

AD-A245 440



IDA PAPER P-2620

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT NEWS ANALYSIS
AND RESEARCH SERVICE (CNARS)
EARLY BIRD AND EARLY BIRD SUPPLEMENT

Michael L. Fineberg
Leslie O. Day

DTIC
SELECTE
JAN 17 1992
S B D

October 1991

92-01427



Prepared for
Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs
(American Forces Information Service)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES
1801 N. Beauregard Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1772

92 1 16 007

IDA Log No. HQ 91-39029

DEFINITIONS

IDA publishes the following documents to report the results of its work.

Reports

Reports are the most authoritative and most carefully considered products IDA publishes. They normally embody results of major projects which (a) have a direct bearing on decisions affecting major programs, (b) address issues of significant concern to the Executive Branch, the Congress and/or the public, or (c) address issues that have significant economic implications. IDA Reports are reviewed by outside panels of experts to ensure their high quality and relevance to the problems studied, and they are released by the President of IDA.

Group Reports

Group Reports record the findings and results of IDA established working groups and panels composed of senior individuals addressing major issues which otherwise would be the subject of an IDA Report. IDA Group Reports are reviewed by the senior individuals responsible for the project and others as selected by IDA to ensure their high quality and relevance to the problems studied, and are released by the President of IDA.

Papers

Papers, also authoritative and carefully considered products of IDA, address studies that are narrower in scope than those covered in Reports. IDA Papers are reviewed to ensure that they meet the high standards expected of refereed papers in professional journals or formal Agency reports.

Documents

IDA Documents are used for the convenience of the sponsors or the analysts (a) to record substantive work done in quick reaction studies, (b) to record the proceedings of conferences and meetings, (c) to make available preliminary and tentative results of analyses, (d) to record data developed in the course of an investigation, or (e) to forward information that is essentially unanalyzed and unevaluated. The review of IDA Documents is suited to their content and intended use.

The work reported in this document was conducted under contract MDA 903 89 C 0003 for the Department of Defense. The publication of this IDA document does not indicate endorsement by the Department of Defense, nor should the contents be construed as reflecting the official position of that Agency.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public Reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE October 1991	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final--August 1990 to October 1991	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Assessment of Current News Analysis and Research Service (CNARS) Early Bird and Early Bird Supplement			5. FUNDING NUMBERS C - MDA 903 89 C 0003 T - T-AB2-629.12	
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael L. Fineberg, Leslie O. Day				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard St. Alexandria, VA 22311-1772			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER IDA Paper P-2620	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AFIS/AFPPS Current News Analysis and Research Service The Pentagon, Room 4C881 Washington, DC 20301			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The purpose of this study was to assist the Current News Analysis and Research Service (CNARS) in ensuring that the information needs of its DoD audience are being met by two publications, Current News Early Bird and its Supplement. In this IDA effort, readership surveys were planned, conducted, and analyzed. The questionnaire that evolved from this effort elicited responses concerning distribution, content, and availability of the publications and demographic information about the readers. Results show that both Early Bird and Supplement are read overwhelmingly by members of the Armed Services. The vast majority of respondents provided high ratings of effectiveness for both, and most noted their ability to inform readers of DoD information that assists them with their jobs. Most respondents held the officer ranks of 04-06, noted affiliation with the Army or Air Force, and help positions described as Manager or Action Officer. Results also indicate that a large proportion of Early Bird and Supplement readers receive these publications through indirect means, outside the distribution channels employed by the CNARS staff; the actual number of readers is nearly twice as large as the 8,600 copies produced each day. The research team recommends that future survey efforts involving this audience explore alternate methods of survey distribution to obtain data from the large audience of indirect recipients.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Survey, Early Bird, availability, audience			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 132	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	

IDA PAPER P-2620

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT NEWS ANALYSIS
AND RESEARCH SERVICE (CNARS)
EARLY BIRD AND EARLY BIRD SUPPLEMENT

Michael L. Fineberg
Leslie O. Day

October 1991

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

Contract MDA 903 89 C 0003

Task T-AB2-629.12

PREFACE

The purpose of this survey was to assist the Current News Analysis and Research Service (CNARS) in ensuring that the information needs of its DoD audience are being met by *Current News Early Bird* and its *Supplement*. A 25 percent response rate supported the conclusion that both *Early Bird* and the *Supplement* are read and judged to be highly effective by a large segment of military and civilian managers in DoD. Results also indicate that a large proportion of readers receive their copies outside the distribution channels used by CNARS. The actual number of readers is estimated at greater than 15,000.

Every survey has its challenges, but this one was especially intriguing. The difficult part was to sample a population about which we knew nothing without using the publication itself as a vehicle for the questionnaire. The insight came with a reference to the science of epidemiology. Once we began to conceive of the distribution of the publication as a "vector" it was merely a matter of analyzing the CNARS distribution modes and then following them with our questionnaire. The "O-DARK-30" exit interviews conducted with literally hundreds of couriers at the CNARS distribution desk will be fondly remembered by the research team.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assist the Current News Analysis and Research Service (CNARS) in ensuring that the information needs of its DoD audience are being met by two publications, *Current News Early Bird* and its *Supplement*. In this IDA effort, readership surveys were planned, conducted, and analyzed. The questionnaire that evolved from this effort elicited responses concerning distribution, content, and availability of the publications and demographic information about the readers. Results show that both *Early Bird* and *Supplement* are read overwhelmingly by members of the Armed Services. The vast majority of respondents provided high ratings of effectiveness for both, and most noted their ability to inform readers of DoD information that assists them with their jobs. Most respondents held the officer ranks of 04-06, noted affiliation with the Army or Air Force, and held positions described as Manager or Action Officer. Results also indicate that a large proportion of *Early Bird* and *Supplement* readers receive these publications through indirect means, outside the distribution channels employed by the CNARS staff; the actual number of readers is nearly twice as large as the 8,600 copies produced each day. The research team recommends that CNARS continue its editorial policies unchanged and that future assessments of the impact of its publications be conducted on a regular basis.

CONTENTS

Preface	iii
Abstract	v
Tables	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	S-1
I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
A. Background	I-1
B. Purpose and Objectives	I-1
C. Technical Approach	I-2
1. Analyze Target Population	I-2
2. Identify Audience Information Needs	I-2
3. Develop Effectiveness Measures	I-2
4. Develop Survey Instrument	I-3
5. Collect and Reduce Data	I-3
II. METHODOLOGY FOR EARLY BIRD/SUPPLEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION	II-1
A. Distribution and Sampling Strategy	II-1
1. Sampling Plan	II-1
2. Distribution Modes and Schedule	II-2
3. Levels of Distribution	II-3
B. Preparation and Clarification	II-3
C. Alerting the Audience to Survey Effort	II-3
1. Two Weeks Prior	II-4
2. One Week Prior	II-4
3. During Distribution Period	II-5
D. Collection of Completed Surveys	II-5
III. RESULTS OF EARLY BIRD SURVEY	III-1
A. Demographics	III-1
B. Distribution, Estimated Audience Size, and Response Rate	III-4
1. Distribution by Employer	III-8
2. Distribution by Job Category	III-12
3. Distribution by Rank/Grade	III-17
4. Estimated Audience Size	III-23

C. Responses to Early Bird Content Items	III-25
1. Content by Employer.....	III-25
2. Content by Job	III-31
3. Content by Rank/Grade	III-40
IV. RESULTS OF CURRENT NEWS SUPPLEMENT SURVEY	IV-1
A. Demographics	IV-1
B. Distribution of Supplement	IV-4
1. Supplement Distribution by Employer	IV-4
2. Supplement Distribution by Job	IV-4
3. Supplement Distribution by Rank/Grade	IV-9
C. Responses to Supplement Content Items.....	IV-9
1. Content by Employer.....	IV-9
2. Content by Job.....	IV-15
3. Content by Rank/Grade.....	IV-20
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	V-1
A. Conclusions Regarding Early Bird.....	V-2
1. Size of the Shadow Audience	V-2
2. Assessment of EB Effectiveness.....	V-2
3. Demographics of the Sample	V-2
4. Distribution of EB Across the Sample	V-3
B. Conclusions Regarding the Supplement.....	V-3
1. Demographics	V-3
2. Distribution of Supplement	V-3
3. Assessment of Supplement Effectiveness	V-3
C. Recommendations.....	V-4
1. Recommendations to Enhance the Effectiveness of EB and EB Supplement	V-4
2. Recommendations to Increase the Reliability and Validity of Future CNARS Surveys.....	V-4
APPENDIX A-- Early Bird/Current News Supplement Questionnaire	A-1
APPENDIX B-- Posters and Notices	B-1
APPENDIX C-- Frequencies of Responses to Questions 3 and 6.....	C-1
APPENDIX D-- Frequencies of Responses to Questions 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 20	D-1
APPENDIX E-- Frequencies of Responses to Questions 18, 22A-22C, 23A-23J, 25A-25C, and 26	E-1
APPENDIX F-- Frequencies of Responses to Questions 21A-21E and 24A-24H	F-1

TABLES

III-1.	Frequency of Responses to Question 2: "I work for:" (Employer) All Respondents	III-2
III-2.	Frequency of Responses to Question 4: "My job can be best described as:" (Job) All Respondents	III-3
III-3.	Frequency of responses to Question 5: "My rank/grade is:" (Rank/Grade) All Respondents.....	III-5
III-4.	Frequency of Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:"	III-6
III-5.	Frequency of All Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:"	III-6
III-6.	Frequency of Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:"	III-7
III-7.	Frequency of Responses to Question 13: "When I pass it on, I:"	III-7
III-8.	Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:" by Employer	III-9
III-9.	Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:" by Employer	III-10
III-10.	Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:" by Employer	III-11
III-11.	Responses to Question 13: "When I pass EB on, I:" by Employer	III-13
III-12.	Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:" by Job (Original Versus Reproductions of EB)	III-14
III-13.	Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:" by Job.....	III-15
III-14.	Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:" by Job	III-16
III-15.	Responses to Question 13: "When I pass it on, I:" by Job	III-18
III-16.	Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:" by Rank/Grade	III-19

III-17.	Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:" by Rank/Grade.....	III-20
III-18.	Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:" by Rank/Grade.....	III-21
III-19.	Responses to Question 13: "When I pass EB on, I:" by Rank/Grade	III-22
III-20.	Frequency of Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:" Indirect Recipients Only	III-23
III-21.	Responses to Question 18: "Of the articles in EB, I usually read:" by Employer	III-26
III-22.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 23A-23J: "EB is a valuable source of information on:" by Employer.....	III-27
III-23.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 22A-22C by Employer	III-29
III-24.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 24A-24H: "EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding:" by Employer	III-30
III-25.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 25A-25C: "EB helps me:" by Employer.....	III-32
III-26.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Question 26: "Overall, I find EB a useful publication" by Employer	III-33
III-27.	Responses to Question 18: "Of the articles in EB, I usually read:" by Job.....	III-34
III-28.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 23A-23J: "EB is a valuable source of information on:" by Job	III-35
III-29.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 22A-22C by Job.....	III-37
III-30.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 24A-24H: "EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding:" by Job.....	III-38
III-31.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 25A-25C: "EB helps me:" by Job	III-39
III-32.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Question 26: "Overall, I find EB a useful publication" by Job.....	III-41
III-33.	Responses to Question 18: "Of the articles in EB, I usually read:" by Rank/Grade	III-42
III-34.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 23A-23J: "EB is a valuable source of information on:" by Rank/Grade	III-43

III-35.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 22A-22C by Rank/Grade.....	III-44
III-36.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 24A-24H: "EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding:" by Rank/Grade.....	III-46
III-37.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 25A-25C: "EB helps me:" by Rank/Grade	III-47
III-38.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 26: "Overall, I find EB a useful publication" by Rank/Grade.....	III-48
IV-1.	Frequency of Responses to Question 27: "I usually receive Current News Supplement" All Respondents.....	IV-2
IV-2.	Frequency of Responses to Question 2: "I work for:" (Employer) Supplement Readers Only.....	IV-3
IV-3.	Frequency of Responses to Question 4: "My job can be best described as:" (Job) Supplement Readers Only	IV-5
IV-4.	Frequency of Responses to Question 5: "My rank/grade is:" (Rank/Grade) Supplement Readers Only	IV-6
IV-5.	Responses to Question 27: "I usually receive Current News Supplement:" by Employer	IV-7
IV-6.	Responses to Question 29: "When I finish with the Supplement, I usually:" by Employer	IV-8
IV-7.	Responses to Question 27: "I usually receive Supplement:" by Job	IV-10
IV-8.	Responses to Question 29: "When I finish with the Supplement, I usually:" by Job	IV-11
IV-9.	Respondents to Question 27: "I usually receive Current News Supplement:" by Rank/Grade	IV-12
IV-10.	Respondents to Question 29: "When I finish with the Supplement, I usually:" by Rank/Grade	IV-13
IV-11.	Responses to Question 28: "Of the articles in Supplement, I usually read:" by Employer	IV-14
IV-12.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 33A-33C: "The Supplement helps me to:" by Employer	IV-16
IV-13.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 34: "Overall, I find the Supplement a useful publication" by Employer	IV-17
IV-14.	Responses to Question 28: "Of the articles in Supplement, I usually read:" by Job	IV-18

IV-15.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 33A-33C: "The Supplement helps me to:" by Job	IV-19
IV-16.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 34: "Overall, I find the Supplement a useful publication" by Job	IV-21
IV-17.	Respondents to Question 28: "Of the articles in Supplement, I usually read:" by Rank/Grade	IV-22
IV-18.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 33A-33C: "The Supplement helps me to:" by Rank/Grade	IV-23
IV-19.	Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 34: "Overall, I find the Supplement a useful publication" by Rank/Grade	IV-24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The American Forces Information Service (AFIS) has established 25 information objectives in support of DoD policy. *Current News Early Bird* and the *Current News Supplement* (EB/Supplement), two of the print media products produced by CNARS, provide a means for achieving those objectives within the military and civilian audience. Specifically, they are designed to keep civilian and military officials abreast of how DoD activities are being reported in newspapers, magazines, newsletters, and other print media and in the on-line electronic news sources such as Desktop Data, Reuters transcript service, and DataTimes. These publications are distributed to enhance the knowledge level and duty performance of DoD personnel thereby increasing force readiness. The daily 18-page EB and the more detailed Supplement (which averages 77 pages daily) are aimed at a DoD-wide audience defined as high-level military and civilian personnel supporting DoD activities. The daily production run consists of 8,600 copies of EB and 650 copies of Supplement.

B. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to assist the Current News Analysis and Research Service (CNARS) in ensuring that the information needs of its Department of Defense (DoD) audiences are being met by EB and the Supplement. This Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) effort was undertaken to plan, conduct, and analyze a survey tailored to the readership of these two publications. The questionnaire that evolved from the goals of this effort elicited responses concerning the distribution, content, and availability of the two publications and demographic information about their readers.

C. TECHNICAL APPROACH

The traditional first step in a survey is to gather information on the size, strata, and distribution of the target population in preparation for sample selection. In the EB/Supplement case, the audience was unknown and the determination of its characteristics

was the major reason to do the study. The method for accomplishing this was to analyze the distribution process for the documents and then follow the same routes with the questionnaires. Distribution routes included courier pick-up directly from the CNARS office, U.S. mail, and the CNARS fax network.

Since one of the major goals of this effort was to obtain information about the existence of readers who receive these publications indirectly, or second-hand, from the initial recipients, surveys were sent out in a proportion much larger than the known number of EB/Supplement copies produced. Two methods were used by the research team to capture information about this "shadow" audience: (1) a ratio of 5 surveys to 1 issue was employed, and (2) questions were included within the survey asking indirect recipients to indicate the method through which they receive the publication.

The next step was to determine whether or not the periodical met the needs of the audience with regard to content and format of information, editorial procedures, and distribution methods, frequency, and timeliness of the articles. Therefore we transformed these effectiveness measures into assessment dimensions relative to the audience requirements identified above. The measures were then used to derive survey items and measurement scales which could be grouped into sections for ease of administration and scoring, and integrated into a prototype survey instrument.

After the prototype was edited for content, syntax, and spelling, it was pretested for "user friendliness" by a small group of IDA personnel representative of the intended audience. The test was conducted to assess readability, comprehension, ease of administration, clarity of instructions, and scoring procedures. Lessons learned were integrated into the second draft which was distributed to the target audience via "saturation" sampling in the three distribution modes.

Responses were keyed into a relational data base and then verified for accuracy as they were received resulting in the means and standard deviations included in summary tables in this report.

D. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SURVEY RESULTS

1. *Current News Early Bird*

Of approximately 20,000 questionnaires sent out, 3,800 responses were received yielding a raw response rate of 19 percent. Using this sample of 3,800, we tabulated the responses to questions dealing with disposition of the EB after the respondent finished

with it. These results allowed a conservative estimate of total audience size (direct and indirect recipients) of 15,213 readers or about two readers per copy of EB. The response rate calculated from this conservative estimate of audience size was 25 percent. Therefore the true response rate lies between 19 and 25 percent.

In terms of content, the vast majority of respondents provided very positive ratings for EB's effectiveness. The specific topics of most interest included DoD Organization and Budget and International Security Issues. Most respondents indicated that EB helps them perform their jobs by providing valuable information regarding DoD policies, procedures, and activities.

2. *Supplement*

Of the 3,800 completed surveys returned, 1,967 indicated that the respondents also read the Supplement. Since this number of readers is three times larger than the daily production run of 650, we can infer that the Supplement also has a large shadow audience, although we could not calculate its size in this study.

The majority of Supplement readers in this sample provided very favorable ratings for Supplement as an effective publication, and indicated that they read half or more of the periodical regularly. Many indicated that Supplement provides them with information that helps them perform their jobs and informs them of the effect of DoD policy decisions on public opinion.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this survey strongly suggest that CNARS is doing a great service for its readers and that the audience is far larger than suspected. Therefore policies and procedures pertaining to publication, editorial activities, and distribution of EB and the Supplement should continue unchanged. It is recommended that the readership be surveyed on a regular basis using the same survey instrument, or at least a representative set of the original survey items, in order to maintain reliability and allow for trend analysis. Any changes in CNARS policy should await the results of the next survey effort.

However, future survey efforts involving this population should explore alternate methods to reach indirect recipients. Multiple, tear-out questionnaires bound into the publications themselves, as well as distribution through other channels such as interoffice mail, have been suggested. Questions addressed to Supplement readers regarding the

method of publication receipt and disposition are also recommended in order to provide a more rigorous estimate of the total size of this readership. In terms of content, it is suggested that CNARS continue to provide articles in the topic areas of DoD Organization and Budget and International Security Issues, as these were rated the most valuable by this sample of respondents.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Current News Early Bird (EB) and the *Current News Supplement* (Supplement) are DoD-oriented publications of the American Forces Information Service (AFIS), edited and produced by the Current News Analysis and Research Service (CNARS). The mission of AFIS is to communicate internal information about DoD policies and programs to the military and civilian audience worldwide through print and broadcast media.

EB and Supplement are two of the print media products produced by CNARS to implement AFIS information objectives in support of DoD policy, within the military and civilian audience. These two daily publications are intended to keep civilian and military officials abreast of how DoD activities are being reported in newspapers, magazines, newsletters, and other print media and in the on-line electronic news sources such as Desktop Data, Reuters transcript service, and DataTimes. The daily 18-page EB and its more detailed Supplement (which averages 77 pages daily) are two key products designed for their DoD-wide audience. The daily production run consists of 8,600 copies of EB and 650 copies of Supplement. The target audience for these two publications has been defined as high-level military and civilian personnel supporting DoD activities. These publications enhance the knowledge level and duty performance of DoD personnel, thereby increasing force readiness.

B. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this effort is to determine whether two specific CNARS periodicals, EB and Supplement, are meeting the information needs of the DoD audience. Therefore, IDA conducted the EB/Supplement Readership Survey to provide the CNARS management with current demographic information about their target audience, estimate the size of the "shadow" audience previously unknown, and measure the perceived effectiveness of the publications.

To accomplish this assessment, we must first define "information needs" and "audience," then we must develop a set of measures of effectiveness, and, finally, produce

a system for collecting audience responses, analyzing the data, and reporting the results. These objectives are delineated in terms of the worksteps presented below.

C. TECHNICAL APPROACH

The technical approach taken to conducting the survey was divided into five phases, with each phase broken down into the steps necessary to implement its objective. The survey distribution technique is explained in detail in Chapter II.

1. Analyze Target Population

In most cases the size, strata, and distribution of the target population are determined in preparation for sample selection. In the EB/Supplement case, the audience characteristics were unknown and, in fact, were the major reason to do the study.

2. Identify Audience Information Needs

To determine whether or not the periodical is meeting the needs of the audience, we first identified the needs of the audience with regard to content and format of information, editorial procedures, and distribution methods, frequency, and latency. In the case of EB the requirements were straightforward. The audience needs a sample of news articles about DoD topics. What isn't obvious is why they need it. If we know what use they have for the information, we may know better what to include in the EB topic menu and how to present it more effectively. This was discovered by a series of interviews with CNARS staff and selected EB readers, in which we established the dimensions on which the audience "unconsciously" evaluates these periodicals.

