AD-A076 796 HRB-SINGER INC STATE COLLEGE PA F/G 5/11
SOCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS RELATED TO DRUG USE IN THE AR--ETC(U)
DEC 73 D G WALIZER DAHC19-73-C-0008
UNCLASSIFIED 4664-F-VOL-3 NL

1 OF 2
AD A076796

LEVEL II

AGO-PRB
Gen

(1)

HRB-SINGER, INC.
SCIENCE PARK, BOX 60 • STATE COLLEGE, PA. 16801
A SUBSIDIARY OF THE SINGER COMPANY

HumRRO
Central Div.—Columbus
JUN 20 1975
2601-23 Cross Country Drive
COLUMBUS, GA. 31906

AD A076796

(14) 4664-F-VOL-3 (NH)

Volume III of IV Volumes

(6) SOCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS RELATED TO DRUG USE IN THE ARMY. Volume III

(10) Prepared by: Donald G. Walizer

Submitted to: U.S. Army Research Institute for
the Behavioral and Social Sciences
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Va. 22209

Contract Number: DAHC-19-73-C-0008

(15)

(11) DECEMBER 1973

(12) 128

COPY NO. 9 OF 16 COPIES

DDC FILE COPY

A 013 389

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DDC
RECEIVED
OCT 30 1979
A

SINGER
AEROSPACE & MARINE SYSTEMS

171950

79 10 29 335

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ARI FIELD UNIT, BENNING
U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
P.O. BOX 2086, FORT BENNING, GEORGIA 31905

PERI-IJ

8 August 1979

SUBJECT: Shipment of Documents

Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314
ATTN: Selection & Cataloging

The Documents in these shipments are approved for public release. The distribution is unlimited.

FOR THE CHIEF:

ALEXANDER NICOLINI
Major, Infantry
R&D Coordinator

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many people who cooperated in this research effort. Most particularly I want to thank the almost 20,000 enlisted men who responded to the questionnaires, and their commanders who gave us both time and facilities to collect the data, often on very short notice.

Special thanks is also due to Dr. Royer Cook, LTC Donald Biesenbach, and Dr. Douglas Ramsay of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Dr. Cook, project COTR, monitored the technical progress of the project. His inputs contributed substantially to the quality of the final products. LTC Biesenbach performed the difficult task of maintaining liason between the Army and the HRB-Singer research staff on three continents. Dr. Ramsey provided both technical inputs and critique, and supervision in Dr. Cook's absence.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the fine support staff at HRB-Singer: Mr. Lawrence Edwards who was responsible for CONUS data collection; Dr. Jerome Clauser and Mr. Robert Carter who collected the data in Korea; Mr. Ronald Long who collected data in CONUS, supervised the data processing, and performed the data analysis; and our three clerks Ms. Audery Davidson, Ms. Darlene Urban, and Mr. Roger Burger, who were responsible for coding the data, maintaining project files, and typing correspondence and manuscripts.

Donald G. Walizer, PhD
HRB-Singer Project Director
State College, PA
December, 1973

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	X
DDC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist.	Avail and/or special
A	

PREFACE

This is the second of four reports on drug use in the Army, prepared by HRB-Singer under contract with the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. There were two research tasks in the project described in these reports. The purpose of Task I was to identify social and organizational correlates of drug use in the Army. The purpose of Task II was to obtain a characterization of overall drug use patterns in the Army. This report presents the results of the Task I research effort.

The criterion variable in Task I was drug use rates among Army TO&E company-size units. The assessment of drug use rates is detailed in Report I of this series. Two groups of Army TO&E company-size units were selected for study: (a) high drug use units; and (b) low drug use units. These units were selected from a cross-section of TO&E units in CONUS, Korea, and Germany giving a 2 x 3 classification design (two levels of drug use and three theaters). Social and organizational variables, such as unit morale, characteristics of the commanding officer, and satisfaction with living conditions, were statistically analyzed to identify significant associations with level of use and theater; and for possible interactions with level of use and theater.

