AD-A278 203

NTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

(2)

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT SURVEY RESULTS: A Light Infantry Division and a Mechanized Infantry Division

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

6. AUTHOR(S)
Joseph M. Rothberg, Nancy Loring Harrison, and Carol S. Fullerton

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Walter Reed Army Institute of Research
Washington, DC 20307-5100

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
WRAIR/
TR-94-0003

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
U. S. Army Medical Research & Development Command
Ft. Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702-5012

10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 19 1994
S B D

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved For Public Release:
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT *(Maximum 200 words)*

The full functioning of an Army division requires assurance that all of its major components are working at an adequate level. This research was undertaken to fill teh apparent lack of any prior psychosocial evaluation of combat service support units. Cohesion and other attributes related to psychological orientation toward being a soldier (including psychological readiness for war) in Army combat service support units is teh focus of study within both conventionally organized and light Divisions.

14. SUBJECT TERMS	15. NUMBER OF PAGES
Cohesion, Readiness, Well-Being, Soldiers, Survey, Combat Service Support, Infantry Division	55
	16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
Unclassified	Unclassified		Unlimited

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239-18
298-102

Encl 3

94-11679
94 4 18 090

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filling in each block of the form follow. It is important to ***stay within the lines*** to meet ***optical scanning requirements***

Block 1. Agency Use Only *(Leave blank)*.

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered. State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C	- Contract	PR	- Project
G	- Grant	TA	- Task
PE	- Program Element	WU	- Work Unit Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s).

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. *(If known)*

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in.... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement. Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."
DOE - See authorities.
NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.
NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code.

DOD - Leave blank.
DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.
NASA - Leave blank.
NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief *(Maximum 200 words)* factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code *(NTIS only)*.

Blocks 17. - 19. Security Classifications. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.

COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT SURVEY RESULTS: A Light Infantry Division and a Mechanized Infantry Division

Joseph M. Rothberg, Ph.D.*
Nancy Loring Harrison, M.A.
Carol S. Fullerton, Ph.D.

From the Department of Military Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, and the Department of Psychiatry, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

*Research Mathematician, Department of Military Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Washington, DC 20307-5100, and Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. Author to whom inquiries should be addressed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank R.Cervantes, G.Gerow, J.Hall, R.Howard, A.Igou, G.Killiebrew, G.Meckel, M.Norris, T.Savage, and N.Thompson for their assistance in carrying out this study. We also wish to thank our colleagues for their thoughtful comments on earlier drafts and to acknowledge the contributions of D.Marlowe without whom this work would not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

The cohesion and psychological readiness for war (psychological orientation toward being a soldier) of junior enlisted (E1-E4) combat service support soldiers in both a light and a mechanized division were measured by an extensive survey questionnaire and the general findings show that:

1. Combat service support soldiers differ from previously surveyed combat soldiers in the way that they think about the Army as revealed in the factor structure of their responses.

2. Satisfaction with the Army is higher in support troops compared to previously surveyed combat troops in one light division.

3. Projections based on very small sample sizes are that the confidence that soldiers have in their company and platoon officers as leaders is the same for male and female officers and does not depend on sex.

4. Projections based on very small sample sizes are that the confidence that soldiers have in their NCOs as leaders is the same for male and female NCOs and does not depend on the sex of the soldiers except that male soldiers report lower confidence in a female First Sergeant.

5. The horizontal cohesion and combat readiness scores were lower in those companies where there was more than one soldier who did not expect to go to war with their unit. The horizontal cohesion score and the proportion of soldiers who did not expect to go were inversely correlated.

6. The well-being and satisfaction of single parents was not different from that of other support soldiers.

7. The horizontal cohesion of line support companies was higher than that of headquarters support companies.

8. The average soldier's rating of platoon and squad level horizontal cohesion was higher than his or her rating of company level horizontal cohesion in the mechanized and light support soldiers as well as in the light combat soldiers.

9. Compared to the support soldiers in the conventionally organized mechanized division, the support soldiers in the light division had the same satisfaction, higher cohesion, higher perceived readiness for combat and the same perceived capability of the unit to perform support and self-defense simultaneously.

INTRODUCTION

The full functioning of an Army division requires assurance that all of its major components are working at an adequate level. This research was undertaken to fill the apparent lack of any prior psychosocial evaluation of combat service support units. Cohesion and other attributes related to psychological orientation toward being a soldier (including psychological readiness for war) in Army combat service support units is the focus of study within both conventionally organized and light Divisions (Harrison, Rothberg and Meckel, 1987).[1] This report presents the findings from the surveys of combat service support soldiers in light infantry and mechanized infantry divisions and selected comparative results from previously surveyed combat soldiers in the same light infantry division.

METHODOLOGIC ISSUES

Method

This survey study of infantry combat service support (CSS) soldiers draws on the items and scales previously developed for combat (CBT) soldiers (Appendix B presents the items and scales). We present the CSS results separately for soldiers in the light (CSSL) and mechanized (CSSM) divisions. The survey instrument was 30 pages in length and was administered to company or battalion groups in one and one-half hour sessions. The great majority of questions asked the soldier to select the single most appropriate response from a small number of alternatives representing assessment of quantities or extent of agreement with substantive or attitudinal issues related to unit climate and interpersonal characterizations. We have used the Unit Manning System Evaluation scales for confidence in officers as leaders, confidence in NCOs as leaders, horizontal cohesion, combat readiness, and general well being. The satisfaction scale was constructed from the 21 item satisfaction section of the questionnaire. The company and platoon/squad level horizontal cohesion scales were constructed from the division of the horizontal cohesion items into unambiguous subsets. To provide comparability with the previously reported combat soldier survey work reported for the Unit Manning System Evaluation,[2,3,4,5,6] the domain of analysis of the survey was restricted to those respondents in the lower enlisted grades (E1 through E4) who were in one of the companies from which there were ten or more E1 through E4 survey respondents. Participation in the survey was voluntary. Because we have no other information, we are forced to assume that the answers of the respondents are representative of those who did not respond to the survey.

Response Rate

The organization of the Combat Service Support units for the light Infantry Division (DISCOM) at the time of our survey in late August and early October 1987 included four Battalions (Headquarters, Medical, Maintenance, and Supply and Transportation) with approximately 615 soldiers in grades E1 through E4 distributed in 15 companies. This is the CSSL sample, see Table 1. The 331 E1-E4 respondents in the 10 companies where there were 10 or more E1-E4 respondents represent two thirds of the companies and 54% of the assigned strength of 615 lower enlisted personnel. The lower enlisted female respondent proportion of 18.9% from the ten companies is not statistically different from the 15.8% proportion of females in the lower enlisted grades in all 15 companies (chi-sq=1.6, df=1, ns).

The organization of the Combat Service Support units in the mechanized infantry division at the time of our survey in May 1988 included six battalions or equivalents (four support battalions, headquarters, and an NBC (nuclear, biological, and chemical) group). This is the CSSM sample, see Table 1. The 1013 E1-E4 survey respondents from companies with 10 or more E1-E4 respondents represent all of the companies and 64% of the 1584 assigned E1-E4 in the 22 companies. The 227 E1-E4 female respondents were 22.4% of the respondents which is the same (chi-sq = 0.7, df = 1, ns) as the proportion of lower enlisted females in this mechanized combat service support division (23.3%). Our statements about CSS soldiers are based on the CSSL and CSSM data.

The data for the combat soldiers (the CBTL sample) were derived from an extended survey with multiple administrations in the same light division (M.Vaitkus, personal communication). Although we selected the data of the 1987 fourth administration, closest in time to the CSSL survey, that time was late in the life cycle of the CBTL and the scores were rapidly changing.[6]) The interpretation of the scores of the CSSL relative to CBTL would change if a different point of comparison were chosen. For comparability, we adopted the same criterion of only reporting the responses of E1-E4 soldiers when they came from a unit where there were 10 or more E1-E4 respondents from that same unit.

Response Style

A preliminary question was raised about the way that CSS and CBT soldiers think about the survey items. To explore the differences between the groups, a factor analysis was run on the 71 core items which had been used without alteration in the surveys of the CBTL (n=844) and CSSL (n=256) soldiers in a light division at the same post and for the CSSM (n=780) at a second post. The principal component factor analysis used varimax rotation and was

arbitrarily limited to six factors. The first listed items (those with loadings of 0.6 or greater on the first of six factors after varimax rotation) were compared by inspection of the items. The rotated factor pattern and eigenvalues for CSSL, CSSM, and CBTL are reproduced as Appendix A.

Descriptively, the first factor accounted for about a sixth of the variance of the data while the six-factor solution accounted for about half of the variance in the data. While the factor analysis of data from the CBTL seemed to account for less variance on the first factor but more on the six-factor solution (compared to the CSSL and CSSM), an appropriate statistical test of this apparent relationship has not been located. The amount of variance accounted for by the first factor is 12.9% for CBTL, 15.0% for CSSM, and 15.2% for CSSL while the variance accounted for by the six factor solution is 51% for CBTL, 46.6% for CSSM, and 47.7% for CSSL. As will be seen below, this similarity of amount of variance explained by the factor analysis is not accompanied by a similarity in the nature of the first listed items included as most heavily loading on the first factor of the six-factor solution.

The response patterns were consistently negative in the CSSL, CSSM and CBTL first listed items. These items may be thought of as those which form the group which was answered most consistently across all of the respondents.

The CSSL first listed items seem to reflect company level fragmentation with the exception of a negative appraisal of the company officers and an indifferent response to the company pride item. The CSSL first listed items of the first factor consist of:--

P2 People in this company feel very close.
P1 This company is one of the best in the Army.
P29 I like being in this company.
P3 The officers in this company really seem to know their stuff.
FX2 I am proud of my company.
FX3 I really feel that I belong in my company.
P28 As time goes on, people in this company will get even tighter.
FX5 There is a lot of teamwork and cooperation among soldiers in my company.
P31 In this company, people really look out for each other.

The CSSM soldiers partially replicated this finding in that their first listed items also seemed to reflect company level fragmentation. The CSSM first listed items of the first factor consist of :--

P29 I like being in this company.
FX2 I am proud of my company.
P1 This company is one of the best in the Army.
FX3 I really feel that I belong in my company.
P4 My company would do a better job in combat.
P12 I am impressed with the quality of leadership in this company.

The CBTL first listed items of the first factor seem to characterize a negation of the "caring leadership" image and consist of:--

DS14 My officers are interested in my personal welfare.

DS16 My officers are interested in what I think and feel about things.
DS12 My platoon leader talks to me personally outside normal duties.
DS13 The company commander talks to me personally outside normal duties.
DS24 Officers in my company are the kind I would want to serve under in combat.
DS17 My NCOs are interested in what I think and how I feel about things.
DS15 My NCOs are interested in my personal welfare.

These results indicate that, as groups, the CSS and CBT soldiers do not respond in the same way. The CSS (both CSSL and CSSM) soldiers seem to be most consistent in terms of the factor of horizontal (peer) items, though they evaluate those items negatively, while the CBTL soldiers were most consistent in terms of the factor of vertical (leader) items though they also evaluate those items negatively.

