Research Note 83-12

5

AD A12719

FILE COPY

Ë

1

日本の教育を設置するという。

SOLDIER (E1-E4) QUALITY OF LIFE AT FORT HOOD: 1975-77

Edwin R. Smootz and Jean Jones

ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

May 1980

04 21 83

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

146

Н

.». •

ECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE		
REPORT DOCUMEN	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
REPORT NUMBER		NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Research Note 83-12	AU-A127	195
. TITLE (and Subtitie)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
SOLDIER (E1-E4) QUALITY JF	LIFE AT	Final Report
FORT HOOD: 1975-77		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
. AUTHOR(a)	<u> </u>	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER()
Edwin R. Smootz and Jean Jo	nes	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AN		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
U.S. Army Research Institut		ARÊA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
and Social Sciences (PERI 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexa	-OH)	2Q263731A768
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND AD		12. REPORT DATE
Deputy Chief of Staff for P	ersonnel	May 1980
Washington, D.C. 20310		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRE	SS(if different from Controlling Offi	
		UNCLASSIFIED
		154. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
		SCHEDULE
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aba	trect entered in Block 20, if differe	nt from Report)
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebe	tract entered in Block 20, if differe	nt from Report)
	trect entered in Block 20, if differe	nt from Report)
8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if Attitudes Attitude Questionnaire 		
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebs 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if Attitudes Attitudes Attitude Questionnaire Quality of Life 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if	necessery and identify by block nu	mber)
9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if Attitudes Attitude Questionnaire Quality of Life 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if In response to requests fro Commanding General of III O Field Unit at Fort Hood dev questionnaire in the fall o various units located at Fo questions calling for ratin	necessary and identify by block num on the Secretary of the Corps and Fort Hood, the reloped and administer of 1975 to a sample of ort Hood. The questic ugs of soldier satisfa	nbor) e General Staff for the he Army Research Institute ed a [®] Quality of Life"
 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if Attitudes Attitude Questionnaire Quality of Life 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if In response to requests fro Commanding General of III (C Field Unit at Fort Hood dev questionnaire in the fall o various units located at Fo questions calling for ratin living, working, and trainit 	necessary and identify by block num on the Secretary of the Corps and Fort Hood, the reloped and administer of 1975 to a sample of ort Hood. The questic ugs of soldier satisfa	mber) e General Staff for the he Army Research Institute ed a [*] Quality of Life ¹⁷ soldiers drawn from the mnaire primarily consisted of ction with various aspects of

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

and administered in the fall of 1976, and again revised and administered a year later, in 1977. The results were summarized for the post as a whole each year, and questions whose answers correlated significantly with stated intent to make a career of the Army were noted. Additionally, those questions for which there were significantly different responses between ethnic groups were noted.

The results indicated that, generally speaking, the quality of life for lower-ranking enlisted men at Fort Hood remained about the same during the 1975-1977 time frame; that the few ethnic differences that appeared indicated that blacks were somewhat more satisfied with the Army than were whites or other ethnic groups; and that the areas most predictive of intent to make a career of the Army were: job satisfaction, satisfaction with off-duty on-post activities, degree of harassment, and the challenge of training activities.

UNCLASSIFIED

ii

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

SOLDIER (E1-E4) QUALITY OF LIFE AT FORT HOOD: 1975 - 1977

FOREWORD

Since the modern U.S. Army has become all-volunteer. it has become increasingly important that job benefits and other benefits offered by the Army are sufficiently attractive to bring into and retain in its forces men and women of sufficient quality and quantity. The long-run test of the attractiveness of the offered benefits will be, of course, the number and type of individuals who continue to enlist or reenlist in the Army. Intermediate steps can be taken, however, to identify some of the primary areas of dissatisfaction among the troops and to take the necessary actions to make life in the Army more attractive to today's soldier. One way to determine areas of dissatisfaction is to ask the individual soldier about the day-to-day problems he faces in the Army and how his own experiences compare with the benefits he was told he would receive. In 1975 the Commanding General at Fort Hood expressed interest in determining satisfaction with selected aspects of Army life at Fort Hood and in identifying additional problem areas relating to the effectiveness of unit operations and training. To this end, the ARI Field Unit was requested to conduct a survey of the lowerranking enlisted men (E1s through E4s) at Fort Hood, Texas.

The research described in this report was in response to a request for technical advisory services by HQ III Corps. The research extended over a three year period commencing in the Fall of 1975 and terminating in the Summer of 1978.



iii

SOLDIER (E1-E4) QUALITY OF LIFE AT FORT HOOD: 1975 - 1977

BRIEF

Requirement:

This research was conducted in 1975, 1976, and 1977 in response to requests from the Secretary of the General Staff for the Commanding General of III Corps and Fort Hood, for assistance from the Army Research Institute in determining areas of soldier dissatisfaction with the quality of life at Fort Hood. Areas identified as sources of soldier dissatisfaction could then be given command attention, with the goal of reducing the sources of discontent and consequently improving the reenlistment rate of lower-ranking enlisted personnel.

Procedure:

The Army Research Institute Field Unit at Fort Hood developed and administered a questionnaire in the Fall of 1975 to a sample of soldiers drawn from the various units located at Fort Hood. The questionnaire primarily consisted of questions calling for ratings of soldier satisfaction with various aspects of living, working, and training at Fort Hood. This questionnaire was revised and administered in the Fall of 1976, and again revised and administered a year later, in 1977. The results were summarized for the post as a whole each year, and questions whose answers correlated significantly with stated intent to make a career of the Army were noted. Additionally, those questions for which there were significantly different responses between ethnic groups were noted.

Findings:

• Generally speaking, the quality of life for lower-ranking enlisted men at Fort Hood remained about the same during the 1975-1977 time frame.

• The few ethnic differences that appeared indicated that blacks were somewhat more satisfied with the Army than were whites or other ethnic groups.

• The areas most predictive of intent to make a career of the Army were: job satisfaction, satisfaction with off-duty on-post activities, perceived degree of harassment, and the challenge of training activities.

Utilization of Findings:

The results of this research were presented to commanders and staff officers of units at Fort Hood in a series of briefings. The results of the 1975 survey were presented in the Spring of 1976, the results of the 1976 survey in the Spring of 1977, and the results of the 1977 survey in the Spring of 1978. Commanders who were briefed included those from III Corps, the 1st Cavalry Division, the 2nd Armored Division, the 13th Corps Support Command, the 6th Air Combat Cavalry Brigade, and the TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity. The results of this effort also served as a basis for the initial development of the survey instrument used in the Commander's Unit Analysis Profile project currently under development by the ARI Field Unit at Fort Hood.



SOLDIER (E1-E4) QUALITY OF LIFE AT FORT HOOD: 1975 - 1977

CONTENTS PAGE INTRODUCTION . 1 METHODOLOGY . . 2 2 Questionnaire Development . . . Questionnaire Administration . 3 . Sample Composition . . . 3 Statistical Analysis . . 3 6 RESULTS . . . Background and Educational Characteristics of the Samples 6 Questionnaire Results 6 ٠ ٠ • Satisfaction With Training 6 . . . Job Satisfaction . . . 13 . . . Satisfaction With Chain of Command . . . 17 ٠ . Satisfaction With Facilities and Services 24 • Satisfaction With Unit . . . 29 • ٠ Satisfaction With Fort Hood 32 ٠ . Satisfaction With the Army . . . 37 • ٠ . . 41 Ethnic/Sex Comparisons • . ٠ Variables Associated With Career Intentions . 53 CONCLUSIONS 57 APPENDIX A . . • A-1 APPENDIX B . • B-1 APPENDIX C . . C-1 TABLES TABLE 1 - Survey Samples for Each Year that the Quality of Life Survey was Administered 5 TABLE 2 - Background Characteristics of the Samples . 7 TABLE 3 - Educational Characteristics of the Samples . 10 TABLE 4 - Items and Summary Statistics Pertaining to

 TABLE 4 - Items and Summary Statistics Fertaining to

 Satisfaction With Training

 TABLE 5 - Items and Summary Statistics Pertaining to

 Job Satisfaction

 Job Satisfaction

vii

TABLE 6 - Items and Summary Statis	-
TABLE 7 - Items and Summary Statis	n of Command 18 tics Pertaining
	acilities and Services . 25
TABLE 8 - Items and Summary Statis Satisfaction With Unit	$\begin{array}{cccc} \text{tics Pertaining to} \\ \bullet & 30 \end{array}$
TABLE 9 - Items and Summary Statis	
Satisfaction with Fort TABLE 10 - Items and Summary Statis	Hood
Satisfaction With the	Army
TABLE 11 - Summary Statistics for Q Significant Difference	uestions Showing s Across Ethnic Groups . 43
TABLE 12 - Summary Statistics for Q	uestions Showing
Significant Difference for 1977 Data	•
TABLE 13 - Statistically Significan	
Coefficients Appearing	
of the Three Years of TABLE 14 - Summary Table of Stepwis	-
Analysis for Variables	
With #63 as Dependent	Variable • • • • • 56

+

viii

•

SOLDIER (E1-E4) QUALITY OF LIFE AT FORT HOOD: 1975 - 1977

INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to identify sources of dissatisfaction among lowerranking enlisted soldiers (E1 through E4) at Fort Hood, the Secretary of the General Staff (SGS) for the Commanding General of III Corps and Fort Hood requested, in 1975, that the Army Research Institute Field Unit at Fort Hood develop a questionnaire for measuring soldier attitudes toward various aspects of living and working at Fort Hood. The primary rationale behind the project was that if major areas of soldier dissatisfaction could be identified, then local commanders could effect changes in administrative policies and procedures in such a way as to mitigate soldier feelings of dissatisfaction and thus reduce the number of personnel exiting the service after their first and/or second enlistment. This would have the advantage of reducing the large costs involved in training new recruits needed to replace lower-ranking soldiers exiting from the service. A secondary purpose of the project was to assess how familiar soldiers were with local regulations and publications.

The first questionnaire developed for the above purposes by the ARI Fort Hood Field Unit was administered in the Fall of 1975 and the results were presented in a previous report.¹ The survey was modified and readministered in the Fall of 1976 and, after further modification, again in the Fall of 1977. The present report presents a comparison of the results of all three questionnaire administrations, excluding those "Fort Hood specific" items (such as familiarity with local regulations and publications), which would be of little interest to a general audience.

In reading this report the reader is cautioned to keep in mind that the results are specific to Fort Hood during the 1975-1977 time frame and are in no way indicative of how Fort Hood compares to other Army installations. While soldiers may express dissatisfaction with one aspect of Fort Hood in the present report, it could actually be the case that Fort Hood was superior in that area compared to other posts, and that no Army post would have received satisfactory ratings in that area had they been examined. Comparisons between posts is a topic for future research and was not attempted for the time period covered by the present report.

¹Jones, Jean and Smootz, Edwin R. Survey of Soldier Quality of Life at Fort Hood, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, in press.

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire Development

The 1975 questionnaire was modeled after an earlier survey by Gividen, Nystrom, and Van Arsdell.² Details of the development of the 1975 questionnaire are given in the report by Jones and Smootz referred to in the Introduction. Basically, the questionnaire included questions covering a diverse set of topics, such as satisfaction with job training and placement, satisfaction with the chain of command, satisfaction with local facilities and services, and general satisfaction with the Army, Fort Hood, and the soldier's unit. (A copy of the complete questionnaire is included in Appendix A.)

The 1976 questionnaire (Appendix B) was a slightly modified version of the 1975 questionnaire. The basic changes involved grouping related questions into functional areas within the questionnaire itself, omitting numerous detailed questions about local news publications and on-post facilities, and adding several questions which results from the 1975 survey indicated would provide useful information on soldier attitudes toward life at Fort Hood. The questions which were added concerned obtaining the right equipment for doing one's job (#22), reasons for dissatisfaction with commander's performance (#34), adequacy of sports activities at Fort Hood (#39), satisfactoriness of barracks (#44), attendance at religious services (#50, 51), performance of military policy (#63e), and adequacy of leave policies (#63f).

For the 1977 administration, the 1976 questionnaire was extensively revised (see Appendix C). Questions concerning knowledge of local rules and regulations were omitted, as were questions tapping soldier knowledge of military subjects. Numerous questions were then added for the purpose of increasing the information obtained in the following functional areas of general interest. Satisfaction with training (#3, 4, 5, 6); satisfaction with chain of command (#13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21); job satisfaction (#23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28); adequacy of post services (#30); morale (#44, 45, 55); treatment of minority groups (#51, 53); satisfaction with Army policies and functions (#57, 38, 59, 60, 61). Finally, questions concerning the size of the community in which a soldier grew up (#76), and whether or not a soldier would like to continue his academic education while in the Army (#82) were also added.

²Gividen, George M., Nystrom, Charles O., & Van Arsdell, Paul M., Jr. <u>Fort Hood Semi-annual Project VOLAR/MVA Evaluation Report</u>, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Command Programs, Fort Hood, Texas, 30 June 1972.

Questionnaire Administration

The procedures for administering the Quality of Life questionnaire were essentially the same in 1976 and 1977 as in 1975. In all three years, the survey was administered in November and December (in the 1977 survey, a few make-up sessions were held in early January) to groups of soldiers in their unit area. Group size generally varied from 25 to 100 soldiers. Two ARI researchers conducted the sessions. In 1975 and 1976, a senior male researcher gave the instructions for completing the questionnaire and was assisted by a junior female researcher. In 1977, the female researcher presented the instructions and was assisted by a mal Sergeant. Both administrators answered individual questions throughout the sessions. The sessions lasted approximately one r. with each survey participant being required to remain at the se for a minimum of 45 minutes in 1975 and 1976, and for a minimum minutes in 1977.

