

Research Note 84-65

ASSESSMENT OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER PILOT PROGRAM:
A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF TWO CLASSES

Laurel W. Oliver and Lawrence R. Hicks

AD A 139178

Submitted by

T. Owen Jacobs, Chief
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

and

Joyce L. Shields, Director
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL RESEARCH LABORATORY



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

March 1984

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

This report has been cleared for release to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). It has been given no other primary distribution and will be available to requestors only through DTIC or other reference services such as the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

DTIC
SELECTED
MAR 15 1984
A

DTIC FILE COPY

84 03 14 017

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 84-65	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. A139178	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program: A Preliminary Analysis of Two Classes		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim - 1980-81
7. AUTHOR(s) Laurel W. Oliver Lawrence R. Hicks		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Human Resources Development Directorate Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Washington, D.C. 20310		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792 Task A, Work Unit 002
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE March 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 72
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES This report is second in a 1980-81 series entitled "Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program." It presents the results of an evaluation of the second class (Class 2-79) of the Organizational Effectiveness Non-Commissioned Officer (OENCO) pilot program and compares these results with those of Class 1-79.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Organizational Development (OD) Training Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Training Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) Training Non-Commissioned Officer Utilization Program Evaluation		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A pilot program was established for training and utilizing noncommissioned officers (NCOs) in Organizational Effectiveness (OE) work, and two classes of Organizational Effectiveness Noncommissioned Officers (OENCOs) were trained and placed in the field. This report presents data collected from the second class (Class 2-79) of the OENCO pilot program and compares the findings with those obtained from the first class (Class 1-79) of OENCOs. Questionnaires were administered to 45 OENCOs, their OESO supervisors, their		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 63 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

1 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

20. (cont'd.)

Key Managers (program managers), and a sample of OE users. In general, results obtained from OENCO Class 2-79 confirm and extend the findings contained in the previous study conducted on Class 1-79. Although OENCOs and OESOs perform many of the same tasks, OESOs make more initial contacts than do OENCOs. OENCOs and OESOs differ in their rankings of some OENCO roles and tasks, suggesting that the OENCO role may need clarification. OESOs and OENCOs consider some of the special OENCO skills and competencies related to NCO status. Many OENCOs suggest adding a field training exercise (FTX) to the OENCO training course, and some OENCOs suggest putting more emphasis on the acquisition of skills such as interviewing. OESOs and Key Managers prefer a ratio of one OENCO for two or three OESOs and believe OENCOs function best at company and battalion levels. All measures of effectiveness used to assess the program (attitudes, performance ratings, increase in OE office productivity, acceptance of OENCOs, and OENCO job satisfaction) indicate that the program has been successful.

This report is second in a 1980-81 series entitled "Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program." The first report presented data collected from Class 1-79.



A-1

FOREWORD

The Leadership and Management Technical area of the Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) is investigating the impact of the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) program of the Army. The following report describes research conducted by the Organizational Effectiveness Technology Development Unit of ARI.

This report is second in a 1980-81 series entitled "Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program." It presents data collected from the second class (Class 2-79) of the Organizational Effectiveness Non-Commissioned Officer (OENCO) pilot program and compares the findings with those obtained from the first class (Class 1-79) of OENCOS.

This in-house research was carried out under Army Project 2Q263731A792, "Command Processes and Evaluation," FY 79 and FY 80 Work Program.

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF
TWO CLASSES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

Late in 1978, the Army decided to establish a pilot program for training and utilizing noncommissioned officers (NCOs) to function as Organizational Effectiveness (OE) practitioners in the Army. Two classes of approximately 45 NCOs were trained and sent to the field. The Army Research Institute (ARI) was asked to evaluate the pilot program, and a previous report (Kessler & Oliver, 1980) presented information on the first class (Class 1-79) of Organizational Effectiveness Noncommissioned Officers (OENCOs) participating in the program. The present report contains data on the second class (Class 2-79) of OENCOs and compares the results with those of Class 1-79.

Procedure:

The procedure followed to obtain information about Class 2-79 was identical to that used to collect data on Class 1-79. Questionnaires were distributed by the major commands (MACOMS) to the OENCOs in Class 2-79, to their Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officer (OESO) supervisors, to their Key Managers (program managers), and a sample of OE users (commanders who had contracted for OE operations in which the OENCOs had participated). The respondents returned their completed forms directly to ARI. Questionnaires were received from 43 OENCOs, 40 OESOs, 34 Key Managers, and 84 OE users.

Findings:

In general, the results obtained from OENCO Class 2-79 confirm and extend the findings of the previous research conducted on Class 1-79. Unless otherwise noted, the findings contained in this section apply to both classes.

1. OENCOs and OESOs perform many of the same tasks, but with a different emphasis. OESOs make more initial contacts and do considerably more assessment analysis than OENCOs.
2. Significantly more members of Class 2-79 than Class 1-79 report the following tasks as most frequent: designing implementations, conducting workshops, and reviewing literature for OE ideas. It is not known why these shifts occurred.

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF TWO CLASSES

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of Present Research	1
PROCEDURE	2
Questionnaires	2
Respondents	2
Distribution of Questionnaires	4
Analyses	4
FINDINGS	4
Description of OENCO Role	4
OENCO Role Characteristics	6
Effectiveness of Pilot Program	8
SUMMARY	11
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	12
REFERENCE	14
APPENDIX A. TABLES	15
APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRES	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number and type of questionnaire respondents by MACOM for Class 1-79 and Class 2-79	3
2. Changes in "Most Frequent" task ratings by OENCOs from Class 1-79 and Class 2-79	5
3. OENCO/OESO ratios preferred by Class 2-79 respondents	8
4. Course changes suggested by OENCO respondents to improve OENCO training (combined results for Classes 1-79 and 2-79).	9

CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Table 5. Responses of OENCOs on two job satisfaction items	10
A-1. Number and type of Class 2-79 questionnaire respondents by MACOM	16
A-2. Average ranking of OENCO role by Class 2-79 OENCOs and OESOs	17
A-3. Percentage of Class 2-79 OENCO's time spent on OE and non-OE activities	17
A-4. Tasks most frequently and least frequently performed by Class 2-79 OENCOs as rated by OENCOs and OESOs	18
A-5. Comparison of OENCO tasks and OESO tasks most frequently performed by Class 2-79 OENCOs and OESOs	19
A-6. Frequency of OE operations in which OENCO participated as reported by Class 2-79 OE users	20
A-7. OESO responses to questions concerning support and planning for Class 2-79 OENCOs	21
A-8. Actions reported by Class 2-79 key managers and OESOs to enhance OENCO utilization	22
A-9. Percent of Class 2-79 OESOs reporting highest and lowest degree of confidence in OENCO ability to perform task	23
A-10. Number and percent of Class 2-79 OENCO respondents enumerating OENCO skills and competencies not possessed by OESOs	24
A-11. Ratings by Class 2-79 OESOs and key managers of OENCO contributions to OE effort	25
A-12. Percentages of Class 2-79 OENCOs, OESOs, and key managers responding that OENCOs could function effectively at various organizational levels "usually" or "almost always"	26
A-13. Number of Class 2-79 key managers and OESOs indicating preferred ratios of OENCOs to OESOs	26
A-14. Preferences of Class 2-79 key managers and OESOs for additional OE personnel	27
A-15. Ratings of OENCO overall competence by Class 2-79 OENCOs and OE users	28

CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Table A-16. Ratings of OENCO overall competence by Class 2-79 OESOs	28
A-17. Average OESO estimates of quantitative measures of OE office productivity before and after Class 2-79 OENCO assigned	29
A-18. Percentages of Class 2-79 OENCOs and OE users responding to questions concerning OENCO acceptance and integration into OE team	30
A-19. Satisfaction of OE users with OE and with Class 2-79 OENCO participation in OE operations	31
A-20. Job satisfaction of Class 2-79 OENCOs	32
A-21. Factors considered by Class 2-79 OESOs to be most important to OENCO competency	33

ASSESSMENT OF THE OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF TWO CLASSES

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Army established a pilot program for training and utilizing non-commissioned officers (NCOs) in Organizational Effectiveness (OE) work. Two classes of approximately 45 NCOs each were trained at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S) and placed in OE jobs throughout the Army. The training given the Organizational Effectiveness Noncommissioned Officers (OENCOs) was identical to that given to the Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officers (OESOs) except that the OENCOs did not participate in a field training exercise.

After the two classes of OENCOs were placed in the field, no more OENCOs were to be trained until the pilot program could be evaluated. Accordingly, the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) was tasked to evaluate the OENCO pilot program. Data collected when the first class (Class 1-79) had been on the job for approximately four or five months indicated that the program was considered very successful at that point (Kessler & Oliver, 1980). OENCOs seemed to bring a different perspective to the OE effort and to be especially effective and credible in dealing with enlisted personnel. The OESO supervisors, Key Managers, and commanders who had used OE were all very satisfied with the OENCOs. In addition, the OENCOs themselves reported a high degree of job satisfaction.