HYPOTHESES AND RESULTS

The hypotheses which we tested in the quantitative survey data were derived from an extensive series of interviews held in the months prior to the survey at the CSSL post.[7,8,9]

The results are presented as CSSL versus CBTL and where the hypotheses permit, are supplemented by the CSSL versus CSSM comparison. Unless otherwise qualified, the term soldier refers to both male and female soldiers.

Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction in Combat and Support Soldiers.

Soldier complaints about the difficulties in meeting the demands of the support mission led us to the hypothesis that the combat support soldiers whom we surveyed would score lower on the measures of soldier satisfaction than comparable enlisted combat soldiers in the same division. The "Satisfaction" scale consists of twenty one items about the Army lifestyle on which the soldiers rated their feelings from "Completely Dissatisfied" to "Completely Satisfied".

The CSSL support soldier score (see Table 2) was not lower but rather, was higher ($t=8.9$, $df=1268$, $p<.001$) than the CBTL combat soldier score. The CSSM score was not different ($t=1.25$, $df=1201$, ns) from the CSSL score.

This contradicts the hypothesis that support soldiers are less satisfied than combat soldiers for light infantry. The lack of difference between the survey scores of the light and mechanized combat service support soldiers leads us to conclude that support soldiers are not less satisfied than combat soldiers.

Hypothesis 2: Leader-Led Confidence and Sex, Officers.

The null hypothesis is that the confidence that soldiers have in their officers as leaders is the same for male and female officers and does not depend on the sex of the soldiers. Data are available for Company Commanders and Platoon Leaders. Despite the small numbers of female leaders which means that the statistical analysis has low power (i.e., there could be a very large effect that we did not detect because of the small numbers) we have chosen to present these data to document our pilot analysis and present a reference point (albeit a weak point) where there was none before.

A: Company Commanders. For the CSSL soldiers, the data do not contradict

the null hypotheses that there are no sex differences in the scores given to their company commanders as leaders (ANOVA for sex of leaders and sex of soldiers, F=2.4, df=3, 935, ns), based on the 9 male and one female company commanders.

For the CSSM soldiers, there is no independent effect for sex of leader or sex of soldier (F=1.4, df=3, 305, ns) but there is a significant interaction term (f=4.75, p=.03) because female soldiers gave elevated confidence scores (x=44.7) to the four female company commanders compared to an elevated mean of 37.4 for the scores given by all CSSM soldiers to the 22 CSSM company commanders.

B: Platoon Leaders. For the CSSL soldiers, the data do not contradict the null hypothesis of no sex differences (F=2.28, df=3, 300, ns) based on the five female and 41 male platoon leaders. For the CSSM soldiers, there is no independent effect for sex of leader and sex of soldier (F=1.8, df=3, 932, ns) but there is a significant reduction in the mean score given by all of their platoon soldiers to the four female platoon leaders (x=33.2) compared to the mean given by all of their platoon soldiers to the 137 male platoon leaders (x=37.7).

Although our analysis was restricted by the small numbers of female officers in command positions, there is no overwhelming evidence that a soldier's confidence in their leader is determined by the sex of the leader. We accept the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: Leader-Led Confidence and Sex, NCOs.

The null hypothesis that the confidence that soldiers have in their NCOs as leaders is the same for male and female NCOs and does not depend on the sex of the soldier was proposed. Confidence of soldiers in their Non-Commissioned Officers was measured by sex of NCO and sex of soldier for Squad Leader, Platoon Sergeant and First Sergeant for both CSSL and CSSM. As was argued above under Hypothesis 2, we present these data despite their statistical weakness.

A: Squad Leaders: For CSSL, there was no effect on the NCO confidence scale scores given by soldiers to their 16 female and 146 male squad leaders as a function of the sex of the soldier, the sex of the squad leader or the interaction of these terms (ANOVA: F=0.3, df=3, 3007, ns). For CSSM, there also was no effect of sex on the scores given to the 45 female and 347 male squad leaders (F=0.2, df=3, 946, ns).

B: Platoon Sergeants: In the CSSL, no female soldiers had a female platoon sergeant. There was no effect on the NCO confidence scale scores given by the soldiers to their one female and 45 male platoon sergeants as a function of the sex of the soldier or the sex of the squad leader (ANOVA: F=0.5, df=2, 308, ns). For CSSM, there also was no effect of sex on the

scores given to the 8 female and 133 male platoon sergeants (F=1.6, df=3, 949, ns).

C: First Sergeants: For CSSL, there was an effect of the sex of the first sergeant on the NCO confidence scale scores given by the soldiers to the one female and 9 male first sergeants (ANOVA: F=5.1, df=3, 308, p=.002). The mean score of 37.9 given to the one female First Sergeant by her 39 soldiers was significantly lower than the average score of 51.2 given by the 273 soldiers to their 9 male First Sergeants (F=14.21, p<.001). For CSSM, there was no effect of the sex of the First Sergeant, the sex of the soldier, or their interaction on the NCO confidence scale scores given by the soldiers to their one female or 21 male First Sergeants (F=.9, df=3, 951, ns).

The null hypothesis was not contradicted in five of the six comparisons for which we had data. The exception was that CSSL male soldiers reported lower confidence in their NCOs if the First Sergeant was female compared to male soldiers reports of NCO confidence when their First Sergeant was male.

Hypothesis 4: Cohesion, Readiness and Non-deployability.

Field observations reported some resentment by male soldiers of their perceived unreliability of female soldiers. One of the reasons for that perception was the assertion by some females that they would not have to go to war with their unit because they were female. The hypothesis was framed that the horizontal cohesion scale scores and the combat readiness scale scores would be lower for those units where the females said that they did not expect to go to war. In consideration of the relatively small numbers of survey respondents, the hypothesis was recast to predict that the scores for the entire company on the horizontal cohesion and readiness for combat scales would be lower in those companies where more than one of the soldiers, male or female, responded that they would not go with their unit if their unit went to war (we refer to such a soldier as a "no-go" and Table 3a presents some of the details of the response to this item).

For CSSL, the no-go rate was 13.3% overall and the distribution was bimodal across companies:--none or one no-go occurred in 6 companies (0%, 0%, 4.3%, 5.0%, 6.7%, 7.7%) while there were four companies with seven to sixteen no-go responses (15.9%, 16.0%, 18.9% and 23.8%). These four companies with seven to sixteen no-go encompassed 67% of the survey respondents. And indeed, the combat readiness scale score for the soldiers in the six companies with none or one no-go (see Table 3) was higher (t=3.77, df=317, p<.001) than the score for the soldiers in the four companies with seven or more no-go responses. The result is similar for the horizontal cohesion scale scores:--for the soldiers in the six companies with none or one no-go, the horizontal cohesion scale scores were higher (t=3.11, df=317, p=0.002) than those of the soldiers in the other four companies. The no-go rate within a company was correlated inversely with the horizontal cohesion score (r=-0.73, n=10, p=.02) but not correlated with the combat readiness score (r=-0.52, n=10, ns).

For CSSM, the no-go rate was 18.6% with approximately continuous variability across companies ranging from 1 to 28 soldiers per company or, on a percentage basis, from a low of 2 no-go in a company of 42 (4.8%) to a high of 6 out of 11 (54.5%) but with no obvious division into two regions as was seen for the CSSL. Since the structure of the data is not the same in the two divisions, we could not provide a parallel analysis for the CSSM that was similar to that used for the CSSL. Instead, we used a median split of the CSSM into the 11 units with the lowest no-go rate contrasted with the other 11. This seems not too far from the 9 and 13 unit split that would have resulted from applying the CSSL unit proportions to the CSSM. An alternative would be to rank order the units and attempt to match the proportion of no-go respondents The mean combat readiness score for the soldiers in units with the lower rate of no-go was higher ($t=3.70$, $df=961$, $p<.001$) than the score for the soldiers in units with the higher rate of no-go. The horizontal cohesion scale scores show a similar pattern:--for soldiers in the units with the lower rate of no-go, the horizontal cohesion scale score was higher ($t=4.24$, $df=972$, $p<.001$) than the score for soldiers in the other companies with the higher rate of no-go. The no-go rate within a company was correlated inversely with the horizontal cohesion score ($r=-0.45$, $n=22$, $p=.04$) but not correlated with the combat readiness score ($r=-.03$, $n=22$, ns).

Our data do not contradict the hypothesis that the presence of soldiers who do not expect to go to war with their unit lowers the average unit horizontal cohesion.

Hypothesis 5: Well-Being and Satisfaction in Single Parents.

The rigorous time demands placed on soldiers in the light CSS were reported to weigh particularly heavily on the single parent. The hypothesis was offered that the Well-Being (GWB) and the Satisfaction (SAT) scale scores would be lower for single parents in the CSSL than for other soldiers in the CSSL, and that the single parent scores would be lower in CSSL compared to CSSM.

With only five single parents in the CSSL there were no measurable differences in the GWB ($t=0.4$, $df=296$, ns) or SAT ($t=0.3$, $df=328$, ns) scores for the single parents (see Table 4) compared to the other, non-single parent soldiers. For CSSM, there also was no difference in the GWB ($t=1.3$, $df=887$, ns) or SAT ($t=0.9$, $df=899$, ns) scores for the 31 single parents compared to the other soldiers. There was no difference in the GWB and SAT scores of single parents between CSSM and CSSL (GWB: $t=0.6$, $df=32$, ns. SAT: $t=0.2$, $df=34$, ns).

Based on the responses of the single parents in our two samples, we could detect no differences in the well-being or satisfaction scores compared to the other combat service support soldiers within their respective divisions nor could we measure a difference between the few single parents in a light versus

a mechanized support division.

Hypothesis 6: Horizontal Cohesion in Headquarters and Line Companies.

The nature of the tasks required of soldiers in line companies is not the same as headquarters companies. We hypothesized that the relatively greater emphasis on group performance observed in the line companies would appear as higher horizontal cohesion. For this phase of the analysis, the headquarters company of the headquarters battalion was omitted.

The average horizontal cohesion scale score of CSSL soldiers in the six line companies (see Table 5) was higher ($t=3.24$, $df=304$, $p=0.001$) than that of the three headquarters companies. This was not seen in the CBTL where the line scores were not different ($t=0.8$, $df=1034$, ns) from the headquarter scores. For the CSSM, the average horizontal cohesion scale score of soldiers in the 17 line companies was higher ($t=2.90$, $df=928$, $p=.004$) than that of the 4 headquarters companies.

The hypothesis that the headquarters companies have lower horizontal cohesion scores was not contradicted within the CSS (CSSL or CSSM) but was rejected for the CBTL companies.

Hypothesis 7: Horizontal Cohesion at the Platoon and Company Level.

The observation that soldiers relate more toward the platoon than the company led to the hypothesis that horizontal cohesion scores relative to the platoon should be higher than for the company. The horizontal cohesion scale is a composite containing six items relating to company, six items relating to platoon or squad, and one non-specific item.