The instructions given to the survey participants were essentially the same for each year: the purpose of the survey was explained, the participants were told that they were selected as representatives of all soldiers at Fort Hood in the pay grades of E1 through E4, and they were informed that the survey was anonymous and that they should therefore be as candid as possible. The procedures for completing the questionnaire were explained and the participants were then allowed to begin.

Sample Composition

The questionnaires were administered to individuals of pay grades E1 through E4 who were selected on the basis of the last two digits (selected randomly each year) of their social security number. Individuals who participated in the 1975 survey came from the 2d Armored Division (2AD), the 1st Cavalry Divison (1CD), and various support units at Fort Hood. Unfortunately, in 1975 no individuals were selected from the 13th Corps Support Command (COSCOM) or from the 6th Air Combat Cavalry Brigade (ACCB), which together accounted for about 15% of the E1 to E4 population at Fort Hood. This situation was corrected in the 1976 and 1977 administrations.

The survey was administered to 423 soldiers in 1975, 227 soldiers in 1976, and 750 soldiers in 1977. Proportionate samples were formed for each year by randomly discarding surveys from each unit sampled so that the sample composition for each year accurately reflected the number of E1s through E4s in a unit relative to the number of E1s through E4s at Fort Hood as a whole. In the 1975 survey, this resulted in a proportionate sample which was about half of the original sample because of the large overrepresentation of soldiers initially sampled from the 1CD. The resulting proportionate samples, upon which the results of the present report are based, are shown in Table 1. It should be noted that while the 1976 and 1977 samples very accurately reflect the unit composition of Fort Hood during those years, the 1975 sample is less accurate because of the omission of data from the 13th COSCOM and 6th ACCB. However, the 1975 sample is accurate in terms of representing the proportions of E1s through E4s that were in the various units that were sampled that year.

Finally, a word of explanation is in order concerning the large sample size in 1977 compared to the previous sample sizes in 1975 and 1976. The 1975 and 1976 sample sizes were quite adequate for generalizing to Fort Hood as a whole. However, following the 1976 survey, numerous unit commanders requested a breakout of the results for their individual units. The 1976 sample size was too small to do this for the smaller units at Fort Hood, and still have confidence in the meaningfulness of the results. Therefore, in anticipation of such requests following the 1977 survey, the sample size was increased for that year.

Statistical Analysis

In order to make statistical comparisons of the answers received during the different years that the questionnaire was administered, average scale scores were computed where appropriate. Responses to the questionnaire items were scored on a scale ranging from -2 to +2. A -2represented the most negative response to a given question, a 0 score represented a borderline or neutral response, and a +2 represented the most favorable response. Analysis of variance was used to determine whether there were significant differences in the answers given to various questions when compared across all of the years that the survey was conducted. These analyses were performed using the BMDP Biomedical Computer Programs.³ Duncan's New Multiple Range test was used to determine where specific differences existed when the overall analysis of variance was significant. In addition, t-tests were used to determine if a mean was significantly different from 0 on those questions which involved a borderline (scale value = 0) response category. This gave an indication as to whother the average response to such questions was in a positive or a negative direction. Finally, correlation and multiple regression analyses were performed to determine which variables were most closely associated with intent to make a career of the Army.

³BMDP Biomedical Computer Programs, W. J. Dixon, ed., University of California Press, 1975, Berkeley.

	THAT THE		SAMPLES OF LIFE			INISTER	El
		1975		1976		1977	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	*	
2 AD	110	50.5	78	37.9	252	38.3	
1 CD	89	40.8	69	33.5	230	35.0	
13th COSCOM			22	10.7	70	10.6	
6th ACCB			12	5.8	39	5.9	
Other Units	19	8.7	25	12.1	67	10.2	
Total	218	100	206	100	658	100	

l

TABLE 1

T SULTS

Background and Educational Characteristics of the Samples

Demographic characteristics of the samples are shown in Table 2. It can be seen that most of the respondents were between 19 and 25 years of age and were male. The predominant racial groups were Caucasian and Black, and most respondents were in the pay grade of E3 and E4. The majority of the respondents were not married, and in 1976 the proportion of such individuals was larger than in 1975 and 1977. This is reflected in the number of children respondents reported having, which was less in 1976 than in 1975 or 1977. About two-thirds of the respondents lived in the barracks, which is, as one would expect, about the same proportion of respondents that were single. About two-thirds of the respondents had been at Fort Hood for 18 months or less, and two-thirds had been in the Army between one and three years. Finally, the distribution of respondents across the various sizes of the communities in which they grew up was fairly even in 1977 (the only year for which data was gathered on this question).

With respect to educational characteristics (see Table 3), it can be seen that about 75% of the respondents in any year had 12 years or more of formal education, although only around 65% reported having received a regular high school diploma. Nineteen percent indicated that they had received a GED diploma and 16% reported having no high school diploma. Only about five percent of the respondents in any of the years of the survey reported having a college degree. Finally, between one-fifth and one-third of the respondents reported that they were currently taking courses to improve their educational or technical qualifications, although in 1977 90% of them said that they were interested in doing so.

Questionnaire Results

In this section, summary statistics are presented for each of the questionnaire items. Differences in answers which varied as a function of year of questionnaire administration are noted. The questions are grouped into general content areas, based on similarity of subject matter, and are discussed with respect to those content areas. The numbers used to refer to specific questions are those numbers used in the 1977 survey (Appendix C).

Satisfaction with Training

The results for questions concerned with training are shown in Table 4. It can be seen that ratings of the challenge of training

TABLE 2

Variable 1975 1976 1977 N <u>%</u> N 5 N % Age 20 9.4 18 and below 22 10.7 43 6.6 19-21 130 61.3 137 66.5 370 56.6 22-25 49 23.1 34 16.6 197 30.2 26 and over 6.2 13 6.4 44 6.9 13 Sex Male 202 94.4 185 91.1 552 92.3 Female 5.6 8.9 46 7.7 12 18 Ethnicity Caucasian 111 52.4 115 56.7 328 50.7 Afro-American 67 31.6 57 28.1 183 28.3 Mexican-American 8.0 4.9 6.3 17 10 41 Puerto Rican 4.2 9 6 3.0 18 2.8 2.4 American Indian 5 3 27 4.2 1.5 2 Oriental 1 .5 1.0 6 0.9 .9 Other 2 10 4.9 44 6.8 Paygrade E1 1.4 7 3.4 9 1.4 3 E2 12.8 74 11.4 27 39 19.0 E3 86 40.8 94 45.9 195 30.0 E4-E5* 95 45.0 65 31.7 372 57.3

į.

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLES

*Some E5s were included in the sample because at the time the sample was chosen, these soldiers were E4s but were promoted to E5 prior to the survey administration date.

7

-1.076

(TABLE 2 Cont.)

Variable	1975		19	76	1977		
	N	<u>8</u>	N	<u>%</u>	N	1	
Marital Status							
Single	126	59.4	146	70.9	366	56.2	
Married	71	33.5	51	24.8	250	38.4	
Divorced	10	4.7	5	2.4	18	2.8	
Other	5	2.4	4	1.9	17	2.6	
Number of Children							
None	140	66.0	162	79.0	424	65.1	
One	43	20.3	30	14.6	147	22.6	
Two	24	11.3	9	4.4	51	7.8	
Three or more	5	2.4	4	2.0	29	4.5	
Living Quarters							
Barracks	141	66.5	143	69.8	381	58.4	
Off-post Housing	68	32.1	58	28.3	247	37.9	
On-post Housing	3	1.4	4	2.0	24	3.7	
Number of months at	Fort H	ood					
1–6	38	18.0	36	17.6	110	16.9	
7-12	81	38.4	90	43.9	189	28.9	
13–18	44	20.9	45	21.9	132	20.2	
19-24	31	14.7	17	8.3	113	17.5	
Over 24	17	8.0	17	8.3	108	16.6	
Number of months in	the Ar	my					
1–12 13–24 25–36 37–48 49–60			77 94 27 3 2	37.4 45.6 13.1 1.5 1.5	104 235 206 63 21	16.0 36.0 31.5 9.6 3.2	
0 ver 60			2	1.0	24	3.7	

8

. . . .

(TABLE 2 Cont.)

Varia	ble	1	977
		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
	of Community in Which rew Up		
a.	1-1000 persons	79	12.2
b.	1001-5000 persons	79	12.2
с.	5001-10,000 persons	84	12.9
d.	10,001-25,000 persons	86	13.3
e.	25,001-50,000 persons	75	11.6
f.	50,001-100,000 persons	66	10.2
g.	100,001-500,000 persons	69	10.6
h.	Over 500,000 persons	111	17.1

ς.
9

- Leven

TABLE 3

EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLES

Variable	1	1975 1976		1975 1976			1977		
	N	<u>×</u>	<u>N</u>	7	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>			
Years of Formal Educ	ation								
Under 10 years	9	4.2	12	6.4	33	5.2			
10-11 years	48	22.4	34	18.1	131	20.2			
12 years	114	53.3	111	59.0	345	53.2			
Over 12 years	43	20.1	31	16.5	139	21.5			
Type of High School	Diplom	a							
GED Diploma	42	19.8	31	15.1	122	19.0			
Regular Diploma	130	61.3	140	68.3	416	64.9			
No Diploma	40	18.9	34	16.6	103	16.1			
Type of College Degr	ee								
Assoc(2 yr.)Degree	10	4.9	4	2.0	21	3.3			
Bach(4 yr.)Degree	0	0.0	3	1.5	20	3.1			
No College Degree	196	95.1	190	96.4	599	93.6			
Currently Enrolled i	n Cour	se to							
Improve Educational	'Techni	cal							
Qualifications									
Yes	44	21.1	67	32.7	201	30.9			
No	165	78.9	138	67.3	449	69.1			
Interested in Taking Improve Educational Qualifications									
Yes					573	89.5			
No					67	10.5			

TABLE 4

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING

....

Scale				1975	1976	1977
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	1.	The training I have received at Fort Hood has been: a. Very challenging. b. Challenging. c. Borderline. d. Unchallenging. e. Very unchallenging.	Mean S.D. N	• -	† .16 1.08 201	+ .24** 1.07 652
+2 +1 0	2.	 The training I have received at Fort Hood has been a. Very useful in preparing me to work in my MOS. b. Useful in preparing me to work in my MOS. c. Of borderline value in preparing me to work in 	Mean S.D.	-	+ .34 1.19	+ .23 1.18
-1 -2		 my MOS. d. Unuseful in preparing me to work in my MOS. e. Very unuseful in preparing me to work in my MOS. 	N	= 205	200	651
		 The field maneuvers and field exercises in which I have participated have been: a. Very useful in training my unit. b. Useful in training my unit. c. Of borderline usefulness in training my unit. d. Unuseful in training my unit e. Very unuseful in training my significantly different from 0 (1) 	unit, p<.05)).	Mean = S.D. = N =	+ .54 1.05 639
		cally significant difference bet	ween	1975 and 19	77	

means (p<.05).

.

.

Table 4 con't.)

<u>Scale</u>

١

	4.	During training and drill periods, the soldiers in my unit:		
+2		a. Are almost always busy with tasks.		+
+1		b. Are frequently busy with tasks.	Mean =	. 39
0		c. Are busy with tasks about half the time.	S.D. = N =	1.14 641
-2		 Are frequently waiting around and doing nothing. 		
-1		e. Are almost always waiting around and doing nothing.		
	5.	The physical training program in my unit is:		
+2		 a. Very adequate for the unit's mission. 		+
+1		b. Adequate for the unit's mission.	Mean =	.27
0		c. Of borderline adequacy for the unit's mission.	S.D.= N =	1.27 648
-1		d. Inadequate for the unit's mission.		
-2		e. Very inadequate for the unit's mission.		
	6.	My training instructors at Fort Hood have been:		
+2		a. Very effective teachers.		+
+2 +1		a. Very effective teachers. b. Effective teachers.	Mean =	.35
+1 0		c. Somewhat effective teachers.	S.D.=	1.01
-1		d. Ineffective teachers.	S.D.= N =	644
-2		e. Very ineffective teachers.	- 11	

<u>1977</u>

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

(#1) increased over time (F=2.93, df=2,1058, p<.05). In 1975 training challenge was rated as "borderline", but by 1977 the average rating had increased in the direction of "challenging" (H_0 : μ =0; \bar{x} =.24, t=5.69, df=651, p<.001).

Although there were no significant differences across time in the answers to the question concerning the usefulness of training at Fort Hood in preparing one to work in his MOS (#2), such training was rated as not significantly different from "borderline" in 1975 but had increased in the direction of being "useful" in 1976 $(H_0:\mu=0; \bar{x}=.34, t=4.09, df=199, p<.001)$ and in 1977 $(H_0:\mu=0, \bar{x}=.23, t=5.0, df=650, p<.001)$.

The remaining questions shown in Table 4 were only asked in the 1977 survey. Perusal of the answers to those questions reveals that the ratings were in the positive direction, although not strongly positive. The usefulness of field training maneuvers and exercises (#3) received the most positive rating ($H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.54$. t=13.14, df=638, <.001), although the adequacy of the physical training program (#5; $H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.27$, t=5.42, df=647, p<.001) and the effectiveness of training instructors (#6; $H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.35$, t=8.93, df=643, p<.001) were also given somewhat positive ratings.

Finally, the average rating given to the extent to which soldiers were busy with relevant tasks during training and drill (#4) was in the "busy half the time" to "busy frequently" interval.

Overall then, it appears that soldier satisfaction with training was somewhat positive in 1977, and had improved somewhat since 1975.