3. Develop Effectiveness Measures

Three major evaluation dimensions are called out in the Task Order, namely, content, format, and distribution. The next step was to develop these effectiveness measurement concepts into assessment dimensions relative to the audience requirements identified above. The study team analyzed each of the three dimensions to identify component measures which tap more sophisticated audience needs--for example, assessments of comprehensiveness, penetration depth, and indicators of inadvertent political or regional bias in the articles selected.

4. Develop Survey Instrument

The measures of effectiveness for content, format, and distribution formed the basis for translating measures into survey items and scales and combining them into a prototype survey instrument for pretest. Such an information item might read, "Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements (a-e) and write its number in the appropriate box." Following this item is a scale on which 1 indicates strong agreement, and 5 means strong disagreement. Items like this one were used to elicit data on the scope of EB coverage, duty relevance, and general value of the publication. After all the items were designed, they were grouped into sections for ease of administration and scoring and integrated into a prototype survey instrument.

After the prototype was edited for content, syntax, and spelling, it was tested for "user friendliness" by a small group of IDA personnel representative of the target audience. The test was conducted to assess readability, comprehension, administrative ease, clarity of instructions, and scoring procedures. Lessons learned were integrated into the second draft. The finished questionnaire is included as Appendix A.

Concurrent with the development of the second draft, IDA began the process of obtaining permission from Washington Headquarters Services/Directorate for Information, Operations, and Reports (WHS/DIOR) to distribute the survey. IDA implemented a request for approval of information collection through the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) [OASD(PA)] including the necessary justification and cost worksheet (Form 101) and was granted report control symbol DD-PA (OT) 1853 February 1991 in accordance with OASD(PA) regulations.

5. Collect and Reduce Data

Once received, the responses were keyed and verified for data reduction and filing. The returns were processed as they were received and a relational data base was developed. The data base is flexible and extensive enough to handle the volume and diversity of responses and any specialized analyses that may be required. The data were first reduced and characterized by means and standard deviations for inclusion in summary tables in this report. If further analyses are required in the future, they can easily be supported with the current data base. In the next chapter we discuss the actual process of survey distribution which in this case is more complex than usual.

II. METHODOLOGY FOR EARLY BIRD/SUPPLEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION

The following discussion details the methodology used for distributing the EB/Supplement Readership Questionnaire, including sampling strategy, mode of distribution, and length of data collection period. Since the target audience of EB is considerably larger than that of Supplement, and the Supplement readers are believed to receive EB as well, a single distribution plan was developed to elicit responses from both audiences. The distribution plan is divided into four major aspects: Distribution and Sampling Strategy; Preparation and Clarification; Notification of Survey Effort; and Collection of Completed Surveys. Each of these aspects is detailed in the following discussions.

A. DISTRIBUTION AND SAMPLING STRATEGY

Since EB/Supplement is distributed via three distinct modes (i.e., courier/CNARS pick-up, CNARS fax network, and direct mail), distribution of the survey also required multiple distribution methods to maximize audience representation.

1. Sampling Plan

The use of all three survey distribution channels allowed the research team the ability to access the formal population of 8,600 EB/Supplement recipients. This initial estimate of the EB/Supplement audience is simply based on the number of publications prepared each day. The pivotal issue in the sampling plan is the perception that the number of publications is a significant underestimate of the actual audience who read EB/Supplement. It was hypothesized before the survey that the "shadow" audience is much greater than the number distributed and that this shadow audience would bias the results if we did not include them in the sample.

Developing a methodology for surveying the "shadow" audience proved very challenging, since no information regarding the size or characteristics of this group existed beyond the speculation of the CNARS staff. Two steps were implemented to verify the existence of this group and obtain demographic information about them. The first approach

was to implant items in the questionnaire designed to elicit information about EB/Supplement readers who may receive the publication indirectly, i.e., by means other than the three distribution channels used by CNARS. The second approach was to produce and distribute the surveys in a much larger proportion than the number of original issues circulated each day. Those who receive EB/Supplement directly were requested to pass the publication and questionnaire along to the indirect recipient.

A ratio of five survey questionnaires for each copy of EB/Supplement was sent to the target audience. This ratio was deemed optimal, as it allowed for more than one reader per issue to complete a survey, and was not excessive in terms of cost or ability to implement. Distributing fewer surveys would sample the shadow audience insufficiently, while a larger ratio of surveys would have been too cumbersome in terms of circulation.

2. Distribution Modes and Schedule

As we stated before, EB and Supplement are distributed to their recipients in three ways. Some get their copies by courier or by picking them up directly from the CNARS desk, some get them in the U.S. mail, and some receive their copies over the CNARS fax network. In order to determine where to send the packages of surveys, the couriers/readers who pick up the publications directly from the CNARS office were interviewed as they waited in line over three consecutive mornings. They were asked their names, the number of copies they pick up, their telephone numbers, and their office numbers and symbols. The IDA team then prepared and distributed bundles of surveys with an accompanying handbill of instructions for the point of contact to deliver the surveys to the direct EB/Supplement recipients.

Those who receive EB/Supplement via direct mail or fax had surveys mailed directly to their work address. (The mailing address of fax locations was requested 2 weeks prior to planned distribution--see Section B.)

The distribution schedule for implementing the survey began March 4, 1991, and continued through March 15, 1991. This time period was chosen based on the physical limitations of distributing to all 8,600 original recipients within 1 day using the different methods. The IDA team concluded that completing distribution within 1 day would be critical only if the survey were evaluating a specific issue. Since the main concern of this effort is the evaluation of EB/Supplement *in general*, the extended distribution period proved adequate.

3. Levels of Distribution

Three levels of distribution were also identified within each distribution mode (i.e., direct mail, pick-up, or fax). These levels include the DoD offices which receive copies of the publications directly from the CNARS office, the points of contact within these offices who distribute each edition within an office, and the individual reader. The typical distribution pattern of EB/Supplement using the courier/CNARS pick-up mode follows the sequence of office delivery to point of contact, then distribution within an office to individual readers.

Fax recipients serve as both the initial office delivery and point of contact. Individuals who receive the original CNARS transmission distribute the publications among readers at their specific locations.

Direct-mail recipients carry out the distribution pattern among the levels in reverse order. They are considered initial readers who may also be points of contact, distributing their EB/Supplement copy among co-workers.

B. PREPARATION AND CLARIFICATION

Preparation of the survey instrument was conducted by the IDA team, which included acquiring mailing labels from CNARS for direct-mail EB/Supplement recipients, obtaining fax numbers and names of initial recipients at those destinations receiving EB/Supplement by fax, and drafting all instructions for inclusion within the survey and within EB itself. Separate letters of introduction/instruction to points of contact, fax recipients, and direct-mail recipients were also prepared during this phase. Evaluation of the survey for coherence and clarity of questions and instruction was conducted by IDA representatives. A sample of 12 individuals unfamiliar with the survey evaluated the instrument for clarity of wording, sufficient representation and coherence of response alternatives, survey format, and time/difficulty to complete. Recommendations resulting from this pretest were incorporated into the survey draft before printing the final version.

C. ALERTING THE AUDIENCE TO SURVEY EFFORT

The survey audience was alerted several times in advance of actual survey implementation to call attention to the importance of the effort and maximize the ultimate participation level. Notification of the upcoming survey was communicated through the three distribution channels, as well as posted within EB/Supplement itself.

The use of pre-survey announcements was determined to be the most effective means of alerting readers to the survey effort, as the anonymity of the audience prevented direct mailing of personal pre- or post-survey correspondence requesting participation. Pre-implementation announcements were also selected as a means to introduce readers to the goals of the effort, instilling a personal interest to participate, and enhancing reader motivation. Follow-up messages communicated after the distribution period were not implemented, as participants were deemed more likely to ask for a survey when aware of its impending distribution, rather than request a copy after the fact. In an attempt to ensure maximum exposure to the readership audience, notification was conducted several times before implementation of the survey, as detailed below.

1. Two Weeks Prior

Initial notification of the forthcoming survey began 2 weeks before the distribution target date (i.e., week of February 18-22). Notification was conducted through all three distribution channels, as well as EB/Supplement itself. Announcements consisted of a general notice on the front page of EB/Supplement addressed to all readers. The announcement was signed by a DoD official to enhance credibility and emphasize the importance of the effort.

The CNARS couriers were notified by posting a sign at the CNARS office giving the planned distribution target dates and encouraging participation in the effort.

Readers receiving EB/Supplement via fax were notified of the survey by a cover page of instructions with their daily copy of EB/Supplement. These recipients were requested to fax information to CNARS including the name of the original fax recipient, the mailing address of their destination, and the number of EB/Supplement readers at their location. Announcement of the survey also involved sending individual letters addressed to direct mail EB/Supplement recipients, again encouraging their participation in the forthcoming effort.

2. One Week Prior

One week before initial distribution, notification was again included within issues of EB/Supplement. A brief reminder was included three times during that publication week (i.e., Monday, Wednesday, and Friday).

3. During Distribution Period

During the distribution period a subsequent reminder was included within the publication. Readers were encouraged to look for and complete a copy of the survey. Handbill-type notices were attached to each bundle of surveys distributed, providing additional instructions to the points of contact who deliver copies of EB/Supplement within their offices, and to direct-mail recipients to pass out copies of the survey to those who share their copy of EB/Supplement. Distribution covered approximately 2 weeks (March 4-15) and reminder notices were included in EB/Supplement during this time period. All notices and posters are included in Appendix B.

D. COLLECTION OF COMPLETED SURVEYS

The IDA team requested respondents to complete the one-page, multiple choice survey and return it, postage paid, within 5 days of receipt. The collection period began March 11, 1991, and continued through May 10, 1991. This extended collection period was deemed necessary, despite the request to return responses within 5 days, as the rate of returns remained fairly constant for several weeks. An earlier cut-off date would have eliminated several valid surveys from the data base. A total of 3,800 completed surveys were received, key punched, verified, and entered into the data base.

III. RESULTS OF EARLY BIRD SURVEY

The following discussion presents the results obtained following analysis of the completed EB surveys. This section is organized by three major themes: Demographics, Distribution, including Estimated Audience Size and Return Rate, and Responses to Content Items.

A. DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographics section of the questionnaire was designed to characterize the EB audience. The survey items requesting the employer, or organizational affiliation (Question 2), the job type held (Question 4), and the rank/grade or equivalent non-Government position level held (Question 5) served as the basis for describing this sample of EB readers; the results are contained in Tables III-1 to III-3 in this chapter. In these and the following tables, any difference from a total of 100% in the "Percent" column is due to rounding beyond the decimal point. Frequencies of responses to the organizational mission question (Question 3) and the education question (Question 6) are presented as tables in Appendix C.

A total of 3,800 completed surveys were received. Of those, the largest proportion reported affiliation with the Air Force (28.2% of all respondents to this item, $n = 1,071$) or the Army (27.2%, $n = 1,034$). See Table III-1 for the frequency distribution of all responses to the affiliation item. The fact that the Air Force had the highest number of respondents may be an artifact created by CNARS' previous affiliation with the Air Force. While this may be an explanation for the preponderance of Air Force readers, it is not a justification. Therefore, in future surveys the research team must be careful to take this bias into account when designing the survey distribution scheme.

Most respondents held jobs which they described as Manager (30.4%, $n = 1,155$) or Action Officer (29.6%, $n = 1,124$). Table III-2 presents the frequency distribution for all responses to the survey question pertaining to the respondent's job. The most frequently reported ranks/grades were officers in the ranks of 04-06 (45.5%, $n = 1,730$) and government employees in the grades of GS/GM13-GS/GM15 (16.9%, $n = 641$).

**Table III-1. Frequency of Responses to Question 2:
"I work for:" (Employer)
All Respondents**

Employer	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Army	1034	27.2%	27.3%
Navy	456	12%	39.4%
Air Force	1071	28.2%	67.7%
Marines	40	1.1%	68.8%
Coast Guard	27	.7%	69.5%
DoD Staff/Agency	510	13.4%	83%
Academic Community	57	1.5%	84.5%
Congress	118	3.1%	87.6%
Congressional Support	21	.6%	88.2%
Non-Academic Research	92	2.4%	90.6%
Other	356	9.4%	100%
No response to this item	18	.5%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Table III-2. Frequency of Responses to Question 4:
 "My job can be best described as:" (Job)
 All Respondents

Job	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Policy Maker	357	9.4%	9.5%
Manager	1155	30.4%	40.1%
Action Officer	1124	29.6%	69.9%
Scholar/Analyst	398	10.5%	80.5%
Clerical/Admini- strative	321	8.4%	89%
Technical	155	4.1%	93.1%
Non-Government Management	19	.5%	93.6%
Other	242	6.4%	100%
No response to this item	29	.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Table III-3 provides the frequency of all responses to the rank/grade item. Based on these results it is apparent that the sample is reflective of the stated target audience for the publication based on interviews with CNARS staff prior to distribution.

B . DISTRIBUTION, ESTIMATED AUDIENCE SIZE, AND RESPONSE RATE

A primary purpose of this effort was to estimate the total size of EB's readership. Although 8,600 EBs are produced daily, the CNARS staff believed that a much greater number of actual readers existed. This so-called "shadow audience" was believed to receive EB second-hand from an original recipient or receive a reproduction of an original copy, but no empirical investigation into the actual existence of this shadow audience or any estimation of its size had ever been attempted.

Gathering data on the existence and size of a shadow audience is at best problematic. The difficulty is simple: the investigator lacks even the rudimentary information about the audience which is required to conduct a survey. At the outset, we had no idea who the shadow audience members were, where they resided, or what their demographic characteristics were. In order to collect such data, a number of questions were included in the survey instrument specifically addressing those who are *not* the first recipient of an original EB or are recipients of photocopies and allowing them to provide information about their mode of receipt. The following questions were designed to investigate these issues:

- Question 9 ("The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:")
- Question 10 ("I usually receive EB from:")
- Question 12 ("When I finish with EB, I usually:")
- Question 13 ("When I pass it on, I:").

These questions provided information regarding the proportion of respondents who receive a reproduction of EB, where/who they receive EB from, what they do with EB after reading it, and how they may pass it on to others. Frequencies of responses to the various options contained in these items are presented in Tables III-4 through III-7. It is apparent from these tables that 62.3% of the respondents receive an original yellow copy of the EB, that almost 50% receive their copy through inter-office mail, that 72% pass it on to others, and that 42% of those who do simply hand it on to a colleague rather than making copies.

**Table III-3. Frequency of Responses to Question 5:
"My rank/grade is:" (Rank/Grade)
All Respondents**

Rank/Grade	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
E1-E6	144	3.8%	3.8%
E7-E9	140	3.7%	7.5%
W1-W4	10	.3%	7.8%
01-03	184	4.8%	12.7%
04-06	1730	45.5%	58.5%
07 and above	111	2.9%	61.5%
GS1-GS7	115	3%	64.5%
GS8-GS12	238	6.3%	70.8%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	641	16.9%	87.8%
SES GS16-GS18	145	3.8%	91.7%
Jr Professional	35	.9%	92.6%
Mid-level Professional	103	2.7%	95.3%
Sr Professional	156	4.1%	99.4%
Clerk/Support	3	.1%	99.5%
Other	18	.5%	100%
No response to this item	27	.7%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Table III-4. Frequency of Responses to Question 9:
"The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:"**

Color	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yellow	2366	62.3%	62.8%
White	1399	36.8%	100%
No response to this item	35	.9%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Table III-5. Frequency of All Responses to Question 10:
"I usually receive EB from:"**

Source	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
CNARS directly	508	13.4%	13.5%
Supervisor	434	11.4%	25.1%
Interoffice Mail	1887	49.7%	75.4%
Coworker	329	8.7%	84.1%
Common Area	42	1.1%	85.2%
US Mail	180	4.7%	90%
Fax	187	4.9%	95%
Other	187	4.9%	100%
No Response to this item	46	1.2%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Table III-6. Frequency of Responses to Question 12:
"When I finish with EB, I usually:"

Question 12	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Pass it on	2712	71.4%	72%
Keep it on file	337	8.9%	81%
Discard it	645	17%	98.1%
Other	72	1.9%	100%
No response to this item	34	.9%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Table III-7. Frequency of Responses to Question 13:
"When I pass it on, I:"

Question 13	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Make copies	183	4.8%	6.3%
Attach it to a distribution list	865	22.8%	36.1%
Hand mine to a colleague	1593	41.9%	91.1%
Other	259	6.8%	100%
No response to this item	900	23.7%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Responses to these same survey items concerning distribution (Questions 9, 10, 12, and 13) were re-examined in more detail and cross-tabulated with three demographic variables: Employer (Question 2), Job (Question 4), and Rank/Grade (Question 5). These results are presented in Tables III-8 through III-19 and are discussed below. See Appendix D for responses to additional questions.

1. Distribution by Employer

Table III-8 presents a cross-tabulation of Question 2 (Employer) by Question 9 ("The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:"). By this we mean that each response to Question 9 is analyzed by the 11 different categories of employer available to the respondent. Total responses to these two items reveal that approximately two-thirds of the respondents receive an original "yellow-cover" copy of EB (62.8%, n = 2,355), while the remaining third receive a reproduction (37.2%, n = 1,397). In-depth inspection of the table indicates that members of a Congressional Support Organization and those in Non-Academic Research Organizations receive the highest proportion of original EBs to copies.

Question 10 ("I usually receive EB from:") identifies the distribution channels through which respondents receive their EBs. Table III-9 presents a breakdown of responses to Question 10 by employer, indicating that across all employers half of this sample receive EB from inter-office mail (50.3%, n = 1,882), and only 23.3% (n = 872) report receiving EB through one of the three identified CNARS distribution channels. Of those who receive their EB through inter-office mail rather than one of the established CNARS distribution channels, the Marines appear to be the most efficient. They report that 69.2% of their EBs come through in this manner. As one would expect, only 21.1% of the Academic Community receives its EBs through inter-office mail; rather, the academics report the highest percentage (38.6%) of EBs coming through direct mail.

Table III-10 shows the frequency of responses to Question 12 ("When I finish with EB, I usually:") broken down by employer. Most respondents, across all employers, report that they pass EB on to others (72%, n = 2,704). Those affiliated with the Marines (78.9%, n = 30) and Air Force (78.3%, n = 833) reported the highest rates of this response. Discard rates are highest (71.4%) among members of Congress and their support staffs. This is not surprising when one considers that each member of Congress can request a personally addressed copy of EB and Supplement without justification.

Table III-8. Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 9			Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
	Yellow	White		
Army	565 55.1%	461 44.9%		1026 27.3%
Navy	236 51.6%	220 48.2%		456 12.1%
Air Force	742 69.7%	323 30.3%		1065 28.4%
Marines	10 25.6%	29 74.4%		39 1%
Coast Guard	3 11.5%	23 88.5%		26 .7%
DoD Staff or Agency	369 72.8%	138 27.2%		507 13.5%
Academic Community	35 63.6%	20 36.4%		55 1.5%
Congress	93 78.8%	25 21.2%		118 3.1%
Congressional Support Organization	19 91.5%	2 9.5%		21 .6%
Non-Academic Research Organization	78 88.6%	10 11.4%		88 2.3%
Other	207 58.6%	148 41.4%		355 9.4%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	2357 62.8%	1397 37.2%		3754 100%

Table III-9. Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 10									Row Total & Percentage of Each Employer
	CNARS pick-up	Supervisor	Inter-office Mail	Co-worker	Common Area	US Mail	Fax	Other		
Army	86 8.4%	143 14%	569 55.6%	104 10.2%	10 1%	7 .7%	53 5.2%	51 5%	1023 27.3%	
Navy	44 9.8%	55 12.2%	207 45.9%	43 9.5%	9 2%	15 3.3%	44 9.8%	34 7.5%	451 12.1%	
Air Force	130 23.3%	146 13.8%	596 56.2%	68 6.4%	14 1.3%	14 1.3%	38 3.6%	55 5.2%	1061 28.4%	
Marines	5 12.8%	0 0%	27 69.2%	1 2.6%	0 0%	2 5.1%	1 2.6%	3 7.7%	39 1%	
Coast Guard	0 0%	1 3.7%	13 48.1%	2 7.4%	0 0%	1 3.7%	8 29.6%	2 7.4%	27 .7%	
DoD Staff or Agency	77 15.4%	48 9.8%	277 55.3%	55 11%	2 .4%	12 2.4%	14 2.8%	16 3.2%	501 13.4%	
Academic Community	16 28.1%	2 3.5%	12 21.1%	3 5.3%	0 0%	22 38.6%	1 1.8%	1 1.8%	57 1.5%	
Congress	45 38.8%	1 .9%	26 22.4%	4 3.4%	0 0%	34 29.3%	0 0%	6 5.2%	116 3.1%	
Congressional Support	6 30%	2 10%	10 50%	0 0%	0 0%	2 10%	0 0%	0 0%	20 .5%	
Non-Academic Research	13 14.1%	3 3.3%	35 38%	14 15.2%	4 4.3%	21 22.8%	2 2.2%	0 0%	92 2.5%	
Other	83 23.4%	32 9%	110 31.1%	33 9.3%	3 .8%	50 14.1%	26 7.3%	17 4.8%	354 9.5%	
Column Total & Average Percentage Across Employers	505 13.5%	433 11.6%	1882 50.3%	327 8.7%	42 1.1%	180 4.8%	187 5%	185 4.9%	3741 100%	

Table III-10. Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 12					Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
	Pass it on to others	Keep it on file	Discard it	Other		
Army	767 74.9%	66 6.4%	174 17%	17 1.7%	1024 27.3%	
Navy	328 72.4%	31 6.8%	83 18.3%	11 2.4%	453 12.1%	
Air Force	833 78.3%	74 7%	144 13.5%	13 1.2%	1064 28.3%	
Marines	30 78.9%	2 5.3%	6 15.8%	0 0%	38 1%	
Coast Guard	20 74.1%	5 18.5%	2 7.4%	0 0%	27 .7%	
DoD Staff or Agency	346 68.5%	34 6.7%	118 23.4%	7 1.4%	505 13.5%	
Academic Community	26 46.4%	19 33.9%	6 14.3%	3 5.4%	56 1.5%	
Congress	35 29.7%	31 26.3%	45 38.1%	7 5.9%	118 3.1%	
Congressional Support	9 42.9%	3 14.3%	7 33.3%	2 9.5%	21 .6%	
Non-Academic Research	61 66.3%	18 19.6%	7 7.6%	6 6.5%	92 2.5%	
Other	249 69.9%	52 14.6%	49 13.8%	6 1.7%	356 9.5%	
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	2704 72%	335 8.9%	643 17.1%	72 1.9%	3754 100%	

Responses to Question 13 ("When I pass EB on I:"), when considered across all employers, indicated that most respondents share their EB with a colleague (54.9%, n = 1,588), or attach it to a distribution list (29.8%, n = 863). Table III-11 presents a complete breakdown of frequencies to Question 13 and Question 2. The Coast Guard is most likely to "hand EB to a colleague" (59.1%) and those involved in Congressional Support are most likely (50%) to "attach it to a distribution list." However, 30.6% of the Academic Community reports accomplishing this task by "making copies."