Purpose of Present Research

The findings described above concerned Class 1-79. The purpose of the present research was to evaluate Class 2-79 after they had had approximately the same time on the job as Class 1-79 and to draw conclusions about the entire pilot program based on initial results from both classes.

The general objectives of the evaluation as specified by the Army were:

1. To describe the current roles of OENCOs and to identify the factors related to OENCO utilization.
2. To determine the role characteristics unique to the OENCO.
3. To assess the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program.

PROCEDURE

Questionnaires

The same four questionnaires were used for the second class (Class 2-79) that were used for Class 1-79. The instructions for a few items, which had proved to cause some minor confusion, were changed slightly to clarify their meaning. Otherwise, the content of the questionnaires was identical. The questionnaires were:

OENCO Pilot Program--OENCO Questionnaire December 1979 (PT5303a)

OENCO Pilot Program--OESO Questionnaire December 1979 (PT5303b)

OENCO Pilot Program--Key Manager Questionnaire December 1979 (PT5303c)

OENCO Pilot Program--Commander/OE User Questionnaire December 1979 (PT5303d)

Most questions were multiple choice items; some items required writing a number (such as a percentage); and a few items were open-ended. Appendix B contains copies of the four questionnaires.

Respondents

Questionnaires were distributed to graduates of Class 2-79, their OESO supervisors, their Key Managers, and commanders who had contracted for OE operations in which OENCOs had participated. Questionnaires were distributed for 20 OENCOs in Forces Command (FORSCOM), 15 in Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), 9 in United States Army Europe (USAREUR), 2 in Military District of Washington (MDW), and 1 each in Health Services Command (HSC), Western Command (WESTCOM), and Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM). Table 1 summarizes the numbers and percentages by major command (MACOM) of the 4 groups of respondents for both classes. (Table A-1 in Appendix A breaks out the "Other" category for Class 2-79.)

Members of Class 2-79 were very similar in demographic characteristics to members of Class 1-79. Pay grades for Class 2-79 ranged from E-6 through E-9, with slightly over half the class members serving in pay grade E-7. Approximately two-thirds of the participants were white; the remaining third was black. Other racial or ethnic minority groups were not represented, and all but one member of the class were men. Class 2-79 was very well educated, and nonrepresentative in this respect of personnel in these pay grades. Among the 49 members of Class 2-79, all but six had completed at least two years of college, and three had obtained postbaccalaureate degrees. In addition, nearly all class members were graduates of advanced NCO Leadership courses. The predominant MOSs (Military Occupational Specialties) were Infantry and Equal Opportunity, held by nine and ten class members respectively.

Table 1

Number and Type of Questionnaire Respondents by MACOM for Class 1-79 and Class 2-79

MACOM	Respondents						
	OENCOs		OESOs		Key Managers		OE Users
	Class 1-79	Class 2-79	Class 1-79	Class 2-79	Class 1-79	Class 2-79	
FORSCOM	11	15	11	18	10	14	13
TRADOC	13	12	12	10	8	9	23
USAREUR	12	9	8	8	9	7	27
Other	5	3	7	4	7	4	5
Totals	41 (79%) ^a	43 (88%) ^b	38 (73%) ^a	40 (82%) ^b	34 (53%) ^a	34 (69%) ^b	77 ^c
							84 ^c

^a Percentages based on responses to the 52 questionnaires distributed.^b Percentages based on responses to the 49 questionnaires distributed.^c OESOs were requested to send Commander/OE User questionnaires to one or more OE users. The authors do not know how many questionnaires were actually distributed.

Distribution of Questionnaires

ARI sent appropriate materials to OE offices in the major commands (MACOMs). For each OENCO, MACOM offices distributed one OENCO questionnaire, one OESO questionnaire, one Key Manager questionnaire, and three Commander/OE User questionnaires to the OESO most familiar with the work of the OENCO. The OESO distributed the set of questionnaires to the appropriate persons. The OESO was also responsible for selecting the OE users to whom the Commander/OE User questionnaire was given.

At the time these questionnaires were distributed, most of the Class 2-79 OENCOs had been on the job about six months. Class 1-79 OENCOs were surveyed when most of them had been in their jobs four to five months.

Analyses

The results of the analyses run on the data are reported as frequency counts, percentages, or averages. Frequency counts and percentages indicate the number or percent of people who responded to each alternative for the item. Averages are usually the arithmetic mean, although sometimes the most frequent response (mode) or the middlemost response (median) is given. Statistical tests of the differences between the responses of the two classes were also conducted. However, so few of these differences were statistically significant that it is likely that most of them occurred by chance.

FINDINGS

The findings presented in this section are based on the responses of OENCOs, OESOs, Key Managers, and OE Users to the questionnaires described above. The emphasis of the findings is on comparisons between Class 1-79 and Class 2-79 and on generalizations which can be made across both classes. Only abbreviated tables will be presented in the text. Appendix A contains detailed results for Class 2-79 which parallel the comparable data contained in the ARI report TR-489, "Assessment of the OENCO Pilot Program: Class 1 Results" (Kessler & Oliver, 1980). References are made to the appropriate tables as each finding is discussed. The results are grouped by the three major research objectives specified by the Army: (1) description of the OENCO role and factors associated with OENCO utilization, (2) role characteristics unique to the OENCO, and (3) determination of the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program.

Description of OENCO Role

Ranking of OENCO Roles. Both OENCO and OESO respondents were asked to rate the importance of different functional aspects of being an OENCO. The respondents ranked several OENCO "roles" according to the importance they perceived for the roles. For both Class 1-79 and Class 2-79, the rankings by OENCOs and OESOs (the latter ranked both actual and expected OENCO roles) were substantially similar. The order of the rankings was identical for the four highest ranked roles (in order of importance, with the highest ranked role first): OE Consultant, Assistant OE, Trainer, and Instructor.

The pattern of average rankings by OENCOs and OESOs was similar for both Class 1-79 and Class 2-79. Details of the Class 2-79 rankings can be found in Table A-2. Class 2-79 OESOs ranked the two top "actual" roles almost identically--1.8 for OE Consultant and 1.9 for Assistant OESO. The OENCO respondents from Class 2-79, on the other hand, ranked Assistant OESO much lower (2.8) than they did OE Consultant (1.3). The average rank for Trainer was the same for both OESOs and OENCOs (3.0). It appears, then, that perceptions of OENCOs and OESOs differ somewhat with respect to the role of Assistant OESO. OENCOs perceive the Assistant OESO role as definitely a secondary one, whereas OESOs view the Assistant OESO role to be as important as the OE Consultant role. Differing perceptions of the OENCO role could lead to misunderstandings between OESOs and OENCOs concerning their respective roles.

OE Activities. OENCOs and OESOs from both classes agreed closely on the total amount of time OENCOs spent on OE-related activities (83% to 86%). (See Table A-3 for Class 2-79 data.) Large percentages (ranging from 70% to 85%) of OENCOs and OESOs from both classes considered interviewing the most frequent OENCO task. Assessment analysis and conducting workshops or meetings were also considered frequent tasks. As was found for Class 1-79, there were some differences between the percentages of OENCOs and OESOs rating a task "most frequent." For example, for Class 2-79, 70% of OENCOs but only 43% of OESOs reported designing implementations as a most frequent OENCO task. Documentation was rated "least frequent" by large percentages of OENCOs and OESOs for Class 2-79, as it was for Class 1-79.

Significantly more OENCOs from Class 2-79 than from Class 1-79 noted three tasks as "most frequent." These tasks, shown in Table 2, were: designing implementations (+28%), conducting workshops/meetings (+22%), and reviewing literature for OE ideas (+25%).

Table 2
Changes in "Most Frequent" Task Ratings by OENCOs from
Class 1-79 and Class 2-79

Task	Respondents rating activity "Most Frequent"		Change
	Class 1-79 (N = 40)	Class 2-79 (N = 43)	
Designing implementations	42%	70%	+28%
Conducting workshops/meetings	45%	67%	+22%
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	12%	37%	+25%

As was the case for the Class 1-79 respondents, Class 2-79 OESOs see themselves as accomplishing more of the initial OE activities (marketing, scouting, entry) than do OENCOs, while OENCOs report doing more training and literature review than do their OESO supervisors. Detailed information on Class 2-79 "most frequent" and "least frequent" tasks can be found in Tables A-4 and A-5.

The OE operations in which OENCOs had participated (as reported by users) were essentially the same for Class 2-79 (Table A-6) as for Class 1-79. Two operations accounted for 59% of the mentions: transition workshop (28%) and survey feedback (31%). The next most frequently mentioned were Leadership and Management Development Course (12%) and workshops (10%). Again, these operations were reported by OE users. Since the user questionnaires were distributed by the OESO supervisors, these operations may represent the more successful operations in which OENCOs participated. We do not know the extent to which these operations are typical of those in which OENCOs take part.