Job Satisfaction

Table 5 shows the results from questions concerned with the degree to which soldiers were satisfied with their jobs. During each year of the survey, soldiers reported spending about 44 hours per week on their jobs (question #83). However, only about two-thirds of this time (25 to 30 hours) was reportedly spent in meaningful work (queston #84). There were no significant differences across time in the ratings which soldiers gave to the question concerning their placement in jobs for which they felt they were or were not suited (#22). Ratings on this question were slightly positive in 1976 (H_0: μ =0; \bar{x} =.33, t=1.87, df=212, p<.06).

Questions 28 and 29 were only asked in 1976 and 1977. There was no change across time in soldiers' responses to the question of how satisfying their job had proven to be (#28), the average ratings being slightly positive in both cases ($H_0:u=0$; for 1976, $\bar{x}=.18$, t=2.22, df=202, p<.03; for 1977, $\bar{x}=.23$, t=4.49, df=654, p<.001). However, there was a significant change in their ratings of how much of a problem they had in getting the right equipment to do their job

TABLE 5

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO JOB SATISFACTION

Scale				<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
83.	The average number of hours that I spend on my job per week is:					
				44.9 13.08 208	42.9 23.13 204	44.7 18.92 648
84.	The average number of hours of meaningful work that I do on my job per week is:					
				29.7 15.9 204	# 24.6 19.03 203	# 28.2 19.5 648
22.	At Fort Hood, I have been placed in jobs for which I am:					
+2 +1	a. Very well suited. b. Well suited.	Mean		• • •	+	+ • 36
0 -1 -2	c. Borderline in suitability. d. Unsuited. e. Very unsuited.	S.D. N		1.28 213	1.12 201	1.25 651
28. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	My job has proved to be: a. Very satisfying. b. Satisfying. c. Borderline. d. Unsatisfying. e. Very unsatisfying.	Mean S.D. N	=		+ .18 1.14 203	+ .23 1.30 655

tMean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05). * Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).

14

· · · · · · ·

(Table 5 con't.)

Scale			19	75	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
29. +2	Obtaining the right equipment to do my job has: a. Never been a problem in					
ŦĊ	the past.				+	+
+1	b. Rarely been a problem in the past.	Mean S.D.			90 1.31	53 * 1.40
0	c. Occassionally been a problem in the past.	N	=		201	647
-1	d. Sometimes been a problem in the past.					
-2	e. Frequently been a problem in the past.					
23. +2 +1 0	My present job is: a. Almost always interesting. b. Frequently interesting. c. Interesting about half	Mean S.D.				.10 1.37
-1 -2	the time. d. Frequently not interesting. e. Almost never interesting.	N	=			652
24.	I feel that how well my present is done is:	job				
+2 +1	a. Very important to the Army. b. Fairly important to the	Mean	=			+ •97
	Army.	S.D.				1.28
0	 c. Of borderline importance to the Army. 	N	=			654
-1 -2	 Not too important to the Army e. Scarcely of any importance to the Army. 	/.				
25.	I am able to do my present job the way I think it should be done:					
+2	a. To a very great extent.					+
+1	b. To a large extent.	Mean				• 39
0 -1	c. To some extent. d. To a small extent.	S.D. N	=			1.26 653
-2	e. Hardly at all.	14	-			

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).
* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (P<.05).

15

- 2 - 44

(Table 5 con't.)

<u>Scale</u>

í

	26.	In my job, I feel that my supervisor is:			
+2		a. Very concerned with the			
-		quality of my work.			+
+1		b. Fairly concerned with the	Mean	=	.86
			S.D.		1.20
0		• • •	N		650
		with the quality of my work.			
-1		d. Fairly unconcerned with the			
		quality of my work.			
-2		e. Almost totally unconcerned			
		with the quality of my work.			
	27.	In my job, my supervisor:			
		a. Almost always sets clear			
		goals for me.			
		b. Usually sets clear goals			
		for me.	Mean	=	. 19
		c. Sets clear goals for me	S.D.	=	1.39
		about half the time.	N	=	647
		d. Occasionally sets clear			
		goals for me.			
		e. Almost never sets clear goals	S		
		for me.			

<u>1977</u>

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

(#29) with the responses indicating less of a problem in 1977 than in 1976 (F=10.69, df=1.846, p<.001).

All of the remaining questions in Table 5 were only asked in 1977. Examination of the results indicates that soldiers felt that their jobs were interesting about half of the time (#23). A rather positive rating was given to the question (#24) concerning how important a soldier felt his job was for the Army ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \ \bar{x}=.97, t=19.29,$ df=654, p<.001), with the average respondent indicating that he felt that his job was "fairly" important to the Army. Soldiers reported that they felt they were able to do their jobs the way they should be done "to some extent" (#25), and there was a fairly positive average rating given to the degree of concern which supervisors gave to the quality of soldiers" work (#26; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \ \bar{x}=.86, t=18.33, df=649,$ p<.001), although soldiers reported that supervisors set clear goals for them only about half of the time (#27).

In summary, soldiers showed mild satisfaction with their jobs at Fort Hood.

Satisfaction with Chain of Command

Table 6 presents the results for questions concerning soldier satisfaction with the chain of command. The first two questions shown indicate how many days a month soldiers saw (#85a-90a) and talked to (#85b-90b) those in their chain of command. One can see that, not surprisingly, there is generally more interaction between soldiers and leaders at lower levels of command than at higher levels. This is true in terms of seeing as well as talking to unit leaders during all three years that the questionnaire was administered (all significant t's≤2.18, df's≥161, p's<.05). Also, as one might expect, soldiers reported seeing each unit leader more than they reported talking to each one during each year that the survey was administered (all $t^{s} \ge 6.32$, df $s \ge 161$, p s < .001). With respect to changes across time, it can be seen that, with the exception of seeing the Command Sergeant Major, the amount of interaction between soldiers and unit leaders did not change between 1975 and 1976. In 1977, soldiers' estimates of the frequency of seeing and talking to unit leaders were significantly lower than the 1975 and 1976 estimates at the lower leadership levels (all significant $p^{s} < .05$, df $s \ge 985$). However, this result was possibly due to the fact that respondents to the 1977 survey were instructed to keep in mind that a month consists of about 21 work days and that the frequency of seeing and talking to unit leaders should be estimated using that figure as an upper limit. This comment, which was not included in the instructions to the 1975 and 1976 surveys, was included as part of the 1977 instructions because discussions with respondents to the 1976 survey indicated that some soldiers made their estimates based upon a 30 day month, whereas others made their estimates based on

TABLE 6

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO SATISFACTION WITH CHAIN OF COMMAND (N is given in parentheses)

85a - 90a. On the average, on how many days a month do you <u>see</u> each of those in your chain of command?	<u>1975</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>1976</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>1977</u> <u>Mean</u>
your chain of committee			
Section/Platoon Sergeant	22.2 (187) *	23.8 (193) *	* 19.5** (648) *
Section/Platoon Leader	19.8 (185)	20.2 (187)	* 16.6** (648)
First Sergeant	19.9 (188)	21.3 (190)	* 17.5** (648)
Company/Troop/Battery Commander	16.4 (179) *	15.7 (186) #	* 13.4** (649) *
Battalion/Squadron	6.8 *	8.6	* 6.1
Command Sergeant Major	(171)	(180) *	(648) *
Battalion/Squadron Commander	6.3 (168)	6.6 (177)	5.4 (647)

* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05). ** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).

1

(Table 6 con t.)

•

:

85b	- 90b. On the average, on how meny days a month do you <u>talk with</u> each of those in your chain of command?	<u>1975</u> <u>Mean N</u>	<u>1976</u> <u>Mean</u> N	<u>1977</u> <u>Mean N</u>
	Section/Platoon Sergeant	19.1 (183) #	19.7 (189) *	# 16.6## (649) #
	Section/Platoon Leader	15•4 (182) #	15.0 (182) #	* 13.0** (649) *
	First Sergeant	11.1 (186) #	10•5 (186) *	* 8.8** (649) *
	Company/Troop/Battery Commander	6∙0 (175) ¥	6.1 (181) *	4.9 (647) *
	Battalion/Squadron Command Sergeant Major	2.2 (166) #	3∙1 (177) ¥	* 1.7 (647) ≢
	Battalion/Squadron Commander	1.8 (163)	1.9 (177)	* 1 . 1 (648)

* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05). ** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).

(Table 6 con't.)

ł

Scale		1975	1976	1977
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 What is your company/troop battery commander's policy about his people coming to talk with him about personal problems or other matters? a. He strongly encourages. b. He encourages us. c. He neither encourages nor discourages us. d. He discourages us. e. He strongly discourages us. 	t Mean = .93 S.D. = .98 N = 188	+ .92 .90 179	t .86 .94 585
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 Based on your experience in trying to talk with your commander, how satisfied/ dissatisfied are you with his "open-door" performance? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	Mean = .11 S.D. = 1.33 N = 149	t .30 1.16 142	† _44 ** 1.25 435
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 Most officers in my unit are: a. Very understanding of their men's needs. b. Understanding of their men's needs. c. Borderline. d. Nonunderstanding of their men's needs. e. Very nonunderstanding of their men's needs. 	t Mean = .17 S.D. = 1.14 N = 214	t . 3 ^u 1. 15 206	+ .24 1.11 648

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05)
** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05)</pre>

(Table 6 con'd.)

·t

١

١

,

<u>Scale</u>				<u>1975</u>	1976	<u>1977</u>
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	16.	 Most NCOs in my unit are: a. Very understanding of their men's needs. b. Understanding of their men's needs. c. Borderline. d. Nonunderstanding of their men's needs. e. Very nonunderstanding of their men's needs. 	Mean S.D. N		+ .40 1.09 205	+ .42 1.02 654
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	19.	In regard to keeping me informed about training events and policies, officers in my unit: a. Do a very good job. b. Do a good job. c. Do a borderline job. d. Do a poor job. e. Do a very poor job.	d Mean S.D. N	• • •	+ * .41 1.18 205	* .10 1.19 654
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	20.	In regard to keeping me informed about training events and policies, NCOs in my unit: a. Do a very good job. b. Do a good job. c. Do a borderline job. d. Do a poor job. e. Do a very poor job.	Mean S.D. N			+ .35 1.15 651
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	13.	With regard to leadership, the officers in my unit do a: a. Very good job. b. Good job. c. Borderline job. d. Poor job. e. Very poor job.	Mean S.D. N			+ .37 1.07 653

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).
* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).

(Table 6 con't.)

1

Scale					1977
	14.	With regard to leadership			
+2		the NCOs in my unit do a: a. Very good job.			+
+1			Mean	=	.31
0		c. Borderline job.	S.D.		1.09
-1 -2		d. Poor job. e. Very poor job.	N	=	651
-2		e. very poor job.			
	17.	Most of the officers in my			
~		unit are:			
+2		 a. Extremely competent at doing their jobs. 			
+1		b. Fairly competent at doing			+
			Mean		.70
0		c. Borderline in competency	S.D.	=	.97
_		at doing their jobs.	N	=	646
-1		d. Somewhat incompetent at			
-2		doing their jobs. e. Extremely incompetent at			
-2		doing their job.			
-	18.	Most of the NCOs in my unit are:	:		
+2		a. Extremely competent at doing their jobs.			
-1		b. Fairly competent at doing			+
•			Mean	=	.69
0		c. Borderline in competency	S.D.	=	.97
		at doing their jobs.	N	=	654
-1		d. Somewhat incompetent at			
- 2		doing their jobs. e. Extremely incompetent at			
- c		doing their jobs.			
	21.	My performance evaluations and			
		efficiency reports have provided me with:	1		
+2		a. A great deal of useful			
		feedback.	Mean	=	.13
+1		b. Much useful feedback.	S.D.	2	1.35
0		c. Some useful feedback.	N	=	361
-1 -2		d. A little useful feedback.			
-2		e. Hardly any useful feedback.			

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

a 20 or 21 day month. Thus, since respondents were acting under a different set of instructions in 1977 compared to 1975 and 1976, one cannot draw any valid conclusions about changes over time in estimates of the frequency of soldier interaction with unit leaders.

Responses to the other questions concerning job satisfaction were somewhat positive. For example, soldiers indicated in 1975, 1976, and 1977 that their company commander generally encouraged them to talk with him about personal problems or other matters (#7, H_0 ; μ =0; all $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$'s \geq .86, t's \geq 13.08, df's \geq 178, p's<.001). Although they gave an average response of "borderline" to the question concerning satisfaction/ dissatisfaction with their commander's open door policy (#11) in 1975, this response had become somewhat positive by 1976 (H_a: \mathcal{M} =0; $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ =.30, t=7.42, df=434, p<.001). In addition, respondents gave slightly positive ratings of officers' understanding of their needs (#15) during each year (H₀: μ =0; all \bar{x} 's \geq .17, t's \geq 2.16, df's \geq 205, p<.03), as well as slightly positive ratings of NCO's understanding of their needs (#16) during each year (H_0 : $\mathcal{M}=0$; all \bar{x} 's \geq .31, all t's \geq 4.08; df's \geq 204, p<.001). No changes between years were recorded for either of the latter two questions. However, there were changes over time for the question concerning how well officers kept their troops informed of training events and policies (#19). In 1975, the average response to this question was "borderline." In 1976, though, the average response significantly increased to being somewhat positive ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\bar{x}=.41$, t=4.96, df=204, p<.001), and then significantly decreased in 1977, although it was still slightly positive at that time ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\bar{x}=.10$, t=2.13, df=653, p<.034).

