

Research Note 84-89



AD-A142 485

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS USED
IN EVALUATING THE NEW INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING COURSE

Samuel Shiflett
Advanced Research Resources Organization

Douglas S. Holmes, Contracting Officer's Representative

Submitted by

T. O. 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

June 1984

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTRONIC
S JUN 27 1984
A

DTIC FILE COPY

This report, as submitted by the contractor, has been cleared for release to Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available 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.

84 06 26 151

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 84-89	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Psychometric Properties of Questionnaire Items Used in Evaluating the New Initial Entry Training Course		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Samuel Shiflett	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) MDA903-79-C-0689	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Advanced Research Resources Organization 4330 East-West Highway Washington, DC 20014		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 20162717A766
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333		12. REPORT DATE June 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 100 + Appendix
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333		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 research was technically monitored by Dr. Douglas S. Holmes of ARI.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Company Commander Questionnaire Initial-Entry Training Evaluation Drill Sergeant Questionnaire Leadership First Sergeant Questionnaire NCOs Soldier's Questionnaire Performance Evaluation Program of Instruction Evaluation		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report is one of a series that describes the development and implementation of a major training evaluation of the new program of instruction (POI) for drill sergeants. This report focuses on the use of four questionnaires--(1) The Company Commander Questionnaire, (2) First Sergeant Questionnaire, (3) Drill Sergeant Questionnaire, and (4) Soldier's Questionnaire. The report describes the general psychometric properties of the items included in each of the four questionnaires, and a chapter is devoted to each. A broad range of possible		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

19 (cont'd)

Socialization Training Indicators
Training
Training Criteria

20. (cont'd)

indicators and criteria were used to reflect the impact of the differential training of drill sergeants. The questionnaire contained large numbers of items dealing with many different aspects of the situation, including perceptions of the behavior of specific training personnel. Items were tailored to tap various types of frequently occurring drill sergeant behaviors which occurred in the training setting. Self-ratings and measures of attitudes towards the training were also analyzed. The final chapter discusses the implications for the actual use of particular items in the formal evaluation procedure. The training evaluation itself is reported in a separate and subsequent report. Recommendations for performing the evaluation portion of the study included using scales from the factor analysis that had loadings above at least .50; and, where possible, .60. Also, that the hypotheses and topics to be examined in the evaluation should be tested with scales derived from these analyses whenever possible.

Accession For	
NTS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D. C. FAR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Auth. and/or	
Special	
AI	

2210
COPY
INSPECTED

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE	5
General Items	5
Descriptions of the Battalion Commander	12
CHAPTER 3: FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE	19
Company Commander	19
Descriptions of Command Sergeant Major	25
General Items	28
CHAPTER 4: DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE	33
Descriptions of the Company Commander	33
Items Describing the First Sergeant	44
General Items	48
CHAPTER 5: SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE	58
General Items	58
Drill Sergeants Trained Under the Old Self-Paced POI (First Listed)	66
Drill Sergeants Trained Under the New Eight-Week POI (First Listed)	73
Second Listed Drill Sergeants	78
Drill Sergeants Trained in the New Eight-Week POI (Second Listed)	79
Drill Sergeants Trained in the Self-Paced POI (Second Listed)	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 6: PERFORMANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE DATA	89
Trainee Administrative Data	89
Non-Drill Sergeant Cadre Items	91
Drill Sergeant Items	92
Physical Training Indicators	94
Summary	94
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	95
Recommendations	99

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Company Commander Questionnaire: General Items	6
Table 2. Company Commander Questionnaire: Battalion Commander Items	7
Table 3. Company Commander Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of General Items	9
Table 4. Company Commander Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Battalion Commander Items	14
Table 5. First Sergeant Questionnaire: General Items	20
Table 6. First Sergeant Questionnaire: Company Commander Items .	21
Table 7. First Sergeant Questionnaire: Command Sergeant Major Items	22
Table 8. First Sergeant Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Company Commander Items	24
Table 9. First Sergeant Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Command Sergeant Major Items	26
Table 10. First Sergeant Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of General Items	29
Table 11. Drill Sergeant Questionnaire: Company Commander Items .	34
Table 12. Drill Sergeant Questionnaire: First Sergeant Items . . .	35
Table 13. Drill Sergeant Questionnaire: General Items	36
Table 14. Drill Sergeant Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Company Commander Items	38
Table 15. Drill Sergeant Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of First Sergeant Items	45
Table 16. Drill Sergeant Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of General Items	50
Table 17. Soldier's Questionnaire: General Items	59
Table 18. Soldier's Questionnaire: Items of First Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in 8-Week POI	60

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Table 19. Soldier's Questionnaire: Items of First Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the Self-Paced POI	61
Table 20. Soldier's Questionnaire: Items of Second Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the 8-Week POI	62
Table 21. Soldier's Questionnaire: Items of Second Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the Self-Paced POI	63
Table 22. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of General Items	64
Table 23. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Items of First Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the Self-Paced POI (Six-Factor)	67
Table 24. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Items of First Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the 8-Week POI (Five-Factor)	75
Table 25. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Items of Second Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the 8-Week POI	80
Table 26. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Items of First Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the 8-Week POI (Four-Factor)	81
Table 27. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Items of Second Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the Self-Paced POI	87
Table 28. Soldier's Questionnaire: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Items of First Listed Drill Sergeant Trained in the Self-Paced POI (Four-Factor)	88
Table 29. Summary of Factors Describing Various Individuals in the Training Setting	97

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This report is one of a series describing the development and implementation of a major training evaluation project carried out by ARRO under the sponsorship of TRADOC, through a contract with the Army Research Institute. The evaluation of the new program of instruction (POI) for drill sergeants involved the use of four separate questionnaires, plus a unit-level information form. The questionnaires were filled out by the company commander, the first sergeant, the drill sergeants, and a sample of trainees in each unit. The background of the evaluation, as well as a detailed description of the questionnaires and forms used, along with the procedures for administering them are reported elsewhere and will not be discussed here. The purpose of this report is to describe the general psychometric properties of the questionnaire items and to make recommendations about the use of those items in evaluating the effects of the new program of instruction for drill sergeants and unit cadre.

The general philosophy used in developing the questionnaires was to sample a broad range of possible indicators and criteria that might reflect the impact of differential training of drill sergeants. Therefore, the questionnaires contain large numbers of items dealing with many different aspects of the situation, including perceptions of the behavior of specific training personnel. The drill sergeant training under evaluation was divided into a number of different modules, each of which should be reflected in certain types of behavior occurring with more or less frequency in the training setting. Therefore, a majority of the items in the various questionnaires focus on these types of behaviors. The questionnaires were also designed in such a way that the same individual would be observed from different perspectives whenever possible. Thus, the drill sergeant, who is the focus of the evaluation, is described by the trainees, as well as the first sergeant and the company commander. In addition, the drill sergeant also has the

opportunity to describe his or her own behavior. This multiple focus allows a certain degree of correction for the fact that perceptual biases inevitably creep into behavioral ratings of this type. Since the program of instruction also dealt with attitudinal aspects of training, a number of items also included in the various questionnaires dealt with individual attitudes, plus general unit atmosphere items. The latter are assumed to more generally reflect individual attitudes of the drill sergeants and other cadre members.

To the extent possible, each major area to be assessed in the evaluation, as outlined in the Research Design Technical Report, had several items designed to tap that dimension, rather than a single item. The use of multiple items to assess a single dimension had the goal of the development of scales composed of two or more individual items, as well as the elimination of items that turned out not to be very useful. Scales composed of several items are, of course, generally more reliable than individual items. Once a reliable scale had been identified and created, additional redundant items could be eliminated, thereby shortening the questionnaires, while at the same time creating more reliable scales.

The analyses of each of the questionnaires are reported in separate chapters. Since each questionnaire contains two or more logical groupings of items, depending on the focus of the items, the internal structure of each chapter reflects the organization of the questionnaire dealt with in that chapter. The final chapter in this report summarizes the analyses of the various questionnaires, and discusses the implications for the actual use of these items in the formal evaluation procedure. The training evaluation itself is reported in a separate and subsequent report. Before moving to the analyses of specific questionnaires, a few comments about the analyses are in order.

The primary statistical technique used to analyze and cluster the items in the various questionnaires was the factor analysis, using principal axis procedures with varimax rotations. A problem common to virtually all of the analyses was the tendency for a huge first factor to appear. This factor, accounting for anywhere from 10 to 43

percent of the variance of the item set, often meant that there was a global evaluative set that reduced our ability to define clearly differentiated scales. This tendency was much more pronounced in describing individuals than with less personalized "climate" type items. In a few cases, the analyses were so messy and difficult to interpret that it did not seem reasonable to define a large number of scales. This problem will be elaborated on later.

The usual criteria for selecting the best rotated factor structure, including examining the Eigen values and the change in percent of variance accounted for by each additional factor, were of course utilized. However, the difficulties we encountered, as briefly mentioned above, meant that to a much greater extent than usual, a subjective judgment of the "psychological meaningfulness" and criterial utility was involved in deciding on the optimal factor structure.

The routine procedure for examining various structures was to instruct the SPSS program to define six principal axis factors and then rotate to a six, five, four, three, and two factor solution. All solutions were examined regardless of the information provided by the Eigen value, which usually indicated that a two or three factor solution would have been best. When it appeared that all six factors in the six factor solution were meaningful and contained at least two highly loading items in each factor, a seventh, eighth, and ninth factor solution was then called for and examined. This additional set of rotations was needed in only a couple of instances. For basic screening purposes, factor loadings in excess of .40 were considered to be significant, although our preference for interpretation was to focus on those with loadings in excess of .60. As will become apparent in the analyses of the soldier questionnaire, loadings above .50 tended to be of adequate stability, while those in the .40's were much more likely to bounce in and out of replications. It should also be kept in mind that when factor loadings are presented, the sign of the loading (positive or negative) reflects the content of the item and the type of scale being used. Since some scales are reversed, a positive sign does not always indicate a "positive" response to that item.

A key to the item codes used in the Tables throughout this report is presented in the Appendix.

CHAPTER 2

COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE

The company commander questionnaire contained two separate item sets, one describing the battalion commander and the other a general climate and perceptual item set. Means and standard deviations of these items are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Variations in the n 's reflects the effect of missing data, and the samples are identical to those used in the factor analyses below.

General Items

There were 42 general items in the company commander questionnaire with 81 usable observations. This ratio of observations to items is far below the "minimum acceptable" rule of thumb of five observations per item. Therefore, as is also the case with the first sergeant analyses, it is necessary to exercise considerable caution in generalizing the factor structures obtained. Normally our rule of thumb would be to show extreme conservatism by selecting a rotated factor solution with only a few factors. Two aspects of the current data set permitted us to be much more liberal in our choice of the most meaningful solution. For one thing, the amount of variance accounted for by the first factor was not excessively larger than the amount accounted for by subsequent factors, as was typically the case with most of the other analyses (and is typical of most factor analyses). The first principal axis factor accounted for 11.1 percent of the variance, while the second accounted for 8.9 percent of the variance. A gentle tapering off of the amount of variance accounted for by subsequent factors occurred in a manner typical of this type of analysis.

A second characteristic of these data was the much reduced amount of cross-loading of items in contrast to several of the other analyses described later in this report. This resulted in more clearly defined factors, and, as it turns out, assisted in the interpretation of the factors in several other data sets. Related to this characteristic was the

TABLE 1
 COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE:
 GENERAL ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR1	4.1481	.8383	81
VAR2	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR3	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR4	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR5	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR6	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR7	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR8	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR9	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR10	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR11	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR12	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR13	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR14	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR15	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR16	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR17	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR18	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR19	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR20	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR21	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR22	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR23	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR24	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR25	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR26	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR27	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR28	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR29	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR30	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR31	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR32	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR33	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR34	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR35	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR36	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR37	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR38	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR39	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR40	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR41	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR42	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR43	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR44	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR45	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR46	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR47	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR48	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR49	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR50	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR51	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR52	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR53	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR54	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR55	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR56	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR57	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR58	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR59	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR60	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR61	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR62	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR63	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR64	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR65	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR66	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR67	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR68	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR69	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR70	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR71	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR72	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR73	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR74	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR75	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR76	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR77	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR78	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR79	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR80	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR81	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR82	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR83	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR84	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR85	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR86	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR87	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR88	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR89	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR90	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR91	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR92	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR93	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR94	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR95	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR96	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR97	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR98	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR99	4.1481	.7546	81
VAR100	4.1481	.7546	81

TABLE 2
 COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE:
 BATTALION COMMANDER ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR 42	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 43	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 44	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 45	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 46	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 47	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 48	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 49	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 50	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 51	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 52	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 53	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 54	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 55	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 56	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 57	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 59	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 60	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 61	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 62	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 63	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 64	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 65	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 66	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 67	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 68	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 69	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 70	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 71	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 72	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 73	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 74	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 75	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 76	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 77	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 78	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 79	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 80	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 81	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 82	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 83	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 84	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 85	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 86	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 87	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 88	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 89	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 90	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 91	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 92	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 93	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 94	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 95	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 96	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 97	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 98	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 99	2.00	1.00	77
VAR 00	2.00	1.00	77

fact that the factor structures presented fairly easy interpretations. In addition, the factors tended to remain stable with varying rotated solutions. Therefore, while keeping in mind that the sizes of the loadings are likely to change substantially and that some items will inevitably appear or disappear with replication of the analysis on other data, we expect that the meaningfulness of the dimensions will, in general, tend to remain stable over replications. For these reasons, the six factor solution was chosen as being meaningful, and is described in the paragraphs below. The complete solution is presented in Table 3.

Factor one dealt with the overall quality of the cadre and included the following items:

- All in all, officers in this unit do a fine job (.56).
- Suggestions made by drill sergeants for improving performance in their units are often implemented by their superiors or by the cadre (.58).
- Drill sergeants get good support from all of the cadre in this unit (.62).
- Trainees in this unit are often abused by the drill sergeant (-.54).
- Trainees in this unit are often abused by cadre who are not drill sergeants (-.65).

The presence of the following items on *factor one*, with somewhat lower loadings, suggests a kind of blame avoidance when problems arise that might reflect on the quality of the cadre. These two items are:

- I wish the trainees were of the same quality they were in the days of the draft (.47).
- I sometimes get the feeling that about the only kinds of people volunteering for the Army nowadays are those who have been rejected everywhere else (.43).

TABLE 3

COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF GENERAL ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
VAR1	.19204	.06596	.48319	-.10474	.22773	.11965
VAR2	.36061	-.03308	.17033	-.05106	.02642	.00948
VAR3	.62811	.07331	.15516	-.08376	-.35952	.26183
VAR4	.02001	.07074	-.05532	-.41869	-.04967	.26199
VAR5	-.03141	.14139	.71583	-.00811	.04205	.04011
VAR6	-.13712	.06589	.22729	.50972	.64180	.09285
VAR7	.00477	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.18448
VAR8	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR9	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR10	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR11	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR12	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR13	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR14	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR15	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR16	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR17	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR18	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR19	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR20	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR21	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR22	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR23	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR24	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR25	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR26	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR27	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR28	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR29	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR30	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR31	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR32	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR33	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR34	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR35	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR36	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR37	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR38	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR39	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR40	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR41	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR42	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR43	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR44	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR45	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR46	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR47	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR48	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR49	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR50	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR51	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR52	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR53	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR54	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR55	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR56	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR57	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR58	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR59	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR60	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR61	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR62	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR63	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR64	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR65	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR66	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR67	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR68	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR69	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR70	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR71	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR72	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR73	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR74	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR75	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR76	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR77	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR78	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR79	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR80	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR81	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR82	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511
VAR83	.06170	.33682	.41570	.32404	.48258	.09285
VAR84	.12837	.03276	.18040	.50972	.17979	.07511

Factor two appears to reflect the extent to which the company commander feels that he or she is under pressure, and tends to include an interesting collection of items that are ramifications of that pressure. Items on this factor are:

- I am under a lot of pressure to see to it that the drill sergeants in my company do a good job of training the trainees (.67).
- I am under a lot of pressure to see to it that the drill sergeants in my company don't abuse the trainees (.70).
- I personally think it's important to try to praise the trainees just so they don't think they're losers (.64).
- Drill sergeants seem to have more trouble understanding how to deal with trainees of the opposite sex than with trainees of their own sex (.63).
- Why a trainee joins the Army makes a difference in how effectively the drill sergeant can train them (.44).
- I think the Army is on track and I plan on staying in the Army for at least 20 years (-.49).

Factor three deals with current restrictions on "leaning on" or threatening the trainees, again with certain implications. Items here are:

- In order to produce a good soldier, the drill sergeant must often violate existing policies (.72).
- Drill sergeants have to swear at the trainees or scare them in order to control what they do (.73).
- A lot of trainees can't be made to do what is necessary unless the drill sergeant acts like he is going to get physical with them (.69).
- If a trainee is to learn to be a good soldier, he must experience a lot of physical and mental stress during basic training (.48).
- It's necessary to lean hard on new trainees until they begin to think less independently (.47).
- Quite a number of trainees are sent to some helping agency on post every cycle (.42).

- Trainees can be motivated to do a better job through the use of push-ups and extra running (.42).

Factor four appears to be a global evaluation of the quality of training and support for training in the unit. Items here are:

- Drill sergeants are given enough time during the cycle to teach the trainees how to "soldier" (.64).
- Drill sergeants get good support from the leadership at the battalion level (.63).
- Female trainees will eventually make as good soldiers as male trainees (.42).
- I am satisfied that on graduation day, we turn out trainees who are fully prepared for either advanced training or for duty positions in field units (.51).
- Drill sergeants get good support from all of the cadre in this unit (.40).
- A drill sergeant can't learn how to motivate today's trainees from books or by sitting in some classroom for several days or weeks (-.44).

Factor five appears to be a general evaluation of the quality of the drill sergeants themselves, along with several items which, in effect, contrast them with the quality of the trainees. Items loading on this factor were:

- I sometimes get the feeling that about the only kinds of people volunteering for the Army nowadays are those who have been rejected everywhere else (-.56).
- I am satisfied that on graduation day, we turn out trainees who are fully prepared for either advanced training or for duties in field units (.48).
- Within a few weeks, most of the trainees handle self-discipline really well (.51).
- In this unit counseling trainees is considered to be an extremely important part of training (.51).
- Stereotypes about how badly the drill sergeants treat the trainees are often true (-.54).

- Drill sergeants are seen as important in a very positive sense in this unit (.58).
- All in all, drill sergeants in this unit do a fine job (.57).

Factor six deals with the extent to which rules must be bent in order to satisfy the requirements. Items loading on this factor were:

- This unit sometimes bends the rules to let trainees graduate who actually did not meet the prescribed standards on performance tests (.53).
- Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (-.67).
- Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (-.62).
- There is enough time in the training cycle to allow trainees to practice new skills until they have mastered them (-.42).
- The only effective way for a drill sergeant to learn to deal with trainees is for the drill sergeant to get right down and do it and learn from his mistakes (.47).
- Drill sergeants who volunteer to be drill sergeants make better trainers than those who do not volunteer (.44).
- I wish the trainees were of the same quality they were in the days of the draft (.41).

It is interesting to note that with just a couple of exceptions, the only items to cross load are those dealing with quality of trainees currently entering the Army. This tendency clearly reflects a generalized belief that this aspect of the training situation pervades nearly everything that happens in the unit.

Descriptions of the Battalion Commander

As with most of the analyses for the company commander questionnaire and the first sergeant questionnaire, this set of analyses involves a fairly large number of items with a fairly small number of observations.

Specifically, there are 77 cases with 48 items. Therefore, as mentioned in each of the other analyses, caution must be exercised in generalizing the stability of the factor structures. In particular, the size of the loadings is likely to vary substantially, and marginal items are likely to enter or disappear with replication of the data set. On the other hand, for the same reasons described earlier, we feel fairly confident that the meaningfulness of the factor structure selected will substantially replicate, even if not completely so. Once again, a six factor solution was chosen, in this particular case because the factors were relatively easy to interpret and lent themselves to a meaningful understanding of the situation as the company commander perceived it. Replications of the factor structure in subsequent waves will be necessary in order to justify the choice of this relatively complex factor solution.

As has been the case with other questionnaires, *factor one* describing an individual tends to be rather large and global, accounting for a substantial proportion of the variance. This phenomenon is undoubtedly related to the strong evaluative component involved in the description of a peer or a supervisor. In the present case, *factor one* accounted for 33 percent of the variance. *Factor two* accounted for only 6.7 percent of the variance. Subsequent factors accounted for slowly declining amounts of variance. The complete factor solution is presented in Table 4.

As indicated above, *factor one* was a global, evaluative judgment of the quality of the battalion commander's leadership skills. Items which appeared on this factor with loadings above .5 are:

- When we receive a new requirement or mission, the battalion commander makes sure we understand the reason for it (.54).
- My battalion commander comes down and tries to do a subordinate's job, even when the subordinate is performing well (-.51).
- When there is a serious problem in the unit, our battalion commander involves his cadre in finding the solution by holding a group problem solving session (.65).

