSONNEL AT SUPPORTED USER UNITS

SUBJECT: Direct Logistic Support (DLS) Implementation Questionnaire

1. The attached questionnaire has been prepared by ARI in response to a request from TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity (TCATA) for assistance in obtaining an answer to the following question pertaining to DLS:

What are the views of DLAA and user (supported unit) personnel regarding the DLS directive "Tell it like it is!" and its impact on DLAA-user relations and DLS effectiveness?

2. I realize that you have busy schedules and other paper work that demands your attention. Your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire ASAP will therefore be greatly appreciated. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have. My phone is [number].

3. Please understand that the information you provide on the questionnaire will be used for research purposes only. Your name and any other identifying information you may provide will not be released by me to any party whatsoever. Furthermore, such identifying information will be destroyed by me as soon as I have finished collecting and processing the questionnaires. Thus you may respond to the questionnaire as freely as you desire with assurance that I will respect your privacy.

4. If you have any reservations about completing any portions of the questionnaire candidly, I would appreciate your contacting me.

5. A copy of the ARI report on the results of this survey, which I will present to TCATA prior to 16 August 1977, will be made available to you.

(signed)

1 Incl.  
as

Dr. R. L. Palmer  
ARI Evaluator

DIRECT LOGISTIC SUPPORT (DLS)  
IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE



DLAA-Users Views Pertaining to  
"Telling It Like It Is"

US Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
-Fort Hood Field Unit-

June 1977

A-03



### Directions for Completing Questionnaire

1. Since it is important to obtain your personal and perhaps private feelings, this questionnaire should be completed without consulting with your colleagues. Your responses should remain anonymous.
2. The items concerning DLS begin on page 1, with one item per page. Unless specified otherwise, each item is answered by checking one (and only one) of the alternatives listed. Occasionally you may not find an alternative that exactly expresses your opinion. In such cases check the alternative that is most appropriate.
3. You will notice that space has been provided for comments after each item. YOUR COMMENTS, OF WHATEVER NATURE, ARE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. Please do not hesitate to write in whatever you wish. As a minimum, try to give some reason, however brief, for choosing the alternative that you checked. You may use the back of the page if you need additional space. Also, if you have important comments you would rather not write down, the ARI evaluator will be glad to talk with you personally.
4. The intent of the questionnaire is not only to collect your views on the topics covered, but also to elicit whatever SUGGESTIONS you may have for improving any situation where you perceive a problem connected with "telling it like it is" and the relationship between DLS user units and the DLAA's. Please include any suggestions you may have in the "comment" sections.
5. The last page of the questionnaire requests typical biographical information that may be useful in analyzing the results of the survey. The items are self-explanatory. Neither your name nor other identifying information will be released.
6. Please take your time in completing the questionnaire. It does not have to be completed at one sitting, but please protect it from the view of others when you are not working on it. When you are finished, please seal it in the envelope provided and drop it in the mail, or, if you prefer, the evaluator will personally pick it up.
7. The following abbreviations are used in the questionnaire:  
  
DARCOM--Development and Readiness Command  
DLAA----DARCOM Logistic Assistance Activity  
DLS-----Direct Logistic Support  
FMT-----Field Maintenance Technician  
LMS-----Logistics Management Specialist  
MRC-----Materiel Readiness Command



### Directions for Completing Questionnaire

1. This questionnaire concerns the impact of the Direct Logistic Support (DLS) directive "Tell it like it is!" on the relationship between DARCOM Logistic Assistance Activities (DLAA) and their supported user organizations.
2. At Fort Hood the III Corps DLAA is supported by two subordinate DLAA's at the division level (1st CD DLAA and 2d AD DLAA). Each DLAA is headed by a "DLAA Chief," whose title prior to the implementation of DLS was "Logistics Assistance Officer." The DLAA staff is made up of several "Logistics Management Specialists" (LMS) and a greater number of other personnel who are representatives of the DARCOM Materiel Readiness Commands (MRC). The latter group consists of "Field Maintenance Technicians" and other maintenance or supply specialists and technicians from ARRCOM, AVSCOM, ECOM, MIRCOM, TARCOM, and TROSCOM.
3. Since it is important to obtain your personal and perhaps private feelings, this questionnaire should be completed without consulting with your colleagues. Your responses should remain anonymous.
4. The items concerning DLS begin on page 1, with one item per page. Unless specified otherwise, each item is answered by checking one (and only one) of the alternatives listed. Occasionally you may not find an alternative that exactly expresses your opinion. In such cases check the alternative that is most appropriate.
5. You will notice that space had been provided for comments after each item. YOUR COMMENTS, OF WHATEVER NATURE, ARE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. Please do not hesitate to write in whatever you wish. As a minimum, try to give some reason, however brief, for choosing the alternative that you checked. You may use the back of the page if you need additional space. Also, if you have important comments you would rather not write down, the ARI evaluator will be glad to talk with you personally.
6. The intent of the questionnaire is not only to collect your views on the topics covered, but also to elicit whatever SUGGESTIONS you may have for improving any situation where you perceive a problem connected with "telling it like it is" and the relationship between DLS user units and the DLAA's. Please include any suggestions you may have in the "comment" sections.
7. The last page of the questionnaire requests typical biographical information that may be useful in analyzing the results of the survey. The items are self-explanatory. Neither your name nor other identifying information will be released nor permanently recorded.