The remaining questions in Table 6 were asked only in 1977. In general, the results were in a positive direction. For example, the average rating of how well NCOs kept troops informed about training events and policies (#20) was mildly positive $(H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.35, t=7.8, df=650, p<.001)$, as were ratings of officer leadership (#13; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.37, t=8.86, df=652, p<.001)$ and NCO leadership (#14; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.31, t=7.15, df=650, p<.001)$. More positive ratings were given to the competency of officers in doing their jobs (#17; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.70, t=18.37, df=645, p<.001)$ and to the competency of NCOs in doing their jobs (#18; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.69, t=18.19, df=653, p<.001)$. Performance evaluations (#21), on the other hand, were generally rated only as providing "some useful feedback."

To summarize, the rating of how well officers kept their troops informed of training events and policies decreased in 1977 compared to 1976. On the other hand, more satisfaction was expressed with commanders "open door" performance in 1977 than in 1975. The remaining questions on commander satisfaction received similar ratings on each year that the survey was administered, with the ratings generally being mildly positive.

Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

Soldiers' responses concerning satisfaction with facilities and services are summarized in Table 7. Perusal of that table reveals that across time, there was a positive trend with respect to mess hall food, in that soldiers became less dissatisfied with both the quality of food (F=13.04, df=2,1003, p<.001) and the quantity of food (F=10.11, df=2,1003, p<.001). The quality of mess hall food (#30a) was given average negative ratings in both 1975 ($H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=-.50$, t=5.72, df=199, p<.001) and 1976 ($H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=-.22$, t=2.5, df=197. p<.01) but by 1977 the average ratings had risen to "borderline." The quantity of mess hall food (#30b) was given a negative rating in 1975 ($H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=-.32$, t=3.65, df=202, p<.001), a "borderline" rating in 1976, and a slightly positive rating in 1977 (H_0 : $\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.10$, t=2.25, df=606, p<.02). Other areas, however, showed negative trends. For example, there was increasing dissatisfaction with government-provided permanent housing (F=10.36, df=2,474, p<.001), sports activities (F=23.35, df=1,78, p<.001), other off-duty activities (F=10.28, df=2.961, p<.001), and the performance of the military police (F=8.12, df=1,746, p<.005). In 1976, government-provided permanent housing (#30d) was given a somewhat positive rating (H_0 : $\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.37$, t=2.84, df=93, p<.006) but, in 1977, it was given a negative rating ($H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.21$, t=3.08, df=298, p<.002). Sports activities (#30e) received a moderately positive rating in 1976 (H_0 :u=0; \bar{x} =.67, t=8.71, df=198, p<.001), which showed a significant drop in 1977 but was still somewhat positive $(H_0;\mu=0;$ \bar{x} =.20, t=4.06, df=582, p<.001). On the other hand, off-duty activities (#30f) received slightly positive ratings in 1975 (H_0 : $\mu=0$; \bar{x} =.23, t=2.90, df=207, p<.004) and 1976 (H₀: μ =0; \bar{x} =.34, t=4.05, df=199, p<.001), but received a rating not significantly different from "borderline" in 1977. Similarly, satisfaction with military police (30q) fell from a somewhat positive rating in 1976 ($H_0: \mu=0$; \bar{x} =.32, t=3.89, df=187, p<.001) to a "borderline" rating in 1977.

Responses to other questions showed no change over time. For example, satisfaction with the barracks (#30c) received average "borderline" ratings in 1976 and 1977, and satisfaction with the on-post transportation system for off-duty soldiers (#30g) received negative ratings in 1975 (H_0 : $\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=-.24$, t=2.67, df=164, p<.008),1976 (H₀: μ =0; \bar{x} =-.23, t=2.38, df=153, p<.02) and in 1977 (H₀: μ =0; \bar{x} =-.43, t=7.89, df=511, p<.001). Satisfaction with medical services also remained relatively constant across time. The hospital emergency room service (#30h) received slightly negative ratings in 1975 (H₀: μ =0; \bar{x} =-.27, t=1.94, df=88, p<.056), 1976 (H₀: μ =0; \bar{x} =-.24, t=1.90, df=135, p<.059) and in 1977 ($H_0:\mu=0$; x=-.29, t=4.72, df=462, p<.001). Medical services for soldiers (#30i) received "borderline" ratings in 1975 and 1976, although the average rating in 1977 was slightly negative ($H_0:\mu=0; \bar{x}=-.18, t=3.66, df=562, p<.001$). Medical services for dependents (#30j) was rated negatively in 1975 ($H_0:\mu=0$; \bar{x} =-.41, t=2.57, df=68, p<.01) and 1977 (H₀: μ =0; \bar{x} =-.15, t=2.21,

TABLE 7

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Scale					<u>1975</u>	1976	1977
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30a.	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the <u>quality</u> of mess hall food? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean S.D. N	=	+ 50 1.24 200	+ +22 1.25 198	*02** 1.11 608
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30b.	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the <u>quantity</u> of mess hall food? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Unsatisfied. e. Very unsatisfied.	Mean S.D. N	=	+ 32 1.25 203	*02 1.21 196	+ .10 ** 1.10 607
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30c.	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the barracks? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean S.D. N	=		.06 1.41 182	01 1.25 592
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30d.	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with government-provide permanent housing for families? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.		=		+ .37 1.27 94	t 21** 1.16 299

ļ

⁺ Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05). ^{*} Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05). ^{**} Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05). (Table 7 con't.)

Scale		1975	1976	1977
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 30e. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with sports activities? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	Mean = S.D. = N	+ .67 1.08 199	+ * .20 1.20 583
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30f. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with off-duty activitie (besides sports activities)? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	s Mean = .23 S.D. = 1.15 N = 208	+ .34 1.17 200	*06** 1.20 556
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30g. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the transportation system for off-duty soldiers? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	t Mean =24 S.D. = 1.16 N = 165	+ 23 1.22 154	+ 43 1.23 512
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 30h. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the hospital emergency room service? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	t Mean =27 S.D. = 1.31 N = 89	+ 24 1.44 136	† 29 1.34 463

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).
* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).
** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).

(Table 7 con't.)

i

i

Scale		<u>1975</u>	1976	<u>1977</u>
30 +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 i. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with medical services for soldiers? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	Mean =01 S.D. = 1.21 N = 138	08 1.32 178	+ 18 1.18 563
30, +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 j. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with medical services for dependents? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	+ Mean =41 S.D. = 1.31 N = 69	12 1.44 91	+ 15 1.28 347
301 +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 k. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with dental services for soldiers? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	t Mean = .45 S.D. = 1.18 N = 107	+ .34 1.23 151	+ .35 1.18 485
30: +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with dental services for dependents? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	Mean =24 S.D. = 1.35 N = 45	.15 1.33 65	.14 1.20 279

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

(Table 7 con't.)

İ

ţ

معر مربع

<u>Scale</u>			1975	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	30m. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the education program for earning a high school diploma? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean S.D. N			+ .53 1.25 372
+2 +1 0	 30n. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the education program for earning a college degree? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. 	Mean S.D.			06 1.36
-1 -2	d. Dissatisfied.e. Very dissatisfied.300. How satisfied or dissatisffied	N	=		439
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	are you with legal services? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean S.D. N			+ .25 1.16 427
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 30q. How satisifed or dissatisfied are you with the performance of military police? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	Mean S.D. N		+ .32 1.14 188	* .04 1.17 560

* Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05). * Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).
df=346, p<.03) and "borderline" in 1976. Dental services for soldiers (#30k) were rated positively in 1975 ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\bar{x}=.45$, t=3.92, df=106, p>.001), 1976 ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$, $\bar{x}=-.34$, t=3.38, df=150, p<.001), and 1977 ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\bar{x}=-.35$, t=6.55, df=484, p<.001), while dental services for dependents (#301) were given average ratings not significantly different from "borderline" during each of those years.

The remaining three questions shown in Table 7 were included only in the 1977 questionnaire administration. Average results to those questions showed moderate satisfaction with the education program for earning a high school diploma (#30m; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.53, t=8.15, df=371,$ p<.001), and with legal services (#300; $H_0: \mathcal{M}=0; \bar{x}=.25, t=4.48,$ df=426, p<.001), but the average response toward satisfaction with the education program toward earning a college degree (#30n) was not significantly different from "borderline."

In summary, it appears that while satisfaction with mess hall food improved over time, satisfaction with other facilities and services either remained the same or declined, with the most consistent dissatisfaction appearing to be with the transportation system for off-duty soldiers. Dissatisfaction with medical services, however, is also noteworthy since, with the exception of dental services for soldiers, medical and dental services consistently received average ratings of "borderline" or lower.

Satisfaction with Unit

Responses to questions concerning soldiers' satisfaction with their units are summarized in Table 8. It can be seen that ratings generally improved over time for those questions which appeared in all three years of the survey. For instance, ratings of the standards of military courtesy in the unit (#39) rose significantly (F=6.42, df=2,1065, p<.002) from a slightly positive rating in 1975 (H₀: \mathcal{M} =0, \bar{x} =.19, t=2.57, df=213, p<.01) to a moderately positive rating in 1977 (H₀: \mathcal{M} =0; \bar{x} =.46, t=11.39, df=648, p<.001). Similarly, ratings of standards of discipline in the unit (#41) changed significantly (F=2.96, df=2,1057, p<.052) from a moderately positive rating in 1975 (H₀: \mathcal{M} =0; \bar{x} =.34, t=4.29, df=213, p<.001) to an even more positive rating in 1977 (H₀: \mathcal{M} =0; \bar{x} =.55, t=13.05, df=643, p<.001). In both cases, the trend of the ratings was in the direction of what soldiers in 1977 thought the standards of military courtesy (#40) and military discipline (#42) should be.

A slightly different picture emerged from the question concerning harassment of soldiers (#43). Here, again, there is a significant change across time (F=3.59, df=2,1055, p<.03), but it involves a change from an average negative response (\bar{x} =-.44) in 1975 to a less negative response (\bar{x} =-.16) in 1976 back to a more negative response (\bar{x} =-.36) in 1977. Thus, the improvement that appeared in 1976 was lost in 1977.

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO SATISFACTION WITH UNIT

ţ

.- - -

Scale				1975	1976	<u>1977</u>
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	39.	In my unit the standards of military courtesy are: a. Very high. b. High. c. Borderline. d. Low. e. Very low.	Mean : S.D. N :		+ .28 1.09 205	† * .46** 1.04 649
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	40.	I feel that the standards of military courtesy in my unit should be: a. Very high. b. High. c. Borderline. d. Low. e. Very low.	Mean S.D. N			+ .95 .91 646
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	41.	In my unit the standards of discipline are: a. Very high. b. High. c. Borderline. d. Low. e. Very low.	Mean S.D. N	••	t .50 1.13 202	+ .55 ** 1.08 644
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	42.	I feel that the standards of discipline in my unit should be: a. Very high. b. High. c. Borderline. d. Low. e. Very low.	Mean S.D. N			+ .83 .92 643

[†] Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05). ** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).

30

(Table 8 con't.)

1

i

Scale		<u>1975</u>	1976	<u>1977</u>
43. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 In my unit there is: a. No harrassment of soldiers. b. Very little harassment. c. Some harassment of soldiers. d. Much harassment of soldiers. e. Almost continual harassment of soldiers. 	† Mean =44 S.D. = 1.19 N = 210	+ *16 1.02 202	+ *36 1.09 646
44. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	During my assignment at Fort Hood my morale has usually been: a. Very high. b. High. c. Borderline. d. Low. e. Very low.	Mean = S.D. = N =		+ 16 1.15 647
45. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	The morale of the soldiers in my unit usually is: a. Very high. b. High. c. Borderline. d. Low. e. Very low.	Mean = S.D. = N =		+ 36 1.00 639
30r. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 How atisfied or dissatisfied are you with leave policies? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied. 	Mcan = S.D. = N =	+ .45 1.15 194	+ * .26 1.23 630

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05). * Statistically significant difference between $aa_Jac \cdot nt$ means (p<.05). Satisfaction with unit leave policies (#30r) also declined significantly in 1977 (F=3.97, df=1,822, p<.05) from a moderately positive response in 1976 ($H_0: \mu=0; \bar{x}=.45, t=5.48, df=193, p<.001$) to a slightly positive response in 1977 ($H_0: \mu=0; \bar{x}=.26, t=5.22, df=629, p<.001$).

Two other questions relevant to satisfaction with the unit concerned individual and unit morale. These questions were asked only in .977, and ratings to both of them were in the negative direction. The average response to the question concerning the level of a soldier's own morale (#44) was slightly negative $(H_0: \mu = 0; \bar{x} = -.16, t = 3.66, df = 646, p < .001)$ and the average response to the question concerning a soldier's estimate of his unit's morale was moderately negative $(H_0: \mu = 0; \bar{x} = -.36, t = 9.02, df = 638, p < .001)$.

Thus, changes over time concerning soldier satisfaction with his unit produced mixed results. Trends in standards of military courtesy and discipline were positive, whereas trends in the degree of harassment reportedly experienced by soldiers and trends in satisfaction with unit level policies were negative.

Satisfaction with Fort Hood

The results to questions about satisfaction with life at Fort Hood per se are shown in Table 9. These questions focused primarily on two areas: theft and treatment of minority groups.

With respect to the theft questions (#46 and #47), it can be seen that the frequency with which individuals reported being a victim of theft increased in 1977 compared to the previous two years (X^2 =8.02, df=2, p<.02). In 1975 and 1976, about half of the respondents reported being the victim of theft while stationed at Fort Hood, but in 1977 this proportion reached 58%. Additionally, the number of times that individuals were victims of theft significantly increased in 1977 compared to the preceding years. Further analysis reveals that, in 1976 and 1977, a greater proportion of victims of theft lived in the barracks than in other types of housing. Chi-square tests showed that in 1976 the proportion of individuals who lived in barracks and reported theft (54.8%) was greater than the proportion of soldiers who lived in other types of housing and reported theft (36.4%). Analogous figures of 60.5% and 51.0%, respectively, were found for 1977. Both of these differences were significant at the 0.01 level of probability.