Support and Planning for OENCOs. Consistent with the results for Class 1-79, Key Managers and OESOs were generally active in thinking about and preparing for the role the new OENCO was to play and in integrating him or her into OE activities (Table A-8). Fewer Class 2-79 OESO respondents (78% vs. 90% for Class 1-79) reported their OE office had been consulted in the assignment, and fewer Class 2-79 OESOs (70% vs. 92% for Class 1-79) said their OE office had requested an OENCO (Table A-7). However, the high proportion of "don't know" responses indicates that these results are due to the fact that the OESOs in question did not know whether their office had been consulted or if an OENCO had been requested.

OENCO Role Characteristics

OENCO Skills. OESO questionnaire items concerning the skills of Class 2-79 OENCOs yielded results similar to those of Class 1-79. With respect to the OENCOs' ability to perform certain tasks, OESOs tended to express highest confidence in most frequently performed tasks, such as interviewing, and lowest confidence in least frequently performed tasks, such as documentation (Table A-9).

Table A-10 indicates that most of the special skills and competencies OENCOs reported they had that OESOs lacked related to their status as senior NCOs: ability to relate better to enlisted personnel (18% of all mentions), different background (39%), and different perspective (9%). Again, the picture emerged of older, experienced soldiers who possessed a different outlook because of their NCO status. Although personal characteristics were sometimes noted (23%), these tended to be traits specific to individuals and not necessarily a result of being an NCO. A comment by one OESO about an OENCO notes the advantage of an NCO perspective and the importance of selection factors: "I am more than happy with my OENCO. He is articulate, intelligent, and energetic. With dual capability (Off/NCO) we have access to information neither could have learned on our own. Keep the OENCO program and select only top-notch NCO's."

OENCO Contributions. Although ratings varied somewhat for Class 1-79 and Class 2-79, the Key Managers and OESOs associated with the OENCOs believed the OENCOs had made positive contributions to the functioning of their OE efforts (Table A-11). There were also no reliable differences between Class 1-79 and Class 2-79 respondents (Table A-12) with respect to levels of functioning--i.e., OENCOs were generally seen by large percentages (80% or more) of OESOs and Key Managers as being most effective at company and battalion levels. Smaller percentages (51% to 74%) agreed that OENCOs could function at higher organizational levels. OENCOs generally felt more confident than did OESOs and Key Managers of OENCO ability to function above battalion level. There appear to be some OENCOs, however, who function effectively at the highest organizational levels. One OESO commented: "SFC _____'s performance in organizational effectiveness is equal to, and in some cases, better than that of OESOs with whom I've worked. Most of our clients are O-5s. SFC _____ has worked with O-5s, O-6s, an O-7, and an O-8. None of these clients were turned off, so to speak, by the fact that he was an NCO. They were primarily interested in what he knew and how he could help them."

Related to the contributions of OENCOs are the views of the Key Managers and OESOs concerning a desirable OENCO/OESO ratio (Table A-13) and on their preferences for additional OE personnel (Table A-14). About 50% of the responses from Class 2-79 Key Managers and OESOs stated that another OESO was preferred. This preference was mainly due to the number of high ranking clients that the offices dealt with. Approximately a quarter of the respondents preferred an OENCO. Several respondents who preferred another OENCO said that OENCOs were equally as qualified as OESOs. One respondent stated, "OENCOs have the same capabilities as the OESO, without some of the drawbacks, such as 'worrying about their careers.'" Another reason for requesting another OESO or OENCO was due to the number of OESOs or OENCOs in their offices, with respondents choosing either another OESO or OENCO to create a mix or balance in the office. One respondent preferred an OE-trained civilian due to the large number of civilians at the location. Thus, preferences for additional personnel seemed to depend more on specific situations rather than on preferences for officers or NCOs per se. The OENCO/OESO ratio most frequently chosen by both Key Manager and OESOs for both classes was "1 OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs." Next most frequently chosen was "1 OENCO for 1 OESO" followed by "2 or 3 OENCOs for 1 OESO." These results are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3
OENCO/OESO Ratios Preferred by Class 2-79 Respondents

	Respondents	
	Key Manager (N = 32)	OESOs (N = 40)
1 OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs	38%	48%
1 OENCO for 1 OESO	28%	33%
2 or 3 OENCOs for 1 OESO	19%	12%
(Other ratios preferred)	(15%)	(7%)

Effectiveness of Pilot Program

Results from both data collections indicate that the OENCO pilot program has been an effective one using the measures described below.

OENCO Competence. Respondents from both classes assessed OENCO competence very favorably. Of the OENCOs, 86% of Class 2-79 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their performance had been excellent. An even larger proportion of OE users (94%) agreed or strongly agreed that their impression of the OENCO's overall competence was highly positive. OESO respondents rated the competence of 88% of their OENCOs as very good or excellent. (See Tables A-15 and A-16.)

Productivity of OE Office. For both classes, OESO respondents estimated that the productivity of their OE offices had increased as a result of adding OENCOs. However, these results are not clear cut because of the personnel turbulence involved. Also, records of the data requested were not always available, and estimates had to be made by the OESOs. (Details for Class 2-79 are given in Table A-17.)

Changes in OENCO Course. OENCOs were asked what changes they felt should be made in the OENCO course to provide more effective training. As this information was not available for Class 1-79 when the previous OENCO pilot program report (Kessler & Oliver, 1980) was written, the results for both classes are shown in Table 4 on the following page.

Eight OENCOs (four from each class) stated that no changes were necessary. Of the 117 suggestions made by the remaining respondents, almost half (47%) suggested lengthening the course to provide the field training exercise (FTX) or to give the same training to both OENCOs and OESOs. One respondent stated, "The NCO course should include the 'FTX.' It is just more experience and it would give the NCOs a feel of what is going on, and at the same time build confidence in themselves." Some OENCOs suggested the same course for NCOs and officers. One OENCO stated, "Stop the OENCO course and send officers and enlisted to same course for same skills; officers will be officers and NCOs will still be NCOs. We know this and so do you." Ten respondents saw a need for better selection of OENCO candidates or instructors, and five expressed a need for clarifying OENCO/OESO roles. It is not clear why all five respondents who requested clarification of the OENCO and OESO roles were from Class 2-79, since Class 2-79 as a group indicated greater sureness about job requirements than did Class 1-79 (see Item 56 section in Table 5).

Another 34% of the total mentions involved specific suggestions for training content. Several OENCO responses concerned more emphasis on the GOQ; more instruction on interviewing techniques, consulting skills, and marketing OE. Also specifically mentioned were: additional emphasis on meeting and dealing with O5s, O6s, and high ranking civilians; open-systems planning; systems management; contracting; designing conferences, workshops, and seminars; dropping the week spent on the GOQ to give more training in management theory; OE in combat; and more realistic case studies.

Table 5

Responses of OENCOs on Two Job Satisfaction Items

Class	Average rating	Responses				
		Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither disagree nor agree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Item 55: I would like to be assigned in the OENCO program during subse- quent tours.						
1-79	4.5	0%	15%	5%	9%	71%
2-79	4.3	0%	5%	18%	19%	58%
Item 56: I'm not sure what is required of me in my present assignment.						
1-79	1.5	63%	2%	29%	5%	0%
2-79	1.6	56%	33%	7%	2%	2%

A changed pattern of responses is also demonstrated for Item 56. In Class 2-79, 89% of the OENCOs disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they were not sure what was required of them in their present assignments. In contrast, only 65% of Class 1-79 OENCOs responded similarly. As the table shows, the shift in response pattern is due to the change in the neutral ("Neither disagree nor agree") category. At the time the first class was surveyed, the OENCO program was very new and it is likely that some Key Managers and OESO supervisors were not yet sure just how to utilize their new OENCOs. By the time the second class was placed in the field, some of these uncertainties may have been clarified.

Additional evidence of the impact of the integration of the Class 2-79 OENCO into the OE program was provided by OESOs concerning the effect OENCOs had had on their managerial/supervisory responsibilities. OESOs were asked how managerial/supervisory requirements associated with having OENCOs in their offices had affected their roles as OESOs. Of the 38 responses, 28 (74%) could be classified as "little, none, or negligible effect." Eight persons mentioned it took extra time to plan, coordinate, or supervise the training needed by their OENCOs. However, this extra time was often offset by the OENCOs' contributions: "Provides me greater flexibility." "Gives me more time to manage the OE office and plan OE strategy for installation." "Increases freedom to do more." One respondent noted that it took a greater amount of time than expected to supervise the OENCO due to the latter's lack of initiative. Under proper direction, however, the supervisor felt the OENCO made valuable contributions.

