

Research Note 83-39



HEIDELBERG NONCOMBATANT EVACUATION OPERATION (NEO) EVALUATION

AD-A141 293

Denna Brown and Sarah Lucken-Newton

Submitted by

ARI FIELD UNIT IN USAREUR

and

Joyce L. Shields, Director  
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL RESEARCH LABORATORY



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1983

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  
ELECTE  
MAY 21 1984  
S D D

DTIC FILE COPY

84 05 21 099

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 83-39	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A141293	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)  HEIDELBERG NONCOMBATANT EVACUATION OPERATION (NEO) EVALUATION	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s)  Denna Brown and Sarah Lucken-Newton	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS  2Q263743A794
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS  --	12. REPORT DATE October 1983	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 60	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)  --	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  --		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Training Command and control Attitudes Readiness		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  The purpose of this research was to evaluate the effects of different types of involvement in a Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) on the participants' attitudes, knowledge, and preparation. Three groups of subjects in Heidelberg, Germany, representing three levels of involvement, were evaluated: (1) active volunteers who attended an NEO briefing and who participated in a mock evaluation, (2) those who attended an NEO briefing and who participated in a paperwork exercise, and (3) individuals who had no known involvement in the NEO process. (Continued)		

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 73

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

1 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

## Item 20 (Continued)

Results of the research indicated that the NEO plan is received favorably and all three groups agreed that an NEO plan was needed. The subjects sampled, even non-attendees, were well informed on NEO procedures. All reported that they were well prepared with needed documents and supplies should an evaluation be necessary. However, a few items (power of attorney and personal property inventories) were not readily available to at least 50% of the sample, and the real need for several items (power of attorney, will, radio) was questioned.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A/1	



HEIDELBERG NONCOMBATANT EVACUATION  
OPERATION (NEO) EVALUATION

FOREWORD

---

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) maintains a field unit with the U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR). The field unit conducts research, and also provides technical advisory service (TAS), on issues relating to personnel and manpower.

This report describes TAS provided to the Directorate Plans, Training, and Security of the Heidelberg Community Commander's Office. The Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) is a system developed to evacuate all U.S. civilians and military dependents in the event of an emergency. Periodic practices are necessary to make sure people have the recommended documents for an evacuation and accurate knowledge of NEO procedures. In November, 1980, the Heidelberg community instituted a new type of NEO exercise which involved a more realistic mock evacuation procedure, and the Army Research Institute acted as an evaluator of the effectiveness of this exercise.

## HEIDELBERG NONCOMBATANT EVACUATION OPERATION (NEO) EVALUATION

### BRIEF

---

#### Requirement:

USAREUR military authorities are responsible for evacuating several hundred thousand non-active duty people from Europe in the event of hostilities. Periodic drills are conducted to impart information on procedures and check people's level of readiness, e.g. availability of critical documents and items. In November, 1980 a full scale mock exercise was conducted by the Heidelberg community in addition to the usual brief paperwork check procedure. This mock evacuation procedure, however, is highly costly in terms of manpower and money. The purpose of this TAS was to evaluate the effects of three levels of involvement in a Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) on participants' attitudes, knowledge, and preparation. Results are pertinent to cost effectiveness determinations and to making recommendations for program improvements.

#### Procedure:

Groups representing three levels of involvement were evaluated: 1) active volunteers who were taken to Ramstein Air Base for a mock evacuation (high involvement); 2) people who processed through the usual NEO procedure which is mainly a paperwork check (intermediate involvement); and 3) people who did not attend either NEO procedure (no involvement). People who attended a NEO briefing (Group 1 or 2) were given a survey on completion of their processing which assessed their attitude toward the briefing as well as the accuracy of their knowledge about NEO. Two weeks later they were mailed a follow-up survey which assessed their retention of what they had learned and asked what preparations they had made in the event of an evacuation. Reasons for non-attendance were also asked.

#### Findings:

Overall the NEO plan is viewed favorably. All three groups were in high agreement that a NEO plan was needed. The least positive perception concerned whether or not the plan would work. The entire Heidelberg community sampled, including non-attenders, was highly informed about basic NEO procedures. Average correct responses on the knowledge test were above 90% for all three groups. Likewise all segments of the community report that they are well prepared with needed documents and supplies should an evacuation be necessary. However, a few items (power of attorney and personal property inventories) were not readily available to at least 50% of the sample, and the real need for several items was questioned (power of attorney, wills, a radio).

Utilization of Findings:

The results led to several suggestions for changes, improvements, and cost effectiveness. In brief they include:

1. More reliance on the media and less on large scale mock evacuations as a cost effective way to disseminate information and as a means of reaching non-attenders.

2. Feedback to the community concerning the high level of knowledge and preparation as a means of further increasing confidence in the plan.

3. Greater emphasis in future NEO exercises on justifying the need for those items which are least likely to be readily available or perceived as necessary.

4. Instituting satellite processing units to reach community members who are non-attenders.

# HEIDELBERG NONCOMBATANT EVACUATION OPERATION (NEO) EVALUATION

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
METHOD . . . . .	3
Group Selection . . . . .	3
Instruments . . . . .	3
Data Collection . . . . .	4
Research Design Overview . . . . .	4
Data Analysis . . . . .	5
RESULTS . . . . .	6
Sample Size and Characteristics . . . . .	6
Attendees . . . . .	6
Non-attendees . . . . .	8
Attitudes About NEO . . . . .	10
Attendees . . . . .	10
Non-attendees . . . . .	15
Knowledge of NEO Procedures . . . . .	18
Attendees . . . . .	18
Non-attendees . . . . .	18
Preparation . . . . .	20
Attendees and Non-attendees . . . . .	20
Relationship Between Preparation and Attitude . . . . .	21
EVALUATION OF RESULTS . . . . .	22
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	24
REFERENCES . . . . .	27
APPENDIX A. SURVEY TO ATTENDERS, TIME ONE . . . . .	A-1
B. SURVEY TO ATTENDERS, FOLLOW-UP . . . . .	B-1
C. SURVEY TO NON-ATTENDERS . . . . .	C-1



## CONTENTS

---

	Page
APPENDIX D. REASONS FOR PREVIOUS NON-ATTENDANCE AT NEO . . . . .	D-1
E. WHERE PEOPLE FOUND OUT ABOUT NEO . . . . .	E-1

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Design schemata . . . . .	5
2. Characteristics of attenders . . . . .	6
3. Reasons for attending a NEO briefing . . . . .	7
4. Comparison of attender/non-attender characteristics . . . . .	9
5. Understandability of presented information . . . . .	11
6. Completeness of presented information . . . . .	12
7. Perceived need for a NEO plan . . . . .	13
8. Perceived effectiveness of the NEO plan . . . . .	14
9. Perceived need for a NEO plan: Comparison of attenders/non-attenders . . . . .	16
10. Perceived effectiveness of the NEO plan: Comparison of attenders/non-attenders . . . . .	17
11. Accuracy of information . . . . .	19
12. Comparison of 1978 and 1980 NEO attitudes . . . . .	23

## INTRODUCTION

---

The Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) is a system developed to evacuate all U.S. civilians and military dependents from Germany in the event of an emergency. It is estimated that in the Heidelberg area alone there reside over 12,000 noncombatants who would require evacuation. To deal with such a large number of people, a plan is needed to assure a way of notifying, assembling, and transporting them under adverse circumstances. Periodic practices are necessary to make sure people have the recommended documents for an evacuation and accurate knowledge of NEO procedures.