2. Distribution by Job Category

Table III-12 presents a breakdown of Question 4 (Job) by Question 9 ("The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:"). Responses to these two items reveal that all job categories receive a higher proportion of yellow covers to white indicating that approximately two-thirds of the respondents receive an original copy of EB (62.9%, n = 2,355), while the remaining third receive a reproduction (37.1%, n = 1,387). The widest difference in the proportion of originals to copies (70.7% originals vs 29.3% copies) occurs among those who identify themselves as Scholar/Analysts.

Question 10 ("I usually receive EB from:") identified the distribution channels through which respondents receive their EBs. Table III-13 presents a breakdown of responses to Question 10 by job, indicating again that across all jobs half of this sample receive EB from interoffice mail (50.3%, n = 1,877), and only 23.3% (n = 869) report receiving EB from one of the three identified CNARS distribution channels. The highest percentage (57.5%) of inter-office mail copies are received by Clerical/Administrative workers and the lowest (21.1%) by Non-Government Management personnel.

Table III-14 offers the frequency of responses to Question 12 ("When I finish with EB, I usually:") broken down by job. Most respondents across all jobs report that they pass EB on to others (72.1%, n = 2,697). Those holding jobs described as Manager (82.7%, n = 948) and Policy Maker (71.9%, n = 256) reported the highest rates of response to this alternative. The lowest rate of "passing it on" was reported by Scholar/Analysts (59.3%). The highest discard rate was reported by Non-Government Management (26.3%).

Table III-11. Responses to Question 13: "When I pass EB on, I:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 13				
	Make Copies	Attach to Distribution List	Hand to a Colleague	Other	Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
Army	62 7.5%	230 27.8%	456 55.1%	80 9.7%	828 28.6%
Navy	18 5.3%	115 33.6%	175 51.2%	34 9.9%	342 11.8%
Air Force	24 2.7%	283 32.4%	493 56.5%	73 8.4%	873 30.2%
Marines	1 3.3%	8 26.7%	17 56.7%	4 13.3%	30 1%
Coast Guard	1 4.5%	6 27.3%	13 59.1%	2 9.1%	22 .8%
DoD Staff or Agency	28 7.5%	107 28.7%	199 53.4%	39 10.5%	373 12.9%
Academic Community	11 30.6%	8 22.2%	16 44.4%	1 2.8%	36 1.2%
Congress	6 14%	3 7%	30 69.8%	4 9.3%	43 1.5%
Congressional Support	1 8.3%	6 50%	5 41.7%	0 0%	12 .4%
Non-Academic Research	7 10.6%	24 36.4%	29 43.9%	6 9.1%	66 2.3%
Other	23 8.6%	73 27.3%	155 58.1%	16 6%	267 9.2%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	182 6.3%	863 29.8%	1588 54.9%	259 9%	2892 100%

Table III-12. Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:" by Job
(Original Versus Reproductions of EB)

Job	Color of EB Cover			Row Total & Percent of Each Job
	Yellow	White		
Policy Maker	221 62.1%	135 37.9%		356 9.5%
Manager	656 57.1%	492 42.9%		1148 30.7%
Action Officer	735 66%	378 34%		1113 29.7%
Scholar/Analyst	277 70.7%	115 29.3%		392 10.5%
Clerical/Administrative	207 64.7%	113 35.3%		320 8.6%
Technical Staff	104 68%	49 32%		153 4.1%
Non-Government Management	13 68.4%	6 31.6%		19 .5%
Other	142 58.9%	99 41.1%		241 6.4%
Column Total and Average Percent Across Jobs	2355 62.9%	1387 37.1%		3742 100%

Table III-13. Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:"
by Job

Job	Question 10								
	CNARS pick-up	Supervisor	Inter-office Mail	Co-worker	Common Area	US Mail	Fax	Other	Row Total & Percent of Each Job
Policy Maker	57 16.6%	24 7%	174 50.7%	14 4.1%	0 0%	25 7.3%	22 6.4%	27 7.9%	343 9.2%
Manager	162 14.2%	124 10.8%	645 56.4%	42 3.7%	42 3.7%	34 3%	82 7.2%	51 4.5%	1144 30.7%
Action Officer	95 8.5%	179 16%	551 49.4%	178 15.9%	26 2.3%	8 .7%	39 3.5%	40 3.6%	1116 28.9%
Scholar/Analyst	62 15.7%	34 8.6%	168 42.5%	44 11.1%	7 1.8%	63 15.9%	4 1%	13 3.3%	395 10.6%
Clerical/Administrative	62 19.4%	22 6.9%	184 57.5%	16 5%	1 .3%	4 1.3%	18 5.6%	13 4.1%	320 8.6%
Technical Staff	20 13.1%	23 15%	67 43.8%	19 12.4%	4 2.6%	5 3.3%	8 5.2%	7 4.6%	153 4.1%
Non-Government Management	3 15.8%	0 0%	4 21.1%	1 5.3%	0 0%	10 52.6%	0 0%	1 5.3%	19 .5%
Other	43 17.8%	24 10%	84 34.9%	14 5.8%	0 0%	31 12.9%	12 5%	33 13.7%	241 6.5%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	504 13.5%	430 11.5%	1877 50.3%	328 8.8%	42 1.1%	180 4.8%	185 5%	185 5%	3731 100%

Table III-14. Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:"
by Job

Job	Question 12					Row Total & Percent of Each Job
	Pass it on to others	Keep it on file	Discard it	Other		
Policy Maker	256 71.9%	32 9%	63 17.7%	5 1.4%	356 9.5%	
Manager	948 82.7%	62 5.4%	127 11.1%	10 .9%	1147 30.6%	
Action Officer	779 69.9%	79 7.1%	235 21.1%	21 1.9%	1114 29.8%	
Scholar/Analyst	235 59.3%	74 18.7%	66 16.7%	21 5.3%	396 10.6%	
Clerical/Administrative	221 69.5%	23 7.2%	70 22%	4 1.3%	318 8.5%	
Technical Staff	108 70.1%	13 8.4%	30 19.5%	3 1.9%	154 4.1%	
Non-Government Management	12 63.2%	2 10.5%	5 26.3%	0 0%	19 .5%	
Other	138 57.7%	50 20.9%	43 18%	8 3.3%	239 6.4%	
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	2697 72.1%	335 9%	639 17.1%	72 1.9%	3743 100%	

Responses to Question 13 ("When I pass EB on I:"), when considered across all jobs, indicated that most respondents share their EB with a colleague (54.9%, n = 1,584), or attach it to a distribution list (29.8%, n = 860). Table III-15 presents a complete breakdown of frequencies to Question 13 and Question 4. Action Officers are most likely to hand it to a colleague (69.2%) and Managers seem to prefer attaching it to a distribution list (40.1%).

3. Distribution by Rank/Grade

In the same manner as the other cross-tabulations, Table III-16 presents a breakdown of Question 5 (Rank/Grade) by Question 9 ("The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:"). Responses to these two items reveal the same summary results as the previous cross-tabulations. It is interesting to note that even though EB is aimed at the senior military and civilian executives, the highest proportion of original copies (88.6%) goes to Junior Professionals. Other than this anomaly, the other proportions seem to be in line with the CNARS distribution philosophy.

Question 10 ("I usually receive EB from:") identified the distribution channels. Table III-17 presents a breakdown of responses to Question 10 by rank/grade, indicating again that across all ranks/grades, half of this sample receive EB from interoffice mail (50.4%, n = 1,882), and only 23.1% (n = 862) report receiving EB from one of the three identified CNARS distribution channels. Interesting support for the high proportion of originals going to Junior Professionals is provided by the fact that they also report the lowest rate of receipt through inter-office mail.

Table III-18 offers the frequency of responses to Question 12 ("When I finish with EB, I usually:") broken down by rank/grade indicates that over 70% pass it on. Those in civilian grades of GS1-GS7 (79.8%, n = 91) and military ranks of 04-06 (76%, n = 1,305) reported the highest pass-along rates among all rank/grade categories. The lowest rate of "passing it along" is reported by the Junior Professionals (37.1%); however, the highest rate of discard is reported among the SES and other senior Professionals (about 46%).

Responses to Question 13 ("When I pass EB on I:"), when considered across all ranks/grades, indicated that most respondents who are willing to share their EB do so by handing it to a colleague (55%) or by attaching it to a distribution list (29.9%). Table III-19 presents a complete breakdown of frequencies to Question 13 and Question 5

Table III-15. Responses to Question 13: "When I pass it on, I:"
by Job

Job	Question 13				
	Make Copies	Attach to Distribution List	Hand to a Colleague	Other	Row Total & Percent of Jobs
Policy Maker	16 5.9%	101 37.1%	127 46.7%	28 10.3%	272 9.4%
Manager	41 4.2%	394 40.1%	454 46.2%	93 9.5%	982 34%
Action Officer	34 4.1%	165 19.7%	580 69.2%	59 7%	838 29.1%
Scholar/Analyst	29 10.9%	70 26.2%	146 54.7%	22 8.2%	267 8.2%
Clerical/Administrative	36 14.8%	49 20.1%	132 54.1%	27 11.1%	244 8.5%
Technical Staff	12 10.6%	30 26.5%	61 54%	10 8.8%	113 3.9%
Non-Government Management	0 0%	8 66.7%	4 33.3%	0 0%	12 .4%
Other	15 9.6%	43 27.6%	80 51.3%	18 11.5%	156 5.4%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	183 6.3%	860 29.8%	1584 54.9%	257 8.9%	2884 100%

Table III-16. Responses to Question 9: "The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade			
	Yellow	White	Row Total & Percent of Each Rank/Grade
E1-E6	97 67.4%	47 32.6%	144 3.8%
E7-E9	83 59.7%	56 40.3%	139 3.7%
W1-W4	7 70%	3 30%	10 .3%
01-03	105 57.1%	79 42.9%	184 4.9%
04-06	986 57.4%	731 42.6%	1717 45.9%
07 and above	68 61.3%	43 38.7%	111 3%
GS1-GS7	71 62.3%	43 37.7%	114 3%
GS8-GS12	139 58.9%	97 41.1%	236 6.3%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	426 67%	210 33%	636 17%
SES,GS16-GS18	118 81.4%	27 18.6%	145 3.9%
Junior Professional	31 88.6%	4 11.4%	35 .9%
Mid-level Professional	81 80.2%	20 19.8%	101 2.7%
Senior Professional	123 81.5%	28 18.5%	151 4%
Clerk/Support	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	3 .1%
Other	14 77.8%	4 22.2%	18 .5%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Rank/Grade	2350 62.8%	1394 37.2%	3744 100%

Table III-17. Responses to Question 10: "I usually receive EB from:"
by Rank/Grade

Rank/ Grade	Question 10								
	CNARS	Super- visor	Inter- office mail	co- worker	common area	US mail	fax	Other	Row Total & Percent of Each Rank/ Grade
E1-E6	32 22.7%	14 9.9%	64 45.4%	6 4.3%	1 .7%	3 2.1%	10 7.1%	11 7.8%	141 3.8%
E7-E9	16 11.4%	9 6.4%	88 62.9%	7 5%	1 .7%	0 0%	10 7.1%	9 6.4%	140 3.7%
W1-W4	1 10%	0 0%	7 70%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 10%	10 .3%
01-03	19 10.4%	30 16.4%	90 49.2%	20 10.9%	1 .5%	4 2.2%	10 5.5%	9 4.9%	183 4.9%
04-06	206 12%	225 13.1%	887 51.8%	151 8.8%	22 1.3%	29 1.7%	109 6.4%	85 5%	1714 45.9%
07+	22 20%	1 .9%	53 48.2%	3 2.7%	0 0%	14 12.7%	7 6.4%	10 9.1%	110 2.9%
GS1- GS7	11 9.6%	11 9.6%	76 66.1%	6 5.2%	1 .9%	1 .9%	5 4.3%	4 3.5%	114 3.1%
GS8- GS12	28 11.8%	26 11%	116 48.9%	25 10.5%	1 .4%	10 4.2%	21 8.9%	10 4.2%	237 6.3%
GS/GM 13-15	59 9.3%	102 16.1%	344 54.4%	69 10.9%	10 1.6%	13 2.1%	8 1.3%	27 4.3%	632 16.9%
SES,GS 16-18	30 21.4%	4 2.9%	74 52.9%	6 4.3%	0 0%	13 9.3%	4 2.9%	9 6.4%	140 3.7%
Jr Prof	7 20%	2 5.7%	5 14.3%	7 20%	1 2.9%	10 28.6%	0 0%	3 8.6%	35 .9%
Mid Prof	21 20.4%	2 1.9%	31 30.1%	11 10.7%	4 3.9%	32 31.1%	1 1%	1 1%	103 2.8%
Sr Prof	44 28.2%	7 4.5%	44 28.2%	15 9.6%	0 0%	39 25%	2 1.3%	5 3.2%	156 4.2%
Clerk	0 0%	0 0%	2 66.7%	0 0%	0 0%	1 33.3%	0 0%	0 0%	3 .1%
Other	4 23.5%	1 5.9%	1 5.9%	2 11.8%	0 0%	6 35.3%	0 0%	3 17.6%	17 .5%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Rank/ Grade	500 13.4%	434 11.6%	1882 50.4%	329 8.8%	42 1.1%	175 4.7%	187 5%	187 5%	3736 100%

**Table III-18. Responses to Question 12: "When I finish with EB, I usually:"
by Rank/Grade**

Rank/Grade	Question 12:				Row Total & Percent
	Pass it on	Keep it on file	Discard it	Other	
E1-E6	94 65.7%	12 8.4%	34 23.8%	3 2.1%	143 3.8%
E7-E9	101 73.2%	6 4.3%	29 21%	2 1.4%	138 3.7%
W1-W4	9 90%	0 0%	1 10%	0 0%	10 .3%
01-03	128 70.3%	18 9.9%	32 17.6%	4 2.2%	182 4.9%
04-06	1305 76%	116 6.8%	275 16%	21 1.2%	1717 45.8%
07 & above	84 75.7%	9 8.1%	16 14.4%	2 1.8%	111 3%
GS1-GS7	91 79.8%	9 7.9%	12 10.5%	2 1.8%	114 3%
GS8-GS12	163 69.1%	23 9.7%	44 18.6%	6 2.5%	236 6.3%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	485 76.3%	32 5%	110 17.3%	9 1.4%	636 17%
SES GS16- GS18	88 61.1%	15 10.4%	38 26.4%	3 2.1%	144 3.8%
Jr Professional	13 37.1%	11 31.4%	8 22.9%	3 8.6%	35 .9%
Mid-level Professional	51 49.5%	30 29.1%	19 18.4%	3 2.9%	103 2.7%
Sr Professional	83 53.2%	44 28.2%	19 12.2%	10 6.4%	156 4.2%
Clerk/Support	2 66.7%	1 33.3%	0 0%	0 0%	3 .1%
Other	8 44.4%	4 22.2%	3 16.7%	3 16.7%	18 .5%
Column Total & Percent	2705 72.2%	330 8.8%	640 17.1%	71 1.9%	3748 100%

**Table III-19. Responses to Question 13: "When I pass EB on, I:"
by Rank/Grade**

Rank/Grade					
	Make Copies	Attach to a distribution list	Hand to a colleague	Other	Row Total & Percent
E1-E6	17 17.2%	19 19.2%	54 54.4%	9 9.1%	99 3.4%
E7-E9	6 5.6%	28 25.9%	67 62%	7 6.5%	108 3.7%
W1-W4	0 0%	3 33.3%	5 55.6%	1 11.1%	9 .3%
01-03	7 5%	36 25.5%	86 61%	12 8.5%	141 4.9%
04-06	50 3.6%	446 32.2%	769 55.6%	119 8.6%	1384 47.9%
07 & above	6 6.9%	29 33.3%	41 47.1%	11 12.6%	87 3%
GS1-GS7	17 16.8%	23 22.8%	50 49.5%	11 10.9%	101 3.5%
GS8-GS12	16 9.1%	41 23.3%	106 60.2%	13 7.4%	176 6.1%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	27 5.3%	150 29.6%	284 56.1%	45 8.9%	506 17.5%
SES GS16- GS18	7 7.2%	34 35.1%	39 40.2%	17 17.5%	97 3.4%
Jr Professional	6 35.3%	1 5.9%	9 52.9%	1 5.9%	17 .6%
Mid-level Professional	5 8.5%	18 30.5%	31 52.5%	5 8.5%	59 2%
Sr Professional	18 18.9%	31 32.6%	43 45.3%	3 3.2%	95 3.3%
Clerk/Support	0 0%	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	0 0%	3 .1%
Other	0 0%	3 33.3%	4 44.4%	2 22.2%	9 .3%
Column Total & Percent	182 6.3%	863 29.9%	1590 55%	256 8.9%	2891 100%

and shows that those most apt to hand it to a colleague are Clerical/Support staff (66.7%), while those most likely to put it on a buck slip are SES or GS16-18 managers (35.1%). Those most likely to make copies are the Junior Professionals (35.3%).

4. Estimated Audience Size

As noted earlier, the methodology used for distributing the survey and a number of questions included within the instrument itself, allowed the researchers to obtain information about the size and character of the shadow audience. Responses to survey Question 10 ("I usually receive EB from:") were selected to serve as the basis for determining the proportion of readers who receive EB via one of the three direct distribution channels (directly from the CNARS office, fax, or U.S. mail), versus those who receive EB some other way. Those who reported receiving EB from one of the recognized distribution channels were considered "direct" recipients, while those who reported acquiring EB from other means were labeled "indirect" recipients and considered part of the shadow audience. Indirect recipients, or shadow audience members, were thus defined as those who receive EB from a supervisor, through inter-office mail, from a co-worker, read it in a common area such as a lunchroom, or receive EB by some other method. Of the 3,800 respondents who answered this item, 2,879 (76.9%) were classified as indirect recipients (Table III-20).

**Table III-20. Frequency of Responses to Question 10:
"I usually receive EB from:"
Indirect Recipients Only**

Source	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Supervisor	434	15.1%	15.1%
Interoffice Mail	1887	65.5%	80.6%
Coworker	329	11.4%	92%
Common Area	42	1.5%	93.5%
Other	187	6.5%	100%
Total	2879	100%	100%

Using this information we developed a method of estimating the total EB audience size, which indicated that the true readership of EB was much larger than the number of copies produced each day. In calculating the estimate of the total audience size, the

percentage of respondents identified as indirect recipients (76.9%) was used in the following formula:

(Percent of indirects + 100%) × Total press run = Total Estimated Audience

or, represented numerically:

$$(76.9\% + 100\%) \times 8,600 = 15,213.$$

The 76.9% represents the percentage of readers over and above the number of assumed direct readers (8,600), thus forming an estimated audience size equal to 176% of the number of copies produced each day. This estimated percentage of audience size is then multiplied by the number of EBs produced to determine the estimated number of people who actually read EB each day. Using this formula the figure of 15,213 total readers emerges as the estimated size of the EB audience.

