

DISCLAIMER

The views and conclusions expressed in this document are those of the author. They are not intended and should not be thought to represent official ideas, attitudes, or policies of any agency of the United States Government. The author has not had special access to official information or ideas and has employed only open-source material available to any writer on this subject.

This document is the property of the United States Government. It is available for distribution to the general public. A loan copy of the document may be obtained from the Air University Interlibrary Loan Service (AUL/LDEX, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 36112) or the Defense Tec'nical Information Center. Request must include the author's name and complete title of the study.

This document may be reproduced for use in other research reports or educational pursuits contingent upon the following stipulations:

-- Reproduction rights do <u>not</u> extend to sny copyrighted msterisl that msy be contsined in the research report.

-- All reproduced copies must contain the following credit line: "Reprinted by permission of the Air Command and Stsff College."

-- All reproduced copies must contain the name(s) of the report's author(s).

-- If format modification is necessary to better serve the user's needs, adjustments may be made to this report--this authorization does not extend to copyrighted information or material. The following statement must accompany the modified document: "Adapted from Air Command and Staff Research Report <u>(number)</u> entitled <u>(title)</u> by <u>(author)</u>."

-- This notice must be included with any reproduced or adapted portions of this document.

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

BLANK PAGES IN THIS DOCUMENT WERE NOT FILMED



REPORT NUMBER 86-0400

TITLE JOB ATTITUDES--HOW SAC PERSONNEL COMPARE WITH THE REST OF THE AIR FORCE

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR STEPHEN D. BULL, III, USAF

FACULTY ADVISOR LIEUTENANT RICHARD L. LAMB, LMDC/AN

SPONSOR MAJOR MICKEY R. DANSBY, LMDC/AN

Submitted to the faculty in partial fulfillment of requirements for graduation.

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE AIR UNIVERSITY MAXWELL AFB, AL 36112

ECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE					
	REPORT DOCUM	ENTATION PAG	E		
UNCLASSIFIED		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT			
28 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	/				
Th DECLASSIFICATION/OOWNGRADING SC	HEOULE	Approved for public releaser Distribution is unlimited.			
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT N 86-0400	UMBER(S)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERIS)		5)	
6. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION ACSC/EDCC	b. Office Symbol (11 applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONI	TORING ORGAN	IZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City. State and ZIP Code) Maxwell AFB, AL 36112-5.	542	7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)			
M NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	BD. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT	INSTRUMENT IC	DENTIFICATION N	UMBER
ac ADDRESS ((11), State and AIP Code)		PROGRAM	PROJECT	TASK	WORK
JOB ATTITUDES-HOW SAC P	ERSONNEL	-			
Bull, Stephen D., III, M	ajor, USAF				
134. TYPE OF REPORT 135. TIN	AE COVERED	14. DATE OF REPO	AT (Yr , Mo., Dey	18. PAGE 0	OUNT
12 COSATI CODES HEID SHOUP SUB GR 19 ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary) - This study compares: SAC () personnel, highlights signs this information. Jong Sachard Sacha	v and identify by block numb personnel's job at gnificant differen ob attitudes were enter's Organizat ttitudes differed sons. SAC office Force counterparts nds SAC staff diss eas of enlisted po	ttitudes with nces, and reco measured usin ional Assessme significantly rs and civilia s, while SAC e seminate these ersonnel attit	those of our mmends how of the Leade nt Package from those nis were pro- nlisted per results to udes and jo	ther Air For SAC can bes ership and survey data e of the dat edominantly rsonnel were o commanders ob related	a more less and
20 DISTINIOUS UN AVAILABILITY OF ABST		21 ABSTRACT SEC	CURITY CLASSIF		
226 NAME OF HESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	WE GEDICUSERS LJ	225 1515940N51		22. OFFICE SY	MHI)L
ACSC/EDCC Maxwell AFB.	AL 36112-5542	(205) 293-	-2483		
				-	

PREFACE _

This report represents the first look in recent years at the job attitudes displayed by SAC personnel--officers, enlisted personnel, and civilians--as compared with those of their counterparts in the rest of the Air Force. This study was made possible through the diligent efforts of the Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) survey and analytical teams over the past eight years. During this period they have visited over 70 bases, interviewing and assisting nearly 300,000 personnel from over 13 major commands/special operating agencies. Their goal was to aid unit commanders in leading more effective organizations. Unfortunately, their service is being discontinued at the end of Fiscal Year 1986 due to budget and manpower reductions. Although there is no way to measure the contribution they have made to the Air Force, this author feels it is substantial. Those unit commanders who have benefited from their insight would surely agree. Accordingly, this research project is dedicated to the men and women in the LMDC at Maxwell AFB, Alabama.

There are several individuals who deserve special recognition for their valued advice and sincerely appreciated patience: Major Mickey R. Dansby, LMDC; Major Stephen L. Havron, Air Command & Staff College; and Lieutenant Richard L. Lamb, LMDC.

The format for this report does not follow the style prescribed by the Air Command & Staff College research handbook. At the request of Major Dansby, the author used the <u>Publication Manual of the American Psychological</u> Association (3rd edition) and format deviations normally used in LMDC reports. For example, the text is printed in double space and the bibliography lists only those references actually cited in this report.

	n For		
TIS	CRA&I	1	
TIC	TAB	C	נ
nanno	unced	C	ן
ustific	ation		-
A.	alability	Code	\$
i t	Avail a Spu	::d / or cial	
- 1	1		
1 1			
A) i-t	alability Avail a Spe	Code :-d / or cial	5

iii

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Major Bull began his career in the United States Air Force in 1973, following graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point. He spent his first nine years as a crew member, beginning in the Pacific Theater as a C-130 navigator in the Military Airlift Command. In 1977, he volunteered for aircrew duty in the Strategic Air Command (SAC), where he served until his current assignment to the Air Command & Staff College. His SAC duty included five years as a B-52 radar navigator and three years on the Headquarters SAC staff. During his last year in SAC he served as Executive Officer, DCS/Plans. It was in this capacity that he became a project officer for a Leadership and Management Development Center organizational assessment visit. This experience rekindled his interest in leadership and organizational effectiveness.

Major Bull has concentrated on this field of study during his civilian and professional military education. While at West Point he undertook studies in operations research and systems management in pursuit of his Bachelor of Science degree. He subsequently marned a Master of Science degree in Systems Management from the University of Southern California in 1980. He has complemented this schooling with several professional military education courses: Squadron Officer School in resisdence; Air Command & Staff College by seminar; and the National Security Management program by correspondence.

iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iii
About the Author	iv
List of illustrations	vi 1
Executive Summary	V111
CHAPTER ONEINTRODUCTION	1
Pu rpose	1
Organization	4
CHAPTER TWOLITERATURE REVIEW	5
Behavioral Research Theory	5
Air Force Studies	7
SAC Background Data	10
Study Expectations	13
LHAP ER THREEMETHOD	15
Instrumentation	15
Data Collection Process	17
Subjects	18
Procedures	19
Summary	21
CHAPTER FOURRESULTS	
Demographic Results	24
Attitudinal Differences	21
SAC Officer Attitudes	28
SAC Enlisted Personnel Attitudes	30
SAC Civilian Attitudes	32
	33
CHAPTER FIVEDISCUSSION	35
Limitations and Assumptions	35
Theoretical Expectations	- 37
Demographic Differences	4.5
Significant DAP Factor Differences	44
Summary	46

CONTINUED

CHAPTER SIXCONCLUSIONS	49
Recommendations	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
AFPENDICIES	
Appendix A, Demographic Survey Data	59
Appendix B, Attitudinal Survey Data	69
Appendix C. Organizational Assessment Package	
Factors and Variables	79

i divisi

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

TABLES

	1	Significantly Different Attitudes Between	
	•	SAC Personnel and other Air Force Personnel	28
TABLE	2	OAP Factor 822, Job Related Satisfaction	38
TABLE	3	Career Intentions	39
TABLE	4	Key DAP Factor Scores	45
TABLE	A-1	Number of Responses by Personnel Category	59
TABLE	A-2	Sex by Personnel Category	59
TABLE	A-3	Age by Personnel Category	59
TABLE	A-4	Time in the Air Force	60
TABLE	A-5	Months in Fresent Career Field	60
TABLE	A-6	Months on Station	61
TABLE	A-7	Months in Present Position	61
TABLE	A-8	Ethnic Group	62
TABLE	A-9	Marital Status	62
TABLE	A-10	Spouse Employment Status: SAC	6.
TABLE	A-11	Spouse Employment Status: Air Force	63
TABLE	A-12	Education Level	64
LABLE	A-13	Highest Level	
		Professional Military Education	64
TABLE	A-14	Number People Directly Supervised	65
TABLE	A-15	Number of Feople for Whom Respondent	
		Writes OER/APR/Appraisal	67
TABLE	A-16	Supervisor Writes Respondent's	
		OER/APR/Appraisal	60
TABLE	A-17	Work Schedule	60
TABLE	A-18	Supervisor Holds Group Meetings	67
TARLE	A-19	Supervisor Holds Group Meetings to	
		Solve Problems	67
TABLE	A-20	Aeronautical Rating and Current Status	68
TABLE	A-21	Career Intent	20
LABLE	B-1	Comparison of UAP Factor Scores	
		Between SAC and other Officers	0.4
THE E	B2	Comparison of DAP Factor Scores	- ,
		Between SAC and other Enlisted	1 .
TARLE	H-3	Comparison of UAP Factor Scores	7.
		Retween SAC and other Civilians	1.0



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part of our College mission is distribution of the students' problem solving products to DoD
sponsors and other interested agencies to enhance insight into contemporary, defense
related issues. While the College has accepted this product as meeting academic requirements for graduation, the views and opinions expressed or implied are solely those of the author and should not be construed as carrying official sanction.

"insights into tomorrow"

ないのであるというというというと

REPORT NUMBER 86-0400

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR STEPHEN D. BULL, III

TITLE JOB ATTITUDES -- HOW SAC PERSONNEL COMPARE WITH THE REST OF THE AIR FORCE

I. <u>Purposet</u> To compare the job attitudes of Strategic Air Command (SAC) personnel with those of the rest of the Air Force, highlight significant differences, and develop recommendations on how the SAC staff can best use this information.

11. Background: Understanding job attitudes has long been recognized as a one of the keys to effectively improving organizational morale and productivity. These same attitudes can have a strong influence on an organization's reputation and its recruiting and retention programs. Comparing the attitudes of SAC personnel on a command scale with those of other personnel in the Air Force can provide a unique perspective of where SAC's organizational strengths and weaknesses lie. Until recently, the Air Force did not have a method for measuring and comparing these attitudes. However, with the advent of the Organizational Assessment Package (OAP), developed by the Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) at Maxwell AFB, Alabama, the Air Force gained an excellent vehicle for performing this task. Officials at SAC and LMDC recognized this opportunity and sponsored this research for that purpose.

CONTINUED

III. <u>Procedure & Results:</u> The following steps were taken to achieve the goal of this research:

1. Past Air Force and SAC studies were reviewed to identify historical attitude trends and problem areas which might be useful in evaluating the survey results.

2. Using the LMDC data base compiled from October 1981 through September 1985, the author compared demographic characteristics and attitudinal mean scores for SAC personnel and the remaining data base. The data base totaled over 108,000 personnel (18,000 SAC). Statistically significant score differences were identified using <u>t</u>-test analysis procedures for the 95% confidence level.

3. A general demographic comparison showed SAC respondents to be younger, less experienced and slightly less educated than the data base. SAC personnel career intentions compared favorably with those of other Air Force personnel. Only SAC enlisted personnel showed a noticeably lower percentage of those "continuing" or "likely to continue" their careers.

4. SAC personnel attitudes were significantly different from those of their Air Force counterparts in 54 of 63 score comparisons (officers--15/21, enlisted personnel--18/21, and civilians--21/21). The scores generally reflected more positive attitudes for SAC officers and civilians, particularly in their appraisal of work group productivity, job importance, and management/supervisory communications. SAC enlisted personnel indicated less favorable attitudes in nearly every comparison.

5. The magnitude of attitude score differences was less than .25 points (on Likert scale of 1 to 7) for all but 7 comparisons. These seven areas highlighted a near uniform perception that SAC jobs are less autonomous, more repetitive, and less intrinsically motivating. Despite this, SAC personnel also indicated a relatively greater desire for more easy and repetitive work and a lesser desire for more "job enrichment."

IV. Conclusions:

1. SAC officers and civilians collectively displayed more positive attitudes towards their jobs and organizations than did their Air Force counterparts. Their stronger perceptions of work group productivity, task importance,

CONTINUED

and the work group process (management and communications) underscored the dedication and teamwork concept that are integral to the SAC mission.

2. SAC enlisted personnel were less positive in appraising their jobs and organizations. They exhibited a definite trend of lower scores in comparison to the other Air Force enlisted personnel. Unlike the SAC officers and civilians, they were less confident in their organizational effectiveness and job importance.

3. The most significant area of specific attitude differences centered on task characteristics--less task autonomy and greater work repetition. These are not negative. They are compatible with the controlled environment of SAC's nuclear deterrence mission.

4. The lower scores for job related satisfaction for SAC officers and enlisted personnel do not support a correlation between job satisfaction and career intention. The less favorable career intentions for SAC enlisted personnel may only reflect a predominantly younger enlisted force and the Air Force-wide lower reenlistment rate for first term airmen. Of greater interest is the potential impact of family attitudes on job satisfaction. The SAC civilians scored very well in job related satisfaction. Family separation as a result of TDY or alert duty is the most noticeable difference between civilian work and military duty.

V. Recommendations:

1. SAC Headquarters should provide the results of this survey to the field via wing commander conferences, squadron commander workshops, and the SAC NCO Leadership School.

2. SAC Headquarters should study the enlisted personnel arena. Their attitude scores indicate the greatest potential for improvement, particularly in the area of job importance and commitment to organizational goals.

3. SAC Headquarters should conduct additional study to identify the critical factor(s) impacting job related satisfaction for officers and enlisted personnel.

4. SAC Headquar *s should obtain a copy of the LMDC data base for future analysis before their organization disbands at the end of Fiscal Year 1986.

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

The Strategic Air Command (SAC) has long been considered the cornerstone of the United States Air Force. Organized in 1946, a full year shead of the Air Force, its nuclear strategic mission dominated our defense budget and drove our national strategy of massive retaliation through the early 1960's (Keany, 1984). Since then, SAC has continued its nuclear deterrent role by maintaining two of the three legs in our nation's nuclear triad--the land based intercontinental ballistic missile and long range bomber aircraft. SAC's role in the Cuban Missile Crisis highlighted the power it can bring to bear in resolving international crises. More importantly, this power is not restricted to the threat of nuclear war. When the Vietnam peace negotiations stalled in December 1972, it was SAC's round-the-clock bombing that convinced the North Vietnamese to resume the peace talks in earnest (Szulc, 1978; Keany, 1984). Despite this critical role SAC plays in our national defense, the attraction of SAC duty sometimes pales beside the glamour of serving in other Air Force commands.

For many, SAC duty is synomynous with longer hours, frequent inspections, monotonous duty, regular family separation and isolated base locations (Peterson, 1971; Wilson, 1972). This author often heard phrases like "no one volunteers for SAC" and "to err is human, to forgive is not SAC policy" long before he elected to pursue his Air Force career in SAC. If these phrases reflect a common perception of SAC duty, then it is understandable why new officers and enlisted personnel would be reluctant to volunteer for SAC duty. This point was driven home in December 1973, when General Meyer, then Commander~in-Chief of SAC, indicated to Lt Gen Roberts, AF/DP, and Lt Gen McBride, ATC/CC, that SAC would not accept new pilots unless higher caliber pilots were more evenly distributed among the commands (Dallenbach, 1985).

うためのである。 「ためのためです」 のないないです。 やんたんためで、 たんたんための

Sector As

Prior to General Meyer's decision, pilot and navigator students selected their assignments in the order of their class standing. SAC oftentimes received the students ranked in the bottom third of their class. Concerned that these students would perceive their SAC assignments as "punishment" and develop a "failure syndrome," Lt Gen Keck, SAC/CV, successfully advocated a revised assignment system (Dallenbach, 1985).