With respect to treatment of minority groups, respondents indicated that treatment of minority ethnic groups at Fort Hood compared to civilian life (#48) was slightly better in 1976 ($H_0: \mu=0; \bar{x}=.28,$ t=3.11, df=173, p<.002) and in 1977 ($H_0: \mu=0; \bar{x}=.15,$ t=2.96, df=543, p<.003). There was no significant change in average reponse over time. When asked about the contribution to racial harmony of the racial

...

.

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO SATISFACTION WITH FORT HOOD

			1975		1976		1977
		N	9/2	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
46.	Have you ever had any of your personal property or money stolen from you at Fort Hood? a. Yes. b. No.	106 108	49.5 50.5			375 270	58.1 41.9
		_		-			
47.	If yes, how many times? a. One time. b. Two times. c. Three times. d. Four times. e. Five times. f. More than five times.	31 37 18 2 3 1	33.7 40.2 19.6 2.2 3.3 1.1	56 18 11 4 2 6	18.6 11.3 4.1 2.1	152 124 65 23 4 36	37.6 30.7 16.1 5.7 1.0 8.9
	Mean	=	2.0		1.9	* 2	.3
Scal	<u>e</u>				<u>1975</u>	1976	<u>1977</u>
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	 48. Compared to civilian treatment of minorit ethnic groups at For a. Much better. b. Better. c. No different. d. Worse. e. Much worse. 	у	od is: M	1ean = S.D. = I =	.05 1.14 194	+ .28 1.20 175	+ .15 1.17 544
+2 +1 0 -1 -2	49. In my unit, racial p are handled by my le a. In a very fair ma b. In a fair manner. c. With borderline f d. In an unfair mann e. In a very unfair	aders nner airne er.	s: Ss. S N	lean = S.D. = I =			+ .36 1.15 618

⁺ Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05). ^{*} Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).

· . ?

and services number of

(Table 9 con't.)

Scale			1975	1976	1977
50.	Is your unit still conducting the monthly two-hour racial aware- ness program seminars (RAPS)?				
	a. Yes.	N =			220
		% =			34.6
	b. No.	N =			269
		% =			42.3
	c. Don't know.	N =			147
		% =			23.1

Scale

ł

+2 +1 0 -1	50a.	 If so, do you feel that the RAPS: a. Contribute greatly to racial harmony. b. Contribute to racial harmony. c. Have no effect on racial harmony. d. Contribute to racial disharmony. 	t Mean =16 S.D. = 1.12 N = 176	06 .09 ** .85 .98 153 402
-2		e. Contribute greatly to racial disharmony.		
	51.	Does your company now participate in a quarterly "People with People Day" or an "Up with People Day" to foster better race relations? a. Yes.	N = % =	1 17 18, 3
		b. No.	z= N= Z=	18.3 320 50.1
		c. Don't know.	N = % =	202 31.6

.

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).
** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).</pre>

(Table 9 con't.)

Scale				<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1</u> 9 <u>77</u>
	51a.	If so, do you feel that the "People with People Day":				
+2		a. Contributes greatly to racial harmony.				
+1		b. Contributes to racial harmony.	Mean	=		+ .29
0		c. Has no effect on racial harmony.	S.D. N	=		1.02
-1		d. Contributes to racial disharmony.				
-2		e. Contributes greatly to racial disharmony.				
	52.	The manner in which female military personnel are assigned to jobs at Fort Hood is:				
+2		a. Very satisfactory.		+	+	
+1		b. Satisfactory.	Mean	29	.43	* .05**
0		c. Borderline in satisfactoriness,	S.D. N	= 1.14 = 178	1.08 155	1.23 419
-1		d. Unsatisfactory.				
-2		e. Very unsatisfactory.				
+2	53.	I feel that female soldiers are shown the proper amount of consideration by male soldiers at Fort Hood: a. Almost all the time.				+
+2		b. Most of the time.	Mean	=		.33
0		c. About half of the time.	S.D.			1.15
-1 -2		d. Not very much of the time.e. Almost never.	N	=		638

t Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).
* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).
** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).

(Table 9	con't.)					
Scale				<u>1975</u>	1976	<u>1977</u>
54. +2	Since being at Fort Hood my opinion of the Army: a. Has become much more favorable.					
+1	b. Has become more favorable.			+ 88	+ 70	+
0	c. Has not changed.	S.D.	=	1.04	1.09	1.12
-1 -2	d. Has become less favorable. e. Has become much less favorable.	N	=	213	203	645

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

awareness program seminars (RAPS) (#50a), which were phased out in 1975 and 1976 and replaced with the "People with People Day" program, soldiers' responses in 1975 were slightly negative ($H_0: \mu=0; \bar{x}=-16,$ t=1.89, df=175, p<.06) but in 1976 and 1977 were not significantly different from 0. Thus, over time ratings of the RAPS gradually improved (F=4.26, df=2.728, p<.01) to the point where they were considered to have no effect on racial harmony one way or the other. In comparison, the ratings in 1977 of the newly instituted "People with People Day" program (#51a) were significantly positive ($H_0: \mu=0;$ $\bar{x}=.29, t=4.15, df=211, p<.001$), indicating a slight contribution to racial harmony in the opinion of the respondents overall. It should be noted, however, that in 1977 only 18.3% of the respondents reported having participated in such programs (#51).

One question which was asked only in 1977 concerned how well racial problems were handled by unit leaders (#49). Average responses to this question were rather positive ($H_0: \mathcal{L}=0; \bar{x}=.36, t=7.75, df=617, p<.001$) indicating that soldiers generally felt that unit leaders handled racial problems in a somewhat fair manner.

With respect to satisfaction with the manner in which female military personnel are assigned jobs at Fort Hood (#52), there was a significant change in the negative direction between 1975 and 1977 (F=6.64, df=2.749, p<.001). Average ratings were significantly positive in 1975 (H₀: M=0; \bar{x} =.29, t=3.37, df=177, p<.001) and in 1976 (H₀: M=0; \bar{x} =.43, t=4.93, df=154, p<.001), but were not significantly different from "borderline" in 1977. In 1977, soldiers were also asked how often female soldiers were shown proper consideration by male soldiers at Fort Hood (#53). Average responses to this question were significantly positive (H₀: M=0; \bar{x} =.33, t=7.21, df=637, p<.001).

Finally, when soldiers were asked how their opinion of the Army has changed since being at Fort Hood (#54), they gave average ratings in the direction of "less favorable" in 1975 ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\overline{x}=.88$, t=12.33, df=212, p<.001), in 1976 ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\overline{x}=.70$, t=9.17, df=202, p<.001), and in 1977 ($H_0: \mathcal{M}=0$; $\overline{x}=.77$, t=17.35, df=644, p<.001). There was no change in these ratings over time.

In summary, one can say that while the theft rate and the utilization of female military personnel showed a general negative trend between 1975 and 1977, the handling of racial problems improved somewhat. The average response to the question concerning changes in opinion of the Army since arriving at Fort Hood was essentially the same during all years of the survey, namely, in the direction of less favorable.

Satisfaction with the Army

Those questions which were concerned with soldier satisfaction with the Army in general are shown in Table 10. Only four of the

•

ITEMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS PERTAINING TO SATISFACTION WITH THE ARMY

Scale					1977
	55.	Being a soldier in the U.S. Army makes me:			
+2		a. Very proud.			t
+1		b. Proud.	Mean		.44
0		c. Neither proud nor	S.D.		.95
		ashamed.	N	=	651
-1		d. Ashamed.			
-2		e. Very ashamed.			
	56.	I think the picture of the			
		Army presented by the			
		popular news media is:			
+2		a. Almost always a fair one.			
+1		b. Usually a fair one.	Mean		.08
0		c. About as often fair as	S.D.		1.05
		unfair.	N	=	638
-1		d. Usually an unfair one.			
-2		e. Almost always an unfair one.			
	57.	Compared to jobs in which I			
		could work in civilian life, the Army is:			
+2		a. Much better.			+
+1		b. Better.	Mean	=	49
0		c. About the same.	S.D.	=	1.14
-1		d. Worse.	N	=	642
-2		e. Much worse.			
	58.	The Army is:			
+2		a. Very important to the			
		defense of our country.			
+1		b. Important to the			+
		defense of our country.	Mean	z	1.53
0		c. Of borderline importance	S.D	=	.81
		to the defense of our	N	=	650
		country.			
-1		d. Unimportant to the defense of our country.			
-2		e. Very unimportant to the			
-		defense of our country.			
• • •			,		

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05)</pre>

(Table 10 con't.)

1

Scale				<u>1975</u>	1976	<u>1977</u>
59. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 The Army is: a. Very concerned with me as an individual soldier. b. Concerned with me as an individual soldier. c. Borderline in it's concern with me as an individual soldier. d. Unconcerned with me as an individual soldier. e. Very unconcerned with me as an individual soldier. 	Mean S.D. N				+ 14 1.19 648
60. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	Army hair length policies are: a. Much too restrictive. b. Too restrictive. c. Just about right. d. Too liberal. e. Much too liberal.	Mean S.D. N				+ .89 1.17 650
61. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	<pre>In general, I think the Army is run: a. Very competently. b. Competently. c. With borderline competence. d. Incompetently. e. Very incompetently.</pre>	Mean S.D. N				01 1.06 648
62. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 When I came on active duty, I was: a. Strongly considering making the Army a career. b. Considering making the Army a career. c. Borderline. d. Opposed to making the Army a career. e. Strongly opposed to making the Army a career. 	Mean S.D. N	Ξ	+ .63 1.24 209	+ .82 1.10 205	t .70 1.18 648

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

(Table 10 con't.)

•

٩

<u>Scale</u>			1975	1976	<u>1977</u>
+2 +1	63.	I am now: a. Strongly considering making the Army a career. b. Considering making the	t	†	t
		Army a career.	Mean = 74	82	76
0		c. Borderline.	S.D. = 1.29	1.13	1.18
-1		d. Opposed to making the Army a career.	N = 209	202	652
-2		e. Strongly opposed to making the Army a career.			
	64.	Would you recommend to a civilian friend of yours that he enlist in the Army?			
+2		a. Yes. Strongly recommend that he enlist.			
+1		b. Yes. Recommend that he enlist.	† Mean =56	+ 53	+ 59
0		c. Borderline.	S.D. = 1.26	1.21	1.24
-1		d. No. Recommend that he not enlist.	N = 211	200	643
- 2		e. No. Strongly recommend that he not enlist.			
	30p.	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the opportunity for promotion?			
+2		a. Very satisfied.	†		+
+1		b. Satisfied.	Mean =25	14	22
0		c. Borderline.	S.D. = 1.21	1.26	1.25
-1		d. Dissatisfied.	N = 194	194	619
-2		e. Very dissatisfied.			

† Mean is significantly different from 0 (p<.05).

questions were presented to respondents in all three years in which the survey was administered. Average responses to each of those questions did not differ from year to year. In all three years, soldiers gave a somewhat positive response to the question as to whether or not they were considering making the Army a career when they first came on active duty (#62; $H_0:\mu=0$; all \bar{x} 's >.63, all t's > 7.35, all df's > 204, p<.001). However they consistently gave significantly negative responses to questions concerning whether or not they were currently considering making the Army a career (#63; $H_0:\mu=0$; all \bar{x} 's < -.74, all t's > 8.34, all df's > 201, p<.001) and whether or not they would recommend to a civilian friend that he enlist in the Army (#64: $H_0:\mu=0$; all \bar{x} 's < -.53, all t's > 6.19, all df's > 199. p(.001). Additionally, soldiers indicated dissatisfaction with the opportunity for promotion (#30p) in both 1975 ($H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=-.25$, t=2.90, df=193, p<.004) and 1977 ($H_0:\mu=0$; \bar{x} =-.22, t=4.28, df=618, p<.001).

The remaining questions in Table 10 were asked only in the 1977 survey and were added to obtain further clarification of why soldiers in previous years had generally expressed negative attitudes toward making a career of the Army. The results are rather revealing. It can be seen that respondents gave a very positive response to the question concerning how important the Army is to the defense of the country (#58; $H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=1.53$, t=48.06, df=649, p<.001). In fact, the average response to this question was the most positive of all responses to questions in the survey. In addition, soldiers gave a positive response ($H_0: \mu=0; \bar{x}=.44, t=11.88, df=650, p<.001$) to the question of how proud they were to be in the Army (#55). However, other questions revealed that soldiers do not necessarily think that they are treated as well as they might be. For example, respondents indicated that their jobs in the Army were somewhat worse than those jobs which they could obtain in civilian life (#57; $H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=-.49$, t=10.93, df=641, p<.001). Furthermore, they felt that the Army was somewhat unconcerned with them as individual soldiers (#59, H_0 , $\mu=0$; \bar{x} =-.14, t=3.00, df=647, p<.003), that the Army hair length policies were too restrictive (#60; $H_0:\mu=0$; $\bar{x}=.89$, t=4.58, df=649, p<.001), and that the Army was run with borderline competence (#61). Finally, they indicated that the picture of the Army presented by the popular news media (#56) was about as often fair as unfair. In summary, although they felt that the Army is important to the defense of the country and they were proud to be a part of it, they felt that it had several serious shortcomings and they were not as interested in being a part of it careerwise as they were when they first entered military service.

Ethnic/Sex Comparisons

In the course of briefing commanders about the results of the quality of life survey, various commanders expressed an interest not

only in the overall results, but also in any differences that might have appeared between ethnic groups in terms of their attitudes toward the various topics touched on in the survey. Consequently, analyses of the questionnaire results were conducted for the purpose of comparing the responses of whites, blacks, and all other minority ethnic groups as a whole. Ideally, comparisons would have been made across all ethnic groups, but the sample size from minority groups other than blacks was too small to permit meaningful statistical comparisons, and so these groups were treated as a single group labelled "other".