8. Please take your time in completing the questionnaire. It does not have to be completed at one sitting, but please protect it from the view of others when you are not working on it. When you are finished, please seal it in the envelope provided and drop it in the mail, or, if you prefer, the evaluator will personally pick it up.

9. The following abbreviations are used in the questionnaire:

DARCOM--Development and Readiness Command  
DLAA----DARCOM Logistic Assistance Activity  
DLS-----Direct Logistic Support  
FMT-----Field Maintenance Technician  
LMS-----Logistics Management Specialist  
MRC-----Materiel Readiness Command

Item 01. One major objective of DLS is to provide for a continuous monitoring of the effects of personnel, training, doctrine, and funding on logistical problems in the areas of supply, maintenance, transportation, and services.

How adequate or inadequate would you say the past experience and training of FMTs and other MRC representatives have been in preparing them for their part in accomplishing this objective?

- ☐ a. Very adequate
- ☐ b. Moderately adequate
- ☐ c. Slightly adequate
- ☐ d. Borderline
- ☐ e. Slightly inadequate
- ☐ f. Moderately inadequate
- ☐ g. Very inadequate

Comment:

Please provide the following biographical information.

Present job title: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Pay grade or rank: \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you been at Fort Hood: \_\_\_\_\_

Is your Fort Hood assignment permanent ( )? or TDY ( )?

If TDY, when will you leave: \_\_\_\_\_

How long at present job? \_\_\_\_\_

How long in this type of work? \_\_\_\_\_

Which MRC do you represent? (Ignore if you are not a MRC representative.)  
\_\_\_\_\_

How long at present pay grade? \_\_\_\_\_

Marital status: \_\_\_\_\_ Single  
\_\_\_\_\_ Married  
\_\_\_\_\_ Divorced or bereaved  
\_\_\_\_\_ Separated  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other

Civilian education (check all that apply)

\_\_\_\_\_ High school diploma or equivalent  
\_\_\_\_\_ Associate degree (Major: \_\_\_\_\_)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Bachelors degree (Major: \_\_\_\_\_)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Masters degree (Major: \_\_\_\_\_)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Military/Professional/Technical Schooling:

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Duty phone: \_\_\_\_\_



APPENDIX B

Report of Follow-Up Administration of DLS  
Implementation Questionnaire to  
MRC Representatives

## FOLLOW-UP ADMINISTRATION OF DLS IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE TO MRC REPRESENTATIVES

The initial administration of the DLS Implementation Questionnaire revealed the presence of a substantial negative component in the attitudes of DLAA personnel toward various aspects of DLS and the directive "Tell it like it is!" especially for MRC reps.

Subsequent to the initial administration, which took place during the last two weeks of June 1977, informal observations by the TCATA evaluators and others suggested that the attitudes of the MRC reps might have undergone significant positive changes. In order to determine whether or not this was true, the questionnaire was administered a second time to the DLAA personnel on 30 August 1977.

Thirty-five (70%) of the 50 assigned MRC reps completed questionnaires during the second administration. Of these, 23 had participated during the earlier administration; 12 had not. Six other DLAA personnel, constituting 75% of the assigned LMSs, NCOs, and DLAA chiefs, also completed questionnaires. Because of the small number of subjects in the latter group, the data obtained from them were not analyzed.

Table 01 compares the mean responses of the MRC reps on the first and second questionnaire administrations. Six aspects of the

---

Insert Table 01 about here

---

data in the table are especially notable:

1. Of the 36 differences shown in the last column, 27 (75%) are positive, 7 (19%) are negative, and 2 (6%) are zero.

2. All of the differences are less than one scale unit, i.e. they can be characterized as "very slight" to "slight" differences.

3. The mean for questionnaire item A-25 (which dealt with predicted success in being able to "tell it like it is" and still assist) increased very slightly but was still negative.