TABLE 4

COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF BATTALION COMMANDER ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
VAR462	.53530	.12776	-.06613	.69308	.18815	-.18565
VAR443	.31647	.37106	-.36813	.32768	.11208	-.03674
VAR445	.37663	-.37811	-.00165	-.01394	.54489	-.15601
VAR467	.66742	.04682	-.66224	.03839	.18003	-.27154
VAR448	.60753	.38182	-.10001	.07014	.20808	-.01338
VAR501	.68349	.36147	-.34338	.11775	.18399	.09993
VAR522	.20505	.12953	-.20998	.39282	.17396	.02634
VAR536	.23045	.10086	-.72771	.14558	.07398	.05407
VAR537	.30135	.06383	-.09770	.22239	.09994	.04907
VAR539	.16157	.60628	-.00518	.21369	.00801	.10830
VAR560	.12684	.35360	-.03626	.28552	.08674	.02180
VAR601	.33582	.01290	-.37392	.08406	.04182	.09477
VAR623	.36932	.13856	-.37546	.68407	.07319	.07166
VAR644	.08733	.26747	-.37533	.22751	.66345	.13970
VAR665	.29782	.08210	-.07060	.39568	.01120	.18493
VAR667	.15740	.10246	-.62003	.22221	.60335	.20156
VAR690	.74286	.37300	-.39371	.29822	.19190	.02282
VAR712	.52730	.00755	-.69661	.36796	.49616	.01329
VAR733	.58748	.36182	-.29883	.15796	.08490	.16854
VAR745	.03648	.25292	-.36393	.30365	.39264	.08167
VAR776	.90369	.00949	-.13315	.11043	.00323	.01559
VAR790	.63844	.05549	-.26649	.00880	.17097	.04816
VAR825	.32337	.04858	-.31140	.31199	.20997	.25207
VAR836	.20949	.06193	-.06317	.38024	.29962	.01203
VAR856	.37336	.06393	-.23103	.17826	.07866	.16898
VAR869	.21580	.16365	-.28065	.10783	.38899	.16156
VAR901	.00891	.11191	-.07433	.42109	.37874	.02743
VAR923	.20538	.30864	.45439	.24370	.12092	.32819
VAR934	.26445	.33066	.48904	.33522	.17033	.10495
VAR994	.24515	.330	.11918	.262	.17642	.01900

- The battalion commander quickly detects differences among his people which need to be settled (.61).
- Even when he disagrees, the battalion commander keeps an open mind and listens to what others have to say (.66).
- My battalion commander encourages me when I want to try something new (.68).
- The battalion commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance, not on their personality or other factors (.71).
- When a subordinate performs a task well, the battalion commander lets him know about it (.66).
- Before the battalion commander punishes someone, he makes sure he knows all the facts - the whole story (.62).
- When I perform well, my battalion commander recognizes it with praise or a reward that means something to me (.74).
- The battalion commander doesn't let me do the things I was trained to do (-.52).
- The battalion commander sees that I get guidance which allows me to do my tasks and takes care of my responsibilities properly (.63).
- I feel confident that my battalion commander will back me up when I make decisions (.77).
- The battalion commander tries to run my company (-.59).
- My input is asked before decisions that affect me are made (.70).
- The battalion commander ensures that decisions are made at the level where the most accurate and most relevant information is to be found (.64).
- The battalion commander knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly (.55).
- The battalion commander acts as if he doesn't trust my judgment (.57).
- I believe the battalion commander when he says it is okay and safe to pass information up to him, whether the information is good or bad (-.56).

Factor two deals with the ability of the battalion commander to use his own judgment and to follow through once having made a decision.

Items here are:

- When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the battalion commander checks to make sure it is done properly (.72).
- When the battalion commander warns a subordinate about something, he follows through with punishment, if the subordinate's performance does not improve (.61).
- My battalion commander exercises his own judgment and makes decisions in areas in which he has the freedom to do so (.56).

Factor three deals with the punitiveness of the battalion commander, particularly with respect to the clarity of the standards set by the commander. Items loading here are:

- When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the battalion commander personally lets him know about it (.74).
- During counseling sessions, the battalion commander orders, threatens, criticizes or preaches (.62).
- Because of the battalion commander's attitude, I avoid letting him know when things aren't going the way he expects them to (.63).
- The battalion commander doesn't let me do the things I was trained to do (.49).
- When the battalion commander establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards if they work at it (.45).
- I believe the battalion commander when he says it is okay and safe to pass information up to him, whether the information is good or bad (.49).

Factor four appears to be a general consideration factor, with a heavy component involving positive feedback. Items loading on this factor were:

- When a subordinate performs a task well, the battalion commander lets him know about it (.52).
- When the battalion commander promises a reward, he follows through (.75).
- The battalion commander is courteous when dealing with his subordinates (.62).
- When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the battalion commander manages to make himself available (.68).
- The battalion commander meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance (.68).
- The battalion commander tries to run my company (-.51).
- Whenever the battalion commander refers someone to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good (.53).
- The battalion commander acts as if he doesn't trust my judgment (.44).
- The battalion commander lets a person who is being counseled do most of the talking (.41).
- When we receive a new requirement or mission, the battalion commander makes sure we understand the reason for it (.41).

Factor five deals with the clarity of the goals and standards set by the battalion commander. Items loading here are:

- The battalion commander gives orders that do not violate legal policies, SOP, regulations, or the UCMJ (.54).
- The battalion commander made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task (-.52).
- The battalion commander clearly defines the goals and priorities of this unit (-.50).
- The battalion commander does not punish a subordinate for poor performance unless there is a reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well (.46).

- When a subordinate asks the battalion commander for help solving a problem, he helps out (.40).
- When members of the cadre in this unit receive OERs, there are no surprises--performance is described in the same manner in which it had already been described during previous conversations (.49).
- When the battalion commander is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on (-.46).
- The battalion commander lets a person who is being counseled do most of the talking (-.47).

Factor six consists almost entirely of the two items dealing with mixed sex training. The items are:

- The battalion commander demands that we take into account physical differences between the male and female trainees when we conduct training (.85).
- The battalion commander acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex (.78).

The product moment correlation between these two items was $r = .47$.

CHAPTER 3
FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE

There were three topic areas incorporated into the first sergeant questionnaire: descriptions of the company commander; the battalion Command Sergeant Major; plus a set of general climate and perceptual items. Means and standard deviations for each set are presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Company Commander

The factor analysis of the first sergeant questionnaire items describing the company commander are based on an n of 82. Since there are 44 items categorized as company commander descriptors, the small n violates the rule of thumb that at least five observations per item are required to be reasonably confident of the stability of the factor structure. Thus, the results of the factor analysis described here should be interpreted with caution. Our approach to living with this problem was to give preference to a simple rather than complex rotated factor solution. That is, we chose to live with a relatively small number of factors rather than to take a chance that the additional factors might be highly unstable, particularly since they typically involved only two or three items. The tendency for a lot of cross-loading to occur, plus items loading together in a non-obvious way, helped to push us toward the position of taking a relatively small number of factors as adequate. This situation is in direct contrast to that encountered in the Company Commander Questionnaire, where factors emerged in a rather clean, clear manner.

The two-factor rotated solution was selected as the most meaningful for this data set. Although several of the more complex factor solutions appeared to be trying to reflect a dimensionality discovered in the descriptions of leaders in other questionnaire sets, the messiness of the cross-loadings and the tendency for superficially unrelated items to load together caused us to finally decide that it was inappropriate to attempt to impose that particular structure onto the data. Thus,

TABLE 5

FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: GENERAL ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR1	4.0118	1.1902	55
VAR2	4.9182	1.7000	55
VAR3	4.2288	1.1700	55
VAR4	4.9945	1.1111	55
VAR5	4.0371	1.1111	55
VAR6	4.2333	1.1111	55
VAR7	4.4033	1.1111	55
VAR8	4.7466	1.1111	55
VAR9	4.6706	1.1111	55
VAR10	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR11	4.7822	1.1111	55
VAR12	4.9476	1.1111	55
VAR13	4.7476	1.1111	55
VAR14	4.5111	1.1111	55
VAR15	4.5555	1.1111	55
VAR16	4.5909	1.1111	55
VAR17	4.5909	1.1111	55
VAR18	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR19	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR20	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR21	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR22	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR23	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR24	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR25	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR26	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR27	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR28	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR29	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR30	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR31	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR32	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR33	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR34	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR35	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR36	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR37	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR38	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR39	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR40	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR41	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR42	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR43	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR44	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR45	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR46	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR47	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR48	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR49	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR50	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR51	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR52	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR53	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR54	4.5229	1.1111	55
VAR55	4.5229	1.1111	55

TABLE 6
 FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE:
 COMPANY COMMANDER ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR42	6.7927	.5384	22
VAR43	6.6463	.8384	22
VAR44	6.1220	.0100	22
VAR45	6.1927	.0100	22
VAR46	6.5000	.0100	22
VAR47	6.1463	.0100	22
VAR48	6.2193	.0100	22
VAR49	6.1098	.0100	22
VAR50	6.8049	.0100	22
VAR51	6.7800	.0100	22
VAR52	6.7193	.0100	22
VAR53	6.5333	.0100	22
VAR54	6.0544	.0100	22
VAR55	6.4955	.0100	22
VAR56	6.1712	.0100	22
VAR57	6.1935	.0100	22
VAR58	6.1935	.0100	22
VAR59	6.2633	.0100	22
VAR60	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR61	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR62	6.4666	.0100	22
VAR63	6.4666	.0100	22
VAR64	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR65	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR66	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR67	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR68	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR69	6.3666	.0100	22
VAR70	6.2561	.0100	22
VAR71	6.2561	.0100	22
VAR72	6.6951	.0100	22
VAR73	6.7439	.0100	22
VAR76	6.8780	.0100	22
VAR77	6.3900	.0100	22
VAR78	6.7561	.0100	22
VAR79	6.5488	.0100	22
VAR80	6.5122	.0100	22
VAR81	6.3900	.0100	22
VAR86	6.7073	.0100	22
VAR87	6.7073	.0100	22
VAR88	6.3900	.0100	22
VAR89	6.5976	.0100	22
VAR90	6.2561	.0100	22
VAR91	6.4878	.0100	22
VAR92	6.4268	.0100	22

TABLE 7
 FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE:
 COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR94	2.2857	1.0676	91
VAR95	2.4835	.8739	91
VAR96	2.7143	.2848	91
VAR97	2.8242	.1794	91
VAR98	2.4596	.1076	91
VAR99	2.5242	.2021	91
VAR100	2.5495	.2235	91
VAR101	2.6154	.0622	91
VAR102	2.7582	.9922	91
VAR103	2.4945	.0520	91
VAR104	2.2418	.7850	91
VAR105	2.8132	.9755	91
VAR106	2.6434	.8910	91
VAR107	2.8132	.2010	91
VAR108	2.5275	.8820	91
VAR109	2.6044	.8949	91
VAR110	2.1319	.0821	91
VAR111	2.4725	.0821	91
VAR112	2.7255	.0821	91
VAR113	2.5165	.0821	91
VAR114	2.1868	.0821	91
VAR115	2.9451	.1866	91
VAR116	2.8462	.5566	91
VAR117	2.2637	.5331	91

we have chosen two factors, *factor one* being a global, overall evaluation of the leader's style, and *factor two* apparently dealing with open communication between the leader and subordinates. Each of the factors will be described in terms of the three or four top loading items, with a complete description of the factor loadings presented in Table 8.

Factor one, the leadership quality dimension, was defined primarily by the following items:

- When the company commander promises a reward, he follows through (.71).
- When a subordinate asks the company commander for help solving a problem, he helps out (.73).
- When a subordinate performs well, the company commander lets him know about it (.73).
- When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the company commander manages to make himself available (.68).
- Before the company commander punishes someone, he makes sure he knows all the facts (.69).

Notice that of the three qualities of leadership that tended to appear in other factor structures (consideration, mutual trust, and leadership effectiveness), this factor appears to be mostly allied with the consideration dimension, with a heavy emphasis on proper recognition of performance and sensitivity to the needs of the soldiers.

Factor two appears to deal fairly directly with various aspects of communication between the commander and his subordinates. The highest loading items on this factor were:

- The company commander sees that I get guidance which allows me to do my tasks and take care of my responsibilities properly (.79).
- My input is asked before decisions that affect me are made (.73).
- My company commander encourages me when I want to try something new (.69).
- When I perform well, my company commander recognizes it with praise or a reward that means something to me (.63).

TABLE 8

FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE:
 VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF COMPANY COMMANDER ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
VAR42	-.170	.419
VAR43	.040	.405
VAR44	.114	.352
VAR45	.010	.445
VAR46	.116	.355
VAR47	.071	.388
VAR48	.078	.310
VAR49	.085	.226
VAR50	.055	.355
VAR51	.070	.300
VAR52	.069	.194
VAR53	.066	.355
VAR54	.044	.385
VAR55	.000	.266
VAR56	.000	.374
VAR57	.000	.277
VAR58	.000	.357
VAR59	.000	.355
VAR61	.000	.366
VAR62	.022	.326
VAR63	.000	.372
VAR64	.000	.302
VAR65	.000	.300
VAR66	.000	.299
VAR67	.000	.222
VAR68	.000	.222
VAR69	.000	.222
VAR70	.000	.222
VAR71	.000	.222
VAR72	.000	.222
VAR73	.000	.222
VAR76	.000	.222
VAR77	.000	.222
VAR78	.000	.222
VAR79	.000	.222
VAR80	.000	.222
VAR81	.000	.222
VAR86	.000	.222
VAR87	.000	.222
VAR88	.000	.222
VAR89	.000	.222
VAR90	.000	.222
VAR91	.000	.222
VAR92	.000	.222

Although we have chosen to call this a communication factor, notice again that in common with *factor one*, rewarding and encouragement are a major component.

Descriptions of Command Sergeant Major

There were 24 items specifically addressed at the Command Sergeant Major. The factor analyses of these items involved an n of 91. Therefore, although again still somewhat below the minimum requirement of five observations per item, the sample size relative to the item set size is approaching a minimally acceptable level. Nevertheless, being so close to the minimum, again we must exercise caution in assuming that the factor structures would remain stable over time. Given the constraints and cautions we have expressed, the five-factor rotated solution was chosen as the most useful, as is shown in Table 9.

Factor one appears to be a general qualitative judgment of the Command Sergeant Major symbolized by the highest loading item:

- The Command Sergeant Major meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance (.75).

Other items loading on this factor were:

- When an NCO performs a task well, the Command Sergeant Major lets him know about it (.56).
- My Command Sergeant Major performs tasks that are absolutely essential to the training session (.46).
- When we are not too sure how the Command Sergeant Major wants a task performed, he spends time explaining and showing us how he wants it done (.60).
- When I first arrived in my present assignment, the Command Sergeant Major made sure that I received training and other assistance to perform tasks which I was not already familiar with (-.57).
- When the Command Sergeant Major establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards if they work at it (-.52).

Factor two appears to be a trust and openness factor. The two highest loading items were:

TABLE 9
 FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
VAR94	.24757	.10208	.39092	.47114	.54825
VAR95	-.01974	-.70396	-.02345	-.15551	-.01169
VAR96	-.10529	.13270	.10888	.06708	.85024
VAR97	.30538	-.24904	.13022	.06940	.89639
VAR98	.56085	.17427	.30515	.34942	.54266
VAR99	.32759	.47139	.67172	.03296	-.01526
VAR100	.12376	.27810	.77260	.08506	.23269
VAR101	.02111	.64090	.38340	.14217	.12529
VAR102	.11916	.12047	.72882	-.06668	.12101
VAR103	.46484	.28426	.28517	.40845	.08794
VAR104	-.06981	-.02252	-.64690	.36186	.05688
VAR105	.29360	.15921	.68661	.31384	.19460
VAR106	.23183	.25254	.78860	.25070	.16681
VAR107	-.78455	-.60394	-.32728	-.13093	.21827
VAR108	.74834	.01647	.62161	.05925	-.07606
VAR109	.44659	.04400	.62161	.12085	.38829
VAR110	.59848	.12487	.46827	.11407	.19577
VAR111	.21577	.05927	.65270	.14808	.05299
VAR112	.34739	.39103	.55168	.06848	.08139
VAR113	-.57458	-.42279	.00430	.21434	-.16958
VAR114	-.52162	.36637	.09949	-.26751	-.01086
VAR115	-.32772	.66432	.17376	.20132	.03032
VAR116	-.24859	.00281	-.28645	-.69490	-.23972
VAR117	.07385	-.20925	-.20409	-.83066	-.00279

- The Command Sergeant Major lets a person being counseled do most of the talking (.64).
- During counseling sessions, the Command Sergeant Major orders, threatens, criticizes or preaches (-.60).
- The Command Sergeant Major is courteous when dealing with his NCOs and privates in my unit (.47).
- When I first arrived in my present assignment, the Command Sergeant Major made sure that I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with (-.42).

Although the first two factors appeared to have a heavy consideration component, *factor three* was defined as being primarily a consideration factor. Highest loading items here were:

- When an NCO asks the Command Sergeant Major for help with a problem, he helps out (.79).
- When someone in the unit wants to talk to the Command Sergeant Major, he makes himself available (.77).
- When the Command Sergeant Major determines that an NCO has a serious problem, he refers him to a helping agency (.73).
- The Command Sergeant Major is courteous when dealing with his NCOs and privates in my unit (.67).
- When the Command Sergeant Major is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to sidestep the issue instead of facing it head-on (-.65).
- Whenever the Command Sergeant Major refers any NCO to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good (.69).
- During counseling sessions, the Command Sergeant Major orders, threatens, criticizes or preaches (-.47).
- My Command Sergeant Major keeps me informed about what tasks he expects me to perform (.62).
- My Command Sergeant Major demands as much from his female NCOs as he does from his male NCOs (.65).
- Whenever the Command Sergeant Major has to chew out an NCO, he does it in private (.55).

Factor four appears to relate to the extent to which the Command Sergeant Major has adequate job knowledge in dealing with NCOs. Items loading here were:

- The Command Sergeant Major made it clear from the beginning how well I was required to perform each task--what his standards were (-.69).
- When we receive a new requirement or mission, the Command Sergeant Major makes sure we understand the reason for it (.47).
- My Command Sergeant Major performs tasks that are absolutely essential to the training session (.41).

Factor five deals with feedback. Items loading here are:

- When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the Command Sergeant Major checks to make sure it is done properly (.85).
- When an NCO does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the Command Sergeant Major personally let him know about it (.70).
- When we receive a new requirement or mission, the Command Sergeant Major makes sure we understand the reason for it (.55).

In this instance, feedback appears to be related to the extent to which the Command Sergeant Major provides feedback about how and why a job is being performed, as well as making sure that he gets the necessary feedback to make such an evaluation.

General Items

The factor analysis of the general item set filled out by the first sergeants involved 45 items based on an n of 85. Since this ratio did not satisfy the rule of thumb for five observations per item, the factor structure selected must be interpreted with caution, and our approach is to select a structure involving a relatively few factors. In this case, the three factor rotated solution was deemed to be meaningful. The complete rotated solution is presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE:
VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF GENERAL ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
VAR1	.57760	.08933	.22732
VAR2	.10867	.67222	.11257
VAR3	.23358	.14447	.22521
VAR4	.13395	.09615	.17068
VAR5	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR6	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR7	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR8	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR9	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR10	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR11	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR12	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR13	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR14	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR15	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR16	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR17	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR18	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR19	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR20	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR21	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR22	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR23	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR24	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR25	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR26	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR27	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR28	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR29	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR30	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR31	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR32	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR33	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR34	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR35	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR36	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR37	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR38	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR39	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR40	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR41	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR42	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR43	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR44	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR45	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR46	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR47	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR48	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR49	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR50	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR51	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR52	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR53	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR54	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR55	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR56	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR57	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR58	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR59	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR60	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR61	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR62	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR63	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR64	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR65	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR66	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR67	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR68	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR69	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR70	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR71	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR72	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR73	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR74	.13388	.06645	.22599
VAR75	.13388	.06645	.22599

Factor one involved general attitudes and perceptions about the new rules and restrictions regarding punishment and motivating trainees. Items loading on this factor were:

- If a trainee is to learn to be a good soldier, he must experience a lot of physical and mental stress during basic training (.58).
- It's necessary to lean hard on new trainees until they begin to think less independently (.52).
- In order to produce a good soldier, a drill sergeant must violate existing policies (.64).
- Drill sergeants have to swear at the trainees or scare them in order to control what they do (.59).
- I am satisfied that on graduation day we turn out trainees that are fully prepared (-.47).
- This unit sometimes bends the rules to let trainees graduate who actually did not meet the prescribed standards on performance tests (.43).
- Drill sergeants can get a lot more out of the trainees by threatening to punish them than by trying to counsel them (.69).
- A lot of trainees cannot be made to do what is necessary unless the drill sergeant acts like he is going to get physical with them (.65).
- Trainees can be motivated to do a better job through the use of pushups and extra running (.46).
- Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (-.69).
- Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (-.55).

Factor two deals with perceived quality of command support for the drill sergeants. Items on this factor are:

- Suggestions made by drill sergeants for improving performance in their unit are often implemented by their superiors or by their cadre (.73).

- Drill sergeants get good support from all of the cadre in their unit (.67).
- Drill sergeants get good support from the leadership at the battalion level (.51).
- Drill sergeants are seen as important in a very positive sense in this unit (.67).
- Why a trainee joins the Army makes a difference in how effectively the drill sergeants can train them (.60).
- All in all, the drill sergeants in this unit do a fine job (.64).
- This unit encourages drill sergeants to try out the newer ideas that they bring with them out of drill sergeant school (.48).
- All in all, officers in this unit do a fine job (.47).

Factor three deals with the extent to which drill sergeants appear to be overworked and, interestingly, includes items about abuse.

Factors loading here are:

- Drill sergeants are given enough time during the cycle to teach the trainees how to "soldier" (.58).
- Trainees could do just as well with a lot less supervision than they get now (.61).
- Trainees in this unit are often abused by the drill sergeants (.62).
- Trainees in this unit are often abused by cadre who are not drill sergeants (.64).
- The drill sergeants have to work such long hours that the quality of their performance suffers (.51).
- There is enough time in the training cycle to allow trainees to practice new skills until they have mastered them (-.41).
- The most important duties a first sergeant has are administrative (.40).

It is not clear why this last item loaded on this particular factor, unless it is a reflection of a feeling that as drill sergeants

become more and more overworked, the first sergeant is more likely to be required to perform duties not normally expected of him. The presence of the abuse items, along with the "overwork" or "sufficient time" items strongly suggest a belief among first sergeants (whether or not they could or would state the connection directly), that trainee abuse is related to, perhaps even caused by, drill sergeant stress induced by overwork.