The pilot assignment issue is symptomatic of the effects of negative rumons of SAC duty. More importantly, if these negative summers have any merit, then one would expect the morale and job attitudes of SAC personnel to be markedly lower than those of the rest of the Air Force population. Unfortunately, no one has conducted a survey to specifically

address this issue. Until recently, the Air Force did not have a method for measuring and comparing these attitudes. However, with the advent of the Air Force Leadership and Management Development Center's (LMDC) Organizational Assessment Package (DAP), the Air Force gained this capability. Since 1978, the LMDC has administered the DAP survey to units of all commands throughout the Air Force, collecting nearly 300,000 responses (Lamb, 1985). This data base provides a vehicle for comparing the demographic characteristics and attitudes of SAC personnel--officer, enlisted, and civilian--with those of the Air Force

Purpose

The purpose of this report was to use the OAP data base to highlight demographic and attitudinal differences between SAC personnel and other Air Force personnel. Any differences which satisfy the 95 percent statistical confidence level were considered significant. These driferences, whether positive or negative, are evaluated and provided to SAC so they can use this information in educating their unit commanders and NCO leaders on SAC personnel attitudes. This information may also prove useful in reviewing, revising and formulating SAC personnel policies.

Organization

This report is structured in the same manner the research was conducted. Chapter Two is a literature review of background studies on SAC and Air Force personnel issues and applicable behavioral research theory. Chapter Three provides a description of the methodolgy used--the survey, the method of collection, who the participants were, and how the data were analyzed. Chapter Four details the statistical results of comparing the demographic and attitudinal characteristics of each population. Analysis of the results, Chapter Five, explores possible explanations for any significant differences. Chapter Six summarizes the evaluation and lists recommended actions for SAC to pursue.

Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although there are no previous studies which compare SAC personnel job attitudes with those of the Air Force population at large, there are several studies which either address specific SAC problem areas or provide a "macro" view of Air Force personnel attitudes. These studies, combined with behavioral research theory, can provide a reasonable background for understanding the OAF survey results.

Behavioral Research Theory

Understanding job attitudes is important because they influence our approach to work and our subsequent behavior or quality of performance. If one wants to alter a behavior, one method is to change the attitude. Because attitudes are formed on the basis of one's experiences, it is possible to modify an attitude by controlling the experiences associated with that attitude (Gray & Starke, 1984). Knowing which factors motivate high productivity then becomes important if one desires to foster a positive job attitude within his or her personnel. There are several complementary motivation theories which examine these factors.

Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs is one of the most widely known theories. He postulates man is motivated by an ascending hierarchy of needs: physiological, security, social, self-esteem and self-actualization. These needs may be satisfied concurrently or individually; however, the theory proposes the motivation to fulfill a higher level needs occurs only if the lower level needs are satisfied. McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y suggests individual motivation is also a function of commitment to organizational goals and the awards earned for achieving those goals. Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory further suggests a motivated individual must value the reward offered and feel the goal is achievable (Dubrin, 1978).

Herzberg's (1966) Two Factor Theory introduced the concept of job enrichment by addressing motivation as a function of job characteristics versus individual needs. He classified these characteristics as either hygiene factors, which prevent job dissatisfaction, or motivation factors, which promote job satisfaction. Hygiene factors (salary, working conditions, interpersonal relations) cannot motivate employees, nor can motivation factors' (achievement, responsibility, recognition) prevent job dissatisfaction. The important point is that job satisfaction is achieved only through motivation factors, not hygiene factors. Therefore, it is possible to have a motivated, but

6

dissatisfied work force, as well as an unmotivated, but satisfied work force (Dubrin, 1978).

One other factor bears mentioning--stress. Negative stress can cause disruptive behavior, hurting both individual performance as well as organizational effectiveness. Several potential sources of negative stress within an organization are exorbitant work demands, role ambiguity, role conflict and underutilization of abilities (Dubrin, 1978).

These behavioral theories identify and interrelate different factors impacting motivation and job attitudes. The Air Force studies and SAC background data examine these factors in more detail.

Air Force Studies

There are two studies of note which address the attitudes of the Air Force population at large. The first, conducted in 1975 after the current all-volunteer force was instituted, examined the career intentions of officers and enlisted personnel. The second study, completed in 1980, examined the correlation between command of assignment and individual job satisfaction and motivation.

Pettit's (1975) study, "Leadership and Management in the All Volunteer Air Force," provides a benchmark on the key factors affecting Air Force personnel career intentions. The strongest positive factor for officers, regardless of

their time in service, was the job itself. For officers with less than eight years of service, the second most important factor was pay and allowances. Older officers rated retirement next. Unlike the officers, the enlisted personnel did not agree on the most favorable factor. First term airmen cited training and education as the prinicipal satisfier, while career airmen rated retirement highest. However, they both agreed on fringe benefits as the second strongest factor.

A CARGE S

Job dissatisfiers reflected the same trend as career motivators. All officers rated family separation as the single most unfavorable factor. Junior officers ranked policies and procedures second, while senior officers were more concerned with little say in assignments. The enlisted personnel disagreed on the number one irritant--first term airmen cited policies and procedures and career airman selected family separation. First term airmen ranked family separation as the second greatest dissatisfier and career airmen ranked little say in assignments next (Pettit, 1975).

Pettit's (1975) study attempted to measure job satisfaction as a function of career intentions. Other studies have shown there is only a low-to-moderate inverse correlation between personnel turnover and job satisfaction (Baron, 1983). Therefore, career intent alone is not a good indicator of job satisfaction. Schneider (1984) argues a better measure is the combination of several variables: the

8

A the second second second second and the second second second second second second second second second second

individual's self-esteem, family situation, and supervisor's behavior. This is in concert with Herzberg's (1966) Two Factor Theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Based upon these theories and the Pettit (1975) study results, one should expect to see commands which ignore job motivators (achievement, increased responsibility, recognition) and force family separation to exhibit lower job satisfaction and higher personnel turnover. A subsequent study of four major Air Force commands supported this viewpoint.

Dirnberger's (1980) study, "Organizational Assessment: Implications for Air Force Major Air Commands," demonstrated a strong, consistent relationship between job satisfaction and command of assignment. His report did not identify which commands were studied, but labeled the results by "Command 1, 2, 3, or 4." Commands 1 and 2, which scored significantly higher in job attitudes and individual motivation factors, also shared unique demographic characteristics: (a) greater percentage of females; (b) greater percentage of civilians; (c) greater percentage of personnel with more than 4 years time of service; (d) greater average time on station; and (e) over 80% of the personnel had a stable day shift. Commands 3 and 4 scored much lower and also shared some unique characteristics: (a) oreater percentage of swing shift, mid shift and crew auty: (b) twice as many enlisted personnel as the other two

9

k,

commands; and (c) greater personnel turnover (separation, retirement).

ころうち ちんちょうち ちょうちょうちょう

harden har

The difference between the highest and lowest scoring commands was significant. Command 2 scored the highest in 20 of 23 factors, and second highest in the remaining three factors. Command 4 scored lowest or next to lowest in every category except one (Dirnberger, 1980). Although pure memographic characteristic comparison is not a valid measure of job satisfaction (Schneider, 1984), Dirnberger (1980) suggested commands with more stable assignments, more civilian personnel and better supervisory climate enjoy better personnel job attitudes and higher individual motivation.

SAC Background Data

Three SAC studies provide valuable insight into the work environment of the SAC combat crew member. Understanding the nature of SAC duty is a prerequisite to evaluating the EMDC DAP survey results. The studies conducted by Peterson (1971), Wilson (1972), and Donnelly (1982) examined the problems confronting the SAC alert crew member.

If one were to summarize SAC duty in one word, it would be "alert." Ever since the Soviets launched Sputnik in 1957 SAC has continuously maintained a portion of its bomber and missile force on twenty-four alert status (Wilson, 1972). This means keeping aircrews, missile crews and maintenance

personnel ready to launch the fleet within a moment's notice. This mission of providing a viable nuclear deterrent against any potential aggressor has imposed significant obstacles to maintaining high morale on the crew force.

The principal morale problem associated with aircrew alert duty is frequent and prolonged family separation (Whitson, 1972). A SAC aircrew member will typically spend one week out of three away from his or her family. Although one can see their family while on alert, it does little to ease the strain. As one crew member was quoted in the AF Times, "Meeting the family at the BX or Officers' Club gets tiresome, and alert duty places the burden of raising a family on the wife" (cited in Wilson, 1972). Watching lieutenant colonels and senior majors serving alert tours only discourages the younger officers' hope of someday escaping alert duty (Wilson, 1972). This dissatisfaction with alert duty is shared by missile crew members.

Peterson's (1971) study, "Results of a Survey of SAC Missile Combat Crews," indicated SAC crew members were convinced of the importance of their mission, but were highly dissatisfied with several aspects of their jobs. These included: long hours, lack of job satisfaction, lack of prestige, the completely boring nature of missile alert duty, and the frequency of inspections and evaluations.

This last complaint is also common to aircrew duty and underscores the high stress environment of SAC duty.

ちていたちると、それいというでき

A CARLES COMPACTIONS AND

The importance of the SAC mission and critical nature of dealing with nuclear weapons demands strict adherence to checklist procedures. Continuous practice leads to monotony and excessive testing creates constant stress to always succeed. Although the pressure to never make a mistake may be self-imposed by the crew member, the resulting stress is very real. This high stress can eventually lead to lower self-esteem and decreased job satisfaction (Baron, 1983).

The location of many SAC bases also has a negative erfect on many SAC personnel. Called the Northern Tier, SAC maintains five bases that are in very cold climates and in sparsely populated areas. Manning these bases with volunteers presents a very difficult challenge for SAC personnel officers. Donnelly's (1982) study, "Increasing the Number of Rated Officer Volunteers for Aircrew Duty at SAC Northern Tier Bases," addressed this problem in detail. SAC offers a "reduced" three year tour to crew members who volunteer for a Northern Tier assignment. Despite this, only 50% of the positions are filled with volunteers. The remaining positions are then (illed with non-volunteers from recent graduates of undergraduate flying training, accessions from other commands, and officers returning from staff duty. The strong likelihood of serving your initial

12

and and the second of the second s

SAC tour at one these less desirable locations may influence the number of volunteers for SAC duty.

Study Expectations

The literature review suggests several results from comparing SAC personnel attitudes with those of the Air Force community at large. The nature of SAC crew duty--frequent family separation, isolated base locations, routine tasks in a high stress environment--will cause a lower relative job satisfaction score (Baron, 1983; Schneider, 1984). However, this job dissatisfaction will not preclude a strongly motivated work force (Herzberg, 1966). SAC personnel's sense of job importance suggests a strong commitment to organizational goals and corresponding high motivation (McGregor, 1960). This commitment and motivation should result in higher scores for perceived job importance and confidence in work group effectiveness.

Exception of the lower scoring commands. However, this lower attitude score will not necessarily manifest itself in less favorable career intentions (Baron, 1983).

1 3

and the second

Chapter Three

METHOD

The information used for this study was gathered with the Leadership and Management Development Center's (LMDC) Organizational Assessment Package (DAP). This chapter describes the DAP survey, the data collection process, the subject groups evaluated and the procedures used for analyzing the data. Understanding the theory upon which the DAP was developed, the method by which it is administered, and how the data is analyzed is a prerequisite for interpreting the results. Equally important, the validity and credibility of the survey itself must be documented.

Instrumentation

The DAP survey was developed jointly by LMDC and the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL) to assist LMDC consultants in evaluating unit organizational leadership weaknesses and strengths. It also provides a data base for Air Force-wide organizational effectiveness research efforts (Shurt, 1985).

Siven the complexity of the organizational environment and the numerous variables which can impact leadership effectiveness, the DAP was developed using the "contingency"

approach to leadership (Short, 1985). This approach contends that no single leadership style is consistently effective. Instead, it suggests that the most effective leadership style is dictated by the unique situation each leader confronts. Therefore, the "contingency" approach is ideally suited to evaluate leadership effectiveness across the broad spectrum of missions, organizational structures, and work group maturity found throughout the Air Force. The specific model used, Hendrix's (1976) "Three Component Leadership Effectiveness Model," measures both the style of leadership and the situational environment. It also measures organizational effectiveness in terms of job satisfaction, organizational climate and workers' perceived productivity (Short, 1985; Davis and Dotson, 1981).

A CARACTER SOLVANIA

1211111

The DAP survey (Appendix C) consists of 109 items which solicit specific demographic data and indications of the respondent's attitudes toward job characteristics, job desires, supervision, work group productivity, organization climate and various job related issues. These items are later combined to form 21 statistical factors which measure the work group input, process and output. This composite picture portrays the organization's overall effectiveness.

The credibility of the OAP has been excellent. From its initial field test in 1978 through more recent studies, the OAP validity, reliability and factor consistency have consistently been rated above average to excellent (Short,

1985; Hightower and Short, August, 1982; 1982a; 1982b). The accuracy of the factors measured by the DAP were found to remain valid even if some of the underlying assumptions in the Hendrix model were inapplicable (Debbeck, 1980).

Data Collection Process

The DAP data base used in this study is compiled from anonymous individual DAP surveys administered during LMDC management consulting visits. The LMDC team only visits a unit if invited by the unit commander. They collect data through mandatory group survey sessions. Each survey is identified only by the respondent's work group code. This insures individual anonymity while still enabling the LMDC consulting team to give each supervisor teedback on his or ber effectiveness as perceived by the subordinates. $\sim o$ or oximately six weeks after the survey, the LMDC team recurns to brief individual supervisors and commanders on their organization s strengths and weaknesses. These feedback sessions are tailored to address only those areas or which each supervisor or commander is responsible. The LEDC team may also recommend management action plans to 1 aprove any weak areas.

The team returns four to seven months later and minimisters a post-intervention (secondary) OAP survey to see if there is any positive effect from the recommended

:7

changes. These results are then reported to the commander and individual supervisors.

The data collected from the numerous surveys are stored in a cumulative data base. The data base used for this study includes all pre-intervention (initial) surveys conducted from October 1981 through September 1985. Data collected prior to October 1981 are maintained in a separate historical data base.

のないという

Subjects

The two groups evaluated were SAC personnel and the remaining LMDC data base. For SAC this includes all officers, enlisted personnel, and Department of the Air Force civil service personnel. The LMDC data base represents all other Air Force personnel, including some Air Force Remerve and Air National Guard personnel. The respective sample sizes are 18,477 (SAC) and 89,707 (Air Force). A more detailed breakout is listed in Table A-1, Appendix A. The entire data base represents over 70 bases and 13 major commands/special operating agencies. The ten SAC bases surveyed include six bomber bases (Anderson, Blytheville, Ellsworth, Fairchild, Loring, Plattsburg), three missile bases (Ellsworth, Vandenberg, Whiteman), a forceunaissance base (Beale), and Headquarters SAC at Offutt OFB (Lamb, 1985).

18

Procedures

The analysis of the survey results was conducted in two separate stages. Examination 1, "Analysis of Demographic Information," characterizes the sample groups and may provide some insight into any attitudinal differences highlighted in the second examination. Examination 2, "Comparison of SAC Personnel to Other Air Force Personnel," compares the attitudinal responses for each personnel category (officer, enlisted, civilian) in SAC with those of their counterparts in the remaining Air Force data base.

The number n shown throughout the study represents the total number of valid responses in the data base for the corresponding item or factor. The value of <u>n</u> fluctuates due to test marking errors or skipped questions. Despite this, the remaining sample size is always large enough to ensure a stable measure. Statistical analyses were performed using the appropriate procedures in <u>SPSS</u>^{*} User's Guide (1983).

Examination 1, Analysis of Demographic Information

For this analysis, the LMDC data base was divided into two groups: those responses from SAC personnel and those from the remaining data base. SPSS* subprogram "Crosstabs" was used to analyze the data.