Social/organizational variables were identified which differentiated significantly between high and low drug use units and units in the three theaters. The interaction analyses indicated that the associations between the social/organizational variables and the level of drug use were independent of the theater in which the units were located. Social/ organizational profiles were developed contrasting high drug use units with low drug use units; and contrasting units in the three geographic areas.

The analysis of supplementary data made possible the comparison of individual characteristics, such as age, pay grade, hometown size, and social class, with self-reports of drug use. These comparisons were related to the findings of the main analyses just discussed, and to the findings of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	1
A. Conclusions	1
1. Conclusion I	1
2. Conclusion II	2
3. Conclusion III	3
4. Conclusion IV	3
5. Conclusion V	3
B. Recommendations	4
1. Recommendation I	4
2. Recommendation II	4
3. Recommendation III	5
4. Recommendation IV	6
II. INTRODUCTION	8
A. Overview	8
B. The Problem	11
C. Hypotheses	13
III. METHOD	15
A. Design	15
B. Instrumentation	16
C. Sampling	16
D. Data Collection and Analysis Procedures	19
IV. RESULTS	21
A. The Social/Organizational Scales	21
1. Discriminant analysis	21
2. Multivariate analysis of variance	23
a. Main effect, level of drug use	23
b. Main effect, theater	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

	Page
c. Interaction, level of use and theater	25
d. Discussion of ANOVA results	27
B. The Interview Data	32
1. EM responses	32
2. CO responses	37
3. Comparison of CO and EM responses	42
C. Background and Personality Data	42
1. Age, Vietnam service, marital status, and pay grade	45
2. Bureaucratic orientation	48
3. Number of months in unit	49
4. Social class	49
5. Religion	50
6. Hometown size	50
7. Education	50
8. Present job	50
9. Summary of individual differences	51
V. INDEX TO APPENDICES	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
II-1	Percentage of respondents (E1-E5, TO & E Units) admitting to drug use (N = 17,141)	12
II-2	Comparison of prevalence of non-prescription drug use among two populations: U.S. Army EM (E1 - E5 TO & E Units), and U.S. College students	14
III-1	Number of TO & E units in each cell of study design	17
III-2	Median weighted use values for high and low use units selected in three theaters	18
III-3	Dates of Data Collection (all months in 1973)	19
IV-1	Descriminant analysis of level of drug use (high or low) using 19 S/O predictor variables	22
IV-2	Analysis of variance summary table, S/O scales, main effect for level of use.	24
IV-3	Analysis of variance summary table, S/O scales, main effect for theater	26
IV-4	Percentages of drug use compared by location (indicated comparisons are with CONUS)	30
IV-5	EM interview data summary table of t tests	33
IV-6	EM perceptions of why people use drugs in the Army (N = 207)	35
IV-7	EM ideas about how Army can reduce use of drugs (N = 127)	35
IV-8	EM perceptions of whether CI is usually worthwhile (N = 51)	36
IV-9	CO interview data, summary table of t tests	37
IV-10	Comparison of CO and EM estimates of drug use rates (from drug use questionnaire)	39
IV-11	CO's perceptions of why people use drugs in the Army (N = 150)	39
IV-12	CO's ideas about how Army can reduce use of drugs (N = 84)	40
IV-13	CO's opinion of random urinalysis program. (N = 56)	41

LIST OF TABLES (CONT'D)

Table		Page
IV-14	What CO would do with a man caught using cannabis for the first time (N = 55)	41
IV-15	Comparison of CO-EM correlations for high and low use units (interview data) 43	
IV-16	Comparison of CO and EM reasons for drug use	43
IV-17	Comparison of CO and EM suggestions for reducing drug use	44
IV-18	Mean age, months in unit, and WEPS scores for three drug categories	46
IV-19	Summary table of chi-square analyses performed on background items from S/O questionnaire (N = 1833)	47

I. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion I. The hypothesis that high drug use Army units are characterized by social/organizational deficiencies and low use units are characterized by social/organizational strengths is accepted.