Factors Important to OENCO Competency. Class 2-79 OESOs (Table A-2i) reacted similarly to their Class 1-79 colleagues in response to the query concerning which factors are important to OENCO competency. For both classes, about two-thirds of the responses were classified as experience/education or skills. Thirty-five percent of the 129 items mentioned by Class 2-79 fell into the experience/education category, which included Army experience, rank, and educational experiences (not necessarily Army-related). The other major category was skills, which accounted for 34% of the mentions. Most of the skills specified were verbal skills or OE skills (e.g., GOQ expertise), but writing and interpersonal skills were also noted frequently. A variety of personal characteristics constituted another 22% of the mentions, and a few respondents reported organizational factors (7% of the mentions).

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results obtained from surveys of OENCOs, their OESO supervisors, their Key Managers, and OE users after OENCOs from both training classes (Class 1-79 and Class 2-79) had been on the job a relatively short time (usually 6 months or less). Results from the Class 2-79 surveys are presented, and differences between that class and Class 1-79 are noted.

For the most part, the Class 2-79 findings confirm the results obtained from the Class 1-79 surveys. These findings are summarized below under the three objectives of the research. The findings hold for both classes unless otherwise noted.

Description of OENCO Role. OENCOs and OESOs rank OENCO roles in the following order: (1) OE Consultant, (2) Assistant OE, (3) Trainer, and (4) Instructor. Although their rankings are in the same order, OENCOs and OESOs view the OE consultant role for OENCOs somewhat differently. OESOs consider the OENCO roles of "OE Consultant" and "Assistant OESO" of almost identical importance, while OENCOs see themselves much less as an "Assistant OESO" than as an "OE Consultant."

Large percentages of OENCO and OESO respondents consider interviewing the most frequent task of the OENCO. Assessment analysis and conducting workshops/meetings are also considered frequent tasks. The largest percentage of OENCOs and OESOs rate "documentation" as least frequent. Significantly larger percentages of OENCOs in Class 2-79 than in Class 1-79 gave "most frequent" ratings to designing implementations, conducting workshops/meetings, and reviewing literature for OE ideas. Future research may clarify the reasons for this shift. Like their counterparts in Class 1-79, Class 2-79 OESOs report more initial OE contacts (marketing, scouting, entry) than do their OENCOs, while the latter report a greater percentage of time spent in training than do the OESOs. The most frequent operations reported by OE users are the transition workshop and survey feedback. It is not known how representative these operations are of the total number of operations in which OENCOs participated.

OENCO Role Characteristics. OESOs report highest confidence in tasks OENCOs frequently perform (e.g., interviewing) and lowest confidence in tasks infrequently performed (e.g., documentation). Most of the special skills and competencies OENCOs feel they had that OESOs lacked tended to be related to NCO status--better able to deal with enlisted people, different background, and a different perspective. Large percentages of Key Managers and OESOs agree that OENCOs function effectively at company and battalion levels, with smaller percentages of these respondents agreeing for higher organizational levels. Both Key Managers and OESOs report that OENCOs had made a variety of contributions to their OE effort. These same respondents indicate their preferred OENCO-OESO ratios are one OENCO for two or three OESOs or one OENCO for each OESO. The most frequent preference (by almost 50% of the OESO and Key Manager respondents) is for an additional OESO, although about a quarter of the respondents would prefer an OENCO. The preference is often based on clientele (type, organizational level) or imbalance in OESO-OENCO ratio.

Effectiveness of Pilot Program. All measures of effectiveness indicate that the OENCO pilot program has been successful. Almost all of the OENCOs are viewed as very competent by OE users, OESOs, and the OENCOs themselves. OE office productivity appears to have increased as a result of the OENCOs' contributions, although interpretation of these results is complicated by personnel turbulence and lack of records data. In general, OESOs find that their managerial and supervisory requirements have been relatively unaffected by having OENCOs in their offices. Respondents feel that any extra time or effort is offset by the OENCOs' contributions.

OESOs believe the most important factors in OENCO competency are skills (verbal, OE, writing, interpersonal), and experience/education (Army experience, rank, educational experiences). Using combined results from both classes, about half the suggestions OENCOs offer for improving their training relate to providing a field training exercise experience. Another third of the suggestions concern specific types of training. OENCOs and OE users perceive a high degree of acceptance of OENCOs and feel they are well integrated into the OE team.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

These conclusions and implications are based on the initial findings of surveys of OENCO Classes 1-79 and 2-79.

1. In general, the OENCO pilot program has been very successful, with OENCOs judged as competent and well integrated into their OE offices where they make positive contributions to the OE program. In addition, OENCOs report high levels of job satisfaction.

2. OENCOs and OESOs view the OE consultant aspect of the OENCO differently, indicating a need for clarification of the OENCO role.

3. Specific circumstances such as the proportion of enlisted or civilian personnel in the organization, the organizational level of the clientele, and the desired OENCO/OESO balance appear to be the criteria for determining whether OENCOs or OESOs are desired as additional OE personnel.

4. The OENCO training course should be modified to include the addition of a field training exercise (FTX)³ and to emphasize specifics such as interviewing techniques (a frequent OENCO task) and GOQ administration and interpretation.

5. Selection criteria are important to the success of the program since factors such as verbal skills and desirable personality characteristics cannot be easily developed during training by those who lack them.

³Officers and NCOs now attend the same OE training course, which includes an FTX.

REFERENCE

Kessler, J. J., & Oliver, L. W. Assessment of the OENCO pilot program:
Class 1-79 results. (ARI Research Note 83-15) Alexandria, VA:
Army Research Institute, 1980.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table A-1

Number and Type of Class 2-79 Questionnaire Respondents by MACOM

MACOM	Respondents			
	OENCos	OESOs	Key Mgrs	OE Users
FORSCOM	19	18	14	40
TRADOC	12	10	9	17
USAREUR	9	8	7	21
USAREC	0	0	0	0
WESTCOM	1	1	1	4
DARCOM	0	0	0	0
INSCOM	0	1	0	0
MDW	1	1	1	1
OTHER	1	1	2	1
Totals	43 (88%) ^a	40 (82%) ^a	34 (69%) ^a	84 ^b

^aPercent returned of 49 questionnaires distributed.^bTotal number of questionnaires distributed by OESOs unknown.

Table A-2

Average Ranking of OENCO Role by Class 2-79 OENCOs and OESOs

Role Title	Respondents' Rankings		
	OENCO	OESO (Actual)	OESO (Expected)
OE Consultant	1.8	1.8	1.4
Assistant OESO	2.8	1.9	1.9
Trainer	3.0	3.0	3.1
Instructor	3.7	4.2	4.2
Administrator	4.6	4.5	4.8
Survey Specialist	4.3	4.7	4.5
Other	5.0	4.5	4.0

Table A-3

Percentage of Class 2-79 OENCO's Time Spent on OE and Non-OE Activities

Respondent	Time Spent on	
	OE Activities	Non-OE Activities
OENCO (N = 43)	86%	14%
OESO (N = 40)	83%	17%

Table A-4

Tasks Most Frequently and Least Frequently Performed by Class 2-79
OENCOs as Rated by OENCOs and OESOs

Type of Task	Percent of Respondents Rating Task			
	Most Frequent		Least Frequent	
	OENCO (N = 43)	OESO (N = 40)	OENCO (N = 43)	OESO (N = 40)
Interviewing individuals/groups	70	85	5	3
Designing implementations	70	43	5	10
Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	67	48	7	10
Process observation	55	50	0	5
Giving organizational feedback	51	43	14	13
Assessment analysis	49	56	9	3
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	37	18	12	8
Marketing OE	29	28	26	33
Training	28	33	44	40
Scouting and entry	26	25	23	33
Preparing, administering, interpreting questionnaires	26	20	35	35
Routine OE-related administration	24	23	14	18
Team building with OE personnel	19	15	16	15
Evaluation of operations	19	8	37	48
Professional development activities	14	5	42	45
Collecting historical data	7	3	60	53
Routine organizational tasks	5	8	67	63
Documentation	5	5	72	80
Other	11	8	16	0

Table A-5

Comparison of OENCO Tasks and OESO Tasks Most Frequently Performed
by Class 2-79 OENCOs and OESOs

Type of Task	Percent of Respondents Rating Task "Most Frequent"	
	OENCO (N = 43)	OESO (N = 40)
Interviewing individuals/groups	70	67
Designing implementations	70	62
Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	67	59
Process observation	55	44
Giving organizational feedback	51	54
Assessment analysis	49	69
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	37	8
Marketing OE	29	39
Training	28	15
Scouting and entry	26	39
Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires	26	24
Routine OE-related administration	24	18
Evaluation of operations	19	13
Team building with OE personnel	19	8
Professional development activities	14	0
Collecting historical data	7	8
Documentation	5	5
Routine organizational tasks	5	3
Other	11	14

Table A-6

Frequency of OE Operations in which OENCO Participated
as Reported by Class 2-79 OE Users

