

AD-A238 056



2

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California



DTIC
ELECTE
JUL 12 1991
S B D

THESIS

SOURCES OF JOB SATISFACTION AND
DISSATISFACTION AMONG MID-GRADE
COAST GUARD OFFICERS

by

James Matthew Hasselbalch

June 1990

Thesis Co-Advisors: Richard A. McGonigal
Kenneth W. Thomas

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

91-04508



91 7 09 082

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited	
2b DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	

6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School	6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) Code 36	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, California 93943-5000		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, California 93943-5000

8a NAME OF FUNDING SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO
		TASK NO	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)
SOURCES OF JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION AMONG MID-GRADE COAST GUARD OFFICERS

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR
Hasselbalch, James M.

13a TYPE OF REPORT Master's Thesis	13b PERIOD COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990, June	15 PAGE COUNT 72
--	---	---	----------------------------

16. ABSTRACT NATURE
The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

17. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	UNCLASSIFIED
		Job Satisfaction; Intrinsic Motivation

18. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
This study replicates a survey that was done in 1983 which identified sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among U.S. Coast Guard officers in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant commander, and commander. The results from the current survey are compared with the previous survey's results and statistically significant changes in the levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are analyzed. In general, levels of satisfaction with intrinsic sources of motivation remained high in both surveys while levels of satisfaction with extrinsic sources of motivation, such as pay and promotion, declined in the current survey. Recommendations are made for improving job satisfaction among these officers.

19. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED / UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified
---	---

22a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Prof. Richard A. McGonigal	22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (408) 646-2186	22c OFFICE SYMBOL Code AS/Mb
--	--	--

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

Sources of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction
Among Mid-Grade Coast Guard Officers

by
James Matthew Hasselbalch
Lieutenant Commander, United States Coast Guard
B.S., United States Coast Guard Academy, 1976

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 1990

Author: James M. Hasselbalch
James M. Hasselbalch

Approved by: Richard A. McGonigal
Richard A. McGonigal, Thesis Co-Advisor

Kenneth W. Thomas
Kenneth W. Thomas, Thesis Co-Advisor

David R. Whipple
David R. Whipple, Chairman
Department of Administrative Sciences

ABSTRACT

This study replicates a survey that was done in 1983 which identified sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among U.S. Coast Guard officers in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant commander and commander. The results from the current survey are compared with the previous survey's results and statistically significant changes in the levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are analyzed. In general, levels of satisfaction with intrinsic sources of motivation remained high in both surveys while levels of satisfaction with extrinsic sources of motivation, such as pay and promotion, declined in the current survey. Recommendations are made for improving job satisfaction among these officers.

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION -----	1
	A. CHANGES IN THE COAST GUARD -----	2
	B. PREVIOUS STUDY -----	4
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW -----	8
	A. HACKMAN AND OLDHAM MODEL -----	9
	B. THOMAS AND VELTHOUSE MODEL -----	10
III.	METHODOLOGY -----	12
	A. INTRODUCTION -----	12
	B. TARGET POPULATION -----	12
	C. QUESTIONNAIRE -----	13
	D. ANALYSIS -----	14
IV.	SURVEY ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS -----	16
	A. SELF-REPORTED FACTORS FOR ACHIEVING CAREER SATISFACTION -----	16
	B. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF CODED ANSWERS -----	17
	C. INTRINSIC MOTIVATION -----	26
	D. CAREER RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE RESPONDENTS -----	29
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	31
	A. CONCLUSIONS -----	31
	B. AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH -----	32
	C. RECOMMENDATIONS -----	32
APPENDIX A:	COVER LETTER TO O-3 TO O-5 CAREER SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE -----	34

APPENDIX B: SURVEY QUESTIONS -----	35
APPENDIX C: SURVEY RESULTS -----	43
LIST OF REFERENCES -----	63
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST -----	64

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank my wife, Peggy, whose constant help and support were invaluable. I never would have finished this thesis without her.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1983, a survey of Coast Guard Officers in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant commander, and commander was conducted by Larry L. Mizell, while he was a graduate student at the Naval Postgraduate School [Ref. 1]. This study identified sources of both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among the officers. In the seven years since this survey was conducted, the Coast Guard's roles and missions have dramatically changed. The Coast Guard, traditionally known for saving lives and property at sea, has become one of the primary Federal law enforcement agencies involved in our nation's war on drugs. Has this shift from "lifesavers" to "smokies of the sea" resulted in new sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction? By replicating the previous survey, current sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are identified and significant changes are analyzed.

While the previous study included a comprehensive review of the existing theories on job satisfaction and motivation, new theories dealing with the satisfaction and motivation that comes from performing the work itself have been developed. In an effort to better measure the levels of "intrinsic" work motivation that exist among the officers surveyed, additional questions were added to the pervious survey questionnaire. (See questions 36 and 37 in Appendix

B.) Information on two current "intrinsic" work motivation theories will be presented in the following chapter.

A. CHANGES IN THE COAST GUARD

Founded in 1790 to enforce the tariff laws of the United States, the ten ships that comprised the original Revenue Cutter Service have been replaced by a Coast Guard fleet today consisting of 255 ships, 207 aircraft and over 2000 small boats [Ref. 2:pp. 14-15]. In the years since the Coast Guard was founded, and prior to the 1980's, the role of the Service had evolved from primarily law enforcement to that of humanitarian service. The Coast Guard saves lives and property at sea, protects the environment, maintains the country's aids to navigation systems, inspects merchant vessels to ensure the safety of the nation's ports and waterways, provides for national defense and conducts law enforcement operations.

The decade of the 1970's saw an increase in the number of laws designed to protect our environment. Laws such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Port and Tanker Safety Act and the Fishery Conservation Management Act, gave the Coast Guard a significant role in protecting our nation's resources [Ref. 2:p. 7]. This evolution from "collectors of the revenue" to lifesavers and protectors of the environment represented the conditions under which the previous survey on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction was conducted.

Starting in the decade of the 1980's, the Coast Guard was given the additional responsibility of stopping the smuggling of illegal drugs into this country. This work has grown in importance to the point where over one-third of the current Coast Guard budget goes towards the enforcement of laws and treaties [Ref. 2:p. 16]. This shift of emphasis away from more humanitarian responsibilities towards that of law enforcement has not been enthusiastically embraced by everyone in the Coast Guard. People who joined the Service in the mid-1970's when search and rescue was the largest program, are now finding themselves in the role of policemen. Comments in a recent Navy Times article indicate that this shift in mission emphasis has lowered morale, especially among the officer corps [Ref. 3:p. 12].

In addition to a changing primary role, there have been problems with having adequate resources to carry out these new duties. The number of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard has remained relatively constant. In 1972 there were approximately 38,400 men and women on active duty. By 1989 this figure was approximately 37,400 [Ref. 2:p. 12]. Funding has also remained relatively constant. The Coast Guard's budget for 1983 (in constant 1989 dollars) was almost \$3 billion while in 1989 the budget was roughly \$3.1 billion [Ref. 2:p. 16]. The Coast Guard has been given more jobs to do without any real increases in people or money.

With this change in job emphasis and an increased workload, the possibility of finding changes in the sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction from that which was reported in the 1983 survey seemed likely and worth pursuing. By identifying current sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the Coast Guard can develop new policies that help to increase the sources of satisfaction and decrease the sources of dissatisfaction. The key to accomplishing all of the Coast Guard's varied tasks will be to increase the performance of individual Coast Guard men and women. If job satisfaction can be improved through new policies, the Service will, at the very least, retain more qualified, experienced people [Ref. 4].