The practice exercises also serve another very important function. If they are well done, they should inspire confidence that the procedures would really work during an evacuation. Unfortunately, this last function is not always served well. As one Heidelberg Officer observed: "The number of dependents in the potential 'war zone' of Central Europe is now greater than 350,000, and current plans for noncombatant evacuation operations were remarkable for their lack of credibility even before the recent fiasco in Iran." (Manning, 1979 p. 12).

This lack of credibility apparently is a worse problem in the Heidelberg community than many other areas of Germany. In 1978, in response to the Commander in Chief, U.S. Army, Europe (CINCUSAREUR), nine USAREUR communities were surveyed to obtain a sample of information regarding NEO. This work was done by the Army Research Institute (Whittenburg, Owns, & Bussey, 1980). Heidelberg was one of the sampled communities. The survey data indicated that Heidelberg was in the bottom 1/3 for attendance at NEO briefings, as well as

for seeing a need for the NEO plan at all. The perceived ability to implement the plan was lowest in the Heidelberg area where only 40% of the respondents thought the plan was practical and could be implemented. Heidelberg was also at the bottom in terms of preparation. Thus, it appears that there is (or at least was in 1978) a type of self-fulfilling prophecy in the Heidelberg area. People do not believe an emergency really could occur or that the plan could work anyway and so do not attend briefings or make preparations.

In November, 1980 the Heidelberg community instituted a new type of NEO exercise which involved a more realistic mock evacuation procedure. A large sample (266) of noncombatants was taken by train to Ramstein Air Base. There they boarded a plane and were briefed about what would happen if they were actually being evacuated. The rest of the community was encouraged to attend an improved briefing procedure which involved, mainly, a check of necessary documents, a film about NEO, and individual counseling on specific areas, e.g., medical problems.

The Army Research Institute (ARI) again acted as an evaluator of the effectiveness of this exercise. The three main objectives evaluated by ARI were:

1. to impart the necessary information to noncombatants about what to do in case of an evacuation: the knowledge dimension,
2. to get noncombatants to take the necessary actions to be prepared if an evacuation occurred: the action dimension,
3. to instill a positive regard for the NEO plan, i.e., to see it as worthwhile, well done, and workable: the attitudinal dimension.

## METHOD

---

### Group Selection

Three groups were compared in this evaluation. Group 1 consisted of all adults on the train to Ramstein. Participation was voluntary, but the participation was almost 100% (N=266). This group of noncombatant volunteers represented the most involved subjects since up to 12 hours of their time was needed to participate in the mock NEO procedure. Group 2 consisted of a sample (N=639) of the people who attended the NEO briefings at the Heidelberg Middle School at Patrick Henry Village (PHV) and the Heidelberg American High School at Mark Twain Village (MTV). Their attendance required up to an hour of time, making them intermediate in level of involvement. Group 3 consisted of a sample (N=91) of non-attenders. These people were randomly selected from the computer lists at the end of the NEO briefing period. They represented no known involvement in the NEO process.

### Instruments

Three surveys were developed to evaluate this exercise. The first survey was given to both groups of attenders--the ones on the train and the ones who attended a briefing at either MTV or PHV. This survey (see Appendix A) consisted of 22 questions geared toward attitudes about the NEO plan and accuracy of factual information gained. The second survey (see Appendix B) was given to the same two groups of attenders as a two week follow-up. The questions on the follow-up focused on actual preparatory behaviors taken or in process, as well as knowledge retained or lost over the two weeks. The third survey (see Appendix C) was given only to the sample of non-attenders.

It asked: reasons for non-attendance, general attitudes toward NEO, knowledge about NEO procedures, and level of preparation.

#### Data Collection

The first survey was given in person by staff from ARI. The train volunteers were given the survey on the return ride to Heidelberg. They had been told in a previous briefing who the data collectors were, the general purpose of the survey, and when it would be given. They were allowed time to fill it out in their individual train compartments, and all completed surveys were collected before people left the train. At the briefings in the schools, ARI staffed a table by the final out-processing station. A sample believed to match the Ramstein train group was selected. Again cooperation was almost 100%. Completed surveys were returned to ARI before people left the briefing area.

The two week follow-up survey and the survey of non-attenders were mailed. Surveys were sent out along with a stamped return envelope addressed to the Community Commander's office, the sponsor of the evacuation. The returned surveys were collected for 10 days then turned over to ARI for data analysis.

From the original 266 train riders, 132 or 50% returned the two week follow-up survey. From the other sample of 639 NEO attenders who processed at the schools, 51% (N=325) returned the follow-up survey. The return rate for the non-attenders was 91, or a little less than 30%.

#### Research Design Overview

A schemata of the overall design is given on the following page.

Table 1

## Design Schemata

	Group One: Train volunteers	Group Two: NEO Exercise Attendees	Group Three: Non-attendees
Time One November 19-20 NEO Briefing	Survey 1: Attitudes and knowledge	Survey 1: Attitudes and knowledge	By definition, these names were not available until the exercise was completed.
Time Two Two week follow-up	Survey 2: Preparatory actions and knowledge	Survey 2: Preparatory actions and knowledge	Survey 3: Attitudes, knowledge, preparation, reasons for non-attendance

Data Analysis

Statistics used were a combination of descriptive and inferential. Summary statistics (frequency counts on choices, % correct answers, means, and ranks) provide feedback on individual questions. Pearson r's were run on relationships of interest, e.g. between attitudes towards NEO and follow-up preparations. Group comparisons were made using t-tests, e.g., positive attitudes compared between attendees and non-attendees. Results are discussed in detail below.

## RESULTS

### Sample size and characteristics

Attendees. The first sample of attendees consisted of 905 people: 266 (29.4%) from the mock evacuation train to Ramstein and 639 (70.6%) who processed through the schools. About 2/3's of the people were dependents of U.S. Forces members who live in on-post quarters. Table 2 gives a more complete analysis of the characteristics of the attendees.

Table 2

#### Characteristics of Attendees

<u>Status of Attendees</u>		<u>Living Quarters of Attendees</u>	
<u>Primary Status</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Living Quarters</u>	<u>Percent</u>
U.S. Forces	10.2%	BEQ	0.2%
Dependent, U.S. Forces	67.9%	BOQ	2.1%
DoD Civilian	13.6%	On-post	68.9%
Dependent, DoD Civilian	5.2%	Off-post government quarters	5.3%
Non DA Civilian	1.3%	Economy housing	23.1%
Other	1.8%	Other	0.4%

This table indicates that all segments of the Heidelberg community were represented at the NEO exercise.