Examination 2, Comparison of SAC Personnel to Other Air Force Personnel

In this analysis, SAC attitudinal responses were compared by personnel category to the corresponding Air Force attitudinal responses. The null hypothesis assumes there are no significant attitudinal differences between SAC and the Air Force population. Two-tailed <u>t</u>-tests were used to determine if there were any significant differences. The level of significance for all <u>t</u>-tests was alpha = .05, which equates to a 95% statistical confidence level. An <u>F</u>-test was used to test the assumption of equal variances. Where necessary, <u>t</u>-tests for unequal variance groups were used. The tabulated results of this comparison are grouped by areas of organizational functioning (detailed description is at Appendix C). These areas include:

1. Work Itself. Measures perceptions of task characteristics and environmental conditions.

2. Job Enrichment. Measures degree to which respondent finds his or her job interesting, meaningful, challenging and responsible.

5. Work Group Process. Assesses the effectiveness of supervisors and the method for accomplishing the work.

4. Work Group Output. Assesses perceptions of quality and quantity of output, pride, individual satisfaction and overall organizational climate.

and the second states a

Summary

The OAP survey is designed to measure organizational leadership and management effectiveness as a function of leadership style, subordinate perception of success and the situational environment. It is based on the "contingency" approach to leadership, using Hendrix's (1976) "Three Component Leadership Effectivenes Model." The validity, reliability, and factor consistency of the OAP have been consistently tested and rated above average.

The data base used in this study was compiled through anonymous individual OAP surveys administered by the LMDC management consulting team during unit visits from October 1981 through September 1985. The LMDC team visited units only upon the request of the unit commanders. The data base contains over 108,000 responses from personnel representing over 13 major commmands/special operating agencies at over 70 bases. This includes over 18,000 SAC responses from 10 SAC bases.

Chapter Four details the results of the two separate examinations, "Analysis of Demographic Information," and "Comparison of SAC Personnel to Other Air Force Personnel." The latter compared attitude scores of SAC personnel with those of their Air Force counterparts. Only those differences which exceeded the 95% confidence level were considered statistically significant.

Chapter Four

RESULTS

The results of the comparisons between SAC personnel and other Air Force personnel are presented in two parts. Examination 1 portrays the demographic characteristics of the SAC respondents. This analysis characterizes the respondents to the survey. The attitude survey results of Examination 2 are presented in a different format--each SAC personnel category (officer, enlisted, civilian) is compared to its Air Force counterpart in each of the four areas of organizational functions (work itself, job enrichment, work group process and work group output).

A general demographic comparison reflects that the SAC population is typically younger, less experienced and less educated than other Air Force personnel. The attitudes SAC personnel share toward their jobs, supervisors and co-workers differ significantly from those of the other Air Force respondents in almost every area of analysis. However, the degree and direction of difference depends very auch upon which personnel category is evaluated. SAC officers and civilians share a predominantly more favorable outloof, while the enlisted personnel are less positive.

The reader is reminded these comparisons reflect the responses in the LMDC data base only, and may not reflect the normative values for SAC and the Air Force as a whole.

Demographic Results

The results of Examination 1 are detailed in Tables A-1 through A-21, Appendix A. As a command, SAC is comprised of a greater percentage of enlisted personnel (72% versus 64%) and fewer civilians (15% versus 25%). Although the overall percentages of females in SAC versus the Air Force are comparable, the majority of SAC females are enlisted personnel (53%) while the majority of other Air Force females are civilians (53%). The distribution of ethnic groups is consistent between officers and enlisted personnel for both sample groups; however, SAC civilians have relatively fewer Hispanics than the other civilian population (4% versus 18%). The majority of SAC respondents are married and living with their spouses. However, proportionally fewer SAC officer and enlisted personnel spouses are employed. While a majority of SAC personnel have their performance reports written by their supervisors, there remains approximately 10% who do not know who writes their reports.

Characteristics such as age, experience, time on station, and career intent vary with each personnel category. The majority of SAC officers are between 26 and
35 years old, have more than 4 years of service, and have been in their present career fields over 36 months. Α majority (85%) have less than 36 months on station. Over 50% have spent less than 12 months in their current jobs. A majority of officers are supervisors, usually of groups exceeding four people. Approximately 45% hold advanced academic degrees and over 60% are graduates of a professional military education program. While over 50% of the officers work a day shift schedule, another 30% follow a crew duty schedule or are frequently gone TDY. Only 20% of the remaining Air Force population describe their work as crew duty or frequent TDY. Nearly 44% of the SAC officers have an aeronautical rating compared to only 35% of the other Air Force officers. Over 70% of the SAC officers surveyed indicated they would definitely, or most likely, make the Air Force a career.

The majority of the SAC enlisted personnel are 17 to 25 years old. While only 41% of the other Air Force enlisted personnel have less than 4 years of service, nearly 50% of the SAC enlisted personnel fall in this category. There is a corresponding difference in job experience and time on station. A greater percentage of SAC enlisted personnel have less than 36 months in their current career fields (47% vencus 41%) and less than 18 months on station (55% vesus 49%). Over 46% have some college education, but no degree. 6 definite majority (65%) follow a normal day shift

25

S. Carlos and

and a second a second

12.2.2

as meller.

schedule. Fewer than 35% of their supervisors use group meetings to solve problems. Only 48% of the SAC enlisted personnel expressed interest in making the Air Force a career. Over 27% indicated they intend to separate or would probably not make the Air Force a career.

The majority of SAC civilians are over 40 years old. have over 12 years of service, over 36 months in their present career fields, and over 36 months on station. While 43% have spent over 36 months in their present duty position, only 41% of the other Air Force civilians are similarly experienced. Unlike the SAC officers and enlisted personnel, a majority of civilian personnel's spouses (70%) are employed. Although the majority of SAC civilians have progressed beyond high school, only 14% have earned a college degree, compared to 25% for their other Air Force counterparts. Very few SAC civilians (33%) are supervisors and fewer still actually rate the performance of the people they supervise (21%). Nearly 88% work a day shift schedule. Fifty percent of their supervisors hold group meetings on a weetily or more frequent basis. Only 35% of their Air Force counterparts hold meetings with the same regularity. Like the SAC officers, 70% of the SAC civilians are interested in continuing their Air Force career.

Attitudinal Differences

The attitudes expressed by SAC personnel differed significantly from those of their Air Force counterparts. The officers differed in 15 of 21 OAP factors, the enlisted personnel in 18 factors, and the civilians in all 21 factors. Table 1 depicts the results by area of organizational functioning, DAP factor, and personnel category. Areas of significant different attitudes are marked with either a plus or minus sign. A plus sign indicates the SAC personnel score was higher than that of their Air Force counterparts; a minus sign indicates a lower relative score for SAC personnel. Detailed comparisons of mean scores, standard deviations, degrees of freedom and totest results are presented in Tables B-1 through B-3 in Appendix B. The factor numbers annotated in parentheses are provided for cross reference between the text, the tables in Appendix B, and the factor definitions in Appendix C.

Although a majority of statistical comparisons exceeded the statistical criterion for significant difference (alpha 5.0%), the magnitude of actual mean score differences was usually less than .25 of a point on a scale of 1 to 7. In Fact, only 7 of the 63 factors reflected a difference greater than .25 of a point. Specific results are detailed by personnel category and functional area.

Table 1

Significantly Different Attitudes Between SAC Personnel and other Air Force Personnel

Function	DAP Factor (Factor number)	Off	Enl	Civ
Work	Job Performance Goals (V810)	+		+
Itself	Task Characteristics (V812)		-	4
	Task Autonomy (VB13)	-		.4.
	Work Repetition (V814)	+	+	+
	Desired Repetitive/Easy Tasks (V816)	+	+	+
	Job Related Training (V823)	+		+
Juti	Skill Variety (VB00)	-	-	+
Lorichment	Task Identity (V801)	+		ş-
	Task Significance (V802)	+	μ.	+
	Job Feedback (V804)		-	+
	Need for Enrichment (VB06)		-	
	Job Motivation Index (V807)		-	t.
Wark Group	Work Support (V805)		_	_
Process	Management and Supervision (V818)	+		+
	Supervisory Communications Climate (VR19)	+		۲
	Organizational Communications Climate (V820)		-	+
Work Group	Pride (V811)			÷
Output	Advancement/Recognition (V817)		-	+
	Perceived Productivity (V821)	+	-	+
	Job Related Satisfaction (V822)	-	-	-+
	General Organizational Climate (V824)	-	+

SAC Officer Attitudes

SAC officers generally reflected more positive attitudes toward their work than the other Air Force officers. In the functional area, work itself, they considered their goals more clear, realistic and challenging (V810). They classified their jobs as very repetitive in nature (V814) and less autonomous, leaving little room for independent

decisions (VB13). However, they also have a greater desire for jobs which are more repetitive and easy (VB16). They are also more pleased with the quality of their training than are their counterparts (VB23).

In the area of job enrichment, SAC officers did not feel they needed to apply as great a variety of skills in successfully completing their tasks (V800). They also felt a stronger identity with their job or mission (V801); one which they felt has a more significant impact on the lives of others (V802). They did not consider their jobs to be as intrinsically motivating (V807). Despite this, their desire for greater job enrichment is less than what their Air Force counterparts expressed (V806).

The work group process scores show SAC officers felt their supervisors generally set higher performance standards and established better work procedures than those of their Air Force counterparts (V818). They also felt they enjoy a better rapport with their supervisors--reflecting the cumulative impact good working environment, encouraged theovation, and performance rewards (V819). However, they had a less enthusiastic attitude towards the work support arowided, such as inadequate tools, work space or competing additional duties (V805).

The work group output results indicate SAC officers felt more positive about their work groups' quality of work, q antity of work, and ability to perform under pressure

(V821). Their sense of pride and perceived apportunity for advancement did not differ significantly from other Air Force officers (V811, V817). Additionally, their overall job satisfaction was less, reflecting the cumulative inputs of work schedules, family attitudes, job security, and co-worker relationships (V822).

1. 2. 2. 2. 2 Car

A CONTRACT STREET

SAC Enlisted Personnel Attitudes

The attitudes of the SAC enlisted personnel were generally more negative than those of their counterparts. Like the officers, they characterized their jobs as more repetitive (V814) and less autonomous (V813). They also felt their job performance goals were less specific, challenging and realistic than did their enlisted counterparts (V810). Although they agreed to a fairly large extent that their tasks require individual initiative, skill variety and responsibility, their task characteristic score was significantly lower than that of their counterparts (V812). Like the officers, their desire for more repetitive and easy tasks significantly exceeded that of their counterparts (V816).

In the area of job enrichment, the SAC enlisted bersonnel were less enthusiastic about the intrinsic motivation potential of their tasks (V807). They felt their motivation demand as great a variety of skills (V800). They did not identify as strongly with their jobs (V801),

30

nor did they ascribe as much importance to their specific tasks in the total mission accomplishment (V802). They also did not feel they received as much clear, direct feedback on their job performance (V804). Despite this, their desire for tasks with more opportunity for individual growth, multiple disciplines, and more independence was less than what their counterparts expressed (V806).

The SAC enlisted personnel were less condemning of the work group process. Their attitudes towards the quality of management and supervision, as well as supervisory communications were neutral, like those of their Air Force counterparts (V818, V819). However, they were less enthusiastic about the work support they received (V805). They were also less positive towards the quality of organizational communications, indicating a perception of more restricted communications (V820).

The results of the work group output reflect a significant difference in all factors. The SAC enlisted personnel felt less personal pride and perceived less opportunity for achievement and recognition (V811, V817). Unlike the officers, they did not express a greater tonfidence in their work groups' performance capability (V811). This attitude was also reflected in their lower Bob Selaced Satisfaction score (V822) and corresponding lower estimation of organizational pride, teamwork, and organizational communications (V824).

7.1

SAC Civilian Attitudes

Not only did the SAC civilians differ significantly from their counterparts in every factor, their attitudes were predominantly more positive. In the first functional area, work itself, they felt their goals were more specific, clear and challenging (V810). They expressed a higher opinion of their job characteristics--skill variety, task significance, and job feedback (V812). Unlike the SAC officers and enlisted personnel, they considered their jobs more autonomous than did their other Air Force counterparts (V813). Although they considered their jobs more repetitive (V814), they also desired more repetitive, easy tasks than did the other Air Force civilians (V816). The scores indicate SAC civilians felt more positive towards the guality of their training (V823).

The SAC civilian attitudes reflected correspondingly positive scores in the job enrichment area. They felt their jobs require a greater variety of skills, provide a more identifiable product, and have a stronger impact on the overall unit mission (VB00, VB01, VB02). They also felt their jobs provide direct feedback on how well they are performing (VB04). Like the SAC officers and enlisted performing (VB04). Like the SAC officers and enlisted oversonnel, they did not desire more enriching jobs as much as their counterparts (VB06). Unlike the officers and eslisted personnel, their Job Motivation Index scores

indicated they felt their work was more intrinsically motivating than did their counterparts (V807).

The work group process scores continue to reflect the more positive attitude of the SAC civilians. Although they were significantly less satisfied with the work support received (V805), they generally felt their supervisors gave better guidance, set higher performance standards, and used better work procedures (V818). They also rated communications significantly better for both supervisors and the total organization (V819, V820).

The work group output scores show the SAC civilians took acceptide in their work, perceived a greater opportunity for advancement, and felt their work groups produce better quality and quantity under pressure than did their other Air Force counterparts (V811, V817, V821). They also indicated a greater satisfaction with their job environment, reflecting the cumulative effect of co-worker relations, family attitudes and work schedule (V822). The significantly different score for general organizational climate reflected a more positive attitude by SAC civilians towards the entire organization (V824).

Summar y

The overall review of mean scores and t-test analyses indicate SAC personnel's attitudes were significantly different in 54 of 63 individual comparisons. The scores

generally reflected more positive attitudes for SAC officers and civilian personnel and less positive attitudes for SAC enlisted personnel. The magnitude of the actual score differences was less than .25 points (on a scale of 1 to 7) for all but 7 factor score comparisons.

The next chapter compares these results with the theoretical expectations presented in Chapter Two. It also examines specific demographic and significant attitudinal differences between the SAC personnel and other Air Force personnel.

Chapter Five

DISCUSSION

Comparing DAP survey results between SAC and other Air Force personnel highlights several important differences. These differences support some of the theoretical expectations postulated in Chapter Two--lower Job Related Satisfaction scores and less favorable career intentions. However, the data do not support the expected lower aggregrate job attitudes of SAC personnel. This chapter details the limitations of this study and then examines the theoretical expectations in light of the actual results. It also examines significant data differences in demographic characteristics and the seven DAP attitudinal factor scores where differences exceeded a value of .25 scale points.

CALLS AND A LONG TO A

Limitations and Assumptions

This study and the data base are bounded by several limitations and necessary assumptions. These include the survey and testing methodolgy, the suitability of prior studies, and the characteristics of the target data base.

Hypothesis testing assumes the sample used is a random representation of the whole population and that the variances within that population are equal. This study used a sample of convenience. The LMDC team conducts OAP surveys

the author assumes there is no "data base" slant towards either high morale or low morale units. Everyone present in the unit must take the survey. The author further assumes this does not influence the honesty of the responses.

The data base includes all surveys conducted from October 1981 through September 1985. While it is possible to sort this data chronologically to measure the impact of Specific policies or programs, the scope of this study was restricted to a single comparison of SAC and the data base over the entire period. Therefore, the relative impacts of major Air Force and Department of Defense (DOD) programs during this period were assumed to be constant. This ignores the "SAC unique" benefits from increased DOD spending under the Reagan Administration for the new B-1B bombers and Peacekeeper missiles, as well as the benefits from the productivity oriented Model Installation Program.

Ī

Although an individual's attitude is influenced by both perent organization policies (e.g., Air Force, MAJCOM) and local unit policies (Alderfer, 1983), the author assumes the organizational environment created by the immediate supervisor and unit commander carries an overriding impact. This accounts for productivity and morale differences between units within the same command. Therefore, any r omand policies should be reviewed in the context of how

they enhance or restrict the unit commander's autonomy in creating the organizational environment he or she desires.