Type of Operation	Number of Times Operation Reported by OE Users
Survey Feedback	32 (31%)
Command Transition Workshop	29 (28%)
Leadership & Management Development Course	12 (12%)
Teambuilding	7 (7%)
Workshop/Workshop Followup	10 (10%)
Role Clarification	4 (4%)
Survey Feedback	2 (2%)
Other (Action Planning, Problem Solving, Complete 4-Step Process)	6 (6%)
Total Mentions	102

Table A-7

OESO Responses to Questions Concerning Support
and Planning for Class 2-79 OENCOs

Questions	OESO Responses (N = 40)		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
Was your OE office consulted regarding the assignment of an OENCO before the assignment was made?	78%	5%	17%
Did your OE office request the assignment of an OENCO?	70%	7%	23%
Was the OENCO assigned to you in lieu of other personnel that you had requested?	10%	80%	10%
Before your OENCO arrived, did you have specific expectations about the role he/she would perform in your OE office and operations?	93%	2%	5%

Table A-8

Actions Reported by Class 2-79 Key Managers and OESOs
to Enhance OENCO Utilization

Type of Action	Affirmative Responses	
	Key Managers (N = 34)	OESOs (N = 40)
Thinking about the role the OENCO should play in our OE office	65%	100%
Notifying unit commanders of the addition of the OENCO to the OE staff	50%	55%
Introducing OENCO to current clients	N/A	90%
Involving the OENCO in an operation for training purposes	N/A	90%
Conducting team building within the OE office with the OENCO	N/A	83%
Scheduling professional development activities for the OENCO	N/A	68%
Directing the OESOs to prepare for the reception of the OENCO into the OE office	41%	N/A
Arranging clerical support for the OENCO	38%	50%
Arranging for appropriate work space for the OENCO	53%	93%
Providing necessary funding support	56%	70%
Other	30%	25%

Table A-9

Percent of Class 2-79 OESOs Reporting Highest and Lowest Degree
of Confidence in OENCO Ability to Perform Task

Task	Percent of OESOs Indicating Confidence in OENCO (N = 40)	
	Highest	Lowest
Interviewing individuals/groups	74	5
Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	56	13
Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	54	5
Assessment analyses	44	10
Process observation	39	15
Giving organizational feedback	39	8
Marketing OE	36	33
Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	33	39
Routine OE-related administration	32	11
Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	31	36
Team building with OE personnel	26	13
Reviewing literature for OE ideas	21	13
Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	18	39
Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	15	28
Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	13	56
Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	13	8
Professional development activities	8	3
Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	0	63

Table A-10
Number and Percent of Class 2-79 OENCO Respondents Enumerating
OENCO Skills and Competencies Not
Possessed by OESOs

Skill/Competency	OENCO Respondents (N = 3 ^a)
Experience/Training/Education	17 (39%)
Personal Characteristics	10 (23%)
Better with Enlisted	8 (18%)
Different Perspective	5 (11%)
Miscellaneous	4 (9%)
Total Mentions	44

^aOf the 43 OENCO respondents, 17 answered "none" to the query, "What special skills or competencies do you feel you have that your local OESOs do not?" The 27 persons answering the item made 44 responses.

Table A-11

Ratings by Class 2-79 OESOs and Key Managers of OENCO
Contributions to OE Effort

Contributions of OENCO	Ratings		
	Has Had Negligible Effect	Has Had Some Effect	Has Had Substantial Effect
Responses of Key Managers (N = 34)			
Enables us to do more for each operation.	1 (3%)	4 (34%)	20 (62%)
Enables the OE office to serve more clients in a given period of time.	0	9 (30%)	21 (70%)
Increases ability to get good info from enlisted personnel.	1 (3%)	11 (34%)	20 (63%)
Enhances credibility of OE within the command.	7 (23%)	13 (43%)	10 (33%)
Enables the OE office to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	10 (35%)	8 (28%)	11 (38%)
Provides access to different set of people than before.	6 (18%)	10 (30%)	17 (52%)
Facilitates routine staff work.	10 (31%)	16 (50%)	6 (19%)
Responses of OESOs (N = 40)			
Provides "extra pair of hands" for the OESO(s).	3 (8%)	4 (10%)	33 (83%)
Enables us to do more for each operation.	2 (5%)	9 (23%)	29 (73%)
Enables us to serve more clients in a given period of time.	3 (8%)	9 (23%)	28 (70%)
Increases our ability to get good info from enlisted personnel.	5 (13%)	12 (30%)	23 (58%)
Increases our credibility with commanders and NCOs.	5 (13%)	12 (30%)	23 (58%)
Enables us to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	17 (43%)	13 (33%)	10 (25%)
Provides access to different set of people than before.	11 (28%)	15 (38%)	14 (35%)
Facilitates routine staff work.	14 (35%)	17 (43%)	9 (23%)

Table A-12

Percentages of Class 2-79 OENCOs, OESOs, and Key Managers Responding that OENCOs Could Function Effectively at Various Organizational Levels "Usually" or "Almost Always"

Organizational Level	Respondent Group		
	OENCO (N = 43)	OESO (N = 40)	Key Manager (N = 34)
Company level	79%	93%	79%
Battalion level	88%	88%	82%
Brigade level	79%	68%	74%
Installation/Division level	79%	57%	66%
MACOM level	71%	51%	56%

Table A-13

Number of Class 2-79 Key Managers and OESOs Indicating Preferred Ratios of OENCOs to OESOs

Preferred Ratio	Respondents	
	Key Managers (N = 34)	OESOs (N = 40)
1 OENCO for 6 or more OESOs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1 OENCO for 4 or 5 OESOs	2 (6%)	2 (5%)
1 OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs	12 (38%)	19 (48%)
1 OENCO for 1 OESO	9 (28%)	13 (33%)
2 or 3 OENCOs for 1 OESO	6 (19%)	5 (13%)
4 or 5 OENCOs for 1 OESO	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
6 or more OENCOs for 1 OESO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table A-14

Preferences of Class 2-79 Key Managers and OESOs for Additional OE Personnel

Type of OE Personnel	Respondents	
	Key Managers (N = 34)	OESOs (N = 40)
Another OESO	16 (49%)	19 (49%)
Another OENCO	9 (27%)	10 (26%)
Both or either	4 (12%)	8 (20%)
Neither/O.K. as is	4 (12%)	0 (0%)
Civilian	0 (0%)	2 (1%)

Table A-15

Ratings of OENCO Overall Competence by Class 2-79
OENCOs and OE Users

Respondent (Competence Statement)	N	Respondents Making Rating				
		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
OENCO ("I think my overall job perfor- mance as an OENCO has been excellent.")	43	0%	2%	12%	23%	63%
OE User ("My impression of this OENCO's overall competence is highly positive.")	84	1%	0%	5%	25%	69%

Table A-16

Ratings of OENCO Overall Competence
by Class 2-79 OESOs

Rating (Scale Value)	Percent of OESOs Making Rating
Poor (1)	0
Fair (2)	7
Good (3)	5
Very Good (4)	30
Excellent (5)	58

Table A-17

Average OESO Estimates of Quantitative Measures of OE Office
Productivity before and after Class 2-79 OENCO Assigned

Measure	Time Period	
	For the three months <u>before</u> OENCO's arrival	For the past three months (with OENCO assigned)
How many separate OE operations did your OE office conduct?	7.8	10.6
For how many different clients?	6.9	9.3
On the average, how many weeks did a client wait from the time of request for OE services until action was initiated?	4.4	2.8
On the average, how many calendar days did it take for your OE office to conduct the agreed-upon OE operation?	24.9	21.6
What <u>percent</u> of their on-duty time did OESOs at your location spend on work "billable" to clients? (Work which is billable to a client involves all the preparation, direct contact, analysis, report writing, etc., such as a management consultant would charge for.)	63.1	64.5
What <u>percent</u> of their on-duty time did OESOs at your location spend on OE mission-related work not considered billable to clients? (Include professional development, research etc.)	21.7	19.1

Table A-18

Percentages of Class 2-79 OENCOs and OE Users Responding to
Questions Concerning OENCO Acceptance and
Integration into OE Team

Item	Responses				
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Disagree nor Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
OENCO Responses (N = 43)					
Commanders/OE users have received me very well.	0%	2%	5%	49%	44%
I have been favorably received by those of equal or lower rank with whom I associate (formal and informal associations).	0%	7%	5%	33%	55%
I work very well with the OESO(s) here.	2%	7%	14%	9%	67%
I work very well with the Key Manager.	0%	14%	16%	30%	40%
This OE office functions effectively as a team.	5%	7%	9%	21%	58%
I have been fully integrated into the OE team here.	2%	9%	12%	9%	68%
OE User Responses (N = 84)					
This OENCO and the OESO(s) work very well together as a team.	1%	0%	10%	21%	68%

Table A-19

Satisfaction of OE Users with OE and with Class 2-79
OENCO Participation in OE Operations