About 2/3's of the people had been in USAREUR more than one year (66.2%), a few, less than 4 months (11.2%), and the remaining (22.6%), from 4 to 12

months. For most (80.4%), this was not their first NEO briefing. Appendix D presents the reasons the other 178 (19.6%) had not attended a briefing before.

It appears that reasons for non-attendance do not reflect negative feelings about the program but, rather, a combination of variables. Half the previous non-attenders either did not know they were required to attend a NEO briefing, or this NEO exercise/ briefing was the first one they knew about since arriving. Since 103 people said they had been in USAREUR less than 4 months, and 73 said it was the first one they knew about, unawareness of NEO briefings seems to be a legitimate reason.

People attended NEO for a variety of reasons as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Reasons for Attending a NEO Briefing		
<u>Number of Responses*</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Reason for attending</u>
517	1	I really wanted to find out about NEO
471	2	Required to come
101	3	Something interesting to do
120	4	Other specified reasons
56	5	It was a break from work for awhile
41	6	Gave me a reason to get away from the house

\*More than one reason could be checked.



People found out about NEO from several main sources. The top three cited were the Heidelberg Herald Post, sponsors, and the weekly bulletin. Appendix E gives complete data on the information sources.

Non-attenders. Surveys were returned by 91 people who did not attend the NEO exercise. The return rate for surveys sent to non-attenders was lower than the return rate of follow-up surveys sent to attenders. A general attitude of lack of interest in NEO by the non-attenders is indicated. Given a return rate of less than 1 in 3, it is not possible to say that those who made the effort to complete the survey are a representative sample of all non-attenders. They may be more cooperative, knowledgeable, or favorably inclined towards NEO.

The non-attenders were slightly different from attenders in that they were more likely to be civilians who live on the economy, and to have been here longer. While 2/3's of the attenders had been in USAREUR a year or more, 3/4's of the non-attenders had been around a year or more. Table 4 compares the primary status and living quarters of the attender and non-attender sample.

Table 4

## Comparison of Attender/Non-attender Characteristics

<u>Primary Status</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>Living quarters</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	Attendees	Non-att.		Attendees	Non-att.
U.S. Forces	10.2	14.1	BEQ	0.2	1.0
Dep., U.S. Forces	67.9	53.3	BOQ	2.1	0.0
DoD Civilian	13.6	26.1	On-post quarters	68.9	57.6
Dep., DoD Civilian	5.2	2.2	Off-post govt. qtrs.	5.3	3.3
Non DA Civilian	1.3	0.0	Economy Housing	23.1	37.0
Other	1.8	4.3	Other	0.4	1.1

Non-attenders cited a variety of reasons for not coming to the NEO exercise. The primary reason cited was "out of town" (i.e., TDY, CONUS, leave). Other frequently cited reasons were "PCSing soon so NEO is not necessary" and "attended recently, no need for another so soon". Few cited interfering problems such as illness, child care demands, transportation, etc. At least those who returned the survey felt they had legitimate reasons for non-attendance. Only one respondent checked "NEO briefings are not worthwhile" although answers were anonymous, and they could have cited such reasons without repercussion. Of course, all those who did not return the survey may have felt both NEO and surveys were not worthwhile.

### Attitudes About NEO

Four questions using a five point Likert type scale were used to assess attitudes towards NEO. Responses were recoded to range from 1 (most unfavorable perception) to 5 (most favorable perception).

Attendees. The attitudes toward the NEO exercise were at the high positive end of the scale. The information was seen as understandably presented and complete by almost 90% of the attendees. There was no difference between the mock evacuees and the regular processors. Likewise, less than 1% would categorically say there was no need for a NEO plan, and less than 10% felt the NEO plan would not work in a true emergency. Both the mock evacuees and regular processors rated the plan favorably. However, there is still some skepticism in spite of the positive feelings about the practice exercises. People felt the exercise itself was well done and a plan was needed, but it remained to be seen what would happen in an actual evacuation. Thus, fewer than 10% said it would not work but only 60% said it would. A third of the sample endorsed the "maybe--hard to tell but better safe than sorry" category. Given that one really cannot know what would happen until the time came, this attitude of "cooperative skepticism" is reasonable. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the attitude data for each separate question. The percent selecting each alternative response is given, as well as the group response means on the 1 - 5 scale. T-tests compare the group means on each of the four questions. Only one question (perceived need for a NEO plan) showed a significant difference between the two groups of attendees. On that question people who processed at the schools (intermediate involvement) perceived a greater need.

Table 5

---

Understandability of Presented Information

---

Survey question: Was the information you received at the NEO exercise today understandable? (check only one)

<u>% endorsement</u>			<u>Response alternative</u>
Group 1 (train) N = 266	Group 2 (schools) N = 639	Combined (Groups 1 & 2) N = 905	
56.8%	67.6%	64.4%	5. Very understandable--I have no serious questions about what to do during an evacuation
40.1%	24.2%	28.9%	4. Understandable--I know more now than I knew before coming.
2.7%	7.4%	5.9%	3. OK--I know more now than I knew before coming.
0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	2. Confusing--I am not too clear about some of the procedures.
0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	1. Very confusing--I have serious questions about what I should do if there were a real evacuation
$\bar{x}=4.53$	$\bar{x}=4.58$	$\bar{x}=4.56$	Group mean response $t=-0.99$ , $p>.05$ , not significant

---

Table 6

## Completeness of Presented Information

Survey question: Was the information you received at the NEO exercise today complete? (check only one)

<u>% endorsement</u>			<u>Response alternative</u>
Group 1 (train) N = 266	Group 2 (schools) N = 639	Combined (Groups 1 & 2) N = 905	
56.6%	66.3%	63.4%	5. Very complete--any questions that I had were answered.
37.2%	24.0%	27.9%	4. Complete--most of the questions that I had were answered.
3.5%	7.7%	6.3%	3. OK--I know about as much as when I arrived.
2.3%	1.6%	1.9%	2. Incomplete--I still have some unanswered questions.
0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	1. Very incomplete--I have serious unanswered questions.
$\bar{x}=4.47$	$\bar{x}=4.54$	$\bar{x}=4.52$	Group mean response t=1.31, p>.05, not significant

Table 7

## Perceived Need for a NEO Plan

Survey question: Do you think there is a real need for an NEO plan? (check only one)

<u>% endorsement</u>			<u>Response alternative</u>
Group 1 (train) N = 266	Group 2 (schools) N = 639	Combined (Groups 1 & 2) N = 905	
61.1%	70.5%	67.8%	5. Definitely yes--I believe an emergency could occur while I am in Europe that might require an evacuation.
31.7%	24.7%	26.4%	4. Yes--there is some chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.
6.9%	5.2%	5.6%	3. Maybe--it is hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.
0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	2. No--there is probably no real no real chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.
0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	1. Definitely no--it is just a waste of time and money.
$\bar{x}=4.53$	$\bar{x}=4.69$	$\bar{x}=4.62$	Group mean response t=-2.66, p=.008, significant