The results are shown in Table 11. Only those questions showing statistically significant differences are shown (all results were tested at alpha=.05, using Kramer's extension of Duncan's New Multiple Range test for unequal sample sizes.⁴ Perusal of this table reveals that no particular topic showed differences between ethnic groups across all three years of the QOL survey. However, there were some differences that appeared during two of the years during which the survey was administered. For example, in the area of training, blacks appeared more satisfied with the challenge of training (#1) than whites in both 1975 and 1977. On the other hand, they did not appear to be as satisfied with the chain of command. For instance, in 1977 blacks gave a significantly lower rating to their commander's "open door" policy (#11) than did whites. They also gave lower ratings to officers' understanding of their men's needs than did either whites or other minority groups, with the difference between blacks and whites also appearing in 1976. Also, in 1977, whites reported talking with their platoon sergeants (#85b) significantly more times per month than did blacks and other minority groups, and whites reported talking to their First Sergeants (#87b) more often than did other minority groups.

With respect to satisfaction with facilities and services, blacks expressed significantly more satisfaction with medical care for dependents (#30j) than did whites and other minority groups in both 1975 and 1977. They also expressed more satisfaction with dental services for soldiers (#30k) than did whites in 1975, and showed significantly more satisfaction with dental care for dependents (#301) than did whites and other minority groups in both 1975 and 1976.

In contrast to the above results on facilities and services, it was found that in 1977 blacks reported significantly more harassment of soldiers (#43) than did other minority groups. Also, in 1975 as

⁴Kramer, C.Y. "Extension of Multiple Range Tests to Group Means with Unequal Numbers of Replications." Biometrics, 1956, 12, 307-310.

ŧ

į

•

į

1

5

....

į

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR QUESTIONS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ACROSS ETHNIC GROUPS (W = white, B = black, 0 = other minorities)

ance, kove ance, kove kove, kove kove, kove kove, kove kove, kove kove, kove kove, kove kove, kove kove, kove, kove, kove kove, kove, kov	training I have sived at Fort Hood been: Very challenging. Mean = Very challenging. N = Borderline. N = Unchallenging. N = Unchallenging. N = Very unchallenging. ed on your experience trying to talk to r commander, how isfied-dissatisfied you with his en-door" performance? Very satisfied. Nean = Borderline. S.D. =
od . Mean S.D. N = ied ance? N.B. N = N =	od . Mean S.D. N = ied N = N = N = N = N = N = N =
	The training I received at Fo has been: a. Very challe b. Challenging c. Borderline. d. Unchallenging e. Very unchal e. Very unchal e. Very unchal fin trying to t your commander satisfied-diss are you with h "open-door" pe a. Very satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied.

* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p< 0.05)

t.)
con
:
(Table

ï

			1975			1976			1977		
Scale		3	- - -	01	31	- <u>m</u>	01	3	Ξ Δ	01	
i.	15. Most officers in my unit are:										
42	a. Very understanding of their men's										
	needs.				•53		. 19	.35	-	• 36	
.	<pre>b. Understanding of S.D their men's needs N =</pre>	11			1.13 115	1.16 57	31.11	1.00 324	1.14 179	1.22 135	
0	:)				
ī	d. Nonunderstanding of										
	their men's needs.										
2-2	e. Very nonunderstanding of their mosts										
	or them real s										
	needs.										
۸											
30	30j. How satisfied or dissatisfied										
	are you with medical										
	services for dependents?										
¥	a. Very satisfied.										
÷			* •39 *	90				36	* .25	* 26	
Э	c. Borderline. S.D. =			1.45				1.27	1.20	1.32	
-	d. Dissatisfied. N =	36		10				165	101	78	
ጉ	e. Very dissatisfied.										

 $^{\bullet}$ Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).

(Table 11 con't.)	con't.)			1975			1976	10		-
Scale			3]	m	0	3	ΩI	01	3	
30k. 12 - 1 - 0 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with dental services for soldiers? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean = S.D. = N =	.16 1.38 50	* .76 .85 42	.43 1.09 14					
-10 6 45 45	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with dental services for dependents? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean = S.D. = N =	-1.00 1.26 20	* .57 1.03 21	* - 75 - 96	16 1.32 37	* 1.00 .84 18	* - 20 10.48		

* Statistically significant difference betwen adjacent means (p<.05).

,

1

٠ ï

.

- -

1977 m

(Table	(Table 11 con't.)			1075			1076			1077	
Scale			3		0	31	о - а)	01	3	- <u>-</u>	01
≠ + +	<pre>43. In my unit, there is: a. No harassment of soldiers.</pre>										
- 0	b. Very little harrass ment of soldiers. c. Some harassment.								37	51 1.09	* 16 1.23
ī	d. Much harassment of soldiers.								323	181	
5 1	e. Almost continual harassment of soldiers.										
≠ 46 7	48. Compared to civilian life, treatment of minority ethnic groups at Fort Hood is:	life, ethnic s:									
; - - c	b. Better.	ean = C	.35	* - 25 - 03	* * * * * * * *				.39	* 17	16** 1 11
γīγ	d. Worse. Networse.		97		32				262	161	116
;											

1

.

* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05). ** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).

con't.)	
Table 11	

01	.16 1.27 95		51** 1.17 134
μ	* .26 1.16 122		*68 1.13 181
3	13 1.24 195		91 1.20 327
01			
[[]			
M			
B			
31			
	Mean = S.D. = N =	ളറ	Mean = S.D. = S.D. = (he state)
	The manner in which female military personnel are assigned to jobs at Fort Hood is: a. Very satisfactory. b. Satisfactory. c. Borderline. d. Unsatisfactory e. Very unsatisfactory.	ч. а.	 b. Considering making the Considering making the taken. c. borderline. d. Opposed to making the Army a career. e. Strongly opposed to making the Army a career.
Scale	52. 57-07-57	€9 47 ♀	

* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05).</p>
** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).</p>

c

1977

1976

1975

ļ

ł

ż

(Table 1	(Table 11 con't.)			1075			1976			1977	
Scale			3	- - - -	0	31	<u>م</u> ا	0	3	- ml	сI
64. +2 +1	Wou tha c the a.										
	he enlist. c. Borderline. d. No. Recommend that he not enlist. e. No. Strongly recommend that he not enlist.	Mean = S.D. = N =								* 34 1.22 180	40** 1.28 135
48											
83.	The average number of hours that I spend on my job <u>per week</u> is:	Mean = S.D. = N =	47.0 12.9 107	44.1 12.6 64	39.3 ** 13.2 34						
84. Statist	 84. The average number of hours of meaningful Mean = work that I do on S.D. = my job per week is: N = Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05). 	ours Mean = S.D. = N = rence be	tween ad	jacent mes	ans (p<.05)				25.9 16.9 325	* 31.2 20.8 ~0	31.0 ** 22.5 134

. ŝ

_

****** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 (p<.05).

(Table 11 con't.)	con't.)			1975	I	:	1976		:	1977	Ċ
Scale			3	œ۱	01	31	m I	01	31	Ξ	01
85b.	On the average, how many days a month do you talk with your platoon sergeant?	Mean = S.D. = N =							17.7 8.36 325	* 15.8 9.8 180	15.3 ** 9.7 136
87b.	87b. On the average, how many days a month do you talk with your First Sergeant?	Mean = S.D. = N =							9.5 8.4 325	8.7 8.5 180	7.3 ** 8.1 136
* Statist ** Statis	* Statistically significant difference between adjacent means (p<.05). ** Statistically significant difference between 1975 and 1977 means (p<.05).	erence betwe ference betw	en adjac een 1975	ent means and 1977	(p<.05). means (p						

, :

. ...

well as in 1977, blacks and other minority groups reported less satisfaction with the treatment of minority ethnic groups at Fort Hood compared to civilian life (#48) than did whites. On the other hand, in 1977 blacks reported more satisfaction than whites with the manner in which females were assigned jobs at Fort Hood (#52).

In the area of job satisfaction, whites in 1975 reported spending significantly more hours on the job each week (#83) than did minority groups other than blacks, and in 1977 reported spending fewer hours per week in meaningful work (#84) than did blacks and other minority groups.

Finally, questions which gave a measure of overall satisfaction with the Army showed whites significantly less satisfied in 1977 than blacks and other minority groups. This result appeared with the question concerning intent to make the Army a career (#63) and with the question concerning whether or not one would recommend to a civilian friend that he enlist in the Army (#64).

In summary, it appears that while there were no consistent differences between various ethnic groups across all three years in which the QOL survey was administered, there were several differences that appeared during several years of the survey which gave some indication of ethnic differences in attitude. Blacks generally seemed to be more satisfied with medical and dental services than were other minority groups and whites. They appeared to be more satisfied with the challenge of training than were whites, and were more likely to make the Army a career and recommend to friends that they enlist than were other minority groups and whites. On the other hand, blacks and other minority groups were less satisfied than whites with the treatment of minority ethnic groups at Fort Hood, and some interactions with the chain of command were more satisfactory for whites than for blacks.

In addition to comparisons among ethnic groups, commanders expressed an interest in any differences that appeared between sex groups. Such comparisons were only possible with data from the 1977 survey because of the small sample size of females in the 1975 and 1976 surveys. The results are shown in Table 12.

It can be seen that there were actually very few differences between males and females. Females were significantly less satisfied with the training they had received at Fort Hood (#2) and with medical services for soldiers (#30). On the other hand, their opinion of the Army since coming to Fort Hood (#54) had not become as unfavorable as the males, and they were less opposed to making the Army a career (#63) than were males. Female soldiers also reported spending less time on the job each week (#83) than did male soldiers,

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR QUESTIONS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SEX GROUPS FOR 1977 DATA (p<.05)

Scale			Male	Female
2. +2 +1 0		Mean =	.24	13
-1 -2	preparing me to work in my MOS. d. Unuseful in preparing me to work in my MOS. e. Very unuseful in preparing me to work in my MO°.	S.D. = N =	1.16 548	1.29 45
30i. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with medical services for soldiers? a. Very satisfied. b. Satisfied. c. Borderline. d. Dissatisfied. e. Very dissatisfied.	Mean = S.D. = N =	16 1.18 465	58 1.10 45
54. +2	Since being at Fort Hood my opinion of the Army: a. Has become much more favorable.			
+1 0 -1 -2	 b. Has become more favorable. c. Has not changed. d. Has become less favorable. e. Has become much less favorable. 	S.D. =	82 1.11 540	44 1.13 46

(Table 1 <u>Scale</u>	2 con't.)		Male	Female
63. +2 +1 0 -1 -2	 I am now: a. Strongly considering making the Army a career. b. Considering making the Army a career. c. Borderline. d. Opposed to making the Army a career. e. Strongly opposed to making the Army a career. 	Mean = S.D. = N =	84 1.18 549	44 1.11 46
83.	The average number of hours that I spend on my job <u>per week</u> is:	Mean = S.D. = N =		38.3 18.3 46
89b.	On the average, on how many day a month do you talk to your battalion command sergeant major?	Mean =	1.7 4.2 546	3.4 7.4 45
90b.	On the average, on how many days a month do you talk to your battalion commander?	Mean = S.D. = N =	=	2.2 5.9 45

ł

1

and they reported talking with their battalion command sergeant majors (#89b) and battalion commanders (#90b) more times per month than their male counterparts. In summary, though women soldiers were more dissatisfied than male soldiers with respect to two specific issues, they appeared somewhat more satisfied with the Army overall than male soldiers.

Variables Associated with Career Intentions

As mentioned in the Introduction, one of the primary purposes of the QOL Survey was to identify areas of soldier discontent so that commanders could work on such areas and attempt to alleviate the problems associated with them, and thus get more soldiers to enlist for a second or third term in the Army. Toward this end, the responses to the various questions listed in the survey were correlated (Pearson's product-moment) with the responses to the question concerning intent to make the Army a career (#63). Those questions which were significantly correlated with stated intent to make the Army a career (p<.05, two-tailed test) and had coefficients equal to or greater than +.20 for two or more years are listed in Table 13.

It can be seen that there were six questions which were significantly correlated with intent to reenlist in the Army during all three years that the survey was administered. These included four questions which, although statistically significant, each only accounted for between four to fourteen percent of the variance in the "intent to make the Army a career" question on any given year. These questions included the challenge of training (#1), the usefulness of training (#2), how suited a soldier felt he was for his job (#22). and amount of harassment experienced (#43). The other two questions were not only significant, but also accounted for substantially more of the variance than the previous four. The correlation coefficients for them ranged from +.48 to +.63 and each question accounted for from 23 to 40 percent of the variance in the career intent question on any given year. These latter two questions included changes in the opinion of the Army since coming to Fort Hood (#54) and the extent to which one would recommend to a friend that he enlist in the Army (#64).

Finally, there were four questions which were significant during just two of the three years of the survey. These included NCO understanding of their men's needs (#16), job satisfaction (#28), satisfaction with off-duty activities (#30f), and treatment of minority groups (#48). These correlations ranged from +.20 to +.35 and accounted for from four to twelve percent of the variance in any given year.

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS APPEARING IN AT LEAST TWO OF THE THREE YEARS OF THE QOL SURVEY (Predictor variables are listed; predicted variable is intent to make

the Army a career, viz #68).