With this estimate of EB audience population, a rate of return for the survey effort was then calculated. This involves dividing the number of completed surveys received (3,800) by the total estimated audience size (15,213), which results in a return rate of nearly 25%. Due to the preliminary nature of this effort, the methodological challenges faced in surveying an unknown population, and the inability to send surveys to specific individuals, the actual rate of return can only be approximated. While this figure of 15,213 total readers is the first estimate ever offered based on empirical data, the researchers acknowledge that it may be conservative. Due to the previously mentioned methodological difficulty faced in identifying the target sample and reaching shadow audience members, the possibility remains that many EB shadow readers were not represented in this estimate.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to estimate the statistical confidence of this estimate of audience size, since a confidence estimate operates on the principle that a "known" population exists and information is available about it. In calculating confidence estimates, the researcher is either trying to determine if the responses to a survey item given by the sample can be generalized to the population with a minimum probability that those responses occurred by chance, or to ensure that the sample accurately reflects the population based on some type of demographic variable. However, since we have no pre-existing information about the population of all EB readers, it is not possible to determine if our sample of respondents is truly representative of the total population.

What this estimate does provide, however, is evidence that EB is in fact reaching an audience far larger than the number of publications produced each day and that the true estimate of the audience size probably is much greater than 15,213 readers.

C. RESPONSES TO EARLY BIRD CONTENT ITEMS

The responses to survey items 18, 22, 23, 25, and 26 concerning the content of EB are discussed in detail in the following section. Each of these response sets is cross-tabulated with the three major demographic items of Employer (Question 2), Job (Question 4), and Grade/Rank (Question 5), which were explored earlier. Tables of overall frequencies of response are provided in Appendix E. Tables of frequency of responses to Questions 21 and 24 are provided in Appendix F.

1. Content by Employer

Table III-21 presents the number and percent of responses to Question 18, which addressed the amount of EB usually read broken down by Employer. Over half (59.3%, $n = 2,238$) of all respondents to these two items read all or more than half of EB. Among those in the military community, respondents from the Army (65.1%, $n = 673$) and Navy (62.2%, $n = 283$) reported the highest ratings regarding the amount of EB read. Among those from the civilian sector (both Government and non-Government) respondents from the Academic Community (71.9%, $n = 41$) and those employed by some "Other" organization not listed (61.8%, $n = 220$) provided the highest ratings.

Question 23 solicits responses regarding the topics of information for which EB is a valuable source. Those who responded to this item indicated that articles regarding DoD Organization and Budget (81%, $n = 3,028$) and International Security Issues (80.6%, $n = 3,017$) were those most well-documented by EB. Table III-22 provides a breakdown of frequencies for each topic by employer. The least well-documented category of information concerned Guard and Reserve affairs with only 42.5% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that EB was a valuable source of information. If we look at the best reported categories of information (International Security and DoD Budget) cross-tabulated with employer, we find that the Academic Community respondents were most enthusiastic about EB's coverage of International Security (94.8% agreed or strongly agreed) and that those in Non-Academic Research were most likely to report that EB provided valuable information concerning DoD organization and budget (89.8% agreed or strongly agreed).

Table III-21. Responses to Question 18: "Of the articles in EB, I usually read:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 18						
	All	More than Half	About Half	Less than Half	One or Two	Headlines Only	None
Army	245 23.7%	428 41.4%	188 18.2%	128 12.4%	37 3.6%	7 .7%	1 .1%
Navy	115 25.3%	168 36.9%	78 17.1%	71 15.6%	18 4%	4 .9%	1 .2%
Air Force	197 18.4%	400 37.4%	211 19.7%	203 19%	33 3.1%	22 2.1%	3 .3%
Marines	8 20.5%	11 28.2%	11 28.2%	7 17.9%	1 2.6%	1 2.6%	0 0%
Coast Guard	4 14.8%	10 37%	7 25.9%	4 14.8%	1 3.7%	1 3.7%	0 0%
DoD Staff or Agency	108 21.2%	186 36.5%	117 23%	68 13.4%	24 4.9%	4 .8%	1 .2%
Academic Community	15 28.3%	26 45.6%	8 14%	8 14%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Congress	13 11%	42 35.6%	32 27.1%	25 21.2%	4 3.4%	2 1.7%	0 0%
Congressional Support	2 9.5%	2 9.5%	10 47.6%	7 33.3%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Non-Academic Research	7 7.6%	31 33.7%	15 16.3%	27 29.3%	10.9%	2 2.2%	0 0%
Other	67 18.8%	153 43%	69 19.4%	51 14.3%	10 2.8%	5 1.4%	1 .3%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	781 20.7%	1457 39.9%	748 19.8%	599 15.9%	139 3.7%	38 1.3%	7 .2%
							Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
							1034 27.4%
							455 12%
							1069 28.3%
							39 1%
							27 .7%
							509 13.5%
							57 1.5%
							118 3.1%
							21 .6%
							92 2.4%
							356 9.4%
							377 100%

Table III-22. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed With Questions 23A-23J:
 "EB is a valuable source of information on:" by Employer

Employer	Q23A	Q23B	Q23C	Q23D	Q23E	Q23F	Q23G	Q23H	Q23I	Q23J
	International Security	Military Balance	DoD Personnel	Operations & Readiness	Research & Development	Guard & Reserves	DoD & Environment	DoD Organization & Budget	DoD Special Operations	Other DoD Issues
Army	788 77.1%	806 78.8%	768 75.2%	666 65.2%	668 65.5%	473 46.4%	683 67.1%	788 77.3%	455 44.8%	240 55.9%
Navy	353 77.6%	340 74.9%	318 70.5%	273 60.5%	285 63.2%	179 39.9%	287 63.8%	372 82.1%	180 40%	65 48.5%
Air Force	871 81.9%	809 76.3%	762 72%	690 65.1%	686 64.9%	415 39.2%	718 67.8%	868 81.9%	439 41.4%	193 52.9%
Marines	32 82.1%	30 76.9%	32 82%	21 53.9%	26 66.7%	15 38.5%	26 67.7%	33 84.6%	11 28.2%	8 66.6%
Coast Guard	15 57.7%	14 51.8%	18 66.6%	19 70.4%	17 62.9%	13 48.1%	17 63%	22 81.5%	6 22.2%	4 50%
DoD Staff or Agency	413 81.5%	393 75.5%	377 74.3%	322 63.8%	311 61.3%	225 44.5%	319 63.2%	397 78.4%	203 40.2%	88 52.7%
Academic Community	54 94.8%	48 80.8%	47 85.5%	47 85.4%	45 81.8%	29 52.7%	29 52.7%	44 80%	31 58.4%	12 70.6%
Congress	99 84.6%	94 80.3%	86 73.5%	79 68.1%	86 74.1%	51 43.9%	53 45.6%	98 84.5%	53 45.7%	16 64%
Congressional Support	17 80.9%	15 75%	12 60%	11 57.9%	12 60%	10 50%	9 45%	16 80%	5 25%	3 75%
Non-Academic Research	75 85.3%	60 88.2%	60 87.4%	48 54%	58 85.2%	30 34.9%	40 45%	80 89.8%	24 27.9%	11 42.3%
Other	305 85.9%	288 81.2%	280 78.6%	255 72.1%	257 72.6%	142 40.3%	247 70%	310 87.6%	175 49.7%	110 71%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employer	3017 80.6%	2885 77%	2760 73.8%	2431 65.1%	2451 65.6%	1582 42.5%	2428 65.1%	3028 81%	1582 42.4%	750 55.9%

Table III-23 shows responses to Item 22A, B, and C. Item 22A concerns the relevance to duty of EB articles. Analysis revealed that 79.6% (n = 2,994) of those who responded to this item agreed or strongly agreed that EB presents duty-relevant articles across all employers. For those respondents from the military community, individuals from the Army (77.7%, n = 797) and Navy (77.3%, n = 351) reported the highest duty relevance. Among the non-military respondents Congressional Support Staff (100%, n = 21) and Congress (99.1%, n = 115) reported the highest rates of agreement. Lowest ratings of duty relevance were reported by the Coast Guard (66.6%) and the Marines (67.5%).

Question 22B, rating EB's contribution to personal knowledge of DoD policies, programs, and activities, resulted in 88.9% (n = 3,308) of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing to this item across all employers. Those from the Marines (94.8%, n = 37) and Air Force (87.9%, n = 936) and the non-Service organizations such as the Academic Community (94.7%, n = 54) and "Other" unspecified organizations (94.3%) reported the highest rates of agreement. Question 22C, regarding the ability of EB to inform individuals on the results of DoD policy decisions, indicated that 81.2% (n = 3,021) agreed or strongly agreed across all employers. Among the Services, those from the Navy (82.4%, n = 373) and Air Force (81.1%, n = 864) gave EB the highest ratings in this area, while non-military organizations reported the highest ratings among those categorized as belonging to "Other" organizations (88%, n = 277) and Congress (83.8%, n = 98). Table III-23 presents a complete breakdown of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed to these three items by employer.

Table III-24 provides detailed frequencies of response, by employer, for those who agreed or strongly agreed with survey items 24A-H. These items requested the rating of EB as an effective aid in decision-making in eight topic areas: R&D, Operations, Logistics, Budget, Procurement/Acquisition, Public Affairs/Legislative, Intelligence and Other DoD Issues. Overall, the respondents who completed these ratings considered EB most effective in aiding decisions on Public Affairs/Legislative issues (50.8%, n = 1,842) and Budget concerns (37.4%, n = 1,349). When analyzed with regard to employer, we find that the highest level of agreement or strong agreement concerning EB as effective in aiding decision-making on Public Affairs/Legislative (69.5%) and on Budget (70.5%) came from members of Congress. The lowest level of agreement concerning Public Affairs/Legislative decisions came from the Coast Guard (40.7%) and the lowest level of agreement about support for budget decisions came from the Marines (23.1%).

Table III-23. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed With Questions 22A-22C by Employer

Employer	Question 22A EB presents articles relevant to my duties	Question 22B EB increases my knowledge of DoD policies, programs activities	Question 22C EB gives me information on the results of DoD policy decisions
Army	797 77.7%	864 87%	812 79.2%
Navy	351 77.3%	397 87.7%	373 82.4%
Air Force	780 73.2%	936 87.9%	864 81.1%
Marines	27 67.5%	37 94.8%	30 76.9%
Coast Guard	18 66.6%	22 82.5%	19 70.4%
DoD Staff or Agency	424 83.4%	458 90.5%	413 81.3%
Academic Community	53 93%	54 94.7%	47 82.4%
Congress	115 99.1%	108 93.1%	98 83.8%
Congressional Support	21 100%	18 85.7%	16 76.2%
Non-Academic Research	86 93.5%	95 92.4%	72 78.3%
Other	322 90.5%	297 94.3%	277 88%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	2994 79.6%	3308 88.9%	3021 81.2%

Table III-24. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 24A-24H:
 "EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding:" by Employer

Employer	Q24A	Q24B	Q24C	Q24D	Q24E	Q24F	Q24G	Q24H
	R&D	Operations	Logistics	Budget	Procurement/ Acquisition	Public Affairs/ Legislative	Intelligence	Other DoD Issues
Army	209 21%	311 31.2%	293 29.4%	231 33.2%	293 29.4%	486 48.8%	237 24.4%	85 23%
Navy	97 24%	130 29.3%	122 27.6%	159 36.1%	145 32.9%	222 50.2%	97 22.4%	26 21.1%
Air Force	190 18.5%	283 27.5%	273 26.6%	386 37.6%	311 30.3%	499 48.4%	207 20.5%	63 19.4%
Marines	5 12.8%	4 10.3%	6 15.4%	9 23.1%	7 17.9%	20 51.3%	7 18.4%	2 20%
Coast Guard	4 14.8%	6 22.2%	7 25.9%	9 33.3%	3 11.1%	11 40.7%	8 29.6%	1 9.1%
DoD Staff or Agency	97 20%	125 25.7%	109 22.5%	165 34%	146 30%	239 49.4%	114 23.8%	33 22.6%
Academic Community	15 34%	18 41.9%	15 34.9%	20 45.5%	20 45.4%	28 62.3%	23 48.9%	9 60%
Congress	64 57.1%	51 49.5%	49 44.1%	79 70.5%	69 61.6%	80 69.5%	38 34.6%	5 26.3%
Congressional Support	3 17.6%	1 5.9%	2 11.8%	8 44.5%	7 41.2%	9 50%	2 11.8%	0 0%
Non-Academic Research	28 34.6%	22 26.5%	19 23.1%	37 45.6%	32 39.5%	48 56.5%	15 18.5%	3 14.3%
Other	121 35.9%	143 42.5%	125 37.1%	146 33.4%	147 43.7%	200 59%	130 39.2%	66 54.1%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	843 23.4%	1098 30.5%	1020 28.3%	1349 37.4%	1180 32.8%	1842 50.8%	878 24.8%	293 25.5%

The frequency of responses for each employer group to Question 25A, B, and C are presented in Table III-25. Question 25A asked respondents to rate the ability of EB to help them set their daily agenda. Only 9% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this item (9%, n = 330) across employers. Item 25B indicates that EB does a better job at helping readers gather the information they need to do their jobs well. Across all employer groups 51.2%, n = 1,905 agreed or strongly agreed that this was the case. Those in non-military organizations rated this item substantially higher than those from military organizations, with respondents from the Academic Community (92.4%, n = 49) and Congressional Support (85%, n = 17) providing noticeably greater ratings than the Navy (46.6%, n = 210) or Army (45.5%, n = 465). Nearly half of the respondents indicated on Question 25C that EB also helps them understand the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion (49.3%, n = 1,823) across all employers. Response rates were almost equally distributed across employer categories.

Table III-26 provides the frequency breakdown of the overall usefulness of EB rating by employer category. Results indicated 94.6% (n = 3,456) of respondents to Question 26 either agreed or strongly agreed that EB is a useful publication. Military personnel from the Navy (94.4%, n = 416) and non-military personnel in the Academic Community (100%, n = 54), Congress (100%, n = 115), and Congressional Support (100%, n = 21) provided the highest ratings.

2. Content by Job

Table III-27 presents the number and percent of responses to Question 18, which addressed the amount of EB usually read broken down by job. Over half (59.2%, n = 2,226) of all respondents reported reading more than half or all of EB regularly. Of this group, those identifying themselves as Non-Government Management represented the highest rate of interest in EB (78.9%) and those calling themselves Scholar/Analysts reported the lowest index of interest in EB.

Table III-28 provides a breakdown of frequencies for topics usually covered in EB by job of the respondent. Question 23 asks the respondent to rate the value of EB as a source of information on the basis of a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The topics are shown across the top of the table. Those who responded to this item indicated that articles regarding DoD Organization and Budget

Table III-25. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 25A-25C:
"EB helps me:" by Employer

Employer	Q25A set my daily agenda	Q25B gather the information I need to do my job well	Q25C understand the effect of my decisions/actions on public opinion
Army	75 7.4%	465 45.5%	506 49.7%
Navy	31 6.9%	210 46.6%	227 50.5%
Air Force	75 7.1%	457 43.3%	499 47.5%
Marines	2 5.2%	16 40%	15 37.5%
Coast Guard	3 11.1%	10 37%	8 29.6%
DoD Staff or Agency	39 7.9%	268 53.8%	255 51.3%
Academic Community	4 7.9%	49 92.4%	17 34%
Congress	9 7.8%	97 83.6%	59 51.3%
Congressional Support	0 0%	17 85%	10 52.7%
Non-Academic Research	9 9.1%	75 82.4%	29 33.7%
Other	84 24.2%	241 68.9%	198 57.5%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	330 9%	1905 51.2%	1823 49.3%

**Table III-26. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Question 26:
"Overall, I find EB a useful publication" by Employer**

Employer	Question 26
Army	927 93.9%
Navy	416 94.4%
Air Force	972 93.4%
Marines	34 85%
Coast Guard	22 81.4%
DoD Staff or Agency	467 95.3%
Academic Community	54 100%
Congress	115 100%
Congressional Support	21 100%
Non-Academic Research	80 98.9%
Other	338 97.9%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	3456 94.6%

Table III-27. Responses to Question 18: "Of the articles in EB, I usually read:"
by Job

Job	Question 18						
	All	More than Half	About Half	Less than Half	One or Two	Headlines Only	None
Policy Maker	100 28%	126 35.3%	60 16.8%	54 15.1%	9 2.5%	7 2%	1 .3%
Manager	223 19.4%	453 39.3%	233 20.2%	195 16.9%	38 3.3%	9 .8%	1 .1%
Action Officer	219 19.5%	474 42.2%	213 19%	165 14.7%	38 3.4%	12 1.1%	2 .2%
Scholar/ Analyst	65 16.3%	125 31.4%	98 24.6%	82 20.6%	23 5.8%	4 1%	1 .3%
Clerical/ Administrative	73 22.8%	118 36.9%	68 21.3%	36 11.3%	15 4.7%	9 2.8%	1 .3%
Technical Staff	29 18.7%	71 45.8%	23 14.8%	20 12.9%	9 5.8%	2 1.3%	1 .6%
Non- Government Management	5 26.3%	10 52.6%	0 0%	2 10.5%	1 5.3%	1 5.3%	0 0%
Other	60 24.8%	75 31%	54 22.3%	42 17.4%	7 2.9%	3 1.2%	1 .4%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	774 20.6%	1452 38.6%	749 19.9%	596 15.8%	140 3.7%	47 1.2%	8 .2%
							3766 100%

**Table III-28. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Questions 23A-23J:
"EB is a valuable source of information on:" by Job**

Job	Q23A	Q23B	Q23C	Q23D	Q23E	Q23F	Q23G	Q23H	Q23I	Q23J
	International Security	Military Balance	DoD Personnel	Operations & Readiness	Research & Development	Guard & Reserves	DoD & Environment	DoD Organization & Budget	DoD Special Operations	Other DoD Issues
Policy Maker	293 82.8%	286 86.8%	268 75.5%	232 65.7%	228 64.6%	157 44.5%	239 67.7%	291 82.4%	140 39.6%	73 61.4%
Manager	943 82.2%	884 77%	861 75.2%	755 66%	753 65.8%	445 38.9%	751 65.8%	942 82.2%	479 41.9%	227 56.9%
Action Officer	878 78.5%	824 73.8%	816 73.3%	695 62.4%	713 64%	446 40.2%	732 65.7%	898 80.5%	435 39.2%	203 52.3%
Scholar/Analyst	327 83.4%	295 75.5%	277 70.8%	241 62.1%	263 67.4%	172 44.6%	229 58.7%	316 80.8%	164 42.3%	64 56.1%
Clerical/ Administrative	237 75.2%	267 85%	228 72.6%	226 72.2%	226 71.9%	171 54.8%	221 71.1%	242 77.5%	182 58.5%	89 57.8%
Technical Staff	119 77.8%	118 77.1%	113 73.9%	103 68.8%	93 60.8%	64 41.8%	97 63.4%	122 79.7%	67 43.8%	33 51.6%
Non-Government Management	15 83.4%	12 66.6%	13 72.2%	9 50%	11 61.1%	7 38.9%	9 50%	15 83.3%	4 23.5%	2 66.7%
Other	199 82.9%	192 79.7%	175 73.2%	162 67.5%	86 65.7%	117 48.8%	145 60.7%	193 80.8%	106 44.2%	54 59.4%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	3011 80.5%	2878 77.1%	2751 73.8%	2423 65.1%	2444 65.5%	1579 42.5%	2423 65.1%	3019 81%	1577 42.4%	745 56%

(81%, n = 3,019) and International Security Issues (80.5%, n = 3,011) were the most adequately documented topics across all jobs with very little variation in frequency or percentage among the job categories.

Table III-29 presents a complete cross-tabulation by job of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with items 22A-C. Overall, the table revealed that 79.7% (n = 2,987) of those who responded to item 22A regarding the duty relevance of EB articles agreed or strongly agreed across all jobs, with Non-Government Management (94.8%, n = 18) and Scholar/Analysts (90.4%, n = 357) reporting the highest rates of agreement.

Question 22B, rating EB's contribution to personal knowledge of DoD policies, programs, and activities, resulted in an average of 89% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing to this item across all jobs with those described as holding Technical jobs (90.9%, n = 140) and Scholar/Analysts (90.9%, n = 359) reporting the highest rates of agreement.

Question 22C, rating the ability of EB to inform individuals on the results of DoD policy decisions, indicated that 81.2% (n = 3,011) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement across all jobs. Action Officers (82.1%, n = 917) and those in some "Other" job category not identified by the available alternatives (83.8%, n = 201) reported the highest rate of agreement with this item.