The scale used to measure the respondent's attitude is the Likert scale, ranging from a value of 1 to 7. The associated descriptors range from very negative to very positive. The author weighed the relative numerical score (comparison between SAC and data base), the general range of the score (negative, neutral, positive), and the statistical significance of the difference when interpreting the results.

Although mean scores differing by only .02 of a point may have proved statistically significant, the author used a minimum difference value of .25 before examining any individual factor. The LMDC staff has learned through experience that areas with measured differences of less than .25 seldom indicate genuine problems and will not likely be affected by policy or procedural changes.

Theoretical Expectations

The results of the attitude survey do not support all theoretical expectations postulated in Chapter Two. The results varied by personnel category, making an overall comparison between SAC and the rest of the Air Force they propriate.

The expected lower job satisfaction attitudes were supported by the results for SAC officers and enlisted

5153 5 5 16 V 5

personnel, but not for the civilians. The comparative scores for DAP Factor 822, Job Related Satisfaction, are listed in Table 2. All three SAC scores were significantly different from the data base scores.

Table 2

DAP Factor 822, Job Related Satisfaction

Personnel Category	SAC	Other Air Force
Officer	5.26	5.38
Enlisted	4.84	4.98
Civilian	5.53	5.41

The inputs which comprise Factor 822 include co-worker relationships, family attitude towards job, work schedule, jub security, and acquired valuable skills (see Appendix C). Although further analysis is required to determine which of these inputs is significant, the author suspects family attitude towards the job may be the key input. Both the enlisted personnel and officers are affected by family separation through alert duty and temporary duty (TDY) commitments, but the civilian personnel are not.

Less favorable career intentions for SAC personnel were many indicated by the demographic survey data. Table I shows the percentage of officers, enlisted personnel and civilians who indicated they will "definitely continue" or "must likely continue" their careers. Only the enlisted

personnel show a marked decrease in those desiring a career. A complete breakout of this information is listed in Table A-21, Apppendix A.

Table 3

Career Intentions

Personnel Category	SAC	Other Air Force
Officer	70.4%	73.0%
Enlisted	48.0%	55.0%
Civilian	71.5%	75.3%

The apparent discontinuity between favorable career intentions and neutral job satisfaction scores for officers is not surprising. As noted in the literature review, personnel turnover and job satisfaction normally share a low-to-moderate inverse relationship. Although the lower career trend for enlisted personnel in the Air Force is mirrored in SAC, the percentage for SAC is notably lower. One possible explanation is SAC's higher percentage of first term arcmen. They have 50% enlisted personnel with less that 4 years service compared with 41% for the rest of the Air Euroe (Table A-4, Appendix A). Because the Air Force restlictment rate for first term airmen is lower than the tart for career airmen-60% first term versus 90% career

percentages of first term airmen to exhibit a lower total enlisted career retention rate.

SAC officers and civilians do not display aggregrate poorer job attitudes as implied by Dirnberger's (1980) study. However, SAC enlisted personnel do show a marked trend of lower attitude scores across the board. Comparing the SAC population's demographic characteristics with those of the anonymous commands in the Dirnberger study, one would reasonably expect SAC to display poorer attitudes and lower job motivation scores. SAC has a lower percentage of civilians, a younger military force with less time on station, more people with irregular duty hours, and more enlisted personnel--all demographic characteristics of the commands which displayed the poorer attitudes. Despite this, a subjective analysis of the DAP survey results fails to support the supposed correlation between demographic characteristics and personnel job attitudes.

The positive or negative values assigned to specific job attitudes reflect which attitudes the organization wants to foster. For example, the OAP survey stresses job motivation potential and organizational health. The first two functional areas, work itself and job enrichment, emphasize those characteristics which Herzberg theorizes will induce individuals to perform at their highest levels. These include achievement, recognition, responsibility, and challenging problems (Hersey et al., 1982). The second two

40

functional areas, work group process and work group output, emphasize the organizational environment's impact on group interaction and productivity. Understanding SAC's mission and its inherent dependence on teamwork becomes important in assessing the positive or negative value of the attitude scores.

As noted in Chapter Four, the collective attitudes of SAC officers and civilians appear very positive. Not only do they significantly differ from the data base scores in 36 of 42 comparisons, these differences also reflect a higher upinion of job importance, a greater confidence in the work group, and a stronger endorsement of their supervision and organizational climate. Of particular note is the high comparative scores in Perceived Productivity (V821). This factor measures the respondent's opinion of the quality, quantity and efficiency of his work group under pressure. because SAC works in teams--be it aircrews, missile crews, ommand and control teams- this esprit de corps is a restical indicator of the collective attitudes of SAC personnel. The few areas that reflect less positive score: enter on the motivation potential of individual jobs, especially autonomy and repetition. This should be the encoded response. The responsibility of working with ouclear weapons leaves no margin for error. SAC's checklist ptilosophy, which has evolved to effectively deal with this "sponsibility, inherently restricts autonomous decision

4:

making and encourages repetitive, compartmentalized procedures. Therefore, the net assessment of SAC officer and civilian job attitudes in comparison to the data base must remain very favorable.

The attitudes of the SAC enlisted personnel reflect a different story. Unlike the officers and civilians, their collective attitude is more negative than their Air Force counterparts. The SAC enlisted personnel show noticeably lower scores for perceived mission importance, confidence in their work group, and faith in their supervision.

There are several possible explanations for this result. SAC has a larger percentage of airmen with less than eight years of service. According to the Pettit (1975) study, one would expect the SAC enlisted force to be more susceptible to key job irritants such as policies and procedures and family separation. As discussed earlier, family separation and close supervision are an inherent nature of SAC duty. Another contributing factor may lie in the duty functions themselves. The majority of enlisted personnel duties are in support functions, such as bomber and missile maintenance or security, instead of primary combat missions. This compounds the problem of conveying job importance and ceinforcing self-esteem.

Demographic Differences

There are three notable demographic data differences which bear mentioning: the disproportionate percentage of females among SAC enlisted personnel, the low percentage of the Hispanic minority in the SAC civilian sector, and the 'ower education level of SAC enlisted and civilian personnel.

Table A-2, Appendix A, highlights the disproportionate bencentage of SAC females among the enlisted personnel (52% SAC versus 40% AF). This difference is a result of SAC's lower percentage of civilian personnel (15% SAC versus 25% (6). Although the overall percentage of total females in SAC is comparable to the Air Force (16% SAC versus 19% AF), the majority of the women in the Air Force are civilian employees. The appreciably fewer civilian positions available in SAC are balanced by a greater number of enlisted female positions.

The apparent disproportionate percentage of Hispanics among SAC civilians: (Table A-8, Appendix A) is a function of

e location more than command of assignment. The majorit. Hispanics in the Air Force are civilians. SAC has a comparatively small civilian population, and very few tober in the Southwest where a majority of personnel of Hispanic beritage reside (U.S. Burgam of the Census, 1984).

The Air Force population shows a five percent advantage or post high school education for enlisted personnel and a

nine percent advantage for civilian personnel. The lower education level for SAC personnel is a function of mission and age. SAC enlisted personnel are younger than their Air Force counterparts. Accordingly, they have had less time to pursue any post high school education. The type of duty reserved for the majority of SAC civilian employees does not require any post high school education.

Significant OAP Factor Differences

Same and a second of

There were only seven DAP factor scores which met the statistical criterion for significant difference and also exceeded an absolute difference of .25 points. Four of these are in the work itself functional area and the other three are in the job enrichment functional area. Table 4 summarizes the factors and the magnitude of the differences.

In the work itself area, the officer scores were noticeably lower than their counterparts' scores in rating Task Autonomy (VB13) and higher in Work Repetition (VB14). These scores are not surprising given the restrictive nature of SAC duty, redundancy of checklist procedures and the education level of the respondents. Although these scores do not necessarily reflect negative attitudes, they do highlight an area for potential improvement which SAC Headquarters, unit commanders and supervisors should esamine.

Table 4

Key DAF Factor Scores

Function	Category/OAF Factor	SAC	AF	Diff
War k	OfficerTask			
Itself	Autonomy (V813)	4.23	4.63	40
	OfficerWork			
	Repetition (V814)	4.53	4.26	+.27
	CivilianWork			
	Repetition (V814)	4.87	4.62	+.25
	Civilian-Desired	7 7/	7 05	
	Easy (asks (V816)	3.38	3.05	+.51
ant	Officer-Job			
Enrichment	Motivation Index (VB07)	117.47	128.29	-10.822
	Enlisted …Job			
	Motivation Index (V807)	92.81	102.19	-9. 311
	CivilianJob			
	Motivation Index (V807)	135.02	130.68	+4.24

The complementary high score for Work Repetition (V814) by SAC civilians underscores the contention that the recetitive checklist approach and stringent control procedures associated with the nuclear weapon mission respects of approach to all problems.

The higher SAC civilian score for Desired Repetitive and tary Tasks (VB16) is compatible with their higher rating of wart Repetition (VB14). This relationship is also true for the officers and enlisted personnel (see Tables R-1 and P.1. Hopendix B). On the surface, this compatibility should be

the Job Related Satisfaction (V822) scores for SAC officers

and enlisted personnel are lower than those of their counterparts. Therefore, SAC population's uniform desire for more easy and repetitive tasks may indicate a totally different perception---a heavier workload. Redundant, routine and time-consuming duties driven by higher echelon controls may produce this perception.

The Job Motivation Index (V807) factor reflects the respondent's perception of his or her jub's intrinsic motivating characteristics. It is a weighted multiplication of the responses to DAP factors measuring Skill Variety. lask Indentity, Task Significance, Job Feedback, Work Support and Task Sutchoomy. Although individual comparisons of these subordinate factor scores seldom reflect attitude differences exceeding .25 points, their combined effect results in a wide range of values. Therefore, this factor serves as a barometer of the cumulative motivating aspect of the many individual factors and does not highlight specific areas for additional study. The beaviest weighted factors used in this calculation are Task Autonomy (VB13) and Jub (eedback (V804). It is highly probable that the resulting Job Motivation Index scores are a strong reflection of the lower Task Autonomy scores already discussed.

Summary

The DAP survey results indicate the majority of SAu personnel attitudes differ from their Air Force

counterparts. The extent of these differences varies with the personnel category examined. The aggregrate SAC officer and civilian attitudes are more positive than those of their counterparts. However, SAC enlisted personnel attitudes are less positive than those of the data base. Both SAC and other Air Force personnel reflect the same trend in job attitudes--civilians are most positive, followed by the officers and then the enlisted personnel.

While SAC personnel attitudes differ from Air Force personnel attitudes in 54 of 63 DAP factor areas, the largest differences lie in SAC's perception of less Task Autonomy, greater Work Repetition, and a lower Job Motivation Index. These scores are consistent with the controlled, checklist nature of SAC duty.

The Job Related Satisfaction scores are lower for SAC officers and enlisted personnel, most probably reflecting the impact of family separation and work schedules. Despite these scores, SAC officer career intentions are only slightly less than those of their Air Force counterparts. However, the SAC enlisted personnel career intentions are nomiceably less than those of the other Air Force enlisted personnel. One reason for this may by the higher percentage of mirst term airmen in SAC.

Chapter Six details the conclusions of this study, recommends specific actions for Headquarters SAC, and suggests areas for further study.

Chapter Six

CONCLUSIONS

The LMDC GAP survey data base, collected from October 1981 through September 1985, has provided an excellent opportunity to compare SAC personnel demographic characteristics and work attitudes with those of other Air Force personnel. This comparison demonstrated SAC personnel attitudes are significantly different from those of their counterparts. The demographic data showed SAC personnel to be younger, less experienced, and slightly less educated. Their attitude scores were significantly different from those of other Air Force personnel in 54 of 63 comparisons. These comparisons led to several conclusions.

First, SAC officers and civilians collectively displayed mode positive attitudes towards their jobs and organizations than did their other Air Force counterparts. Although only SAC civilians scored a higher Job Related Satisfaction score, both the SAC officers and civilians responded with higher estimates of work group productivity, job importance, and management/supervisory communications. This underscores the upit/group cohesiveness and teamwork cuncept which is integral to SAC operational effectiveness.

40

SAC enlisted personnel were less positive in appraising their jobs and organizations. Their scores were significantly lower than those of their other Air Force counterparts in 18 of 21 factor score comparisons. They did not share the other SAC personnel's confidence in group productivity, job importance and communications effectiveness.

こうちょう いろうちょう

54 N 12

Creation Control

There were only seven factor scores where SAC personnel differed from their counterparts by .25 scale points or more (on a scale of 1 to 7). These centered on the degree of Task Autonomy, Work Repetition, Desire for Easy and Sepetitive Work, and the overall Job Motivation Index. SAC personnel felt their jobs allow less independent judgement, are more repetitive, and are inherently less motivating. Despite this, they all expressed relatively more desire for easy and repetitive tasks than did their counterparts. Therefore, the job characteristics appear to be compatible with the job desires.

Some of the theoretical expectations postulated about SAC attitudes were supported. The lower Job Related Satisfaction scores by SAC officer and enlisted personnel supported the Herzberg (1966) Two Factor Theory and Schneider's (1984) argument that self-esteem, family situation and supervisory behavior are critical factors in precluding job dissatisfaction. The family separation aspect of SAC duty may be the principal cause of this lower

50

Job satisfaction. The expected strong commitment to organizational goals reflected itself in higher Job importance and work group output scores for officers and civilians, but not for the enlisted personnel.

No. of the local division of the local divis

ANNON PERSONAL PROPERTY.

A CARLON

See. 1

Statices.

Dirnberger's (1980) study predicted SAC personnel would desplay more negative job attitudes solely on the basis of demographic characteristics of more crew members, more solisted personnel, fewer civilians, and less experienced eversonnel on station. Despite this, only the SAC enlisted personnel showed overall poorer job attitudes than their counterparts. The expected less favorable career intentions, based upon the Pettit (1975) study, were only marginally indicated by the demographic survey data. This solvengthens Paron & (1983) contention that job satisfaction underparts.

Recommendations

These recommendations are designed to build upon the results from this study. The overall intent is to contained on the tata provided through this analysis. If incorrecommendations and sationale are listed below: I. SAP Heatges term should provide the results of this

www.lothe field via wing Commander conferencer, squadrop -mander work thops and the SAC NCO Leadership School. I - wortant to close the feedback loop on a command scale

to insure our commanders and first line supervisors are aware of the general SAC trends. This would achieve a twofold purpose. First, the commanders and first line supervisors need to be aware of potential job motivation problem areas within their units. Second, these leaders could provide an excellent forum for discussing methods of improving those areas in which SAC personnel showed poorer attitudes.

2. SAC Headquarters should study the enlisted personnes arena. This area shows the greatest room for improvement. SAC enlisted personnel attitudes towards the organizational effectiveness and job importance are the most disconcerting and, perhaps, the easiest to rectify. Building commitment to organizational goals can reinforce individual achievement motivations. Emphasizing teamwork can strengthen individual perceptions of job importance as well. Are the young collisted personnel aware of their contribution to the unit mission? Are they afforded orientation rides on bombers of tablers? Are they afforded the opportunity to witness missife launch exercises?

3. SAC Headquarters should conduct additional study to identify the specific variable which most impacts Job Related Satisfaction (V822) scores for officers and enlisted personnel. Although the family separation aspect of officer and enlisted duty is the most noticeable difference from civilian duty, there is no conclusive evidence this is the

principal cause for their lower scores. The LMDC data base contains attitude scores on all the variables which comprise the aggregrate Job Related Satisfaction score. If the semily attitude input proves significant, additional cohormation is available through the LMDC Family Durvey data hase.

4. SAC Headquarters should obtain the entire IMDE DAP date base for future analysis. The LMDE analysis expension will be disbanded at the end of Fiscal Year 1986. However, they will transfer their data base to the All force Human Research Laboratory in June, 1986.