1975 1976 1977 Question# +.26 +.27 +.29 1 (Training Challenge) +.21 2 (Training Usefulness) +.20 +.21 (NCO Understanding) 16 +.20 +.23 (Job Suitability) +.21 22 +.21 +.23 +.34 (Job Satisfaction) +.35 28 30f (Off-duty Activities) +.25 +.25 43 (Harassment) +.38 +.34 +.28 48 (Minority Group Treatment) +.27 +.23 +.48 54 (Opinion Army since Fort Hood) +.60 +.60 64 (Recommend Army to Friend) +.58 +.63 +.53

In order to determine how predictive of reenlistment intent the above variables would be in combination, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed using the data from the 1977 survey, for which the sample size was sufficiently large (in excess of 400) for running a valid multiple regression analysis. Questions #54 (opinion of the Army since being at Fort Hood) and #64 (recommend enlistment to a friend) were not included in this analysis because they do not directly represent content areas concerning quality of life, but rather represent opinions of a respondent which derive from attitudes he has about areas of life in the Army as represented in the other eight questions listed in Table 13. Thus the stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed only on variables 1, 2, 16, 22, 30f, 43, and 48. Again, it should be mentioned that these variables were selected because they were both statistically significant (p<.05) and greater than +.20 on two or more of the years that the survey was administered.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 14. It can be seen that 19% of the variance in responses to question #63 was accounted for by responses to just four questions in combination, viz. job satisfaction (#28), satisfaction with off-duty on-post activities (#30f), harassment (#43), and training challenge (#1). The remaining variables (#2, 16, 22, and 48) did not contribute significantly toward accounting for any additional variance in question #63 when factored into the multiple regression equation and thus are not included in Table 14.

In summary, the results indicate that those factors which are most significantly associated with a soldier's decision to make the Army a career include satisfaction with one's job, satisfaction with off-duty on-post activities, freedom from harassment, and the extent to which training is perceived as challenging.

SUMMARY TABLE OF STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR VARIABLES 1, 28, 30f, and 43 WITH #63 AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

<u>Step #</u>	Variable Entered	<u>Multiple</u> R	<u></u> <u></u> 2
1	#28 (Job Satisfaction)	• 35	. 12
2	#30f (Off duty Activities)	+.40	. 16
3.	43 (Harrassment)	+.42	. 18
4	<pre>1 (Training Challenge)</pre>	+.44	. 19

1

ŧ

CONCLUSIONS

When one peruses the preceding results, there appear to be no substantial changes in attitude over time that are particularly striking by their magnitude. Positive trends in some areas, such as increased satisfaction with training, were offset by negative trends in other areas, such as with "services." Many areas showed no change over time. Thus, the quality of life for lower-ranking enlisted personnel at Fort Hood generally remained about the same overall during 1975-1977 time frame in which the surveys were administered.

The few ethnic differences that appeared indicated that blacks were somewhat more satisfied with the Army than were whites or other ethnic groups. This was particularly indicated by the fact that they were more interested in making a career of the Army than were whites or other minority groups. A similar trend existed for females, who indicated more interest in making a career of the Army than did males.

Finally, with respect to identifying variables predictive of reenlistment, which was the major purpose of the project, it should first be noted that the measure of reenlistment in the present study was stated intention of making the Army a career. This assumes that intention to reenlist is associated with actually reenlisting when the time comes to do so. Evidence from other studies^{5,6} supports this assumption. Data from such studies show that, generally speaking, about 90% of lower-ranking enlisted soldiers expressing negative attitudes toward reenlisting do not reenlist, while about 40% of those expressing positive attitudes toward reenlisting actually reenlist.

The Alley and Gould study⁵ also showed, at least among Air Force personnel, that reenlistment intent and whether or not a soldier actually reenlisted were more closely associated with each other when the decision as to whether or not to reenlist had to be made relatively soon (within a year) versus not very soon (e.g., 2 or 3 years away). For example, of those soldiers who were in the last year

^bGoldman, Lawrence A. and Worstine, Darrell A. Survey Report: Job Satisfaction and Reenlistment Intent for First Term Personnel. U.S. Army Military Personnel Center, May 1977.

⁵Alley, William E. and Gould, R. Bruce. Feasibility of Estimating Personnel Turnover from Survey Data - A Longitudinal Study. Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, AFHRL-TR-755-54, October 1975.

of their enlistment term 62% actually reenlisted after earlier indicating that they intended to do so. Thus, the association between stated intent to reenlist and actually reenlisting appears to be of sufficient magnitude that one is justified in making decisions about what factors are most predictive of soldier reenlistment when one's only measure of reenlistment is their stated intention of whether or not they will reenlist or make a career of the Army.

With this argument in mind, it appears that the most valid course of action that commanders at Fort Hood could take, based upon the results in this report, with respect to increasing the rate at which lower ranking enlisted soldiers would reenlist with the intention of making a career of the Army would be to direct their efforts toward improving four specific aspects of soldier life, to include job satisfaction, off-duty on-post activities, reduction of harassment, and the challenge of training activities. In short, from a reenlistment perspective, soldiers want to have jobs which are satisfying to them, they want to have leisure activities which are readily accessible to them (i.e on post) during their off-duty hours, they do not want to feel harassed, and when they train they want to engage in training activities that pose a challenge to them.

It might be noted that some aspect of job satisfaction has emerged as a relatively important variable with respect to career intentions in other $\text{Army}^{7,8}$, Navy^{9} and Air Force¹⁰ studies. Thus, it would seem that this area would be a prime candidate for attention from commanders who were interested in getting their troops to reenlist and making the Army a career.

The other three areas identified in this report as having a significant effect on reenlistment do not specifically emerge in the above referenced studies as important variables (possibly because different questions were asked in each study). However, one Army

⁷Holz, Robert F. and Gitter, A. George. Assessing the Quality of Life in the U.S. Army. U.S. Army Res. Inst. for Reh. and Soc. Sci., Technical Paper 256, September 1974.

⁸See Footnote 6.

⁹Orend, Richard J., Stroad, Kenneth W., Jr., and Michaels, Marsha J. The Quality of Navy Life Inventory. Human Resources Research Organization FR-ED-77-1, Jan. 1977.

¹⁰See Footnote 5.

study¹¹ did show satisfaction with Army haircut regulations as an important predictor of reenlistment. This can be compared to the present report's finding of freedom from harassment as a significant predictor, since soldiers frequently interpret enforcement of haircut standards as a form of harassment.

The remaining two variables of training challenge and off-duty on-post activities appear unique as <u>important</u> contributors to reenlistment of lower ranking enlisted men at Fort Hood.

In conclusion, the foregoing results can be summarized as three general findings: (1) During the time frame in which the study was conducted the overall quality of life for lower ranking enlisted men at Fort Hood remained relatively constant; (2) Blacks appeared to be somewhat more satisfied with the Army than were whites or other ethnic groups; and (3) the variables most predictive of reenlistment intent were job satisfaction, satisfaction with off-duty on-post activities, perceived degree of harassment, and the challenge of training activites.

The results of this study served as the basis for construction of the survey instrument used in the Commander's Unit Analysis Profile project currently under development by the ARI Field Unit at Fort Hood. The purpose of the project is to provide a means by which a Company level commander can rapidly and easily measure soldier satisfaction with his unit, and identify specific areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

11See . potnote 7.

Appendix A

1975 Quality of LIfe Questionnaire

QUESTIONS ON SOLDIERS' ATTITUDES AND INFORMATION REGARDING TRAIMING, WORKING, AND LIVING AT FORT HOOD

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information from you regarding training, working, and living at Fort Hood. Your answers will help the Commanding General to determine what conditions are in need of improvement, and will assist him in determining the action he must take to improve the quality of life for all of us at Fort Hood.

We have no need to know who you are personally. No effort will be made to identify either you or your unit (do <u>NOT</u> write your name, SSAN or unit on the questionnaire).

(x,y) = (x,y,y)

INSTRUCTIONS



A-2

10.	What ethnic group do you consider that you belong to? A. Afro-American E. Oriental B. American Indian F. Puerto Rican C. Caucasian G. Other D. Mexican American
11.	How many years of <u>formal</u> education have you completed? A. 1-6 (grammar school) B. 7-9 (junior high) C. 10-11 (high school) E. 00 12 E. 00 1
12.	What high school diploma do you have? A. GED high school diploma B. Regular high school diploma C. Neither of them
13.	What college diploma to you have? A. 2-year college (associate) diploma B. 4-year college (bacheler) diploma C. Neither of them
14.	Do you have a post-greduade degree? A. Yes P No
15.	Are you now taking any low sets to improve your extractional or technical (malification A. Yes In If yes, please name the course(s) and the school(s):



A-4

ودا بيو مارم بيست بعد الارام

REMARKS



<u>∴</u>-5
15.	
	beer and liquor in on-post clubs?
	A. Clubs cannot sell beer and liquor until 11:00 AM
•	B. Clubs cannot sell beer and liquor until 430 PM
	C. Clubs cannot sell beer and liquor on Son as
	D. Clubs cannot sell beer and liquor to minors
	E. I don't know
16.	What reason did the CG give for he directive on beer
	and liquor sales?
	A. He said that the sale of a cholic tems should be as
	closely controlled as the sale of preservption medicine
	B. He wanted to reduce the number of minitary alcoholics
	C. He wanted the military to have more money for food.
	clothing, and shelter
	D. He wanted to reduce the number of instances of personnel
	being ineffective on their job due to the effects of beer
	and liquor
	E. All of the above
	F. None of the above
	G. I don't know
17	
17.	How many issues per weak do you usually read of the
17a.	Temple Dail Telegram
	A. None G. G.
176.	Killen Deily Vereid?
	A. None D. 3 Constant of the second s
17c	oppens Cons Press?
	A. None B. Che
\frown	
18.	How many of the weekly "Boyle Notes" have you read during
$\langle O \rangle$	the last five weeks?
	B 2
	3 "Bugle Notes" is
	D. 4 D. Mone, but I know what it is
	()
	\sim



••

21-38. If you do not read the Sentinel, skip to question 39. For each item or part of the Sentinel listed below, tell how often you read the item by checking a box (x) under the appropriate column to the left of the item. THEN, tell how much space you think should be given to each item by checking a box under the appropriate column to the right of the item.

1

. . . .

the item.				3
Usually Read Sometimes Read Never Read	~		Space 18	Eliminate Don't Know
A B C	ζ.	$\sim \sim$	A B	F F
21a. ()()()	Front page feature ar) (CC)) 216.
22a. ()()()	Unit news		, lag	
23a. ()()()	Community news		$) \bigcirc	236.
24a. ()()()	Articles on individual	sildiers	$\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{Q}$	<u>24b.</u>
25a. ()()()	Editorials (o.g., Foch			() 256.
26a. ()()()	Speaking out vetters	to Editor		() () 26b.
27a. ()()()	Scheight Tall (b) "The	Armadi No (() () 27b.
28a. ()()()	Eye Gatcher (Jeffrey)	102	SUNC)	() () 28b.
29a. ()()(Social News	22 6		() () 29t.
30a. ()())	Charel Schedule	$\gamma \sim$		() () 30b.
31a. () ()	Nothion News		\mathbf{Y} $()$ $()$ $()$	() () <u>3</u> 16.
<u>32a.</u>	Edication Information)()()()	() () <u>3</u> 2b.
33a	Consumer The from JA) () () ()	() () 335.
$3(2, \mathbf{O})) \cup \mathbf{V}$	Sport Pres	200 ·)()()()	() () 34H.
35a. ()	charge inco ans)()()()	() () <u>3</u> 56.
<u>36a. ()()()</u>	Other Adv	V ()()()()	() () <u>3</u> 6b.
37a. ()()()	Movie/Entertainment S	hedule ()()()()	() () 37b.
38a. ()()()	Recreation Services Sc	hedule ()()()()	() () <u>3</u> 8b.

39-74 At the left of each facility or service listed below please tell how often you use each. THEN, tell how satisfied-dissatisfied you are with the facility or service by checking a box (x) under the appropriate column at the right.



REMARKS

....

75. How many times have you seen the III Corps Commanding General's TV panel show "Off the Top"? D. None, but I knew of it A. 3 None, I didn't know В. Ε. 2 С. there uch a **rogra**m 1 76. What did you think of the General's TV show? A. Very good D. Β. Good £. с. Borderline F. 1t. 77. The training I have received at Formerood A. Very challenging ing challengi Β. Challenging C. Borderline as been: 78. The training I have receive 00 in my MOS A. Very useful in preparing me t<u>o</u> work MOS B. Useful in preparing per to MOS C. Of borderline value 😘 p epai to worl D. Unuseful in preparing m my MO E. Very unuseful in prep work ig 79. When I came on active of A. Strongly considering the Army mak B. Considering making th а car C. Borderline Opposed to maning the D. my a ca Greer king the Ε. Strong opposed to ALC: TO 80. I am not ng making ider Α. St Β. Cć mak g the A С. Bord ing the Arm D sed to making the e is: 81 sment of solde Inctle har ery ome harassment ch harassmeni continua

A-10



A-11

A ST MILLS .

. . . .



A-12

REMARKS



Appendix B

1976 Quality of Life Questionnaire

QUESTIONS ON SOLDIERS' ATTITUDES AND INFORMATION REGARDING TRAINING, WORKING, AND LIVING AT FORT HOOD

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information from you regarding training, working, and living conditions at Fort Hood. Your answers will help the Commanding General to determine what areas are in need of improvement, and will assist him in determining the action he must take to improve the quality of life for all of us at Fort Hood.

We have no need to know who you are personally. No effort will be made to identify either you or your unit (do <u>NOT</u> write your name, SSAN or unit on the questionnaire).

INSTRUCTIONS





PART II





B-5



B-6

1

Familiarity with Local Publications





B-8



B-9

. . . .