For CSSL, the average soldier's responses on the platoon and squad level sub-scale score (see Table 6) was indeed higher ($t=3.48$, $df= 637$, $p= 0.003$) than the company level horizontal cohesion sub-scale score. This was seen as well in the CBTL ($t=5.4$, $df=2063$, $p<.001$). For CSSM, the platoon and squad level sub-scale score is also higher ($t=8.24$, $df=1933$, $p<.001$) than the company level horizontal cohesion sub-scale score.

These data are consistent with the hypothesis that self-reported rating of horizontal cohesion is stronger for the platoon and squad items than it is for the company items.

Hypothesis 8: Light versus Conventional Organization and Scores for Satisfaction, Readiness, Horizontal Cohesion, and Dual Mission.

The negative effect of the workload associated with light compared to mechanized DISCOM units was tested by comparison of the soldiers' survey responses. The reports of their satisfaction (SAT), readiness for combat (RFC), horizontal cohesion (HC), and perception of ability to simultaneously perform the support and defense components of their mission (DM) were compared.

The scores for the CSSL (see Table 7) were not entirely the same (SAT: $t=1.2$, $df=1201$, ns. RFC: $t=8.0$, $df=1280$, $p<.001$. HC: $t=3.9$, $df=1291$, $p<.001$. DM: $t=1.1$, $df=1310$, ns) as the scores for CSSM.

The CSSL had the same satisfaction, higher cohesion, higher perceived readiness for combat, and the same perceived ability to perform the unit's support and defense mission compared to CSSM.

DISCUSSION

The cohesion and psychological orientation toward being a soldier (including psychological readiness for war) of junior enlisted (E1-E4) combat service support soldiers in both a light and a conventionally organized division were surveyed with an extensive questionnaire and show that, on a unit basis, there were a number of differences.

Combat service support soldiers differ from combat soldiers in the way that they think about the Army. This was revealed in the factor structure of their responses. The extent to which these differences influence the subsequent analyses is unclear but it does suggest that scales developed and validated on CSS soldiers may not be maximally efficient or entirely appropriate for CBT soldiers. This qualitative picture could benefit from further study to derive a formal procedure for drawing inferences about the meaning of these differences.

Satisfaction with the Army is higher in support troops compared to combat troops as surveyed in one light division. This is an unexpected finding which may be due to the combat units being late in their COHORT life-cycle (as suggested by M.Vaitkus, personal communication) This relation could be pursued by systematic interviews or by comparison of these satisfaction scores with those of other pairs of combat and support divisions.

Confidence that soldiers have in their company and platoon officers as leaders is the same for male and female officers and does not depend on sex. Similarly, the confidence that soldiers have in their NCOs as leaders is the same for male and female NCOs and does not depend on the sex of the soldiers with the exception of male soldiers reporting lower confidence in a female First Sergeant. These findings suggest that the informal attitudes and the formal policies of the Army are not greatly divergent.

The horizontal cohesion and combat readiness scores were lower in those companies where there was more than one soldier who did not expect to go with their unit if it were sent to war. The horizontal cohesion score and the proportion of soldiers who did not expect to go were inversely correlated. This appears to be a strong effect in which the responses of a relatively small number of soldiers who did not expect to go to war were associated with the lower average horizontal cohesion scores of the survey respondents in the same company. The relation of these response to other behaviors is unknown.

The well-being and satisfaction of single parents was not different from that of other soldiers. The small numbers of single parents who were respondents in our surveys required large differences to be present before the null hypotheses of no difference were rejected.

The horizontal cohesion of line support companies was higher than that of headquarters support companies. We believe that there is a strong association

between horizontal cohesion and proficiency in the performance of many group tasks and that the lower headquarters scores are due to fewer group tasks which give fewer opportunities for developing horizontal cohesion and implicitly in the headquarters leadership who do not organize tasks on a group basis.

The average soldier's rating of platoon and squad level horizontal cohesion was higher than his or her rating of company level horizontal cohesion. This result is consonant with the field reports and provides indirect support for the use of this measurement of horizontal cohesion

The soldiers in the light division had the same satisfaction, higher cohesion, higher perceived readiness for combat and the same perceived capability of the unit to simultaneously perform support and self-defense compared to the conventionally organized division.

In summary, the survey responses of soldiers in light and mechanized combat service support units differ from combat soldiers and between themselves.

CONCLUSION

The findings reported above can be grouped into three sets of results:

1. There are measurable differences between combat and support troops,
2. Sex is not a factor in soldier's confidence in their leaders, and
3. The horizontal cohesion measure appears to parallel the extent to which the soldiers reflect the work-group goals as the norm.

The implications of these results are:

1. The characterization of "the Army" requires data from the combat support soldiers to represent the entire Army,
2. Personnel policies involving soldiers' confidence in their leaders can be made without concern for the sex of either the soldiers or their leaders, and
3. The assessment of cohesion and psychological orientation toward being a soldier (including psychological readiness for war) requires the interaction of questionnaire and field interview methodologies.

Table 1. Survey response rate for combat service support soldiers in a light (CSSL) and a mechanized (CSSM) division.

	CSSM	CSSL
E1-E4 Strength	1584	615
Female E1-E4 Strength	369	97
E1-E4 Respondents*	1013	331
E1-E4 Female Respondents*	227	63
Response Rate	64%	54%
Female Response Rate	62%	65%

* Only includes those respondents from a company where there were 10 or more E1-E4 respondents in that company.

Table 2. Survey scores for satisfaction in support soldiers in a mechanized (CSSM) and a light (CSSL) division and in combat soldiers in the same light division (CBTL).

	CSSM	[Pr]	CSSL	[Pr]	CBTL
Satisfaction, mean	45.3	ns	46.7	***	37.8
std dev	16.96		16.26		14.68
n	901		302		968

*** Pr < .001

Table 3. Survey scores for combat readiness and horizontal cohesion by non-deployment expectation for combat service support soldiers in a light (CSSL) and a mechanized (CSSM) division.

	CSSM			CSSL		
	Non-Deploy*/Company			Non-Deploy/Company		
	(0-19%)	[Pr]	(19+%)	(0-13%)	[Pr]	(13+%)
Number of Companies	11		11	6		4
Combat Readiness, mean	40.9	***	36.9	52.7	***	45.5
std dev	16.61		16.33	17.09		15.63
n	575		388	105		214
Horizontal Cohesion, mean	41.8	***	37.0	48.5	**	42.1
std dev	16.84		18.16	18.30		16.89
n	588		386	106		213

* "NO" as % of "NO" + "YES" on U2F, see appendix B-21.

** Pr < .01

*** Pr < .001

Table 3a. Survey responses to U2F, "Non-Deployability" item ("If your unit was sent to war today would you expect to go to war with it?") by sex for combat service support soldiers (E1-E4 in companies with 10 or more E1-E4 respondents) in a light (CSSL, n = 268) and a mechanized (CSSM, n = 766) division.

	CSSM			CSSL		
(%)	M	F	M+F	M	F	M+F
"YES"	83.2	59.1	77.8	87.7	75.0	85.4
Other than yes	16.8	40.9	22.2	15.7	25.0	14.6
"NO"	14.2	37.8	19.5	13.4	23.3	13.4
"MY UNIT WILL NOT BE DEPLOYED"	2.6	3.2	2.7	2.2	1.7	1.2

Table 4. Survey scores for well-being and satisfaction in combat service support soldiers in a light (CSSL) and a mechanized (CSSM) division by single parent status.

	CSSM			CSSL		
	Sngl Prnt [Pr]		Othr	Sngl Prnt [Pr]		Othr
Well-Being, mean	57.3	ns	62.0	64.0	ns	60.6
std dev	22.12		19.10	17.20		19.10
n	29		860	5		293
Satisfaction, mean	42.7	ns	45.4	44.4	ns	42.7
std dev	18.43		16.91	12.51		14.35
n	31		870	5		325

Table 5. Survey scores for horizontal cohesion in combat service support soldiers in a mechanized (CSSM) division and a light (CSSL) division and in combat soldiers in the same light (CBTL) division by headquarters or line companies.

	CSSM	CSSL	CBTL
Headquarters, mean	32.1	41.3	46.4
std dev	17.67	16.45	16.87
n	41	178	242
[Pr]	**	***	ns
Line, mean	40.3	47.8	45.4
std dev	17.51	18.40	18.51
n	889	128	794

** Pr < .01

*** Pr < .001

Table 6. Survey scores for platoon/squad and company horizontal cohesion in combat support soldiers in a mechanized (CSSM) division and a light (CSSL) division and in combat soldiers in the same light division (CBTL).

	CSSM	CSSL	CBTL
Platoon/Squad, mean	43.0	46.8	48.2
std dev	20.13	19.95	20.72
n	964	321	1034
[Pr]	***	**	***
Company, mean	35.7	41.5	43.4
std dev	18.80	18.92	19.52
n	971	318	1031

** Pr < .01

*** Pr < .001

Table 7. Survey scores for satisfaction, readiness for combat, horizontal cohesion and dual mission for combat service support soldiers in a light (CSSL) and a mechanized (CSSM) division.

	CSSM	[Pr]	CSSL
Satisfaction, mean	45.3	ns	46.7
std dev	16.96		16.26
n	901		302
Readiness for Combat, mean	39.3	***	47.8
std dev	16.61		16.45
n	963		319
Horizontal Cohesion, mean	39.9	***	44.2
std dev	17.52		17.60
n	974		319
Dual Mission, mean	2.42	ns	2.49
std dev	0.97		0.99
n	995		317

*** Pr < .001

REFERENCES

1. Harrison, N.L, Rothberg, J.M., and Meckel, G. "Cohesion and Psychological Readiness in Combat Service Support Units of a Light and Non-Light Division" Washington, DC: Department of Military Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. 1987.

2. Marlowe, D.H., New Manning System Field Evaluation: Technical Report No. 1. Defense Technical Information Center, Alexandria, VA Document Number ADA 162087. 1985.

3. Marlowe, D.H., New Manning System Field Evaluation. Technical Report No. 2. Washington, DC: Department of Military Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. 1986.

4. Marlowe, D.H., New Manning System Field Evaluation: Technical Report No. 3. Defense Technical Information Center, Alexandria, VA Document Number ADA 207195. 1986.

5. Marlowe, D.H., New Manning System Field Evaluation: Technical Report No. 4. Defense Technical Information Center, Alexandria, VA Document Number ADA 207026. 1986.

6. Marlowe, D.H., New Manning System Field Evaluation: Technical Report No. 5. Defense Technical Information Center, Alexandria, VA Document Number ADA 207193. 1987.

7. Harrison, N.L., Kirkland, F.R., and Rothberg, J.M. "Army Culture, Stress, and Leadership in Division Support Commands" in preparation, 1989.

8. Harrison, N.L., Teitelbaum, J., and Rothberg, J.M. "Cohesion in Mixed Gender Units: Patterns and Dilemmas" in preparation, 1989.