Table 8

---

 Perceived Effectiveness of the NEO Plan
 

---

Survey question: Do You think in a true emergency the NEO plan would really work? (check only one)

<u>% endorsement</u>			<u>Response alternative</u>
Group 1 (train) N = 266	Group 2 (schools) N = 639	Combined (Groups 1 & 2) N = 905	
15.1%	14.4%	14.7%	5. Definitely yes--I have great faith in the plan.
50.0%	43.1%	45.3%	4. Yes--I feel pretty sure it would work.
26.4%	35.6%	32.6%	3. Maybe--hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.
7.8%	4.0%	5.2%	2. No--I think there are some real problems with the plan.
0.8%	2.9%	2.2%	1. Definitely no--I have no faith at all in this plan.
$\bar{x}=3.71$	$\bar{x}=3.62$	$\bar{x}=3.65$	Group mean response $t=1.36, p>.05$ , not significant

---

Additionally, responses to these four questions were totalled to give an overall attitude score. This total score could range from 4 (4x1, most unfavorable response on all 4 questions) to 20 (4x5, most favorable response on all 4 questions). The total scores for the two groups of participants did not differ (Group 1, mock evacuees  $\bar{X}=17.26$ ; Group 2, NEO briefing  $\bar{X}=17.39$ ;  $t=-1.02$ ,  $p>.05$ , not significant).

Non-attenders. The attitude data from the non-attenders is more mixed. Attenders and non-attenders were almost identical in their perception that a NEO plan was needed. However, the non-attenders were much more negative about whether the NEO plan would work. Tables 9 and 10 compare responses of attenders vs. non-attenders on these two questions.



Table 9

Perceived Need for a NEO Plan

Survey question: Do you think there is a real need for an NEO plan? (check only one)

<u>% endorsement</u>		<u>Response alternative</u>
Non-attenders N = 91	Total attenders N = 905	
58.2%	67.8%	5. Definitely yes--I believe an emergency could occur while I am in Europe that might require an evacuation.
35.2%	26.4%	4. Yes--There is some chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.
5.5%	5.6%	3. Maybe--it is hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.
0.0%	0.1%	2. No--there is probably no real chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.
1.1%	0.1%	1. Definitely no--it is just a waste of time and money.
$\bar{x}=4.49$	$\bar{x}=4.62$	Group mean response $t=-1.38$ , $p>.05$ , not significant

Table 10

---

 Perceived Effectiveness of NEO Plan
 

---

Survey question: Do you think in a true emergency the NEO plan would really work? (check only one)

<u>% endorsement</u>		<u>Response alternative</u>
Non-attenders N = 91	Total attenders N = 905	
7.8%	14.7%	5. Definitely yes--I have great faith in the plan.
24.4%	45.3%	4. Yes--I feel pretty sure it would work.
35.6%	32.6%	3. Maybe--hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.
28.9%	5.2%	2. No--I think there are some real problems with the plan.
3.3%	2.2%	1. Definitely no--I have no faith at all in this plan.
$\bar{x}=3.04$	$\bar{x}=3.65$	Group mean response $t=-6.00$ , $p<.0001$ , significant,

---

Table 9 shows that 93% of the non-attenders and 94% of the attenders feel there is a need for a NEO plan, an almost identical response. A t test of tender vs. non-attender mean responses shows no difference between the two groups ( $t=-1.38$ ,  $p>.05$ , not significant). However, Table 10 shows quite a divergence in views about whether the plan would actually work. While only 7% of the attenders say it would not work, 32% of the non-attenders choose negative evaluative statements. The t test for these group means shows a highly significant difference.

#### Knowledge of NEO Procedures

Attenders. Ten true/false questions were asked about basic NEO procedures and requirements. The results show that people's perceptions that information was understandable and complete were accurate. Their correct answer rate was very high. Table 11 presents the questions, responses, and correct answers. Accuracy was above 90% on all but two questions. These two questions pertained to pets and foreign nationals neither of which are relevant to the total sample, i.e., if you do not own a pet, there is no reason to know what you should do with one during an emergency. The level of accuracy was above 90% for both the group who took the train to Ramstein ( $\bar{X}=9.46$  out of a possible 10 correct, time one) and the group who processed at the schools ( $\bar{X}=9.26$ , time one). On the same test given for the two week follow-up, there was no loss of knowledge. In fact the score for those who attended actually improved slightly ( $\bar{X}=9.58$ , time two).

Non-attenders. Table 11 also gives the percent of correct answers for the non-attenders. Interestingly, it appears that those who did not go know as much about NEO as those who did go. A couple of factors may account for

Table 11

## Accuracy of Information

Survey question: Respondents were to note whether the following statements were true or false. Correct answers are noted in parentheses.

Two week follow-up % Correct answers		<u>Response alternative</u>
Non-attenders N = 91	Attenders N = 905	
97.8%	94%	All sponsors should have emergency pay and allowance forms on record. (true)
92.4%	92.6%	You are allowed to take up to 600 lbs. of personal belongings with you. (false)
91.3%	92%	In an evacuation, the military has control only over active duty military. Civilians and dependents should go to the nearest U.S. Embassy. (false)
91.3%	92.9%	In case of an evacuation, a USAREUR ID card is the only identification you need with you. (false)
77.2%	75.7%	Only one pet per family can be taken with you in an evacuation. (false)
90.2%	86.1%	Foreign nationals (e.g., German babysitters, relatives of a German spouse, etc.) are not allowed to go with you. (true)
98.9%	95.5%	A complete inventory of your personal property is a highly recommended item. (true)
91.3%	91.4%	If you need to drive your car, you should have your driver's license, registration papers (blue or white forms), and a half tank of gas. (true)
95.7%	94.1%	People who need medical help (sick, injured, and women in the 9th month of pregnancy) are evacuated through medical channels. (true)
96.7%	95%	Some other things you may need during an emergency evacuation are extra food, clothes, a first aid kit, etc. (true)
$\bar{x}=9.33$	$\bar{x}=9.58$	Group mean response $t=2.68, p=.008$ , significant

this. They were a self-selected group of non-attenders, 71% of whom said they had attended a NEO before. They probably retained some knowledge. More likely though, was an article in the Heidelberg Herald Post that gave all of the answers to the questions on the same day people should have been receiving the survey. If people had read the feature article, it was easy enough to sit down and fill out the survey. Since the knowledge score for the attenders was also higher on the follow-up than immediately after the briefing, it is likely that the newspaper article had an effect.