CHAPTER 4

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE

The drill sergeants described their company commander and their first sergeant, as well as filling out a rather long list of general items. Thus, there are three item sets in the questionnaire, and their means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 11, 12, and 13. In all three item sets, the n well exceeds the rule-of-thumb minimum of five observations per item.

Descriptions of the Company Commander

The company commander was described on a set of 51 items distributed throughout the entire item set in the questionnaire. As usual, the first principal axis factor accounted for an overwhelmingly large amount of variance, 34.2%. The second factor accounted for only 4.1% of the variance, and subsequent factors accounted for similar but slowly declining amounts of variance. Thus, variance accounted for by the third through sixth factors were 3.7, 3.2, 2.8, and 2.5%. The six-factor solution was chosen as most meaningful, and is presented in Table 14.

Factor one was a general quality of leadership factor, and contained items dealing with the activity and knowledge of the company commander, as well as items on participative decision making, an open and encouraging attitude, and willingness to personally give feedback and guidance.

Items appearing on this factor with loadings above .50 are as follows:

- The company commander knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly (-.51).
- My company commander takes an active role in the leadership of this unit (-.55).
- The company commander made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task (-.58).

TABLE 11
 DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE:
 COMPANY COMMANDER ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR11	2.00	1.00	66
VAR12	2.00	1.00	66
VAR13	2.00	1.00	66
VAR14	2.00	1.00	66
VAR19	2.00	1.00	66
VAR20	2.00	1.00	66
VAR22	2.00	1.00	66
VAR23	2.00	1.00	66
VAR29	2.00	1.00	66
VAR30	2.00	1.00	66
VAR31	2.00	1.00	66
VAR32	2.00	1.00	66
VAR34	2.00	1.00	66
VAR35	2.00	1.00	66
VAR36	2.00	1.00	66
VAR37	2.00	1.00	66
VAR38	2.00	1.00	66
VAR40	2.00	1.00	66
VAR41	2.00	1.00	66
VAR42	2.00	1.00	66
VAR43	2.00	1.00	66
VAR44	2.00	1.00	66
VAR45	2.00	1.00	66
VAR46	2.00	1.00	66
VAR47	2.00	1.00	66
VAR48	2.00	1.00	66
VAR49	2.00	1.00	66
VAR50	2.00	1.00	66
VAR53	2.00	1.00	66
VAR54	2.00	1.00	66
VAR55	2.00	1.00	66
VAR56	2.00	1.00	66
VAR57	2.00	1.00	66
VAR58	2.00	1.00	66
VAR59	2.00	1.00	66
VAR60	2.00	1.00	66
VAR62	2.00	1.00	66
VAR63	2.00	1.00	66
VAR64	2.00	1.00	66
VAR65	2.00	1.00	66
VAR66	2.00	1.00	66
VAR67	2.00	1.00	66
VAR68	2.00	1.00	66
VAR69	2.00	1.00	66
VAR70	2.00	1.00	66
VAR71	2.00	1.00	66
VAR72	2.00	1.00	66
VAR73	2.00	1.00	66
VAR74	2.00	1.00	66

TABLE 12
 DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE:
 FIRST SERGEANT ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR1120	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1119	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1118	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1117	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1116	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1115	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1114	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1113	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1112	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1111	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1110	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1109	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1108	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1107	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1106	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1105	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1104	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1103	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1102	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1101	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1100	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1099	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1098	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1097	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1096	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1095	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1094	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1093	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1092	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1091	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1090	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1089	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1088	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1087	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1086	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1085	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1084	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1083	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1082	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1081	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1080	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1079	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1078	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1077	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1076	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1075	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1074	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1073	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1072	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1071	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1070	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1069	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1068	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1067	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1066	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1065	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1064	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1063	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1062	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1061	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1060	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1059	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1058	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1057	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1056	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1055	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1054	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1053	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1052	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1051	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1050	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1049	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1048	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1047	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1046	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1045	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1044	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1043	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1042	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1041	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1040	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1039	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1038	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1037	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1036	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1035	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1034	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1033	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1032	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1031	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1030	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1029	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1028	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1027	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1026	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1025	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1024	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1023	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1022	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1021	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1020	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1019	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1018	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1017	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1016	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1015	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1014	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1013	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1012	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1011	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1010	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1009	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1008	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1007	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1006	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1005	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1004	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1003	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1002	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1001	4.010	1.331	662
VAR1000	4.010	1.331	662

TABLE 13

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: GENERAL ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VARI1	4.47	1.00	1
VARI2	4.47	1.00	1
VARI3	4.47	1.00	1
VARI4	4.47	1.00	1
VARI5	4.47	1.00	1
VARI6	4.47	1.00	1
VARI7	4.47	1.00	1
VARI8	4.47	1.00	1
VARI9	4.47	1.00	1
VARI10	4.47	1.00	1
VARI11	4.47	1.00	1
VARI12	4.47	1.00	1
VARI13	4.47	1.00	1
VARI14	4.47	1.00	1
VARI15	4.47	1.00	1
VARI16	4.47	1.00	1
VARI17	4.47	1.00	1
VARI18	4.47	1.00	1
VARI19	4.47	1.00	1
VARI20	4.47	1.00	1
VARI21	4.47	1.00	1
VARI22	4.47	1.00	1
VARI23	4.47	1.00	1
VARI24	4.47	1.00	1
VARI25	4.47	1.00	1
VARI26	4.47	1.00	1
VARI27	4.47	1.00	1
VARI28	4.47	1.00	1
VARI29	4.47	1.00	1
VARI30	4.47	1.00	1
VARI31	4.47	1.00	1
VARI32	4.47	1.00	1
VARI33	4.47	1.00	1
VARI34	4.47	1.00	1
VARI35	4.47	1.00	1
VARI36	4.47	1.00	1
VARI37	4.47	1.00	1
VARI38	4.47	1.00	1
VARI39	4.47	1.00	1
VARI40	4.47	1.00	1
VARI41	4.47	1.00	1
VARI42	4.47	1.00	1
VARI43	4.47	1.00	1
VARI44	4.47	1.00	1
VARI45	4.47	1.00	1
VARI46	4.47	1.00	1
VARI47	4.47	1.00	1
VARI48	4.47	1.00	1
VARI49	4.47	1.00	1
VARI50	4.47	1.00	1

TABLE 13 (CONTINUED)

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: GENERAL ITEMS

VAR1113	.7106
VAR1115	.7082
VAR1114	.2706
VAR1115	.8447
VAR1116	.2376
VAR1117	.1200
VAR1118	.3459
VAR1119	.6047
VAR1200	.4659
VAR1201	.8800
VAR1202	.5741
VAR1203	.8612
VAR1204	.9788
VAR1205	.8094
VAR1206	.3741
VAR1207	.8471
VAR1208	.6094

TABLE 14

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF COMPANY COMMANDER ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
VAR11	.51039	-.06769	-.38441	.05185	-.16713	.20398
VAR12	.35675	-.08597	-.03279	-.00153	-.15863	.05904
VAR13	-.49521	-.08420	-.25485	-.26774	-.08838	.18098
VAR14	-.45757	-.07591	-.04445	-.08774	-.11577	.06446
VAR19	-.04624	-.26350	-.28103	-.00203	-.03684	.31375
VAR20	-.54607	-.14599	-.53916	-.07389	-.02384	.18004
VAR28	-.43290	-.15466	-.42260	-.07584	-.10458	.15054
VAR30	-.58469	-.23147	-.22324	-.06746	-.07715	.16066
VAR31	-.11002	-.04617	-.10745	-.13080	-.00050	.71872
VAR32	-.12842	-.21152	-.33427	-.05784	-.15907	.25261
VAR34	-.59944	-.28601	-.27254	-.08441	-.06176	.04368
VAR35	-.67536	-.32136	-.25635	-.07537	-.00265	.06946
VAR36	-.12892	-.29308	-.59474	-.16470	-.04903	.08689
VAR37	-.48812	-.28048	-.02708	-.18361	-.15759	-.11237
VAR39	-.62424	-.16188	-.22020	-.10301	-.05160	.13602
VAR40	-.73009	-.17840	-.00268	-.02291	-.10795	.02869
VAR41	-.73654	-.17640	-.21373	-.05805	-.14676	.07373
VAR42	-.57034	-.30264	-.30946	-.06334	-.07376	.07408
VAR43	-.61955	-.48666	-.19220	-.06188	-.24657	.00035
VAR44	-.62750	-.36262	-.19220	-.05091	-.05237	.01116
VAR45	-.59223	-.36891	-.17167	-.03359	-.18797	.05057
VAR46	-.17652	-.35852	-.20350	-.14252	-.03988	.01152
VAR47	-.36297	-.36446	-.64719	-.07702	-.05654	.02522
VAR48	-.26641	-.41611	-.35535	-.01075	-.12115	-.04988
VAR49	-.26371	-.59039	-.33192	-.07178	-.22680	.05559
VAR50	-.31519	-.60566	-.33792	-.07111	-.10496	.00542
VAR53	-.05381	-.63288	-.00737	-.13111	-.03798	.08693
VAR54	-.23999	-.67248	-.46121	-.01831	-.29846	.09813
VAR56	-.18371	-.57031	-.18731	-.01831	-.09121	.02785
VAR57	-.18676	-.68868	-.63314	-.20189	-.17077	.05556
VAR58	-.15030	-.19531	-.15565	-.11707	-.13477	.03003
VAR60	-.17887	-.52982	-.32816	-.07014	-.46625	.04239
VAR61	-.10363	-.32165	-.26943	-.00403	-.60898	.01347
VAR62	-.08139	-.16192	-.33083	-.07014	-.01973	.10502
VAR63	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR64	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR65	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR66	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR67	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR68	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR69	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR70	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR71	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR72	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR73	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR74	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR75	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR76	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR77	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR78	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR79	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR80	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR81	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR82	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR83	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR84	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR85	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR86	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR87	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR88	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR89	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR90	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR91	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR92	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR93	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR94	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR95	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR96	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR97	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR98	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR99	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242
VAR100	-.08139	-.33603	-.35083	-.07014	-.15095	.16242

- My company commander knows what is going on in this unit (.60).
- When we receive a new requirement or mission, the company commander makes sure we understand the reason for it (.68).
- When there is a serious problem in the unit, our company commander involves his cadre in finding the solution by holding a group problem-solving session (.62).
- When there is a question about responsibilities on various unit tasks, the company commander holds a meeting to lay out individual responsibilities (.73).
- The company commander quickly detects differences among his people which need to be settled (.74).
- Even when he disagrees, the company commander keeps an open mind and listens to what others have to say (.53).
- My company commander encourages me when I want to try something new (.57).
- The company commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance, not on their personalities or other factors (.62).
- When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the company commander personally lets him know about it (.59).
- When a subordinate performs a task well, the company commander lets him know about it (.65).
- When I perform well, my company commander recognizes it with praise or a reward that means something to me (.54).
- The company commander sees that I get guidance which allows me to do my tasks and take care of my responsibilities properly (.56).
- The company commander ensures that decisions are made at the level where the most accurate and most relevant information is to be found (.52).
- When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the company commander checks to make sure it is done properly (.62).

Items which loaded in the forties are as follows:

- The company commander clearly defines the goals and priorities of this unit (-.49).
- When I first arrived in my present assignment, the company commander made sure I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with (-.46).
- When the company commander establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards if they work at it (-.43).
- The company commander's punishments seem to be fair (-.43).
- The company commander makes sure that what we do in this unit is necessary to accomplish our training mission (.49).
- The company commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance, not on their personalities or other factors (.43).
- I feel confident that my company commander will back me up when I make decisions (.48).
- My input is asked before decisions that effect me are made (.49).

In summary then, this factor represents a very strong evaluative judgment of the quality of the company commander's leadership. It is interesting to note that involvement of the drill sergeants in the policy and decision-making process is seen as extremely important, and is related to the extent to which the company commander knows what is going on in a unit and is actively performing his role as the commander. Providing information on how a task is to be done, why a task is being required, as well as personal feedback about performance of both a positive and negative nature are all seen as positive qualities of leadership.

Factor two is a consideration and sensitivity dimension, almost in the classic sense of consideration behavior. It includes the following items in order of descending loadings:

- When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the company commander manages to make himself available (.67).

- Before the company commander punishes someone, he makes sure that he knows all the facts (.59).
- The company commander is courteous when dealing with his subordinates (.60).
- When a subordinate asks the company commander for help in solving a problem, he helps out (.58).
- When the company commander determines that a subordinate has a serious problem, he refers the subordinate to a helping agency (.57).
- Whenever the company commander refers someone to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good (.57).
- When the company commander promises a reward, he follows through (.56).
- The company commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance, not on their personalities or other factors (.49).
- The company commander meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance (.49).
- The company commander makes sure that what we do in this unit is necessary to accomplish our training mission (.47).
- When the company commander is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on (-.47).
- When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the company commander checks to make sure it is done properly (.45).
- When the company commander warns a subordinate about something, he follows through with punishment if the subordinate's performance does not improve (.42).
- The company commander lets the person being counseled do most of the talking (.43).
- During counseling sessions, the company commander orders, threatens, criticizes or preaches (-.42).
- Whenever the company commander has to chew out a subordinate, he does it in private (.42).

Factor three deals with trust, particularly mutual trust: the extent to which the company commander trusts the drill sergeant and the extent to which the drill sergeants feel comfortable and confident that they are being dealt with fairly by the company commander. The items loading .4 or above on this factor are as follows:

- The company commander acts as if he doesn't trust my judgment (.64).
- I fear the consequences when I tell my company commander about a mistake my subordinates or I have made (.54).
- When the company commander establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards if they worked at it (-.44).
- The company commander comes down and tries to do a subordinate's job even when he is performing well (-.59).
- Even when he disagrees, the company commander keeps an open mind and listens to what others have to say (.48).
- Because of the company commander's attitude, I fail to let him know when things aren't going the way he expects them to (-.65).
- When the company commander is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on (-.46).
- During counseling sessions, the company commander orders, threatens, criticizes or preaches (-.53).
- The company commander doesn't let me do the things I was trained to do (-.43).
- I feel confident that my company commander will back me up when I make decisions (.51).
- The company commander ensures that decisions are made at the level where the most accurate and the most relevant information is to be found (.42).

It is noteworthy that a number of the items loading on this factor also cross-load on either the first or the second factor. In general, these three factors seem to represent a cluster dealing with overall

quality of the company commander. It is apparent that to some extent, the dimensions of mutual trust, consideration and concern, and leadership qualities overlap with one another. Nevertheless, they appear quite clearly to represent distinct components, and should be retained as separate dimensions. The next three factors are fairly minor in the sense that they involve only two or three items, and may reflect in part simply method variance. Nevertheless, the contents of the items allow a fairly easy labeling of the factors.

Factor four contains two items which deal with the handling of mixed sex training. The items are:

- The company commander demands that we take into account physical differences between the male and female trainees when we conduct training (.68), and
- The company commander acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex (.68).

The inter-correlation between these two items is .40.

Factor five contains three items that, in general, reflect the extent to which the company commander is perceived as being fair. The item loading on this factor are:

- When the drill sergeants in this unit receive EERs, there are no surprises--performance is described in the same manner in which it had already been described during previous conversations (.61).
- The company commander does not punish a subordinate for poor performance unless there is reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well (.60), and
- There is enough time in the training cycle to allow trainees to practice skills until they have mastered them (.45).

It is interesting to note the added quality the addition of this last item onto this factor gives to the meaning of these factors. The external constraint of amount of time available to perform all the

tasks is seen as being related to the extent to which punishments and performance evaluations are fair.

Factor six contains the two items dealing with the perception of the company commander being under pressure from above to do a good job. These items are:

- The company commander is under a lot of pressure to see to it that I do a good job of training my trainees (.73), and
- The company commander is under a lot of pressure to see to it that I don't abuse the trainees (.72).

The inter-correlation among these items is .37, in spite of the high loadings. Thus, as with the preceding factor, internal consistency by combining these items into a scale would be modest at best.

Items Describing the First Sergeant

The first principal axis factor accounted for 49.2% of the total variance, making it one of the most global first factors in any of the item sets. The five factor rotated solution was selected as most interpretable; however this particular analysis was one of the messiest and most difficult to interpret. A great deal of cross-loading occurred for many items and my suspicion is that some of the problems arises from the more ambiguous role that the first sergeant plays in a unit. Quite frankly, if it were not for the fact that several other factors show a similarity to those found in structures described elsewhere, it would have been difficult or impossible to interpret.

Factor one, which is the global factor accounting for almost 50% of the variance, is labeled the consideration or sensitivity factor. Although there are a number of differences as well as similarities, the structure seems most similar to the factor describing the company commander's consideration behavior. Because of the large number of cross-loadings, only the two or three top-loading items will be described in this section. A complete presentation of the five factor structure can be found in Table 15. Examples of items on this factor are:

TABLE 15

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF FIRST SERGEANT ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
VAR129	-.69793	-.22063	-.05853	-.62634	.04986
VAR134	.33113	-.14455	.22373	-.61363	-.05678
VAR135	-.12265	-.24131	-.11973	-.37439	-.10460
VAR136	-.57020	-.46327	-.11131	-.63002	-.10363
VAR135	-.69149	-.55276	-.21850	-.54764	-.07332
VAR136	-.67832	-.71298	-.24323	-.74658	-.11948
VAR137	-.14976	-.16531	-.45223	-.41393	-.30786
VAR139	-.12374	-.33632	-.31423	-.38491	-.18991
VAR140	-.11148	-.33632	-.31423	-.38491	-.18991
VAR141	-.62248	-.04575	-.10205	-.13503	-.16220
VAR142	-.62248	-.04575	-.10205	-.13503	-.16220
VAR143	-.63371	-.16433	-.10331	-.12674	-.14450
VAR144	-.64403	-.18638	-.10307	-.20607	-.23369
VAR145	-.91024	-.12289	-.44390	-.07637	-.19794
VAR146	-.91024	-.12289	-.44390	-.07637	-.19794
VAR147	-.44046	-.64234	-.20408	-.19812	-.11331
VAR149	-.53373	-.72803	-.23637	-.20322	-.13219
VAR150	-.60930	-.41787	-.33737	-.20322	-.12033
VAR151	-.64770	-.49170	-.30126	-.30335	-.06979
VAR152	-.56262	-.50684	-.42468	-.30335	-.17759
VAR153	-.54942	-.11162	-.58022	-.31203	-.10049
VAR154	-.64776	-.45216	-.38343	-.25443	-.20363
VAR155	-.57780	-.31177	-.14397	-.40344	-.07353
VAR156	-.31601	-.54655	-.27063	-.22761	-.10314
VAR157	-.62694	-.10054	-.33324	-.18500	-.16759
VAR158	-.56153	-.49288	-.05763	-.19014	-.19014
VAR159	-.56153	-.49288	-.05763	-.19014	-.19014
VAR160	-.56153	-.49288	-.05763	-.19014	-.19014

- Whenever the first sergeant refers a subordinate to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good (.71).
- When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the first sergeant personally let him know about it (.73).
- When the first sergeant determines that a subordinate has a serious problem, he refers him to a helping agency (.67).
- When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the first sergeant makes himself available (.63), and
- When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the first sergeant checks to make sure it is done properly (.66).

Factor two appears to be a mutual trust factor in the sense described earlier for the items describing the company commander. Again, because of the large number of cross-loadings, only the most significant items will be described in this paragraph. The entire loading set can be found in Table 15. Items defining this factor included:

- When a subordinate is performing well, the first sergeant comes down and tries to do the subordinate's job (-.71).
- During counseling sessions, the first sergeant orders, threatens, criticizes or preaches (-.73).
- The first sergeant acts as if he doesn't trust my judgment (.61).
- The first sergeant is courteous when dealing with his subordinates (.57).

It is worth noting that the concept of trust is very closely bound up with being courteous in dealing with the drill sergeant.

Factor three appears to be a mixed bag of items that roughly relate to the concept of fairness. Four items loaded above .4.

- The first sergeant gets orders that do not violate local policy, SOP, regulations, or the UCMJ (.45).

- The first sergeant lets a person being counseled do most of the talking (.69).
- The first sergeant is courteous when dealing with his subordinates (.42).
- The first sergeant does not punish a subordinate or recommend him for punishment for poor performance unless there is reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well (.58).

Factor four appears to correspond roughly to the dimension labeled "quality of leadership" in the company commander analyses. Items loading on this factor include:

- Our first sergeant made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task (-.63).
- My first sergeant knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly (-.61).
- When I first arrived in my present assignment, my first sergeant made sure that I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with (-.63).
- Our first sergeant keeps us informed about what tasks he expects us to perform (.55).
- The first sergeant's punishments seem to be fair (-.59).
- When we receive a new requirement or mission, the first sergeant makes sure we understand the reason for it (.55).
- The first sergeant gives orders that do not violate local policies, SOP regulations, or the UCMJ (.42).
- The first sergeant makes sure that what he tells us to do is necessary to accomplish our training mission (.52).
- When the first sergeant rewards me for good performance, he gives me a reward that means something to me (.40).

Two points about this factor need to be kept in mind. One is that the concept of leadership strongly incorporates the idea of explaining the purposes for one's actions and providing adequate structuring and training. Again, several of these items cross-loaded on some of the preceding factors.

Factor five is essentially the mixed-sex factor involving two items, one strongly and one weakly. Items loading on this factor were:

- Our first sergeant demands that we take into account physical differences between male and female trainees when we conduct training (.80).
- The first sergeant acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex (.40).

The Pearson correlation between these two items, however, was only .28.