9. Harrison, N.L. "Methodological Description of the Light Discom Study: April 1986 - January 1988" in preparation, 1989.

ROTATION METHOD: VARIMAX

ROTATED FACTOR PATTERN

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6	
P2	0.75799	0.15519	0.12940	0.26306	0.06981	0.09805	PEOPLE CLOSE IN COMPANY
P1	0.69833	0.31755	0.06097	0.15692	0.12628	0.07871	COMPANY IS ONE OF BEST
P29	0.67387	0.12425	0.15080	0.19904	0.19226	0.22405	LIKE BEING IN COMPANY
P3	0.64987	0.07390	0.35660	-0.10103	0.05796	0.03567	OFFICERS KNOW THEIR STUFF
FX2	0.64210	0.24033	0.14348	0.18242	0.27162	0.16241	PROUD TO BE IN COMPANY
FX3	0.62979	0.08781	0.17286	0.26299	0.28139	0.11798	BELONG IN MY COMPANY
P28	0.62958	0.18333	0.16601	0.32066	0.12965	0.01942	PEOPLE WILL GET TIGHTER
FX5	0.62743	0.28757	0.12158	0.17197	0.16575	0.04804	TEAMWORK IN MY COMPANY
P31	0.62106	0.17826	0.09112	0.32778	0.11612	0.21680	PEOPLE LOKK OUT FOR EACH OTHER
P32	0.59434	0.35296	0.05046	0.09575	0.11167	0.02455	BETTER TRAINED THAN OTHER COMPANIES
P33	0.59376	0.14606	0.40725	-0.16189	-0.02075	0.05250	OFFICERS LEAD WELL IN COMBAT
U1	0.59354	0.16522	0.02733	0.11119	0.27806	0.19869	LEVEL OF UNIT MORALE
FX6	0.56693	0.15775	0.34587	-0.06128	0.14677	-0.01115	OFFICERS GET COOPERATION
P4	0.56257	0.40154	0.10241	0.07187	0.07392	-0.11157	COMPANY WOULD DO BETTER JOB IN COMBAT
P25	0.56202	0.04882	0.09110	0.15312	0.05066	0.14201	SPEND TOUR IN COMPANY
P12	0.52939	0.37313	0.21800	0.03145	0.15249	0.03451	IMPRESSED WITH LEADERSHIP
S24	0.52156	0.15383	0.49743	-0.00342	0.00072	-0.06480	WANT TO GO COMBAT UNDER THESE OFFICERS
FX8	0.50097	0.20379	0.38241	0.05851	0.02344	0.04719	DO ANYTHING FOR OFFICERS AFTER DUTY
P30	0.48512	0.11459	0.07032	0.11732	0.14591	0.29607	DONT WATCH POSS IN COMPANY
S28	0.47976	0.24361	0.26768	-0.02640	0.22327	0.25821	CHAIN-O-COMMAND WORKS WELL
P24	0.40257	0.18582	0.19366	0.29628	0.15084	0.19650	TRUST PEOPLE IN COMPANY
U13A	-0.30321	-0.16545	0.04371	-0.03887	-0.28050	-0.05785	CONDITION OF UNIT EQUIPMENT
U2A	-0.46115	-0.31595	0.00794	-0.07832	-0.23914	0.09539	PERFORM UNIT MISSION IN WAR
U18	-0.58640	-0.00984	-0.44718	-0.13294	-0.05908	-0.00991	OFF-EM RELATIONS
U15	-0.64845	-0.12799	0.02813	-0.20224	-0.14704	-0.07596	UNIT TOGETHERNESS
S25	0.20141	0.69394	0.19764	0.10579	0.21003	0.19866	WANT TO GO COMBAT UNDER THESE NCOS
P34	0.32543	0.64847	0.13113	-0.01859	0.18978	0.19957	NCOS LEAD WELL IN COMBAT
P6	0.39610	0.60973	0.10065	0.01312	0.15969	0.15497	NCOS KNOW THEIR STUFF
S15	0.17478	0.58194	0.33944	0.15176	0.17673	0.17095	NCOS INTERESTED IN MY PERS WELFARE
S21	0.12318	0.55742	0.02756	0.24715	0.00412	0.01127	FEEL GOOD GO WAR WITH SQUAD
FX9	0.29885	0.55427	0.22824	0.04279	0.20409	0.14210	DO ANYTHING FOR NCOS AFTER DUTY
S22	0.26655	0.53955	0.14218	0.32276	0.09617	-0.02952	FEEL GOOD GO WAR WITH PLTN
S18	0.10507	0.51275	0.06095	0.14145	-0.05040	0.23596	SQD LDR KNOWS HIS/HER STUFF
FX7	0.38681	0.48578	0.11032	-0.04400	0.33123	0.18951	NCOS GET COOPERATION
S17	0.19686	0.47563	0.42211	0.21182	0.23728	0.18491	NCOS INTERESTED IN MY FEEL/THINK
S19	0.13737	0.46651	0.42737	0.11438	0.06180	0.08927	PLTN SGT KNOWS HIS/HER STUFF
P20	0.29563	0.44813	-0.02562	-0.03264	0.31123	-0.24797	TRAINING LEVEL HIGH
P35	0.40656	0.43991	0.07568	0.12684	0.20139	-0.01074	TRUST COMPANY SOLDIERS IN COMBAT
P19	0.32622	0.42478	0.14153	-0.01877	0.30121	-0.12974	CONFIDENCE IN USE OF WEAPONS
FX15	0.28613	0.39659	0.13068	0.13054	0.26551	-0.10658	MY COMPANY WILL PLAY PART IN WINNING
U3	-0.32063	-0.35122	0.04246	-0.01091	-0.20065	0.13833	FELLOW SOLDIER READINESS TO FIGHT
S16	0.31773	0.08170	0.66789	0.07356	0.14008	0.14095	OFFICERS INTERESTED IN MY FEEL/THINK
S14	0.31999	0.10268	0.66103	0.03289	0.09787	0.13484	OFFICERS INTERESTED MY WELFARE
S12	0.04036	0.11257	0.64900	0.23274	0.16246	0.00503	PLTN LDR TALKS TO ME AFTER DUTY
S13	0.05955	0.01903	0.60392	0.11498	0.04773	0.17712	CO TALKS TO ME AFTER DUTY
S11	0.00954	0.14618	0.50030	0.22368	0.17614	-0.02607	PLTN SGT TALKS TO ME AFTER DUTY
S20	0.30623	0.23103	0.48024	0.08550	0.02612	0.03643	PLTN LDR KNOWS HIS/HER STUFF
P17	0.34445	0.17679	0.36200	0.15596	0.25987	0.08393	PERS PROB TO CHAIN-O-COMMAND
S4	0.15785	0.00974	0.07258	0.74581	0.05866	-0.06108	AFTER DUTY WITH PLTN
S10	0.13155	0.22881	0.10902	0.69685	0.09001	0.10975	PLTN LEND MONEY IN EMERGENCY
S8	0.25547	0.20372	0.14782	0.68836	0.04169	0.10082	PERS PROB TO PLTN MEMBERS

TATION METHOD: VARIMAX

ROTATED FACTOR PATTERN

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6	
P10	0.15678	-0.01656	0.09203	0.67195	0.05154	-0.13510	CLOSEST FRIENDS ARE COWORKERS
P9	0.12616	-0.08303	0.12492	0.66685	0.01286	0.01126	AFTER-DUTY TIME IN COMPANY
S9	0.04916	0.34192	0.04435	0.66077	0.10591	0.11928	SQD LEND MONEY IN EMERG
S7	0.15562	0.26100	0.07639	0.61926	-0.00435	0.19116	PERS PROB TO SQD MEMBERS
FX10	0.07559	0.10604	0.11205	0.06760	0.71691	0.00993	WHAT I DO IS WORTHWHILE
FX13	0.19580	0.14726	0.22496	0.03997	0.53264	0.17784	CAN BE ALL I CAN BE
FX4	0.29900	0.00824	0.07084	0.14731	0.49509	-0.21899	IMPORTANT PART OF COMPANY
P23	0.11358	-0.04544	0.13726	0.23055	0.46599	0.15262	RACE MIX AFTER DUTY
U16	0.24566	0.17456	-0.01622	0.08890	0.45128	0.08473	LEVEL OF PERSONAL MORALE
FX1	0.05566	0.33251	0.22279	0.03817	0.44751	0.04357	PROUD TO BE IN ARMY
P18	0.12052	0.16538	0.14861	-0.13975	0.41796	0.06680	HAVE CONFIDENCE IN WEAPONS
FX14	0.05913	0.18437	0.03455	-0.04364	0.39766	0.09806	US EQUIP BETTER THAN RUSSIAN
P21	-0.09573	0.33498	-0.19975	0.08422	0.39744	-0.28023	COMBAT CONFIDENCE IN SELF
P22	0.12043	0.06749	0.08713	0.14112	0.36977	0.14192	RACE MIX DURING DUTY
S5	-0.12187	-0.02889	-0.12740	0.00036	-0.31214	-0.08766	RACE MIX AFTER DUTY
U14A	-0.02323	0.01506	0.20018	-0.00211	-0.43020	0.29328	SKILLS TO SUPPORT MISSION IN WAR
FX16	0.17449	0.13575	0.04465	0.10912	0.04508	0.75460	HAVE ENOUGH PERSONAL TIME
FX18	0.12859	0.08459	0.14018	0.00454	0.17845	0.71735	HAVE ENOUGH FAMILY TIME
FX17	0.19025	0.10908	0.11493	0.06937	0.14125	0.71693	HAVE ENOUGH RELAX TIME
P26	0.34222	0.23206	0.30397	0.03927	0.32669	0.37947	SUPERIORS TREAT ME AS PERSON

VARIANCE EXPLAINED BY EACH FACTOR

FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6
10.769298	6.364911	4.756819	4.599951	4.288259	3.082126

FINAL COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES: TOTAL = 33.861365

U2A	U13A	U14A	U3	U15	U1	U16	U18	FX1	FX2	FX3	FX4
0.384966	0.204755	0.311923	0.287480	0.505958	0.509497	0.309824	0.565191	0.366917	0.624064	0.596491	0.409257
FX5	FX6	FX7	FX8	FX9	FX10	FX13	FX14	FX15	FX16	FX17	FX18
0.550504	0.491343	0.545263	0.444937	0.512293	0.548147	0.427564	0.208337	0.355123	0.634233	0.600062	0.589796
P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P9	P10	P12	P17	P18	P19	P20
0.638982	0.699056	0.569788	0.511288	0.588482	0.483400	0.505743	0.492439	0.379846	0.262645	0.414803	0.448288
P21	P22	P23	P24	P25	P26	P28	P29	P30	P31	P32	P33
0.404853	0.203437	0.327397	0.383245	0.372731	0.515627	0.577550	0.519063	0.376131	0.593722	0.502606	0.569135
P34	P35	S4	S5	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14
0.619805	0.421296	0.593688	0.137038	0.518217	0.614367	0.583363	0.587284	0.353495	0.516094	0.415498	0.578742
S15	S16	S17	S18	S19	S20	S21	S22	S24	S25	S28	
0.567911	0.598604	0.578524	0.355886	0.444018	0.387108	0.387877	0.496677	0.547338	0.655956	0.478394	