### Preparation

Attenders and Non-attenders. Reported preparation was very high. Given a potential range of scores from 13 (13x1, very unprepared on all 13 items) to 65 (13x5, very prepared on all 13 items), the mean of both groups was 59. Thus, preparation was high and there was no difference between groups (attenders  $\bar{X}=59.43$  and non-attenders  $\bar{X}=59.41$ ,  $t=-.03$ ,  $p>.05$ , not significant). Items most likely to be on hand were passports, POV registration, shot records, seasonal clothes, blankets, and toilet articles (over 90%). Least likely were power of attorney and personal property inventories (below 50%). Other items were available on the average to about 2/3's of those sampled. Five of the 13 items were checked by at least a few people as items they thought were unnecessary. Those five were as follows: emergency pay forms (2.3%), power of attorney (10.6%), wills (5.7%), radio (4.5%), 3 days food (1.1%). Numbers in parentheses indicate the percent of the sample endorsing the alternative "Have no intention of doing this because I do not believe it is really necessary".

Relationship between preparation and attitude. Pearson correlations were run between attitude scores and the degree of preparation. Attitude scores were summed for four questions as noted earlier. Thus, attitude scores could range between 4 (most negative) and 20 (most positive). In the same manner, scores for the 13 degree of preparation items were totaled, producing a range of scores from 13 (lowest degree of preparation) to 65 (highest degree of preparation). These two sets of scores formed the data for the Pearson correlations. It was believed that there should be a positive relationship, i.e., people who believed the plan would work should do more of what they were supposed to do in order to prepare for an emergency. Conversely, people who saw no need for a NEO plan or did not think it would work anyway probably would not bother with all the preparatory details. For attenders this positive relationship was true. The correlation between attitude and preparation was statistically significant ( $r=.27$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Those who believed a plan was needed and that it could work were better prepared. However, the relationship did not hold for non-attenders ( $r=.03$ , not significant). While not as positive toward the NEO plan, they claimed to be just as prepared. Since items called for are common, e.g., clothes or POV registration, it is likely non-attenders have those around anyway for other reasons. Thus, on many items, they may be just as prepared. However, it may be less likely they will go out and get those items that are specifically needed for NEO.

The correlation, although significant, does not demonstrate that the positive attitude causes people to prepare better. However, this is a possibility and given the significance of the relationship, it certainly is preferable to have a positive attitude. Anything that would encourage these attitudes could be useful.

## EVALUATION OF RESULTS

The basic impression from these data is that the NEO exercise went very well. The sample of almost 1,000 Heidelberg Community members had a positive attitude toward the exercise and displayed a high level of accurate knowledge about NEO procedures. This was true for the mock evacuees, the group who processed through regular means, and even for people who did not attend.

The implications of the lack of practical differences between the two groups of attenders are not clear cut. Since both groups scored above 90% accuracy on the knowledge survey, the added time and expense of the train ride to Ramstein is not very cost effective in increasing knowledge. Also, there is no difference between groups in attitudes. However, it is still possible that the mock evacuation had an indirect effect. The preparation and planning needed for the train experience plus its high visibility may have convinced the community that the people in charge of NEO were really taking their responsibility seriously. Thus, they may have felt the plan was more likely to work and taken their own participation and responsibility more seriously.

At the very least there is an impressive difference in the Heidelberg community between 1980 and 1978 data. People attending briefings are much more positive about NEO now. Questions in 1978 were not identical to 1980 questions but a few tentative comparisons are possible.

Table 12

## Comparison of 1978 and 1980 NEO Attitudes

---

<u>1978</u>	<u>1980</u>	
64.9%	92.3%	Understanding and completeness of NEO briefing
35.7%	7.4%	NEO plan could <u>not</u> be implemented
39.7%	93.2%	Perceived need for NEO plan

---

These percentages indicate a better attitude toward NEO now but should not be considered unquestionably valid since differences in wording can change responses.

Most likely, two factors account for this positive trend: 1) better NEO planning, and 2) history. As stated before, the NEO exercise was highly visible and carried out well which is likely to engender favorable responses. But additionally, the real evacuation of Americans from Iran and the concurrent threatening situation in Poland may also have increased people's sense of vulnerability. Maybe it really could happen to them and they ought to take it more seriously. Even people who did not go to NEO agreed that a plan was needed.



## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

---

1. Outcome measures, i.e., attitudes, knowledge, and preparations, show no practically useful differences between attenders who went all the way to Ramstein and those who processed at the schools. Thus, the cost effectiveness of a full scale mock exercise is questionable. It is likely the same function could be served by infrequent but highly visible exercises involving smaller numbers of people. Information about how the plane looks, the crowded uncomfortable conditions, lack of bathroom facilities, etc. can be presented to people using films at the NEO briefing. The impression that evacuation plans are well thought out and conducted in an organized, efficient way can be conveyed by highly publicizing those mock evacuations that do take place--even in other communities.
2. In terms of knowledge about NEO procedures, all elements of the Heidelberg community appear to be well informed, even non-attenders. Again fact sheets, initial briefings after arrival, and newspaper articles seem sufficient to get information disseminated throughout the community. Undoubtedly, there is a hard-core group of "know nothing non-attenders" out there who were not sampled but they may be impossible to reach anyway. In the case of a real evacuation, members of the Heidelberg community at this time appear to have an excellent knowledge of procedures.
3. Attitudes toward NEO are very positive generally. The briefings were seen as complete and understandable by those who attended them. All groups sampled, whether or not they attended, agree that a NEO plan is needed.

4. The main exception to positive attitudes is in believing that the plan would work if the time for implementing it really came. People did not fault this plan specifically but rather any possible attempt to move so many people quickly under adverse conditions. To the plan's credit is the fact that people who attend NEO briefings are much more likely to believe it would work. Non-attenders were quite pessimistic--a third saying it would not work, and another third giving the operation a "maybe". Only 32% of the non-attenders compared to 60% of the attenders said it would work. Ironically, when people are asked why it might not work, the non-attenders are cited as problems--they would be running around not knowing what to do and getting in the way.

Well disseminated feedback about the NEO exercise should be useful in overcoming pessimism. If people know how well informed and potentially prepared their community is, it may dispel the Keystone Cops chaotic scenario some of them project onto an evacuation. Publicity after the operation may prove just as valuable as the visibility of the operation itself. It is suggested that the sources which were most valuable in informing community members about NEO in the first place be used again, i.e., the Heidelberg Herald Post and Weekly Bulletin.

5. Attitudes toward NEO appear to be much more favorable in the Heidelberg community than they were two years ago.
6. People are very well prepared, according to their self reports, in certain areas. However, several needed items are not as available as they should be, specifically: the personal property inventory, power of attorney, wills, and emergency pay forms. The reason for these items and how to get them needs to be stressed--again through the media in order to reach the

non-attenders, as well as at briefings. Additionally, the need to have certain items or all is questioned by some people. If these items are truly necessary, they need to be explained better; if they are not necessary, it might be better to drop them so that the credibility of the whole program is not questioned. The items questioned by more than 5% of a sample were power of attorney and wills. There may be an element of denial involved with these where people will not admit the possibility of their own or loved one's mortality that would make a will necessary. The "hopefully you'll never need it but just in case" tact may be best, along with an explanation of what it can be good for. Another problem is that the power of attorney available at the JAG office is much too broad. Many people might be reluctant to sign a document conveying so much power to another, even a spouse. A limited power of attorney might be more appealing.