When they were combined in a single, weighted equation (discriminant function) the 19 social/organizationa (S/O) scales used in this study correctly assigned 75% of the units tested to the high or low drug use condition. The key variables in the prediction of high drug use units were found to be considerate behavior of the commanding officer, EM opinions of their officers, and unit morale. (The S/O scales are defined in Appendix B.)

A profile of low drug use Army TO&E company-size units was developed as a result of the analysis of the 19 S/O scales and supporting interviews:

LEADERSHIP. In low drug use units commanding officers are perceived by the EM as being more considerate than CO's of high use units. This means the CO's of low use units keep less to themselves and find more time to listen to the EM. CO's are more likely to explain their actions and are seen as friendly and approachable. Also, they are more likely to accept suggestions from the EM. the EM in low drug use units generally have a higher opinion of their officers. They state more frequently that command information classes are worthwhile; and see their CO's as having more knowledge about drugs. The CO's and EM of low drug use units have similar opinions about the causes of illegal drug use.

JOB SATISFACTION. Compared to EM in high drug use units, EM in low use units are significantly more satisfied with their Army duty. They feel that their jobs are more important and that they are more likely to be rewarded for good performance. EM reporting illegal drug use are less likely to be working in a job of their choice.

MORALE. EM in low drug use units report fewer signs of physical and psychological distress. They are less homesick, bored, and lonely than EM in high drug use units. They feel more energetic, daydream less, and feel less irritable. When asked about their morale in general, they report having significantly higher morale.

OPINION OF THE ARMY. EM in low drug use units have a higher overall opinion of the Army. They feel that control and discipline are firm but necessary; and report spending less time doing unimportant things. They are more likely to say the Army is run well or that the Army is giving them a square deal than EM in high drug use units.

In terms of relative importance, it was found that the social/organizational scales had, on the average, more powerful associations with drug use than indicators of individual background differences. The conclusion that individual differences are associated with drug use has been reached repeatedly in previous research. What the current research has attempted to underscore is that behavior is a function of both individual background differences, and differences in social/organizational environment.

> Conclusion II. The hypothesis that Army TO&E company-size units have different social/organizational profiles in CONUS, Korea, and Germany is accepted.

Compared to the units in CONUS, the units in Korea had a similar S/O profile, except that the units in Korea were more satisfied with their social life and spent more time in group activities. The units in Germany exhibited a negative profile compared to CONUS units. The units in Germany have the characteristics of enclaves from which the troops seldom venture. The EM, through living in more constant close contact with one another for a long period of time, know each other more intimately, and have considerably more interpersonal friction. The morale of the EM is lower, and the units are perceived as less happy places to be. The units have more control over the lives of the EM and are less oriented towards achieving specific goals. Opportunities for social life are lacking, and living conditions are less satisfactory. EM opinions of the officers and of the Army in general are poor.

The negative S/O profile exhibited by the units in Germany is significant because the use of illegal drugs is higher in Germany than in CONUS or Korea. Compared to CONUS, the EM in Germany reported significantly more use of amphetamines, sedatives, and opiates. Germany also had the highest overall rating of drug use prevalence (Korea had the lowest).

Conclusion III. The hypothesis that the associations between social/organizational characteristics and drug use are moderated by theater is rejected.

No significant interaction between level of drug use and theater was found with any of the S/O scales. At present it must be assumed that the social/organizational characteristics associated with drug use are the same in the three geographic areas studied.

Conclusion IV. The hypothesis that the relationships between drug use and individual characteristics identified in this study replicate the findings reported by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse is accepted.

With the exception of a lack of association between cannabis use and level of education, the results of the present study were consistent with the findings of the National Commission. The illegal use of cannabis and other drugs is an age-related phenomenon, rising through the teens, peaking in the young adult years, then dropping continuously with age. For EM 23 and younger, never having been married is associated positively with illegal drug use. Social class, hometown size, and religion are also associated with drug use; with relatively more users from the middle social classes, from hometowns of more than 25,000 and of the Catholic religion.