BIBLIOGRAPHY _

- Baron, R. A. (1983). Behavior in organizations. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Breeden, J. (1984). United States Air Force summary (11th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Headquarters United States (air Force (FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY).
- Dallenbach, P. (1985). HQ AFMPC historical file data on evolution of the Air Force pilot assignment system. Unpublished raw data.
- Davis. H. T., & Dotson, A. (1981). Supervisory factors related to three criteria of organizational effectiveness. Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Air Force Institute of Technology School of Logistics.
- Dirnberger, K. R. (1980). Organizational assessment: implications for Air Force major commands (Rep. No. 0570-80). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air Command & Staff College.
- Donnelly, M. J. (1982). Increasing the number of rated officer volunteers for aircrew duty at SAC northern tier bases (Rep. No. 82-0720). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air Command & Staff College.
- Dub: In, A. J. (1978). Human relations. Reston, VA: Reston Fublishing.

- frav, L. G., % Starke, F. A. (1984). Organizational behavior: concepts and applications (3rd ed.). Columbus, UH: Merrill.
- liendrix, W. H. (1976). Contingency approaches to leadership: A review and synthesis (AFHRL-TR-76-17). Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.
- Hersey, F., & Blanchard, E. R. (1982). Management of organizational behavior (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Frentice-Hall.
- Hereberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Eleveland: World Publishing Co.

CONTINUED _____

- Hightower, J. M., & Short, L. O. (August, 1982). Stability of the Organizational Assessment Package factorial validity across groups. Paper presented at the 90th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Hightower, J. M., & Short, L. O. (1982a). Factor Stability of the organizational assessment package (LMDC-TR-82-1). Maxwell AFB, AL: Leadership and Nanagement Development Center.
- Hightower, J. M., & Short, L. O. (1982b). Temporal stability of the factor scructure of the organizational assessment package (LMDC-TR-82-2). Maxwell AFB, AL: leadership and Management Development Center.
- Keany, T. A. (1984). Strategic bombers and conventional weapons (National Security Affairs Monograph Series 84-4). Washington, DC: National Defense University.
- Lamb, R. L. (1985). LMDC DAP survey information file data. Unpublished raw data.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Henbeck, J. C. (1980). Statistical properties of the Air Force Organizational Assessment Package (DAP) (Rep. No. 1845-80). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air Command & Staff College.
- Peterson, R. L. (1971). Results of a survey of SAC missile combat crews. (Limited publication available from Air University Library, catalog number 01-0141115-104, Maxwell AFB, AL.)

CONTINUED ____

- Pettit, G. C. (1975). Leadership & management in the all-volunteer force (Rep. No. 5723). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air War College.
- Schneider, B. (1984). Organizational behavior (Rep. No. 84-3). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Short, L. D. (1985). The United States Air Force Organizational Assessment Package (DAP) (LMDC-TR-85-2). Maxwell AFB, AL: Leadership and Management Development Center.

SPSS[®] user's guide. (1983). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Szulc, T. (1978). The illusion of peace: Foreign policy in the Nixon years. New York: Viking.
- U.S. Bureau of Census. (1984). Statistical abstract of the United States: 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: McGraw-Hill.

enlson, 0. (1972). The Strategic Air Command's deterrent force's monale (Rep No. 4756). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air War follege. Table A-1

Appendix A

Number of Respondents by Fersonnel Category

	SAC n = 18,477 (100%)	Air Force 89,707 (100%)	
Officer	2,406 (13.0%)	10,304 (11.5%)	
Enlisted Civilian	13,279 (71.9%) 2,792 (15.1%)	57,268 (63.8%) 22,135 (24.7%)	

Table A-2

Sex by Fersonnel Category

	Sf	AC	Air I	Force	
	Male(%)	Female(%)	Male(%)	Female(%)	
	<u>n</u> = 15,510	2,903	72,495	16,889	
Officer	15.6	10.0	12.4	7.6	
Enlisted	75.6	52.4	69.5	39.9	
Civilian	10.8	37.6	18.1	52.5	

Table A-3

				SAC			Air Force		
				Dff(%)	En1(%)	Civ(Z)	Off(%)	En1(%)	C1v(%)
				n = 2,406	13,279	2,791	10,304	57,261	22,130
17	to	20	Yrs	0.0	17.8	0.8	0.0	12.9	1122
21	to	25	Yrs	11.5	40.6	5.1	12.4	37.4	6.4
26	to	30	Yrs	50.2	18.2	10.1	27.6	19.8	10.6
31	to	35	Yrs	25.7	12.1	16.9	22.9	15.1	14.0
56	te	40	Yrs	18.2	7.7	12.7	19.9	10.3	14.2
41	to	45	Yrs	8.7	2.4	11.6	11.5	3.0	12.7
46	to	50	Yrs	3.2	0.5	12.5	3.6	0.8	14.2
> :	50 1	rs		2.2	0.5	30.5	2.1	0.7	26.6

Age by Personnel Category

Ŀ

Table A-4

Time in Air Force								
		SAC		Ai	r Force			
	0ff(%)	En1(%)	Civ(%)	0ff(%)	En1(%)	Civ(%)		
	<u>n</u> = 2,402	13,240	2,347	10,287	57,120	19,765		
<1 Yr	3.7	9.5	5.2	3.2	6.5	5.1		
1-2 Yr	6.7	14.8	4.9	5.0	11.4	5.0		
2-3 Yr	8.4	13.3	5.5	7.5	12.3	5.2		
3-4 Yr	7.0	12.3	5.3	7.2	11.1	4.9		
4-8 Yr	22.7	19.6	12.4	21.5	20.7	11.8		
8-12 Yr	17.9	10.6	14.7	15.8	13.4	12.2		
> 12 Yr	33.6	19.9	52.0	39.8	24.6	55.8		

Table A-5

		SAC		A1	r Force	
	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)
	<u>n</u> = 2,376	13,181	2,694	10,245	56,956	21,580
· · · · ·	 E \	·				
6 105	3.4	6.3	1.2	3.2	4.6	5.4
to 12 Mos	8.8	9.7	7.0	7.3	7.6	7.3
2 to 18 Mos	8.6	9.8	5.6	7.7	7.9	6.0
9 to 36 Mos	22.1	21.6	12.9	21.5	20.7	13.6
36 Mos	55.1	52.6	67.3	58.3	59.2	67.7

Months in Present Career Field

and the second second

Table A-6

Months on Station

	$\frac{0ff(\chi)}{n} = 2,396$	En1(%) 13,174	Civ(%) 2,712	Dff(%) 10,275	En1(%) 57,020	Civ(%) 21,642
4 Mos 6 to 12 Mos 12 to 18 Mos 18 to 36 Mos 36 Mos	15.2 16.8 16.7 36.1 15.2	17.2 19.4 17.4 29.1 16.9	5.2 6.7 5.6 13.9 68.6	13.5 16.4 16.4 35.9 17.8	15.0 18.3 15.8 32.9 18.0	6.4 8.0 6.3 15.2 64.1

Table A-7

Months in Present Position

~						
		SAC		Ai	r Force	
	Off(%)	En1(%)	Civ(%)	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)
	<u>n</u> = 2,395	13,178	2,724	10,254	55,924	21,785
< 6 Mos	26.5	31.1	14.5	26.5	26.9	13.9
6 to 12 Mos	24.9	24.9	12.5	24.5	23.9	15.1
12 to 18 Mos	16.4	16.2	6.9	17.2	16.4	10.5
18 to 36 Mos	24.2	20.2	16.8	24.9	23.3	19.9
) 36 Mos	8.0	7.6	47.5	6.9	9.5	40.6

Marine.

۶¢

AMANANA ATTACANAN INAGANAN ATTACANA PERSONANA ANANANA ANANANAN INAGANAN INAGANAN

Sector Sector

F

h

Table A-8

Ethnic Group SAC Air Force Off(%) Enl(%) Civ(%) Off(%) Enl(%) Civ(%) <u>n</u> = 2,398 13,159 2,733 10,248 56,888 21,807 _____ Amer Indian/Alaskan0.81.32.40.71.41.2Asian/Pacific Is1.52.38.81.41.92.0Black5.814.16.35.816.810.0Hispanic2.04.13.62.55.517.6 2.0 White 87.9 74.7 74.9 87.5 70.8 66.5 2.0 Other 3.5 4.0 2.1 3.6 2.7 ----------

Table A-9

Marital Status

			SAC		Ai	r Force	
		0ff(%)	En1(%)	Civ(%)	0ff(%)	En1(%)	Civ(%)
	Ū =	2,403	13,268	2,776	10,296	57,151	22,074
Not Married		19.3	36.7	14.8	21.6	35.3	19.1
Married		79.3	60.9	80.3	76.8	62.5	74.8
Single Parent		1.4	2.4	4.9	1.6	2.2	6.1

. .

Table A-10

Spouse Employment Status: SAC

Ū	Geograph	ically 9	Separated	Geograph	ically	Together
	Off(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)	Off(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)
	= 84	604	159	1,821	7,483	2,071
Civilian Employed	63.1	59.4	60.4	30.3	34.3	54.2
Not Employed	19.1	27.3	22.0	61.6	50.5	27.8
Mulitary Member	17.8	13.3	17.6	8.1	15.2	16.0

Table A-11

Spouse Employment Status: Air Force

	Geograph	ically Separated	Geographically	Tagether
Ū	= 342	2,899 914	7,564 32,82	4 15,588
Civilian Employed Not Employed Military Member	57.9 20.2 21.9	58.4 70.7 26.2 16.8 15.4 12.5	35.2 38.7 56.0 47.3 8.8 14.0	54.3 34.8 10.9
Appendix A

Table A-12

		Educati				
		SAC		Ai	r Force	-
<u>n</u> =	0ff(%) = 2,397	En1(%) 13,216	2,735	0++(%) 10,279	En1(%) 57,070	Civ(%) 21,855
Non HS Grad	0.0	0.9	8.2	0.0	0.7	5.0
HS Grad or GED	0.1	49.3	34.2	0.2	44.2	28.2
> 2 Yrs College	1.9	13.4	19.5	1.2	16.4	18.2
Master's Degree	32.9	0.4	3.1	37.5	3.2 0.5	7.7
Doctoral Degree	. 9.1	0.1	0.4	7.8	0.1	1.1

Table A-13

SAC X) En1(X) 5 13,263 	Civ(%) 2,755 	Ai Off(%) 10,288	r Force En1(%) 57,118	Civ(%) 22,035
%) En1(%) 5 13,263 35.4	Civ(%) 2,755 	0ff(%) 10,288	En1(%) 57,118	Civ(%) 22,035
5 13,263 35.4	2,755 	10,288	57,118	22,035
	 78 t			
35.4	78 3	74 7	TA 7	70 /
	/0.0	34.2	20.7	/0.0
30.9	8.8		29.7	7.5
26.2	5.8		31.5	6.2
4.0	2.4		5.1	2.0
	0.8	26.6		1.1
	3.2	23.5		3.4
	0.7	12.4		1.4
	4.0 	4.0 2.4 0.8 3.2 0.7	4.0 2.4 0.8 26.6 3.2 23.5 0.7 12.4	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Highest Level Professional Military Education

Appendix A

Table A-14

		SAC		Ai	r Force		
	Off(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(7)	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)	
Ū	= 2,283	11,871	2,314	9,719	52,138	18,198	
None	44.7	62.2	67.3	40.5	59.8	70.1	
1 Ferson	6.9	7.6	4.4	7.3	7.6	2.7	
2 People	6.0	6.8	3.7	6.5	7.3	2.4	
3 People	9.4	6.0	3.8	7.7	5.5	2.6	
4 to 5 People	13.2	8.2	7.2	13.8	7.8	5.2	
6 to 8 Fecole	8.3	4.0	4.5	10.5	4.9	4.6	
9 or More People	11.5	5.1	9.1	13.7	7.1	12.4	

Number People Directly Supervised

Table A-15

Number of People for Whom Respondent Writes OER/AFR/Appraisal

		SAC		Ai	r Force	
	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)
<u>n</u> =	2,402	13,256	2,779	10,271	57,057	22,071
None	54.2	69.4	79.1	50.9	65.9	78.8
1 Ferson	9.0	8.2	3.4	9.3	8.7	1.9
2 Feople	7.0	6.6	3.0	7.0	8.1	1.8
3 People	8.5	5.5	3.2	6.8	5.7	1.9
4 to 5 Feople	10.7	7.3	5.2	11.4	6.9	3.7
6 to 8 People	7.3	2.2	2.5	8.7	2.5	3.2
9 or More People	2.3	0.8	3.6	5.9	2.2	8.7

Appendix A

A STORE

Table A-16

	Supervi	isor Wri	ites Resp	ondent's	OER/APR/A	opraisal	
	<u>n</u> =	Off(%) 2,371	SAC En1(%) 13,062	Civ(%) 2,682	Ai: Off(%) 10,150	Force Enl(%) 56,451	Civ(%) 21,379
Yes No Nat Sure		79.0 12.0 9.0	74.2 14.4 11.4	83.9 8.1 8.0	77.1 14.9 8.0	69.4 19.7 10.9	77.0 9.8 13.2
			Table Work S	A-17 chedule			
	<u>n</u> =	Off(%) 2,378	SAC Enl(%) 13,143	Civ(%) 2,715	Ai Off(%) 10,203	r Force Enl(%) 56,703	Civ(%) 21,650
Day Shift Swing Shift Mid Shift Rotating Shi Irregular Sci Erec IDY/On-	fts hedule	51.9 0.3 0.0 4.7 11.9	63.2 4.8 2.7 15.4 10.8	87.8 2.1 0.6 4.9 3.0	61.1 0.2 0.0 4.7 12.6	59.3 8.0 3.1 13.1 12.5 2.8	88.0 3.3 0.8 4.4 2.2

66

.

`...

Table A-18

Supervisor Holds Group Meetings

		SAC			r Force	
	Off(%)	En1(7.)	Civ(%)	Off(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)
	<u>n</u> = 2,369	13,063	2,736	10,188	56,339	21,790
Never	7.7	18.4	13.2	6.3	16.0	9.6
Occasionally	24.9	32.7	29.9	22.5	34.0	35.2
Monthly	15.5	7.7	7.2	13.3	9.0	20.0
Weekly	36.8	28.1	40.8	43.6	27.2	29.3
Daily	10.7	10.7	7.0	12.5	11.6	4.1
Continuously	3.4	2.4	1.9	1.8	2.2	1.8

Table A-19

	Supervisor	Holds Group	Meetings	to Solve	Problems	
	0f	SAC f(%) Enl(%)	Civ(%)	Ai Off(%)	ir Force Enl(%)	Civ(%)
	<u>n</u> = 2,	359 12,999	2,712	10,128	55,961	21,474
Never Occasionally	15 42	.2 26.5	22.6 42.1	15.4 42.5	24.7 39.8	24.4 45.1
Half the Tim Always	e 20 21	.5 15.7 .9 18.2	15.2 20.1	22.3 19.8	16.9 18.6	15.4 15.1

Accendix A

22

Table A-20

		SA	С	Air F	orce
		Off(%)	En1(%)	0ff(%)	Enl(%)
	<u>n</u> =	2,402	13,207	10,137	56,048
Nonrated, Not on Aircrew		53.5	91.0	62.7	90.5
Nonrated, on Aircrew		0.5	2.1	2.8	2.0
Rated, in Crew/Operations J	Job	32.9	1.2	25.5	1.7
Rated, in Support Job		11.0	5.7	9.0	5.8

Aeronautical Rating and Current Status

Table A-21

٠

Career Intent

		SAC		Ai	r Force	
	0ff(%)	Enl(%)	Civ(%)	0ff(%)	En1(%)	Civ(%)
Ū =	2,395	13,192	2,267	10,243	56,955	19,152
Retire in 12 Mos	2.6	3.1	8.9	3.6	3.1	5.9
Career	47.6	30.5	46.9	51.8	35.9	52.0
Most Likely Career	23.8	17.5	24.6	22.2	19.1	23.3
Maybe Career	16.0	21.5	13.5	14.9	20.4	12.5
Frob No Career	6.4	16.3	3.2	4.7	13.0	3.5
Separate	3.6	11.1	2.9	2.8	8.5	2.8