In summary, the extensive cross-loading and the lack of clarity in interpreting the factors leads one to be very cautious in the creation of scales from these items. As indicated previously, my suspicion is that while the factor structure appears to be recognizable as that appearing for the company commander descriptions, the messiness and ambiguity are primarily a result of the more ambiguous role as a leader rather than as a paper-pushing administrator that the first sergeant typically plays in a training situation. In other words, many of these items are not seen as being as relevant to describing the first sergeant's behavior as they are for describing the company commander.

General Items

There were 73 general items spread throughout the drill sergeant questionnaire. An n of 425 provides an adequate sample size for the factor analyses. The initial principal axis factor accounted for 11.3 percent of the variance with the second factor accounting for 5.8 percent of the variance, followed by a general decline in variance accounted for with subsequent factors. This pattern confirms the findings in other sections of this report that the first factor is inevitably substantially larger than the subsequent factors, but that the general items not describing an individual result in a much smaller gap between the first and second factor than do items describing a specific individual. A decision on the best rotated solution was made somewhat more difficult than in the other data sets because of the appearance of a rather weak factor in the midst of otherwise fairly well defined and easily interpreted factors. This phenomenon occurred on rotations involving more

than four factors. The nine factor solution was finally decided upon primarily because of the added meaningful information provided by using such a large structure. This decision was made in spite of the presence of a couple of weak and difficult to interpret factors. This somewhat less conservative decision was made partly with the knowledge that subsequent data collections in the overall project would provide an opportunity to confirm or disconfirm the stability and meaningfulness of the factors, particularly those that appeared beyond the fourth factor. We are reasonably confident that the first four or five factors will replicate without any difficulty. The real question involves the utility and stability of the remaining, somewhat minor factors. The nine factor solution is presented in Table 16.

Factor one could be labelled a "unit pride" factor as reflected in the following items:

- All in all, officers in this unit do a fine job (.68).
- We get together as a work group to identify problems and, when possible, solve them and implement the recommended changes (.71).
- The people in this unit show that they have alot of pride in what they are doing (.72).
- The whole team pitches in and helps straighten things out when one individual makes a mistake (.72).
- All in all, drill sergeants in this unit do a fine job (.51).
- I get along well with the other drill sergeants (.45).
- I would like to remain in this unit beyond my regular tour of duty (.52).
- All in all, I am satisfied with my job (.46).
- I am satisfied that on graduation day, we turn out trainees who are fully prepared for either advanced training or for duty positions in field units (.41).
- There is more emphasis on punishment than on rewards in dealing with trainees in my company (-.41).

TABLE 15

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR
MATRIX OF GENERAL ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
VAR1	0	0	0	0
VAR2	0	0	0	0
VAR3	0	0	0	0
VAR4	0	0	0	0
VAR5	0	0	0	0
VAR6	0	0	0	0
VAR7	0	0	0	0
VAR8	0	0	0	0
VAR9	0	0	0	0
VAR10	0	0	0	0
VAR11	0	0	0	0
VAR12	0	0	0	0
VAR13	0	0	0	0
VAR14	0	0	0	0
VAR15	0	0	0	0
VAR16	0	0	0	0
VAR17	0	0	0	0
VAR18	0	0	0	0
VAR19	0	0	0	0
VAR20	0	0	0	0
VAR21	0	0	0	0
VAR22	0	0	0	0
VAR23	0	0	0	0
VAR24	0	0	0	0
VAR25	0	0	0	0
VAR26	0	0	0	0
VAR27	0	0	0	0
VAR28	0	0	0	0
VAR29	0	0	0	0
VAR30	0	0	0	0
VAR31	0	0	0	0
VAR32	0	0	0	0
VAR33	0	0	0	0
VAR34	0	0	0	0
VAR35	0	0	0	0
VAR36	0	0	0	0
VAR37	0	0	0	0
VAR38	0	0	0	0
VAR39	0	0	0	0
VAR40	0	0	0	0
VAR41	0	0	0	0
VAR42	0	0	0	0
VAR43	0	0	0	0
VAR44	0	0	0	0
VAR45	0	0	0	0
VAR46	0	0	0	0
VAR47	0	0	0	0
VAR48	0	0	0	0
VAR49	0	0	0	0
VAR50	0	0	0	0
VAR51	0	0	0	0
VAR52	0	0	0	0
VAR53	0	0	0	0
VAR54	0	0	0	0
VAR55	0	0	0	0
VAR56	0	0	0	0
VAR57	0	0	0	0
VAR58	0	0	0	0
VAR59	0	0	0	0
VAR60	0	0	0	0
VAR61	0	0	0	0
VAR62	0	0	0	0
VAR63	0	0	0	0
VAR64	0	0	0	0
VAR65	0	0	0	0
VAR66	0	0	0	0
VAR67	0	0	0	0
VAR68	0	0	0	0
VAR69	0	0	0	0
VAR70	0	0	0	0
VAR71	0	0	0	0
VAR72	0	0	0	0
VAR73	0	0	0	0
VAR74	0	0	0	0
VAR75	0	0	0	0
VAR76	0	0	0	0
VAR77	0	0	0	0
VAR78	0	0	0	0
VAR79	0	0	0	0
VAR80	0	0	0	0
VAR81	0	0	0	0
VAR82	0	0	0	0
VAR83	0	0	0	0
VAR84	0	0	0	0
VAR85	0	0	0	0
VAR86	0	0	0	0
VAR87	0	0	0	0
VAR88	0	0	0	0
VAR89	0	0	0	0
VAR90	0	0	0	0
VAR91	0	0	0	0
VAR92	0	0	0	0
VAR93	0	0	0	0
VAR94	0	0	0	0
VAR95	0	0	0	0
VAR96	0	0	0	0
VAR97	0	0	0	0
VAR98	0	0	0	0
VAR99	0	0	0	0
VAR100	0	0	0	0

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6	FACTOR 7	FACTOR 8	FACTOR 9
VAR 1	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 2	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 3	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 4	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 5	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 6	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 7	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 8	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 9	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 10	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 11	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 12	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 13	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 14	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 15	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 16	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 17	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 18	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 19	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 20	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 21	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 22	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 23	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 24	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 25	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 26	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 27	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 28	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 29	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 30	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 31	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 32	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 33	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 34	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 35	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 36	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 37	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 38	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 39	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 40	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 41	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 42	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 43	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 44	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 45	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 46	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 47	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 48	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 49	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 50	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 51	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 52	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 53	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 54	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 55	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 56	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 57	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 58	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 59	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 60	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 61	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 62	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 63	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 64	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 65	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 66	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 67	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 68	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 69	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 70	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 71	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 72	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 73	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 74	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 75	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 76	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 77	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 78	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 79	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 80	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 81	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 82	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 83	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 84	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 85	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 86	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 87	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 88	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 89	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 90	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 91	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 92	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 93	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 94	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 95	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 96	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 97	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 98	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 99	1	1	1	1	1
VAR 100	1	1	1	1	1

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
VARI 17	.03603	.24822	.11674	.13312
VARI 18	-.06747	.73005	.09000	.00113
VARI 19	.04982	-.16354	.02753	.03606
VARI 20	.23488	.01770	.12440	.00000
VARI 21	.20444	.47140	.03722	.00000
VARI 22	.00044	.12100	.14524	.00000
VARI 23	-.06722	.36850	.07491	.11111
VARI 24	.01135	-.33379	.00256	.00000
VARI 25	.06327	.71111	.00000	.00000
VARI 26	.04089	.45327	.06351	.00000
VARI 27	.04410	.83977	.06306	.13404
VARI 28	.05522	.88778	.06306	.13404

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6	FACTOR 7	FACTOR 8	FACTOR 9
VAR1 17	-.27291	.36934	-.22946	-.01026	.08296
VAR1 18	-.04282	-.05685	-.08197	-.02907	.06176
VAR1 19	-.09425	-.07293	.01375	-.00065	.04830
VAR1 20	-.07994	-.18195	.28455	-.18433	.07963
VAR1 21	.13782	.11412	.02712	-.09663	.12971
VAR1 22	.07628	.07686	-.11376	-.04712	.03495
VAR1 23	-.06147	-.10219	-.09748	.05680	-.09604
VAR1 24	.12367	-.01185	.21029	.17452	.22018
VAR1 25	.04181	.05744	-.02101	.04239	.03592
VAR1 26	.04606	.15500	-.13908	.00512	.15596
VAR1 27	.02448	.07780	-.17301	-.11569	.04838
VAR1 28	.10356	-.03803	-.11831	.07198	.16397

Factor two is very clearly a "tension or stress" factor. Items loading on this factor included:

- I sometimes think I could break under all of the pressure that I am getting (.73).
- After a days work I frequently go home with a headache (.71).
- Lately I've been tense about my work (.69).
- When I first wake up in the morning and think of going to work, I get a stomach ache (.64).
- If I could, I'd get out from under the hat right now (.61).
- All in all, I am satisfied with my job (-.55).
- Many times my job and my family pull me in opposite directions (.53).
- I have to work such long hours, the quality of my performance suffers (-.52).
- My family wants me to leave the Army because its demands interfere with my family life (.45).
- The amount of work I have to do is reasonable (-.47).
- I hardly ever worry about my job (-.45).

Factor three encompasses what we would call "old fashioned attitudes towards discipline." It includes the following items:

- New trainees think too independently and need to be leaned on hard for awhile (.50).
- If a trainee is to learn to be a good soldier he must experience alot of physical and mental stress during basic training (.55).
- You've got to swear at the trainees or scare them in order to control what they do (.63).
- I can get alot more out of the trainees by threatening to punish them than I can by trying to counsel them (.65).
- Alot of trainees can't be made to do what is necessary unless the drill sergeant acts like he is going to get physical with them (.67).

- Some of the things we are supposed to do to teach the trainees are just theories that can't be applied as effectively as old fashioned fear (.54).
- I wish the trainees were of the same quality they were in the days of the draft (.42).
- This would have been a much better unit if some of the trainees had been weeded out earlier by use of the trainee discharge program (.40).
- I sometimes get the feeling that about the only kinds of people volunteering for the Army nowadays are those who have been rejected everywhere else (.49).
- I holler and scream more than the other drill sergeants (.42).

Factor four is composed of several items that basically reflect the drill sergeant's evaluation of the drill sergeant school they attended.

Items loading on this factor were:

- I had used a good deal of what I learned in the drill sergeant course to help me successfully motivate trainees (.68).
- The drill sergeant course taught me the necessary skills I need to lead my trainees (.63).
- When I tried the leadership techniques I learned in drill sergeant school, I found that none of them worked (-.53).
- I don't think the drill sergeant school adequately prepared me for the problems I had to face (-.60).
- I was given enough time during the cycle to teach the trainees how to "soldier" (.41).

Factor five is a perception of the extent to which trainees have adequate self discipline, and includes an implicit belief about why females may be less easily trained. Items on this factor were:

- After about three weeks in the cycle I don't have to lean on the trainees as much (.56).
- Within a few weeks most of the trainees handle self discipline really well (.59).

- There is a place for female trainees in the kind of training we are supposed to be doing (.67).
- I would be upset if I had to train a female platoon (-.44).
- Our female trainees will eventually make as good soldiers as male trainees (.61).

Factor six is a rather ambiguous factor that appears to reflect a general perception of the respondent's style as a drill sergeant. It contains only one item loading above .5. The items on this factor were:

- The other drill sergeants think that I am too soft on the trainees (.53).
- For reinforcement training, I often have to teach subjects that I am not familiar with (.49).
- My trainees could do just as well with a lot less supervision from me (.43).

The general tone of this factor appears to reflect the extent to which the drill sergeant feels that too much supervision is unnecessary. He also perceives this belief as being related to perceptions of being too soft.

Factor seven deals rather specifically with whether or not the unit is perceived to be graduating unqualified trainees, whether male or female. The items loading here were:

- Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (.61).
- Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (.62).
- Having another drill sergeant in the platoon relieves alot of the stress (.43).

This last item again suggests an interesting linkage being made in the minds of the drill sergeant between having enough staff in the unit and the ability to train soldiers up to the appropriate level of ability.

Factor eight is the other of the two rather ambiguous factors that appeared in this structure. It actually has no items loading above .5, and we therefore choose to leave it uninterpreted. The highest loading item in this factor was:

- I use a referral list when trainees have problems I can't solve (.43).

Factor nine deals with family support. It contained three items:

- My family is not interested in my work (-.71).
- I get a lot of understanding from my family when things are not going well in the unit (.68).
- My family wants me to leave the Army because its demands interfere with my family life (-.47).

This latter item cross-loaded on the "tension and stress" factor, but the other two items broke out very cleanly from that factor.

CHAPTER 5

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

The soldier's questionnaire contained three distinct sets of items. The first section consisted of 16 general attitudinal and perceptual items that were subjected to one set of factor analyses. The remaining two sections in the questionnaire contained descriptions of each of two drill sergeants with whom the trainee had interacted. Drill sergeants were dichotomized along two separate characteristics: (1) whether they were trained in the self-paced or in the eight week POI; and (2) whether they were listed first or second by the trainees on the soldier's questionnaire. This procedure yielded a four-fold categorization of drill sergeants: (1) eight week POI/first listed; (2) eight week POI/second listed; (3) self-paced POI/first listed; and (4) self-paced POI/second listed. A factor analyses for each of the four combinations of these groupings was then performed. This approach was taken in order to look at the effects of a replication of the analyses on the stability of the factor structure, and to examine the stability or generalizability of the factor structures across dimensions of major relevance in this study: the type of training received by the drill sergeants.

It was assumed that the first described drill sergeant would have been most familiar to the trainees and would provide the most reliable data. It was also expected that the sample sizes for the two sets of analyses would be larger for the first listed drill sergeant, since a number of trainees did not describe a second drill sergeant. Means for the general items and for each of the four subsets of drill sergeant descriptions are presented in Tables 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21.

General Items

Based on an n of 2,236, the factor analyses were performed on the 16 general perceptual items. The two-factor rotated solution was deemed to be best and is presented in Table 22. *Factor one* accounted for 23.5 percent of the variance, while *factor two* accounted for an additional 10.6 percent of the variance.

TABLE 17

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: GENERAL ITEMS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
VAR1	4.3913	.9050	220
VAR2	4.7348	1.1068	220
VAR3	4.1073	1.0823	220
VAR4	4.4352	1.0273	220
VAR5	4.5005	.9256	220
VAR6	4.1968	1.0974	220
VAR7	3.9445	1.2094	220
VAR8	3.4262	1.2526	220
VAR9	3.4343	1.3296	220
VAR10	3.8372	1.2444	220
VAR11	3.5801	1.2851	220
VAR12	3.5899	1.3615	220
VAR13	3.8913	1.2615	220
VAR14	4.6869	.7833	220
VAR15	4.2013	1.0017	220
VAR16	3.4065	1.3694	220

TABLE 18

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: ITEMS OF FIRST LISTED
 DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN 8-WEEK POI

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
1	1.00	0.00	1
2	1.00	0.00	1
3	1.00	0.00	1
4	1.00	0.00	1
5	1.00	0.00	1
6	1.00	0.00	1
7	1.00	0.00	1
8	1.00	0.00	1
9	1.00	0.00	1
10	1.00	0.00	1
11	1.00	0.00	1
12	1.00	0.00	1
13	1.00	0.00	1
14	1.00	0.00	1
15	1.00	0.00	1
16	1.00	0.00	1
17	1.00	0.00	1
18	1.00	0.00	1
19	1.00	0.00	1
20	1.00	0.00	1
21	1.00	0.00	1
22	1.00	0.00	1
23	1.00	0.00	1
24	1.00	0.00	1
25	1.00	0.00	1
26	1.00	0.00	1
27	1.00	0.00	1
28	1.00	0.00	1
29	1.00	0.00	1
30	1.00	0.00	1
31	1.00	0.00	1
32	1.00	0.00	1
33	1.00	0.00	1
34	1.00	0.00	1
35	1.00	0.00	1
36	1.00	0.00	1
37	1.00	0.00	1
38	1.00	0.00	1
39	1.00	0.00	1
40	1.00	0.00	1
41	1.00	0.00	1
42	1.00	0.00	1
43	1.00	0.00	1
44	1.00	0.00	1
45	1.00	0.00	1
46	1.00	0.00	1
47	1.00	0.00	1
48	1.00	0.00	1
49	1.00	0.00	1
50	1.00	0.00	1
51	1.00	0.00	1
52	1.00	0.00	1
53	1.00	0.00	1
54	1.00	0.00	1
55	1.00	0.00	1
56	1.00	0.00	1
57	1.00	0.00	1
58	1.00	0.00	1
59	1.00	0.00	1
60	1.00	0.00	1
61	1.00	0.00	1
62	1.00	0.00	1
63	1.00	0.00	1
64	1.00	0.00	1
65	1.00	0.00	1
66	1.00	0.00	1
67	1.00	0.00	1
68	1.00	0.00	1
69	1.00	0.00	1
70	1.00	0.00	1
71	1.00	0.00	1
72	1.00	0.00	1
73	1.00	0.00	1
74	1.00	0.00	1
75	1.00	0.00	1
76	1.00	0.00	1
77	1.00	0.00	1
78	1.00	0.00	1
79	1.00	0.00	1
80	1.00	0.00	1
81	1.00	0.00	1
82	1.00	0.00	1
83	1.00	0.00	1
84	1.00	0.00	1
85	1.00	0.00	1
86	1.00	0.00	1
87	1.00	0.00	1
88	1.00	0.00	1
89	1.00	0.00	1
90	1.00	0.00	1
91	1.00	0.00	1
92	1.00	0.00	1
93	1.00	0.00	1
94	1.00	0.00	1
95	1.00	0.00	1
96	1.00	0.00	1
97	1.00	0.00	1
98	1.00	0.00	1
99	1.00	0.00	1
100	1.00	0.00	1

TABLE 19

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: ITEMS OF FIRST LISTED
 DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE SELF-PACED POI

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
DS1	1.9873	1.2014	788
DS2	3.6832	1.1580	788
DS3	4.5241	1.2439	788
DS4	3.5205	1.1783	788
DS5	1.5076	1.0949	788
DS6	2.2412	1.5574	788
DS7	2.3390	1.4622	788
DS8	2.2411	1.1620	788
DS9	4.4003	1.2546	788
DS10	3.4900	1.2333	788
DS11	4.4790	1.1944	788
DS12	4.4790	1.0949	788
DS13	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS14	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS15	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS16	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS17	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS18	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS19	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS20	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS21	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS22	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS23	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS24	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS25	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS26	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS27	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS28	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS29	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS30	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS31	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS32	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS33	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS34	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS35	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS36	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS37	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS38	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS39	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS40	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS41	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS42	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS43	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS44	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS45	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS46	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS47	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS48	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS49	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS50	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS51	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS52	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS53	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS54	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS55	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS56	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS57	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS58	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS59	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS60	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS61	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS62	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS63	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS64	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS65	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS66	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS67	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS68	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS69	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS70	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS71	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS72	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS73	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS74	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS75	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS76	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS77	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS78	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS79	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS80	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS81	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS82	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS83	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS84	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS85	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS86	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS87	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS88	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS89	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS90	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS91	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS92	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS93	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS94	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS95	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS96	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS97	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS98	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS99	4.4888	1.0949	788
DS100	4.4888	1.0949	788

TABLE 20

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: ITEMS OF SECOND LISTED
 DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE 8-WEEK POI

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
05110000	4.1761	1.2783	507
05110001	4.6667	1.0867	507
05110002	4.2860	1.3000	507
05110003	4.1330	1.3000	507
05110004	4.7712	1.3000	507
05110005	4.6134	1.3000	507
05110006	4.5556	1.3000	507
05110007	4.9277	1.3000	507
05110008	4.4667	1.3000	507
05110009	4.0197	1.3000	507
05110010	4.0158	1.3000	507
05110011	4.0663	1.3000	507
05110012	4.1622	1.3000	507
05110013	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110014	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110015	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110016	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110017	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110018	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110019	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110020	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110021	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110022	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110023	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110024	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110025	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110026	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110027	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110028	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110029	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110030	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110031	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110032	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110033	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110034	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110035	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110036	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110037	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110038	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110039	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110040	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110041	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110042	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110043	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110044	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110045	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110046	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110047	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110048	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110049	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110050	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110051	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110052	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110053	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110054	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110055	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110056	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110057	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110058	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110059	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110060	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110061	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110062	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110063	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110064	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110065	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110066	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110067	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110068	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110069	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110070	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110071	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110072	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110073	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110074	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110075	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110076	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110077	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110078	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110079	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110080	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110081	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110082	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110083	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110084	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110085	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110086	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110087	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110088	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110089	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110090	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110091	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110092	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110093	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110094	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110095	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110096	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110097	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110098	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110099	4.2899	1.3000	507
05110100	4.2899	1.3000	507

TABLE 21

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: ITEMS OF SECOND LISTED
 DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE SELF-PACED POI

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV	CASES
DS11001	2.1970	1.3146	731
DS11002	3.7832	1.2103	731
DS11003	4.2242	1.1141	731
DS11004	3.3355	1.1192	731
DS11005	1.8249	1.1501	731
DS11006	2.4487	1.1038	731
DS11007	2.0026	1.1492	731
DS11008	4.3222	1.1380	731
DS11009	4.0022	1.1380	731
DS11010	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11011	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11012	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11013	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11014	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11015	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11016	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11017	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11018	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11019	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11020	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11021	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11022	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11023	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11024	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11025	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11026	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11027	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11028	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11029	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11030	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11031	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11032	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11033	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11034	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11035	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11036	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11037	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11038	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11039	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11040	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11041	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11042	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11043	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11044	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11045	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11046	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11047	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11048	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11049	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11050	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11051	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11052	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11053	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11054	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11055	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11056	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11057	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11058	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11059	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11060	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11061	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11062	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11063	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11064	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11065	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11066	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11067	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11068	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11069	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11070	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11071	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11072	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11073	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11074	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11075	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11076	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11077	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11078	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11079	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11080	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11081	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11082	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11083	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11084	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11085	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11086	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11087	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11088	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11089	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11090	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11091	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11092	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11093	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11094	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11095	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11096	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11097	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11098	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11099	4.0036	1.1380	731
DS11100	4.0036	1.1380	731

TABLE 22

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX
OF GENERAL ITEMS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
VAR1	.30456	.52005
VAR2	.01574	-.76226
VAR3	.27900	.74634
VAR4	.48211	.30323
VAR5	.22157	.80628
VAR6	.65922	.70163
VAR7	.42334	.70551
VAR8	.14059	.64256
VAR9	.45542	.75743
VAR10	.03075	-.76135
VAR11	.23045	.77741
VAR12	-.05521	-.15957
VAR13	.66585	-.77247
VAR14	.50751	.23262
VAR15	.61044	.21475
VAR16	.62511	.79460

Factor one was defined as a "general quality of training factor. The highest loading items included:

- The training I received was hard and made me show how well I could do (.66).
- The drill sergeants had enough time during the cycle to teach us how to be good soldiers (.67).