The individual background characteristics provided evidence that drug use is related to individual-environment interactions. Regardless of age group, cannabis use decreases with increasing rank. Increasing use of cannabis and other drugs is negatively assoicated with a soldier's bureaucratic orientation, and with his getting the job of his choice. Finally, the use of cannabis is highest in the initial months of entry into a unit.

Conclusion V. Commanding officers of high and low drug use units disagree on the reasons for drug use; and CO's of low use units are in closer agreement with the reasons given by the enlisted men.

Commanding officers of high use units tend to downplay the role of the Army's social/organizational environment in affecting drug use, and give relatively greater emphasis to the roles of personality and membership in a drug-using subculture. This is, in effect, a denial by the CO's of high use units that they (or the Army in general) can play a meaningful role in reducing drug use in the Army.

EM in general, and CO's of low use units, show greater recognition that illegal drugs are frequently used as a means of coping with a social environment which is perceived as distressful or lacking in meaning.

While a line of causality between social/organizational characteristics and illegal drug use has not been clearly established in the present research, it would seem to be a significant fact that CO's of low drug use Army units more frequently acknowledge that the social/organizational environment contributes to drug use. It would seem to be even more significant considering the fact that the perceived behavior of the CO is associated with a unit's drug use rate. The facts make it difficult not to conclude that the leadership of the CO contributes, at least indirectly, to the rate of use of illegal drugs by his men.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation I. That the Army conduct some controlled social experiments to demonstrate the causal nature of social/organizational characteristics in contributing to forms of social deviance.

It can be hypothesized that the social/organizational characteristics examined in this study are related to other forms of social deviance in the Army (e.g., AWOL rates) besides illegal drug use. It can further be hypothesized that these characteristics are related to measures of unit efficiency and effectiveness. It is possible that the current research has utility beyond the specific problem of drug use, and further studies to verify these hypotheses are encouraged.

With the specific issue of drug use, additional research needs to be conducted for two purposes: (a) to demonstrate the causal nature of the important social/organizational characteristics identified in this study; and (b) to demonstrate the feasibility of manipulating the social/organizational environment of company-size Army units to reduce the rate of drug use (and possible other forms of social deviance).

Recommendation II. In seeking solutions to the problems of drug use, the Army should work toward the improvement of the social/organizational environment.

CO's and EM were in agreement that improving the quality of Army life, and improving the Army's leadership (especially the area of interpersonal communications) would help to reduce drug use in the Army. (See Appendix E for definitions of the terms used, e.g., "improve quality of life.") Both of these suggestions are consistent with the findings of this study.

The next most frequent suggestions of the CO's were to improve the Army's drug education and to give more emphasis to detection and punishment. There is some indication in the data that CO's of low use units know more about drugs than CO's of high use units. Perhaps improved drug education for officers would be beneficial.

The EM and CO's were opposed on the matter of emphasizing detection and punishment. The EM would prefer that the Army de-emphasize the drug problem. The results of the present study suggest that detection and punishment programs that result in lowered morale might have effects opposite of those intended by actually causing illegal drug use to increase. The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse suggested two reasons for drug use: (a) availability, and (b) need. It would seem that detection and punishment programs would be most effective if directed towards shutting off the supply of drugs; while concurrent attention were being directed by unit commanders to reducing need through improvement of the social/organizational environment.

The third and fourth most frequent suggestions from the EM were job enrichment and, as just discussed, de-emphasizing the drug problem. The finding that job satisfaction significantly differentiates between high and low use units lends credence to the suggestion that the Army should emphasize job enrichment. It was also found that relatively fewer people who are working in a job of their choice, use drugs. It is significant that the CO's tended to suggest keeping the men busy, while the EM emphasized being kept busy with meaningful jobs.

Recommendation III. That the Army provide it's officers and NCO's with more training in interpersonal communications and in handling social problems; and that it reward the behaviors which result from such training.