ROTATION METHOD: VARIMAX

ROTATED FACTOR PATTERN

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6	
P29	0.69572	0.18099	0.07905	0.21385	-0.02545	0.20153	LIKE BEING IN COMPANY
FX2	0.68244	0.22458	0.06802	0.16089	0.19043	0.21315	PROUD TO BE IN COMPANY
P1	0.68098	0.13510	0.16889	0.15529	0.17151	0.07322	COMPANY IS ONE OF BEST
FX3	0.65335	0.16415	-0.03074	0.26589	0.06783	0.24921	BELONG IN MY COMPANY
P4	0.60275	0.14068	0.26396	0.05252	0.22527	0.02426	COMPANY WOULD DO BETTER JOB IN COMBAT
P12	0.60184	0.29773	0.26374	0.04172	0.12600	0.17817	IMPRESSED WITH LEADERSHIP
P25	0.59156	0.09474	0.10397	0.14444	-0.11593	0.08028	SPEND TOUR IN COMPANY
P32	0.58256	0.10204	0.35805	0.08547	0.19380	-0.00288	BETTER TRAINED THAN OTHER COMPANIES
P2	0.57807	0.07500	0.40101	0.21565	0.07285	0.04193	PEOPLE CLOSE IN COMPANY
P33	0.56017	0.39111	0.29332	-0.13697	0.07010	0.00929	OFFICERS LEAD WELL IN COMBAT
P28	0.55239	0.17692	0.26818	0.26802	0.08649	0.13233	PEOPLE WILL GET TIGHTER
U1	0.55126	0.15364	0.18072	0.08989	0.10716	0.14243	LEVEL OF UNIT MORALE
FX8	0.53688	0.25078	0.07369	-0.07769	0.20010	0.10804	DO ANYTHING FOR OFFICERS AFTER DUTY
P3	0.53002	0.40697	0.23714	-0.13771	0.09116	0.03847	OFFICERS KNOW THEIR STUFF
FX13	0.51928	0.12080	-0.03629	0.11100	0.13657	0.39644	CAN BE ALL I CAN BE
FX5	0.51160	0.10055	0.35105	0.24014	0.18113	0.19291	TEAMWORK IN MY COMPANY
P31	0.50897	0.14881	0.46777	0.23552	0.06130	0.07491	PEOPLE LOKK OUT FOR EACH OTHER
FX15	0.50740	0.10456	0.08408	0.08154	0.38204	0.28069	MY COMPANY WILL PLAY PART IN WINNING
FX6	0.49640	0.26514	0.21380	-0.00730	0.18280	0.17711	OFFICERS GET COOPERATION
FX10	0.48351	0.04220	-0.11922	0.21044	0.30943	0.30775	WHAT I DO IS WORTHWHILE
S28	0.47566	0.28606	0.35961	0.11761	0.05811	0.27853	CHAIN-O-COMMAND WORKS WELL
P35	0.47063	0.12938	0.33719	0.17660	0.23697	0.04384	TRUST COMPANY SOLDIERS IN COMBAT
FX4	0.45542	0.11024	-0.17496	0.22194	0.25911	0.16551	IMPORTANT PART OF COMPANY
P20	0.45001	0.09691	0.35252	0.00503	0.21355	0.01450	TRAINING LEVEL HIGH
P26	0.43626	0.23435	0.26832	0.18167	0.03161	0.31995	SUPERIORS TREAT ME AS PERSON
P30	0.43597	0.03448	0.28372	0.15941	0.02949	-0.05896	DONT WATCH POSS IN COMPANY
FX1	0.40704	0.14961	-0.15822	0.13859	0.29872	0.33937	PROUD TO BE IN ARMY
U16	0.40475	0.18694	-0.08618	0.11555	0.23019	0.26118	LEVEL OF PERSONAL MORALE
P17	0.39201	0.29527	0.21155	0.18733	0.12422	0.18529	PERS PROB TO CHAIN-O-COMMAND
FX9	0.33644	0.18408	0.19770	0.17300	0.23695	0.26582	DO ANYTHING FOR NCOS AFTER DUTY
S14	0.33032	0.70929	0.05053	0.01707	0.09258	0.14041	OFFICERS INTERESTED MY WELFARE
S16	0.35018	0.69472	0.10188	0.02061	0.07433	0.08799	OFFICERS INTERESTED IN MY FEEL/THINK
S13	0.21838	0.68460	-0.07903	0.20388	-0.01502	-0.06938	CO TALKS TO ME AFTER DUTY
S12	0.11847	0.64802	0.03603	0.29301	0.02661	0.02130	PLTN LDR TALKS TO ME AFTER DUTY
S11	0.03616	0.59171	0.10050	0.35593	0.04271	0.02667	PLTN SGT TALKS TO ME AFTER DUTY
S20	0.18965	0.56418	0.27306	0.07488	0.11915	0.18759	PLTN LDR KNOWS HIS/HER STUFF
S24	0.47523	0.51624	0.25779	-0.07630	0.12662	0.07751	WANT TO GO COMBAT UNDER THESE OFFICERS
S15	0.14309	0.51035	0.30228	0.22689	0.18532	0.34657	NCOS INTERESTED IN MY PERS WELFARE
S19	0.10939	0.47035	0.26503	0.12531	0.11844	0.18169	PLTN SGT KNOWS HIS/HER STUFF
S17	0.17908	0.42319	0.34895	0.29549	0.14592	0.39758	NCOS INTERESTED IN MY FEEL/THINK
U18	0.32909	0.38264	0.10491	-0.01344	0.14733	0.06544	OFF-EM RELATIONS
P6	0.36609	0.18877	0.51857	0.08608	0.15926	0.27332	NCOS KNOW THEIR STUFF
P34	0.32908	0.22597	0.49406	0.07158	0.23809	0.22613	NCOS LEAD WELL IN COMBAT
P23	0.13023	0.05929	0.44527	0.15576	-0.05926	0.01479	RACE MIX AFTER DUTY
S25	0.33970	0.28928	0.44468	0.15422	0.27061	0.22913	WANT TO GO COMBAT UNDER THESE NCOS
S18	-0.01910	0.15772	0.42967	0.18427	0.12885	0.21306	SQD LDR KNOWS HIS/HER STUFF
P24	0.38756	-0.02362	0.42103	0.28845	0.04184	-0.00636	TRUST PEOPLE IN COMPANY
P22	0.07435	0.05800	0.40550	0.11023	0.07070	0.20813	RACE MIX DURING DUTY
FX7	0.36647	0.13408	0.38094	0.14310	0.20847	0.26338	NCOS GET COOPERATION
S5	-0.14780	-0.08304	-0.36218	0.06250	0.08783	0.03715	RACE MIX AFTER DUTY

ROTATION METHOD: VARIMAX

ROTATED FACTOR PATTERN

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6	
S4	0.15783	0.10784	0.02220	0.67602	0.04627	-0.00139	AFTER DUTY WITH PLTN
P10	0.16687	-0.04054	-0.00851	0.64587	-0.02307	-0.05622	CLOSEST FRIENDS ARE COWORKERS
P9	0.16253	0.06621	-0.05137	0.63049	0.00485	-0.04762	AFTER-DUTY TIME IN COMPANY
S7	0.12060	0.08281	0.25331	0.61522	0.10330	0.17352	PERS PROB TO SQD MEMBERS
S8	0.16445	0.14781	0.25740	0.60965	0.06741	0.10594	PERS PROB TO PLTN MEMBERS
S9	-0.00748	0.21284	0.23728	0.58175	0.16886	0.13436	SQD LEND MONEY IN EMERG
S10	0.06715	0.26386	0.20990	0.55858	0.12686	0.10131	PLTN LEND MONEY IN EMERGENCY
S22	0.23326	0.22938	0.37315	0.37384	0.31905	0.16316	FEEL GOOD GO WAR WITH PLTN
S21	0.16075	0.14636	0.36386	0.37277	0.28430	0.16269	FEEL GOOD GO WAR WITH SQUAD
U3	0.04373	0.11405	0.24693	0.07382	0.63123	-0.03712	FELLOW SOLDIER READINESS TO FIGHT
U14A	-0.03312	0.00906	-0.13967	0.13317	0.59964	-0.08453	SKILLS TO SUPPORT MISSION IN WAR
U2A	0.20071	0.11647	0.18416	0.05317	0.53468	0.01722	PERFORM UNIT MISSION IN WAR
U15	0.28126	0.12410	0.34301	0.11662	0.51567	0.02943	UNIT TOGETHERNESS
U13A	0.14753	0.14922	0.17522	-0.05565	0.49866	0.07596	CONDITION OF UNIT EQUIPMENT
P21	0.11143	-0.03434	-0.17487	0.12810	0.47895	0.03336	COMBAT CONFIDENCE IN SELF
P19	0.39845	0.08603	0.32995	-0.01741	0.41752	0.10628	CONFIDENCE IN USE OF WEAPONS
P18	0.27178	0.03047	0.06873	-0.03769	0.40523	0.22902	HAVE CONFIDENCE IN WEAPONS
FX17	0.24187	0.10963	0.14980	0.01888	-0.02577	0.74994	HAVE ENOUGH RELAX TIME
FX18	0.23348	0.08233	0.13263	0.02518	-0.00808	0.73572	HAVE ENOUGH FAMILY TIME
FX16	0.12051	0.08670	0.22212	0.04480	0.01663	0.69903	HAVE ENOUGH PERSONAL TIME
FX14	0.28562	0.06323	0.00230	-0.01474	0.34721	0.35609	US EQUIP BETTER THAN RUSSIAN

VARIANCE EXPLAINED BY EACH FACTOR

FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6
10.664017	5.366160	4.988234	4.446289	3.849225	3.808209

FINAL COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES: TOTAL = 33.122134

U1	U16	FX1	FX2	FX3	FX4	FX5	FX6	FX7	FX8	FX9	FX10
0.400000	0.340754	0.436714	0.628377	0.592154	0.393965	0.522769	0.427261	0.430702	0.414304	0.342898	0.484518
FX13	FX14	FX15	FX16	FX17	FX18	P1	P2	P3	P4	P6	P9
0.473699	0.333155	0.506853	0.562297	0.656391	0.620871	0.569398	0.554163	0.531538	0.506869	0.546046	0.433247
P10	P12	P17	P18	P19	P20	P21	P22	P23	P24	P25	P26
0.450407	0.569773	0.370466	0.297605	0.460948	0.382017	0.291092	0.233789	0.246731	0.413020	0.410483	0.453608
P28	P29	P30	P31	P32	P33	P34	P35	S4	S5	S7	S8
0.505186	0.610023	0.301508	0.564836	0.522857	0.576556	0.516398	0.441195	0.496181	0.172917	0.504842	0.502593
S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	S16	S17	S18	S19	S20
0.486659	0.456556	0.490741	0.522279	0.569219	0.644464	0.578242	0.629330	0.599599	0.305805	0.366179	0.483819
S21	S22	S24	S25	S28	U2A	U13A	U14A	U3	U15	U18	
0.425901	0.514438	0.586659	0.546326	0.532192	0.376768	0.332263	0.405130	0.481170	0.492540	0.291883	