Responses of OE Users (N = 84)					
Item	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The effect of recent OE operations on my unit/organization has been highly positive.	1%	0%	4%	46%	49%
There is a high probability that my unit/organization will request OE services in the future.	1%	0%	7%	30%	62%
The effect of this OENCO on the OE operation(s) in question was highly positive.	1%	0%	9%	36%	54%
I would like to have this OENCO participate in future OE operations in my unit/organizations.	1%	0%	6%	19%	74%

Table A-20

Job Satisfaction of Class 2-79 OENCOs

Responses of OENCOs (N = 43)					
Item	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
My work here is personally satisfying.	2%	7%	9%	33%	49%
I am using my OE skills in a highly effective manner.	0%	7%	12%	37%	44%
I feel that what I do as an OENCO improves the user organization.	0%	0%	5%	42%	53%
This assignment has increased my competence as a soldier.	0%	7%	7%	28%	58%
I'm not sure what is required of me in my present assignment.	56%	33%	7%	2%	2%
The climate in which I work allows me to use my abilities and knowledge of OE in an effective manner.	2%	7%	12%	35%	44%
I would like to be assigned in the OENCO program during subsequent tours.	0%	5%	19%	19%	58%

Table A-21

Factors Considered by Class 2-79 OESOs To Be Most
Important to OENCO Competency

Factor	Number of Times Factor Mentioned
Experience/Education	45 (35%)
Skills	44 (34%)
Personal Characteristics	29 (22%)
Organizational Support	9 (7%)
Miscellaneous	<u>2 (2%)</u>
Total Mentions	Total 129

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES

1. OENCO PILOT PROGRAM--OENCO QUESTIONNAIRE
2. OENCO PILOT PROGRAM--OESO QUESTIONNAIRE
3. OENCO PILOT PROGRAM--KAY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE
4. OENCO PILOT PROGRAM--COMMANDER/OE USER QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B-1

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - OENCO QUESTIONNAIRE

DECEMBER 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303a

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM

OENCO Pilot Program - OENCO Questionnaire

PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE

AR 70-1

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

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. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

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. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM

Privacy Act Statement - 26 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

DATE RECEIVED

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: OENCO QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire is to be completed by all OENCOs graduated from OETC/OECS in 1979. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the Army with accurate feedback information about the OENCO Pilot Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence, and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on this research will not identify individuals or units. Names are requested only for follow-up purposes. (Completed questionnaires should be mailed to the Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B, Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in the envelope provided for this purpose.)

1. Name: _____
2. Mailing Address: _____

3. Name of OESO most familiar with your work: _____
4. Your rater (if different): _____
5. Key Manager: _____
6. Total number of OESOs in your OE office: _____
7. Total number of OENCOs in your OE office (including yourself): _____
8. MACOM: ___(1) FORSCOM ___(6) USAREC
 ___(2) TRADOC ___(7) MDW
 ___(3) USAREUR ___(8) WESTCOM
 ___(4) INSCOM ___(9) Other (please specify):
 ___(5) DARCOM

During the past three months, please estimate the percent of your on-duty time that you have spent on:

9. % OE mission-related activities
10. % Activities not related to OE mission

11. Sex: ___(1) Male
 ___(2) Female

1: 16

12. Rank: ___(1) E-6 ___(4) E-9
 ___(2) E-7 ___(5) Other (please specify):
 ___(3) E-8 _____

1: 17

13. PMOS: _____

1: 18, 1

14. Training: ___(1) OENCO Class 1-79
 ___(2) OENCO Class 2-79
 ___(3) OESO course
 ___(4) Other (please specify):

1: 20

Rank the following titles according to how well they describe the role you are actually performing. (Use "1" for that which best describes your role; "2" for that which is next best; "3" for next best; and so on.)

15. ___ OE Consultant 16. ___ Assistant OESO
17. ___ Administrator 18. ___ Instructor
19. ___ Trainer 20. ___ Survey Specialist
21. ___ Other (please specify): _____

1: 21 1: 22

1: 23 1: 24

1: 25 1: 26

1: 27

To what extent do you feel that, as an OENCO, you could function effectively at the following levels? (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
22. Company level	1	2	3	4	5
23. Battalion level	1	2	3	4	5
24. Brigade level	1	2	3	4	5
25. Installation/Division level	1	2	3	4	5
26. MACOM level	1	2	3	4	5

1: 28

1: 29

1: 30

1: 31

1: 32

Indicate the relative frequency with which you perform the OE tasks listed below. Circle a "1" for the five tasks least frequently performed. Circle a "3" for the five tasks most frequently performed. Then circle a "2" for the remaining tasks.

	<u>Least Frequent</u>		<u>Most Frequent</u>	
27. Marketing OE	1	2	3	1:33
28. Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	1:34
29. Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	1:35
30. Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	1:36
31. Process observation	1	2	3	1:37
32. Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	1:38
33. Assessment analysis	1	2	3	1:39
34. Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	1:40
35. Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	1:41
36. Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	1:42
37. Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	1:43
38. Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	1	2	3	1:44
39. Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	1:45
40. Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	1:46
41. Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	1:47
42. Professional development activities	1	2	3	1:48
43. Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	1:49
44. Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	1:50
45. Other (please specify):	1	2	3	1:51

46. What percent of your OE-related duties require the training you received at OETC/OECS?

____%

47. What specific skills and knowledge that you acquired at OETC/OECS are not being used? Note reasons where possible. (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

48. Describe below how you feel you can be most effectively used as an OENCO. (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

49. Describe below what you feel is the least effective use of you as an OENCO. (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

50. What special skills or competencies do you feel you have that your local OESOs do not? (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

51. How should the OENCO course be changed in order to provide more effective training for OENCOs? (Use back of page if more space is needed.)

Indicate the extent of your agreement with the statements given below.
Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither Disagree nor Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
52. I feel that what I do as an OENCO improves the user organization.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 54
53. This assignment has increased my competence as a soldier.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 55
54. My work here is personally satisfying.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 56
55. I would like to be assigned in the OENCO program during subsequent tours.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 57
56. I'm not sure what is required of me in my present assignment.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 58
57. My training at OETC/OECS prepared me well for the job here.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 59
58. I have been fully integrated into the OE team here.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 60
59. The preparations that were made to integrate me into the local organization and OE efforts were excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 61
60. I am using my OE skills in a highly effective manner.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 62
61. I think my overall job performance as an OENCO has been excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 63

Indicate the extent of your agreement with the statements given below.
Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither Disagree nor Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
62. The climate in which I work allows me to use my abilities and knowledge of OE in an effective manner.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 64
63. I work very well with the OESO(s) here.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 65
64. I work very well with the Key Manager.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 66
65. Commanders/OE users have received me very well.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 67
66. This OE office functions effectively as a team.	1	2	3	4	5	1: 68
67. I have been favorably received by those of equal or lower rank with whom I associate (formal and informal associations).	1	2	3	4	5	1: 69
68. Please give us any additional information or comments you may have concerning your job as an OENCO.						

APPENDIX B-2

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - OESO QUESTIONNAIRE

DECEMBER 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303b

DATE RECEIVED _____

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - OESO QUESTIONNAIRE

Office
Use
Only

Instructions: This questionnaire should be completed by the OESO who works most closely with the OENCO named below. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the Army with accurate feedback information about the OENCO Pilot Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence, and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on this research will not identify individuals or units. Names are requested only for follow-up purposes. (Completed questionnaires should be mailed to the Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B, Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in the envelope provided for this purpose.)

The OENCO of concern for this questionnaire _____

1. Your name _____

2. Grade: ___(1) 0-3 ___(4) 0-6
 ___(2) 0-4 ___(5) Other (please specify):
 ___(3) 0-5 _____

3. MACOM: ___(1) FORSCOM ___(6) USAREC
 ___(2) TRADOC ___(7) MDW
 ___(3) USAREUR ___(8) WESTCOM
 ___(4) INSCOM ___(9) Other (please specify):
 ___(5) DARCOM _____

4. Mailing Address: _____

5. AUTOVON: _____

6. Total number of OESOs in your OE office: (including yourself): _____

7. Total number of OENCOs in your OE office: _____

8. How many months has your OENCO worked in your OE office? _____ months

1:7

1:8

1:9,10

1:11,12

1:13,14

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM

OENCO Pilot Program - OESO Questionnaire

PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE

AR 70-1

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

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. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

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. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM

Privacy Act Statement - 28 Sep 75

DA Form 4338-R, 1 May 75

For items 9-12, please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
9. Was your OE office consulted regarding the assignment of an OENCO before the assignment was made?	1	2	3	1:15
10. Did your OE office request the assignment of an OENCO?	1	2	3	1:16
11. Was the OENCO assigned to you in lieu of other personnel that you had requested?	1	2	3	1:17
12. Before your OENCO arrived, did you have specific expectations about the role he/she would perform in your OE office and operations?	1	2	3	1:18

If you answered "No" to item 12, please skip to item 20. If you answered "Yes" to item 12, please rank the following titles according to how well they describe the role you expected your OENCO to play when he/she was assigned to your office. (Use "1" for that which best describes the expected OENCO role; "2" for that which next best describes it; "3" for next best; and so on.)