The effective commander is both a task leader (he gets the job done) and a social-emotional leader (he maintains good interpersonal relationships in the unit). Traditionally, leaders have been trained primarily in accomplishing the mission, and have been rewarded for behaviors which were considered to contribute to this goal. In recent years considerable organizational behavior research has been done on the deleterious effects of ignoring the social-emotional needs of a work group and concentrating strictly on the tasks of the

group. Some of the deleterious effects of neglecting social-emotional needs are high employee turnover, material waste, missed work days, undesirable social behavior, work slowdowns, and resistence to change.

There is some evidence that with training and proper incentives, commanders can function effectively as both task leaders and social-emotional leaders. Leaders can be instructed in skills for dealing with social situations just as they can be taught combat skills. But how they behave as leaders is ultimately a function of how they are rewarded for behaving by their superiors. It is imperative that all levels of command become involved if company-level leaders are to become effective in handling social situations as well as task-related situations.

Recommendation IV. That the Army give special consideration to improving the social/organizational climate that exists in Germany.

Based on interviews of EM and CO's, much of the negative climate in Germany seems to be related to the length of the duty tour. Troops are presently being removed from a familiar culture and loved ones for a very long time. This by itself has a demoralizing effect. In addition, individuals are placed in an environment which they do not consider as very desirable. There seemed to be agreement among the EM that they could cope with their situation more effectively if they didn't have to be in that situation for such a long time (several years).

An obvious, though probably impractical, solution would be to reduce the tour in Germany to 13 months as it is in Korea. Alternate solutions suggested by the EM include frequent rotation of units or individuals within Germany; more liberal transfer policies within Germany; provision of government housing or financial support for all married EM; overseas pay; provision of free or low cost transportation home; and more liberal leave policies (e.g., not being required to be there a year before being eligible to return home on leave.)

In addition, EM and CO's suggested other areas of the social/organizational environment that could be improved in Germany; more and better planned trips; improved living conditions with more privacy and opportunity to secure personal possessions; better medical facilities; more personal freedom off-duty; more opportunity to pursue educational goals; cultural exchange programs; and less invasion of privacy.

These are only suggestions, and there are no guarantees that they would be effective if implemented. Since these suggestions came from the EM it is reasonable to infer that they are important to the EM in a motivational sense.

For the most part the questionnaire and interview data appear to indicate that the negative S/O climate in Germany is related to a lack of meaning in that environment. This lack of meaning is apparently a result of doing the same things in the same place with the same people for a long period of time with little sense of mission and few outside diversions.

II. INTRODUCTION

A. OVERVIEW

The Army is directing a great deal of its resources in a multipronged attack on the problem of illegal drug use. This problem is being attacked through legal, law enforcement, medical, educational, and social channels with varying and uncertain degrees of success. However, in order to wage a successful campaign against illegal drug use, more information is needed regarding the nature and dynamics of drug use in the military.

To understand illegal drug use one must know the answers to several questions: Who uses drugs? What drugs are used and in what manner? What are the major factors contributing to drug use? What can be done to prevent drug use? Much research is needed to provide satisfactory answers to these questions. This report details research directed primarily at the latter two questions.[1]

Youthful experimentation with drugs like alcohol and tobacco is nothing new. But why the current wave of youthful experimentation with the illegal drugs? The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse[2] has suggested two reasons: (a) these other drugs are, perhaps for the first time, widely available; and (b) the need is there. Quoting from the Commission's report (pp. 102 - 103):

> "Young people as well as their elders use drugs because they satisfy a need, or, at least, satisfy it better than anything else they have tried. We know that these drugs alter the ways in which individuals experience reality, and we assume, on the basis of considerable information, that this change of experience is perceived by those who use drugs as rewarding. When something has happened to an individual that makes the experience of reality extraordinarily painful, when the individual is sick or injured, society approves the use of drugs to alter this experience. In other circumstances, however, use is disapproved because it does not deal with an exceptionally harsh reality, but, instead, serves to transcend what we think of as ordinary reality. It is this transcendent use of drugs that our society discourages, for it

---

[1] There are three other reports in this series which, together, address each of these questions directly. They are "Assessment of Drug Abuse Prevalence", "Shifts in Drug Use Patterns Among Army Personnel", and "Executive Summary of Drug Abuse Research."