Also loading very highly on this factor were:

- Right now I am sure my body is in very good physical condition due to physical training (.61).
- There was enough time during the training cycle to allow us to practice new skills until we had mastered them (.63).

Moderately loading items were:

- All the things I learned now are important for a soldier to know (.48).
- We are happy in this platoon (.42).
- Most trainees can be left without someone to watch them and still do all they're supposed to do (.46).
- Right now, because of the training I've received, I am sure I can hit targets with my weapon (.51).

Factor two was an "attitude toward the Army" factor. Highest loading items were:

- I'm sorry I enlisted in the Army (-.79).
- If I could get out of the Army at any time, I would get out right now (-.76).

Three additional items loaded moderately high on this factor. They were:

- I feel that I am serving my country well by being in the Army (.52).
- I look forward to my Army job after I finish training (.60).
- I would like to make the Army a career (.64).

It might be worth mentioning in passing that an intriguing factor appeared in the three and four-factor rotated solution, but dropped out in the

fifth and sixth level solution. There were basically two items defining this factor:

- There was a lot of competition among platoons (.61).
- The drill sergeants in this unit often give conflicting orders, telling us to do things differently (.65).

It was decided not to include this factor as one of those for scale derivation purposes because the Pearson product-moment correlation between those two items was only .07, thus indicating that any scale derived would have an alpha approaching zero. Nevertheless, the appearance of these two items together on the same factor, however tenuously, suggests an interesting hypothesis about the dynamics of competition in these situations. Perhaps we could suggest that while modest amounts of competition may be healthy, intense competition could become dysfunctional, resulting in the drill sergeants competing amongst themselves to the detriment of the training.

More complex factor solutions basically resulted in single items loading on each additional factor. The first two factors picked up 13 of the 16 items with loadings above .42. The remaining three items were the two just discussed in terms of the third factor, and the item:

- Drill sergeants don't let female trainees get out of doing things just because they are female.

Drill Sergeants Trained Under the Old Self-Paced POI (First Listed)

There were 788 cases in which a trainee described a drill sergeant trained in the old self-paced POI as the first drill sergeant. The six-factor solution yielded a fairly good and interpretable factor structure (see Table 23). The first principal axis factor in this data set accounted for 24.5 percent of the variance. This was followed by an extremely sharp drop-off in percent of variance accounted for, with the next five factors accounting for 4.6, 4.0, 3.6, 3.2, and 2.7 percent of the variance, respectively. The precipitous drop in the amount of variance accounted for repeats the pattern described in previous chapters for items describing an individual.

TABLE 23

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF ITEMS
OF FIRST LISTED DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE SELF-PACED POI

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
87	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TABLE 23 (CONTINUED)

The following table shows the results of the analysis of variance for the data in Table 23. The first column shows the source of variation, the second column shows the degrees of freedom, the third column shows the mean square, the fourth column shows the F value, and the fifth column shows the probability of the F value being due to chance.

	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
1	.08602	1
2	.07290	.225
3	.25076	.131
4	.11977	.250
5	.00184	.000
6	.00000	.000
7	.00000	.000
8	.00000	.000
9	.00000	.000
10	.00000	.000
11	.00000	.000
12	.00000	.000
13	.00000	.000
14	.00000	.000
15	.00000	.000
16	.00000	.000
17	.00000	.000
18	.00000	.000
19	.00000	.000
20	.00000	.000
21	.00000	.000
22	.00000	.000
23	.00000	.000
24	.00000	.000
25	.00000	.000
26	.00000	.000
27	.00000	.000
28	.00000	.000
29	.00000	.000
30	.00000	.000
31	.00000	.000
32	.00000	.000
33	.00000	.000
34	.00000	.000
35	.00000	.000
36	.00000	.000
37	.00000	.000
38	.00000	.000
39	.00000	.000
40	.00000	.000
41	.00000	.000
42	.00000	.000
43	.00000	.000
44	.00000	.000
45	.00000	.000
46	.00000	.000
47	.00000	.000
48	.00000	.000
49	.00000	.000
50	.00000	.000
51	.00000	.000
52	.00000	.000
53	.00000	.000
54	.00000	.000
55	.00000	.000
56	.00000	.000
57	.00000	.000
58	.00000	.000
59	.00000	.000
60	.00000	.000
61	.00000	.000
62	.00000	.000
63	.00000	.000
64	.00000	.000
65	.00000	.000
66	.00000	.000
67	.00000	.000
68	.00000	.000
69	.00000	.000
70	.00000	.000
71	.00000	.000
72	.00000	.000
73	.00000	.000
74	.00000	.000
75	.00000	.000
76	.00000	.000
77	.00000	.000
78	.00000	.000
79	.00000	.000
80	.00000	.000
81	.00000	.000
82	.00000	.000
83	.00000	.000
84	.00000	.000
85	.00000	.000
86	.00000	.000
87	.00000	.000
88	.00000	.000
89	.00000	.000
90	.00000	.000
91	.00000	.000
92	.00000	.000
93	.00000	.000
94	.00000	.000
95	.00000	.000
96	.00000	.000
97	.00000	.000
98	.00000	.000
99	.00000	.000
100	.00000	.000

Factor one was an overall evaluative description of the drill sergeant as an all-around, concerned, competent, soldier and leader. Ten of the 62 items entered onto this factor with loadings in excess of .60. Eleven additional items loaded between .40 and .60. The four highest loading items on this factor were:

- When I went to my drill sergeant for help, he listened well and cared about what I said (.76).
- When I had a problem, I went to my drill sergeant to talk things out (.70).
- When a trainee performed tasks well, the drill sergeant let him know about it (.70).
- My drill sergeant helped me to solve my problems (.69).

These items basically deal with a sensitive, aware individual who is able and willing to listen to trainee problems. Additional high-loading items included:

- My drill sergeant made me feel like a winner when I did something well (.61).
- When I finished a task, my drill sergeant told me how well I did (.64).
- Our drill sergeant kept us informed about how well he thought we were doing in training (.60).
- When my drill sergeant rewarded me for good performance, he gave a reward that meant something to me (.62).
- When I wanted to talk to my drill sergeant, he made himself available (.64).
- Whenever my drill sergeant referred a trainee to a helping agency, he followed up by checking to see that the agency did some good (.65).

Note that most of these items deal with positive feedback and a concern for making sure that the trainee succeeded.

Items loading in the .50's and high .40's included:

- When I didn't know exactly what my drill sergeant wanted me to do, he would spend the time explaining and showing me how he wanted it done (.52).

- When we received a new requirement or mission, the drill sergeant made sure we understood the reason for it (.49).
- When we asked our drill sergeant for help in solving a problem, he helped out (.58).
- Before my drill sergeant punished someone, he made sure he knew all the facts, the whole story (.58).
- When my drill sergeant determined that a trainee had a serious problem, he referred the trainee to a helping agency (.53).
- I tried out the things my drill sergeant told me to do after he advised me about some problems (.56).
- Our drill sergeant tried to scare us into doing what he wanted (-.50).

Factor two described the clarity of the expectations and instructions of the drill sergeant. The factor consisted primarily of six highly similar items that varied only in the words "what," "when," "where," and "how well." The items were included in this form on the assumption that because of the training in the new POI, it might be possible for trainees to distinguish among the various components of this type of communication. It is fairly clear that this fine a discrimination was not very well made by the trainees (or by members of the cadre, for that matter), and there was a tendency for all of the items to load together. The seven items loading above .4 were as follows:

- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what he wanted us to do (.79).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood when we had to do it (.80).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood where we had to do it (.79).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how well we had to do it (.69).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what would happen to us if we did it right (.49).

- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how we had to do it (.74).
- When we received a new requirement or mission, the drill sergeant made sure we understood the reason for it (.45).

This last item also appeared on *factor one* with a loading of .49.

Factor three encompasses the concepts of fairness and overall competence. Nine items appeared on this factor with a loading of .4 or above. The most important items were:

- My drill sergeant was always on my back (-.58).
- My drill sergeant picked on me (-.56).
- My drill sergeant's personal appearance was squared away (.52).
- My drill sergeant was in excellent physical condition (.50).
- My drill sergeant treated me the same as he treated everyone else (.59).
- Overall, my drill sergeant did a very good job (.59).

Also loading on this factor were:

- Our drill sergeant is such a good soldier, he could show us how to best perform our tasks (.44).
- My drill sergeant did not treat us very badly or abuse us (.44).
- Punishments my drill sergeant gave seemed to be fair (.47).

Factor four was a good soldier or expert soldier factor. This factor consisted primarily of the four items in another specially constructed set of questions that asked about specific areas of expertise the drill sergeant was expected to train. The extremely high loadings for all four areas of expertise indicated little, if any, differentiation among them by the trainees. The items and loadings were as follows:

- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in basic rifle marksmanship (.73).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in first aid (.73).

- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in military customs and courtesies (.71).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in physical readiness training (.71).

Also confirming the meaningfulness of this factor was the presence of two other items:

- Our drill sergeant is such a good soldier, he could show us how to best perform our tasks (.42).
- My drill sergeant was in excellent physical condition (.41).

Both of these items also loaded on the preceding factor.

Factor five can be defined as a general quality of training factor. The two highest loading items were:

- Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (.61).
- Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (.60).

Four additional items loading on this factor were:

- My drill sergeant had to work such long hours he looked too tired to train us (.42).
- When my drill sergeant was told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tried to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on (.50).
- My drill sergeant got along well with other drill sergeants (-.42).
- My drill sergeant was very concerned with our scores on BRM, end-of-cycle tests, etc. (-.44).

On this factor we see a combination of items dealing with concern for and maintenance of standards for both males and females, as well as the drill sergeant's ability to get along with his peers and perform his duties adequately.

Factor six was basically a "fairness of punishment" factor, with all items dealing with punishment in one form or another. Six items loaded on this factor with loadings of .4 or more. They were:

- Our drill sergeant checked trainees with bad attitudes a lot more often than he checked the other trainees (.44).
- If you don't do what you're supposed to, the whole unit may be punished for it (.43).
- When a trainee did something wrong or performed a task poorly, the drill sergeant personally let him know about it (.56).
- When a trainee broke down and cried, the drill sergeant didn't holler or make fun of him (.40).
- My drill sergeant did not punish a trainee for poor performance unless the trainee was no longer trying to perform (.40).
- When my drill sergeant warned a trainee about something, he followed through with punishment, if the trainee's performance did not improve (.50).

Notice that the items can be interpreted as conveying the idea of fairness and consistency of punishment, or lack of it. It is interesting to note that the item "punishments my drill sergeant gave seemed to be fair" did not load on this factor, but did load on *factor one* and *factor three*. Similarly, the item "before my drill sergeant punished someone, he made sure he knew all the facts" did not load on this factor, but did appear on *factor one*.

Nine of the 62 items did not load on any of the six factors with a loading of .4 or above. Several of these items had been included to assess specific behaviors trained in the new POI. An example of this was the item "my drill sergeant had trouble working with members of the opposite sex," and "whenever our platoon marched in formation, short people were in the front."

Drill Sergeants Trained Under the New Eight-Week POI (First Listed)

The analyses of the drill sergeants who were trained under the new eight-week POI, and who were listed first in the questionnaire, involved an *n* of 400. The first principal axis factor accounted for 25.6 percent of the variance, while the second accounted for 5.2 percent.

A five-factor varimax rotated solution was chosen as the best for the data set, and is presented in Table 24. This is in contrast to the previously described six-factor solution chosen for descriptions of drill sergeants trained in the old self-paced POI. The following paragraphs will not only provide descriptions of the factors as they emerged in the current data set, but will also contain comments on the similarities and dissimilarities to that characteristic of the drill sergeants trained in the self-paced POI. In noting differences between the two factor structures, it is important to keep in mind an important area of colinearity. That is, the drill sergeants trained in the new eight-week POI are, by definition, less experienced than those trained in the previous self-paced POI. This correlation occurs simply because the new POI is more recent and completely replaced the old POI. Since there is a fair amount of overlap in the two programs during the year-long phasing-in period for the new POI, it may be possible to co-vary experience for a subsample of drill sergeants who graduated during the year in which the old POI was being replaced by the new POI. This analysis would be appropriate in the Evaluation Technical Report.

Factor one is an all-around evaluative factor concerned with the competence and leadership of the drill sergeant. It is highly similar to the first factor emerging in the descriptions of drill sergeants trained under the old self-paced POI. As might be expected, the size of the factor loadings bounced around somewhat, but the content of the factor remains surprisingly stable. The main change in this sample occurs in the fact that several items which obtained a loading of .4 on the current factor did not load at this level on the corresponding factor in the other set. Most of these items did, however, load between .3 and .4 in the original factor structure. For the sake of brevity, items that are common to both factors will not be repeated here. The reader is referred to the description of the drill sergeants trained in the self-paced POI. In addition, it is possible to directly compare the two factor structures by examining the appropriate tables. Here, items that appeared on this factor, but not on the others will be listed. Additional items were:

TABLE 24

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF ITEMS
 OF FIRST LISTED DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE 8-WEEK POI

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
01	.07957	.05372	.04830	-.59584	-.00208
02	.05859	.15549	.11445	-.00119	.20334
03	.02218	.10234	.34467	.00119	.13034
04	.01079	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
05	.00218	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
06	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
07	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
08	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
09	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
10	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
11	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
12	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
13	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
14	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
15	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
16	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
17	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
18	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
19	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
20	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
21	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
22	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
23	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
24	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
25	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
26	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
27	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
28	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
29	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
30	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
31	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
32	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
33	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
34	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
35	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
36	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
37	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
38	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
39	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
40	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
41	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
42	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
43	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
44	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
45	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
46	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
47	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
48	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
49	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
50	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
51	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
52	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
53	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
54	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
55	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
56	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
57	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
58	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
59	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
60	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
61	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
62	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
63	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
64	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
65	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
66	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
67	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
68	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
69	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
70	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
71	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
72	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
73	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
74	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
75	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
76	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
77	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
78	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
79	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
80	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
81	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
82	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
83	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
84	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
85	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
86	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
87	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
88	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
89	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
90	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
91	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
92	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
93	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
94	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
95	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
96	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
97	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
98	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
99	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034
100	.00119	.10929	.12244	.00119	.13034

- My drill sergeant treated me the same as he treated everyone else (-.48).
- Overall, my drill sergeant did a very good job (-.53).
- Our drill sergeant checked us to make sure we performed each task the way he wanted it done (.44).
- Our drill sergeant seemed to rate us by how well we performed in training--not other things like personality, race, or sex (.50).

Factor two concerned the clarity of instructions and expectations of the drill sergeant, and corresponds to *factor two* of the descriptions of drill sergeants trained under the old self-paced POI. Again, the factor structure was extremely similar, although two additional items achieved a .4 or above loading in this data set. They are:

- When we received a new requirement or mission, the drill sergeant made sure that we understood the reason for it (.49).
- When we asked our drill sergeant for help in solving a problem, he helped out (.42).

Both of these items also cross loaded on *factor one*. The other items are described in the section describing drill sergeants trained under the old self-paced POI.

Factor three deals with the expertise of the drill sergeant and might be considered a "good soldier" factor. This factor corresponds to *factor four* in the previously mentioned factor structure. Here, the factor simplified somewhat from that previously found. Items loading here were:

- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in basic rifle marksmanship (.69).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in first aid (.71).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in military customs and courtesies (.71).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in physical readiness training (.73).

- My drill sergeant made both male and female trainees meet the required standards in order to graduate (.51).

This item did not load on the equivalent factor for drill sergeants trained in the self-paced POI. In addition, two items that had loaded marginally on the previous factor, did not meet the criteria set here:

- Our drill sergeant is such a good soldier, he could best show us how to perform our tasks (.34).
- My drill sergeant was in excellent physical condition (.38).

Factor four is the fairness factor and corresponds roughly to *factor three* of the data set for drill sergeants trained in the self-paced POI. However, it does not contain the competence implications found in the other data set. Items loading here were:

- My drill sergeant was always on my back (-.60).
- Our drill sergeant made work just to keep us busy when we didn't have anything important to do (-.54).
- My drill sergeant picked on me (-.59).
- I tried out the things my drill sergeant told me to do after he advised me about some problems (.50).

This later item did not load on the corresponding fairness and competence factor for drill sergeants trained in the old POI.

Factor five is a somewhat diffuse factor dealing primarily with the ability of the drill sergeant to cope with touchy issues. The two highest loading items are those dealing with whether or not the trainees were allowed to graduate when they were not qualified to do so. The four items loading here were:

- Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (.58).
- Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests (.60).

- When my drill sergeant warned a trainee about something, he followed through with punishment if the trainees performance did not improve (-.48).
- My drill sergeant had to work such long hours he looked too tired to train us (.42).

In passing, it should be noted that there are certain similarities between this factor and the factor labeled "general competence" in the data set describing drill sergeants trained in the old self-paced POI.

The punishment factor which appeared in the data set for self-paced trained drill sergeants did not appear in the factor analyses for drill sergeants trained in the new eight-week POI. Actually, a punishment factor somewhat similar to that found for drill sergeants trained in the old POI, did emerge in the nine factor rotated solution, as the eighth factor. However, since several of the other factors that emerged in that solution were so minor, involved only one or two modestly loading items, and were difficult to interpret, it was decided against using that solution.

Second Listed Drill Sergeants

The formatting of the soldier's questionnaire required the soldier responding to describe two different drill sergeants. The factor analyses described above are based on the descriptions for the first drill sergeant described by the trainee. Because of the requirement for a second description, it is possible to obtain a measure of the stability of the factor structure reported for the first listed drill sergeants. In general, we would expect the previously described factor structures to be more representative and more stable than those found for the second listed drill sergeant. There are several reasons for this expectation. First of all, the sample sizes were expected to be somewhat smaller for the second listed drill sergeants, because a number of trainees only described one drill sergeant, leaving the second section blank. In addition, we expected that the trainees would tend to use the first section to describe the drill sergeant they were most familiar with. The second section probably got a somewhat less familiar drill sergeant. Third, fatigue and boredom in filling out the questionnaire, a problem

common to any lengthy questionnaire in any setting, undoubtedly would have been setting in at about this point, and so the responses are probably more careless and hasty. Nevertheless, or perhaps because of these probable factors, it should be informative to compare the two sets of factor structures.

Drill Sergeants Trained in the New Eight-Week POI (Second Listed)

The n for this sample was 507, in contrast to an n of 400 for the first listed drill sergeant trained under the eight-week POI. Thus, our expectation that the n would be smaller here was incorrect. This unexpected reversal is probably due to the fact that drill sergeants in the eight-week POI are less experienced and less senior, therefore, are less likely to have direct responsibility for the control of the trainees. In other words, they are more likely to be assistant platoon leaders.

The amount of variance controlled by the first principal axis factor was 27.5 percent of the variance which is a slight increase over the 25.6 percent of the variance controlled by the same factor in the first listed new-POI data set. This suggests a slight simplification process going on in the response set of the trainees. This suspicion is further confirmed by the fact that the four-factor solution was deemed to be best, in contrast to the five and six factor solutions for the drill sergeants when described first in the questionnaire. Furthermore, when the four-factor solution for the first listed drill sergeants trained under the eight-week POI is compared to the one being described here, there is a great deal of similarity. As a result of these findings, our recommendation will be to treat only the first four factors as being stable enough to use in a serious evaluation effort. The four-factor solution is described in the paragraphs below, and the complete listing of factor loadings is presented in Table 25. In addition, the corresponding four-factor solution for the first listed drill sergeant trained in the new POI is presented in Table 26 for comparison purposes. However, only minimal reference will be made to it in the text.