B. PREVIOUS STUDY

The previous study used a combination of interviews and a survey questionnaire to identify sources of both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The survey was mailed to a randomly selected group of Coast Guard officers in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant commander and commander who were stationed in California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Hawaii and the Far East. Of the 205 surveys that were distributed, 164 were completed and returned. This was a response rate of 80 percent. The study also relied on interviews with individual officers which were conducted in the following locations: Anchorage, Alaska; Kodiak, Alaska; Long Beach,

California; San Francisco, California; and Seattle, Washington.

1. Findings

One part of the survey asked officers to indicate what they felt were the two most important factors in achieving career satisfaction. Answers to this question were placed into categories by the researcher. The ten sources of job satisfaction which were mentioned most often are listed below in descending order of significance.

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Recognition	52
Job Challenge	44
Job Location	32
Sense of Accomplishment	31
Meaningful Job	31
Promotion	29
Good Leadership and Effective Superiors	27
Job Freedom	27
Family Happiness	25
Pay	24

Another part of the survey asked individuals to rate their level of satisfaction with 30 specific factors related to their work. (Responses to these questions are shown in the last column in Appendix C, and will be discussed later.) Three strong sources of dissatisfaction emerged in these

data, and were discussed at length in the previous study. These dissatisfiers were a lack of recognition, frequent transfers, and poor leadership/ineffective bosses [Ref. 1:pp. 48-52].

When asked about the level of recognition that they received, 26.8 percent of the officers surveyed expressed dissatisfaction, while 22.6 percent felt the level of recognition was "borderline." If you consider "borderline" responses to represent a lack of satisfaction, as the previous study's author did, then 49.4 percent of the officers surveyed were "dissatisfied" with the level of recognition that they received. [Ref. 1:p. 49]

As shown in the list on the previous page, desire for recognition was the most important factor among the officers surveyed in achieving job satisfaction. Other significant factors that contributed to job satisfaction were a challenging job, a sense of accomplishment on the job and having a job that was meaningful [Ref. 1:pp. 36-43]. These and others of the factors which were considered most important by the officers in the 1983 study bear directly upon what has been called "intrinsic task motivation." Since the previous study only briefly discussed theories in this area, the next chapter will present more information on intrinsic task motivation. Chapter III will discuss the methodology used in the current survey. Chapter IV will present the

survey results and Chapter V will present recommendations and conclusions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

While the previous study presented a comprehensive review of various theories on job satisfaction, dissatisfaction and motivation [Ref. 1:pp. 14-30], additional material on intrinsic task motivation is discussed in this chapter. Intrinsic motivation involves the satisfaction one gets from doing a job well. This internal reward is one that the individual gives to himself. This approach to motivation differs from earlier theories that focused on extrinsic motivators or "external" rewards such as pay and promotion.

Interest in intrinsic motivation has been growing in the research literature. It comes at a time when the importance of workers' "commitment" or "involvement" in their work has become more apparent in producing quality work. This is the form of motivation which American industry is reemphasizing in order to compete more effectively and is built into W. Edwards Deming's Total Quality Management (TQM) and similar programs. The two theories on intrinsic task motivation that are discussed in this chapter are the model by J. Richard Hackman and Gene Oldham and the model by Kenneth W. Thomas and Betty A. Velthouse.

A. HACKMAN AND OLDFHAM MODEL

This model identifies three psychological states that are critical in determining a person's motivation and satisfaction on the job. These psychological states are: experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility and knowledge of results. Experienced meaningfulness relates to how worthwhile or important the individual feels the job is. This worth or importance is measured by the individual's own system of values. Experienced responsibility relates to how much the individual believes that he or she is personally responsible for the outcomes of his or her efforts. This psychological state is strongly influenced by the amount of direction or autonomy given the individual. Determining whether or not one's work outcomes are satisfactory is defined as knowledge of results. [Ref. 5:p. 58]

When these three conditions are present, a person tends to feel very good about himself when he performs well. And those good feelings will prompt him to try to continue to do well--so he can continue to earn the positive feelings in the future. That is what is meant by "internal motivation"--being turned on to one's work because of the positive internal feelings that are generated by doing well, rather than being dependent on external factors (such as incentive pay or compliments from the boss) for the motivation to work effectively. [Ref. 5:p. 58]

Remove any of these critical states and motivation will drop. When all three states are high, internal work motivation, job satisfaction and work quality will be high as well. Under these conditions, absenteeism and job turnover rates will be low. [Ref. 5:pp. 58-59]

B. THOMAS AND VELTHOUSE MODEL

A second theory on intrinsic task motivation identifies four "task assessments" critical to achieving intrinsic motivation. These task assessments are judgments which workers make about four characteristics of their work and performance. The four characteristics are: impact, competence, meaningfulness and choice. Impact is the degree to which an individual sees his or her efforts as making a difference in accomplishing the task or job. Competence is the degree to which the individual perceives that he or she can skillfully perform the task activities required by the job. Meaningfulness is the value or worthiness that the task holds for the individual when judged against the individual's own value system or standards. The final task assessment, choice, is the extent to which an individual's behavior is seen as self-determined. The term is analogous to the experienced sense of responsibility in the Hackman and Oldham theory. Each of these four task assessments must be present for intrinsic motivation to take place. [Ref. 6:pp. 13-17]

Intrinsically motivated behavior is important in part because it results in effort that does not depend on the supervision of others or upon rewards from others. The task itself provides the motivation and individuals will demonstrate flexibility in controlling their accomplishment of the job, initiating new tasks in response to new problems

or opportunities, and resiliently sustaining motivation in
the face of obstacles. [Ref. 6:p. 17]

III. METHODOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this research was to determine if the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction reported in the 1983 study had significantly changed. A survey questionnaire was used to gather the necessary information. This questionnaire contained all of the questions from the previous survey along with three new questions. Two additional questions were introduced to more completely measure intrinsic motivation variables. The new items concerned how the respondents felt concerning the meaningfulness of their job and their sense of competence. The third new question asked whether the respondents would recommend making the Coast Guard a career.

B. TARGET POPULATION

As was the case in the previous survey, the target population for this survey consisted of active duty Coast Guard officers in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant commander and commander. Officers in these grades comprise approximately 60 percent of the Coast Guard officer corps [Ref. 1:p. 31]. Unlike the previous survey which targeted only those officers stationed on the West Coast, Alaska, Hawaii and the

Far East, this survey was based on a more representative sample of officers throughout the entire Coast Guard.

The Defense Manpower Data Center in Monterey, California provided a listing of randomly selected officers in these grades. A total of 406 officers were randomly selected to receive the survey (137 lieutenants, 138 lieutenant commanders and 131 commanders). The response rate on the current survey was 84 percent. This compares favorably with the previous survey's response rate of 80 percent [Ref. 1:p. 32].

A cover letter was included with each survey (see Appendix A). This letter explained that the survey was being sent to a group of randomly selected officers from throughout the Coast Guard and that information from the survey would be used for research purposes only. The letter also stated that all responses to the questionnaire would be kept in strictest confidence. The respondents were encouraged to write in comments that they might have regarding any of the survey questions.

C. QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire used in this study is shown in Appendix B. It contained 39 questions. The first five questions on the survey asked for demographic data. The respondents were asked to provide their rank, age, sex, marital status and the type of unit to which they were assigned. Questions six

through 37 addressed a wide range of topics and asked the respondents to indicate their level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction on each topic. Some of these topics were: military benefits, promotion rates, assignments, family concerns, quality of coworkers, career counseling, sense of accomplishment and recognition. The final questions (38 and 39) asked the respondents to list two factors that they felt were the most important in achieving career satisfaction and asked them to indicate if they would recommend making the Coast Guard a career if asked for such advice by a junior officer.

D. ANALYSIS

The results from each survey were coded, entered into the mainframe computer at the Naval Postgraduate School and analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Handwritten comments from the survey questionnaire were analyzed separately. Appendix C provides a listing of the results from the survey questions.

In conducting the statistical analysis, the first two answers for each question were treated as indicating "satisfaction." The last two answers for each question were treated as indicating "dissatisfaction." The middle answer for each question indicated a "neutral" or "borderline" response. The chi-square goodness of fit statistical method was then used to determine if the overall distribution of the

"satisfied," "dissatisfied," and "neutral" responses from each question were significantly different from the results in the previous study [Ref. 7:p. 467].

If the chi-square goodness of fit method indicated that there was a significant difference (at the five percent level of significance), further statistical testing was done. The standard method for testing for differences between population proportions [Ref. 7:p. 448] was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the proportion of officers who expressed "satisfaction." This method was also used to determine if there was a significant difference in the proportion of officers who expressed "dissatisfaction." The chi-square values and the Z values for each question are included in Appendix C. The results will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

IV. SURVEY ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A. SELF-REPORTED FACTORS FOR ACHIEVING CAREER SATISFACTION

In both the current survey and the previous survey, the respondents were asked to identify two factors that they felt were the most important in achieving career satisfaction (see question 38 in Appendix B). The respondents wrote in their own answers to this question and the ten most often mentioned responses from the current survey are listed below.

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Ranking</u>	
		<u>1990</u>	<u>1983</u>
Recognition	63	1	1
Challenging Job	53	2	2
Enjoyable Job	50	3	25
Job Freedom	49	4	8
Meaningfulness/Worth of Job	43	5	5
Promotions	41	6	6
Pay/Benefits	39	7	10
Family	32	8	9
Job Accomplishment	26	9	4
Expertise/Competence	21	10	14

Because the individual responses to this question were grouped into "factor" categories by the author, the relative ranking of these individual factors is subject to error due to possible misinterpretation of the respondent's answers on

the part of the author. In addition, the respondent's answers may have contained elements of more than one factor which would make it impossible to assign the answer to a single factor category. Comparison of the factor ranking in the current survey with the ranking from the previous survey is subject to error as well. Identical responses could have been interpreted differently by each study's author and assigned to different factor categories. For these reasons, the results from this part of the survey were not heavily relied upon. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that eight of the top ten factors identified in the previous survey reappear in the current listing of factors contributing to career satisfaction.

B. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF CODED ANSWERS

The results obtained from the first 35 questions were compared with the results from the previous survey.

There were statistically significant differences in three areas dealing with the demographics of the samples. The mix of lieutenants, lieutenant commanders and commanders in the current sample differed from the previous sample. There was a smaller proportion of lieutenants and a larger proportion of commanders in the current sample. (The Chi-square and Z values are listed in Appendix C.) The age mix in the current sample also differed from that of the previous sample. The proportion of officers in both the 25-30 and 31-35 year age

brackets were smaller in the current sample while the proportion of officers in both the 36-40 and over 40 age brackets were larger. (See Appendix C.) With a higher proportion of officers in the grade of commander and a lower proportion of officers in the grade of lieutenant, this result is to be expected. The final demographic difference was in the marital status of the respondents. The current sample had proportionately fewer single officers, proportionately more married officers and proportionately fewer divorced officers than did the previous sample. (See Appendix C.) Some of the statistically significant changes in the levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction may be a result of these higher proportions of both older and married officers in the current sample.

Of the questions that dealt with sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, there were 12 questions that had statistically different results from those of the previous survey. These 12 questions are listed below by the magnitude of change.

<u>Question Topic</u>	<u>Chi-square</u>
Promotion	385.99
Pay	54.22
Attitude of Family Toward Career	30.74
Job Burnout	24.05
Attitude of Family Toward Moves	23.09
Selection Process	16.55
Equitable Assignment Process	14.24
Most Important Factor in Assignment	12.98
Satisfaction with Geographic Location	8.32
Challenge of Job Assignment	8.07
Satisfaction with Career Pattern	7.20
Retirement Plan	6.29

Each of these questions will be discussed individually.

1. Promotion (Q9)

By far the most significant changes in both the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction concerned the rate of promotions. The proportion of officers who felt that they were being promoted either too quickly or much too quickly decreased from 7.9 percent in the previous survey to 1.8 percent in the current survey. The proportion of officers who felt that they were being promoted either too slowly or much too slowly increased from 34.2 percent in the previous survey to 85.7 percent in the current survey. Officers who felt that the promotion rate was "just right," represented 57.9 percent of those surveyed in the previous sample but

only represented 12.5 percent of those surveyed in the current sample. Some typical comments from the questionnaire were:

12 years to O-4 is too long.

From O-1 to O-3, promotions are "just right" but beyond that it is much too slow.

The system is so slow that I have seriously considered getting out....

O-3 to O-4 is the worst! It's practically depressing.

Am not happy that my USN counterparts make rank much faster than I do.

Slowing of advancement is everyone's biggest complaint--we've got to fix it....

G-P has not been honest about promotion opportunity--people need to be given straight info--out front, not through Alumni Bulletin articles--people need to be able to make informed career choices.

Promotions have slowed down over the past several years, especially for lieutenants seeking promotion to lieutenant commander. In 1983, an officer could expect to be promoted to lieutenant commander after approximately ten years of service [Ref. 8:p. 33]. By 1988, promotion to lieutenant commander took approximately 11.6 years [Ref. 9:p. 16]. This trend is continuing with the lieutenant commander promotion point expected to increase to 12.5 years in the near future [Ref. 9:p. 18].

2. Pay (Q6)

The proportion of officers satisfied with their level of pay decreased from 79.9 percent in the 1983 sample to 65.6

percent in the current sample. The proportion of officers expressing dissatisfaction increased from 4.8 percent to 11.8 percent. Some of the comments were:

Felt "rich" as an Ensign living in Government housing, felt very "poor" as a Lieutenant trying to live in Boston.

Am less satisfied with each annual cost of living pay raise that is less than the annual inflation rate, and which, studies show, cause us to fall further behind the equivalent civilian pay.

3rd year pilot with Northwest makes more money than Coast Guard Commandant.

The pay itself is not bad, but doesn't reflect the cost of living in high-cost metropolitan areas where many officers are stationed....

...our present pay system is not adequately addressing the cost of living differences throughout the country.

3. Attitude of Family Toward Career (Q18)

There was an increase in the proportion of officers who felt that their family had either a positive or very positive attitude toward their Coast Guard career. The proportion of officers who felt that their family had either a negative or very negative attitude toward their career was not significantly different from the previous survey's results. The percentage of "satisfied" responses was 79.1 in the current sample while the percentage of "dissatisfied" responses was 4.2. Some of the written comments were:

(My) Wife is very proud of CG in general and my career, but would prefer less transfers and less separations.

They like everything except moving.