ROTATION METHOD: VARIMAX

ROTATED FACTOR PATTERN

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6	
DS14	0.73819	0.07998	0.25236	0.11510	0.05311	0.10609	OFFICERS INTERESTED MY PERSONAL WELFARE
DS16	0.73109	0.09338	0.26408	0.06949	0.07194	0.12822	OFFICERS INTERESTED WHAT I THINK & FEEL
DS12	0.69389	0.05054	0.07453	0.19443	0.01616	0.02030	PLATOON LEADER TALKS TO ME AS PERSON
DS13	0.68294	-0.02876	0.21572	0.14587	-0.00428	0.06429	CO COMMANDER TALKS TO ME AS A PERSON
DS24	0.61372	0.27382	0.33716	0.04880	0.05606	0.12485	CO OFFICRS GOOD TO SERVE UNDER IN COMBAT
DS17	0.60399	0.26373	0.06820	0.18874	0.15614	0.31652	NCOS INTERESTED IN WHAT I THINK & FEEL
DS15	0.60095	0.28178	0.05763	0.23524	0.16217	0.25137	NCOS INTERESTED IN MY PERSONAL WELFARE
DS28	0.58118	0.17291	0.23302	0.09590	0.11573	0.37597	MY CHAIN OF COMMAND WORKS WELL
DP33	0.55954	0.23126	0.41098	0.00736	0.12755	0.06550	CO OFFICERS WOULD LEAD WELL IN COMBAT
DS20	0.55368	0.42474	0.08128	0.08451	-0.03806	0.02898	MY PLATOON LEADER KNOWS HIS STUFF
DP12	0.54174	0.19836	0.42820	0.07053	0.11111	0.25426	IMPRESSED BY QUALITY OF LEADERS THIS CO
DS11	0.53024	0.07782	0.03754	0.32177	0.07463	0.14380	PLATOON SGT TALKS TO ME AS PERSON
DF08	0.52818	0.09924	0.50536	0.03245	-0.00323	0.02508	SLDRS IN CO DO MOST ANYTHING FOR OFFICRS
DP26	0.51408	0.12034	0.30792	0.09812	0.23610	0.36792	SUPERIORS TRY TO TREAT ME AS A PERSON
DS25	0.50261	0.46666	0.13906	0.12090	0.17305	0.25103	CO NCOS GOOD TO SERVE UNDER IN COMBAT
DP03	0.48973	0.29206	0.43634	0.02001	-0.02961	0.08535	OFFICERS IN THIS CO KNOW THEIR STUFF
DU18	0.48063	0.22471	0.33426	-0.06610	0.13037	-0.03365	QUALITY OF RELATION/ OFFICERS & ENLISTED
DP17	0.46153	0.09561	0.28803	0.16943	0.12424	0.28941	HELP PERSONAL PROB DFE CO CH/OF/COMMAND
DF09	0.40486	0.23893	0.27887	0.18839	0.15990	0.24800	SOLDIERS IN CO DO MOST ANYTHING FOR NCOS
DP19	0.18943	0.60198	0.23056	0.19233	0.21486	0.06445	CONFIDENCE COMPANY ABILITY USE WEAPONS
DP21	-0.06312	0.58966	0.15990	0.21263	-0.11250	0.02797	ALOT OF CONFIDENCE IN SELF IN COMBAT
DP18	0.11957	0.58199	0.15504	0.04254	0.06984	0.18459	I HAVE ALOT OF CONFIDENCE IN WEAPONS
DS18	0.32121	0.54389	-0.04758	0.22497	-0.03680	0.13990	MY SQUAD LEADER KNOWS HIS STUFF
DF14	-0.00107	0.54127	0.13061	0.03982	0.04310	0.23913	US ARMY EQUIPMENT BETTER THAN RUSSIAN
DF15	0.21735	0.51852	0.40877	0.06985	0.11148	0.17816	MY CO WILL PLAY PART WINNING CONFLICTS
DS21	0.30360	0.50840	0.12271	0.35620	0.07663	0.01036	IF WAR, FEEL GOOD ABOUT GO W/MY SQUAD
DS22	0.34042	0.49789	0.17994	0.41458	0.15180	-0.01183	IF WAR, FEEL GOOD ABOUT GO W/MY PLATOON
DU17	0.12080	0.49349	0.09240	-0.07398	0.22692	0.12540	CONDITION OF UNIT WEAPON SYSTEMS
DU02	0.22136	0.49105	0.25712	-0.02835	0.30436	-0.06439	COMPANY READINESS FOR COMBAT
DP06	0.36468	0.48074	0.15843	0.14606	0.16040	0.27833	NCOS IN THIS CO KNOW THEIR STUFF
DU14	-0.03407	0.47918	0.16769	0.08875	-0.05133	-0.21543	OWN SKILL & ABILITY AS SOLDIER
DP20	0.25977	0.47446	0.29035	0.10168	0.18114	0.09085	LEVEL OF TRAINING IN THIS CO VERY HIGH
DU03	0.22059	0.46704	0.27813	0.05760	0.27461	-0.15966	FELLOW SOLDIERS COMBAT READINESS
DF01	0.04052	0.46465	0.41305	0.10172	-0.10131	0.24511	PROUD TO BE IN ARMY
DS19	0.31408	0.46307	-0.13425	0.18434	0.07708	0.15747	MY PLATOON SERGEANT KNOWS HIS STUFF
DP34	0.42292	0.45048	0.20676	0.11121	0.18067	0.23776	CO NCOS WOULD LEAD WELL IN COMBAT
DF07	0.34149	0.38401	0.28927	0.12454	0.16681	0.23822	SOLDIERS WILLINGLY COOPERATE W/NCOS
DF03	0.22017	0.25058	0.66176	0.21283	0.03155	0.24056	FEEL I BELONG IN MY COMPANY
DF02	0.26033	0.36185	0.61984	0.15223	0.03943	0.21439	PROUD OF MY COMPANY
DP29	0.30377	0.08000	0.61824	0.24452	0.18672	0.17189	I LIKE BEING IN THIS COMPANY
DF04	0.21951	0.32704	0.56149	0.13209	0.00748	0.15805	I AM IMPORTANT PART OF COMPANY
DF01	0.28811	0.29689	0.53764	0.19740	0.15778	0.12235	THIS CO ONE OF BEST IN ARMY
DP25	0.28896	-0.10382	0.51743	0.14828	0.26035	0.12621	WANT TO SPEND ALL ENLIST IN THIS CO
DP04	0.29572	0.43048	0.48852	0.23086	0.09205	0.04860	THIS CO BE BETTER IN COMBAT THAN MOST
DF05	0.25989	0.27215	0.48339	0.28132	0.31513	0.11513	ALOT OF TEAMWORK IN COMPANY
DF06	0.44970	0.28114	0.47456	0.04636	0.03927	0.09002	SOLDIERS WILLINGLY COOPERATE W/OFFICERS
DP02	0.18014	0.14859	0.47282	0.32672	0.40877	0.08032	PEOPLE IN THIS CO FEEL VERY CLOSE
DF10	0.13765	0.41874	0.44555	0.10392	-0.00457	0.33126	WHAT I DO IN ARMY IS WORTHWHILE
DP28	0.21558	0.19505	0.42430	0.20326	0.41168	0.09630	PEOPLE IN CO GET EVEN TIGHTER IN TIME

ROTATION METHOD: VARIMAX

ROTATED FACTOR PATTERN

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6	
DP32	0.30489	0.37677	0.41478	0.19441	0.27620	0.01881	THIS CO BETTER TRAINED THAN MOST OTHERS
DU16	0.15393	0.26835	0.39466	0.02380	-0.01256	0.22501	LEVEL OF PERSONAL MORALE
DU01	0.36885	0.27884	0.36968	-0.00574	0.19026	0.11155	LEVEL OF COMPANY MORALE
DP35	0.20703	0.34042	0.34789	0.25099	0.32010	0.02630	CO SOLDIERS SKILLED CAN TRUST IN COMBAT
DS08	0.25531	0.06419	0.10323	0.74368	0.14505	-0.02800	MOST OF PLATOON HELP ME W/PERSONAL PROB
DS09	0.11166	0.20884	0.10846	0.72995	0.08491	-0.07466	MOST OF SQUAD LEND ME MONEY WHEN NEED
DS10	0.15039	0.20030	0.12033	0.71677	0.12839	-0.06094	MOST OF PLATOON LEND ME MONEY WHEN NEED
DS04	0.05781	0.08979	0.06284	0.67198	0.00739	0.13537	I SPEND ALOT TIME W/PLATOON AFTER DUTY
DS07	0.27882	0.08435	0.01115	0.66294	0.11563	-0.01008	MOST OF SQD HELP ME W/PERSONAL PROBLEM
DP09	-0.02126	0.08944	0.17478	0.61591	0.06207	0.18918	I SPEND TIME W/ PEOPLE IN CO AFTER DUTY
DP10	0.02405	0.03472	0.22701	0.56650	0.03370	0.15278	CLOSEST FRIENDS ARE PEOPLE I WORK WITH
DP23	-0.00183	0.15156	0.04239	0.16089	0.69151	0.16438	DIFFERENT RACES IN CO MIX AFTER DUTY
DP22	-0.05406	0.29223	-0.06092	0.19545	0.57884	0.00946	DIFFERENT RACES IN CO MIX DURING DUTY
DS05	0.04133	-0.14487	0.00152	-0.14125	0.56478	0.09686	AFTER DUTY, RACES HANG OUT SEPARATELY
DP24	0.18539	0.21665	0.26281	0.24214	-0.52922	0.10596	MOST PEOPLE IN CO CAN BE TRUSTED
DP31	0.21929	0.13569	0.43546	0.30626	0.51409	0.07463	PEOPLE IN CO LOOK OUT FOR EACH OTHER
DU15	0.14784	0.30082	0.38440	0.19941	0.40944	-0.09516	TOGETHERNESS OF UNIT MEMBERS
DP30	0.24340	-0.09079	0.34330	0.12626	0.38338	0.20533	NO NEED TO WATCH BELONGINGS IN THIS CO
DF17	0.24654	0.15076	0.19286	0.05765	0.10467	0.70475	ENOUGH TIME FOR RELAX & ENTERTAINMENT
DF18	0.25856	0.10242	0.18883	0.07602	0.11698	0.68202	ENOUGH TIME FOR FAMILY AND FRIENDS
DF16	0.21055	0.12314	0.17942	0.04688	0.12909	0.66319	ENOUGH TIME TAKE CARE OF PERSONAL NEEDS
DF13	0.23539	0.25676	0.37259	0.07357	0.04196	0.44662	ARMY GIVES CHANCE TO BE ALL I CAN BE