Factor one is called "the clarity of goals and results" factor. Items loading on this factor included:

TABLE 25

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF ITEMS
OF SECOND LISTED DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE 8-WEEK POI

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
05110	.000	.000	.000	.000
05111	.000	.000	.000	.000
05112	.000	.000	.000	.000
05113	.000	.000	.000	.000
05114	.000	.000	.000	.000
05115	.000	.000	.000	.000
05116	.000	.000	.000	.000
05117	.000	.000	.000	.000
05118	.000	.000	.000	.000
05119	.000	.000	.000	.000
05120	.000	.000	.000	.000
05121	.000	.000	.000	.000
05122	.000	.000	.000	.000
05123	.000	.000	.000	.000
05124	.000	.000	.000	.000
05125	.000	.000	.000	.000
05126	.000	.000	.000	.000
05127	.000	.000	.000	.000
05128	.000	.000	.000	.000
05129	.000	.000	.000	.000
05130	.000	.000	.000	.000
05131	.000	.000	.000	.000
05132	.000	.000	.000	.000
05133	.000	.000	.000	.000
05134	.000	.000	.000	.000
05135	.000	.000	.000	.000
05136	.000	.000	.000	.000
05137	.000	.000	.000	.000
05138	.000	.000	.000	.000
05139	.000	.000	.000	.000
05140	.000	.000	.000	.000
05141	.000	.000	.000	.000
05142	.000	.000	.000	.000
05143	.000	.000	.000	.000
05144	.000	.000	.000	.000
05145	.000	.000	.000	.000
05146	.000	.000	.000	.000
05147	.000	.000	.000	.000
05148	.000	.000	.000	.000
05149	.000	.000	.000	.000
05150	.000	.000	.000	.000
05151	.000	.000	.000	.000
05152	.000	.000	.000	.000
05153	.000	.000	.000	.000
05154	.000	.000	.000	.000
05155	.000	.000	.000	.000
05156	.000	.000	.000	.000
05157	.000	.000	.000	.000
05158	.000	.000	.000	.000
05159	.000	.000	.000	.000
05160	.000	.000	.000	.000
05161	.000	.000	.000	.000
05162	.000	.000	.000	.000
05163	.000	.000	.000	.000
05164	.000	.000	.000	.000
05165	.000	.000	.000	.000
05166	.000	.000	.000	.000
05167	.000	.000	.000	.000
05168	.000	.000	.000	.000
05169	.000	.000	.000	.000
05170	.000	.000	.000	.000
05171	.000	.000	.000	.000
05172	.000	.000	.000	.000
05173	.000	.000	.000	.000
05174	.000	.000	.000	.000
05175	.000	.000	.000	.000
05176	.000	.000	.000	.000
05177	.000	.000	.000	.000
05178	.000	.000	.000	.000
05179	.000	.000	.000	.000
05180	.000	.000	.000	.000
05181	.000	.000	.000	.000
05182	.000	.000	.000	.000
05183	.000	.000	.000	.000
05184	.000	.000	.000	.000
05185	.000	.000	.000	.000
05186	.000	.000	.000	.000
05187	.000	.000	.000	.000
05188	.000	.000	.000	.000
05189	.000	.000	.000	.000
05190	.000	.000	.000	.000
05191	.000	.000	.000	.000
05192	.000	.000	.000	.000
05193	.000	.000	.000	.000
05194	.000	.000	.000	.000
05195	.000	.000	.000	.000
05196	.000	.000	.000	.000
05197	.000	.000	.000	.000
05198	.000	.000	.000	.000
05199	.000	.000	.000	.000
05200	.000	.000	.000	.000

TABLE 26

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF ITEMS
OF FIRST LISTED DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE 8-WEEK POI

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
JS1	.03559	.03525	.04521	-.56522
JS2	.06920	-.10585	.18557	.03440
JS3	.43592	-.16754	.33374	.15144
JS4	.06936	.04205	.05010	.45661
JS5	.11453	.03312	-.11771	.55266
JS6	.16361	.08873	.33419	.15326
JS7	.00018	.14574	.01957	.05781
JS8	.00740	.13350	.13131	.43670
JS9	.45934	.14373	.23543	.25532
JS10	.43122	.14656	.55435	.05944
JS11	.30005	.09908	.57333	.10302
JS12	.28427	.16742	.61345	.30002
JS13	.11549	.05503	.67884	.11302
JS14	.00422	.02500	.59189	.16373
JS15	.22383	.02243	.37725	.31073
JS16	.42574	.11023	.42027	.15405
JS17	.53165	.02201	.30319	.30533
JS18	.03025	.03543	.03333	.17895
JS19	.32062	.03210	.03451	.35074
JS20	.35784	.03208	.16287	.25454
JS21	.72323	.07180	.04045	.25475
JS22	.29795	.05755	.02164	.01282
JS23	.31041	.45755	.07999	.01282
JS24	.31437	.74508	.14413	.13846
JS25	.24165	.70285	.18504	.01282
JS26	.11135	.73115	.22602	.02767
JS27	.43785	.37677	.19747	.02221
JS28	.27844	.77479	.14440	.03422
JS29	.12144	.00884	.11310	.15250
JS30	.60760	.45155	.09121	.11881
JS31	.52334	.45410	.16131	.00035
JS32	.60919	.45336	.10414	.15692
JS33	.30275	.44337	.22427	.06885
JS34	.66831	.39332	.11245	.00551
JS35	.47270	.39332	.22778	.41117
JS36	.12742	.11121	.19273	.00260
JS37	.12392	.17421	.07447	.39282
JS38	.15735	.33104	.07541	.39282
JS39	.63045	.33592	.11613	.02220
JS40	.49983	.33332	.27373	.05669
JS41	.00911	.11513	.26223	.05669
JS42	.00272	.11513	.52550	.11713
JS43	.00519	.23062	.17237	.02420
JS44	.00997	.13822	.05540	.21640
JS45	.00597	.15733	.11480	.21313
JS46	.14958	.36215	.11746	.15433
JS47	.4558	.14400	.13967	.08649
JS48	.77887	.00000	.02016	.31402
JS49	.61795	.02015	.05572	.31402
JS50	.66111	.10995	.14224	.13934
JS51	.70701	.02679	.15171	.18897
JS52	.64540	.09066	.05334	.18897
JS53	.16103	.02600	.00337	.59222
JS54	.48736	.02600	.20534	.55822
JS55	.00146	.10995	.20534	.47211
JS56	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS57	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS58	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS59	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS60	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS61	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS62	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS63	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS64	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS65	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS66	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS67	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS68	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS69	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS70	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS71	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS72	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS73	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS74	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS75	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS76	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS77	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS78	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS79	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS80	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS81	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS82	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS83	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS84	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS85	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS86	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS87	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS88	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS89	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS90	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS91	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS92	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS93	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS94	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS95	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS96	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS97	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS98	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS99	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322
JS100	.00348	.10995	.15824	.18322

- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what he wanted us to do (.64).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood when we had to do it (.74).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how well we had to do it (.74).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what would happen to us if we did it right (.55).
- Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how we had to do it (.69).
- When I didn't know exactly what my drill sergeant wanted me to do, he would spend time explaining and showing me how he wanted it done (.47).
- When we received a new requirement or mission, the drill sergeant made sure we understood the reason for it (.56).
- When we asked our drill sergeant for help solving a problem, he helped out (.46).
- My drill sergeant's standards were reasonable--I knew I could meet all the standards if I worked at it (.47).
- When I finished a task, my drill sergeant told me how well I did (.41).
- Our drill sergeant checked us to make sure we performed each task the way he wanted it done (.64).
- My drill sergeant spent most of his time helping us prepare for tasks (.45).

Note the inclusion of monitoring and giving of feedback into this factor, as well as the clear definition of goals.

Factor two is the competence factor. Items loading here included:

- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in basic rifle marksmanship (.68).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in first aid (.72).

- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in military customs and courtesies (.78).
- My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in physical readiness training (.78).
- My drill sergeant made both male and female trainees meet the required standards in order to graduate (.42).
- My drill sergeant's personal appearance was squared away (.44).
- My drill sergeant was in excellent physical condition (.58).
- Overall, my drill sergeant did a very good job (.44).

Factor three was the sensitivity factor, with a special emphasis on counseling skills. Items loading on this factor above .4 were:

- My drill sergeant made me feel like a winner when I did something well (.52).
- Punishments my drill sergeant gave seemed to be fair (-.46).
- My drill sergeant helped me to solve my problems (-.66).
- When I didn't know exactly what my drill sergeant wanted me to do, he would spend time explaining and showing me how he wanted it done (.51).
- When we received a new requirement or mission, my drill sergeant made sure we understood the reason for it (.41).
- When we asked our drill sergeant for help solving a problem, he helped out (.58).
- When I finished a task, my drill sergeant told me how well I did (.56).
- When a trainee performed a task well, my drill sergeant let him know about it (.61).
- Our drill sergeant kept us informed about how well he thought we were doing in training (.54).
- When my drill sergeant promised a trainee a reward, he followed through and made sure the trainee got it (.55).
- When my drill sergeant rewarded me for good performance he gave a reward that meant something to me (.64).

- Before my drill sergeant punished someone, he made sure that he knew all the facts--the whole story (.55).
- When I wanted to talk to my drill sergeant, he made himself available (.68).
- When my drill sergeant determined that a trainee had a serious problem, he referred a trainee to a helping agency (.63).
- Whenever my drill sergeant referred a trainee to a helping agency, he followed-up by checking to see that the agency did some good (.63).
- When I had a problem I went to my drill sergeant to talk things out (.70).
- When I went to my drill sergeant for help, he listened well and cared about what I said (.74).
- I tried out the things my drill sergeant told me to do after he advised me about some problems (.53).

Note again, that certain components dealing with reward and punishment also loaded on *factor one*. In general, we see a tendency, repeated several times, for the providing of feedback to be both a sign of consideration and sensitivity, as well as an indicator of quality of leadership and clarity of goals.

Factor four is a fairness and sensitivity factor, with several of the items dealing with punishment. It is a general stylistic appraisal of the way the drill sergeant dealt with individual trainees. Items loading here were:

- My drill sergeant was always on my back (.61).
- Our drill sergeant made work just to keep us busy when we didn't have anything important to do (.41).
- My drill sergeant picked on me (.69).
- My drill sergeant treated me the same as he treated everyone else (-.48).
- Overall, my drill sergeant did a very good job (-.44).

- My drill sergeant had trouble working with trainees of the opposite sex (.42).
- My drill sergeant showed favoritism for certain trainees in our unit (.50).
- When my drill sergeant was told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tried to side-step the issue instead of facing it head on (-.40).
- During counseling sessions, my drill sergeant ordered, threatened, criticized, or preached (-.58).
- Our drill sergeant tried to scare us into doing what he wanted (-.48).

In the corresponding four factor solutions for the first listed drill sergeant trained in the new eight-week POI, the following major differences were noted. In comparing the factor structures for the first and second listed drill sergeants, when both were trained in the new POI, it appears that the biggest difference in the two factor structures is in the order in which the factors appeared. Factors one, two, three, and four in the second listed drill sergeant set emerged in the order three, one, two, and four in the first listed set. Items loading in the 30's and 40's were (not surprisingly) less stable than higher loading items.

Drill Sergeants Trained in the Self-Paced POI (Second Listed)

This set of analyses was based on a n of 731 observations. The first principal axis factor accounted for 30.6 percent of the variance with the usual precipitous drop-off in variance accounted for by subsequent factors.

The first factor is the consideration/sensitivity/counseling factor, while the second factor is the goal clarity factor. The third factor is the military competence factor and the fourth factor is the punitiveness factor. Since the loadings result in a highly similar set of items to those previously described for the drill sergeants trained in the new eight-week POI, a listing of the items will not be presented here. Instead, the reader is referred to the description

presented elsewhere, and to Table 27 which presents the complete factor loadings for this data set, as well as to Table 28 which presents the four-factor solution for the first listed drill sergeants trained in the old self-paced POI.

To briefly summarize the results of our informal "cross-validation," we have four fairly reliable factors common to drill sergeants trained under two different programs of instruction and with somewhat different degrees of contact with trainees. Beyond four factors, however, the stability of the results becomes highly suspect.

TABLE 27

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF ITEMS
OF SECOND LISTED DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN THE SELF-PACED POI

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
DS101	.30	.07	.00	.41
DS102	.12	.20	.00	.23
DS103	.18	.20	.64	.23
DS104	.16	.11	.04	.42
DS105	.33	.22	.10	.45
DS106	.09	.25	.78	.13
DS107	.11	.17	.55	.26
DS108	.10	.13	.23	.46
DS109	.11	.00	.23	.46
DS110	.11	.14	.77	.11
DS111	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS112	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS113	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS114	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS115	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS116	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS117	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS118	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS119	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS120	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS121	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS122	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS123	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS124	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS125	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS126	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS127	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS128	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS129	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS130	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS131	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS132	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS133	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS134	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS135	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS136	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS137	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS138	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS139	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS140	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS141	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS142	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS143	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS144	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS145	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS146	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS147	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS148	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS149	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS150	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS151	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS152	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS153	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS154	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS155	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS156	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS157	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS158	.11	.16	.75	.11
DS159	.11	.16	.72	.11
DS160	.11	.16	.75	.11

TABLE 28

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF ITEMS
 OF FIRST LISTED DRILL SERGEANT TRAINED IN SELF-PACED POI

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
0051	1	1	1	1
0052	1	1	1	1
0053	1	1	1	1
0054	1	1	1	1
0055	1	1	1	1
0056	1	1	1	1
0057	1	1	1	1
0058	1	1	1	1
0059	1	1	1	1
0060	1	1	1	1
0061	1	1	1	1
0062	1	1	1	1
0063	1	1	1	1
0064	1	1	1	1
0065	1	1	1	1
0066	1	1	1	1
0067	1	1	1	1
0068	1	1	1	1
0069	1	1	1	1
0070	1	1	1	1
0071	1	1	1	1
0072	1	1	1	1
0073	1	1	1	1
0074	1	1	1	1
0075	1	1	1	1
0076	1	1	1	1
0077	1	1	1	1
0078	1	1	1	1
0079	1	1	1	1
0080	1	1	1	1
0081	1	1	1	1
0082	1	1	1	1
0083	1	1	1	1
0084	1	1	1	1
0085	1	1	1	1
0086	1	1	1	1
0087	1	1	1	1
0088	1	1	1	1
0089	1	1	1	1
0090	1	1	1	1
0091	1	1	1	1
0092	1	1	1	1
0093	1	1	1	1
0094	1	1	1	1
0095	1	1	1	1
0096	1	1	1	1
0097	1	1	1	1
0098	1	1	1	1
0099	1	1	1	1
0100	1	1	1	1

CHAPTER 6
PERFORMANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

The Unit Performance and Administrative Data Form attempts to obtain information about the status of the unit that could be used as independent as well as dependent variables in assessing the actual effectiveness of the drill sergeants in carrying out their jobs. "Administrative data" refers to routinely maintained indicators of the unit's status and includes the number of trainees in the unit, the number of discharge actions initiated, article 15's administered, letters of discipline administered, number of sick calls, number of drill sergeants authorized as well as actually present, plus some basic information on the physical abilities performance tests of the trainees. The data set includes information on the status of the trainees, as well as the status of the cadre itself.

The detailed nature of the questionnaire, along with the importance of maintaining discrete indicators as separately identifiable criteria, as well as the extremely low variance on many items, resulted in the decision not to attempt to factor analyze this data set. Instead, this chapter will present a brief summary of some basic characteristics of the data. In particular, information regarding the base rate appearance of the indicator will be presented. As will be seen, in a number of instances there was no variance on the indicator, and in many other instances, there was very little variance. The chapter will end with a brief recommendation on the way to consolidate and simplify this particular form. The actual utility of the indicators in terms of linking them to the evaluation criteria remains to be seen.

Trainee Administrative Data

The range of responses on the first six items indicates that all could be used as indicators with enough variance to reflect

relationships with the independent variables, if such exist. Item number two, regarding how many trainees were in the cycle and actually graduated with their unit, appears to have been misunderstood by several respondents, since there were five forms with zeros filled in. With respect to the number of discharge actions initiated, there appears to be enough variation on each of the items to be potentially usable as a criterion. However, in most cases, the distributions are badly skewed toward responses of zero and one. The week-by-week break out may be too detailed, and unless there are specific reasons for keeping them separate, a more comprehensive and usable criterion may simply be a sum for the entire training cycle. A middle step might be to break the cycle into two or three periods and collect information for those periods rather than on a week-by-week basis.

The five items dealing with article 15's all appear to have a reasonable spread of responses and are probably usable as indicators. There is some tendency for a bunching up toward the "zero" and "one" end of the scale when the specific reasons for the article 15's are requested. If the preliminary evaluation research, to be reported in another technical report, does not show any real distinction or utility in breaking out the reasons for the article 15's then it would be recommended that they be combined or that these requests be eliminated and that only the overall number of article 15's be requested.

The letters of reprimand section required that letters of reprimand be recorded according to whether or not they were given by a field grade or a company grade officer. As it turned out, the base rate of letters of reprimand is so small that any break out of this type is almost meaningless. Only one letter of reprimand was given by a field grade officer in this entire sample. The overall low frequency of this type of punishment is such that the recommendation here is that the break-out by field and company grade be eliminated, and that the sections identifying the reason for the letter also

be eliminated for having too low a base rate. The only items that had satisfactory distribution of items for evaluation use really were item number 7, asking for the total number of letters; and item number 8, asking for the total number of trainees who received letters.

The item asking for the number of court martials for trainees suggests that the base rate is too low to be a useful indicator. In only 7 of 104 units one court martial was initiated. Items asking about AWOLs and IG complaints have sufficient, although not spectacular spread so as to provide reasonable variance for evaluation along that dimension.

All of the sick call items had a substantial amount of spread on them, and therefore had enough variance in them to be useful as an evaluation criterion. The real question is to what extent the break outs by injury, illness and sex will provide meaningful connections to the independent variables. Our recommendation here is to keep all of the indicators as is, unless the evaluation research shows them to be useless.

Non-Drill Sergeant Cadre Items

The base rates on the non-drill sergeant cadre items are so low as to make them almost useless. It is definitely an exercise in futility to break out the items by whether or not they were given by field grade or company grade officers. The break out by reasons for the administrative action also are not likely to provide any information not already provided in the general question requesting total numbers of a particular type of action. Half of the variation that does appear to exist appeared to be related to one or two units having a very special problem. For example, one unit out of 104 reported giving 61 article 15's to non-drill sergeant cadre. This does not even seem reasonable and may be an error in understanding of the question by the person filling it out. Our recommendation

for this section is to consolidate all of the items and break outs into six single-response questions requesting the following information:

- Total number of article 15's.
- Total individuals receiving article 15's.
- Total number of letters of reprimand.
- Total number of individuals receiving letters of reprimand.
- Total number of court martials.
- Total number of AWOLs.

Even with this condensation in responses, it is likely that there will be no variance on some of the items in any given period of time.

Drill Sergeant Items

The items dealing with drill sergeant's strength appeared to generally be adequate in terms of amount of variance in each item. It is not clear in scanning the data that the distinction between the first day of training and the last day of training is going to be very meaningful, and appears to have generated more than a little confusion. In particular, item five, "how many drill sergeants were administratively removed from the drill sergeant program during the cycle," seems very ambiguous in terms of first and last day. At the very least, only a single response should be required of this item. Again, in a few cases, there appeared to be some gross misunderstandings of the requirement of the item. For example, on the item requesting the number of drill sergeant designees, four units indicated that there were eight or more designees in the unit, indicating that the entire unit was made up of designees, an unlikely if not impossible circumstance.

The number of punitive administrative actions taken against drill sergeants again is so low that they may not be very useful as

indicators in the evaluation study. For example, a total of three article 15's were administered to drill sergeants in all of the 104 units in the survey. Similarly, only 11 letters of reprimand were administered throughout the survey. As a result, the elaborate break outs required in the form are really exercises in filling in zeros. They are unlikely to provide any information not already obtained in the general item requesting total numbers of a particular action. Therefore, the same recommendation made for non-drill sergeants cadre administrative items is being made for drill sergeant administrative items. That is, this section should be reduced to six single-response items requesting:

- Total number of article 15's.
- Number of individuals receiving article 15's.
- Total number of letters of reprimand.
- Number of individuals receiving letters of reprimand.
- Number of individuals court martialed.
- Number of individuals absent without leave.

Again, even with this reduction and simplification, it is likely that minimal useful variance will be available on these items in any given survey period.

One solution to the low variance situation on some of these items is to take the simplification process one step further. That is, to lump all punitive actions together into a single "punitive action" indicator. Thus, you might have an indicator entitled "drill sergeant punitive actions" which includes all article 15's, all letters of reprimand, and all court martials initiated. Items might be weighted by their seriousness. It should also be kept in mind, that in addition to the items actually present in the data form, several created criteria are probably very important to examine.

For example, the ratio of drill sergeants actually present to those authorized is probably a better indicator of unit strength than either of the items alone. Similarly, the relationship between trainee strength and drill sergeant strength should also be reflected in one of the indicators. The ratio of drill sergeant designees to total number of drill sergeants may also be an interesting criterion or independent variable depending on the nature of the evaluation analysis being conducted. In general, it is extremely important to make sure that some of these raw data numbers be cast into the proper context when being used in the evaluation.

Physical Training Indicators

The items indicating average unit performance on the PT tests indicate a reasonable enough spread to make them satisfactory as evaluation criteria. It will be necessary to keep in mind that the Army was switching from a 500 point to a 300 point scoring procedure. Some units were on the new procedure, while others were still on the old procedure. Scores will have to be adjusted accordingly using item number one on page 10. Unfortunately, five units did not indicate whether they were on the old or new scoring procedure. In addition, 35 units did not indicate any average score and therefore have missing data on this indicator.

Summary

The performance and administrative data, on the whole, look reasonably adequate to serve as criteria in the evaluation portion of the study. As indicated in the text above, the base rates on some of the administrative items, primarily in terms of unit cadre rather than trainees, indicate a need to substantially simplify the data reporting procedure. Implementing the recommendations made here will probably improve the quality of the data, and certainly will improve the acceptability of the forms to the individuals having to fill it out.

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the factor analyses presented in the previous chapters are encouraging in the sense that a number of meaningful factors emerged. In addition, a number of factors tended to reappear in different item sets across questionnaires, thereby raising the possibility of a conceptual consistency in interpretations from the various perspectives represented by the different questionnaires. Unfortunately, the emergence of these repeating themes did not occur as extensively or as cleanly as one might have hoped.

A somewhat discouraging result of these analyses emerges in the probability that only a small number of items can be recommended for elimination from the questionnaires on the basis of these analyses. The inability to recommend the elimination of large numbers of items comes from the fact that many of the factors contained only two or three items, and thus constituted a minimum number of items for a scale. In other words, all of the items in the factor would have to be included in a scale and none could be recommended for elimination. The exception to this frequently occurring pattern was on the first and occasionally the second factor in a factor structure. Here the opposite situation tends to be true. An extremely large number of items typically loaded on these factors and one could select from among the highest loading items, create a four or five item scale, and, in many cases, still have ten or 15 items which loaded on the factor that could be eliminated.