Very positive regarding CG missions, negative occasionally regarding frequent moves and numerous poor geographical areas of duty stations.

Negative aspects exist, but overall, positive feelings toward CG and my role(s).

4. Job Burnout (Q27)

The number of officers reporting that they had experienced job burnout during their career increased from 58.5 percent in the 1983 sample to 71.9 percent in the current sample. Since everyone was asked to provide written comments on this survey question, there were many comments. Some of these comments were:

No matter how hard you work the tasking continues with no additional staff/personnel support.

From my experience, the Coast Guard is constantly playing catch-up in between crisis management. Personnel are not adequately trained and the supervisor has little control over who works for him. There is constant pressure and not enough time and resources to do a consistently good job.

Usually after 2-3 months of 60-70 hour weeks.

In some jobs the system makes it so hard to achieve success that I have given up on accomplishing a task that I know would improve the operation.

Too many collateral duty jobs.

Do more, do it better--by the way do it with less.

I'm tired of watching units struggle to keep all the balls in the air while HQ throws out more balls and tells them they're not overworked no matter what they feel.

Long hours, extra effort, high initiative for position--absolutely no recognition by command.

5. Attitude of Family Toward Moves (Q14)

Although the overall distribution of answers was significantly different, there was no significant change in either the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The percentage of officers who indicated that this question was "not applicable," was 5.1 in the current sample and was 14.0 in the previous sample. This change in the proportion of non-married officers most likely accounts for the statistically significant change in the overall distribution.

6. Selection Process (Q10)

There was significantly more dissatisfaction with the selection process used in officer promotions. Officers expressing dissatisfaction made up 29.8 percent of the current sample while the percentage in the previous sample had been 20.7. Some of the comments were:

No way to climb ahead on merit. No way for performers to progress ahead of duds in previous year groups.

Too many good officers are being passed over.

Good people are passed over, bad people are promoted, and no reasons are given by the board.

The people I've seen being passed over have been passed over as a result of one supervisor's remarks. One person should not have that much of an impact on another person's career. Everybody makes mistakes and there don't seem to be that many mistakes that should end a career....

Selection boards do not take technical expertise into account or balance the needs of the Service when promoting officers. Selection board promotion criteria seems to be 180 degrees out of phase with where the program manager (Service) tells you to go.

The OER system we have now does not allow for mistakes.

I don't think anyone, except for those who participate (on a promotion board) know what actually goes on or what's important.

7. Equitable Assignment Process (Q11)

The proportion of officers that felt the assignment process was equitable in all fields increased from 13.4 percent in the previous sample to 20.4 percent in the current sample. The proportion of officers who were dissatisfied did not significantly change. Although the change in dissatisfaction was not statistically significant, the percent of dissatisfied officers is still high (49.8 percent in the current sample). Some of the comments were:

Post-graduate school opportunities for pilots are slim....

Heart of the problem seems to be the CG's need for specialists coupled with words and actions advocating generalists.

Our promotion system emphasizes a "well-rounded officer" yet technical experts go from one tech job to the next and don't get "well rounding" experience. Jobs are mainly at Washington, DC, Governor's Island, NY, and Alameda, CA, lovely choices all.

It is at the whim of the detailee.

Engineers are stuck with MLC or HQ. So short of engineers you can never get out of specialty for career enhancement or change of pace.

8. Most Important Factor in Assignment (Q15)

The only significant change was in the proportion of officers who felt that billet location was the most important factor. This proportion decreased from 22.6 percent in the previous sample to 14.8 percent in the current sample.

Billet type was most important to 29.6 percent of the officers in the current sample while 55.6 percent of the officers felt both billet type and billet location were most important.

9. Satisfaction with Geographic Location (Q12)

While the overall distribution of answers differed between the two samples, the proportions of officers that were satisfied and dissatisfied were not significantly different between the samples. Those that were satisfied with their geographic location comprised 80.6 percent of the current sample while those that were dissatisfied comprised 10.2 percent.

10. Challenge of Job Assignment (Q20)

The overall distribution of the answers differed between the two samples. Individual proportions in the satisfaction and dissatisfaction categories, however, did not significantly change. In the current sample, 92.2 percent of the officers felt that their job assignments had been challenging or very challenging. Only 2.1 percent of the officers felt that their jobs had been unchallenging or very unchallenging.

11. Satisfaction with Career Pattern (Q33)

In this category the overall distribution of answers differed between the two samples while the individual proportions of satisfied and dissatisfied officers were not statistically significant. Officers that were satisfied or very

satisfied made up 70.7 percent of the current sample while those that were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied made up 10.0 percent.

12. Retirement Plan (Q7)

The overall distribution of answers differed between the two samples. Individual proportions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not significantly different between the two samples. Those officers who felt that the current retirement system was either adequate or very adequate made up 69.5 percent of the current sample while those who felt the current system was inadequate or very inadequate made up 7.6 percent of the current sample.

C. INTRINSIC MOTIVATION

Specific questions on the survey attempted to identify how the respondents felt regarding the four task assessments in the Thomas/Velthouse theory which are critical to achieving intrinsic motivation. The level of impact, which is the degree to which an individual sees his or her efforts as making a difference in accomplishing the task or job, was measured by question 25. This question asked the respondent to describe feelings of accomplishment achieved on the job. The responses to this question were: very positive, positive, borderline, negative or very negative. There was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of answers to this question between the two surveys. In the

current survey, 88.4 percent of the respondents experienced either positive or very positive feelings of accomplishment on the job.

The level of competence, which is the degree to which the individual can skillfully perform the task activities required of him or her, was measured by questions 24 and 37. In question 24, the respondent was asked to evaluate his or her overall qualifications for the assignments that he or she had received. The possible answers were: very well qualified, qualified, borderline, unqualified or very unqualified. There was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of the answers to this question between the two surveys. In the current survey, 97.0 percent of the respondents felt that they were either very well qualified or qualified for their assignments. In question 37, the respondent was asked if he or she got a feeling of competence from performing his or her work. The possible answers were: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree or strongly disagree. This was a new question that was not on the previous survey. The percentage of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing was 85.8 percent.

Meaningfulness is the value that the task holds for the individual when judged against the individual's own value standards. Question 36 asked the respondent to agree or disagree with the statement: The work I am doing is important. The possible answers were: strongly agree,

agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree. Since this question did not appear on the previous survey, no comparison between samples can be made. The results from this question show that 88.2 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their work was important.

The level of choice was measured by questions 29 and 30. In question 29 the respondent was asked about how adequate his or her level of job freedom was in performing the job. The possible answers were: very adequate, adequate, borderline, inadequate or very inadequate. The distribution of answers was not significantly different between the two surveys. 86.1 percent of the respondents felt that their level of job freedom was either adequate or very adequate. Question 30 asked the respondents to either agree or disagree with the statement: During the normal course of my job I feel restricted by the power of control that others have over me. The possible answers were: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree or strongly disagree. The distribution of answers did not significantly differ between the two samples. In the current survey, 50.6 percent of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement. 24.2 percent either agreed or strongly agreed, while 25.2 percent were neutral.