Table III-30 provides a detailed cross-tabulation of frequencies and percentages of response by job to eight areas of military decision-making: R&D, Operations, Logistics, Budget, Procurement/Acquisition, Public Affairs/Legislative, Intelligence, and Other DoD Issues. Overall, the respondents considered EB most effective in supporting decisions concerning Public Affairs/Legislative issues (50.8%, n = 1,834) and Budget (37.5%, n = 1,346).

Survey question 25A (Table III-31) asked respondents to rate the ability of EB to help them set their daily agenda. Approximately 9% of these respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this item (8.9%, n = 329) across jobs. Responses to item 25B indicate that EB does better at helping readers gather the information they need to do their jobs well. Across all job categories, 51.1% (n = 1,898) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that EB also helps them understand the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion (49.3%, n = 1,818) for all jobs.

**Table III-29. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed With Questions 22A-22C
by Job**

Job	Question 22A	Question 22B	Question 22C
	EB presents articles relevant to my duties	EB increases my knowledge of DoD policies, programs and activities	EB gives me information on the results of DoD policy decisions
Policy Maker	309 86.6%	317 89.3%	282 79%
Manager	959 83.2%	983 88.5%	902 81.3%
Action Officer	905 80.8%	1002 89.7%	917 82.1%
Scholar/Analyst	357 90.4%	359 90.9%	317 80.1%
Clerical/Administrative	123 38.9%	263 83.2%	250 79.4%
Technical	106 69.3%	140 90.9%	127 83%
Non-Government Management	18 94.8%	17 89.5%	15 79%
Other	210 87.5%	216 90%	201 83.8%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	2987 79.7%	3297 89%	3011 81.2%

Table III-30. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 24A-24H:
 "EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding:" by Job

Job	Q24A	Q24B	Q24C	Q24D	Q24E	Q24F	Q24G	Q24H
	R&D	Operations	Logistics	Budget	Procurement/ Acquisition	Public Affairs/ Legislative	Intelligence	Other DoD Issues
Policy Maker	99 25.9%	120 34.9%	112 32.5%	152 44.1%	127 36.7%	200 57.8%	83 24.4%	26 28.7%
Manager	258 22.9%	342 30.3%	337 29.9%	442 39.1%	375 33.3%	582 51.5%	275 24.9%	108 30.7%
Action Officer	200 18.4%	288 26.5%	252 23.2%	356 32.8%	291 26.8%	510 46.9%	216 20.1%	60 17%
Scholar/ Analyst	114 31.7%	107 29.7%	101 28.1%	159 44.5%	144 40%	202 55.7%	115 32.2%	20 22.7%
Clerical/ Administrative	74 25.2%	101 24.4%	93 31.7%	93 31.6%	98 33.4%	132 34.7%	93 32.6%	35 27%
Technical	40 27.2%	49 33.4%	41 27.9%	53 35.8%	52 35.2%	80 54.4%	36 24.8%	18 34.6%
Non-Government Management	5 35.7%	6 40%	6 42.9%	6 42.9%	6 46.2%	12 75%	1 7.1%	0 0%
Other	61 27.5%	81 36.3%	73 32.9%	85 38.3%	82 36.9%	116 51.8%	56 25.7%	24 32.4%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	841 23.4%	1094 30.4%	1015 28.3%	1346 37.5	1175 32.7	1834 50.8	875 24.8	291 25.4

Table III-31. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 25A-25C:
 "EB helps me:" by Job

Job	Q25A set my daily agenda	Q25B gather the information I need to do my job well	Q25C understand the effect of my decisions/actions on public opinion
Policy Maker	41 11.8%	223 63.3%	216 61.7%
Manager	122 10.6%	599 52.2%	556 49.7%
Action Officer	73 6.6%	501 45.1%	590 53%
Scholar/Analyst	44 11.5%	284 72.8%	174 45.9%
Clerical/Administrative	20 6.7%	58 19.4%	112 37%
Technical	10 6.6%	67 44.1%	73 48.3%
Non-Government Management	0 0%	15 83.3%	3 21.4%
Other	19 8.1%	151 63.2%	94 40.7%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	329 8.9	1898 51.1	1818 49.3

Table III-32 (Question 26) provided an overall usefulness rating of EB and indicated that across all jobs 94.6% (n = 3,446) of these respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that EB is a useful publication.

3. Content by Rank/Grade

Table III-33 presents the number and percent of responses to Question 18, which addressed the amount of EB usually read broken down by rank/grade. Over half (59.2%, n = 2,232) of all respondents read more than half or all of EB across all rank/grade categories. The highest rates of positive response occurred among officer grades of O7 and higher (69.3%, n = 73), and E7-E9 (67%, n = 93).

Question 23 was designed to gather information regarding the topics of information for which readers find EB a valuable source. Table III-34 provides a breakdown of frequencies and percentages for each information topic by rank/grade. The following categories of information were listed: International Security Issues, Military Balance/Threat, DoD Manpower and Personnel, Operations and Readiness, R&D, Guard and Reserve affairs, DoD and the Environment, DoD Organization and Budget, DoD Special Operations, and Other DoD Issues. Those who responded to this item indicated that articles regarding DoD Organization and Budget (80.9%, n = 3,018) and International Security Issues (80.5%, n = 3,010) were most adequately documented in EB across all ranks/grades.

Table III-35 presents a complete breakdown of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed to items 22A-22C by rank/grade. Item 22A, regarding the duty relevance of EB articles revealed that 79.4% (n = 2,979) agreed or strongly agreed across all ranks/grades, with non-Government Mid-level Professionals (97%, n = 100) and those holding positions categorized as "Other" (94.4%, n = 17) reporting the highest rates of agreement. Question 22B, concerning EB's contribution to knowledge of DoD policies, programs, and activities, resulted in 88.9% (n = 3,297) of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing across all ranks/grades. Disregarding Clerks and Support personnel because of their extremely small representation (n = 3), Senior Professionals showed the highest level of agreement (95.5%, n = 149) and E7-E9 reported the lowest (79.2%, n = 110). Question 22C, concerning the ability of EB to inform individuals on the results of DoD policy decisions, indicated that 81.2% (n = 3,011) agreed or strongly agreed across all ranks/grades with Senior Professionals reporting the highest level of agreement (85.9%, n = 134) and Junior Professionals reporting the lowest (71.4%, n = 25).

**Table III-32. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed With Question 26:
"Overall, I find EB a useful publication" by Job**

Job	Question 26
Policy Maker	354 97.1%
Manager	1074 95.7%
Action Officer	1012 94.1%
Scholar/Analyst	380 97.2%
Clerical/Administrative	264 88.6%
Technical	138 90.2%
Non-Government Management	18 100%
Other	226 95%
Column Total and Average Percent Across Jobs	3446 94.6

Table III-33. Responses to Question 18: "Of the articles in EB, I usually read:"
by Rank/Grade

Rank/ Grade	Question 18							
	All	More than half	About half	Less than half	One or two	Only the headlines	None	Row Total & Percent
E1-E6	38 26.4%	50 34.7%	24 16.7%	17 11.8%	8 5.6%	7 4.9%	0 0%	144 3.8%
E7-E9	44 31.7%	49 35.3%	20 14.4%	22 15.8%	4 2.9%	0 0%	0 0%	139 3.7%
W1-W4	1 10%	3 30%	4 40%	0 0%	0 0%	2 20%	0 0%	10 .3%
O1-O3	20 10.9%	84 45.7%	39 21.2%	26 14.1%	7 3.8%	6 3.3%	2 1.1%	184 4.9%
O4-O6	373 21.6%	685 39.7%	335 19.4%	272 15.7%	43 2.5%	17 1%	2 .1%	1727 45.8%
O7 & above	34 30.6%	43 38.7%	22 19.8%	10 9%	2 1.8%	0 0%	0 0%	111 2.9%
GS1-GS7	25 21.7%	48 41.7%	30 26.1%	6 5.2%	3 2.6%	2 1.7%	1 .9%	115 3.1%
GS8- GS12	53 22.3%	82 34.5%	51 21.4%	37 15.5%	10 4.2%	4 1.7%	1 .4%	238 6.3%
GS/GM13 - GS/GM15	118 18.4%	251 39.2%	119 18.6%	112 17.5%	33 5.2%	5 .8%	2 .3%	640 17%
SES GS16- GS18	32 22.1%	51 35.2%	30 20.7%	20 13.8%	10 6.9%	2 1.4%	0 0%	145 3.8%
Jr Profes- sional	3 8.6%	8 22.9%	11 31.4%	10 28.6%	2 5.7%	1 2.9%	0 0%	35 .9%
Mid-Level Profes- sional	9 8.7%	37 35.9%	20 19.4%	27 26.2%	8 7.8%	2 1.9%	0 0%	103 2.7%
Sr Profes- sional	27 17.3%	56 35.9%	30 19.2%	33 21.2%	9 5.8%	1 .6%	0 0%	156 4.1%
Clerk/ Support	0 0%	0 0%	3 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 .1%
Other	3 16.7%	5 27.8%	6 33.3%	4 22.2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	18 .5%
Column Total & Percent	780 20.7%	1452 38.5%	744 19.7%	596 15.8%	139 3.7%	49 1.3%	9 .2%	3768 100%

Table III-34. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 23A-23J: "EB is a valuable source of information on:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade	Q23A	Q23B	Q23C	Q23D	Q23E	Q23F	Q23G	Q23H	Q23I	Q23J
	International Security	Military Balance	DoD Personnel	Operations/Readiness	R&D	Guard & Reserves	DoD DoD & Environment	DoD Organization & Budget	Special Operations	Other
E1-E6	118 81.1%	123 86%	107 74.8%	102 71.3%	107 74.8%	71 50%	99 70.2%	118 81.7%	89 62.7%	39 54.9%
E7-E9	98 70.5%	106 76.8%	101 73.2%	91 65.9%	92 66.6%	53 38.4%	81 58.7%	103 74.6%	51 37.2%	28 49.1%
W1-W4	6 60%	8 80%	6 60%	6 60%	6 60%	4 40%	6 60%	8 80%	4 40%	3 50%
O1-O3	148 80.4%	140 75.5%	134 73.8%	118 64.8%	118 64.4%	71 38.8%	130 65.9%	154 84.8%	79 43.2%	32 47.1%
O4-O6	1441 83.6%	1305 75.9%	307 76%	1088 63.3%	1125 65.5%	675 39.4%	1147 66.8%	1405 81.8%	654 38.1%	325 55.9%
O7 & above	98 88.9%	89 82.4%	87 79.8%	65 59.6%	73 66.9%	58 53.7%	85 78.7%	93 86.1%	44 40.7%	28 62.2%
GS1-GS7	83 75.5%	97 88.2%	72 65.4%	80 73.4%	77 70.7%	70 64.2%	83 75.4%	84 76.3%	89 83.3%	35 62.5%
GS8-GS12	173 73.9%	189 80.1%	173 73.6%	179 76.5%	154 66.1%	115 49.1%	153 65.6%	167 75.6%	124 53%	60 54.6%
GS/GM 13-GS/GM 15	483 76.2%	480 75.6%	435 68.7%	387 62.6%	372 58.7%	263 41.6%	406 64.3%	506 80%	278 44.1%	119 56.2%
SES GS16-GS18	111 76.6%	104 71.7%	110 75.9%	98 67.6%	31 73.8%	74 51.1%	97 66.9%	118 80%	62 42.7%	30 65.2%
Jr Professional	28 80%	26 76.5%	20 58.9%	19 56.6%	23 69.7%	10 30.3%	15 45.4%	24 70.5%	12 36.3%	6 60%
Mid-level Professional	79 77.4%	74 72.6%	68 67.3%	65 64.3%	69 68.3%	46 45.5%	35 34.6%	81 80.2%	40 40%	16 50%
Sr Professional	130 86.5%	117 77%	117 77.5%	105 69.5%	112 73.7%	84 42.9%	91 59.9%	134 88.1%	64 42.6%	25 59.5%
Clerk/Support	1 33.3%	3 100%	3 100%	3 100%	3 100%	3 100%	2 66.6%	2 66.3%	3 100%	3 100%
Other	17 64.6%	14 63.3%	13 72.3%	11 61.1%	7 38.9%	3 17.7%	6 35.3%	13 72.3%	6 35.3%	3 60%
Column Total & Percent	3010 80.5%	2874 76.9%	2753 73.8%	2425 65.1%	2445 65.6%	1580 42.5%	2426 65.2%	3018 80.9%	1579 42.4%	752 55.9%

Table III-35. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 22A-22C by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade	Q22A	Q22B	Q22C
	EB presents articles relevant to my duties	EB increases my knowledge of DoD policies, programs and activities	EB gives me information on the results of DoD policy decisions
E1-E6	70 49%	119 83.3%	115 80.4%
E7-E9	78 55%	110 79.2%	107 77%
W1-W4	6 60%	8 80%	8 80%
O1-O3	143 78.2%	165 91.2%	148 81.7%
O4-O6	1440 83.4%	1497 89%	1393 82.7%
O7 & above	97 87.3%	101 90.9%	93 84.5%
GS1-GS7	39 35.5%	95 85.6%	89 80.9%
GS8-GS12	150 64.7%	215 91.9%	189 80.5%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	523 81.9%	568 89%	504 79%
SES GS16-GS18	136 93.8%	128 88.3%	112 77.3%
Jr Professional	33 94.3%	33 94.3%	25 71.4%
Mid-level Professional	100 97%	90 87.3%	77 74.7%
Sr Professional	147 94.2%	149 95.5%	134 85.9%
Clerk/Support	2 66.6%	3 100%	3 100%
Other	17 94.4%	16 88.9%	14 77.8%
Column Total & Percent	2979 79.4%	3297 88.9%	3011 81.2%

Table III-36 provides a detailed frequency of responses by rank/grade to eight areas of decision-making. Survey items 24A-H requested the rating of EB as an effective aid in decision-making in eight different topic areas: R&D, Operations, Logistics, Budget, Procurement/Acquisition, Public Affairs/Legislative, Intelligence and Other DoD Issues. Across all ranks/grades, the respondents considered EB most effective as a decision aid in the area of Public Affairs/Legislative issues (50.8%, n = 1,837) and Budget concerns (37.3%, n = 1,344). In regard to Public Affairs, senior professionals indicated most agreement (64.3%, n = 90) and E7-E9 reported the least (43.5%, n = 57). When considering the Budget area, Senior Professionals again reported the highest level of agreement (57.1%, n = 79) and E7-E9 were again lowest in agreement (25.2%, n = 32).

The frequency of responses for each rank/grade to items 25A-25C are presented in Table III-37. Survey question 25A asked respondents to rate the ability of EB to help them set their daily agenda. Only 9% of these respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this item (8.8%, n = 327) across rank/grade. Item 25B indicates that EB does a better job at helping readers gather the information they need to do their jobs well (51%, n = 1,892) across all ranks/grades. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that EB also helps them understand the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion (49.3%, n = 1,818) for all ranks/grades.

Table III-38 for Question 26 provides a frequency breakdown of overall usefulness ratings of EB by rank/grade. The respondents indicated that 94.7% (n = 3,446) of these respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that EB is a useful publication across all ranks/grades with the highest level of agreement among the Senior Professionals (99.3%, n = 151) and the lowest level occurring among military officers O7 and above (40.1%, n = 99).

Table III-36. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 24A-24H: "EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/ Grade	Q24A	Q24B	Q24C	Q24D	Q24E	Q24F	Q24G	Q24H
	R&D	Operations	Logistics	Budget	Procurement	Public Affairs/ Legislative	Intelligence	Other DoD issues
E1-E6	31 23.3%	49 37.1%	43 32.6%	51 38.6%	47 35.6%	71 53.8%	45 34.9%	20 32.3%
E7-E9	22 16.7%	37 28.3%	31 23.6%	33 25.2%	32 24.4%	57 43.5%	28 21.7%	6 12.7%
W1-W4	1 10%	5 50%	3 30%	4 40%	1 10%	3 30%	4 40%	1 25%
O1-O3	38 21.6%	56 31.7%	52 29.5%	61 34.9%	55 31.4%	89 50.6%	46 26.2%	8 12.9%
O4-O6	339 20%	490 28.9%	463 27.3%	642 37.8%	514 30.3%	885 52%	383 22.9%	141 27.3%
O7 & above	32 30.2%	38 35.2%	40 37.4%	48 44.8%	41 38.7%	70 64.2%	29 27.6%	11 33.3%
GS1-GS7	32 31.1%	44 41.9%	35 33.7%	34 32.7%	39 37.5%	49 47.1%	41 40.2%	17 36.2%
GS8-GS12	56 26.3%	81 37.5%	65 30.4%	73 33.9%	71 32.8%	104 48.2%	57 27.5%	19 23.2%
GS/GM13 - GS/GM15	132 21.6%	165 26.9%	161 26.3%	208 33.9%	191 31.3%	191 44.2%	124 20.7%	40 20.9%
SES GS16-GS18	32 23.2%	28 20.5%	33 24%	48 34.8%	45 32.6%	69 50%	26 19.2%	7 20%
Jr Professional	10 32.3%	6 19.3%	6 19.3%	16 51.6%	15 48.4%	19 61.3%	9 30%	2 25%
Mid-level Professional	34 36.9%	32 34.8%	28 30.8%	40 44%	39 42.9%	49 52.1%	26 27.7%	8 30.7%
Sr Professional	69 51.1%	54 40%	50 36.8%	79 57.1%	73 53.6%	90 64.3%	43 31.9%	10 31.3%
Clerk/Support	2 66.7%	2 66.6%	2 66.7%	2 66.7%	2 66.3%	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	2 66.7%
Other	5 29.4%	5 31.3%	4 25.1%	5 31.3%	7 43.8%	10 58.8%	2 11.8%	2 50%
Column Total & Percent	835 23.2%	1092 30.3%	1016 28.3%	1344 37.3%	1172 32.5%	1837 50.8%	873 24.6%	294 25.5%

Table III-37. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 25A-25C: "EB helps me:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade	Q25A	Q25B	Q25C
	Set my daily agenda	Gather the information I need to do my job well	Understand the effect of my decisions/actions on public opinion
E1-E6	12 8.7%	34 24.8%	54 39.4%
E7-E9	6 4.5%	38 28.8%	55 41%
W1-W4	0 0%	4 40%	4 40%
01-03	12 6.6%	80 44.2%	90 49.5%
04-06	167 9.7%	869 50.5%	905 52.7%
07 & above	10 9.4%	69 62.7%	64 60.3%
GS1-GS7	6 5.6%	21 29.6%	53 49.1%
GS8-GS12	17 7.5%	108 46.8%	85 37.8%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	43 6.8%	316 49.8%	306 48.4%
SES GS16-GS18	24 17%	100 70.4%	82 58.1%
Jr Professional	4 11.5%	29 82.8%	12 36.4%
Mid-level Professional	5 5.1%	78 78%	34 34.7%
Sr Professional	19 13.1%	127 83.6%	67 46.9%
Clerk/Support	1 33.3%	2 66.6%	2 66.6%
Other	1 5.6%	17 94.5%	5 27.8%
Column Total & Percent	327 8.8%	1892 51%	1818 49.3%

**Table III-38. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 26:
"Overall, I find EB a useful publication" by Rank/Grade**

Rank/Grade	Question 26
E1-E6	120 88.02%
E7-E9	119 88.8%
W1-W4	8 80%
01-03	163 91.1%
04-06	1596 95.2%
07 & above	99 40.1%
GS1-GS7	97 91.5%
GS8-GS12	210 92.5%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	582 94.5%
SES GS16-GS18	137 98.6%
Jr Professional	34 100%
Mid-level Professional	99 98%
Sr Professional	151 99.3%
Clerk/Support	3 100%
Other	18 100%
Column Total and Average Percent	3446 94.7%

IV. RESULTS OF CURRENT NEWS SUPPLEMENT SURVEY

Survey items 27 through 34 requested information from readers of *Current News Supplement* (Supplement). The following section describes the demographics of those who responded to these items, their frequency of receipt of the publication, as well as their responses to the survey questions regarding the content of Supplement.

A. DEMOGRAPHICS

Survey respondents were requested to answer Questions 27-34 only if they read Supplement in addition to EB. The number of Supplement readers among this sample of respondents was determined by selecting all those who provided any response to Question 27 which inquired as to how often they received the Supplement. Of the 3,800 total survey respondents, 1,967 also indicated that they received the Supplement (Table IV-1). The most frequent response was "every day" (13.7%, n = 521) and the least frequent was 2.5% (n = 96), who received the Supplement only once a month. While this number of reported Supplement readers far exceeds the 650 copies produced daily, no reliable estimate of the "shadow" Supplement audience could be calculated, as it was for EB. The methods used to estimate EB's shadow readership involved the use of questions specifically addressing distribution, but no comparable questions were included in the survey pertaining to Supplement. Future survey efforts involving this audience should include questions regarding mode of receipt in order to determine how many readers are direct versus indirect Supplement recipients.