Appendix B

Table B-i

Comparison of DAP Factor Scores Between SAC and Other Officers

T . b 1 . c . c			
ladie B-1			
moarison of OAP F tween SAC and Oth	actor Sco er Office	res	
THE WORK IT	SELF		
er) Mean	<u>s d</u>	<u>d f</u>	<u>t</u>
(V810)		3519	4.63***
4.80	.94		
4.70	.99		
(812)		12250	.98
5.36	.93		
5.34	.96		
		7740	15 50
		5509	-12.58***
4.23	1.45		
4.63	1.32		
		12507	
4 57	1 74	000	
4.30 A 74	1.34		
4.20	1.20		
/ Tasks (V816)		12135	3.43**
2.54	1.05		
2.46	1.05		
(823)		2986	3.33++
4.73	1.42		
4.66	1.49		
freedom are give ed.	n when <u>t</u> .	-test for g	roups with
*** <u>p</u> €.001			
	tween SAC and Oth THE WORK IT er) Mean V810) 4.80 4.70 812) 5.36 5.34 4.23 4.63 4.23 4.63 4.53 4.63 4.53 4.63 4.53 4.65 4.53 4.65 4.66 4.66 4.66 4.66 4.66 4.66 4.65 4.66 4.65 4.66 4.65 4.66 4.65 4.66 4.65 4.66 4.65 4.75	tween SAC and Other Office THE WORK ITSELF er) Mean <u>SD</u> V810) 4.80 .94 4.70 .99 812) 5.36 .93 5.34 .96 4.23 1.43 4.63 1.32 4.53 1.34 4.63 1.32 4.53 1.34 4.26 1.36 Tasks (V816) 2.54 1.05 2.46 1.05 2.46 1.05 2.46 1.49 4.66 1.49	tween SAC and Other Officers THE WORK ITSELF er) Mean <u>SD</u> <u>df</u> V010) <u>3519</u> 4.80 .94 4.70 .99 812) 12290 5.36 .93 5.34 .96 3309 4.23 1.43 4.63 1.32 12503 4.53 1.34 4.26 1.36 Tasks (V016) 12135 2.54 1.05 2.46 1.05 2.84 1.05 2.986 4.73 1.42 4.66 1.49 2986 4.73 1.42 4.66 1.49

Appendix B

Table B-1 (continued)

	JCB ENRICHM	ENT		
CAP Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	SD	df≁	t
				-
Skill Variety (V800)			12586	-2.82**
SAC Officers	5.37	1.26		
Other Officers	5.45	1.29		
Task Identity (VB01)			12551	3.03**
SAC Officers	5,29	1.20		
Other Officers	5.20	1.22		
other officers	0120			
Task Significance (V802)			12605	2.21*
SAC Officers	5.84	1.23		
Other Officers	5.78	1.25		
Job Feedback (V804)			12570	-0.36
SAC Officers	4.88	1.18		
Other Officers	4.89	1.18		
Need for Enrichment (VB06)			3282	-2.36#
SAC Officers	6.05	0.91		
Other Officers	6.10	0.85		
Job Motivation Index (V807)			11490	-6.71+++
SAC Officers	117.47	65.78		
Other Officers	128.29	67.42		

a

Approximate degrees of freedom are given when \underline{t} -test for groups with unequal variance is used.

*p..05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Table B-1 (continued)

W	CRK GROUP F	PROCESS		
GAF Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	<u>50</u>	<u>äf</u> -	<u>t</u>
Work Support (V805)			12120	-4.86***
SAC Officers Other Officers	4.45 4.58	1.08		
Management and Supervision (V	818)	1 70	11862	3.18**
Other Officers	5.39	1.32		
Supervisory Communications Cl	imate (V819 4.94	7) 1,40	1:606	3.02**
Other Officers	4.84	1.42		
Organizational Communications SAC Officers	Climate (\ 4.92	V820) 1,23	11719	1.33
Other Officers	4.88	1,27		
w	ORK GROUP (DUTPUT		
Pride (VR11)			3444	0.90
SAC Officers Other Officers	5.50 5.47	1.35 1.40		
Advancement/Recognition (V817)		12306	-1.64
Other Officers	4.54	1.18		
Ferceived Productivity (V821)	5,89	1.07	3585	6.24***
Other Officers	5.74	1.09		
Job Relateo Satisfaction (V82 SAC Officers	2) 5.26	1.13	3134	-4.51***
Other Officers	5.39	1.08		
General Organizational Climat SAC Officers	e (V824) 5.22	1.21	3329	0.78
Other Officers	5.20	1.26		

Appendix B

Table B-2

Comparison of DAP Factor Scores Between SAC and Other Enlisted

	HE WORK IT	SELF		
OAP Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>df</u> *	ţ
Job Performance Goals (V810)			67874	-2.64**
SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted	4.72 4.74	.97 .98		
Task Characteristics (V812)	4 82	1 04	17884	-15.43***
Other Enlisted	5.06	.99		
Task Autonomy (V813) SAC Enlisted	3.66	1 45	18533	-15.52***
Other Enlisted	3.88	1.41		
Work Repetition (V814)			69361	9.65***
SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted	5.24 5.11	1.37		
Desired Repetitive/Easy Tasks	(V816)		18909	5.72***
SAC Enlisted	3.29	1.44		
Other Enlisted	3.20	1.41		
Job Related Training (V823)			66372	-0.95
SAU Enlisted Other Enlisted	4.46	1.58		

a

Approximate degrees of freedom are given when \underline{t} -test for groups with unequal variance is used.

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Appendix B

Table 8-2 (continued)

	JOB ENRICH	1ENT		
CAP Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	SD	<u>d f</u> •	t
Skill Variety (V800)			18747	-13.63***
SAC Enlisted	4.44	1.52		
Other Enlisted	4.63	1.44		
Task Identity (V801)			18671	-10.78***
SAC Enlisted	4.94	1.32		
Other Enlisted	5.08	1.23		
Task Significance (V802)			19022	-5.04***
SAC Enlisted	5.65	1.36		
Other Officers	5.71	1.30		
Job Feedback (804)			19104	-12.45***
SAC Enlisted	4.63	1.33		
Other Enlisted	4.79	1.28		
Need for Enrichment (V806)			18366	-6.61***
SAC Enlisted	5.41	1.28		
Other Enlisted	5.49	1.23		
Job Motivation Index (V807)			17664	-14.83***
SAC Enlisted	92.81	61.16		
Other Enlisted	102.19	63.19		

a

in induced

Approximate degrees of freedom are given when \underline{t} -test for groups with unequal variance is used.

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

	Tabl	e B-2	(conti	nued)
--	------	-------	--------	-------

W(DRK GROUP P	ROCESS		
DAP Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	SD	df-	t
Wart Support (VR05)			 47914	
SAC Enlisted	4,47	1.11	6/616	- 6 .
Other Enlisted	4.55	1.12		
Management and Supervision (V)	318)		18036	-1.
SAC Enlisted	4.88	1.60	10000	•••
Other Enlisted	4.90	1.57		
Supervisory Communications C1:	imate (V819	•)	66055	-1.
SAC Enlisted	4.47	1.65		
utner Enlisted	4.32	1.65		
Organizational Communications	Climate (V	820)	17724	-4.
SAC Enlisted	4.32	1.34		
Other Enlisted	4.39	1.31		
iii	ORK GROUP C	UTPUT		
FFICE (VGLL) SOF Folietad	A 75	1 71	18/03	-11.
Other Enlisted	4.94	1.65		
				_
Advancement/Recognition (V817)		66691	-2.
SAC Enlisted	4.24	1.20		
uther chiisted	4.21	1.20		
Perceived Productivity (VB21)			18361	-2.
SAC Enlisted	5.44	1.27		
Other Enlisted	5.47	1.24		
Job Related Satisfaction (V82	2)		16369	-10.
SAC Enlisted	4.84	1.26		
Other Enlisted	4.98	1.21		
General Organizational Climat	e (V824)		17367	-10.
-		1 42		
SAC Enlisted	4.28	1.74		
	OAP Factor (Factor Number) Work Support (V805) SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted Management and Supervision (Vi SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted Supervisory Communications C1 SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted Other Enlisted Other Enlisted Other Enlisted Pride (V811) SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted Advancement/Recognition (V817 SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted Perceived Productivity (V821) SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted Dther Enlisted Job Related Satisfaction (V62 SAC Enlisted Other Enlisted	OAP Factor (Factor Number)MeanWork Support (V805) SAC Enlisted4.47 Other EnlistedWanagement and Supervision (V816) SAC Enlisted4.88 4.90Supervisory Communications Climate (V815) SAC Enlisted4.47 4.90Supervisory Communications Climate (V815) SAC Enlisted4.32 4.32Urganizational Communications Climate (V SAC Enlisted4.32 4.32Other Enlisted4.32 4.34Other Enlisted4.75 4.34Other Enlisted4.75 4.24 0ther EnlistedPerceived Productivity (V821) SAC Enlisted5.44 5.47Job Related Satisfaction (V622) SAC Enlisted5.47Job Related Satisfaction (V622) SAC Enlisted4.64 4.98	OAP Factor (Factor Number)MeanSDWork Support (V805)SAC Enlisted4.471.11Other Enlisted4.551.12Management and Supervision (V816)SAC Enlisted4.881.60Other Enlisted4.901.57Supervisory Communications Climate (V819)SAC Enlisted4.471.65Other Enlisted4.521.63Urganizational Communications Climate (V820)SAC Enlisted4.321.34Other Enlisted4.321.34Other Enlisted4.371.31WORK GROUP OUTPUTPride (V811)SAC Enlisted4.751.71Other Enlisted4.751.71Other Enlisted4.241.20Other Enlisted4.271.20Perceived Productivity (V821)SAC Enlisted5.44SAC Enlisted5.441.27Other Enlisted5.471.24Job Related Satisfaction (V822)SAC Enlisted4.98SAC Enlisted4.981.21	OAP Factor (Factor Number) Mean SD df- Work Support (V805) 67816 67816 SAC Enlisted 4.47 1.11 Other Enlisted 4.55 1.12 Management and Supervision (V816) 18036 SAC Enlisted 4.88 1.60 Other Enlisted 4.97 1.57 Supervisory Communications Climate (V819) 66055 SAC Enlisted 4.47 1.63 Other Enlisted 4.52 1.63 Urganizational Communications Climate (V820) 17724 SAC Enlisted 4.37 1.31

Table B-3

Factor Number nce Goals (lians vilians eristics (V lians vilians vilians vilians vilians vilians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V810) (V812)) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	Mean 4.92 4.84 5.38 5.30 4.66 4.57 4.87	SD 1.01 1.00 .89 .96 1.30 1.36	<u>df</u> 23716 3399 3452	<u>t</u> 3.51* 4.46* 5.09*
nce Goals (lians vilians eristics (V lians vilians y (V813) lians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V810) (V812)) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.92 4.84 5.38 5.30 4.66 4.57 4.87	1.01 1.00 .87 .76 1.30 1.36	23716 3399 3452	3.51* 4.46* 5.04*
lians vilians eristics (V lians vilians y (V813) lians vilians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V812))) (V823) of freedom sed.	4.92 4.84 5.38 5.30 4.66 4.57 4.87	1.01 1.00 .87 .76 1.30 1.36	3399 3452	4.46×
vilians eristics (V lians vilians y (V813) lians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V812)) (V823) of freedom sed.	4.84 5.38 5.30 4.66 4.57 4.87	1.00 .89 .96 1.30	3399 3452	4.46* 5.09*
eristics (V lians vilians y (V813) lians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V812)) (V823) of freedom sed.	5.38 5.30 4.66 4.57 4.87	.87 .76 1.30 1.36	3399 3452	4.46
eristics (v lians vilians y (V813) lians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V823) (V823) of freedom sed.	5.38 5.30 4.66 4.57 4.87	.87 .76 1.30 1.36	3452	2,044
vilians vilians vilians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.66 4.57 4.87	.96 1.30 1.36	3452	2.094
<pre>villans y (V813) lians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians</pre>) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.66 4.57 4.87	1.30 1.36	3452	2,094
y (V813) lians vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.66 4.57 4.87	1.30 1.36	3452	5.094
<pre>ion (V814) lians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians</pre>) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.66 4.57 4.87	1.30 1.36	UIGE	
vilians ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.57	1.36		
ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.87			
ion (V814) lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians) sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.87			
lians vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.87		3526	8.83*
vilians titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.		1.37		
titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians degrees of ance is use	sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.	4.62	1.44		
titive/Easy lians vilians Training (V lians vilians degrees of ance is use	sy Tasks ((V823) of freedom sed.				
lians vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V823) of freedom sed.	V816)	- 77	3314	10.28
vilians Training (V lians vilians 	(V823) of freedom sed.	2.26	1.44		
Training (V lians vilians degrees of ance is use	(V823) of freedom sed.	3.05	1.39		
degrees of ance is use	of freedom			22177	1 0 4 4
vilians degrees of ance is use	of freedom sed.	4 60	1 48	221/3	4.041
degrees of ance is use	of freedom sed.	4.46	1 67		
degrees of ance is use	of freedom sed.	4.40	1.07		
		are give	n when <u>t</u> -	test for gr	oups with
* <u>p</u> <.01.	***⊵ <.0	01			
* ϱ<.	01.	prees of freedom e is used. 01. ***⊵<.0	prees of freedom are give e is used. 01. ##* <u>p</u> <.001	prees of freedom are given when <u>t</u> - e is used. .01. *** <u>p</u> <.001	prees of freedom are given when <u>t</u> -test for gr e is used. .01. +**⊵<.001

Appendix B

CAN AND

ROG

STATE AND ADDRESS

Table B-3 (continued)

J	IOB ENRICHM	1ENT		
GAP Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	<u>sd</u>	<u>df</u> *	<u>t</u>
Skill Variety (VB00)			3531	1.98*
SAC Civilians	5,12	1.29		
Other Civilians	5.07	1.38		
Task Identity (VB01)			3540	3.36**
SAC Civilians	5.40	1.11		
Other Civilians	5.32	1.18		
Task Significance (V802)			3550	5.07***
SAC Civilians	5.82	1.18		
Other Civilians	5.70	1.27		
Job Fæedback (V804)			3222	3.15**
SAC Civilians	5.12	1.21		
Other Civilians	5.04	1.28		
Need for Enrichment (V806)			23646	-3.30##
SAC Civilians	5.63	1.19		
Other Civilians	5.71	1.18		
Job Motivation Index (VB07)			21899	2.87**
SAC Civilians	135.02	69.46		
Other Civilians	130.68	70.40		

a.

Approximate degrees of freedom are given when \underline{t} -test for groups with unequal variance is used.

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

and the second second and the second seco

WO	RK GROUP F	ROCESS		
GAP Factor (Factor Number)	Mean	SD	<u>df</u> *	<u>t</u>
Work Support (V805)	A 41	1 10	23683	-2.69**
Other Civilians	4.01	1.10		
Ucher CIVITIENS	4.07	1.1.1		
Management and Supervision (V8	18)		3155	2.59*
SAC Civilians	5.06	1.68		
Other Civilians	4.97	1.63		
Supervisory Communications Cli	mate (V819	•)	22956	3.72***
SAC Civilians	4.69	1.73		
Other Civilians	4.56	1.70		
Arnanizational Communications	Climate (V	820)	22577	5 87444
SAC Civilians	4.77	1.40	22377	3.03
Other Civilians	4.59	1.41		
wu	JKK GRUUP U	UIPUI		
Pride (V811)			3574	4.93***
SAC CIVILIANS	5.54	1.36		
other civilians	3.40	1+40		
Advancement/Recognition (V817)			3144	3.71***
SAC Civilians	3.89	1.39		
Other Civilians	3.78	1.34		
Perceived Productivity (V821)			3273	3.26**
SAC Civilians	5.71	1.22		
Other Civilians	5.63	1.26		
Job Related Satisfaction (V87)	2)		22169	5.05***
SAC Civilians	5.53	1.06	2210.	
Other Civilians	5.41	1.09		
General Organizational Climate	e (V824)		22502	6.88***
SAC Civilians	4.97	1.38		
Uther Civilians	4.76	1.39		

Table B-3 (continued)

-

-

-

services and the second teachers and the second second second second second second second second second second

.