7. Most segments of the community are represented at NEO exercises. However, civilians who live on the economy are somewhat over represented among the non-attenders. They are not as likely to be exposed to the Weekly Bulletin and other sources of information. Probably the best way to reach them is at work with reminder memos from an immediate supervisor stating that there is a NEO exercise scheduled, that civilians and their dependent spouses are also required to attend and encouragement or release time to go. NEO information brochures posted on the office bulletin board or routed among the civilian personnel in an office could also be useful. Satellite processing units at places that employ large numbers of civilians might be useful in reaching civilians who are reluctant to drive and find parking at the centralized processing areas.

## REFERENCES

---

Manning, F.J. Continuous operations in Europe: Feasibility and the effects of leadership and training. Parameters, Journal of the U.S. Army War College, IX (3), Sept. 1979, 8-17.

Whittenburg, J.A., Owens, G., & Bussey, L.J. USAREUR-Wide Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) Survey. Army Research Institute, USAREUR Field Unit, Draft working paper, 29 Jan., 1980.

Appendix A  
Survey to Attenders, Time One



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
HEADQUARTERS, US MILITARY COMMUNITY ACTIVITY, HEIDELBERG  
APO NEW YORK 09102

AEUSG-SP

Dear Heidelberg Community Member:

Those of us in charge of the NEO planning want to carry out this work as well as we possibly can. Someday it might be very important that these plans work well. The few minutes of your time that it takes to fill out these forms can give us valuable information. We appreciate your time and cooperation.

This is a survey to obtain information about the Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) Plan in Heidelberg. We would like to get information about three areas covering the NEO Plan:

1. Whether you get necessary information about NEO plans and requirements.
2. Whether you believe the NEO plans are practical, and
3. Whether you are prepared for an evacuation if required.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Mark all answers in booklet by putting an X or ✓ mark in front of your answer.
2. Place your name, unit (APO) address and telephone, if available, on the last page of the survey booklet. We need this information to contact you once at a later date to obtain additional brief information about your experience. No feedback by individual name will be given to anyone. We are only interested in average group responses.
3. Read each question and all answers carefully before selecting your answer. If the question does not apply to you, indicate this. Unless directed to check all answers that apply, choose the one answer that most correctly answers the question from your point of view.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

  
ROBERT L. RAY  
Colonel, FA  
Deputy Community Commander

GROUP 1

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974  
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM

NEO EXERCISE EVALUATION

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 78

DA Form 4348-R, 1 May 78

2

(c.1) (c.2) (c.3) <sup>1</sup>(c.4)

1. How long have you been in USAREUR?

- (c.5) 1. ☐ less than a month      4. ☐ 7 to 9 months  
2. ☐ 1 to 3 months      5. ☐ 10 to 12 months  
3. ☐ 4 to 6 months      6. ☐ more than 12 months

2. Have you attended a community briefing on the NEO plan in Heidelberg before today?

- (c.6) 1. ☐ yes (skip to question 4)      2. ☐ no (answer question 3)

3. If you have not attended a community NEO briefing before, why not?  
(check all that apply)

- (c.7) 1. ☐ This is the first one I knew about  
(c.8) 1. ☐ I did not know they were required.  
(c.9) 1. ☐ I did not have transportation to get to one.  
(c.10) 1. ☐ I could not get time off from work to attend.  
(c.11) 1. ☐ I had problems finding child care.  
(c.12) 1. ☐ They are scheduled at a bad time.  
(c.13) 1. ☐ I was told they were not worthwhile.  
(c.14) 1. ☐ other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Why are you here today? (check all that apply)

- (c.15) 1. ☐ Told I was required to come.  
(c.16) 1. ☐ I really wanted to find out about NEO.  
(c.17) 1. ☐ It was something to do that might be interesting.  
(c.18) 1. ☐ It was a break from my work for awhile.  
(c.19) 1. ☐ It gave me a reason to get away from the house for awhile.  
(c.20) 1. ☐ other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_



5. How did you know about the NEO exercise today?  
(check all that apply)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (c.21) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Heidelberg Herald Post          | (c.27) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Someone phoned my home               |
| (c.22) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Other newspaper                 | (c.28) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Someone left a<br>message at my home |
| (c.23) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly bulletin                 | (c.29) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Someone phoned my office             |
| (c.24) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Bulletin board notices          | (c.30) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> My club or organization              |
| (c.25) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> My sponsor told me              | (c.31) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Told by my boss at work              |
| (c.26) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or neighbors<br>told me | (c.32) 1. <input type="checkbox"/> other (Please specify)               |
- 
- 

6. Was the information you received at the NEO exercise today  
understandable? (check only one)

- (c.33) 1. ☐ Very understandable--I have no serious questions about  
what to do during an evacuation.
2. ☐ Understandable--I know more now than I knew before coming.
3. ☐ OK--I know about as much as when I arrived.
4. ☐ Confusing--I am not too clear about some of the procedures.
5. ☐ Very confusing--I have serious questions about what I  
should do if there were a real evacuation.

7. Was the information you received at the NEO exercise today  
complete? (check only one)

- (c.34) 1. ☐ Very complete--any questions that I had were answered.
2. ☐ Complete--most of the questions that I had were answered.
3. ☐ OK--I know about as much as when I arrived.
4. ☐ Incomplete--I still have some unanswered questions.
5. ☐ Very incomplete--I have serious unanswered questions.

8. Do you think there is a real need for an NEO plan?  
(check only one)

- (c.35) 1. ☐ Definitely yes--I believe an emergency could occur while I am in Europe that might require an evacuation.
2. ☐ Yes--there is some chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.
3. ☐ Maybe--it is hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.
4. ☐ No--there is probably no real chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.
5. ☐ Definitely no--it is just a waste of time and money.

9. Do you think in a true emergency the NEO plan would really work?  
(check only one)

- (c.36) 1. ☐ Definitely yes--I have great faith in the plan.
2. ☐ Yes--I feel pretty sure it would work.
3. ☐ Maybe--hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.
4. ☐ No--I think there are some real problems with the plan.
5. ☐ Definitely no--I have no faith at all in this plan.

10. Before today have you made any of the necessary or recommended preparations for an evacuation? (check only one)

- (c.37) 1. ☐ Very prepared--I could have been ready in a day if necessary.
2. ☐ Somewhat prepared--I had many of the items at hand but a few important ones are missing.
3. ☐ Somewhat unprepared--I had a few of the items at hand.
4. ☐ Very unprepared--I had little if anything, and it would take quite a while to get them together.