[2] Drug use in America: Problem in perspective. Second report of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

threatens to disable the user from dealing with reality, to the detriment of his own welfare, and more remotely to the welfare of the community.

The need for transcendent use of drugs, as reflected by use patterns themselves, subsumes two partially distinguishable phenomena. One is a need for some coping device: the need to transcend ordinary life because one's life is distressing. The second need is for a searching device: the need to transcend ordinary life because it is meaningless, or, on a more mundane level, boring. Among youth, the new wave of drug experimentation seems primarily related to this search for meaning."

The Commission has adopted the social psychological perspective that drug use, like other classes of behavior, is considered to be purposive, goal oriented, or functional.[3] Based on the Commission's rationale, one would expect to find, given availability of drugs, increased drug use where the social/organizational environment of an Army unit is distressing or lacks meaning. (The social environment is not clearly distinguishable from the organizational environment in the military.)

Whether an individual perceives a particular social/organizational environment as distressful or lacking in meaning depends on how he interprets that environment in light of his previous experiences and his current expectations.[4] To the extent that a group of individuals share a set of common meanings about a particular environment, their behavior in that environment will be similar. Thus, it is possible to study either individual variation or collective commonalities with regard to behavior in the same or different social/organizational environments.

In the present research, primary emphasis was on the study of a collective behavior, illegal drug use, in different social/organizational environments (Army TO&E companies in different geographic regions). The research question was, "Can characteristics of the social/organizational envivonments of Army TO&E units be identified that are associated significantly with illegal drug use?"

---

[3] Jessor, R. & Jessor, S.L. A social psychology of marijuana use: Longitudinal studies of high school and college youth. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 29, 1-15.

[4] Blumer, H. Symbolic interactionism perspective and method. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.

There is a growing body of research on organizations that link the behavior of individuals in organizations to characteristics of the organization's environment.[5] This research literature suggests a number of factors that might contribute to both a distressful organizational environment and one lacking in meaning for the participants. Such an environment, according to the hypothesis of the study, will be assoicated with higher than average drug use. The organizational factors include leadership, job demands, rewards for performance, meaningfulness of the job, attitudes towards the organization, and characteristics of the group such as cohesiveness.

5

a. Baehr, M. E., & Renck, R. The definition and measurement of employee morale. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1958, 3, 157-163.

b. Datel, W. E., Engle, E. O., & Barba, M. A. Affect levels in a company of basic trainees. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 903-909.

c. Datel, W.E., & Lifrak, S. T. Expectations, affect change, and military performance in the Army recruit. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 855-879.

d. Evan, W. M. Peer group interaction and organizational socialization: A study of employee turnover. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 436-440.

e. Fleishman, E. A. & Harris, E. F. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 43-56.

f. Hemphill, J. K. Group dimensions, a manual for their measurement. Columbus Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research Monograph No. 87, 1956.

g. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

h. Likert, R. New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

From the standpoint of the social environment, one would expect satisfaction with living conditions, opportunities for a satisfactory social life, and the general quality of interpersonal relations in the unit to contribute to an environment which would be experienced as comforting or distressful, meaningless or meaningful.[6]

In the present research, a wide range of social and organizational characteristics were considered to provide as complete a picture as possible of the relationship between the social/organizational environment and illegal drug use. The measures selected to assess these characteristics were hopefully concrete enough to result in meaningful recommendations should any prove to be significant.

B. THE PROBLEM

The Vietnam conflict focused the public's attention on the use of illegal drugs by soldiers - particularly the use of heroin and cannabis. Use of these drugs was high because of availability and because of need associated with the stresses of being in or near combat. But what about the use of drugs in today's peacetime Army? Is drug use still high? If so, what are the social/organizational factors associated with high drug use in TO&E Army units during peacetime?