Appendix B

i. k



ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT PACKAGE SURVEY

FACTORS

AND

VARIABLES

JANUARY 1986

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT CENTER AIR UNIVERSITY Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112-5712

FACTORS AND VARIABLES OF THE ANTIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT PACKAGE		
FACTORS AND VARIABLES OF AMILZATIONAL ASSESSMENT PL	THE	NCKAGE
FACTORS AND VARIABLES	8	2
FACTORS AND	VARIABLES	ASSESSMENT
- ¥	FACTORS AND	REAN12AT LOKAL

conduct research on Air Force systemic issues using information in the OMP database. (b) provide leedership and management treining, and (c) provide management consultation service to Air Force communders upon request. Force Numman Resources Laboratory and the Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) end is used to eid LMDC in its missions to: (a) The DAP is a 109-item survey questionnaire designed jointly by the Air

Allowchle responses to the attitudinal items on the survey range from 1 (low) to 7 (high). The attitudinel items are grouped into 25 fectors that address such areas as the job itself, management and supervision, address that communication, and performance in the organization. Each data record communication? A trunnelly coded descriptors and 24 demographic items as well as the responses to the 91 attitudinel items.

The fectors measured by the GAP are grouped into e systems model to essess three aspects of a work group: input, process, and output (edapted from McGrath's model).

5 Input. In LMDC's edaptation of the model, input is comprised demographics, work itself, end job enrichment. Bemographics. Descriptive or background information about the respondents to the OMP survey.

8. Work [tself. The work fiself has to do with the task properties (technologies) and environmentel conditions of the job. It essenses the petterns of datacturistics members bring to the proper or organization, and petterns of differentiation and integration among position and rules. The following DAP factors mesure the work itself.

- 006 Job Desires (Heed For Enrichment) 810 Job Performance Gaals 812 Task Characteristics 813 Tesk Autonomy 814 Jook Repetition 816 Desired Repetitive Easy Tesks 823 Job Releted Training

- Desired Repetitive Easy Tesks Job Releted Training Job Influences (not a statistice) factor)

C. Job Enrichment. Messures the degree to which the job itself is Interesting, meaningful, challenging, and responsible. The following OMP factors measure job enrichment:

- 80C Skill Variety 801 Task Identity 802 Task Significance 806 Jub Feedback 806 Need for Enrichment Index (Job Desires) 807 Jub Motivation Index

- 808 OJI Tetal Score 809 Job Motivetion Index Additive 825 Motivetion Potential Score

Mork Group Process. The work group assesses the pattern of activity and interaction among the group members. The following GAP fectors measures leadership and the work group process:

- 805 Performance Berriers/Blockeges (Work Support) 818 Menayement and Supervision 819 Supervisory Communications Climate 820 Orgenizational Communications Climate Work Interferences (mot a statistical factor) Supervisory Assistance (mot a statistical factor)

Mork Group Output. Measures task performance, group development, end effects on group members. Assesses the quantity end quelity of task performance and alteration of the group's reletion to the environment. Assesses changes in positions and role patterns, end in the development of norms. Assesses changes on skills end ettitudes, end effects on edjustment. The 'allowing OAP factors measure the work group output:

- 21.1 Pride B17 Advancement/Racognition B21 Nork Louge Effectiveness (Perceived Productivity) B22 Uon Related Satisfection B22 General Organizational Citmate

EXTERNALLY CODED DESCRIFTORS

Batch Number

Jullen Dete of Survey

Major Command

Bese Code

Consultetion Method

Consultant Code

Survey Version

These items are concatenated to each data record during EUP processing.) (Note:

...

Statement	Totel months in present career field:	1. Lass then 1 month Z. More than 1 month, less then 6 months	 More then b months, less than 12 months A More then 12 months, less than 18 months Kore than 18 months, less than 24 months 	 More then 24 months, less than 36 months More than 36 months 	fotel months et this station:	 Less than 1 month Bore than 1 month, less than 6 months Mone than 6 months, less than 12 months 	4. Nore than 12 months, less than 18 months 5. Nore than 18 months, less than 24 months	. The then 36 months, it's then so wonths	Tatal months in present position:	 Less than I month Nore then I month, less then 6 months More than 6 months, less than 12 months 	 More Duan 12 months, less than 18 months More than 24 months, less then 24 months More than 24 months, less than 16 months More than 34 months 	Your Ethnic Group is:	1. American Indian or Alesten Netive 2. Asian or Pecific Islander	 Bleck, mot of Mispenic Origin Mispanic Of Mispenic Origin Whith pot of Mispenic Origin 	6. Other	Which of the following "best" describes your maritel status?	0. Not married.	 Narried: Spouse is a civilian employed outside home.
Statement Number	2				ſ				•			•				11		
Yariable Number	ŝ				30				8			100				800		
WHIC (TENS (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR)		nt Statement	Separat ser's Code	bort Gross Cade	ž	Tear age 1s	few are (efficer, enlisted, 65, etc.)	teur pay pride 1s		31 X Dag	me are an the respectul sheet.)	(bet ned)	(Just used)	fetal years in the Air Force:	1. Less then 1 year	 Merry then 1 year, less theme 2 years Merry them 2 years, less than 3 years 	4. Nore than 3 years, less than 4 years	s. Pero Dan 4 years, less Dan 8 years 6. Nore Dan 8 years
DEPOSA				•		¢	•	•		•	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	•		-				
					•		•		•			ē	200	100				

Mot married.
 Mutried: Spouse is civilien employed Mutried: Spouse is civilien employed Mutried: Spouse is civilian sealoyed Mutried: Spouse mot employed outside Mutried: Spouse mot employed outside Mutried: Spouse mot employed outside Mutried: Spouse is a military member. Mutried: Spouse is a military member. Mutried: Spouse is a military member.

	S ta tement	Your work requires you to work primarily: 1. Alone 2. With one ar boo people 3. As a small work group (3-5 people) 4. As a large work group (6 or more people) 5. Other	Mhat is your usual work schedwie? 1. Dey shift, mormally stable hours 2. Swing shift (about 1600-2400)	 Mid shift (about 2400-0600) Roteling shift schewis Roteling shift work with frreguler/un- stoole hours Frequent TDT/trevel or frequently on- call to report to work Crev schewig 	Now often does your supervisor hold group meetings?	 Never 4. Meetly Occasionally 5. Deily Nonthly 6. Continuously Now often are group meetings used to polve problems and exhilis analysis 	I. Hever J. About helf the time 2. Occessionally 4. All of the time What is your eeroneuticel rating and current status?	 Monrated, mot on eitcrew Monrated, mot on eitcrew Monrated, mot on eitcrew Rated, in support job Rated, in support job 	v
	Statement Number	=	12		1	-	51		
	Yerieble Number	94	\$10		016	(10	010		
Statement	Tour highest education level obtained is:	 Mon-high school gradwate Nigh school gradwate Less Dan "we years cellege Twe years or more cellege Twe years or more cellege Matters Degree Matters Degree 	Mighest level of professional military aducation (residence er correspondence); 0. None er mot applicable	1. MCD Orfentation Course er USAF Supervi- sor Course (MCD Phase 1 or 2) 2. MCD Kradeey (MCD Phase 3) 3. MCD Kradeey (MCD Phase 4) 5. Senior MCD Kradeey (MCD Phase 5) 5. Senior MCD Kradeey (MCD Phase 5) 5. Senior MCD Kradeey (MCD Phase 5) 5. Introvellate Service School (1.e., JCSC, JCSC, JCSC)	7. Senier Service School (1.e., AUC, ICAF, MUC)	Nov many presite do you directly supervise? 1. Kune 5. 4 to 5 2. 1 6. 4 to 8 3. 2 7. 9 or more 4.]	for how many people do you write performinge reports? 1. Mone 5. 4 to 5 2. 1 5. 6 to 8 2. 7. 9 er more	Dees your lupervisor actually write your perfermance report? 1. Tes 2. Mo 3. Mot sure	~
Statement Number	•		•			•	•	2	
Yariable Rumber	68		010		110		210	(10	

FACTORS	sisti of two or more variables which cerrespond to a soure can be derived for each fector except 805, g a "streight everege." The formula for computing	Messures the degree to which e job requires a activities in cerrying out the work; involves the skills and talents of the worker; skills required	Staltement	To what extent does yeer Job ruquire you to do many different things, using a variety ef your taients and shifist	To what extent does your joo require you to use a number of complex skifis?	kesures the degree to which the job requires ientlifieble piece of work from beginning to end.	Statement.	To what extent does your job involve doing a whole task or muit of work?	To what extent does your job provide you with a chance to finish completely the piece of work you have begun?
	series factor com n the OV. A mean 9 and 825 by usin	Scill variation. Scill variation ifferent tests or or of different : the worker.	Statement Rumber	1	£	IASK IDENTITY: H e "Male" and Id	Statement Rember	=	R
	Each 800 : statements fr 807 - 808 , 807	FACTOR BOO - vertery ef al use of a number ere valued by	Yariable Number	ĨQ	212	FACTOR BOI - completion of	Yarlable Humber	202 ,	112
ement Statement	16 Maich of the following best describes your censer an employment latentions? 1. Planning to retire in the mer 12 months 2. Vitanning to retire in the force as 12	 all continue injuit to be all force as a career in the continue injuit to be all force in a life of the all force is a career All continue injuit the be all force is a career 	6. Vill separate/terminate from Je Air Force as soon as possible Statement [] ims added to the Out on 19 Jan 80 and resisced	pears on page 6. Although ne fonger exed, Yerlaile Di4 fs als collected from about 25,000 samples for this variable base.					
Statem	16		tar(ab)e 000. Sta	a Dia wich appr ban braux & L					
Tariable mor	£10		- 310						

•

.

~

i.

83

. . .

 Statement Statement	INUEX (JOB DESIRES): Hes to do wit personal grewth, ose of skills, o		Statement	the characteristics	deservations to have independence in	ay work.	A job that is meaningful.	The opportunity for personal growth in my job.	Opportunities is my work to use my skil	Oppertunities to perform e variety of t	: A composite index defived from the six overell "motivating potentiel" of a job; high <u>internal</u> work motivetion an the par	ding factors:	sence Burrfers/blockeges /	•00•119-	sesses one's perception of motivation pro s e varietion of e scele employed by othe	sies in the following formula:	211+4272 24210
 Automatic the description of the jac. Statematic Statematic	- NEEU FOR EXHICHER I Aracteristics (autonomy Anal		Statement Kumber	. I vould like to have	5		25	3	54	55	- JOB MULITATION INCE SLICE UNL TETTECE UN Which e job will prompt ents.	omouted using the foilo 800 Skill variet 801 Task idantit	805 Farformance 805 Farformance 813 Task eutonom	(800+801+802+802) /4)	- OUT TOTAL SCORE: AS	amputed using the veria	4+[1/24+E024+2024+1024]
Autorial the espire to mich the job has a <u>Statement</u> Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement Statement	related Ch		Tariable Humber	(In my Job	249		250	152	252	8	Cherectari Cherectari Jeb encumb	Index is c		formule	FACTOR BOB	Score is o	Formule
	- 1						t			₹ 5							
	it impost on the lives or work of others; the importance of the J	Statement Statement	19 Te what artent is your job riguilitan	use it streets subers in same laporten May?	27 To what attent does doing your job well affect a lot of people?	(MOT USED)	· Joh Ffffhitten Massural Die Anno in Alifa Correlia int the m	required by The Jac results in the worker absolution of the data data and data a about Jac automates or information on panel and poor parionance.	Statement Statement	22 To what activit are you able to determine I well you are deling your jub villout foodbit from enyone else?	26 To what extent dur: your jab provide the chance to know for yourself when you do e good job, and to be responsible for your own wark?	- VOK SPPOIL: Nesure: Die zigne te wich wert performance is <u>y böditional G</u> ullas, deta'is, instequete tools, equipment, er wort	Statement Statement	2] To what arent do additional doting later- fars with the performance of picer primary jeb?	24 In white extent de you have oderiuite bools and equipment to accompilish your jub?	25 To what estant is the amount of work space provided adequate?	(8 - 208 - 201 - 208)/3

A. Barristania

F

9

84

FACIOR RC9 - JOB MOTIVATION INOCI ----- ADDITIVE: This factor is a muriation of a Keile employee by ether job extinction theorists.

index is computed using the following factors:

Skill veriety	fesh identity	lest significance	and an and an and and
8	100	208	A16

test significance	Performance berriers Alectages	fact autonomy
		_

eus Perfermance Beriers/ 813 Test eutonomy 804 Jant repetition

formula ((800-801-802-805)/4)-813-808

FACTOR BIO - JOB PERFORMANCE SCALS: Measures be estant to which Job performance goals are clear, specific, resilitic, understandable, and challenging.

Statement	te what estant do you know esactly whet fi espected of you in perferming your jebt	Te what extent era your job perfermance poels difficult to accomplish?	le whet extent are your job perfermance poels cleer?	To what estant are your jeb parfermance poels specific?	Te what artent ere your job perfermance poels reclistic?
Statement Rumber	x	35	×	16	×
tarlesie Numer	217	218	675	274	121

FACTOR 811 - PRIDE: Measures the pride in one's work.

Statement	Te what extent are you proved of your job?	le whet extent does your work give you a feeling of prida?
Statement Humber	R	3
Tariable Rumber	\$15	275

=

FACTOR B12 - TACK CMURACTERISTICS: A combinetion of skill veriety, task Tdentity. Last ignificence, and jub feedbeck designed to meesure severel espects ef one's job.

fertabla	Statement	
	ruber -	STR Temers
10	17	To whet extent does your job require yow to do many different things, using a veriety of your talents and skills?
202	=	To will estend does your Job Involve doing a whole task or unit of work?
10	61	To whet extent is your job significent, in thet it effects others in some important way?
272	22	To what extent ere you able to determine how well you ere defing your job without feedback from anyone eise?
508	\$2	To what extent does your job provide the charce to know for yourself when you do a good job, and to be responsible for your own world
017	22	To whet extent does woing your job well effect e lot of people?
211	82	To whet extent does your job provide you with e chemce to finish completely the piece of work you have begun?
212	£	le what extent does your job require you te use a number of complex skills?
FACTOR 813 - TASK Freedom to do Dia Mating, end meens	<pre>c AUTOHOM1: Meesu z vork as one sees for eccomplishin</pre>	res the degree to which the job provides fit; discretion in scheduling, decision g e job.
ferleble	Statement	

Statement	To whet extent does your job provide e greet deel of freedom end independence in scheduiling your work?	To what extent does your job provide e greet deel of freedom and independence in selecting your own procedures to accompilish it?	To what attent does your job give you freedom to do your work as you see fif?	To whet estent ere you alfowed to make the major decisions required to perform your job well?
Statement Number	8	z	2	IC
fer lebie fumber	570	1/2	C12	•

2

8)

FACTOR 314 - VORG REPETITION: Messures the estant to which one performes the same Lates or Taxis the same type of problems in his or her job on a regular basis.

Statement	To what extant do you perform the same tasks repeatedly within a thort period of time?	In what extent are you faced with the seme type of predime on A weakly besist
Statement Number	£	9
Tertable Member	928	22,

FACTOR BIS (MOT USED)

FACTON 815 - OCSIRED ALPETITINE EAST TASKS: Neesenes the extent to which eee desires his of Ner Job Tempine repetitive Lasts er tasks that ere easy to accomplish.

tent.	in which tasks are repetitive.	in which tasks are relatively easy t
Statement Bumber States	15 V 25	S/ A Job accomp
Terisble Pumber	255	F2

FACTOR - JOB THELUTINCES (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR):

8

Sta temps t	To hit ertent de you feel accountable to you supervisor in accompiliahisg your job?	To what extend the co-workers to your work group mulaitain high standards of performance?	
	1	27	
Pumber	215	942	

FACION BIJ - ADVANCENERI/RECOGNITION: Messures and's averanges of advancement and recognition, and feetings at being prepared (i.e., learning new stills for premacion).