The problem lies in the fact that this first factor is virtually always a global, evaluative judgment, and involves a number of different aspects of the leader or situation which are interesting in their own right. To eliminate these items on the basis of an artifactually large first factor means that much potentially useful information would be lost. A final reason for not being able to eliminate a large number of items from the questionnaires lies in the fact that in many of the

analyses, more than a few items failed to load on any of the factors. Thus, there is no rationale for eliminating them, particularly if their content deals with an aspect of interest or relevance to the evaluation purposes of the project.

In the following paragraphs, several problems and cautions that emerged in the analyses will be presented. Then some of the more interesting and perhaps unexpected findings will be highlighted, followed by a closing section in which specific recommendations will be made.

A problem always present in interpreting multiple factor analyses is in dealing with the psychological meaning of the factors. This problem has at least three aspects in the present analyses. As indicated in Table 29, a number of factors appeared to emerge in more than one data set describing individuals. In particular, the consideration factor appeared in every description of an individual. On the face of it, this multiple appearance of the same factors can be seen as a positive characteristic of the data, for it indicates a certain amount of convergence and agreement from various perspectives within the setting. While this is undoubtedly true, it is important to realize that while we have chosen to use the same label for similar factors in different data sets, the fact remains that in no case are the factors identical. Loading sizes inevitably vary, and items present in one analysis are absent from another. Thus, while there may indeed be a common core of similarity for a particular psychological factor, the various factors also clearly differ in some aspects.

This problem is most pronounced in the early factors which tend to contain large numbers of items and which, as a result, have a rather complex mixture of item contents. Thus, a global evaluative judgment of a leader which we labeled "consideration" tends to have a different meaning or emphasis, depending on who is doing the describing and who is being described. If it is considered to be desirable to have an identical scale for measuring the same dimension across all individuals, then the only strategy to follow is to select the four or five items

TABLE 29

Summary of Factors Describing Various Individuals in the Training Setting

Respondent	Subject	<u>Factors</u>											
		Consideration	Leadership/ Effectiveness	Mutual Trust	Punishment	Goal Clarity	Communication/ Participation	Feedback	Mixed Sex Training	Use of Judgment	Job Knowledge Competence	Under Pressure	Fairness
Battalion Commander	From Company Commander Questionnaire	X	X		X	X			X	X			
Company Commander	From Drill Sergeant Questionnaire	X	X	X					X			X	
Company Commander	From First Sergeant Questionnaire	X					X						
Command Sergeant Major	From First Sergeant Questionnaire	X	X	X						X			X
First Sergeant	From Drill Sergeant Questionnaire	X	X	X								X	
Drill Sergeant	From Soldier's Questionnaire	X				X							X

common to all of the factor structures and use them to define the scale. This has the disadvantage of eliminating the subtle but meaningful differences in the construct from individual to individual, but has the decided advantage of maintaining a constant operational definition of the construct across all individuals.

A closely related problem lies in the often inadequate labeling of factors. Because of the complexity of the item content on many of the factors, it is often not easy to select a simple and adequately descriptive label for that factor. In several cases, we used two or three synonyms in the same phrase to try to characterize the same factor. To the extent that our labeling is inadequate, then some factors which appear to be related because of the labeling may in fact not be, while others which appear to be distinct, may in fact be the same. For example, the punishment factor and the fairness of punishment factor may well be conceptually very close, but the particular set of items that happened to fall together led us to select slightly different labels. This is a highly judgmental and subjective process, and we do not feel any particular investment in the retention of one label versus another. In the final analysis, the content of the factors must determine their meaningfulness.

A pattern of results that occurred with some frequency, and which created some of the labeling problems just alluded to could, perhaps, be referred to as a "double meaning" phenomenon. In effect, two qualitatively distinct content areas tend to load together on the same factor. The most common occurrence of this type in the present set of analyses involved items related to the quality of the trainees. In general, when these items appeared in a factor, they accompanied items describing some other aspect of the situation, such as the quality of the drill sergeants. In effect then, these second content area items act as an anchor or a contrast to what we have judged to be the primary content or meaning of the factor. Thus, when a factor contains items dealing with amount of time and pressure a drill sergeant feels while at the same time containing items dealing with the quality of the trainees, we assume that

the factor is a time and pressure factor rather than a trainee quality factor. We also make the further assumption that, implicitly, the items are linked in the heads of the respondents in a sort of causal belief system. That is, the factor is really reflecting a drill sergeant saying that he is under pressure and doesn't have enough time because the quality of the trainees is declining.

This pattern is quite interesting, but creates problems in judging what the true nature of the factor is and in deciding on which items to include in a scale reflecting that factor. It is also somewhat disconcerting since in several cases it was expected that these two content areas would emerge as separate dimensions, and in fact this goal represented a major focus in the developmental stages of the project. In other words, it was thought desirable to have a quality of soldiers scale and a quality of drill sergeants scale. Factor analytically, they did not emerge separately, therefore, from that perspective there is no rationale for treating them separately. However, the goals of the evaluation requirement partly determine which items are retained and used in subsequent analyses. In a case like this, our recommendation would be to attempt to create two separate scales, each of which would hopefully have an acceptably high alpha, even though the scales may be correlated. Their different content would then be sufficient justification for creating two correlated scales.

Recommendations

Keeping in mind the constraints and problems described in the preceding paragraphs, our recommendations for performing the evaluation portion of the study and the creation of scales from these factor analyses are fairly straight-forward. In general, we recommend using items with loadings above at least .50 and, where possible, items should exceed .60. As a general strategy, the hypotheses and topics to be examined in the evaluation should be tested with the scales derived from these analyses whenever possible. Although this is the desirable state of affairs, it will often not be possible to do so. In some cases factors

do not have any close correspondence to a particular evaluation topic. In even more cases, there simply is no factor-derived scale to reflect a topic area because none emerged in the analyses. In this situation, it is only logical to use the items that were originally designed to assess a particular topic area. For example, the item dealing with whether or not short people marched in the front of a platoon never loaded on any of the factors. Nevertheless, it can easily be used to assess whether or not trainees perceived this to be occurring, and thereby tests the hypothesis that drill sergeants trained in the new POI would be more likely to carry out this requirement than would drill sergeants trained in the self-paced POI.

In addition to the size of loadings, the other factor for consideration in deciding on what items to incorporate into a particular scale, consists of content similarity. Contrast items that appeared in some of the double meaning factors should probably not be included in the scale definition. This procedure allows a conceptually cleaner interpretation of the meaning of the scale. In addition, where a similar scale exists across respondents and across stimuli, such as the recurring leadership factors, the scales should probably contain identical items in all cases, even though this approach results in some highly loading and important items being left out of some scales. However, this slight distortion of the meaning of the scale for a particular subset of individuals is more than compensated for by the resulting consistency and meaningfulness of the scale across all levels of respondent and stimulus object.

APPENDIX A

Listing of Item Codes

COMPANY COMMANDER QUESTIONNAIRE

VAR

1. If a trainee is to learn to be a good soldier, he* must experience a lot of physical and mental stress during basic training.
2. All in all, officers in this unit do a fine job.
3. I wish the trainees were of the same quality they were in the days of the draft.
4. I sometimes get the feeling that about the only kinds of people volunteering for the Army nowadays are those who have been rejected everywhere else.
5. Female trainees will eventually make as good soldiers as male trainees.
6. It's necessary to lean hard on new trainees until they begin to think less independently.
7. In order to produce a good soldier, a drill sergeant must often violate existing policies.
8. Drill sergeants have to swear at the trainees or scare them in order to control what they do.
9. I am satisfied that on graduation day, we turn out trainees who are fully prepared for either advanced training or for duty positions in field units.
10. Quite a number of trainees are sent to some helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.) on post every cycle.
11. This unit sometimes bends the rules to let trainees graduate who actually did not meet the prescribed standards on performance tests.
12. Drill sergeants can get a lot more out of the trainees by threatening to punish** them than by trying to counsel them.
13. A lot of trainees can't be made to do what is necessary, unless the drill sergeant acts like he is going to get physical with them.
14. Drill sergeants are given enough time during the cycle to teach the trainees how to "soldier."

VAR

15. Trainees could do just as well with a lot less supervision than they now get.
16. I personally think it's important to try to praise the trainees just so they don't think they're losers.
17. I am under a lot of pressure to see to it that the drill sergeants in my company do a good job of training the trainees.
18. Suggestions made by drill sergeants for improving performance in their unit are often implemented by their superiors or by the cadre.
19. Drill sergeants get good support from all of the cadre in this unit.
20. Drill sergeants get good support from the leadership at the battalion level.
21. Trainees in this unit are often abused by the drill sergeants.
22. Trainees in this unit are often abused by cadre (who are not drill sergeants).
23. Within a few weeks, most of the trainees handle self-discipline really well.
24. Trainees can be motivated to do a better job through the use of push-ups and extra running.
25. In this unit, counseling trainees is considered to be an extremely important part of training.
26. Drill sergeants seem to have more trouble understanding how to deal with trainees of the opposite sex than with trainees of their own sex.
27. Stereotypes about how badly the drill sergeants treat the trainees are often true.
28. Drill sergeants are seen as important in a very positive sense in this unit.
29. I am under a lot of pressure to see to it that the drill sergeants in my company don't abuse the trainees.

VAR

30. I think most of the trainees today join the Army:
31. _____ a. To serve their country
32. _____ b. To get training and job skills
33. Why a trainee joins the Army makes a difference in how effectively the drill sergeants can train them.
34. The only effective way for a drill sergeant to learn to deal with trainees is for the drill sergeant to get right down and do it and learn from his mistakes.
35. Drill sergeants who volunteer to be drill sergeants make better trainers than those who do not volunteer.
36. All in all, the drill sergeants in this unit do a fine job.
37. Drill sergeants don't let female trainees get out of doing things just because they're female.
38. The newer drill sergeants become better drill sergeants than the "old hands."
39. A drill sergeant can't learn how to motivate today's trainees from books or by sitting in some classroom for several days or weeks.
40. This unit encourages drill sergeants to try out the newer ideas that they bring with them out of drill sergeant school.
41. I think the Army is on track and I plan on staying in the Army for at least 20 years.
42. When we receive a new requirement or mission, the battalion commander makes sure we understand the reason for it.
43. My battalion commander comes down and tries to do a subordinate's job, even when the subordinate is performing well.
44. The battalion commander gives orders that do not violate legal policies, SOP, regulations, or the UCMJ.
45. The battalion commander makes sure that what we do in this unit is necessary to accomplish our training mission.

VAR

46. When there is a serious problem in the unit, our battalion commander involves his cadre in finding the solution by holding a group problem-solving session.
47. When there is a question about responsibilities on various unit tasks, the battalion commander holds a meeting to lay out individual responsibilities.
48. The battalion commander quickly detects differences among his people which need to be settled.
49. Even when he disagrees, the battalion commander keeps an open mind and listens to what others have to say.
50. My battalion commander encourages me when I want to try something new.
51. When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the battalion commander checks to make sure it is done properly.
52. The battalion commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance--not on their personalities or other factors.
53. When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the battalion commander personally lets him know about it.
54. When a subordinate performs a task well, the battalion commander lets him know about it.
55. When the battalion commander promises a reward (like a pass, letter of commendation, etc.), he follows through.
56. When the battalion commander warns a subordinate about something, he follows through with punishment, if the subordinate's performance does not improve.
57. Before the battalion commander punishes someone, he makes sure that he knows all the facts--the whole story.
58. Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.

VAR

59. The battalion commander is courteous when dealing with his subordinates.
60. When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the battalion commander manages to make himself available.
61. The battalion commander lets a person who is being counseled do most of the talking.
62. When the battalion commander is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on.
63. When the battalion commander determines that a subordinate has a serious problem, he refers the subordinate to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).
64. The battalion commander meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance.
65. When members of the cadre in this unit receive OERs, there are no surprises--performance is described in the same manner in which it had already been described during previous conversations.
66. During counseling sessions, the battalion commander orders, threatens, criticizes, or preaches.
67. When a subordinate asks the battalion commander for help solving a problem, he helps out.
68. The battalion commander does not punish a subordinate for poor performance, unless there is a reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well.
69. When I perform well, my battalion commander recognizes it with praise or a reward that means something to me.
70. The battalion commander doesn't let me do the things I was trained to do.
71. The battalion commander sees that I get guidance which allows me to do my tasks and take care of my responsibilities properly.
72. I feel confident that my battalion commander will back me up when I make decisions.

VAR

73. The battalion commander tries to run my company.
74. Often my suggestions for improving performance in this unit are implemented by my superiors or the cadre.
75. The battalion commander demands that we take into account physical differences between the male and female trainees when we conduct training.
76. The battalion commander acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex.
77. My input is asked before decisions that affect me are made.
78. The battalion commander ensures that decisions are made at the level where the most accurate and most relevant information is to be found.
79. Whenever the battalion commander has to "chew out" a subordinate, he does it in private.
80. Whenever the battalion commander refers someone to a helping agency, he follows-up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
81. Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
82. Because of the battalion commander's attitude, I avoid letting him know when things aren't going the way he expects them to.
83. The drill sergeants have to work such long hours, the quality of their performance suffers.
84. There is enough time in the training cycle to allow trainees to practice new skills until they have mastered them.
85. My battalion commander exercises his own judgment and makes decisions in areas in which he has the freedom to do so.
86. During training on site, I normally see my battalion commander:
 - a. Never
 - b. Once a month or less
 - c. Once a week to once a month
 - d. Two or three times a week
 - e. Every day at least once

VAR

87. The battalion commander knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly.
88. The battalion commander acts as if he doesn't trust my judgment.
89. The battalion commander clearly defines the goals and priorities of this unit.
90. When I first arrived in my present assignment, the battalion commander made sure that I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with.
91. When the battalion commander establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards, if they work at it.
92. The battalion commander made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task--what his standards were.
93. I believe the battalion commander when he says it is OK and safe to pass information up to him, whether the information is good or bad.
94. The battalion commander's punishments seem to be fair.

FIRST SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE

VAR

1. If a trainee is to learn to be a good soldier, he* must experience a lot of physical and mental stress during basic training.
2. All in all, officers in this unit do a fine job.
3. I wish the trainees were of the same quality they were in the days of the draft.
4. I sometimes get the feeling that about the only kinds of people volunteering for the Army nowadays are those who have been rejected everywhere else.
5. Female trainees will eventually make as good soldiers as male trainees.
6. It's necessary to lean hard on new trainees until they begin to think less independently.
7. In order to produce a good soldier, a drill sergeant must often violate existing policies.
8. Drill Sergeants have to swear at the trainees or scare them in order to control what they do.
9. I am satisfied that on graduation day, we turn out trainees who are fully prepared for either advanced training or for duty positions in field units.
10. Quite a number of trainees are sent to some helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.) on post every cycle.
11. This unit sometimes bends the rules to let trainees graduate who actually did not meet the prescribed standards on performance tests.
12. Drill sergeants can get a lot more out of the trainees by threatening to punish* them than by trying to counsel them.

VAR

13. A lot of trainees can't be made to do what is necessary, unless the drill sergeant acts like he is going to get physical with them.
14. Drill sergeants are given enough time during the cycle to teach the trainees how to "soldier."
15. Trainees could do just as well with a lot less supervision than they now get.
16. I personally think it's important to try to praise the trainees just so they don't think they're losers.
17. The most important duties a first sergeant has are administrative.
18. Suggestions made by drill sergeants for improving performance in their unit are often implemented by their superiors or by the cadre.
19. Drill sergeants get good support from all of the cadre in their unit.
20. Drill sergeants get good support from the leadership at the battalion level.
21. Trainees in this unit are often abused by the drill sergeants.
22. Trainees in this unit are often abused by cadre (who are not drill sergeants).
23. Within a few weeks, most of the trainees handle self-discipline really well.
24. Trainees can be motivated to do a better job through the use of push-ups and extra running.
25. In this unit, counseling trainees is considered to be an extremely important part of training.
26. Drill sergeants seem to have more trouble understanding how to deal with trainees of the opposite sex than with trainees of their own sex.
27. Stereotypes about how badly the drill sergeants treat the trainees are often true.
28. Drill sergeants are seen as important in a very positive sense in this unit.

VAR

29. I think most of the trainees today join the Army:
30. _____ a. To serve their country.
31. _____ b. To get training and job skills
32. Why a trainee joins the Army makes a difference in how effectively the drill sergeants can train them.
33. The only effective way for a drill sergeant to learn to deal with trainees is for the drill sergeant to get right down and do it and learn from his mistakes.
34. Drill sergeants who volunteer to be drill sergeants make better trainers than those who do not volunteer.
35. All in all, the drill sergeants in this unit do a fine job.
36. The drill sergeants don't let female trainees get out of things just because they're female.
37. The newer drill sergeants become better drill sergeants than the "old hands."
38. A drill sergeant can't learn how to motivate today's trainees from books or by sitting in some classroom for several days or weeks.
39. This unit encourages drill sergeants to try out the newer ideas that they bring with them out of drill sergeant school.
40. In my job, I often perform the same duties as a drill sergeant.
41. It is important for a first sergeant to be involved in the evaluation of training.
42. The company commander's punishments seem to be fair.
43. When we receive a new requirement or mission, the company commander makes sure we understand the reason for it.
44. The company commander comes down and tries to do the subordinate's job, even when he is performing well.
45. The company commander gives orders that do not violate local policies, SOP, regulations, or the UCMJ.

VAR

46. The company commander makes sure that what we do in this unit is necessary to accomplish our training mission.
47. When there is a serious problem in the unit, our company commander involves his cadre in finding the solution by holding a group problem-solving session.
48. When there is a question about responsibilities on various unit tasks, the company commander holds a meeting to lay out individual responsibilities.
49. The company commander quickly detects differences among his people which need to be settled.
50. Even when he disagrees, the company commander keeps an open mind and listens to what others have to say.
51. My company commander encourages me when I want to try something new.
52. When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the company commander checks to make sure it is done properly.
53. The company commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance--not on their personalities or other factors.
54. When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the company commander personally lets him know about it.
55. When a subordinate performs a task well, the company commander lets him know about it.
56. Because of the company commander's attitude, I fail to let him know when things aren't going the way he expects them to.
57. When the company commander promises a reward (like a pass, letter of commendation, etc.), he follow through.
58. When the company commander warns a subordinate about something, he follows through with punishment, if the subordinate's performances does not improve.

VAR

59. Before the company commander punishes someone, he makes sure that he knows all the facts--the whole story.
60. Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
61. The company commander is courteous when dealing with his subordinates.
62. When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the company commander manages to make himself available.
63. During counseling sessions, the company commander lets the person being counseled do most of the talking.
64. When the company commander is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to sidestep the issue instead of facing it head-on.
65. When the company commander determines that a subordinate has a serious problem, he refers the subordinate to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).
66. The company commander meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance.
67. When members of the cadre in this unit receive EERs, there are no surprises--performance is described in the same manner in which it had already been described during previous conversations.
68. During counseling sessions, the company commander orders, threatens, criticizes, or preaches.
69. When a subordinate asks the company commander for help solving a problem, he helps out.
70. The company commander does not punish a subordinate for poor performance, unless there is reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well.
71. When I perform well, my company commander recognizes it with praise or a reward that means something to me.
72. The company commander doesn't let me do the things I was trained to do.

VAR

73. The company commander sees that I get guidance which allows me to do my tasks and take care of my responsibilities properly.
74. The drill sergeants have to work such long hours, the quality of their performance suffers.
75. Often my suggestions for improving performance in this unit are implemented by my superiors or the cadre.
76. The company commander demands that we take into account physical differences between the male and female trainees when we conduct training.
77. The company commander acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex.
78. My input is asked before decisions that affect me are made.
79. The company commander ensures that decisions are made at the level where the most accurate and most relevant information is to be found.
80. Whenever the company commander has to "chew out" a subordinate, he does it in private.
81. Whenever the company commander refers someone to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
82. Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
83. When my battalion commander has the freedom to do so, he makes decisions which affect the way I do my job.
84. The battalion commander pays attention to my needs as a first sergeant.
85. There is enough time in the training cycle to allow trainees to practice new skills until they have mastered them.
86. The company commander knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly.
87. The company commander acts as if he doesn't trust my judgement.
88. The company commander clearly defines the goals and priorities of this unit.

VAR

89. When I first arrived in my present assignment, the company commander made sure that I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with.
90. I believe the company commander when he says it is OK and safe to pass information up to him, whether the information is good or bad.
91. When the company commander establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards, if they work at it.
92. The company commander made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task--what his standards were.
93. How long have you worked with your current company commander? _____ months
94. When we receive a new requirement or mission, the Command Sergeant Major makes sure we understand the reason for it.
95. The Command Sergeant Major comes down and tries to do my job for me, even when I am performing well.
96. When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the Command Sergeant Major checks to make sure it is done properly.
97. When an NCO does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the Command Sergeant Major personally lets him know about it.
98. When an NCO performs a task well, the Command Sergeant Major lets him know about it.
99. The Command Sergeant Major is courteous when dealing with his NCOs and privates in my unit.
100. When someone in the unit wants to talk to the Command Sergeant Major, he makes himself available.
101. The Command Sergeant Major lets a person being counseled do most of the talking.
102. When the Command Sergeant Major determines that an NCO has a serious problem, he refers him to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).