During the screening for the selection of Army TO&E units for the present study, data on the current prevalence of drug use were obtained.[7] These data are presented in Table II-1. In terms of use, alcohol was used by nearly 80% of the E1-E5's on a monthly basis, with cannabis use running second at about 40%. The use of hallucinogens, amphetamines, and barbiturates was also high

---

[6]
a. Lazarus, R.S. Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: Wiley, 1966.

b. Starr, A., Betz, E.L., & Menne, J.W. Differences in college student satisfaction: Academic dropouts, nonacademic dropouts, and nondropouts. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, Counseling Center, mimeograph, 1971.

c. Zurcher, L.A., Jr. The sailor aboard ship: A study of role behavior in a total institution. Social Forces, 1965, 43, 389-399.

[7] Hurst, P.M., Walizer, D.G., Rindone, W., & McKendry, J. Assessment of drug abuse prevalence. State College, Pa.: HRB-Singer, 1973. Prepared under Contract No. DAHC-19-73-C-0008.

Table II-1 Percentage of Respondents (E1-E5, TO&E Units) Admitting to Drug Use (N = 17,141)

	Used Every Day in Last Month	Used 15-30 Days in Last Month	Used 7-14 Days in Last Month	Used 3-6 Days in Last Month	Used 1 or 2 Days in Last Month	Did Not Use In Last Month
Alcohol[a]	10.6	16.5	18.2	17.6	15.5	21.6
Cannabis	11.3	9.8	6.4	5.6	7.1	59.8
Hallucinogens	0.5	1.3	1.7	3.4	6.4	86.7
Amphetamines	0.7	1.7	2.5	4.0	6.0	85.1
Barbiturates	0.6	1.3	1.7	2.6	4.1	89.6
Other Sedatives	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.5	3.0	92.9
Cocaine	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.7	3.5	92.3
Methadone	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.5	1.2	96.8
Opiates	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.7	3.4	91.8

a. Percentages in the alcohol category are adjusted for 513 no responses (N = 16,628)

(From Hurst, P.M., Walizer, D.G., Rindone, W., & McKendry, J. Assessment of Drug Abuse Prevalence. State College, Pa.: HRB-Singer Report # 4664-1, 1973.)

on a monthly basis at 10-15%. Alcohol and cannabis were the only drugs used daily by a substantial proportion (over 1%) of the E1-E5 population. (They were each used about 11% on a daily basis). The majority of users of drugs other than alcohol and cannabis used drugs six or less days per month and could be classified as occasional users, probably weekenders.

It is possible to compare illegal drug use by Army EM (E1-E5) with use by college students who are in the same approximate age range. This comparison is made in Table II-2. The prevalence of drugs in both populations is quite similar. This suggests that the prevalence of illegal drugs in the Army may be about average for this age group. This fact should not detract from the also important fact that Army units show considerable variability in the prevalence of illegal drugs. Some units are far above average, and some units are far below average in prevalence. It was the goal of the present research to identify the social/organizational factors that characterized units which were above and below average on illegal drug prevalence.

In order that the study results might be generalized to the population of Army TO&E units, data from units in representative geographic locations was desired. It was conceivable that the relationship between a social/organizational factor, such as job satisfaction, and drug use might be moderated by theater. This might occur if U.S. Army TO&E units in CONUS, Europe, and Asia constitute populations with different social/organizational characteristics. In the study design, units were selected from a cross-section of TO&E units in CONUS, Germany, and Korea to test this possibility.

C. HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis I. Army TO&E company-size units with high rates of drug use have social/organizational deficiencies; while low drug use units have social/organizational strengths.

Hypothesis II. Army TO&E company-size units in CONUS, Germany, and Korea have significantly different social/organizational profiles.

Hypothesis III. The associations between social/organizational characteristics and drug use are moderated by theater.

Hypothesis IV. The relationships between drug use and individual background characteristics identified in this study replicate the findings reported by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse.