D. CAREER RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE RESPONDENTS

Question 39 on the survey asked the respondents to indicate what they would say to a junior officer who had asked them for advice on whether to make the Coast Guard a career or return to civilian life. This question did not appear on the previous survey questionnaire. Answers were grouped in three broad categories. The author's categories were: generally recommend making the Coast Guard a career, generally recommend returning to civilian life, and other. There were 148 officers who made a recommendation to either stay in the Coast Guard or return to civilian life. Of these officers, 69.6 percent favored making the Coast Guard a career. The remaining 30.4 percent favored returning to the civilian sector. There were 179 officers who did not make any recommendation as to whether the junior officer should stay in the Coast Guard or leave the Service. Some of the comments from these officers were:

Take a hard look at your goals, at where you want to be at age 40 and what things make you happy. The Coast Guard can be a great profession, but it isn't for everyone....

Do what makes you happy--that is more important than money or a title.

Depends on the person's goals. If the individual was "operationally" oriented (afloat, airdale) and enjoyed "stress" (and was good at it) I would encourage them to remain in the Service. If money was a major goal, and the individual was into "high tech," I would encourage them to return to civilian life.

Give it a lot of thought. (You) Work too hard for too little pay/recognition in exchange for job satisfaction. Make sure that's what you want. Other benefit is that you

won't find a more dedicated, well-intentioned group of people anywhere.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

For the most part, the sources of satisfaction as reported by the officers surveyed, remained the same as in the previous study. Eight of the top ten factors identified in the current survey as being most important in achieving career satisfaction, had been among the top ten factors identified in the previous study.

Of more interest were the changes in levels of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction identified by the current survey. The lengthening of time between promotions has caused increased dissatisfaction among the officers surveyed. The current pay system, which has not kept up with inflation and which does not completely reflect the differences in the cost of living throughout the country, has also been a source of increasing dissatisfaction. Officers who reported experiencing job burnout increased from 58.5 percent in the previous survey to 71.9 percent in the current survey. Even with these areas of increased dissatisfaction, the current survey indicated that family support for the officer's career was statistically higher now than in 1983. Of the 148 officers who made a recommendation to either make the Coast Guard a career or return to civilian life, 103 or 69.6 percent recommended making the Coast Guard a career. The answer to

this apparent dichotomy can be found by reexamining the results from the questions dealing with intrinsic task motivation. Levels of satisfaction in the questions that dealt with impact, competence, meaningfulness and choice were high. These four task elements also appeared on the list of the ten factors most important to the officers in achieving career satisfaction. Despite declining levels of satisfaction with extrinsic motivators, the levels of satisfaction with these intrinsic motivators remain high. From the results of this survey, the majority of Coast Guard officers are receiving a large amount of satisfaction from the job itself.

B. AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

While both this study and the previous study targeted mid-grade Coast Guard officers, a similar study could be done with enlisted personnel. Comparison of the results from these studies would be interesting and could prove valuable. Additionally, both the current survey and the previous survey examined officers from all career paths. Further analysis in specific career areas, for example aviation versus surface operations, may prove to be beneficial.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered:

1. Assignment policies that stress matching an officer's talents and skills with the needs of the job (i.e., competence), are a vital part of maintaining high

levels of intrinsic task motivation. Training and education must be provided for those officers deficient in these required job skills.

2. Occasional mistakes are a part of life and should not be considered fatal. The common belief that one mistake will ruin your career has to be dispelled. The Coast Guard would benefit from modifying the current Officer Evaluation Reporting System so that innovation is encouraged and the inevitable mistakes that go with attempting something new are acceptable.
3. Micro management from supervisors is reducing intrinsic motivation for many. The vast majority of officers feel they have the necessary skills to do the job and want to do it right. Give them the freedom and authority to do the job as they see best.
4. While pay and promotion opportunity are largely dependent on actions by Congress, the Coast Guard should provide more information to service members on current efforts to address these problems.
5. Although the majority of officers are receiving motivation from the job itself, the increase in the proportion of officers who have experienced job burnout is significant. Even the most highly motivated individual will become discouraged if given more jobs than he or she can effectively accomplish. Efforts to eliminate unnecessary work and to reduce or streamline the remaining work would be beneficial.
6. Policies that serve to increase the level of satisfaction in the task elements necessary for intrinsic motivation should be encouraged. In the past, much of the policy which attempted to increase retention was focused on extrinsic rewards. Policies that concentrate on extrinsic rewards neglect many of the factors which appear most important to officer satisfaction.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO O-3 TO O-5 CAREER SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Fellow Coast Guard Officer:

Thank you for taking the time to read this. The enclosed survey has been sent to 300 randomly selected officers throughout the Coast Guard.

I am studying those factors that contribute most significantly to a lack of career contentment. Information obtained and developed will be used strictly for research purposes.

Your responses are an essential portion of this project at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, and only your cooperation can make this beneficial to the Coast Guard. All responses to this questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence.

Your cooperation in answering the attached questions candidly is requested. Any additional comments are welcomed and encouraged. When responding to the questionnaire, please base your answers relative to your entire Coast Guard career, not just your present assignment.

Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible and no later than 9 March. I sincerely appreciate your effort and hope that your present tour is a rewarding one.

J. M. HASSELBALCH, LCDR, USCG

Instructions:

- (1) Use pen or pencil.
- (2) Please place an "X" on the line that corresponds to your response.
- (3) If you have additional comments, please feel free to write them directly on the survey form in the open margins.
- (4) If possible, please complete the questionnaire in one sitting. It should take about 10-20 minutes.
- (5) When you are finished, please return the completed survey form in the envelope provided.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. What is your rank?

_____ LT _____ LCDR _____ CDR

2. What is your age?

_____ 25-30 _____ 31-35 _____ 36-40 _____ Over 40

3. Please indicate your sex.

_____ Male _____ Female

4. What is your marital status?

_____ Single _____ Married

_____ Divorced _____ Other (separated, widowed)

5. What type of unit is your present duty station?

ASHORE

_____ Headquarters
_____ District Office
_____ Group/Station
_____ Marine Safety Office
_____ Air Station
_____ Other (Specify)

AFLOAT

_____ HEC
_____ MEC
_____ PB
_____ WLB/WLM
_____ Other (Specify)

6. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your pay level?

_____ Very Satisfied
_____ Satisfied
_____ Borderline
_____ Dissatisfied
_____ Very Dissatisfied

7. What is your overall reaction toward the adequacy of the present military retirement plan?

- Very Adequate
- Adequate
- Borderline
- Inadequate
- Very Inadequate

8. How would you rate military benefits overall?

- Very Adequate
- Adequate
- Borderline
- Inadequate
- Very Inadequate

9. In general, how do you feel about how quickly officers are being promoted?

- Much Too Quickly
- Too Quickly
- Just Right
- Too Slowly
- Much Too Slowly

10. What is your reaction to the overall selection process for officer promotion?

- Very Positive
- Positive
- Borderline
- Negative
- Very Negative

11. The assignment process is equitable in all career fields for Coast Guard Officers.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

12. To what extent have you been satisfied with the geographic area of your assignment?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Borderline
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

13. How would you evaluate your ability to influence the selection of geographic area for your assignment?

- Exceptionally Good
- Somewhat Good
- So-so
- Somewhat Poor
- Exceptionally Poor

14. What has been the attitude of your family toward your frequency of moves in the Coast Guard?

- Very Positive
- Positive
- Borderline
- Negative
- Very Negative
- Not Applicable

15. When being assigned, what factor is most important to you, billet type or billet location?

- Billet Type
- Billet Location
- Both Equally Important

16. With an impending transfer, I am normally given adequate notification prior to my departure for a new duty station.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

17. How would you describe the quality of subordinates that you have encountered during your career?

- Exceptionally Good
- Somewhat Good
- So-so
- Somewhat Poor
- Exceptionally Poor