Table IV-2 provides a frequency distribution for Employer groups responding to the Supplement items. In terms of employer or organizational affiliation (Question 2), individuals from the Air Force (28.2%, n = 554) and Army (26.9%, n = 530) were the most frequent recipients of the Supplement among the Armed Forces sector, and DoD Staff/Agency employees (14.5%, n = 286) the most frequent recipients among the civilian community. The fact that the Air Force yielded the highest number of recipients may be an artifact created by CNARS' previous affiliation with the Air Force. While this may explain the preponderance of copies going to Air Force readers, it is not a justification; future

**Table IV-1. Frequency of Responses to Question 27:
 "I usually receive Current News Supplement"
 All Respondents**

How often Supplement is Read	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Every day	521	13.7%	26.5%
More than once a week	440	11.6%	48.9%
Once a week	320	8.4%	65.1%
Twice a month	174	4.6%	74%
Once a month	96	2.5%	78.9%
Rarely	416	10.9%	100%
No response to this item (non- Supplement readers)	1833	48.2%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Table IV-2. Frequency of Responses to Question 2:
"I work for:" (Employer)
Supplement Readers Only**

Employer	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Army	530	26.9%	27%
Navy	212	10.8%	37.8%
Air Force	554	28.2%	66.1%
Marines	20	1%	67.1%
Coast Guard	14	.7%	67.8%
DoD Staff/Agency	286	14.5%	82.4%
Academic Community	26	1.3%	83.7%
Congress	53	2.7%	86.4%
Congressional Support	10	.5%	86.9%%
Non-Academic Research	59	3%	89.9%
Other	198	10.1%	100%
No Response to this item	5	.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	1967	100%	100%

researchers must be careful to take this bias into account when designing the survey distribution scheme.

With respect to recipients' jobs (Question 4), individuals holding jobs described as Manager (30.9%, n = 602) and Action Officer (29.5%, n = 576) were most likely to receive the Supplement. See Table IV-3 for a frequency of jobs for Supplement respondents. Analysis of the rank/grade or equivalent non-Government level associated with these jobs (Question 5) indicated that most respondents to the Supplement items were in Officer grades 04-06 (44.7%, n = 879) or levels GS/GM13-GS/GM15 (18.2%, n = 358). Table IV-4 provides a frequency distribution by rank/grade for all Supplement readers.

B. DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPLEMENT

In this section the frequency with which respondents receive Supplement (Question 27) is cross-tabulated with the three demographic variables of Employer (Question 2), Job (Question 4), and Rank/Grade (Question 5), which were analyzed above.

1. Supplement Distribution by Employer

Nearly half of the Supplement readers report receiving the publication either every day or more than once per week (48.9%, n = 958) across all employer groups. Those working for DoD Staff/Agency organizations (32.2%, n = 92) and the Army (29.6%, n = 157) were the two groups with the highest reported rate of daily receipt. See Table IV-5 for a complete breakdown of employer (Question 2) by frequency of receipt (Question 27).

Responses to Question 29 ("When I finish with Supplement, I usually:") indicated that two-thirds of all respondents pass the publication on to others (68.8%, n = 1,243) across all employer groups, with those from the Marines (78.9%, n = 15) and the Air Force (75.6%, n = 393) providing the highest rates and members of Congress providing the lowest rates of "pass alongs." See Table IV-6 for an analysis of Question 29 by all Employer groups.

2. Supplement Distribution by Job

When considering the frequency of Supplement receipt by Job (Question 4), those described as Clerical/Administrative personnel report the highest rate of daily receipt

**Table IV-3. Frequency of Responses to Question 4:
"My job can be best described as:" (Job)
Supplement Readers Only**

Job	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Policy Maker	203	10.3%	10.4%
Manager	602	30.9%	41.3%
Action Officer	576	29.5%	70.8%
Scholar/Analyst	193	9.9%	80.7%
Clerical/Admini- strative	155	7.9%	88.6%
Technical	79	4%	92.7%
Non-Government Management	13	.7%	93.3%
Other	130	6.6%	100%
No response to this item	16	.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	1967	100%	100%

**Table IV-4. Frequency of Responses to Question 5:
"My rank/grade is:" (Rank/Grade)
Supplement Readers Only**

Rank/Grade	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
E1-E6	74	3.8%	3.8%
E7-E9	65	3.3%	7.1%
W1-W4	5	.3%	7.4%
01-03	87	4.4%	11.8%
04-06	879	44.7%	56.7%
07 and above	64	3.3%	60%
GS1-GS7	61	3.1%	63.1%
GS8-GS12	111	5.6%	58.8%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	358	18.2%	87.1%
SES GS16-GS18	82	4.2%	91.3%
Jr Professional	17	.9%	92.2%
Mid-level Professional	55	2.8%	95%
Sr Professional	85	4.3%	99.3%
Clerk/Support	2	.1%	99.4%
Other	11	.6%	100%
No response to this item	11	.6%	not included
Column Total & Percent	1967	100%	100%

Table IV-5. Responses to Question 27: "I usually receive Current News Supplement:"
by Employer

Employer	Every day	More than once a week	Once a week	Twice a month	Once a month	Rarely	Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
Army	157 29.6%	108 20.4%	75 14.2%	34 6.4%	23 4.3%	133 25.1%	530 27%
Navy	59 27.8%	43 20.3%	34 16%	12 5.7%	10 4.7%	54 25.5%	212 10.8%
Air Force	151 27.3%	130 23.5%	107 19.3%	45 8.1%	24 4.3%	97 17.5%	554 28.2%
Marines	3 15%	7 35%	0 0%	4 20%	0 0%	6 30%	20 1%
Coast Guard	2 14.3%	0 0%	1 7.1%	1 7.1%	0 0%	10 71.4%	14 .7%
DoD Staff or Agency	92 32.2%	55 19.2%	36 12.6%	29 10.1%	14 4.9%	60 21%	286 14.6%
Academic Community	6 23.1%	4 15.4%	5 19.2%	5 19.2%	2 7.7%	4 15.4%	26 1.3%
Congress	6 11.3%	6 11.3%	12 22.6%	16 30.2%	10 18.9%	3 5.7%	53 2.7%
Congressional Support	1 10%	2 20%	4 40%	3 30%	0 0%	0 0%	10 .5%
Non-Academic Research	9 15.3%	10 16.9%	18 30.5%	11 18.6%	5 8.5%	6 10.2%	59 3%
Other	33 18.7%	74 37.4%	28 14.1%	14 7.1%	8 4%	41 20.7%	198 10.1%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	519 26.5%	439 22.4%	320 16.3%	174 8.9%	96 4.9%	414 21.1%	1962 100%

Table IV-6. Responses to Question 29: "When I finish with the Supplement, I usually:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 29				
	Pass it on to others	Keep it on file	Discard it	Other	Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
Army	351 72.7%	41 8.5%	81 16.8%	10 2.1%	483 26.7%
Navy	133 71.9%	18 9.7%	30 16.2%	4 2.2%	185 10.2%
Air Force	393 75.6%	36 6.9%	86 16.5%	5 1%	520 28.8%
Marines	15 78.9%	1 5.3%	3 15.8%	0 0%	19 1.1%
Coast Guard	5 50%	2 20%	3 30%	0 0%	10 6%
DoD Staff or Agency	160 60.4%	24 9.1%	75 28.3%	6 2.3%	265 14.7%
Academic Community	9 39.1%	11 47.8%	1 4.3%	2 8.7%	23 1.3%
Congress	9 18%	16 32%	23 46%	2 4%	50 2.8%
Congressional Support	7 70%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%	10 6%
Non-Academic Research	38 66.7%	14 24.6%	4 7%	1 1.8%	57 3.2%
Other	123 66.5%	28 15.1%	31 26.8%	3 1.6%	185 10.2%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	1243 68.8%	193 10.7%	338 18.7%	33 1.8%	1807 100%

(45.8%, n = 71), and Policy Makers (34.5%, n = 70), the second most frequent. The highest percentages of those who report getting Supplement *rarely* are Action Officers (23.8%, n = 137) and "Others" (23.8%, n = 31). Table IV-7 provides a complete distribution of Job (Question 4) by frequency of receipt (Question 27).

Those respondents holding jobs of Manager (79%, n = 436) and Policy Maker (68.1%, n = 128) were the most likely to pass Supplement on to others, with 68.8% (n = 1,237) of all respondents to these two items (Question 29 and Question 4) indicating this response. Non-Government Managers are the most likely to discard the Supplement (38.5%, n = 24). Table IV-8 provides an analysis of the frequency of responses to these two items.

3. Supplement Distribution by Rank/Grade

Examination of the responses to Question 27 by the rank/grade (Question 5) of respondents indicated that military personnel in the ranks of E1-E6 report the highest rate of daily receipt (48.6%, n = 36), with SES GS16-GS18 level civilians the second most frequent recipients (46.3%, n = 38). The least frequent recipients with a reliable number of responses are E7-E9 (26.2%, n = 17 report receiving Supplement rarely). Table IV-9 details the frequency of receipt (Question 27) by all rank/grades (Question 5).

When examining Question 29 by rank/grade, 68.9% (n = 1,242) of all rank/grades indicated that they share their Supplement with others. Civilians in grades of GS1-GS7 (80.4%, n = 45) and Officers in ranks of 04-06 (74%, n = 594) provided the highest "pass along" rates while Mid-level Professionals report the lowest (50%, n = 27) with any reliability. A complete breakdown of responses to these items is provided in Table IV-10.

C. RESPONSES TO SUPPLEMENT CONTENT ITEMS

The responses to survey items concerning the content of Supplement have been examined and then cross-tabulated with the three demographic items of Employer (Question 2), Job (Question 4), and Grade/Rank (Question 5) in order to show the distribution of responses.

1. Content by Employer

Table IV-11 presents the frequencies and percentages of responses to Question 28, which addressed the amount of Supplement usually read cross-tabulated by Employer.

Table IV-7. Responses to Question 27: "I usually receive Supplement:"
by Job

Job	Question 27						
	Every working day	More than once a week	Once a week	Twice a month	Once a month	Rarely	Row Total & Percent of Each Job
Policy Maker	70 34.5%	43 21.2%	32 15.8%	13 6.4%	8 3.9%	37 18.2%	203 10.4%
Manager	155 25.7%	171 28.4%	83 13.8%	45 7.5%	20 3.3%	128 21.3%	602 30.9%
Action Officer	120 20.8%	128 22.2%	102 17.7%	52 9%	37 6.4%	137 23.8%	576 29.5%
Scholar/Analyst	29 15%	37 19.2%	42 21.8%	38 19.7%	12 6.2%	35 18.1%	193 9.9%
Clerical/ Administrative	71 45.8%	26 16.8%	19 12.3%	6 3.9%	3 1.9%	30 19.4%	155 7.9%
Technical	26 32.9%	12 15.2%	13 16.5%	8 10.1%	6 7.6%	14 17.7%	79 4%
Non-Government Management	3 23.1%	2 15.4%	5 38.5%	1 7.7%	2 15.4%	0 0%	13 .7%
Other	40 30.8%	19 14.6%	21 16.2%	11 8.5%	8 6.2%	31 23.8%	130 6.7%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	514 26.3%	438 22.5%	317 16.2%	174 8.9%	96 4.9%	412 21.1%	1951 100%

Table IV-8. Responses to Question 29: "When I finish with the Supplement, I usually:"
by Job

Job	Question 29				
	Pass it on to others	Keep it on file	Discard it	Other	Row Total & Percent of Each Job
Policy Maker	128 68.1%	22 11.7%	35 18.6%	3 1.6%	188 10.5%
Manager	436 79%	24 4.3%	81 14.7%	11 2%	552 30.7%
Action Officer	355 67.2%	51 9.7%	113 21.4%	9 1.7%	528 29.4%
Scholar/Analyst	100 55.2%	45 24.9%	32 17.7%	4 2.2%	181 10.1%
Clerical/ Administrative	92 65.2%	16 11.3%	31 22%	2 1.4%	141 7.8%
Technical	50 67.6%	9 12.2%	14 18.9%	1 1.4%	74 4.1%
Non-Government Management	8 61.5%	0 0%	5 38.5%	0 0%	13 .7%
Other	68 56.2%	26 21.5%	24 19.8%	3 2.5%	121 6.7%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	1237 68.8%	193 10.7%	335 18.6%	33 1.8%	1798 100%

Table IV-9. Respondents to Question 27: "I usually receive Current News Supplement:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/ Grade	Question 27						
	Every working day	More than once a week	Once a week	Twice a month	Once a month	Rarely	Row Total & Percent
E1-E6	36 48.6%	16 21.6%	8 10.8%	2 2.7%	1 1.4%	11 14.9%	74 3.8%
E7-E9	20 30.8%	19 29.2%	6 9.2%	2 3.1%	1 1.5%	17 26.2%	65 3.3%
W1-W4	1 20%	1 20%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 60%	5 .3%
01-03	17 19.5%	18 20.7%	21 24.1%	7 8%	5 5.7%	19 21.8%	87 4.4%
04-06	222 25.3%	223 25.4%	125 14.2%	66 7.5%	40 4.7%	203 23.1%	879 44.9%
07 & above	23 35.9%	17 26.6%	10 15.6%	3 4.7%	2 3.1%	9 14.1%	64 14.1%
GS1-GS7	22 36.1%	10 16.4%	13 21.3%	2 3.3%	3 4.9%	11 18%	61 3.1%
GS8-GS12	40 36%	19 17.1%	16 14.4%	5 4.5%	7 6.3%	24 21.6%	111 5.7%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	72 20.1%	75 20.9%	67 18.7%	49 13.7%	17 4.7%	78 21.8%	358 18.3%
SES GS16- GS18	38 46.3%	15 18.3%	10 12.2%	4 4.9%	0 0%	15 18.3%	82 4.2%
Jr Profes- sional	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	5 29.4%	2 11.8%	4 23.5%	17 .9%
Mid-level Profes- sional	9 16.4%	4 7.4%	14 25.5%	12 21.8%	9 16.4%	7 12.7%	55 2.8%
Sr Profes- sional	12 14.1%	16 18.6%	24 28.2%	14 16.5%	6 7.1%	13 15.3%	85 4.3%
Clerk/ Support	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	0 0%	2 .1%
Other	4 36.4%	1 9.1%	1 9.1%	2 18.2%	3 27.3%	0 0%	11 .6%
Column Total & Percent	518 28.5%	437 22.3%	317 16.2%	174 8.9%	96 4.9%	414 21.2%	1856 100%

Table IV-10. Respondents to Question 29: "When I finish with the Supplement, I usually:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade	Question 29				
	Pass it on to others	Keep it on file	Discard it	Other	Row Total & Percent
E1-E6	42 59.2%	11 15.5%	17 23.9%	1 1.4%	71 3.9%
E7-E9	44 73.3%	4 6.7%	11 18.3%	1 1.7%	60 3.3%
W1-W4	2 66.7%	0 0%	1 33.3%	0 0%	3 .2%
01-03	52 68.4%	7 9.2%	17 22.4%	0 0%	76 4.2%
04-06	594 74%	63 7.8%	136 16.9%	10 1.2%	803 44.6%
07 & above	40 66.7%	8 13.3%	12 20%	0 0%	60 3.3%
GS1-GS7	45 80.4%	4 7.1%	6 10.7%	1 1.8%	56 3.1%
GS8-GS12	67 65.7%	17 16.7%	17 16.7%	1 1%	102 5.7%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	231 69.4%	25 7.5%	68 20.4%	9 2.7%	333 18.8%
SES GS16-GS18	44 57.9%	6 7.9%	24 31.6%	2 2.6%	76 4.2%
Jr Professional	6 35.3%	6 35.3%	5 29.4%	0 0%	17 .9%
Mid-level Professional	27 50%	15 27.8%	9 16.7%	3 5.6%	54 3%
Sr Professional	43 53.8%	24 30%	10 12.5%	3 3.8%	80 4.4%
Clerk/Support	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	1 .1%
Other	5 50%	2 20%	3 30%	0 0%	10 .6%
Column Total & Percent	1242 68.9%	193 10.7%	336 18.6%	31 1.7%	1802 100%

Table IV-11. Responses to Question 28: "Of the articles in Supplement, I usually read:"
by Employer

Employer	Question 28						Row Total & Percent of Each Employer
	All	More than half	About half	Less than half	One or two	Only Headlines	
Army	62 12.9%	111 23.1%	102 21.3%	102 21.3%	73 15.2%	30 6.3%	480 26.6%
Navy	25 13.7%	37 20.3%	40 22%	46 25.3%	24 13.2%	10 5.5%	182 10.1%
Air Force	53 10.1%	82 15.7%	114 21.8%	123 23.5%	93 17.8%	58 11.1%	523 28.9%
Marines	1 5.3%	5 26.3%	6 31.6%	3 15.9%	1 5.3%	3 15.8%	19 1.1%
Coast Guard	0 0%	1 10%	3 30%	3 30%	1 10%	2 20%	10 .6%
DoD Staff or Agency	16 6%	40 15.1%	62 23.4%	74 27.9%	49 18.5%	24 9.1%	265 14.7%
Academic Community	4 16.7%	8 33.3%	6 25%	5 20.8%	1 4.2%	0 0%	24 1.3%
Congress	6 12%	6 12%	7 14%	21 42%	9 18%	1 2%	50 2.8%
Congressional Support	0 0%	0 0%	2 20%	3 30%	4 40%	1 10%	10 .6%
Non-Academic Research	2 3.4%	9 15.5%	15 25.9%	21 36.2%	11 19%	0 0%	58 3.2%
Other	18 9.7%	69 37.1%	30 16.1%	37 19.9%	22 11.8%	10 5.4%	186 10.3%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	187 10.3%	368 20.4%	387 21.4%	438 24.2%	288 15.9%	139 7.7%	1807 100%

Over half (52.1%, n = 942) of all respondents to these two items (Questions 2 and 28) read half or more of the Supplement. Of those respondents reporting reliable frequencies, Army personnel (57.3%, n = 275) and the Academic Community (75%, n = 18) reported the highest percentages.

Survey question 33A asked respondents to rate the ability of Supplement to help them set their daily agenda. Only 10% of these respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this item (10.2%, n = 178) across employers. Responses to item 33B indicates that Supplement does a better job at helping readers gather the information they need to do their jobs well. Across all employer groups 48.4% (n = 843) reported agreement or strong agreement. Those in non-military organizations rated Supplement's information content substantially higher than those from military organizations, with respondents from Non-Academic Research organizations (87.5%, n = 49) and the Academic Community (85.5%, n = 18) providing much higher ratings than the Navy (42.3%, n = 74) or Army (42%, n = 196). These are the lowest ratings with reliable frequencies. Nearly half of the respondents to Question 33C indicated that Supplement also helps them understand the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion (45.5%, n = 786) across all employers. The frequency of responses for each employer group to these three items are presented in Table IV-12.

Responses to Question 34 provided an overall usefulness rating for Supplement and indicated that 79.1% (n = 1,398) of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that Supplement is a useful publication across all employers. Of those providing reliable frequencies, DoD Staff/Agency personnel provided the most enthusiastic ratings (81.4%, n = 211). Table IV-13 provides the frequency breakdown of the usefulness ratings by Employer.

2. Content by Job

When Question 28 was cross-tabulated by Job (Question 4), 52.1% (n = 936) again read half or more of Supplement across all response categories. Those described as Policy Makers (56.6%, n = 108) provided the highest ratings. Table IV-14 provides a frequency breakdown of responses to these two items.