VARIANCE EXPLAINED BY EACH FACTOR

FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5	FACTOR6
9.179702	7.485376	7.348636	5.102846	3.609913	3.514918

FINAL COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES: TOTAL = 36.241391

DU01	DU02	DU03	DU14	DU15	DU16	DU17	DU18	DF01	DF02	DF03	DF04
0.399138	0.453826	0.448361	0.315821	0.476570	0.302819	0.339358	0.415728	0.468842	0.652361	0.653359	0.512899
DF05	**DF06**	**DF07**	**DF08**	**DF09**	**DF10**	**DF13**	**DF14**	**DF15**	**DF16**	**DF17**	**DF18**
0.566976	0.518370	0.447844	0.545907	0.421329	0.513369	0.466800	0.370655	0.532241	0.550367	0.627903	0.597617
DP01	**DP02**	**DP03**	**DP04**	**DP06**	**DP09**	**DP10**	**DP12**	**DP17**	**DP18**	**DP19**	**DP20**
0.539036	0.558378	0.524083	0.575537	0.513736	0.457986	0.398718	0.598146	0.433005	0.417809	0.538723	0.428330
DP21	**DP22**	**DP23**	**DP24**	**DP25**	**DP26**	**DP28**	**DP29**	**DP30**	**DP31**	**DP32**	**DP33**
0.435901	0.465382	0.555860	0.500308	0.467699	0.574246	0.535278	0.605092	0.390418	0.619773	0.521367	0.556090
DP34	**DP35**	**DS04**	**DS05**	**DS07**	**DS08**	**DS09**	**DS10**	**DS11**	**DS12**	**DS13**	**DS14**
0.526091	0.445922	0.485295	0.371010	0.537937	0.654836	0.613458	0.611170	0.418407	0.528065	0.539203	0.642331
DS15	**DS16**	**DS17**	**DS18**	**DS19**	**DS20**	**DS21**	**DS22**	**DS24**	**DS25**	**DS28**	
0.588680	0.639397	0.599198	0.472791	0.395815	0.503003	0.498561	0.591218	0.586424	0.597308	0.585911	

"SATISFACTION" items

FEELINGS ABOUT ARMY LIFESTYLE

Please rate how you feel about each of these issues as they affect your own life. There are five possible answers; these are listed below. Circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel about each aspect of your life.

Completely Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Can't Say	Somewhat Satisfied	Completely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

F13. The unit I am assigned to.....1 2 3 4 5 (110)
F14. My duty hours.....1 2 3 4 5 (111)
F15. The location of this post.....1 2 3 4 5 (112)
F16. My unit's leave/time off policies.....1 2 3 4 5 (113)
F17. My unit's training and field exercise schedule....1 2 3 4 5 (114)
F19. Army pay and allowances.....1 2 3 4 5 (115)
F20. The Army way of life.....1 2 3 4 5 (116)
F22. The job security in the Army.....1 2 3 4 5 (117)
F23. The standard of living in the Army.....1 2 3 4 5 (118)
F24. The Army's retirement benefits.....1 2 3 4 5 (119)
A1. Army recruiter practices and information.....1 2 3 4 5 (120)
A2. How often I do work I am trained for.....1 2 3 4 5 (121)
A3. The amount of "make work" assignments I'm given...1 2 3 4 5 (122)
A4. How much I am required to "hurry up and wait".....1 2 3 4 5 (123)
A5. Opportunities for advancement/promotion.....1 2 3 4 5 (124)
A6. Opportunity to gain civilian skills while in Army.1 2 3 4 5 (125)
A7. The privacy I have in my present living quarters..1 2 3 4 5 (126)
A8. The social and recreational opportunities on Post.1 2 3 4 5 (127)
A9. The military discipline on this Post.....1 2 3 4 5 (128)
A10. The overall quality of Post medical care.....1 2 3 4 5 (129)
A11. Opportunities for military schooling.....1 2 3 4 5 (130)

"SATISFACTION" scale

```
        * V43=SATISFACTION ;

ARRAY SAT FY11A--A118;
 DO OVER SAT;
     IF SAT GE 6 THEN SAT = .;
 END;
V43 = (( FY13+FY14+FY15+FY16+FY17+FY19+FY20+FY22+FY23+FY24
        +A1+A2+A3+A4+A5+A6+A7+A8+A9+A10+A11)- 21.)*(100./(100-21.));
```

"CONFIDENCE IN OFFICER LEADERS" items

We would like to know your opinions about yourself and others in your unit. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel. There are five possible answers; these are:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Can't Say	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

P33. The officers in this company would lead well in combat.....1 2 3 4 5 (252)

P3. The officers in this company really seem to know their stuff.....1 2 3 4 5 (226)

P24. My leaders are better than the leaders of other units.....1 2 3 4 5 (222)

P12. I am impressed by the quality of leadership in this company.....1 2 3 4 5 (233)

S21. If we went to war tomorrow, I would feel good about going with my squad.....1 2 3 4 5 (308)

S24. Officers in my company are the kind I would want to serve under in combat.....1 2 3 4 5 (311)

S28. My chain-of-command works well.....1 2 3 4 5 (313)

"CONFIDENCE IN OFFICER LEADERS" scale

```
                    * V20 = OFFCON_MOD;

ARRAY AV20 P33 P3 FX24 P12 S20 S24 S28;
  DO OVER AV20;
    IF AV20 > 5 THEN AV20 = .;
  END;
V20 = ((P33+P3+FX24+P12+S20+S24+S28)-7)*(100/28);
```

"CONFIDENCE IN NCO LEADERS" items

We would like to know your opinions about yourself and others in your unit. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel. There are five possible answers; these are:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Can't Say	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

P34. The NCOs in this company would lead well in combat.....1 2 3 4 5 (253)

P6. The NCOs in this company really seem to know their stuff.....1 2 3 4 5 (228)

S18. My squad leader really seems to know his or her stuff.....1 2 3 4 5 (305)

S19. My platoon sergeant really seems to know his or her stuff.....1 2 3 4 5 (306)

S25. NCOs in my company are the kind I would want to serve under in combat.....1 2 3 4 5 (312)

"CONFIDENCE IN NCO LEADERS" scale

```
                    * V21 = NCOCON;

ARRAY AV21 P34 P6 S18 S19 S25;
  DO OVER AV21;
    IF AV21 > 5 THEN AV21 = .;
  END;
V21 = ((P34+P6+S18+S19+S25)-5)*5;
```

"HORIZONTAL COHESION" items

We would like to know your opinions about yourself and others in your unit. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel. There are five possible answers; these are:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Can't Say	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

F5.	There is a lot of teamwork and cooperation among soldiers in my company	1	2	3	4	5	(205)
F8.	People in this company feel very close to each other	1	2	3	4	5	(225)
F9.	I spend my after-duty hours with people in this company	1	2	3	4	5	(230)
F10.	My closest friendships are with the people I work with	1	2	3	4	5	(231)
F24.	Most of the people in my company can be trusted	1	2	3	4	5	(243)
F31.	In this company, people really look out for each other	1	2	3	4	5	(250)
F35.	Soldiers in this company have enough skills that I would trust them with my life in combat	1	2	3	4	5	(254)
S4.	I spend a lot of time with members of my <u>platoon</u> <u>after</u> duty hours	1	2	3	4	5	(292)
S7.	I can go to most people in my <u>squad</u> for help when I have a personal problem, like being in debt	1	2	3	4	5	(294)
S8.	I can go to most people in my <u>platoon</u> for help when I have a personal problem, like being in debt	1	2	3	4	5	(295)
S9.	Most people in my <u>squad</u> would lend me money in an emergency	1	2	3	4	5	(296)
S21.	If we went to war tomorrow, I would feel good about going with my <u>squad</u>	1	2	3	4	5	(308)
S22.	If we went to war tomorrow, I would feel good about going with my <u>platoon</u>	1	2	3	4	5	(309)

"HORIZONTAL COHESION" scale

```
                    * V24 = HOR_COH;

ARRAY AV24
   FX5 P2 P9 P10 P24 P31 P35 S4 S7 S8 S9 S21 S22
;
  DO OVER AV24;
    IF AV24 > 5 THEN AV24 = .;
  END;
NUM_MISS = NMISS (OF
   FX5 P2 P9 P10 P24 P31 P35 S4 S7 S8 S9 S21 S22
);
  IF NUM_MISS > 1 THEN V24 = .;
  IF NUM_MISS = 1 THEN V24 = (INT((SUM(OF
   FX5 P2 P9 P10 P24 P31 P35 S4 S7 S8 S9 S21 S22
)*13/12)-13)*(100/52));
  IF NUM_MISS = 0 THEN V24 = (SUM(OF
   FX5 P2 P9 P10 P24 P31 P35 S4 S7 S8 S9 S21 S22
)-13)*(100/52);
```

"PLATOON/SQUAD HORIZONTAL COHESION" items

We would like to know your opinions about yourself and others in your unit. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel. There are five possible answers; these are:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Can't Say	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

S4. I spend a lot of time with members of my platoon after duty hours.....1 2 3 4 5 (292)

S7. I can go to most people in my squad for help when I have a personal problem, like being in debt.....1 2 3 4 5 (294)

S8. I can go to most people in my platoon for help when I have a personal problem, like being in debt.....1 2 3 4 5 (295)

S9. Most people in my squad would lend me money in an emergency.....1 2 3 4 5 (296)

S21. If we went to war tomorrow, I would feel good about going with my squad.....1 2 3 4 5 (308)

S22. If we went to war tomorrow, I would feel good about going with my platoon.....1 2 3 4 5 (309)

"PLATOON/SQUAD HORIZONTAL COHESION" scale

```
V24B = ((S4 + S7 + S8 + S9 + S21 + S22)-6)*(100/24);
```

"COMPANY HORIZONTAL COHESION" items

We would like to know your opinions about yourself and others in your unit. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel. There are five possible answers; these are:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Can't Say	Agree	Strongly Agree

F5.	There is a lot of teamwork and cooperation among soldiers in my company.....	1	2	3	4	5	(205)
P2.	People in this company feel very close to each other.....	1	2	3	4	5	(225)
P9.	I spend my after-duty hours with people in this company.....	1	2	3	4	5	(230)
P24.	Most of the people in my company can be trusted.....	1	2	3	4	5	(243)
P31.	In this company, people really look out for each other.....	1	2	3	4	5	(250)
P35.	Soldiers in this company have enough skills that I would trust them with my life in combat.....	1	2	3	4	5	(254)

"COMPANY HORIZONTAL COHESION" scale

```
V24AA = ((FX5+P2+P9+P24+P31+P35)-6)*(100/24.);
```

"COMBAT READINESS" items

UNIT INFORMATION

Next we ask questions about your equipment and your unit. Read each statement carefully and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes your opinion.