18. What has been the attitude of your family toward your Coast Guard career?

- Very Positive
- Positive
- Borderline
- Negative
- Very Negative
- Not Applicable

19. The public recognizes and genuinely appreciates the Coast Guard's mission?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

20. Most of the billets during my career have been ...

- Very Challenging
- Challenging
- Borderline
- Unchallenging
- Very Unchallenging

21. How would you describe the treatment that you have personally received from your detailer?

- Exceptionally Good
- Somewhat Good
- So-so
- Somewhat Poor
- Exceptionally Poor

22. In general, to what extent have you been satisfied with the billet assignments during your career?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Borderline
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

23. How would you evaluate your ability toward influencing your particular billet assignment?

- Exceptionally Good
- Somewhat Good
- So-so
- Somewhat Poor
- Exceptionally Poor

24. How would you evaluate your qualifications overall for the billet assignments that you have received?

- Very Well Qualified
- Qualified
- Borderline
- Unqualified
- Very Unqualified

25. How would you describe your feelings of accomplishment achieved on the job?

- Very Positive
- Positive
- Borderline
- Negative
- Very Negative

26. In general, how would you describe the amount of recognition that you have received for special achievement or extra efforts?

- Very Adequate
- Adequate
- Borderline
- Inadequate
- Very Inadequate

27. Have you ever experienced a sense of job burnout during your career?

No
 Yes
Explain:

28. In general, how would you rate the overall quality of your superiors?

Exceptionally Good
 Somewhat Good
 So-so
 Somewhat Poor
 Exceptionally Poor

29. How adequate is the degree of freedom that you are given in the performance of your job?

Very Adequate
 Adequate
 Borderline
 Inadequate
 Very Inadequate

30. During the normal course of my job I feel restricted by the power of control that others have over me.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neutral
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

31. Up to this point in time, my career expectations are being fulfilled.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neutral
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

32. If you so desired, what are your chances of altering your normal career pattern?

- Exceptionally Good
- Somewhat Good
- So-so
- Somewhat Poor
- Exceptionally Poor

33. In general, how satisfied are you with your career pattern?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Borderline
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

34. Have you been given career counseling?

- Yes
- No

35. How satisfied are you with the career guidance that has been given to you?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Borderline
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

36. The work I am doing is important.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

37. I get a feeling of competence from performing my work activities.

- _____ Strongly Agree
- _____ Agree
- _____ Neutral
- _____ Disagree
- _____ Strongly Disagree

38. Please indicate two factors that you consider most important in achieving career satisfaction.

1.

2.

39. If a junior officer wanted your advice on whether he/she should make the Coast Guard a career or return to civilian life, what would you tell him/her? Why?

Feel free to use the remaining space for any other comments you may have. Please return the survey using the pre-addressed envelope. Thank you!

APPENDIX C
SURVEY RESULTS

Q1: RANK OF RESPONDENT.

	<u>Current Survey</u>		<u>Previous Survey</u>	
	N	%	N	%
LT	110	33.2	76	46.3
LCDR	109	32.9	53	32.3
CDR	<u>112</u>	33.8	<u>35</u>	21.3
	331		164	

Distribution: Chi-square = 36.70 (P value = 0.0000)

LT: Z = -2.83 (P value = 0.0023)

LCDR: Z = 0.13 (P value = 0.4483)

CDR: Z = 2.86 (P value = 0.0021)

Q2: AGE OF RESPONDENT.

	<u>Current Survey</u>		<u>Previous Survey</u>	
	N	%	N	%
25-30	34	10.3	43	26.2
31-35	70	21.1	53	32.3
36-40	127	38.4	44	26.8
Over 40	<u>100</u>	30.2	<u>24</u>	14.6
	331		164	

Distribution: Chi-square = 116.65 (P value = 0.0000)

25-30: Z = -4.59 (P value = 0.0000)

31-35: Z = -2.72 (P value = 0.0033)

36-40: Z = 2.56 (P value = 0.0052)

Over 40: Z = 3.77 (P value = 0.0001)

Q3: SEX OF RESPONDENT.

	<u>Current Survey</u>		<u>Previous Survey</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Male	320	96.7	160	97.6
Female	<u>11</u>	3.3	<u>4</u>	2.4
	331		164	

Distribution: Chi-square = 1.25 (P value = 0.2636)

Q4: MARITAL STATUS.

	<u>Current Survey</u>		<u>Previous Survey</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Single	17	5.2	24	14.2
Married	304	92.1	136	80.5
Divorced	5	1.5	7	4.1
Other	<u>4</u>	1.2	<u>2</u>	1.2
	330		169	

Distribution: Chi-square = 29.96 (P value = 0.0000)

Single: Z = -3.47 (P value = 0.0003)

Married: Z = 3.76 (P value = 0.0001)

Divorced: Z = -1.80 (P value = 0.0359)

Other: Z = 0.00 (P value = 1.0000)

Q5: TYPE OF UNIT.

	<u>Current Survey</u>		<u>Previous Survey</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Headquarters	64	19.3	-	-
District Office	40	12.1	48	29.3
Group/Station	14	4.2	10	6.1
Marine Safety	40	12.1	23	14.0
Air Station	46	13.9	39	23.8
Other Ashore	99	29.9	27	16.5
HEC	2	0.6	4	2.4
MEC	11	3.3	7	4.3
PB	5	1.5	-	-
WLB/WLM	3	0.9	3	1.8
Other Afloat	<u>7</u>	2.1	<u>3</u>	1.8
	331		164	

Q6: SATISFACTION WITH PAY LEVEL.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Satisfied	11	11	27	49	14.8	17.7
Satisfied	54	53	61	168	50.8	62.2
Borderline	27	31	17	75	22.7	15.2
Dissatisfied	15	13	7	35	10.6	3.0
Very Dissatisfied	3	1	0	<u>4</u>	1.2	1.8
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 54.22 (P value = 0.0000)

Satisfaction: Z = -3.28 (P value = 0.0005)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 2.50 (P value = 0.0062)

Q7: REACTION TOWARD MILITARY RETIREMENT PLAN.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Adequate	14	17	24	55	16.8	19.5
Adequate	49	64	60	173	52.7	55.5
Borderline	33	23	19	75	22.9	17.7
Inadequate	10	4	8	22	6.7	6.7
Very Inadequate	2	0	1	<u>3</u>	0.9	0.6
				328		

Distribution: Chi-square = 6.29 (P value = 0.0431)

Satisfaction: Z = -1.27 (P value = 0.1020)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 0.12 (P value = 0.4522)

Q8: RATING OF MILITARY BENEFITS OVERALL.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Adequate	13	4	10	27	8.2	4.9
Adequate	54	43	54	151	45.9	53.0
Borderline	26	46	35	107	32.5	29.9
Inadequate	13	14	9	36	10.9	9.8
Very Inadequate	3	1	4	<u>8</u>	2.4	2.4
				329		

Distribution: Chi-square = 1.95 (P value = 0.3772)

Q9: FEELINGS TOWARDS QUICKNESS OF PROMOTION.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Much Too Quickly	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Too Quickly	2	2	2	6	1.8	7.9
Just Right	7	17	17	41	12.5	57.9
Too Slowly	60	57	79	196	59.8	29.3
Much Too Slowly	40	31	14	<u>85</u>	25.9	4.9
				328		

Distribution: Chi-square = 385.99 (P value = 0.0000)