Satisfaction with Fort Hood

1

63. Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the various aspects of life at Fort Hood lister below. Check that ŝ If you me n the orgin to response which best describes how you fee dissatsfied with an area, please tell as the right of the item. SATISFIE 63a. Government-provided permanent housing for familie 63b. Quality of mess) 0 Quantity of 63c. me Opportunity 63d.) 63e. Perfd mar of ml poli) rv 63f. () 63g. zency room ()Hos) ()()63 ces for ()() ser lependents () () ()() ces) () 0 0 () () ()()() service solders) Dent ental ser)()()()()() (endens 64. personal property or money have you even m 0 stolen from you F A. Yes No 65. If yes, how many time



B-11

......

And the commences

Appendix C

1977 Quality of Life Questionnaire

SOLDIER ATTITUDES TOWARD LIFE AT FORT HOOD

U S Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Fort Hood Field Unit

1

Not to be shown to unauthorized persons. Not to be reproduced in any form without the specific permission of the TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

TITLE OF QUESTIONNAIRE: Soldier Attitudes Toward Life at Fort Hood Survey

PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE: AR 70-1

AUTHORITY: 10 USC Sec 4503

PURPOSE(s): The data collected with the attached forms are to be used for research purposes only.

> This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information.

Major Command

(e.g., 2nd AD, 1st CD, etc.)

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information from you regarding your perceptions of the training, working and living conditions at Fort Hood. The survey questionnaire was developed at the request of the Commanding General at Fort Hood and your answers will help him in determining which areas are in need of improvement and what actions to take in order to improve the quality of life for soldiers at Fort Hood.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. This questionnaire is anonymous. You do NOT need to write your name, social security account number or unit (other than your major command) on the questionnaire. Since the questionnaire results will be analyzed separately for each major command (such as 2nd Armored Division, 1st Cavalry Division, 13th COSCOM, 6th ACCB), however, we would appreciate your writing the major command to which you belong in the blank at the top of this page.

2. Please do NOT mark your answers to the items on the questionnaire itself. All items should be answered using the attached answer sheet (except for Question 65, for which space is provided on page 16 of the questionnaire). Most of the items are multiple-choice, and for these items, you should blacken out the letter on the answer sheet which represents your answer. For example, if you were asked a question having response alternatives A, B, C, D and E and you chose "A" for your answer, you would indicate your choice in this way:... B C D E. Be careful, when blackening out the letters, not to let your marks stray into areas above or below the line or into nearby letters. Use a No. 2 lead pencil <u>only</u> to blacken the letters (pencils will be provided). If you want to change an answer, just erase your marks and blacken through another letter.

There are a few items in the questionnaire which are not multiple choice. For these items, simply write in your answers on the answer sheet in the spaces provided.

If you have any problems in using the answer sheet, please raise your hand and one of the monitors will provide you with assistance.

3. Although we would like for you to mark your answers to the questions on the attached answer sheet, we realize you may have comments you would like to make about some of the questions. Please write any comments which relate to a particular question next to that question on the questionnaire itself. Question 65 on the questionnaire asks you to make any additional comments or suggestions you might wish to make. All your comments will be extracted from the questionnaires, verbatim, and presented to the Commanding General.

4. Please take your time in answering the questions and try to consider them carefully. You have been chosen, through a random selection procedure, to represent the rest of the soldiers on Fort Hood and your responses will be treated as representative of your fellow soldiers. Feel free to be completely open in your responses - we want and need honest answers. Remember, none of these answers will be identified with you individually.

5. Since you have been chosen to represent other Fort Hood soldiers, we would like to strongly encourage you to participate in the survey. In order to get an accurate picture of the way the enlisted men feel about life on Fort Hood, we need the cooperation of almost all of those chosen to participate in the survey. However, participation is voluntary and if you do not wish to answer any or all of the items for any reason, you are free to leave them blank.

6. The last two pages of the questionnaire ask for certain biographical information, which may be useful in analyzing the results of the survey, since we have often found in the past that answers differ for groups which vary in age, sex, race, etc.

7. Approximately 30 minutes will be required to complete the questionnaire. To avoid disturbing others, no one may leave before that time.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

1. The training I have received at Fort Hood has been: A. Very challenging B. Challenging C. Borderline D. Unchallenging OVery unchallenging Ε. 2. The training I have received at For has A. Very useful in preparing me to nv MOS B. Useful in preparing me to wor C. Of borderline value in preparin in my 🎽 D. Unuseful in preparing me Very unuseful in preparing Ε. MOS 3. The field maneuvers and f d e 0 have been: A. Very useful in training B. Useful in training m uni C. Of borderline us hing m D. Unuseful in traf Ε. Very unuseful it 4. During training unit: the Are almost Α. th task aΓ Β. tly Are freque tasks С. Are bu wit out hal D. Are fr ar Ε. Are almo 5. The program the Α or B t.he for uate fo rs at Fort H ers et i ve éwhat ei achei Ineffect erv

- 7. What is your company/troop/battery commander's policy about his people coming to talk with him about personal problems or other matters?
 - A. He strongly encourages us
 - B. He encourages us
 - C. He neither encourages nor discourges
 - D. He discourages us
 - E. He strongly discourages us
 - F. I don't know
- 8. While at Fort Hood, have you tried to talk the him about such problems:
 A. Yes
 B. to
- 9. If yes, how many times? Nirite in the ctual number of times in the blanks provided on your answer sheet?

O

- 10. If you tried, how many times did you actually get to balk with him? (Write in the actual number of times in the blanks provided on your answer sheet)
- 11. Based on your experience in thying to take with our commander how satisfied-dissetiefied are you with his "open door" performance?
 - A. Very satisfied
 - B. Satisfied
 - C. Borderine
 - D. Dissadisfid
 - E. Very dissetistied
 - F. Lange not bried to talk to min
- 12. If you are dissibilitied with your commander's "open-door" prformance, why are you disabilitied?
 A. I had unable to see him.
 B. he did not take the appropriate actions to help me deal with my problem.

In failed to notify me of any action taken in regard to my

0

I am NOT

(please

13. With regard to leadership, in our cers in my unit do a:

A. Very good io B. Good job

 \bigcirc

- B. Good jobC. Borderline job
- D. Poor job
- E. Very poor job
 - very poor jor



14. With regard to leadership, the NCO's in my unit do a: A. Very good job B. Good job C. Borderline job D. Poor job è \mathbf{O} E. Very poor job 15. Most officers in my unit are: A. Very understanding of their men's meds B. Understanding of their men's he 👧 C. Borderline D. Nonunderstanding of their men's E. Very nonunderstanding of their men 16. Most NCO's in my unit are: 0 A. Very understanding of heir B. Understanding of the C. Borderline needs D. Nonunderstanding of <u>thei</u> en Men's E. Very nonunderstanding 17. Most of the officer in are: A. Extremely competer the Β. Fairly compet their en D С. Borderline in at D. Somewhat Incom doing Ε. Extremel inc 18. Most of the unit A. mely doing B ompeter compet ing events and policies, keeping me my erv good -10 bord poor D. а Do C-7



27. In my job, my supervisor: A. Almost always sets clear goals for me B. Usually sets clear goals for me C. Sets clear goals for me about half the time D. Occasionally sets clear goals for me Ο Ε. Almost never sets clear goals for me 28. My job has proved to be: A. Very satisfying Satisfying в. C. Borderline D. Unsatisfying Ε. Very unsatisfying 29. Obtaining the right equipment A. Has never been a problem 0 in B. Has rarely been a 🎢 C. Has occasionally een a prob in the past D. Has sometimes been a grob the pasi E. Has frequently een n the C-9

30. Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the various aspects of life at Fort Hood listed below. Check that response which best describes how you feel. If you are dissatisfied with an area, please tell us way on the back of the page. know E \mathbf{O} 30a. Quality of mess hal 5000 306. Quantity of mess han fð 30c. Barracks Government-provided 30d. permanent housing for fa) es ſ 30**e**. Sports activ) (ties 30f. Off-duty acti tit (be () sports activities 30g. Transporta off () soldiers) 30h. .() Hospi emerge () ser 30i. Other) ()for ii ei (es SOL 907 30j. ()dependents () Me 30k. ()() soldie 3 301. depend ()'or ł) 30m for am ploma) () () ogram earnin 3(()() C) () مم ()()005 l) () () (•) () ty fo) () Ø of mance of polic) () () () () polici) ()()) () (e (C-10



	five weeks?	_	-				
	A. 1	Ε.	5				
	B. 2	F.			ow what	F	
	C. 3	-	"Bugle	Notes 1	\mathbf{V}		
	D. 4	G.	None, l	out I know	what it is	•	
35.		typically	read the	items pos	ted your	r unit	
	bulletin board?			07			
	A. Twice a day	F.	Every	her werk		\frown	
	B. Once a day	G.	Onge a	month	J (05	
	C. Every other o	lay H.	Hardly	ever 🔪 🔪		\mathbf{V}	
	D. Every third d	ay I.	Novel	\sim			
	E. Once a week		\sim	マン		$\sim \sim$	
6.	Of the last five	issues	the week	N Port Ho	od sentine	l (the	くく
	post newspaper),		ave you	read at le	ast a ber		\sim
	A. None		3	>			\mathbf{N}
	B. 1	E.	7 /			\sim	ソ
	C. 2		<u>₅</u> ∖)			$\langle H \rangle$	-
		くべ	\mathbf{X}		\mathbf{N}	<u>\v)</u>	
7.	How many times ha	ve von see			manding G	eneral's	
	TV panel show Of	C the Town	in the	last two m	hhs?		
	A. 1			7			
	B. 2			くシン		\searrow	
	C. 3	\sim	^			\sim	
	D. 4					え	
		nem of it	∧`	くくく	$\Delta / / \Delta$		
			there				
	F. None, and I d	TAL KIOW		as wich a		•	
8.	What gld you than	was the d		V shor?	\mathbf{V}		
0.		the U	THE BILLS	v snow	()		
	A Very good		ンへ		\checkmark		
	B. Good		<u>````</u>	っく			
	c. Borler Ishe		<u></u>	() ()	V		
			No.	// ~			
	En Very poor	N		$\sim \sim$			
	i io not see i	く		101			
		<i>、</i> / / 、	\sim	ッく			
		tandards o	of males	y don't es	y are:		
▾,	A. Very high			\sim			
	High 💦	\sim	バヘ	S			
	C. Border 1 ne		$\sim c$	×			
	D. Low	\sim \sim	\sim	7			
	E. Very low	5 (9	>) ∨				
	• · · ·		$\mathbf{\mathbf{X}}$				
			\mathbf{N}				
			N				
			ソ				





52. The manner in which female military personnel are assigned to jobs at Fort Hood is: A. Very satisfactory B. Satisfactory O C. Borderline in satisfactoriness D. Unsatisfactory Ε. Very unsatisfactory I don't know F. 53. I feel that female soldiers are sh amount <u>(n</u> at For consideration by male soldiers A. Almost all the time B. Most of the time C. About half of the time 0 D. Not very much of the E. Almost never the Army: 54. Since being at Fort Hood inion Dſ ωv CI A. Has become much more fa ora B. Has become more rayo C. Has not changed D. Has become Kess vorable E. Has become 0 55. Being a soldie Army make A. Very p - 01 Β. Proud C. Nej ther p **āshame** d D. Ε. 56. opular news media of nes fai one often eir as unfai one 1)7 ir on n civilian life, the Army is: Compared to jo Much bet Better About th D. Worse Much worse Ε.

58. The Army is:

- A. Very important to the defense of our country.
- B. Important to the defense of our county
- C. Of borderline importance to the defense of our country
- D. Unimportant to the defense of our gourry
- E. Very unimportant to the defense of our country

59. The Army is:

- A. Very concerned with me as an individual soldier
- B. Concerned with me as an individual soldier
- C. Borderline in its concern for me as a polvidual se
- D. Unconcerned with me as an individual soldie
- E. Very unconcerned with me as an individual soldier

Ø

0

60. Army hair length policies are:

- A. Much too restrictive
- B. Too restrictive
- C. Just about right
- D. Too liberal
- E. Much too liberal

61. In general, I think the Army 1 run:

- A. Very competen ly
- B. Competently
- C. With bordenline comprovince
- D. Incompetently
- E. Very incompetently

62. When I come on active duty, I w

- A. Strongly considering making the acmy a B. Considering making the Army a career
 - orgerlin

Opposed to making the Army career Scomes opposed to making the Army a career

. Aron ly considering making the army a career

- C. Corderline
- D. Opposed to making the Arm, a career

E. Strongly opposed to making the himy a career

- 64. Noted you recommend to a cruitian griend of yours that he enlist in the Army?
 - A. Yes. Strong recommend that he enlist
 - B. Yes. Recommend that he mist
 - C. Borderline
 - D. No. Recommend that he not enlist
 - E. No. Strongly recommend that he not enlist

65. <u>Additional Comments</u>. If you have additional comments or suggestions to make about life at Fort Hood or life in the Army, please write them below. Use the back of the page if you need more space.

0

C

0

0

.1

1

•

ŝ



BIOGRAPHICAL DATA



C-18

-

78. What high school diploma do you have? A. GED high school diploma B. Regular high school lploma C. Neither of them 79. What college diploma do you have? A. 2-year college (associate degree diplo B. 4-year college (bachelor degre) di loma C. Neither of them 80. Do you have a degree higher the degree? b. A. Yes. Β. 81. Are you currently taking any Ο or technical qualificati ns. A. Yes 82. Are you interested in tak e courses to imp av mo ng educational or technical cions? au A. Yes 83. per week is The average numb I spen t. of answer hours on 84. The average nu of mean my ŌD job <u>per we</u>k alk with 85. On the average how many d on each of chose in chain on answer sheet) Ik with Him Person Sect/P 88a. В8ъ. 89a. 89b. 90ь. 20a.