Table IV-15 presents responses to survey questions 33A-33C. Question 33A asked respondents to rate the ability of Supplement to help them set their daily agenda. Again, few respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this item (10.3%, n = 178) across

**Table IV-12. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions
33A-33C: "The Supplement helps me to:" by Employer**

Employer	Q33A	Q33B	Q33C
	Set my daily agenda	Gather the information I need to do my job well	Understand the effect of my decisions/actions on public opinion
Army	42 9%	196 42%	215 46.4%
Navy	15 8.6%	74 42.3%	82 46.9%
Air Force	32 6.4%	192 38.6%	199 40.2%
Marines	1 5.6%	7 36.8%	8 42.1%
Coast Guard	0 0%	4 40%	3 30%
DoD Staff/Agency	20 7.8%	131 51.5%	123 48.1%
Academic Community	4 19.1%	18 85.5%	9 42.9%
Congress	4 8.4%	35 74.5%	19 40.4%
Congressional Support	0 0%	6 60%	5 50%
Non-Academic Research	2 3.6%	49 87.5%	20 37.8%
Other	58 32.4%	130 71%	103 58.2%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	178 10.2%	843 48.4%	786 45.5%

**Table IV-13. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 34:
"Overall, I find the Supplement a useful publication" by Employer**

Employer	Question 34
Army	384 80.6%
Navy	142 79.3%
Air Force	358 71.2%
Marines	16 84.3%
Coast Guard	6 60%
DoD Staff/Agency	211 81.4%
Academic Community	22 100%
Congress	38 79.1%
Congressional Support	8 80%
Non-Academic Research	56 96.6%
Other	157 86.3%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Employers	1398 79.1%

Table IV-14. Responses to Question 28: "Of the articles in Supplement, I usually read:" by Job

Job	Question 28						
	All	More than half	Abr half	Less than half	One or two	Headlines only	Row Total & Percent of Each Job
Policy Maker	29 15.2%	45 23.6%	34 17.8%	39 20.4%	30 15.7%	14 7.3%	191 10.6%
Manager	55 9.9%	125 22.6%	105 19%	141 25.5%	81 14.6%	46 8.3%	553 30.8%
Action Officer	40 7.6%	92 17.6%	128 24.1%	135 25.8%	91 17.4%	39 7.5%	523 29.1%
Scholar/Analyst	16 8.7%	33 18%	46 25.1%	55 30.1%	25 13.7%	8 4.4%	183 10.2%
Clerical/Administrative	23 16.3%	25 17.7%	30 21.3%	17 12.1%	24 17%	22 15.6%	141 7.8%
Technical	5 6.6%	20 26.3%	17 22.4%	16 21.1%	15 19.7%	3 3.9%	76 4.2%
Non-Government Management	0 0%	4 30.8%	5 38.5%	2 15.4%	2 15.4%	0 0%	13 .7%
Other	17 14.4%	23 19.5%	21 17.8%	32 27.1%	19 16.1%	6 5.1%	118 6.6%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	185 10.3%	367 20.4%	384 21.4%	437 24.3%	287 16%	138 7.7%	1798 100%

Table IV-15. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 33A-33C:
 "The Supplement helps me to:" by Job

Job	Q33A	Q33B	Q33C
	Set my daily agenda	Gather the information I need to do my job well	Understand the effect of my decisions/actions on public opinion
Policy Maker	16 8.8%	97 52.7%	98 53.3%
Manager	76 14.3%	272 51%	247 46.5%
Action Officer	32 6.3%	201 39.6%	227 44.8%
Scholar/Analyst	18 10.6%	124 71.2%	76 44.4%
Clerical/Administrative	18 13.6%	32 25.8%	47 35.6%
Technical	7 100%	31 44.3%	36 51.4%
Non-Government Management	0 0%	10 90.9%	6 60%
Other	11 9.5%	65 55.5%	44 39.3%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	178 10.3%	834 48.3%	1390 79.2%

jobs. Item 33B indicated that Supplement does a better job at helping readers gather the information they need to do their jobs well (48.3%, n = 834) across all jobs. However, better than three quarters of the respondents to Question 33C agreed or agreed strongly that Supplement helps them understand the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion (79.2%, n = 1,390) across all jobs.

Table IV-16 presents responses to Question 34 which provided an overall usefulness rating of Supplement. These responses indicated that 79.2% (n = 1,390) of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that Supplement is a useful publication across all jobs with Scholars/Analysts finding it most useful (89.8%, n = 159).

3. Content by Rank/Grade

Across all ranks/grades (Question 5), more than half of the respondents (52.3%, n = 942) again read at least half of Supplement. Those in officer ranks of O7 and above (64.9%, n = 39) and civilian grades of GS8-GS12 (65.7%, n = 67) provided the highest ratings. Table IV-17 lists the complete frequency of responses to these two items.

Survey question 33A asked respondents to rate the ability of Supplement to help them set their daily agenda. Again, only 10% either agreed or strongly agreed with this item (10.4%, n = 179) across ranks/grades. Responses to item 33B indicated that Supplement helps readers gather the information they need to do their jobs well (48.5%, n = 830) across all ranks/grades. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that Supplement also helps them understand the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion (45.4%, n = 774) across all ranks/grades. The frequency of responses for each job group to these three items are presented in Table IV-18.

Question 34 provided an overall usefulness rating of Supplement and indicated that 79.3% (n = 1,396) of these respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that Supplement is a useful publication across all ranks/grades with Senior Professionals being the most enthusiastic (94.9%, n = 73). Table IV-19 provides the frequency analysis of this usefulness rating by rank/grade.

A discussion of these results and the conclusions and recommendations to be drawn from them are contained in the next chapter. Detailed analyses of response frequencies for each survey question are presented in the Appendixes.

**Table IV-16. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 34:
"Overall, I find the Supplement a useful publication" by Job**

Job	Question 34
Policy Maker	150 81.6%
Manager	436 81.1%
Action Officer	378 73.8%
Scholar/Analyst	159 89.8%
Clerical/Administrative	103 73.6%
Technical	56 77.7%
Non-Government Management	12 100%
Other	96 79.4%
Column Total & Average Percent Across Jobs	1390 79.2%

Table IV-17. Respondents to Question 28: "Of the articles in Supplement, I usually read:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade	Question 28						
	All	More than half	About half	Less than half	One or two	Only the headlines	Row Total & Percent
E1-E6	12 17.1%	14 20%	15 21.4%	12 17.1%	7 10%	10 14.3%	70 3.9%
E7-E9	10 16.9%	15 25.4%	9 15.3%	12 20.3%	7 11.9%	6 10.2%	59 3.3%
W1-W4	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	4 .2%
O1-O3	2 2.6%	12 15.8%	23 30.3%	19 25%	11 14.5%	9 11.8%	76 4.2%
O4-O6	86 10.7%	174 21.6%	159 19.7%	194 24%	129 16%	65 8.1%	807 44.8%
O7 & above	8 13.3%	17 28.3%	14 23.3%	11 18.3%	10 16.7%	0 0%	60 3.3%
GS1-GS7	8 14%	9 15.8%	15 26.3%	9 15.8%	8 14%	8 14%	57 3.2%
GS8-GS12	15 14.7%	20 19.6%	32 31.4%	8 7.8%	20 19.6%	7 6.9%	102 5.7%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	28 8.5%	63 19.2%	68 20.7%	94 28.7%	52 15.9%	23 7%	328 18.2%
SES GS16-GS18	7 9.3%	11 14.7%	14 18.7%	21 28%	14 18.7%	8 10.7%	75 4.2%
Jr Professional	3 17.6%	3 17.6%	4 23.5%	5 29.4%	2 11.8%	0 0%	17 .9%
Mid-level Professional	0 0%	11 20.4%	8 14.8%	22 40.7%	13 24.1%	0 0%	54 3%
Sr Professional	7 8.6%	17 21%	20 24.7%	22 27.7%	14 17.3%	1 1.2%	81 4.5%
Clerk/Support	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 .1%
Other	0 0%	4 36.4%	3 27.3%	4 36.4%	0 0%	0 0%	11 .6%
Column Total & Percent	187 10.4%	371 20.6%	384 21.3%	434 24.1%	287 15.9%	139 7.7%	1802 100%

Table IV-18. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Questions 33A-33C: "The Supplement helps me to:" by Rank/Grade

Rank/Grade	Question 33A	Question 33B	Question 33C
	Set my daily agenda	Gather the information I need to do my job well	Understand the effect of my decisions/actions on public opinion
E1-E6	11 15.5%	19 26.8%	27 38.1%
E7-E9	6 10.3%	18 31.6%	20 35.1%
W1-W4	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
01-03	5 6.5%	36 46.8%	34 44.2%
04-06	93 11.9%	355 45.6%	371 47.7%
07 & above	6 10.7%	34 58.6%	34 60.8%
GS1-GS7	6 11.3%	14 26.5%	24 45.2%
GS8-GS12	8 8.6%	43 45.3%	38 40.9%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	19 6%	147 46.7%	133 42.2%
SES GS16-GS18	9 12.7%	47 64.4%	36 50%
Jr Professional	1 6.3%	11 68.8%	6 37.5%
Mid-level Professional	3 5.8%	43 78.9%	16 32%
Sr Professional	10 13.7%	64 85.3%	41 56.1%
Clerk/Support	1 100%	1 100%	1 100%
Other	1 9.1%	10 90.9%	3 27.3%
Column Total & Average Percent	179 10.4%	830 48.5%	774 45.4%

**Table IV-19. Respondents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed to Question 34:
"Overall, I find the Supplement a useful publication" by Rank/Grade**

Rank/Grade	Question 34
E1-E6	57 78.7%
E7-E9	43 71.6%
W1-W4	1 33.3%
01-03	57 75%
04-06	609 77.8%
07 & above	52 89.7%
GS1-GS7	43 76.4%
GS8-GS12	75 74.3%
GS/GM13-GS/GM15	250 78.2%
SES GS16-GS18	62 84.9%
Jr Professional	16 94.2%
Mid-level Professional	47 88.6%
Sr Professional	73 94.9%
Clerk/Support	1 100%
Other	11 100%
Column Total & Average Percent	1396 79.3%

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Developing a methodology for this survey was more challenging than usual because the goal was to measure the size, composition, and opinions of an audience we knew nothing about. Given the undefined characteristics of the total audience, every effort was made to capture information from as many potential readers as possible in order to establish an initial basis for describing the population. The use of saturation techniques for survey distribution resulted in a total of 3,800 valid responses. Given the anonymity of this population prior to this effort and subsequent difficulty in survey distribution, the rate of response (approximately 25%) is considered favorable. While the survey distribution techniques of the present effort were exploratory in nature, the method of sending significantly more surveys than the number of known first-hand readers successfully allowed individuals who receive copies of *Early Bird* (EB) indirectly to be represented. This saturation technique, coupled with responses to questions concerning mode of receipt and mode of disposition after reading the publications, allowed us to analyze the random sample of responses we received to estimate the character of the shadow audience.

The results obtained and conclusions offered regarding this sample of EB/Supplement readers provide a better understanding of the informal distribution modes most commonly employed and may serve as a basis for guiding future research of this audience. With the estimates of audience size and other lessons learned from this initial survey effort, alternate methods of EB/Supplement distribution can be explored and other more sophisticated approaches to sampling the direct and indirect populations of readers can be developed. Future investigations could be accomplished by distributing a preliminary survey instrument included as a tear out page of a particular issue of EB and Supplement. In future studies this simple response form could ask the respondent who he is, where he got his copy, what he does with it, whom he gives it to, and whether or not he makes additional copies. The resulting information could be used to characterize the audience that exists beyond the official mailing lists in order to validate the first estimate obtained by the present approach. Since the existence of the shadow audience has now been verified, we recommend including at least five survey instruments per issue so that more of these readers may participate.

A. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING EARLY BIRD

Overall, the most widely represented groups who responded to this survey were officers in the ranks 04-06 from the Army and Air Force. The largest civilian group of respondents were among grades GS/GM13-GS/GM15. The most frequently reported positions were from those described as Managers and Action Officers.

1. Size of the Shadow Audience

By examining the methods by which individuals report receiving their EB, the total EB audience (direct and indirect) was estimated conservatively to be 15,213 readers. This estimate is based directly on the number of readers who report receiving EB from a source other than one of the three formal CNARS channels of distribution. The results of this survey provide the first empirical evidence of the existence and estimated size of this "shadow" audience.

2. Assessment of EB Effectiveness

The responses to survey items assessing the content of EB indicated that overall the vast majority of respondents are using EB and view the publication very positively. Most individuals reported that they read half or more of EB and find articles on DoD Organization and Budget and International Security Issues the most valuable. Most respondents also found EB relevant to their duties and considered it a contribution to their knowledge of DoD policies, programs, and activities. The majority of respondents also felt that EB informed them of the results of DoD policy decisions. In addition, many individuals indicated that EB is an effective aid in decision-making, especially in Public Affairs/Legislative issues. Most readers also agreed that the publication provides information that assists them in performing their jobs and in understanding the effects of their actions on public opinion.

3. Demographics of the Sample

Most EB readers are Army and Navy personnel and civilians working in Non-Academic Research organizations in the job categories of Manager or Action Officer at the rank/grade of 04-06/GS13-15. They usually receive an original copy of EB; however, they receive it most often through inter-office mail. When they finish with EB they most often pass it on, usually by personally handing it to a colleague.

4. Distribution of EB Across the Sample

Even though the majority of respondents receive an original ("yellow copy") of EB, they are not necessarily direct recipients of the publication. Results showed that most people receive their copy of EB through indirect methods of distribution, such as inter-office mail, rather than through one of the three formal distribution channels employed by the CNARS staff. This implies that a significant proportion of readers are sharing their copies. This implication is further supported by the fact that most respondents report passing their EB on to others, usually to a colleague, when they have finished reading it. Those working in Non-Academic Research organizations are most likely to get an original copy of EB while those in the Coast Guard are least likely to get a "yellow bird."

B. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE SUPPLEMENT

1. Demographics

Survey items pertaining to Supplement indicated that 1,967 of the total 3,800 survey respondents report reading Supplement. Although this number is three times the daily production run of 650, no reliable calculation of the estimated shadow audience was possible, due to the lack of information regarding the mode of receipt. Most Supplement readers are Army or Air Force personnel and civilians working for DoD Staff/Agencies who hold jobs as Managers and Action Officers in the ranks of 04-06 and grades of GS13-15.

2. Distribution of Supplement

Over two thirds of Supplement readers indicated that they pass the publication on to others after reading it, thus implying that a shadow audience exists for Supplement as well as EB. Of those who report reading Supplement, most read it at least once a week, with a large proportion reading it more frequently than once per week. In terms of how much of the Supplement they read, there is a normal distribution with the highest frequency and percentage associated with the response of "less than half."

3. Assessment of Supplement Effectiveness

In terms of content, over three quarters of Supplement readers view the publication as generally useful. About half indicate that Supplement provides information that assists

them in performing their jobs and in understanding the effect of their decisions and actions on public opinion.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions just discussed, recommendations are provided below to increase the effectiveness of these publications in terms of distribution. Following these suggestions, a few recommendations are offered to the CNARS staff regarding future survey techniques for this audience in order to ensure that EB and Supplement remain useful and available publications for the DoD community.

1. Recommendations to Enhance the Effectiveness of EB and EB Supplement

- Save money by encouraging readers to share EB and EB Supplement by means other than duplication via periodic reminders in the publications, since readers are already inclined in this direction.
- Employ the more conservative estimate of the size of the shadow audience if a reduction in the daily press run is being considered.

2. Recommendations to Increase the Reliability and Validity of Future CNARS Surveys

- Explore alternate survey distribution methods, such as multiple tear-out surveys within the publication.
- Future survey efforts should employ alternate channels, such as inter-office mail, to distribute the survey, as this was the most frequently reported mode of EB distribution.
- Future survey research regarding Supplement should include items addressing the distribution channels through which readers receive their Supplement, in order to establish the total audience size.

APPENDIX A

**EARLY BIRD/CURRENT NEWS SUPPLEMENT
QUESTIONNAIRE**

SURVEY OF CURRENT NEWS ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH SERVICE'S (CNARS) EARLY BIRD/CURRENT NEWS SUPPLEMENT READERS

If you are an Early Bird (EB) or Current News (CN) Supplement Reader, please complete the following survey in ink. The information that you provide will help us better understand your needs. If you have already completed this survey or if you have never seen the EB or CN Supplement, please pass this questionnaire on to an EB or CN Supplement Reader. Thank you.

I. DEMOGRAPHICS

My office symbol is

My zip code at work is

Unless otherwise instructed, please choose the one answer that best fits your situation and place its number in the box provided.

2. I work for:

1. Army
2. Navy
3. Air Force
4. Marines
5. Coast Guard
6. DoD Staff or Agency
7. Academic Community
8. Congress
9. Congressional Support Organizations
10. Non-Academic Research Organization
11. Other (specify)

3. The mission of my organization is:

1. Policy Making
2. Research and Development
3. Operations
4. Intelligence
5. Public or Legislative Affairs
6. Budget and Finance
7. Acquisition
8. Human Resources
9. Logistics/Support
10. Other (specify)

4. My job can be best described as:

1. Policy Maker
2. Manager
3. Action Officer
4. Scholar/Analyst
5. Clerical/Administrative
6. Technical Staff
7. Non-Government Management
8. Other (specify)

5. My rank/grade is:

- (DoD Personnel)
1. E1 -E6
 2. E7-E9
 3. W1 -W4
 4. O1-O3
 5. O4-O6
 6. O7 or above
 7. GS1 -GS7
 8. GS8-GS12
 9. GS/GM13-GS/GM15
 10. SES, GS16-GS18,

(Non-Government Personnel)

11. Junior Professional
12. Mid-level Professional
13. Senior Professional
14. Clerk/Support
15. Technician
16. Other (specify)

6. My highest level of education is:

1. High School Graduate or GED
2. Some College, but no Degree
3. Associate's Degree
4. Bachelor's Degree
5. Master's Degree
6. Ph.D./Professional Degree

7. I am currently (circle all that apply in this question only):

1. Active Duty
2. Reservist
3. National Guard
4. Civilian Government Employee
5. Civilian Non-Government Employee
6. Retiree (Civilian Government)
7. Retiree (Civilian Non-Government)
8. Retiree (Military)
9. Other (specify)

II. EARLY BIRD

8. I usually receive Early Bird (EB):

1. Every working day
2. More than once a week
3. Once a week
4. Twice a month
5. Once a month
6. Rarely

9. The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually:

1. Yellow
2. White

10. I usually receive EB from:

1. Current News Analysis and Research Service (Directly)
2. My Supervisor
3. Inter-office mail
4. A co-worker
5. The lunch room/common area
6. U.S. mail
7. Fax
8. Other (specify)

11. The most recent issue of EB I received was:

1. Today's
2. 1 - 2 days old
3. 3 - 4 days old
4. 5 - 6 days old
5. More than a week old
6. Don't remember

12. When I finish with EB I usually:

1. Pass it on to others (Go to Q13)
2. Keep it on file (Go to Q17)
3. Discard it (Go to Q17)
4. Other (specify)

13. When I pass it on, I:

1. Make copies
2. Attach it to a distribution list
3. Hand mine to a colleague
4. Other (specify)

14. Using the method in Question 13, I believe that the number of other employees who read my EB is at least:

1. 1 - 10
2. 11 - 20
3. 21 - 50
4. More than 50

15. Those I pass EB on to are mostly:

1. Policy Makers
2. Managers
3. Action Officers
4. Scholars/Analysts
5. Clerical/Administrative Staff
6. Technical Staff
7. Non-Government Management
8. Other (specify)

16. Most of the people I pass it on to hold the rank/grade of:

- (DoD Personnel)
1. E1 -E6
 2. E7-E9
 3. W1 -W4
 4. O1-O3
 5. O4-O6
 6. O7 or above
 7. GS1 -GS7
 8. GS8-GS12
 9. GS/GM13-GS/GM15
 10. SES, GS16-GS18,

(Non-Government Personnel)

11. Junior Professional
12. Mid-level Professional
13. Senior Professional
14. Clerk/Support
15. Technician
16. Other (specify)

17. The number of people working in my office is approximately:

1. Less than 10
2. 10 - 15
3. 16 - 20
4. 21 - 25
5. 26 - 30
6. 31 - 35
7. More than 35

18. Of the articles in EB, I usually read:

1. All
2. More than half
3. About half
4. Less than half
5. One or two
6. Only the headlines
7. None

19. Of the EB issues received throughout a month, I usually read in some detail:

1. 1 - 5
2. 6 - 10
3. 11 - 15
4. 16 - 20

20. The total number of minutes I usually spend reading each issue of EB is:

1. Less than 15
2. 15 - 30
3. 31 - 45
4. 46 - 60
5. More than 60

21. Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements a-e and write its number in the appropriate box.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

- a. The articles in EB represent the most current news available on DoD topics.
- b. EB is a valuable news source on DoD issues.
- c. EB presents a variety of political opinions on most DoD issues.
- d. Overall, the sources used in EB represent a wide variety from across the country.
- e. The wide range of DoD topics presented in EB helps me in my job.

22. Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements a-c and write its number in the appropriate box.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

- a. EB presents articles relevant to my duties.
- b. EB increases my knowledge of DoD policies, programs, and activities.
- c. EB gives me information on the results of DoD policy decisions.

23. Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements a-k and write its number in the appropriate box.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

EB is a valuable source of information on:

- a. International security issues
- b. Military balance/threat
- c. DoD manpower and personnel
- d. Operations and readiness
- e. Research and development
- f. Guard and Reserve affairs
- g. DoD and the environment
- h. DoD organization and budget
- i. DoD special operations
- j. Other DoD issues (specify)

Please remember to return this questionnaire within the week!

See
Back



SURVEY OF CURRENT NEWS ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH SERVICE'S (CNARS) EARLY BIRD/CURRENT NEWS SUPPLEMENT READERS

If you are an Early Bird (EB) or Current News (CN) Supplement Reader, please complete the following survey in ink. The information that you provide will help us better understand your needs. If you have already completed this survey or if you have never seen the EB or CN Supplement, please pass this questionnaire on to an EB or CN Supplement Reader. Thank you.