The following questions ask what you know about the NEO procedures.

Please check these statements as either true or false.

	TRUE	OR	FALSE	
(c.38)	1. true		2. false	11. All sponsors should have an emergency pay and allowance form on record.
(c.39)	1. true		2. false	12. You are allowed to take up to 600lbs. of personal belongings with you.
(c.40)	1. true		2. false	13. In an evacuation, the military has control only over active duty military. Civilians and dependents should go to the nearest U. S. Embassy.
(c.41)	1. true		2. false	14. In case of an evacuation, a USAREUR ID card is the only identification you need with you.
(c.42)	1. true		2. false	15. Only one pet per family can be taken with you in an evacuation.
(c.43)	1. true		2. false	16. Foreign nationals (e.g. German babysitters, relatives of a German spouse, etc.) are not allowed to go with you.
(c.44)	1. true		2. false	17. A complete inventory of your personal property is a highly recommended item.
(c.45)	1. true		2. false	18. If you need to drive your car, you should have your driver's license, registration papers (blue or white forms), and a half tank of gas.
(c.46)	1. true		2. false	19. People who need medical help (sick, injured, and women in the 9th month of pregnancy) are evacuated through medical channels.
(c.47)	1. true		2. false	20. Some other things you may need during an emergency evacuation are extra food, clothes, a first aid kit, etc.

21. What is your primary status?

(c.48) 1. ☐ A U. S. forces member.

2. ☐ A dependent of a U. S. forces member.

3. ☐ A U. S. civilian employee of DOD.

4. ☐ A dependent of a U. S. civilian employee.

5. ☐ Non DA civilian (AAFES, Red Cross, etc.)

6. ☐ other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

22. Where do you presently live?

(c.49) 1. ☐ BEQ

2. ☐ BOQ

3. ☐ On-post government housing

4. ☐ Off-post government housing

5. ☐ On the economy

6. ☐ other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

UNIT ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix B**

**Survey to Attenders, Follow-up**



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
HEADQUARTERS, US MILITARY COMMUNITY ACTIVITY, HEIDELBERG  
APO NEW YORK 09102

26 NOV 1980

AEUSG-DC

Dear Heidelberg Community Member:

Recently, you completed a survey for us which gave us useful information for future planning of NEO exercises. You can again be helpful to us and your community by taking a few more minutes to fill out this follow-up questionnaire. This is the final piece of information we will need to evaluate the effectiveness of the NEO Exercise. We will not contact you again. However, we do ask that you fill in your name and address, so we can match your answers this time with what you told us immediately following the NEO Exercise. Thank you again for the time and cooperation you have given us to help make this a better program for your Heidelberg Community.

This is a follow-up survey on the Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) Plan in Heidelberg. We would like to get further information on:

1. What you remember or have since learned about the NEO procedures.
2. What actions you have taken in the last few days to prepare for NEO, if an evacuation were really necessary.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Mark all answers in booklet by putting an X or ☒ mark by your answer.
2. Place your name, unit (APO) address, and telephone number, if available, on the last page of the survey booklet. We need this information to match these answers to your last answers. No feedback by individual name will be given to anyone. We are only interested in average group responses.
3. Read each question and all answers carefully before selecting your answer. If the question does not apply to you, indicate this. Choose the one answer that most correctly answers the question from your point of view.
4. When you have completed the survey, put it in the enclosed addressed envelope and return it to us. No stamp is needed.

Sincerely,



ROBERT L. RAY  
Colonel, FA  
Deputy Community Commander

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974  
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM

NEO EXERCISE EVALUATION

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 78

DA Form 4344-R, 1 May 78

The following questions ask what you know about the NEO procedures.

Please check these statements as either true or false.

	TRUE	OR	FALSE	
(c.22)	1. true		2. false	9. All sponsors should have an emergency pay and allowance form on record.
(c.23)	1. true		2. false	10. You are allowed to take up to 600 lbs. of personal belongings with you.
(c.24)	1. true		2. false	11. In an evacuation, the military has control only over active duty military. Civilians and dependents should go to the nearest U. S. Embassy.
(c.25)	1. true		2. false	12. In case of an evacuation, a USAREUR ID card is the only identification you need with you.
(c.26)	1. true		2. false	13. Only one pet per family can be taken with you in an evacuation.
(c.27)	1. true		2. false	14. Foreign nationals (e.g. German babysitters, relatives of a German spouse, etc.) are not allowed to go with you.
(c.28)	1. true		2. false	15. A complete inventory of your personal property is a highly recommended item.
(c.29)	1. true		2. false	16. If you need to drive your car, you should have your driver's license, registration papers (blue or white forms), and a half tank of gas.
(c.30)	1. true		2. false	17. People who need medical help (sick, injured, and women in the 9th month of pregnancy) are evacuated through medical channels.
(c.31)	1. true		2. false	19. Some other things you may need during an emergency evacuation are extra food, clothes, a first aid kit, etc.



# Action Checklist

(c.) (c.) (c.) (c.)

Mark the appropriate column for each NEO related action. Check only one category per item.

ITEM	Item is available and at hand.	Could get, buy, or find with one day's notice	In the process of arranging for this.	Item is <u>not</u> at hand or quickly available	Have no intention of doing this because I do not believe it is really necessary.
a. Passport (c.32)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
b. Personal property inventory (c.33)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
c. Completed emergency pay and allowances form (c.34)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
d. POV registration forms, if you own a car--check here if you do not own a car: <u>Not applicable</u> (c.35)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
e. Immunization (shot) records for each dependent (c.36)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
f. Insurance policies and other personal records (c.37)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
g. Power of attorney (c.38)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
h. Up-to-date wills (c.39)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
i. Small transistor radio and extra batteries (c.40)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
j. Three (3) days supply of food (c.41)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
k. Seasonal clothes (c.42)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
l. Two (2) blankets per person (c.43)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
m. Toilet articles (c.44)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

UNIT ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix C**  
**Survey to Non-attenders**



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
HEADQUARTERS, US MILITARY COMMUNITY ACTIVITY, HEIDELBERG  
APO NEW YORK 09102

AEUSG-DCC

26 NOV 1980

Dear Heidelberg Community Member:

During the week of November 17-21, the Heidelberg Military Community Office conducted a large scale Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) Exercise. It may not be possible for everyone to attend such an exercise. However, we would like to find out what information people have about NEO plans from any possible source. It might be very important someday that such a plan work well, and that people receive and understand information about what to do if an emergency evacuation were needed. Our records show that you did not attend the briefing, but we would still appreciate your taking a few minutes to fill out the attached questionnaire. This information can be valuable to us in planning future NEO exercises. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

This is a survey to obtain information about the Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (NEO) Plan in Heidelberg. We would like to get information about three areas covering the NEO Plan:

1. Whether you get necessary information about NEO plans and requirements.
2. Whether you believe the NEO plans are practical.
3. Whether you are prepared for an evacuation, if required.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Mark all answers in booklet by putting an X or ✓ mark by your answer.
2. Read each question and all answers carefully before selecting your answer. If the question does not apply to you, indicate this. Choose the one answer that most correctly answers the question from your point of view.
3. When you have completed the survey, put it in the enclosed addressed envelope and return it to us. No stamp is needed.
4. Do not put your name or other identifying information anywhere on the survey.