Satisfaction: Z = -3.29 (P value = 0.0005)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 11.62 (P value = 0.0000)

Q10: REACTION TO SELECTION PROCESS.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Positive	0	3	8	11	3.3	2.4
Positive	24	40	53	117	35.6	41.5
Borderline	46	31	26	103	31.3	35.4
Negative	32	21	20	73	22.2	15.2
Very Negative	7	13	5	<u>25</u>	7.6	5.5
				329		

Distribution: Chi-square = 16.55 (P value = 0.0003)

Satisfaction: Z = -1.07 (P value = 0.1423)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 2.15 (P value = 0.0158)

Q11: EQUITABLE ASSIGNMENT PROCESS IN ALL FIELDS.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	0	1	6	7	2.1	0.6
Agree	14	24	22	60	18.3	12.8
Neutral	42	28	27	97	29.7	31.7
Disagree	38	33	39	110	33.6	44.5
Strongly Disagree	14	21	18	<u>53</u>	16.2	10.4
				327		

Distribution: Chi-square = 14.24 (P value = 0.0008)

Satisfaction: Z = 1.90 (P value = 0.0287)

Dissatisfaction: Z = -1.07 (P value = 0.1423)

Q12: SATISFACTION WITH GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Satisfied	42	30	42	114	34.4	53.0
Satisfied	51	54	48	153	46.2	32.9
Borderline	8	15	7	30	9.1	7.3
Dissatisfied	6	7	10	23	6.9	6.1
Very Dissatisfied	3	3	5	<u>11</u>	3.3	0.7
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 8.32 (P value = 0.0156)

Satisfaction: Z = -1.45 (P value = 0.0735)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 1.24 (P value = 0.1075)

Q13: ABILITY TO INFLUENCE GEOGRAPHIC AREA OF ASSIGNMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Exceptionally Good	9	10	4	23	6.9	10.4
Somewhat Good	31	43	53	127	38.4	35.4
So-so	31	34	30	95	28.7	24.4
Somewhat Poor	26	12	15	53	16.0	17.7
Exceptionally Poor	13	10	10	<u>33</u>	10.0	12.2
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 4.23 (P value = 0.1206)

Q14: ATTITUDE OF FAMILY TOWARDS MOVES.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Positive	6	4	5	15	4.5	7.9
Positive	39	44	40	123	37.2	29.9
Borderline	26	25	30	81	24.5	20.1
Negative	17	16	21	54	16.3	20.1
Very Negative	10	16	15	41	12.4	7.9
Not Applicable	12	4	1	<u>17</u>	5.1	14.0
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 23.09 (P value = 0.0000)

Satisfaction: Z = 0.83 (P value = 0.2033)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 0.16 (P value = 0.4364)

Q15: MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN ASSIGNMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Billet Type	34	26	38	98	29.6	24.4
Billet Location	17	13	19	49	14.8	22.6
Both Important	59	70	55	<u>184</u>	55.6	53.0
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 12.98 (P value = 0.0015)

Billet Type: Z = 1.21 (P value = 0.1131)

Billet Location: Z = -2.15 (P value = 0.0158)

Both Important: Z = 0.55 (P value = 0.2912)

Q16: ADEQUATE NOTIFICATION OF IMPENDING TRANSFER.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	9	17	23	49	14.8	17.1
Agree	51	50	51	152	45.9	44.5
Neutral	11	13	18	42	12.7	9.1
Disagree	25	23	14	62	18.7	18.3
Strongly Disagree	14	6	6	<u>26</u>	7.9	11.0
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 5.58 (P value = 0.0614)

Q17: QUALITY OF SUBORDINATES.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Exceptionally Good	49	35	49	133	40.4	34.8
Somewhat Good	46	64	57	167	50.8	53.0
So-so	11	9	5	25	7.6	11.0
Somewhat Poor	3	0	1	4	1.2	0.6
Exceptionally Poor	0	0	0	<u>0</u>	0.0	0.6
				329		

Distribution: Chi-square = 3.90 (P value = 0.1423)

Q18: ATTITUDE OF FAMILY TOWARD CAREER.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Positive	32	30	37	99	30.0	28.0
Positive	56	47	59	162	49.1	43.3
Borderline	11	20	12	43	13.0	9.8
Negative	2	5	2	9	2.7	4.3
Very Negative	1	3	1	5	1.5	1.2
Not Applicable	8	3	1	<u>12</u>	3.6	13.4
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 30.74 (P value = 0.0000)

Satisfaction: Z = 1.93 (P value = 0.0268)

Dissatisfaction: Z = -0.64 (P value = 0.2611)

Q19: PUBLIC APPRECIATION OF COAST GUARD MISSION.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	11	10	15	36	10.9	12.8
Agree	64	59	63	186	56.4	52.4
Neutral	13	27	23	63	19.1	19.5
Disagree	15	11	8	34	10.3	14.0
Strongly Disagree	7	1	3	<u>11</u>	3.3	1.3
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 0.84 (P value = 0.6570)

Q20: CHALLENGE OF JOB ASSIGNMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Challenging	42	33	45	120	36.4	29.3
Challenging	58	64	62	184	55.8	59.8
Borderline	6	10	3	19	5.8	9.8
Unchallenging	4	1	2	7	2.1	0.6
Very Unchallenging	0	0	0	<u>0</u>	0.0	0.6
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 8.07 (P value = 0.0177)

Satisfaction: Z = 1.14 (P value = 0.1271)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 0.71 (P value = 0.2389)

Q21: TREATMENT RECEIVED FROM DETAILERS.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Exceptionally Good	16	23	30	69	20.9	19.5
Somewhat Good	44	47	44	135	40.9	39.0
So-so	23	20	21	64	19.4	22.6
Somewhat Poor	17	13	11	41	12.4	11.6
Exceptionally Poor	10	5	6	<u>21</u>	6.4	7.3
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 2.14 (P value = 0.3430)

Q22: SATISFACTION WITH BILLET ASSIGNMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Satisfied	33	33	52	118	35.6	44.5
Satisfied	66	55	51	172	52.0	41.5
Borderline	10	16	6	32	9.7	10.4
Dissatisfied	1	4	3	8	2.4	3.7
Very Dissatisfied	0	1	0	<u>1</u>	0.3	0.0
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 1.11 (P value = 0.5741)

Q23: INFLUENCE OVER BILLET ASSIGNMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Exceptionally Good	9	12	14	35	10.6	11.0
Somewhat Good	44	47	55	146	44.2	43.3
So-so	29	28	19	76	23.0	20.7
Somewhat Poor	18	15	13	46	13.9	13.4
Exceptionally Poor	9	7	11	<u>27</u>	8.2	11.6
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 1.98 (P value = 0.3716)

Q24: QUALIFICATION FOR BILLET ASSIGNMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Well Qualified	49	56	67	172	52.0	44.5
Qualified	55	50	44	149	45.0	50.0
Borderline	4	2	1	7	2.1	4.3
Unqualified	2	1	0	3	0.9	1.2
Very Unqualified	0	0	0	<u>0</u>	0.0	0.0
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 4.11 (P value = 0.1281)

Q25: FEELINGS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Positive	49	48	49	146	44.2	39.6
Positive	42	47	57	146	44.2	48.8
Borderline	12	12	4	28	8.5	9.1
Negative	5	2	2	9	2.7	1.8
Very Negative	1	0	0	<u>1</u>	0.3	0.6
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 0.69 (P value = 0.7082)