13. ___ OE Consultant	14. ___ Assistant OESO	1:19 1:20
15. ___ Administrator	16. ___ Survey Specialist	1:21 1:22
17. ___ Trainer	18. ___ Instructor	1:23 1:24
19. ___ Other (please specify): _____		1:25

Now rank the following titles according to how well they describe the role your OENCO is actually performing. (Use "1" for that which best describes his/her actual role; "2" for that which next best describes it; "3" for next best; and so on.)

20. ___ OE Consultant	21. ___ Assistant OESO	1:26 1:27
22. ___ Administrator	23. ___ Survey Specialist	1:28 1:29
24. ___ Trainer	25. ___ Instructor	1:30 1:31
26. ___ Other (please specify): _____		1:32

27. If there is a substantial difference between your rankings for the expected role and your rankings for the actual role, please explain.

During the past three months, please estimate the percent of on-duty time that your OENCO has spent on:

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 28. ___% OE mission-related activities | 1:33,34 |
| 29. ___% Activities not related to OE mission | 1:35,36 |

Check any of the following that were done to support the transition of your OENCO into his/her new position.

- | | |
|---|------|
| 30. ___ Thinking about the role the OENCO should play in our
OE office | 1:37 |
| 31. ___ Notifying unit commanders of the addition of the OENCO
to the OE staff | 1:38 |
| 32. ___ Introducing OENCO to current clients | 1:39 |
| 33. ___ Involving the OENCO in an operation for training purposes | 1:40 |
| 34. ___ Conducting team building within the OE office with the
OENCO | 1:41 |
| 35. ___ Scheduling professional development activities for the
OENCO | 1:42 |
| 36. ___ Arranging clerical support for the OENCO | 1:43 |
| 37. ___ Arranging for appropriate work space for the OENCO | 1:44 |
| 38. ___ Providing necessary funding support | 1:45 |
| 39. ___ Other (please specify):
_____ | 1:46 |

Indicate the relative frequency with which your OENCO performs the OE tasks listed below during normal on-duty time. Circle a "1" for the five tasks least frequently performed. Circle a "3" for the five tasks most frequently performed. Then circle a "2" for the remaining tasks.

	Least Frequent		Most Frequent
40. Marketing OE	1	2	3
41. Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3
42. Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3
43. Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3
44. Process observation	1	2	3
45. Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3
46. Assessment analysis	1	2	3
47. Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3
48. Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3
49. Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3
50. Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3
51. Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	1	2	3
52. Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3
53. Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3
54. Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3
55. Professional development activities	1	2	3
56. Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3
57. Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3
58. Other (please specify):	1	2	3

Now indicate the relative frequency with which you perform the OE tasks listed below. Circle a "1" for the five tasks least frequently performed. Circle a "3" for the five tasks most frequently performed. Then circle a "2" for the remaining tasks.

	Least Frequent		Most Frequent	
59. Marketing OE	1	2	3	1:66
60. Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	1:67
61. Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	1:68
62. Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	1:69
63. Process observation	1	2	3	1:70
64. Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	1:71
65. Assessment analysis	1	2	3	1:72
66. Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	1:73
67. Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	1:74
68. Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	1:75
69. Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	1:76
70. Documentation (time, costs, tracking your operations)	1	2	3	1:77
71. Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	1:78
72. Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	1:79
73. Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	2:7
74. Professional development activities	1	2	3	2:8
75. Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	2:9
76. Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	2:10
77. Other (please specify):	1	2	3	2:11

For the tasks listed below, circle a "1" for the five tasks for which you have the lowest degree of confidence in your OENCO's skills and abilities; circle a "3" for the five tasks for which you have the highest degree of confidence. For the remaining tasks, circle a "2" to indicate an intermediate degree of confidence or a "4" to indicate you have no basis for making a judgment.

	<u>Degree of Confidence</u>			
	<u>Lowest</u>		<u>Highest</u>	<u>No Basis</u>
78. Marketing OE	1	2	3	4
79. Scouting and entry (contracting and orientation)	1	2	3	4
80. Collecting historical (e.g., records) data	1	2	3	4
81. Interviewing individuals/groups	1	2	3	4
82. Process observation	1	2	3	4
83. Preparing, administering, and interpreting questionnaires (e.g., the GOQ)	1	2	3	4
84. Assessment analysis	1	2	3	4
85. Giving organizational feedback	1	2	3	4
86. Designing implementation (e.g., workshop, transition meeting)	1	2	3	4
87. Training (e.g., conducting Leadership & Management Development Course)	1	2	3	4
88. Conducting workshops, meetings, etc.	1	2	3	4
89. Documentation (time, costs; tracking your operations)	1	2	3	4
90. Evaluation of operations (preparing case studies, cost-benefit analysis, feedback to commanders)	1	2	3	4
91. Routine OE-related administration	1	2	3	4
92. Reviewing literature for OE ideas	1	2	3	4
93. Professional development activities	1	2	3	4
94. Routine organizational tasks (duty NCO, details, etc.)	1	2	3	4
95. Team building with OE personnel	1	2	3	4
96. Other (please specify):	1	2	3	4

In your OE office, how often does each of the following initiate the commitment of resources to OE work? (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response. If category does not apply, leave item blank.)

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
97. Key Manager	1	2	3	4	5	2:31
98. Senior OESO	1	2	3	4	5	2:32
99. Other OESOs	1	2	3	4	5	2:33
100. OENCO	1	2	3	4	5	2:34

In your opinion, to what extent could your OENCO function effectively at the

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
101. Company level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:35
102. Battalion level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:36
103. Brigade level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:37
104. Installation/Division level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:38
105. MACOM level?	1	2	3	4	5	2:39

How are decisions made concerning who does what in your OE shop? To what extent is each of the following considered in making assignments?

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
106. Level of the client	1	2	3	4	5	2:40
107. Client preference	1	2	3	4	5	2:41
108. Preference of OESO/OENCO	1	2	3	4	5	2:42
109. Skills of OESO/OENCO	1	2	3	4	5	2:43
110. Whoever is available	1	2	3	4	5	2:44
111. Whoever made initial contact	1	2	3	4	5	2:45
112. Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	4	5	2:46

How does your OENCO expand the capabilities of your OE office? Estimate the extent to which having an OENCO has affected the capabilities listed below. Please circle the number of your chosen response.

	<u>Negligible Effect</u>	<u>Some Effect</u>	<u>Substantial Effect</u>	
113. Provides "extra pair of hands" for the OESO(s).	1	2	3	2:47
114. Enables us to do more for each operation.	1	2	3	2:48
115. Enables us to serve more clients in given period of time.	1	2	3	2:49
116. Increases our ability to get good information from enlisted personnel.	1	2	3	2:50
117. Increases our credibility with commanders and NCOs.	1	2	3	2:51
118. Enables us to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	1	2	3	2:52
119. Provides access to different set of people than before.	1	2	3	2:53
120. Facilitates routine staff work.	1	2	3	2:54
121. Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	2:55
122. What should be the ratio of OENCOs to OESOs?				
____(1) One OENCO for each OESO			____(5) One OESO for 2 or 3 OENCOs	
____(2) One OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs			____(6) One OESO for 4 or 5 OENCOs	2:56
____(3) One OENCO for 4 or 5 OESOs			____(7) One OESO for 6 or more OENCOs	
____(4) One OENCO for 6 or more OESOs			____(8) Other (please specify): _____	

- | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|------|
| 123. Is this OENCO formally assigned to your OE office? | 1 | 2 | 2:57 | | | |
| 124. Do you have supervisory responsibility for this OENCO? | 1 | 2 | 2:58 | | | |
| 125. If you responded "No" to item 123 or item 124, please explain the nature of any supervisory and control difficulties that may have arisen. | | | | | | |
| 126. How have the managerial/supervisory requirements associated with having an OENCO in your office affected your role as an OESO? | | | | | | |
| 127. What has been your impression of this OENCO's overall competence? | | | | | | |
| | <u>Poor</u> | <u>Fair</u> | <u>Good</u> | <u>Very Good</u> | <u>Excellent</u> | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2:59 |
| 128. To what extent has your OENCO lived up to the expectations you originally had for him/her? | | | | | | |
| ___(1) Not quite lived up to those expectations. | | | | | | |
| ___(2) Fully met those expectations. | | | | | | |
| ___(3) Exceeded those expectations. | | | | | | |
| 129. If you had your choice, which of the following would you prefer? | | | | | | |
| ___(1) Another OENCO | | | | | | |
| ___(2) Another OESO | | | | | | |
| ___(3) Other (please specify): _____ | | | | | | |
| 130. Please state the reason for the choice you made in item 129. | | | | | | |

Where possible, use records data
for items 131-136.