S La Lament	To whit extent are you owere at promotion/od- vencement opportuniting that affect you?	To what estimat do you have the opportunity to propress up your carear ladder?
Statement	1	:
Tsrisble Number	1(2	472

To what attent are you being propered to accept increased responsibility?	To what extent do people who perform well receive recognition?	To what extent to you have the opportunity to learn skills which will improve your promo- tion potential?
4	51	47
240	141	276

FACTOR BIS - MUMAGHENT and SUPERVISION (A): Measures the degree to which the worker has high performance standsrds and good work procedures. Measures support

Id. end C 18.15.44 58 59 61 61 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 64 63 64 63 64 63 64 63 64 65 64 65 65 65 65 65 66 66 66 66 66 66 76 76 76 76 76 76 76	a overell quality of supervision.	Statement	thy supervisor is a good planaer.	My supervisor sets high performance standards.	My supervisor encourages taxmark.	My supervisor represents the group et eil times.	My supervisor establishes good work procedents.	My supervisor has made his responsibilities cleer to the group.	by supervisor fully expleins procedures to each group member.	Ny supervisor performs well under pressure.	VISION IN): (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR)	
	nd. and the o	ts travent	5	59	3	•	3	8	54	65	ISTATERALS	is tement
	pine pus	Tarfable Number	5	501	010	11	211		51		ACTOR -	Isriable

Statement	My supervisor teles time to help an when meded.	My supervisor lets as know when I am doing a poor job.	When [need technical advice, [usually go to my supervisor.
Statement Number	3	И	52
Tariable Number	\$ 2 \$	134	439

:

シュー 二日 しょう シック シーク

e

~	• 51	Į	
- S	135	ĨN.	
2 69 7	115	10248	
10 geð	. 8 91	1	
	12.00	OV CINE	
2001	111 80	I lapr	
11E:	A 1.00	IL CAL	
s cub	de' P	2 5	÷
AT 10H	005 5	JAVAN	June 7
344.0K1	Ser e	Har I	CLN.
CET 50	1 1 1 1	. t	vodn p
ERVIS	11465	-lres	-
- 50	Derce		5
610 0	OFET	1128	
FACTO	The -	00	5

Variable Number	Statement Rumber	S ta tempert
126	61	Ny supervisor siss members for Uve r ideas a Usik improvements.
828	3	My supervisor espiains how my job soutribute: to the everall mission.
10	63	My supervisor helps as set specific goals.
(1)	20	Ny separtiser lets mittan aken (mitsing a pool jeb.
501	22	X seperation alvays belos me loorane of performance.
136	¢,	Y supervisor insures that I get jub raiated training then needed.
168	2	Ny job performance has leproved aur la feed- beck received from by supervisor.
211	32	Ny supervisor frequently gives an l'eedbach de New weil 1 en doing my job.
FACTOR 8.0 -	ORGANIZATIONAL COM Predities Ust Unars	UNICATIONS CLIMATE. Mussures the degree to which 15 an open communications environment in the Information is provided to accomplish the job.

Statement	ldeus dereigned by wy wart growp are readily accepted by management personnel dione my supperisor.	My erganization provides all the m-cessary 'Aformation for me to do my job eflectively.	Ny organization provides adoquate information to my work prove.	by work grown is usually aware of important events and situations.	My complaints are aired satisfactorily.	The taferruction in any organization is widely shared so that those needing it have it available.
Statement	20	3	1	5	*	ī
Yariable Rumber	ğ	100	200	500	ğ	Ş

My organization has clear-cut goals.	The goels of my organizetion are reasonable.	Ny erganization provides accurate information to my work group.
*	5	100

-1E -1E

FALTON 821 - WDBX GROUP EFECTIVENESS: Measures one's view of the quantity. <u>Meatlity, and efficiency of work genor</u>aled by his un her work group.

Yerlable Rusber	Statement Number	St. Commit
52	11	The <u>quentity</u> of output of your work group is rely high.
912	78	The <u>guality</u> of output of your work group is very high.
261	61	When high priority work arises, such as short suspenses, cresh programs, and schedule changes, the people is ay work group do ea outstanding job is handling these situations.
35	8	Tour work group elways gets maximum output from available resources (c.g., personnel and materiel).
265	18	Tour work group's performence in comparison to similar work groups is very high.

FACIOR - WORK [NIERFERENCES (NOT A STATISTICUL FACTOR): Identifies things that Impede an individuel's Job performance.

Sta tement	To what extent do you have the mecessery supplies to accompifsh yo <mark>ur job?</mark>	To what extent do details (test mot covered by primary or additional duty descriptions) Interfere with the performance of your primary job?	To what extent does a bottlemeck fa your orgisization seriously affect the flow ef work either to or from your group?
Statement Number	9	\$	8
Yariabie Rumber	112	8/2	279

15

9

ħ.

FACION 822 - JOS BELAIED SATIESACTIONE: Nessures the degree to which the worker Is generally satisfied with factors surrounding the Job.

Statement	fealing of Meipfulmass The Cherce to Meip propia and improva Unair weifere through the performanca of my job. The importance of my job performance to the weifere of athers.	Co-wortar Raietionshigs By amount of effort compared to the effort of the co-worter, but an indicate with ca-worteri share the load, and the spirit of teamont which exists among of co-worters.	family Attitude Toward Job The ricognition and the pride of family has in the work I da.	bort Schadule 15 unit schoole; flatibility and regularity at my work schoole; the number of hours I work per week.	Job Security	Acquired Teluable Stills The Chance to acquire valuable stills in my Job which prepare am for feture apportunitias	My Job es a Musie	
Statemat Benber	101	102	[0]	ğ	101	108	5	
Yariabia Rumber	<u>201</u>	5	017	111	118	119	£21	

88

FACTOR 823 - JOB RELATED TRAINE: Measuras be extent to which one is satisfied with on-the-job and technical training received.

Statement.	On-the-Job Treining (OUT) The TUT instructional methods and instructors' competence.	Technicel Training (Other them QUT) The Unchnicel Training Thure incelved to
Statement	ş	£
Yariable Rumber	H	2112

perfere by currant job.

2

FACTOR 824 - GENEEN, ONGLUIZATIONAL CLIMIE: Neasuras the Individual's parception of his of her organizational environment es a whole (t.e. spirit of tarament communications, orranizational oride, atc.).

 Statement	My orgenization is very interested in the attitudes of the group emakers tomard their johs.	My organization has a vary strong interest in the wifers of its people.	I am vary proud to work for this organizacion.	l feel responsible to ay organization in accomplishing its mission.	Parsonnel in my unit ere recognized for out- standing performanca.	I as usually given the opportunity to show or demonstrate my work to others.	There is a high spirit of teamwork among my co-workers.	Thare is outstanding cooperation between work groups of my organization.	l fasi motivatad to contribute my best efforts to the mission of my organization.	My organizetion rewards individuels based on performanca.	d SCARS: This factor is another us letton of a
Sta tement Rumber		2	3	8	32	2	z	35	•	8	MOTIVETION POTENTIA
Yarfeble Kumber	SOC	306	307	8	010	110	210		510	916	ACTOR 025 -

xeria <u>employed by other job activition</u> theorists. The score ranges bitwawn 1 and 343 with 109 being the Air Force average. Low scores indicate a poorly mulivating job. Xoore is computed using the following factors:

Still variety Teck identity	Task significant	Tesk autonomy
008	20	-

formule [(800-801-802)/3)-813-804

-

¥	1
نيها	1
-	1
-	۰,
•	
-	1
3	
2	
-	

.

Teriobi		Statement		Yarlable Number	Factor	Statement Mumber	
	3						
12	218/008	2	To what actions dues your job requirations to the many sittlement to hear to the second sittlements of your tailants or a sittley of your tailants	512	116	R	To what attent does your Job give you freedom to do your work as you see fit:
				\$15	113	11	To what extend are you allowed to make
202	218/164	•	To what actant does your job tampico doteg a <u>ubbil</u> last or walt of wort?				the major decisions required to perform your job well?
ĩ	13/209	•1	Te what artent is your jeb significant. in that it affects athers in some	\$12	119	32	To what attent are you proved of your Jobs
			sepertant way?	216*	:	a	
2 7 702	:	:	(Met used)			:	to your supervisor in accomplishing
ē	6	a	To wat artant de additional durias intarfare with the performance of your primary yok?	111	018	X	To what attant do you know exactly what is expected of you in performing
ê	<u>s</u>	52	To what extend do yes have advanced bools and equipment to accompilial year jool	=	910	35	rear joer Te what attant are yeer job performance geals difficult to accompilsal
ę	ŞQ	25	to must extend in the amount of work	022 9 612	:	ł	(Met used)
£	218/908	z	teres provides accounts to what actant does your jab provide	122	910	R	to what extent are your job performance goals realistic?
			the clarks to there for yourtain were	\$21-125	:	:	(Net used)
210	218/208	27	To what estant dues delay your job usil affect a let of propied	922	11	\$	To what estant do you perform the same tasts repeatedly within a short period of time?
1112	218/108	R	Te what estant doos your job provide you with a chuice be field completely the piece of writ you have begunt	î	11	8	To what actent are you faced with the same type of problem on a weekly busis?
212	218/008	59	le what extant door your joh requira you to ese a mumber af complex stillist	· This vi factor).	riable 1	s an alement of "	'job influences" (not a statistical

8

•

(met usued) A job in which tasts are relatively easy to accompilsh. The <u>quanity</u> of output of your work group is very high. The <u>quality</u> of output of your work group is very high. The <u>quality</u> of output of your work group is when hige priority work arises, such as shor very high. Inc. quality be projes in my work group do an output of a my work group do an output of a maniting these situations. (Not used) Your work group always gets maximum output from costilable resources (e.g., personnel an output from costilable resources (e.g., personnel an from costilable resources (e.g., personnel an from costilable resources (e.g., personnel an from costilable resources (s.g., personnel an from tork group's performance in comparison to stallar work groups is vury high. (not used) To what estent does your job provide a great fo what astent does your job provide a great fo what astent does your job provide a great		
deal of fraadom and independence in selecting your own procedures to accompilsh it?		
To that attant does your fob aroutde a groat	5	519
To what extent does your job provide a great deal of freedom and independence in schedeling yeer work?	8	5
(Mot wsad)	:	
Tour work group's performance in comparison to similar work groups is very high.		128
sataria)).		
Tour work group always gets maximum outpet from tvallable reconverts (s = ================================	8	128
situations. (Not used)		1 263
when high priority user arrest, such at pr suspenses. Crath preprens, and schedule changes. We prople in my user group do an outstanding ich in hundligh these	c	ž
The quality of output of your work group is vary high.	78	
the guantity of output at your work group very high.		ž
A job in which tasks are relatively easy th accompilsh.	5	
(Het used)	;	4 257

Variable		Statement					
-	F ac : or	Ruber	Statement		FACTOR	Humber	S Cal Brean E
"	0	36	To what extert are your job perfermance goals clear?	çoc	27	53	My wort group is usually aware of important events and situations.
¥/2		37	le what aitant are your jeb performance goals specific?	Ř	27	2	My completints are stred satisfectorily.
275	110	2	To what actant does your work give you a fooling of pride?	305	124	4	My organization is very interested in the attitudes of the group members tourd their
3/2	-	5	Te what attant de you have the opportunity ta learn utilis untrin util keprove your promotion petanticit	306	924	3	jobs. My organization has e very strong interest i the weifors of its peeple.
	:	Ş	Te what extent do you have the necessery supplies to accomplish your job?	iQC	929	69	f an wery proved to work for this
8/2	1	•	Te unit extent de details (tast mat corered by primary en additional dury descriptions) Interfere uith the performance of your primary Johi	5	53	ş	ergenizetien. I feel responsible to ay organization fa accomplishing its alssion.
6/2	:	8	Te whet attant does a buttlanach 'r your organization seriously affect une flow ef wart either ta er from your group?	ş	620	Ŧ	The information is my organization is widely shared to that these meeting it have it avoitable.
142-082	:	:	(bet esod)	310	128	26	Personnei in ay unit ere recognized for eutstanding performance.
8	2	2	(dess developed by my work group are raddily accepted by annoyement periodnel doors my supervisor.	311	824	8	i am usually given the opportunity to show or domenstrate my work to others.
ž	2	3	Ny organization provides all the mecassary Information for me to do or job offoctively.	216	128	z	There is a kigh spirit of teamort among my
õ	2	z	Ny erganization provides adequate information to by work prove.	86	926	56	converses. There is outstanding cooperation between work groups of my erganization.
·· These	variab!	as are alcounts of	r "werk interferences" (met a statisticei				

L L

Sector and the sector of the s

** These variables are alterents of "word incorrections" a statistic facturi.

54

	supervisor asks members for their ideas on	at myroremets.	supervisor explains hav my job contributes the overall mission.	16 4544)	superviser heips me set specific goeis.	1t esed)	supervisor lets me traaw when I am doing a Mi job.	superviser lets me know when I am doing a rr job.	seperation aturys helps an improve by		superviser inseres that i get job related if aing when meeded.	job performance has impreved due to Hibact recaived from my supervisor.	t esed)	un i meed technical advica, i esually go to summeriant.		12050 1	supervisor frequently gives an feedback on	it esed?	supervisor fully explains procederes to A group member.	it asod)	apervisory assistance" (not a statistical
2	£.	3 Ž	18	(K 6	£	Ĩ	£ŝ.	₽Ž	Ŧ	È	25	E?	1	š1			£ 3		ŧ	8	5. JO 514
Statement	67	;	3	:	69	:	2	11	22	:	5	4 2	:	75		: :	۲	:	3	:	las are alener
Factor	618	:	-	:	619	:	618	:::	613			618	:	:	ł			:		t	varlab
Yarlable Rumbar	929	423	824	0(1 7 621	10	432	££ •	••••	435		11	/6+	2	***66*	100 0 000		ž	*** * ***	\$1	446-704	factor).
at Statement	My signization has clear-cut goals.	i feel motivated to contribute my best afforts to the aission of my argumization.	ty organization revards individuals based on performance.	The goals of my arganization are reasonable.	My erganization provides accurate informatica ta ev utri erbue.	(met ased)	My superviser is a good plasmar.	Ny sapartiwar sats high parfarmance standards.	(Met used)	by supervisor excourges tommert.	My superviser represents the graup at all	W superviser astabilishes good work		ry superviser with sever will responsibilities clear to the prive.	(Mat sted)	My supervisor performs will under pressure.	(Mot stad)	Ny supervisor tates time to help m when	[met 4:e4]	alaanse of "unsurvitory accitizanta" (ant a statistical	
Statement Bumbar	z		=	2	8	. 1	8	8	;	8	3	29	;	2	;	59	:	3	:		: :
F ac tor	92 8	824	824	0218	Q78	;		:	:	818					:		:	:	;	14.1	
	314	315	910	111	318	19-01	ş	Ş	609-90	•I0	111	115	:		14 1 115	416	E29-211		53		ector).

\$

.

z

<u>foutument</u> <u>feeling of Hulpfelaces</u> The <u>chares is help people</u> and hence their unifer thereach the performance of my job. The hence we of my job performance is the welfere of others.	(her meed)	Co-worter Malationships Wy amount of aifert compared to the affert of or-worter, the street is which wy co-worter there be lood, and the spirit of teament which stists among up co-worters.	Faulty Attitude Texand Job The recognition and the pride op faulty has to the work 1 do.	0- be-Job Fraining (011) The Tur Tastweitent, meDecis and fastweiters' computance.	Technical Trateine (Other than OUT) The bechnical Unaling I have received to perform any convent Joh.	(Net esed)	Nert Schedule My unit Ribbles flexibility and regularity of my unit schedule; the number of hears f unit per uset.	Jab Security	Actived Teleoble Stills In Charce In Acquire valuable stills in ar Jah Wich proper an for febre apportantiles.	(Tet esed)	Py Job as a theile	(pet ered)
	:	102	[0]	š	10	:	508	107	5	:	5	:
2 2	:	<u>5</u>	÷	3	[28	:	2	22	2	:	2	:
	12-32	Ş.	110	111	21/2	311-611	111	218	113	120-122	22	124-999

•

.

-