Sincerely,

  
ROBERT L. RAY  
Colonel, FA  
Deputy Community Commander

**DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974**  
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

**TITLE OF FORM**

**NEO EXERCISE EVALUATION**

**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 - 25 Sep 78**

**DA Form 4368-A, 1 May 78**

(c.1) (c.2) (c.3) <sup>2</sup>(c.4)

1. How long have you been in USAREUR?

- (c.5) 1. ☐ less than a month      4. ☐ 7 to 9 months  
2. ☐ 1 to 3 months      5. ☐ 10 to 12 months  
3. ☐ 4 to 6 months      6. ☐ more than 12 months

2. Have you ever attended an official briefing on the NEO plan since you arrived in USAREUR this tour?

- (c.6) 1. yes ☐      2. no ☐

3. People may have problems attending a NEO briefing for a number of reasons. Check any of the following that were problems for you during the November, 1980 NEO exercise. (check all that apply)

- (c.7) 1. ☐ I was ill.  
(c.8) 2. ☐ I did not know they were required.  
(c.9) 3. ☐ I did not have transportation to get to it.  
(c.10) 4. ☐ I could not get time off from work to attend.  
(c.11) 5. ☐ I had problems finding child care.  
(c.12) 6. ☐ They are scheduled at a bad time.  
(c.13) 7. ☐ I was told they were not worthwhile.  
(c.14) 8. ☐ I did not know one was scheduled.  
(c.15) 9. ☐ I am PCSing very soon and no longer need to know about NEO.  
(c.16) 10. ☐ other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Do you think there is a real need for a NEO plan? (check only one)

- (c.17) 1. ☐ Definitely yes--I believe an emergency could occur while I am in Europe that might require an evacuation.  
2. ☐ Yes--there is some chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.  
3. ☐ Maybe--it is hard to tell, but better safe than sorry.  
4. ☐ No--there is probably no real chance an emergency could occur that might require an evacuation.  
5. ☐ Definitely no--it is just a waste of time and money.

5. Do you think in a true emergency the NEO plan would really work?
- (c.18) 1. ☐ Definitely yes--I have great faith in the plan.
2. ☐ Yes--I feel pretty sure it would work.
3. ☐ Maybe--hard to tell but better safe than sorry.
4. ☐ No--I think there are some real problems with the plan.
5. ☐ Definitely no--I have no faith at all in this plan.
6. Before today have you made any of the necessary or recommended preparations for an evacuation?
- (c.19) 1. ☐ Very prepared--I could have been ready in a day if necessary.
2. ☐ Somewhat prepared--I had many of the items at hand, but a few important ones are missing.
3. ☐ Somewhat unprepared--I had a few of the items at hand.
4. ☐ Very unprepared--I had little, if anything, and it would take quite a while to get them together.
7. What is your primary status? (check only one)
- (c.20) 1. ☐ A U. S. forces member.
2. ☐ A dependent of a U. S. forces member.
3. ☐ A U. S. civilian employee of DOD
4. ☐ A dependent of a U. S. civilian employee.
5. ☐ Non DA civilian (AAFES, Red Cross, etc.)
6. ☐ other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
8. Where do you presently live?
- (c.21) 1. ☐ REQ 2. ☐ BOQ
3. ☐ On-post government housing
4. ☐ Off-post government housing
5. ☐ On the economy 6. ☐ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

The following questions ask what you know about the NEO procedures.

Please check these statements as either true or false.

	TRUE	OR	FALSE	
(c.22)	1. true		2. false	9. All sponsors should have an emergency pay and allowance form on record.
(c.23)	1. true		2. false	10. You are allowed to take up to 600 lbs. of personal belongings with you.
(c.24)	1. true		2. false	11. In an evacuation, the military has control only over active duty military. Civilians and dependents should go to the nearest U. S. Embassy.
(c.25)	1. true		2. false	12. In case of an evacuation, a USAREUR ID card is the only identification you need with you.
(c.26)	1. true		2. false	13. Only one pet per family can be taken with you in an evacuation.
(c.27)	1. true		2. false	14. Foreign nationals (e.g. German babysitters, relatives of a German spouse, etc.) are not allowed to go with you.
(c.28)	1. true		2. false	15. A complete inventory of your personal property is a highly recommended item.
(c.29)	1. true		2. false	16. If you need to drive your car, you should have your driver's license, registration papers (blue or white forms), and a half tank of gas.
(c.30)	1. true		2. false	17. People who need medical help (sick, injured, and women in the 9th month of pregnancy) are evacuated through medical channels.
(c.31)	1. true		2. false	19. Some other things you may need during an emergency evacuation are extra food, clothes, a first aid kit, etc.



# Action Checklist

Mark the appropriate column for each NEO related action. Check only one category per item.

ITEM	Item is available and at hand.	Could get, buy, or find with one day's notice.	In the process of arranging for this.	Item is <u>not</u> at hand or quickly available.	Have no intention of doing this because I do not believe it is really necessary.
a. Passport (c.32)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
b. Personal property inventory (c.33)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
c. Completed emergency pay and allowances form (c.34)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
d. POV registration forms, if you own a car--check here if you do not own a car: Not applicable----- (c.35)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
e. Immunization (shot) records for each dependent (c.36)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
f. Insurance policies and other personal records (c.37)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
g. Power of attorney (c.38)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
h. Up-to-date wills (c.39)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
i. Small transistor radio and extra batteries (c.40)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
j. Three (3) days supply of food (c.41)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
k. Seasonal clothes (c.42)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
l. Two (2) blankets per person (c.43)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.
m. Toilet articles (c.44)	5.	4.	3.	2.	1.

Appendix D

Reasons For Previous Non-Attendance at NEO

Number of Responses	Rank	Reason Given
73	1	This is the first one I knew about
60	2	Other specified reasons
24	3	I did not know they were required
15	4	I could not get time off from work
11	5	I had problems finding child care
8	6	Scheduled at a bad time
5	7	I was told they were not worthwhile
4	8	I did not have transportation

Total = 200 (people could check more than one reason)

Appendix E

Where People Found Out About NEO

Number of responses	Rank	Source of Information
397	1	Heidelberg Herald Post
315	2	Sponsor
312	3	Weekly bulletin
278	4	Someone left a message at home
247	5	Bulletin board
186	6	Friends and neighbors
139	7	Told by boss
115	8	Other specified source
76	9	Other newspaper
34	10	Club or organization
26	11	Someone phoned office
25	12	Someone phoned home