Q26: AMOUNT OF RECOGNITION RECEIVED.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Adequate	15	13	21	49	14.8	11.0
Adequate	49	39	35	123	37.2	39.6
Borderline	23	26	30	79	23.9	22.6
Inadequate	15	22	18	55	16.6	18.9
Very Inadequate	8	9	8	<u>25</u>	7.6	7.9
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 1.21 (P value = 0.5461)

Q27: JOB BURNOUT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
No	27	31	34	92	28.1	41.5
Yes	82	75	78	<u>235</u>	71.9	58.5
				327		

Distribution: Chi-square = 24.05 (P value = 0.0000)

Satisfaction: Z = -2.99 (P value = 0.0014)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 2.99 (P value = 0.0014)

Q28. QUALITY OF SUPERIORS.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Exceptionally Good	14	17	19	50	15.2	20.1
Somewhat Good	61	56	64	181	54.8	50.0
So-so	26	24	19	69	20.9	20.7
Somewhat Poor	6	10	7	23	7.0	7.3
Exceptionally Poor	3	1	3	<u>7</u>	2.1	1.8
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 0.01 (P value = 0.9950)

Q29: DEGREE OF JOB FREEDOM.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Adequate	31	42	61	134	40.6	45.1
Adequate	60	49	41	150	45.5	41.5
Borderline	8	13	9	30	9.1	9.8
Inadequate	8	3	1	12	3.6	3.7
Very Inadequate	3	1	0	<u>4</u>	1.2	0.0
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 1.35 (P value = 0.5092)

Q30: RESTRICTED IN JOB PERFORMANCE.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	6	5	3	14	4.2	3.7
Agree	31	20	15	66	20.0	19.5
Neutral	23	27	33	83	25.2	25.0
Disagree	47	46	48	141	42.7	45.7
Strongly Disagree	3	10	13	<u>26</u>	7.9	6.1
				330		

Distribution: Chi-square = 0.24 (P value = 0.8869)

Q31. FULFILLMENT OF CAREER EXPECTATIONS.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	20	10	22	52	15.8	17.7
Agree	55	55	62	172	52.3	51.2
Neutral	14	17	12	43	13.1	15.2
Disagree	16	21	14	51	15.5	14.0
Strongly Disagree	4	5	2	<u>11</u>	3.3	1.8
				329		

Distribution: Chi-square = 2.93 (P value = 0.2311)

Q32: CHANCE OF ALTERING CAREER PATTERN.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Exceptionally Good	6	3	3	12	3.6	1.2
Somewhat Good	24	16	29	69	21.0	25.6
So-so	34	30	27	91	27.7	26.8
Somewhat Poor	27	32	23	82	24.9	31.7
Exceptionally Poor	18	27	30	<u>75</u>	22.8	14.6
				329		

Distribution: Chi-square = 0.83 (P value = 0.6603)

Q33: SATISFACTION WITH CAREER PATTERN.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Satisfied	27	26	34	87	26.3	29.3
Satisfied	50	45	52	147	44.4	47.6
Borderline	23	23	18	64	19.3	15.2
Dissatisfied	8	11	7	26	7.9	6.7
Very Dissatisfied	2	4	1	<u>7</u>	2.1	1.2
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 7.20 (P value = 0.0273)

Satisfaction: Z = -1.46 (P value = 0.0721)

Dissatisfaction: Z = 0.76 (P value = 0.2236)

Q34: RECEIVED CAREER COUNSELING.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Yes	37	26	35	98	29.6	29.9
No	73	83	77	<u>233</u>	70.4	70.1
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 0.01 (P value = 0.9203)

Q35: SATISFACTION WITH CAREER GUIDANCE.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Very Satisfied	6	4	4	14	4.2	3.7
Satisfied	24	23	30	77	23.3	20.1
Borderline	36	37	37	110	33.2	32.3
Dissatisfied	34	33	22	89	26.9	21.3
Very Dissatisfied	10	12	19	<u>41</u>	12.4	22.6
				331		

Distribution: Chi-square = 3.59 (P value = 0.1661)

Q36: MY WORK IS IMPORTANT.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	50	43	62	155	47.0	-
Agree	42	57	37	136	41.2	-
Neutral	11	6	8	25	7.6	-
Disagree	6	2	5	13	3.9	-
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	<u>1</u>	0.3	-
				330		

Q37: FEELING OF COMPETENCE FROM DOING MY WORK.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Strongly Agree	46	36	40	122	36.9	-
Agree	45	62	55	162	48.9	-
Neutral	9	10	12	31	9.4	-
Disagree	10	1	5	16	4.8	-
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	<u>0</u>	0.0	-
				331		

Q39: WOULD YOU RECOMMEND COAST GUARD OR CIVILIAN CAREER.

	LT	LCDR	CDR	TOTAL	%	1983%
Coast Guard	37	34	32	103	31.5	-
Civilian	18	14	13	45	13.8	-
Other Response	54	61	64	<u>179</u>	54.7	-
				327		

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Mizell, Larry L., Sources of Career Dissatisfaction Among Mid-Level Coast Guard Officers, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, June 1983.
2. U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Coast Guard, Coast Guard 200 Years of Service--Overview 1989-1990, U.S. Coast Guard, September 1989.
3. Longo, James, "Yost 'Outspoken Diplomat' Woos and Wins Hill for Coast Guard's Missions," Navy Times, Vol. 39, No. 22, 12 March 1990.
4. Muchinsky, P.M., and Tuttle, M.L., "Employee Turnover: An Empirical and Methodological Assessment," Journal of Vocational Behavior, Vol. 14, pp. 43-77, 1979.
5. Hackman, J. Richard; Oldham, Gene; Janson, Robert; and Purdy, Kenneth, "A New Strategy for Job Enrichment," California Management Review, Vol. XVII, No. 4, Summer 1975.
6. Thomas, Kenneth W., and Velthouse, Betty A., "Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An 'Interpretive' Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation," paper presented at the annual Academy of Management Meeting, San Diego, California, 1985.
7. Weiss, Neal A., and Hassett, Matthew J., Introductory Statistics, 2nd Ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1987.
8. Venuto, Kenneth T., "Officer Promotion," The Bulletin--United States Coast Guard Academy Alumni Association, Vol. 49, No. 3, June/July 1987.
9. Kirkpatrick, Kent, and Bechtle, Jon, "Officer Promotion Update," The Bulletin--United States Coast Guard Academy Alumni Association, Vol. 51, No. 3, June/July 1989.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6145	2
2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5002	2
3. LCDR James M. Hasselbalch Department of Economics/Management U.S. Coast Guard Academy New London, CT 06320-4195	4
4. Professor Richard A. McGonigal, Code AS/Mb Department of Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
5. Professor Kenneth W. Thomas, Code AS/Th Department of Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
6. CDR William J. Wilkinson Commandant (G-CPE-1) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, DC 20593-0001	2
7. CDR David S. Belz Commandant (G-CPA-1) U.S. Coast Guard Washington, DC 20593-0001	1
8. LT Lee T. Romasco Leadership School USCG Training Center (t-lam) Petaluma, CA 94952-5000	1
9. CDR Larry L. Mizell Coast Guard Group Grand Haven 650 Harbor Ave. Grand Haven, MI 49417	1

10. Commandant (G-PO) 1
U.S. Coast Guard
Washington, DC 20593-0001
11. Commandant (G-CCS-3) 1
U.S. Coast Guard
Washington, DC 20593-0001