VAR

103. My Command Sergeant Major performs tasks that are absolutely essential to the training session.
104. When the Command Sergeant Major is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on.
105. Whenever the Command Sergeant Major refers an NCO to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
106. When an NCO asks the Command Sergeant Major for help with a problem, he helps out.
107. During counseling sessions, the Command Sergeant Major orders, threatens, criticizes, or preaches.
108. The Command Sergeant Major meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance.
109. My Command Sergeant Major keeps me informed about what tasks he expects me to perform.
110. When we are not too sure how the Command Sergeant Major wants a task performed, he spends time explaining and showing us how he wants it done.
111. My Command Sergeant Major demands as much from his female NCOs as he does from his male NCOs.
112. Whenever the Command Sergeant Major has to "chew out" an NCO, he does it in private.
113. When I first arrived in my present assignment, the Command Sergeant Major made sure that I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with.
114. When the Command Sergeant Major establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards if they work at it.
115. The Command Sergeant Major acts as if he doesn't trust my judgement.
116. The Command Sergeant Major made it clear from the beginning how well I was required to perform each task--what his standards were.

VAR

117. The Command Sergeant Major knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly.

DRILL SERGEANT QUESTIONNAIRE

VAR

1. I have used a good deal of what I learned in the drill sergeant course to help me successfully motivate trainees.
2. The drill sergeant course taught me the necessary skills I need to lead my trainees.
3. I use a referral list when trainees have problems I can't solve.
4. Many of the things drill sergeants learn in the drill sergeant course don't get tried in the unit.
5. The only way to learn to deal with trainees is to get right down and do it and learn from your own mistakes.
6. When I tried the leadership techniques I learned in drill sergeant school, I found that none of them worked.
7. I don't think the drill sergeant school adequately prepared me for the problems I had to face.
8. The other drill sergeant(s) discouraged me from using the leadership techniques I learned in training.
9. It is important that the physical environment on post (e.g., barracks, equipment, vehicles) be adequately maintained for me to properly train.
10. I feel pretty comfortable about the way I am evaluated as a drill sergeant.
11. The company commander knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly.
12. The company commander acts as if he* doesn't trust my judgment.
13. The company commander clearly defines the goals and priorities of this unit.

VAR

14. When I first arrived in my present assignment, the company commander made sure I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with.
15. I was given enough time during the cycle to teach the trainees how to "soldier."
16. There is too much emphasis on statistics (e.g., BRM, PT, IPT scores) in this unit.
17. As a drill sergeant, it is my responsibility to keep the TDP rate as low as possible by working harder with marginal trainees.
18. The training schedule/POI is frequently used as an excuse to prevent improvement of training.
19. The company commander is under a lot of pressure to see to it that I do a good job of training my trainees.
20. My company commander takes an active role in the leadership of this unit.
21. TDP rates are closely monitored by the battalion.
22. I would like to remain in this unit beyond my regular tour of duty.
23. All in all, officers in this unit do a fine job.
24. We get together as a work group to identify problems and, when possible, solve them and implement the recommended changes.
25. The whole team pitches in and helps straighten things out when one individual makes a mistake.
26. The people in this unit show that they have a lot of pride in what they are doing.
27. There is more emphasis on punishment* than on rewards in dealing with trainees in my company.
28. I fear the consequences when I tell my company commander about a mistake my subordinates or I have made.
29. When the company commander establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards, if they work at it.

VAR

30. The company commander made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task--what his standards were.
31. The company commander is under a lot of pressure to see to it that I don't abuse the trainees.
32. The company commander's punishments seem to be fair.
33. How long have you worked with your current company commander?
_____ months
34. My company commander knows what is going on in this unit.
35. When we receive a new requirement or mission, the company commander makes sure we understand the reason for it.
36. The company commander comes down and tries to do a subordinate's job, even when he is performing well.
37. The company commander gives orders that do not violate local policies, SOP, regulations, or the UCMJ.
38. The company commander makes sure that what we do in this unit is necessary to accomplish our training mission.
39. When there is a serious problem in the unit, our company commander involves his cadre in finding the solution by holding a group problem-solving session.
40. When there is a question about responsibilities on various unit tasks, the company commander holds a meeting to lay out individual responsibilities.
41. The company commander quickly detects differences among his people which need to be settled.
42. Even when he disagrees, the company commander keeps an open mind and listens to what others have to say.
43. My company commander encourages me when I want to try something new.

VAR

44. When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the company commander checks to make sure it is done properly.
45. The company commander evaluates his subordinates based on their performance--not on their personalities or other factors.
46. When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the company commander personally lets him know about it.
47. When a subordinate performs a task well, the company commander lets him know about it.
48. Because of the company commander's attitude, I fail to let him know when things aren't going the way he expects them to.
49. When the company commander promises a reward (like a pass, letter of commendation, etc.), he follows through.
50. When the company commander warns a subordinate about something, he follows through with punishment, if the subordinate's performance does not improve.
51. Before the company commander punishes someone, he makes sure that he knows all the facts--the whole story.
52. Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
53. The company commander is courteous when dealing with his subordinates.
54. When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the company commander manages to make himself available.
55. The company commander lets a person being counseled do most of the talking.
56. When the company commander is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on.
57. When the company commander determines that a subordinate has a serious problem, he refers the subordinate to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).

VAR

58. The company commander meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance.
59. There is enough time in the training cycle to allow trainees to practice new skills until they have mastered them.
60. When the drill sergeants in this unit receive EERs, there are no surprises--performance is described in the same manner in which it had already been described during previous conversations.
61. During counseling sessions, the company commander orders, threatens, criticizes, or preaches.
62. When a subordinate asks the company commander for help solving a problem, he helps out.
63. The company commander does not punish a subordinate for poor performance, unless there is reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well.
64. When I perform well, my company commander recognizes it with praise or a reward that means something to me.
65. The company commander doesn't let me do the things I was trained to do.
66. The company commander sees that I get guidance which allows me to do my tasks and take care of my responsibilities properly.
67. I feel confident that my company commander will back me up when I make decisions.
68. Often my suggestions for improving performance in this unit are implemented by my superiors or the cadre.
69. The company commander demands that we take into account physical differences between the male and female trainees when we conduct training.
70. The company commander acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex.
71. My input is asked before decisions that affect me are made.

VAR

72. The company commander ensures that decisions are made at the level where the most accurate and most relevant information is to be found.
73. Whenever the company commander has to "chew out" a subordinate, he does it in private.
74. Whenever the company commander refers someone to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
75. Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
76. When my battalion commander has the freedom to do so, he makes decisions which affect the way I do my job.
77. I have to work such long hours, the quality of my performance suffers.
78. New trainees think too independently and need to be leaned on hard for a while.
79. If a trainee is to learn to be a good soldier, he must experience a lot of physical and mental stress during basic training.
80. You've got to swear at the trainees or scare them in order to control what they do.
81. I wish the trainees were of the same quality they were in the days of the draft.
82. I sometimes get the feeling that about the only kinds of people volunteering for the Army nowadays are those who have been rejected everywhere else.
83. This would have been a much better unit, if some of the trainees had been "weeded out" earlier by use of the Trainee Discharge Program.
84. I am satisfied that on graduation day, we turn out trainees who are fully prepared for either advanced training or for duty positions in field units.
85. I think most of the trainees today join the Army:
86. _____ a. To serve their country
87. _____ b. To get training and job skills

VAR

88. Why a trainee joins the Army makes a difference in how effectively I can train him.
89. The most important thing a trainee should know is basic soldiering skills.
90. I can get a lot more out of the trainees by threatening to punish them than I can by trying to counsel them.
91. A lot of trainees can't be made to do what is necessary, unless the drill sergeant acts like he is going to get physical with them.
92. I feel I am free to discipline trainees as much as I should be.
93. Some of the things we are supposed to do to teach the trainees are just theories that can't be applied as effectively as old-fashioned fear.
94. My trainees could do just as well with a lot less supervision from me.
95. I personally think it's important to try to praise the trainees just so they don't think they're losers.
96. After about 3 weeks in the cycle, I don't have to "lean" on the trainees as much.
97. Within a few weeks, most of the trainees handle self-discipline really well.
98. Trainees can be motivated to do a better job through the use of push-ups and extra running.
99. I send quite a number of trainees to some helping agency on post every cycle.
100. In this unit, it is considered that counseling trainees is an extremely important part of training.
101. For reinforcement training, I often have to teach subjects that I am not familiar with.
102. I feel that I don't have enough power to control my trainees.
103. I get along well with the other drill sergeants.

VAR

104. The other drill sergeant(s) think(s) that I am too soft on the trainees.
105. I am more likely to use punishment than the other drill sergeant(s).
106. Having another drill sergeant(s) in the platoon relieves a lot of the stress.
107. Our unit gets very good maintenance support (of barracks, equipment, vehicles, etc.) from this post.
108. I holler and scream more than the other drill sergeant(s).
109. There is a place for female trainees in the kind of training we are supposed to be doing.
110. I would be upset if I had to train a female platoon.
111. I don't let female trainees get out of things just because they're female.
112. It's almost impossible to find time to send trainees with problems to one of the agencies on post that might help them.
113. Many times my job and my family pull me in opposite directions.
114. Our female trainees will eventually make as good soldiers as male trainees.
115. If I could, I'd get out from under the "hat" right now.
116. My family wants me to leave the Army because its demands interfere with my family life.
117. I have a lot more trouble understanding how to deal with trainees of the opposite sex than with trainees of my own sex.
118. I sometimes think I could break under all of the pressure that I'm getting.
119. I get a lot of understanding from my family when things are not going well on the job.
120. All in all, drill sergeants in this unit do a fine job.
121. The amount of work I have to do is reasonable.

VAR

122. My family is not interested in my work.
123. Lately I've been tense about my work.
124. I never have trouble keeping my private or family life from influencing how I handle my trainees.
125. After a day's work, I frequently go home with a headache.
126. I hardly every worry about my job.
127. When I first wake up in the morning and think of going to work, I get a stomach ache.
128. All in all, I'm satisfied with my job.
129. Our first sergeant made it clear from the beginning how well we were required to perform each task--what his standards were.
130. My first sergeant knows enough about my job to identify when I perform poorly.
131. The first sergeant acts as if he doesn't trust my judgment.
132. When I first arrived in my present assignment, my first sergeant made sure that I received training and other assistance in performing tasks which I was not already familiar with.
133. The first sergeant's punishments seem to be fair.
134. Our first sergeant keeps us informed about what tasks he expects us to perform.
135. When we receive a new requirement or mission, the first sergeant makes sure we understand the reason for it.
136. When a subordinate is performing well, the first sergeant comes down and tries to do the subordinate's job.
137. The first sergeant gives orders that do not violate local policies, SOP, regulations, or the UCMJ.
138. The first sergeant makes sure that what he tells us to do is necessary to accomplish our training mission.

VAR

139. When the first sergeant establishes standards, they are reasonable--just about everyone thinks they can meet all the standards, if they work at it.
140. Our first sergeant demands that we take into account physical differences between male and female trainees when we conduct training.
141. When someone in the unit wants to talk to him, the first sergeant makes himself available.
142. When something critical must be done by a member of this unit, the first sergeant checks to make sure it is done properly.
143. When the first sergeant is told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tries to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on.
144. The first sergeant lets a person being counseled do most of the talking.
145. When the first sergeant determines that a subordinate has a serious problem, he refers the subordinate to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).
146. Whenever the first sergeant refers a subordinate to a helping agency, he follows up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
147. During counseling sessions, the first sergeant orders, threatens, criticizes, or preaches.
148. The first sergeant evaluates his subordinates based on their performance--not on their personalities or other factors.
149. When a subordinate does something wrong or performs a task poorly, the first sergeant personally lets him know about it.
150. When a subordinate performs a task well, the first sergeant lets him know about it.
151. The first sergeant is courteous when dealing with his subordinates.
152. The first sergeant does not punish a subordinate or recommend him for punishment for poor performance, unless there is reason to believe that the subordinate is no longer trying to perform well.

VAR

153. When the first sergeant promises a subordinate a reward (like a pass, letter of commendation, etc.), he follows through.
154. When the first sergeant rewards me for good performance, he gives me a reward that means something to me.
155. When the first sergeant warns a subordinate about something, he follows through with punishment, if the subordinate's performance does not improve.
156. Before the first sergeant punishes someone or recommends punishment, he makes sure that he knows the facts--the whole story.
157. Whenever the first sergeant has to "chew out" a subordinate, he does it in private.
158. The first sergeant acts quickly against members of the cadre who fraternize with trainees of the opposite sex.
159. When a subordinate asks the first sergeant for help solving a problem, he helps out.
160. The first sergeant meets or exceeds all Army standards for personal appearance.

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

VAR

1. I feel that I am serving my country well by being in the Army.
2. I'm sorry that I enlisted in the Army.
3. There was a lot of competition among platoons.
4. All the things I am learning now are important for a soldier to know.
5. I look forward to my Army job after I finish training.
6. The training I received was hard and made me show how well I could do.
7. We are happy in this platoon.
8. I would like to make the Army a career.
9. Most trainees can be left without someone to watch them and still do all they are supposed to do.
10. If I could get out of the Army at any time, I would get out right now.
11. Drill sergeants don't let female trainees get out of doing things just because they are female.
12. The drill sergeants in this unit often give conflicting orders, telling us to do things differently.
13. The drill sergeants had enough time during the cycle to teach us how to be good soldiers.
14. Right now, because of the training I've received, I am sure I can hit targets with my weapon.
15. Right now, I am sure my body is in very good physical condition (due to physical training).
16. There was enough time during the training cycle to allow us to practice new skills until we had mastered them.

FIRST LISTED

DS

1. My drill sergeant was always on my back.
2. After the first couple of weeks, I did things on my own without being told to do them by my drill sergeant.
3. Our drill sergeant is such a good soldier, he* could show us how to best perform our tasks.
4. Our drill sergeant "made work" just to keep us busy when we didn't have anything important to do.
5. My drill sergeant picked on me.
6. Whenever our platoon marched in formation, short people were in the front.
7. During the first few days of training, when we were breaking in our boots, our drill sergeant didn't make us run.
8. My drill sergeant did not treat us very badly or abuse us.
9. My drill sergeant made me feel like a "winner" when I did something well.
{My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in:
10. {Basic rifle marksmanship.
11. {First aid.
12. {Military customs and courtesies.
13. {Physical readiness training.
14. My drill sergeant made both male and female trainees meet the required standards in order to graduate.
15. My drill sergeant's personal appearance was "squared away."
16. My drill sergeant was in excellent physical condition.
17. My drill sergeant treated me the same as he treated everyone else.

DS

18. Overall, my drill sergeant did a very good job.
19. My drill sergeant had trouble working with trainees of the opposite sex.
20. My drill sergeant showed favoritism for certain trainees in our unit.
21. Punishments* my drill sergeant gave seemed to be fair.
22. My drill sergeant helped me to solve my problems.
23. Our drill sergeant didn't cut anyone any "slack," unless there was a very good reason.
24. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what he wanted us to do.
25. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood when we had to do it.
26. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood where we had to do it.
27. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how well we had to do it.
28. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what would happen to us, if we did it right.
29. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how we had to do it.
30. My drill sergeant had to work such long hours, he looked too tired to train us.
31. When I didn't know exactly what my drill sergeant wanted me to do, he would spend time explaining and showing me how he wanted it done.
32. When we received a new requirement or mission, the drill sergeant made sure we understood the reason for it.

DS

33. When we asked our drill sergeant for help solving a problem, he helped out.
34. My drill sergeant's standards were reasonable--I knew I could meet all the standards, if I worked at it.
35. When I finished a task, my drill sergeant told me how well I did.
36. Our drill sergeant checked us to make sure we performed each task the way he wanted it done.
37. Our drill sergeant checked trainees with bad attitudes a lot more often than he checked the other trainees.
38. If you don't do what you are supposed to, the whole unit may be punished for it.
39. When a trainee did something wrong or performed a task poorly, the drill sergeant personally let him know about it.
40. When a trainee performed a task well, the drill sergeant let him know about it.
41. Our drill sergeant kept us informed about how well he thought we were doing in training.
42. Our drill sergeant seemed to rate us by how well we performed in training--not other things like personality, race, or sex.
43. Our unit permits female trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
44. When a trainee broke down and cried, the drill sergeant didn't holler or make fun of him.
45. My drill sergeant did not punish a trainee for poor performance, unless the trainee was no longer trying to perform.
46. When my drill sergeant promised a trainee a reward (like a pass, or another privilege), he followed through and made sure the trainee got it.
47. When my drill sergeant rewarded me for good performance, he gave a reward that meant something to me.

DS

48. When my drill sergeant warned a trainee about something, he followed through with punishment, if the trainee's performance did not improve.
49. When my drill sergeant was told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tried to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on.
50. Before my drill sergeant punished someone, he made sure that he knew all the facts--the whole story.
51. When I wanted to talk to my drill sergeant, he made himself available.
52. When my drill sergeant determined that a trainee had a serious problem, he referred the trainee to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).
53. Whenever my drill sergeant referred a trainee to a helping agency, he followed-up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
54. When I had a problem, I went to my drill sergeant to talk things out.
55. When I went to my drill sergeant for help, he listened well and cared about what I said.
56. During counseling sessions, my drill sergeant ordered, threatened, criticized, or preached.
57. I tried out the things my drill sergeant told me to do after he advised (counseled) me about some problems.
58. Our drill sergeant tried to scare us into doing what he wanted.
59. Our unit permits male trainees to graduate even when they have failed to perform to standards on performance tests.
60. My drill sergeant got along well with other drill sergeants.
61. My drill sergeant spent most of his time helping us prepare for tests.
62. My drill sergeant was very concerned with our scores on BRM, end of cycle tests, etc.

SECOND LISTED

DS

101. My drill sergeant was always on my back.
102. After the first couple of weeks, I did things on my own without being told to do them by my drill sergeant.
103. Our drill sergeant is such a good soldier, he* could show us how to best perform our tasks.
104. Our drill sergeant "made work" just to keep us busy when we didn't have anything important to do.
105. My drill sergeant picked on me.
106. Whenever our platoon marched in formation, short people were in the front.
107. During the first few days of training, when we were breaking in our boots, our drill sergeant didn't make us run.
108. My drill sergeant did not treat us very badly or abuse us.
109. My drill sergeant made me feel like a "winner" when I did something well.
{My drill sergeant showed us he was an expert in:
 110. {Basic rifle marksmanship.
 111. {First aid.
 112. {Military customs and courtesies.
 113. {Physical readiness training.
114. My drill sergeant made both male and female trainees meet the required standards in order to graduate.
115. My drill sergeant's personal appearance was "squared away."
116. My drill sergeant was in excellent physical condition.
117. My drill sergeant treated me the same as he treated everyone else.

DS

118. Overall, my drill sergeant did a very good job.
119. My drill sergeant had trouble working with trainees of the opposite sex.
120. My drill sergeant showed favoritism for certain trainees in our unit.
121. Punishments* my drill sergeant gave seemed to be fair.
122. My drill sergeant helped me to solve my problems.
123. Our drill sergeant didn't cut anyone any "slack," unless there was a very good reason.
124. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what he wanted us to do.
125. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood when we had to do it.
126. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood where we had to do it.
127. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how well we had to do it.
128. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood what would happen to us, if we did it right.
129. Whenever we got ready to perform a new task for the first time, the drill sergeant made sure we understood how we had to do it.
130. My drill sergeant had to work such long hours, he looked too tired to train us.
131. When I didn't know exactly what my drill sergeant wanted me to do, he would spend time explaining and showing me how he wanted it done.
132. When we received a new requirement or mission, the drill sergeant made sure we understood the reason for it.

DS

133. When we asked our drill sergeant for help solving a problem, he helped out.
134. My drill sergeant's standards were reasonable--I knew I could meet all the standards, if I worked at it.
135. When I finished a task, my drill sergeant told me how well I did.
136. Our drill sergeant checked us to make sure we performed each task the way he wanted it done.
137. Our drill sergeant checked trainees with bad attitudes a lot more often than he checked the other trainees.
138. If you don't do what you are supposed to, the whole unit may be punished for it.
139. When a trainee did something wrong or performed a task poorly, the drill sergeant personally let him know about it.
140. When a trainee performed a task well, the drill sergeant let him know about it.
141. Our drill sergeant kept us informed about how well he thought we were doing in training.
142. Our drill sergeant seemed to rate us by how well we performed in training--not other things like personality, race, or sex.
144. When a trainee broke down and cried, the drill sergeant didn't holler or make fun of him.
145. My drill sergeant did not punish a trainee for poor performance, unless the trainee was no longer trying to perform.
146. When my drill sergeant promised a trainee a reward (like a pass, or another privilege), he followed through and made sure the trainee got it.
147. When my drill sergeant rewarded me for good performance, he gave a reward that meant something to me.

DS

148. When my drill sergeant warned a trainee about something, he followed through with punishment, if the trainee's performance did not improve.
149. When my drill sergeant was told about a touchy or embarrassing problem, he tried to side-step the issue instead of facing it head-on.
150. Before my drill sergeant punished someone, he made sure that he knew all the facts--the whole story.
151. When I wanted to talk to my drill sergeant, he made himself available.
152. When my drill sergeant determined that a trainee had a serious problem, he referred the trainee to a helping agency (social worker, Red Cross, chaplain, etc.).
153. Whenever my drill sergeant referred a trainee to a helping agency, he followed-up by checking to see that the agency did some good.
154. When I had a problem, I went to my drill sergeant to talk things out.
155. When I went to my drill sergeant for help, he listened well and cared about what I said.
156. During counseling sessions, my drill sergeant ordered, threatened, criticized, or preached.
157. I tried out the things my drill sergeant told me to do after he advised (counseled) me about some problems.
158. Our drill sergeant tried to scare us into doing what he wanted.
160. My drill sergeant got along well with other drill sergeants.
161. My drill sergeant spent most of his time helping us prepare for tests.
162. My drill sergeant was very concerned with our scores on BRM, end of cycle tests, etc.