For the three
months before
OENCO's
arrival

For the past
three months
(with OENCO
assigned)

131. How many separate OE operations
did your OE office conduct? _____ (2:62,63) _____ (2:64,65)
132. For how many different clients? _____ (2:66,67) _____ (2:68,69)
133. On the average, how many weeks
did a client wait from the time
of request for OE services until
action was initiated? _____ (2:70,71) _____ (2:72,73)
134. On the average, how many calendar
days did it take for your OE office
to conduct the agreed-upon OE
operation? _____ (2:74,75) _____ (2:76,77)
135. What percent of their on-duty
time did OESOs at your location
spend on work "billable" to
clients? (Work which is billable
to a client involves all the
preparation, direct contact,
analysis, report writing, etc.,
such as a management consultant
would charge for.) _____ % (3:7,8) _____ % (3:9,10)
136. What percent of their on-duty
time did OESOs at your location
spend on OE mission-related work
not considered billable to clients?
(Include professional development,
research, etc.) _____ % (3:11,12) _____ % (3:13,14)

Note: The percentages for items 135 and 136 will not total 100%. It is
expected that some proportion of time will be spent on normal
administrative duties.

137. Please note below any factors that may have affected the numbers
above (e.g., significant turnover, leave periods, reorganizations).

- For the next three items, please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
138. Has a client ever requested that you not use this OENCO in an OE operation?	1	2	3:15
139. Has this OENCO ever asked not to participate in an OE operation for a particular unit/organization?	1	2	3:16
140. Has a client ever asked that this OENCO participate in an OE operation in his unit/organization?	1	2	3:17
141. What are those factors, personal and organizational, that are most important to OENCO competency (e.g., formal education, verbal skills, rank, previous Army experiences, local support)?			

142. Please give us any additional information or comments that might help us to understand better what having an OENCO has meant to your OE office.

APPENDIX B-3

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - KEY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE

DECEMBER 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303c

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM OENCO Pilot Program - Key Manager Questionnaire	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE AR 70-1
--	---

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

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. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

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. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM

Privacy Act Statement - 26 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

DATE RECEIVED _____

Office
Use
Only

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - KEY MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire should be completed by Key Managers. Its purpose is to provide the Army with accurate feedback information about the OENCO Pilot Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence, and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on this research will not identify individuals or units. Names are requested only for follow-up purposes. (Completed questionnaires should be mailed to the Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B, Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in the envelope provided for this purpose.)

The OENCO of concern for this questionnaire is _____

1. Your name: _____

2. Grade: ___ (1) 0-3 ___ (4) 0-6
 ___ (2) 0-4 ___ (5) Other (please specify):
 ___ (3) 0-5 _____

1:7

3. MACOM: ___ (1) FORSCOM ___ (6) USAREC
 ___ (2) TRADOC ___ (7) MDW
 ___ (3) USAREUR ___ (8) WESTCOM
 ___ (4) INSCOM ___ (9) Other (please specify):
 ___ (5) DARCOM _____

1:8

4. Mailing Address: _____

5. AUTOVON: _____

6. Total number of OESOs in your OE office: _____

1:9,10

7. Total number of OENCOs in your OE office: _____

1:11,12

8. Are you a school-trained OESO (i.e., do you have an ASI 5Z)?

___(1) Yes

1:13

___(2) No

9. Have you attended the Key Manager's Course?

___(1) Yes

1:14

___(2) No

10. How many months has this OENCO been assigned to your office?

1:15,1

_____ months

Check below the actions you yourself directed or performed to support the transition of this OENCO into his/her new position.

11. ___ Thinking about the role the OENCO should play in our OE office

1:17

12. ___ Notifying unit commanders of the addition of the OENCO to the OE staff

1:18

13. ___ Directing the OESOs to prepare for the reception of the OENCO into the OE office

1:19

14. ___ Arranging clerical support for the OENCO

1:20

15. ___ Arranging for appropriate work space for the OENCO

1:21

16. ___ Providing necessary funding support

1:22

17. ___ Other (please specify): _____

1:23

18. If you had your choice, which of the following would you prefer?

___(1) Another OESO

___(2) Another OENCO

1:24

___(3) Other (please specify): _____

19. Please state the reason for the choice you made in item 18.

How does your OENCO expand the capabilities of your OE office? Estimate the extent to which having an OENCO has affected the capabilities listed below. Please circle the number of your chosen response. If you cannot respond to the item, leave it blank.

	<u>Has Had Negligible Effect</u>	<u>Has Had Some Effect</u>	<u>Has Had Substantial Effect</u>	
20. Enables us to do more for each operation.	1	2	3	1: 25
21. Enables the OE office to serve more clients in a given period of time.	1	2	3	1: 26
22. Increases ability to get good information from enlisted personnel.	1	2	3	1: 27
23. Enhances credibility of OE within the command.	1	2	3	1: 28
24. Enables the OE office to conduct different types of operations than we did before.	1	2	3	1: 29
25. Provides access to different set of people than before.	1	2	3	1: 30
26. Facilitates routine staff work.	1	2	3	1: 31
27. Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	1: 32
28. Concerning this OENCO's strengths and weaknesses, what feedback have you received as a result of his/her participation in OE operations?				

29. What should be the ratio of OENCOS to OESOs?

- ☐ (1) One OENCO for each OESO ☐ (5) One OESO for 2 or 3 OENCOS
☐ (2) One OENCO for 2 or 3 OESOs ☐ (6) One OESO for 4 or 5 OENCOS
☐ (3) One OENCO for 4 or 5 OESOs ☐ (7) One OESO for 6 or more OENCOS
☐ (4) One OENCO for 6 or more OESOs ☐ (8) Other (please specify): _____

1:33

In your opinion, to what extent could this OENCO function effectively at the

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>
30. Company level?	1	2	3	4	5
31. Battalion level?	1	2	3	4	5
32. Brigade level?	1	2	3	4	5
33. Installation/Division level?	1	2	3	4	5
34. MACOM level?	1	2	3	4	5

1:34

1:35

1:36

1:37

1:38

35. What are those factors, personal and organizational, that are most important to OENCO competency (e.g., formal education, verbal skills, rank, previous Army experiences, local support).

36. Please give us any additional information or comments that might help us to understand better what having an OENCO has meant to your OE office.

APPENDIX B-4

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM - COMMANDER/OE USER QUESTIONNAIRE

DECEMBER 1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PT 5303d

2

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a)	
TITLE OF FORM	OENCO Pilot Program - Commander/OE User Questionnaire
PREScribing DIRECTIVE AR 70-1	
1. AUTHORITY 10 USC Sec 4503	
2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S) The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.	
3. ROUTINE USES 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. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.	
4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION 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. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.	
FORM	Privacy Act Statement - 26 Sep 75

DATE RECEIVED _____

Office
Use
Only

OENCO PILOT PROGRAM: COMMANDER/OE USER QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire is intended to be completed by commanders and/or users of OE services who have worked with the OENCO named below. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information which will provide the Army with feedback concerning the OENCO pilot program. The objectives of this data collection are to determine: (1) the current roles of OENCOs, (2) the role characteristics unique to OENCOs, and (3) the effectiveness of the OENCO pilot program. All answers will be treated in strict confidence, and your anonymity will be maintained. Reports based on responses to this questionnaire will not identify units or individuals. (Completed questionnaires should be mailed to the Army Research Institute, ATTN: PERI-IM-B, Dr. Laurel Oliver, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333, in the envelope provided for this purpose.)

The OENCO of concern in this questionnaire is _____

If this OENCO has participated in more than one OE operation for your unit/organization, please give us your overall impressions. Please also describe on the line below the type of operation(s) that was/were involved (e.g., command transition workshop, survey feedback, Leadership and Management Development Course).

1. _____

1: 7-16

2. My organizational level is:

- | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| ____(1) Company | ____(4) Installation/Division |
| ____(2) Battalion | ____(5) MACOM |
| ____(3) Brigade | ____(6) Other (please specify): |
| | _____ |

1: 17

3. My grade is:

- | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| ____(1) O-1 | ____(5) O-5 |
| ____(2) O-2 | ____(6) O-6 |
| ____(3) O-3 | ____(7) Other (please specify): |
| ____(4) O-4 | _____ |

1: 18

Cdr-1

Indicate the extent of your agreement with each of the statements given below. Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	
4. The effect of recent OE operations on my unit/organization has been highly positive.	1	2	3	4	5	1:19
5. There is a high probability that my unit/organization will request OE services in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	1:20
6. The effect of this OENCO on the OE operation(s) in question was highly positive.	1	2	3	4	5	1:21
7. My impression of this OENCO's overall competence is highly positive.	1	2	3	4	5	1:22
8. This OENCO and the OESO(s) work very well together as a team.	1	2	3	4	5	1:23
9. I would like to have this OENCO participate in future OE operations in my unit/organization.	1	2	3	4	5	1:24
10. Based on your experience with him/her, what would you say are the particular strengths and weaknesses of this OENCO?						