4. The mean for questionnaire item A-27 (which reflected overall attitude toward DLS) was the same for both administrations; i.e., it remained negative.

5. The overall means at the end of the table suggest that for MRC reps a very slight overall positive attitude change took place between the first and second administration; but for practical purposes, the amount of change seemed insignificant. All in all, the MRC reps were still not positive toward DLS.

Table 02 portrays the average percentages of positive, neutral, and negative mean responses of MRC reps on the first and second administrations for all questionnaire items combined. The percentage

---

Insert Table 02 about here

---

of positive mean responses increased six percentage points; the percentage of negative mean responses decreased seven percentage

points; the percentage of neutral mean responses remained about the same. Despite these changes, however, the MRC reps continued to exhibit more negative attitudes than those exhibited by user personnel and the LMS group on the first questionnaire administration. (None of the three groups, it will be recalled, gave a preponderance of positive responses on the initial administration.)

The percent of MRC reps who were to some extent doubtful of success in "telling it like it is" one day and assisting the next (Item A-25) was 76 in the first administration and 66 in the second, which supports the notion that some positive attitude change occurred but also reinforces the earlier finding that the majority of MRC reps were sceptical.

Thus, the second administration of the DLS Implementation Questionnaire did not substantially change the conclusion arrived at on the basis of the first administration.



TABLE 01: COMPARISON OF MEAN RESPONSES OF MRC REPRESENTATIVES ON 1ST AND 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE DLS IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE<sup>a</sup>

Questionnaire item	Initial administration	Second administration	Difference <sup>b</sup>
01	+0.9	+0.8	-0.1
02	-1.1	-0.7	+0.4
03	+0.7	+0.8	+0.1
04	-0.7	-0.1	+0.6
05	+0.1	-0.1	-0.2
06	-1.1	-0.7	+0.4
07	+1.0	+0.9	-0.1
08	-0.8	-0.6	+0.2
09	-1.6	-1.0	+0.6
10	-1.9	-1.0	+0.9
11	-1.4	-0.7	+0.7
12 <sup>c</sup>	--	--	--
13 <sup>d</sup>	--	--	--
14-1	+0.6	+1.0	+0.4
14-2	+0.3	+0.7	+0.4
14-3	-0.8	-0.8	0.0
14-4	-1.4	-1.1	+0.3
14-5	-0.8	-1.0	-0.2
15-1	-1.6	-1.2	+0.4
15-2	-0.5	-0.1	+0.4
16	-0.2	-0.1	+0.1
17	-0.6	-1.4	-0.8
18	-1.0	-0.6	+0.4
19	-0.2	0.0	+0.2
20	+1.1	+0.9	-0.2
21	+0.5	+0.2	-0.3
22-1	+0.6	+0.8	+0.2
22-2	0.0	+0.6	+0.6
22-3	-1.7	-1.0	+0.7
22-4	-1.8	-0.9	+0.9
23-1	+0.7	+0.9	+0.2
23-2	+0.2	+0.8	+0.6
23-3	-1.2	-0.6	+0.6
23-4	-1.5	-0.6	+0.9
24	-1.3	-0.5	+0.8

(Continued)

TABLE 01 (continued)

Questionnaire item	Initial administration	Second administration	Difference <sup>b</sup>
25	-1.8	-1.2	+0.6
26	0.0	+0.3	+0.3
27	-0.6	-0.6	0.0
Overall mean:	-0.5	-0.2	+0.3

Note. In general, positive values favor DLS; negative values are unfavorable to DLS. Possible range: -3 to +3.

<sup>a</sup>Form A.

<sup>b</sup>Positive values suggest positive changes in attitudes; negative values suggest negative changes.

<sup>c</sup>The values for this row--respectively, 43.6, 46.8, and 3.2--are not necessarily favorable or unfavorable to DLS and are eliminated in the computation of the overall means at the bottom of the table.

<sup>d</sup>The values for this row--respectively, -0.5, +0.5, and +1.0--are not necessarily favorable or unfavorable to DLS and are eliminated in the computation of the overall means at the bottom of the table.

TABLE 02: COMPARISON OF MRC REPRESENTATIVES ON 1ST AND 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE DLS IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE: PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE, NEUTRAL, AND NEGATIVE MEAN RESPONSES, ALL<sup>a</sup> QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS COMBINED

Response type	Initial administration	Second administration
Positive	24	30
Neutral	30	31
Negative	46	39

<sup>a</sup>All except items A-12 and A-13, for which the designations positive, neutral, and negative are not appropriate.