	VERY HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	VERY LOW	
U2A. How would you rate your unit's ability to perform its support mission in war?	1.....	2	3	4.....	5	(85)
U3. How would you describe your fellow soldiers' readiness to fight if and when it is necessary?	1.....	2	3	4.....	5	(91)
U13A. How would you rate the condition of your unit's equipment (tools, trucks, and so forth)?	1.....	2	3	4.....	5	(87)

We would like to know your opinions about yourself and others in your unit. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel. There are five possible answers; these are:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Can't Say	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

F14. The equipment of the American Army is better than that of the Russian Army.....	1	2	3	4	5	(212)
F15. My company will play a part in winning future conflicts.....	1	2	3	4	5	(213)
F4. I think this company would do a better job in combat than most other Army units.....	1	2	3	4	5	(227)
F18. I have a lot of confidence in our weapons.....	1	2	3	4	5	(237)
F19. I have real confidence in our company's ability to use our weapons.....	1	2	3	4	5	(238)
F20. I think the level of training in this company is very high.....	1	2	3	4	5	(239)
F32. I think we are better trained than most other companies in the Army.....	1	2	3	4	5	(251)

"COMBAT READINESS" scale

```
 * V18 = COMBAT_MOD;

ARRAY AV18 U2A U3 FX15 P4 U13A FX14 P18 P19 P20 P32;
  DO OVER AV18;
    IF AV18 > 5 THEN V18=.;
  END;
V18=((U2A+U3+FX15+P4+U13A+FX14+P18+P19+P20+P32)-10)*(100/40);
```

Three items were inverted before scale generation as follows:

```
U2A = (5 - U2A) + 1;

U3  = (5 - U3 ) + 1;

U13A= (5 -U13A) + 1;
```

"WELL-BEING" items

YOUR CURRENT LIFE SITUATION

Now we ask questions about stresses and strains which you may have experienced lately. Read each question below carefully, and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes how you feel.

W1. During the past month, how have you been feeling in general?

1. IN EXCELLENT SPIRITS
2. IN VERY GOOD SPIRITS
3. IN GOOD SPIRITS MOSTLY
4. I HAVE BEEN UP AND DOWN IN SPIRITS A LOT
5. IN LOW SPIRITS MOSTLY
6. IN VERY LOW SPIRITS (133)

W2. During the past month, have you been bothered by nervousness or your "nerves?"

1. EXTREMELY SO; I COULD NOT WORK OR TAKE CARE OF THINGS
2. VERY MUCH SO
3. QUITE A BIT
4. SOME, ENOUGH TO BOTHER ME
5. A LITTLE
6. NOT AT ALL (134)

W3. During the past month, have you been in firm control of your behavior, thoughts, emotions, or feelings?

1. YES, DEFINITELY SO
2. YES, FOR THE MOST PART
3. GENERALLY SO
4. NOT TOO WELL
5. NO, AND I AM SOMEWHAT DISTURBED
6. NO, AND I AM VERY DISTURBED (135)

W4. During the past month, have you felt so sad, discouraged, hopeless, or had so many problems that you wondered if anything was worthwhile?

1. EXTREMELY SO, TO THE POINT I HAVE JUST GIVEN UP
2. VERY MUCH SO
3. QUITE A BIT
4. SOME, ENOUGH TO BOTHER ME
5. A LITTLE BIT
6. NOT AT ALL (136)

W5. During the past month, have you been under or felt you were under any strain, stress, or pressure?

1. YES, ALMOST MORE THAN I COULD BEAR OR STAND
2. YES, QUITE A BIT OF PRESSURE
3. YES, SOME MORE THAN USUAL
4. YES, SOME BUT ABOUT USUAL
5. YES, A LITTLE
6. NOT AT ALL (137)

"WELL-BEING" items (cont)

W6. During the past month, how happy, satisfied, or pleased have you been with your personal life?

1. EXTREMELY HAPPY, COULD NOT HAVE BEEN MORE SATISFIED OR PLEASED
2. VERY HAPPY
3. FAIRLY HAPPY
4. SATISFIED, PLEASED
5. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
6. VERY DISSATISFIED (138)

W7. During the past month, have you had any reason to wonder if you were losing your mind, or losing control over the way you act, talk, think, feel, or of your memory?

1. NOT AT ALL
2. ONLY A LITTLE
3. SOME, BUT NOT ENOUGH TO BE CONCERNED WITH
4. SOME, AND I HAVE BEEN A LITTLE CONCERNED
5. SOME, AND I AM QUITE CONCERNED
6. YES, VERY MUCH SO AND I AM VERY CONCERNED (139)

W8. During the past month, have you been anxious, worried or upset?

1. EXTREMELY SO, TO THE POINT OF BEING SICK OR ALMOST SICK
2. VERY MUCH SO
3. QUITE A BIT
4. SOME, ENOUGH TO BOTHER ME
5. A LITTLE BIT
6. NOT AT ALL (140)

W9. During the past month, have you been waking up fresh and rested?

1. EVERY DAY
2. MOST EVERY DAY
3. FAIRLY OFTEN
4. LESS THAN HALF THE TIME
5. RARELY
6. NONE OF THE TIME (141)

W10. During the past month, have you been bothered by any illness, bodily disorders, pains, or fears about your health?

1. ALL THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. A GOOD BIT OF THE TIME
4. SOME OF THE TIME
5. A LITTLE OF THE TIME
6. NONE OF THE TIME (142)

"WELL-BEING" items (cont)

W11. During the past month, has your daily life been full of things that were interesting to you?

1. ALL THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. A GOOD BIT OF THE TIME
4. SOME OF THE TIME
5. A LITTLE OF THE TIME
6. NONE OF THE TIME (143)

W12. During the past month, have you felt downhearted and blue?

1. ALL OF THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. A GOOD BIT OF THE TIME
4. SOME OF THE TIME
5. A LITTLE OF THE TIME
6. NONE OF THE TIME (144)

W13. During the past month, have you been feeling emotionally stable and sure of yourself?

1. ALL OF THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. A GOOD BIT OF THE TIME
4. SOME OF THE TIME
5. A LITTLE OF THE TIME
6. NONE OF THE TIME (145)

W14. During the past month, have you felt tired, worn out, used-up, or exhausted?

1. ALL OF THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. A GOOD BIT OF THE TIME
4. SOME OF THE TIME
5. A LITTLE OF THE TIME
6. NONE OF THE TIME (146)

For each of the next four scales, the words at each end of the 0-to-10 scale describe opposite feelings. Circle the number along the line which is closest to how you have generally felt DURING THE PAST MONTH.

W15. During the past month, how concerned or worried about your health have you been?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (148-149)

NOT AT ALL CONCERNED — VERY CONCERNED

"WELL-BEING" items (cont)

W16. During the past month, how relaxed or tense have you been?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (150-151)

VERY RELAXED — VERY TENSE

W17. During the past month, how much energy, pep, vitality, have you felt?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (152-153)

NO ENERGY AT ALL, LISTLESS — VERY ENERGETIC DYNAMIC

W18. During the past month, how depressed or cheerful have you been?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (154-155)

VERY DEPRESSED — VERY CHEERFUL

"WELL-BEING" scale

```
*          GWB EDIT;

ARRAY AWW WW1-WW18;


IF W15 = 99 THEN W15 = .;
IF W16 = 99 THEN W16 = .;
IF W17 = 99 THEN W17 = .;
IF W18 = 99 THEN W18 = .;

ARRAY GG1 W1 W3 W6 W7 W9 W11 W13;
ARRAY GG2 W2 W4 W5 W8 W10 W12 W14;
ARRAY GG3 W15 W16;

ARRAY WGG1 WW1 WW3 WW5 WW7 WW9 WW11 WW13;
ARRAY WGG2 WW2 WW4 WW6 WW8 WW10 WW12 WW14;
ARRAY WGG3 WW15 WW16;

DO OVER GG1;
  IF GG1 = 1 THEN WGG1 = 5;
    ELSE IF GG1 = 2 THEN WGG1 = 4;
    ELSE IF GG1 = 3 THEN WGG1 = 3;
    ELSE IF GG1 = 4 THEN WGG1 = 2;
    ELSE IF GG1 = 5 THEN WGG1 = 1;
    ELSE IF GG1 = 6 THEN WGG1 = 0;
    ELSE WGG1 = .;
END;

DO OVER GG2;
  IF GG2 = 1 THEN WGG2 = 0;
    ELSE IF GG2 = 2 THEN WGG2 = 1;
    ELSE IF GG2 = 3 THEN WGG2 = 2;
    ELSE IF GG2 = 4 THEN WGG2 = 3;
    ELSE IF GG2 = 5 THEN WGG2 = 4;
    ELSE IF GG2 = 6 THEN WGG2 = 5;
    ELSE WGG2 = .;
END;

DO OVER GG3;
  IF GG3= 00 THEN WGG3 = 10;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 01 THEN WGG3 = 09;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 02 THEN WGG3 = 08;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 03 THEN WGG3 = 07;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 04 THEN WGG3 = 06;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 05 THEN WGG3 = 05;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 06 THEN WGG3 = 04;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 07 THEN WGG3 = 03;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 08 THEN WGG3 = 02;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 09 THEN WGG3 = 01;
    ELSE IF GG3 = 10 THEN WGG3 = 00;
    ELSE WGG3 = .;
END;
```

"WELL-BEING" scale (cont)

```
WW17 = W17;
WW18 = W18;

      *      GWB SCORING, V8=GWB1, ALLOWS MISSING  V9=GWB2, NEEDS ALL;

     N_GWB = N(OF WW1-WW18);
  IF N_GWB = 18 THEN
        GWB1 = SUM(OF WW1-WW18);
    ELSE IF N_GWB > 15 AND N_GWB < 18 THEN
        GWB1 = 18*(SUM(OF WW1-WW18)/N_GWB);

GWBWOR = WW10 + WW15;
GWBENE = WW9 + WW14 + WW17;
GWBSAT = WW6 + WW11;
GWBCHR= WW1 + WW4 + WW12 + WW18;
GWBTEN = WW2 + WW5 + WW8 + WW16;
GWBEMO = WW3 + WW7 + WW13;

GWB2 = GWBWOR + GWBENE + GWBSAT + GWBCHR + GWBTEN + GWBEMO;
V8 = GWB1;
V9 = GWB2;
```

"NON-DEPLOYABILITY" item

U2F.	If your unit was sent to war today would you expect to go with it?	1. MY UNIT WILL NOT BE DEPLOYED 2. YES 3. NO	(100)

"NON-DEPLOYABILITY" scale

```
* CREATE OPTOUT OF GOING TO WAR VARIABLE, OPT;

IF U2F = 3 THEN OPT = 'NOT GO';
IF U2F NE 3 THEN OPT = 'GO/OTH';
```

"DUAL MISSION" item

UNIT INFORMATION

Next we ask questions about your equipment and your unit. Read each statement carefully and then circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes your opinion.

	VERY HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	VERY LOW	
U14C. How would you rate your unit's ability to perform its support mission and provide its own defense at the same time under fire?	1.....	2	3	4.....	5	(90)

"DUAL MISSION" scale

U14C = Δ - IU14C;