1. DEMOGRAPHICS My office symbol is My zip code at work is Unless otherwise instructed, please choose the one answer that best fits your situation and place its number in the box provided. 2. I work for: ☐ 1. Army 2. Navy 3. Air Force 4. Marines 5. Coast Guard 6. DoD Staff or Agency 7. Academic Community 8. Congress 9. Congressional Support Organizations 10. Non-Academic Research Organization 11. Other (specify) 3. The mission of my organization is: ☐ 1. Policy Making 2. Research and Development 3. Operations 4. Intelligence 5. Public or Legislative Affairs 6. Budget and Finance 7. Acquisition 8. Human Resources 9. Logistics/Support 10. Other (specify) 4. My job can be best described as: ☐ 1. Policy Maker 2. Manager 3. Action Officer 4. Scholar/Analyst 5. Clerical/Administrative 6. Technical Staff 7. Non-Government Management 8. Other (specify) 5. My rank/grade is: ☐ (DoD Personnel) 1. E1 -E6 2. E7-E9 3. W1 -W4 4. O1-O3 5. O4-O6 6. O7 or above 7. GS1 -GS7 8. GS8-GS12 9. GS/GM13-GS/GM15 10. SES, GS16-GS18, (Non-Government Personnel) 11. Junior Professional 12. Mid-level Professional 13. Senior Professional 14. Clerk/Support 15. Technician 16. Other (specify) 6. My highest level of education is: ☐ 1. High School Graduate or GED 2. Some College, but no Degree 3. Associate's Degree 4. Bachelor's Degree 5. Master's Degree 6. Ph.D./Professional Degree	7. I am currently (circle all that apply in this question only): 1. Active Duty 2. Reservist 3. National Guard 4. Civilian Government Employee 5. Civilian Non-Government Employee 6. Retiree (Civilian Government) 7. Retiree (Civilian Non-Government) 8. Retiree (Military) 9. Other (specify) II. EARLY BIRD 8. I usually receive Early Bird (EB): ☐ 1. Every working day 2. More than once a week 3. Once a week 4. Twice a month 5. Once a month 6. Rarely 9. The color of the front page of the EB I receive is usually: ☐ 1. Yellow 2. White 10. I usually receive EB from: ☐ 1. Current News Analysis and Research Service (Directly) 2. My Supervisor 3. Inter-office mail 4. A co-worker 5. The lunch room/common area 6. U.S. mail 7. Fax 8. Other (specify) 11. The most recent issue of EB I received was: ☐ 1. Today's 2. 1 - 2 days old 3. 3 - 4 days old 4. 5 - 6 days old 5. More than a week old 6. Don't remember 12. When I finish with EB I usually: ☐ 1. Pass it on to others (Go to Q13) 2. Keep it on file (Go to Q17) 3. Discard it (Go to Q17) 4. Other (specify) 13. When I pass it on, I: ☐ 1. Make copies 2. Attach it to a distribution list 3. Hand mine to a colleague 4. Other (specify) 14. Using the method in Question 13, I believe that the number of other employees who read my EB is at least: ☐ 1. 1 - 10 2. 11 - 20 3. 21 - 30 4. More than 30	15. Those I pass EB on to are mostly: ☐ 1. Policy Makers 2. Managers 3. Action Officers 4. Scholars/Analysts 5. Clerical/Administrative Staff 6. Technical Staff 7. Non-Government Management 8. Other (specify) 16. Most of the people I pass it on to hold the rank/grade of: ☐ (DoD Personnel) 1. E1 -E6 2. E7-E9 3. W1 -W4 4. O1-O3 5. O4-O6 6. O7 or above 7. GS1 -GS7 8. GS8-GS12 9. GS/GM13-GS/GM15 10. SES, GS16-GS18, (Non-Government Personnel) 11. Junior Professional 12. Mid-level Professional 13. Senior Professional 14. Clerk/Support 15. Technician 16. Other (specify) 17. The number of people working in my office is approximately: ☐ 1. Less than 10 2. 10 - 15 3. 16 - 20 4. 21 - 25 5. 26 - 30 6. 31 - 35 7. More than 35 18. Of the articles in EB, I usually read: ☐ 1. All 2. More than half 3. About half 4. Less than half 5. One or two 6. Only the headlines 7. None 19. Of the EB issues received throughout a month, I usually read in some detail: ☐ 1. 1 - 5 2. 6 - 10 3. 11 - 15 4. 16 - 20 20. The total number of minutes I usually spend reading each issue of EB is: ☐ 1. Less than 15 2. 15 - 30 3. 31 - 45 4. 46 - 60 5. More than 60	21. Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements a-e and write its number in the appropriate box. 1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree a. The articles in EB represent the most current news available on DoD topics. ☐ b. EB is a valuable news source on DoD issues. ☐ c. EB presents a variety of political opinions on most DoD issues. ☐ d. Overall, the sources used in EB represent a wide variety from across the country. ☐ e. The wide range of DoD topics presented in EB helps me in my job. ☐ 22. Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements a-c and write its number in the appropriate box. 1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree a. EB presents articles relevant to my duties. ☐ b. EB increases my knowledge of DoD policies, programs, and activities. ☐ c. EB gives me information on the results of DoD policy decisions. ☐ 23. Using the scale below, select the best response for each of the statements a-k and write its number in the appropriate box. 1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree EB is a valuable source of information on: a. International security issues ☐ b. Military balance/threat ☐ c. DoD manpower and personnel ☐ d. Operations and readiness ☐ e. Research and development ☐ f. Guard and Reserve affairs ☐ g. DoD and the environment ☐ h. DoD organization and budget ☐ i. DoD special operations ☐ j. Other DoD issues (specify)
--	--	---	--

Please remember to return this questionnaire within the week!

See
Back



APPENDIX B

POSTERS AND NOTICES

COURIERS

**THE CNARS EARLY BIRD
SURVEY
WILL BE CONDUCTED
DURING MARCH 1991
BY A TEAM OF
CONTRACTORS**

**PLEASE
HELP US KEEP YOU
BETTER INFORMED**

THANKS FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Notice of 4 March 1991

EARLY BIRD READER SURVEY

Given recent world events, news regarding Defense issues has never been more important. In an effort to provide our readers with the best possible coverage, the CURRENT NEWS staff is seeking your impressions of *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement*.

Beginning March 15, 1991, we will distribute a brief survey designed to get information to better serve our readers.

We need the cooperation of all *Early Bird* and *Supplement* readers, to ensure we obtain the most accurate and complete information possible. Please look for your copy of the survey and respond quickly. Your support for this effort will help guarantee continued improvement in delivery of vital of DoD-related news. Thank you.

Notice of 11 March 1991

EARLY BIRD READER SURVEY

A quick reminder that beginning March 15, 1991, we will distribute a brief survey to all *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement* readers. This survey will help us better define the information needs of the *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement* audience.

Given recent world events, news regarding Defense issues has never been more important. Please help us improve our ability to meet your information needs by quickly completing and returning your copy of the survey.

Survey Instructions

If you are an *Early Bird* or *Current News Supplement* reader, please complete the following survey. The information you provide will help us better understand your information needs. If you have already completed a copy of this survey, or if you have never seen the *Early Bird* or *Current News Supplement*, please pass this questionnaire on to an *Early Bird* or *Current News Supplement* reader. Thank you.

Notices for Placement on or about 22 March 1991

FARLY BIRD READER SURVEY

A quick reminder that we are currently distributing a brief survey to all *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement* readers. This survey will help us better define the information needs of the *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement* audience.

We thank those of you who have already completed and returned a questionnaire, and if you have not yet completed a copy of this survey we encourage you take a few moments and respond. Your participation will help us improve our ability to meet your information needs.

EARLY BIRD READER SURVEY

A quick reminder that we are currently distributing a brief survey to all *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement* readers. This survey will help us better define the information needs of the *Early Bird* and *Current News Supplement* audience.

We thank those of you who have already completed and returned a questionnaire, and if you have not yet completed a copy of this survey we encourage you take a few moments and respond. Your participation will help us improve our ability to meet your information needs.

APPENDIX C

**FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONS 3 AND 6**

[Any difference from 100% in the total of the Percent column is due to rounding.]

**Frequency of Responses to Question 3:
"The mission of my organization is:"**

Mission	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Policy making	878	23.1%	23.6%
R&D	253	6.7%	30.4%
Operations	390	10.3%	40.9%
Intelligence	271	7.1%	48.1%
Public or Legislative Affairs	321	8.4%	56.8%
Budget & Finance	175	4.6%	61.5%
Acquisition	143	3.8%	65.3%
Human Resources	106	2.8%	68.1%
Logistics/Support	268	7.1%	75.3%
Other	918	24.2%	100%
No response to this item	77	2%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 6:
"My highest level of education is:"**

Education	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
High School or GED	89	2.3%	2.4%
Some college, no degree	339	8.9%	11.3%
Associate's Degree	105	2.8%	14.1%
Bachelor's Degree	746	19.6%	33.8%
Master's Degree	2089	55%	89%
Ph.D/Professional Degree	416	10.9%	100%
No response to this item	16	.4%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

APPENDIX D

**FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONS 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, AND 20**

[Any difference from 100% in the total of the Percent column is due to rounding.]

**Frequency of Responses to Question 8:
"I usually receive Early Bird (EB):"**

Receive EB	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Every working day	2875	75.7%	76.3%
More than once a week	713	18.8%	95.2%
Once a week	99	2.6%	97.8%
Twice a month	31	.8%	98.6%
Once a month	16	.4%	99.1%
Rarely	35	.9%	100%
No response to this item	31	.8%	nor included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 14:
"Using the method in Question 13, I believe that the number of
other employees who read my EB is at least:"**

Others	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-10	2499	65.8%	85.9%
11-20	307	8.1%	96.5%
21-50	65	1.7%	98.7%
50+	37	1%	100%
No response to this item	892	23.5%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 15:
"Those I pass EB on to are mostly:"**

Question 15	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Policy Makers	221	5.8%	7.6%
Managers	519	13.7%	25.5%
Action Officers	1469	38.7%	76%
Scholars/Analysts	285	7.5%	85.8%
Clerical/Admini- strative	130	3.4%	90.3%
Technical Staff	149	3.9%	95.4%
Non-Government Management	19	.5%	96%
Other	115	3%	100%
No response to this item	893	23.5%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 16:
"Most of the people I pass it on to hold the rank/grade of:"**

Rank/Grade	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
E1-E6	100	2.6%	3.5%
E7-E9	81	2.1%	6.3%
W1-W4	2	.1%	6.4%
01-03	190	5%	13%
04-06	1345	35.4%	59.7%
07 & above	54	1.4%	61.6%
GS1-GS7	34	.9%	62.8%
GS8-GS12	214	5.6%	70.2%
GS/GM13- GS/GM15	580	15.3%	90.3%
SES GS16-GS18	53	1.4%	92.2%
Jr Professional	18	.5%	92.8%
Mid-level Professional	90	2.4%	95.9%
Sr Professional	92	2.4%	99.1%
Clerk/Support	2	.1%	99.2%
Technician	2	.1%	99.3%
Other	21	.6%	100%
No response to this item	922	24.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Frequency of Responses to Question 17:
"The number of people working in my office is approximately:"

Number others	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than 10	1812	47.7%	47.9%
10-15	830	21.8%	69.9%
16-20	334	8.8%	78.7%
21-25	181	4.8%	83.5%
26-30	124	3.3%	86.8%
31-35	83	2.2%	89%
35+	417	11%	100%
No response to this item	19	.5%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Frequency of Responses to Question 19:
"Of the EB Issues received throughout a month, I usually read in some detail:"

Number read	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5	721	19%	19.1%
6-10	746	19.6%	39%
11-15	739	19.4%	58.6%
16-20	1560	41.1%	100%
No response to this item	34	.9%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Frequency of Responses to Question 20:
"The total number of minutes I usually spend reading each issue of EB is:"

Time spent	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than 15 minutes	850	22.4%	22.5%
15-30	2305	60.7%	83.4%
31-45	513	13.5%	97%
46-60	92	2.4%	99.4%
More than 60	22	.6%	100%
No response to this item	18	.5%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

APPENDIX E

**FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONS 18, 22A-22C, 23A-23J, 25A-25C, AND 26**

[Any difference from 100% in the total of the Percent column is due to rounding.]

**Frequency of Responses to Question 18:
"Of the articles in EB, I usually read:"**

Articles Read	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
All	782	20.6%	20.6%
Over half	1459	38.4%	59.1%
About half	753	19.8%	79%
Less than half	599	15.8%	94.8%
1-2	140	3.7%	98.5%
Headlines only	49	1.3%	99.8%
None	8	.2%	100%
No response to this item	10	.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 22A:
"EB presents articles relevant to my duties:"**

Q22A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1185	31.2%	31.4%
Agree	1816	47.8%	79.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	593	15.6%	95.2%
Disagree	163	4.3%	99.5%
Strongly Disagree	18	.5%	100%
No response to this item	25	.7%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 22B:
"EB increases my knowledge of DoD policies,
programs and activities "**

Q22B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1497	39.4%	40.1%
Agree	1821	47.9%	88.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	326	8.6%	97.6%
Disagree	74	1.9%	99.6%
Strongly Disagree	14	.4%	100%
No response to this item	68	1.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses Question 22C:
"EB gives me information on the results of DoD policy decisions "**

Q22C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1066	28.1%	28.6%
Agree	1964	51.7%	81.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	568	14.9%	96.4%
Disagree	118	3.1%	99.6%
Strongly Disagree	16	.4%	100%
No response to this item	68	1.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23A:
"EB is a valuable source of information on
International Security Issues"**

Q23A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	971	25.6%	25.8%
Agree	2059	54.2%	80.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	626	16.5%	97.2%
Disagree	97	2.6%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	10	.3%	100%
No response to this item	37	1%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23B:
"EB is a valuable source of information on Military balance/threat"**

Q23B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	827	21.8%	22%
Agree	2067	54.4%	77%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	732	19.3%	96.4%
Disagree	122	3.2%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	12	.3%	100%
No response to this item	40	1.1%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23C:
"EB is a valuable source of information
on DoD manpower & personnel"**

Q23C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	655	17.2%	17.5%
Agree	2116	55.7%	73.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	839	22.1%	96.2%
Disagree	133	3.5%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	10	.3%	100%
No response to this item	47	1.2%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23D:
"EB is a valuable source of information on Operations & Readiness"**

Q23D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	555	14.6%	14.8%
Agree	1884	49.6%	65.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1066	28.1%	93.5%
Disagree	230	6.1%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	13	.3%	100%
No response to this item	52	1.4%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23E:
"EB is a valuable source of information on Research & Development"**

Q23E	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	483	12.7%	12.9%
Agree	1976	52%	65.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1084	28.5%	94.5%
Disagree	194	5.1%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	12	.3%	100%
No response to this item	51	1.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23F:
"EB is a valuable source of information on
Guard and Reserve affairs"**

Q23F	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	261	6.9%	7%
Agree	1328	34.9%	42.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1761	46.3%	89.6%
Disagree	359	9.4%	99.2%
Strongly Disagree	30	.8%	100%
No response to this item	61	1.6%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23G:
"EB is a valuable source of information on DoD and the environment"**

Q23G	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	539	14.2%	14.4%
Agree	1898	49.9%	65.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1075	28.3%	93.8%
Disagree	215	5.7%	99.6%
Strongly Disagree	16	.4%	100%
No response to this item	57	1.5%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23H:
"EB is a valuable source of information on
DoD organization and budget"**

Q23H	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	814	21.4%	21.7%
Agree	2223	58.5%	81%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	602	15.8%	97%
Disagree	103	2.7%	99.8%
Strongly Disagree	9	.2%	100%
No response to this item	49	1.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23I:
"EB is a valuable source of information on DoD special operations"**

Q23I	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	341	9%	9.1%
Agree	1247	32.8%	42.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1529	40.2%	83.4%
Disagree	540	14.2%	97.8%
Strongly Disagree	81	2.1%	100%
No response to this item	62	1.6%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 23J:
"EB is a valuable source of information on Other DoD issues"**

Q23J	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	237	6.2%	17.6%
Agree	516	13.6%	55.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	550	14.5%	96.7%
Disagree	35	.9%	99.3%
Strongly Disagree	9	.2%	100%
No response to this item	2453	64.6%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 25A:
"EB helps me set my daily agenda "**

Q25A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	102	2.7%	2.7%
Agree	229	6%	8.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1418	37.3%	47.1%
Disagree	1481	39%	87%
Strongly Disagree	482	12.7%	100%
No response to this item	88	2.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 25B:
"EB helps me gather the information I need to do my job well "**

Q25B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	478	12.6%	12.8%
Agree	1432	37.7%	51.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1094	28.8%	80.4%
Disagree	603	15.9%	96.6%
Strongly Disagree	127	3.3%	100%
No response to this item	66	1.7%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 25C:
"EB helps me understand the effect on my decisions/actions
on public opinion "**

Q25C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	442	11.9%	11.9%
Agree	1386	36.5%	49.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1286	33.8%	84%
Disagree	476	12.5%	96.8%
Strongly Disagree	118	3.1%	100%
No response to this item	92	2.4%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 26:
"Overall, I find EB a useful publication "**

Q26	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1948	51.3%	53.2%
Agree	1518	39.9%	94.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	157	4.1%	98.9%
Disagree	32	.8%	99.8%
Strongly Disagree	7	.2%	100%
No response to this item	138	3.6%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

APPENDIX F

**FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONS 21A-21E AND 24A-24H**

[Any difference from 100% in the total of the Percent column is due to rounding.]

**Frequency of Responses to Question 21A:
"The articles in EB represent the most current news
available on DoD topics "**

Q21A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1744	46.2%	46.2%
Agree	1815	48.1%	94.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	162	4.3%	98.7%
Disagree	45	1.2%	99.9%
Strongly Disagree	5	.1%	100%
No response to this item	29	.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 21B:
"EB is a valuable news source on DoD issues "**

Q21B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	2202	57.9%	59%
Agree	1366	35.9%	95.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	132	3.5%	99.1%
Disagree	23	.6%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	10	.3%	100%
No response to this item	67	1.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 21C:
"EB presents a variety of political opinions on most DoD issues "**

Q21C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	875	23%	23.5%
Agree	1913	50.3%	75%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	736	19.4%	94.8%
Disagree	177	4.7%	99.6%
Strongly Disagree	16	.4%	100%
No response to this item	83	2.2%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 21D:
"Overall, the sources used in EB represents a wide variety
from across the country "**

Q21D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1071	28.2%	28.8%
Agree	1947	51.2%	81.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	496	13.1%	94.4%
Disagree	199	5.2%	99.7%
Strongly Disagree	10	.3%	100%
No response to this item	77	2%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Frequency of Responses to Question 21E:
"The wide range of DoD topics presented in EB helps me in my job "

Q21 E	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1219	32.1%	32.8%
Agree	1678	44.2%	77.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	676	17.8%	96.1%
Disagree	114	3%	99.1%
Strongly Disagree	32	.8%	100%
No response to this item	81	2.1%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

Frequency of Responses to Question 24A:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding R&D"

Q24A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	150	3.9%	4.1%
Agree	695	18.3%	23.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2162	56.9%	83.1%
Disagree	540	14.2%	98.1%
Strongly Disagree	70	1.8%	100%
No response to this item	183	4.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24B:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding Operations"**

Q24B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	209	5.5%	5.8%
Agree	892	23.5%	30.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1910	50.3%	83.2%
Disagree	531	14%	97.8%
Strongly Disagree	78	2.1%	100%
No response to this item	180	4.7%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24C:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding Logistics"**

Q24C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	153	4%	4.2%
Agree	871	22.9%	28.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2015	53%	84.1%
Disagree	510	13.4%	98.2%
Strongly Disagree	66	1.7%	100%
No response to this item	185	4.9%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24D:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding Budget"**

Q24D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	270	7.1%	7.5%
Agree	1084	28.5%	37.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1741	45.8%	85.5%
Disagree	458	12.1%	98.2%
Strongly Disagree	66	1.8%	100%
No response to this item	181	4.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24E:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions
regarding Procurement/acquisition"**

Q24E	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	213	5.6%	5.9%
Agree	970	25.5%	32.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1904	50.1%	85.3%
Disagree	463	12.2%	98.1%
Strongly Disagree	67	1.8%	100%
No response to this item	183	4.8%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24F:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions
regarding Public Affairs/Legislative"**

Q24F	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	593	15.6%	16.3%
Agree	1255	33%	50.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1404	36.9%	89.5%
Disagree	339	8.9%	98.8%
Strongly Disagree	43	1.1%	100%
No response to this item	166	4.4%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24G:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions regarding Intelligence"**

Q24G	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	187	4.9%	5.3%
Agree	694	18.3%	24.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1928	50.7%	78.9%
Disagree	631	16.6%	96.6%
Strongly Disagree	121	3.2%	100%
No response to this item	239	6.3%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%

**Frequency of Responses to Question 24H:
"EB is an effective aid in making decisions
regarding Other DoD Issues"**

Q24H	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	103	2.7%	8.9%
Agree	191	5%	25.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	709	18.7%	86.8%
Disagree	132	3.5%	98.2%
Strongly Disagree	21	.6%	100%
No response to this item	2644	69.6%	not included
Column Total & Percent	3800	100%	100%