Table II-2 Comparison of prevalence of non-prescription drug use among two populations: U.S. Army EM (E1-E5, TO&E units), and U.S. college students.

Drug Category	U.S. Army EM[a], use in previous 30 days, 1973	U.S. College Students[b], ever use. 1972
Alcohol	78%	83%
Marihuana[c]	40%	50%
Hallucinogens	13%	14%
Stimulants[d]	23%	24%
Depressants[e]	18%	15%
Opiates	8%	6%

a. Data from Hurst, et.al., p. 33 (footnote 7).

b. Data from second report of National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, p. 83 (footnote 2).

c. Cannabis in Hurst, et.al.

d. Amphetamines and cocaine combined in Hurst, et.al.

e. Barbiturates and other sedatives combined in Hurst, et.al.

III. METHOD

A. DESIGN

The study used an extreme comparisons, cross-sectional design. Two groups of Army TO&E company-size units were studied: (a) high drug use units; and (b) low drug use units. These units were selected from a cross-section of TO&E units in CONUS, Germany, and Korea. This gave a total of 2 x 3 = 6 groups to be studied.

A two-way classification analysis of variance (ANOVA) design was used to analyze the differences in social/organizational characteristics among the six groups of TO&E units. The ANOVA classification factors (two levels of drug use and three theaters) were not experimental treatments, and the reader is cautioned that the attribution of causation remains ambiguous with this design. For example, if the ANOVA results would indicate that EM in high use units report less job satisfaction, this is not grounds for inferring that job dissatisfaction is caused by drug use, or vice versa. It only indicates that the two variables are associated in a nonrandom way. They might both be "caused" by a third variable, e.g., leadership.

The purpose of the present study is to determine if, as predicted, increased drug use is associated with a social/organizational environment that is distressful or lacking in meaning. Once it is determined that certain environmental characteristics are associated with drug use, experiments can be conducted to address the issues of causality.

In collecting the data on social/organizational factors, data were also collected on certain individual characteristics, such as religious background and level of education. These individual characteristics were analyzed independently of the social/organizational characteristics. Individual characteristics were compared with the individual's self-report of drug use. When it was appropriate to make these comparisons statistically, the choice of the test statistic depended on the nature of the data (e.g., ranked, contingency, means).

B. INSTRUMENTATION

Two questionnaires and two interview schedules were developed for this study. Enlisted men completed the two questionnaires and participated in an interview. The other interview schedule was developed for commanding officers (CO's).

The first questionnaire completed by the enlisted men was a self-report drug use questionnaire. (Development of this questionnaire is detailed in a previous report; see footnote 7). The second questionnaire was a 251-item instrument (Appendix A) which included background questions, a personality scale, and 19 social/organizational scales. This questionnaire is referred to throughout the report as the S/O questionnaire. The personality and social/organizational scales are defined in Appendix B and keyed to the S/O questionnaire.

Interviews were conducted using a standardized interview format (Appendix C), with several questions being identical on the CO and EM schedules. Both CO's and EM were asked what they thought contributed to drug use in the Army, and what they thought the Army could do to reduce drug use. Questions were also asked to assess the relationship between the CO and the EM in his unit; and to assess various social and organizational characteristics (such as morale and leadership).

The questionnaires were pretested at a CONUS Army post with 135 enlisted men, and modifications were made to increase the clarity of the items and to remove poor or redundant items. The pretest data were used to compute the reliability of each S/O scale with coefficient alpha.[8] The obtained scale reliabilities are presented in Appendix B.

C. SAMPLING

For the sample of company-size TO&E units, six CONUS posts and six major commands in Germany were selected which maximized command and geographical diversity. Since the number of TO&E units in Korea was much

---

[8] Nunally, J. D. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

smaller, the sample there was not based on any prior partitioning. Thirty of the units at each of the six CONUS posts and six USAREUR commands, and 150 units from Korea, were selected at random from all of the TO&E units with a troop strength of greater than 40. This selection of units constituted the screening sample.

The total screening sample was 180 units in CONUS, 180 in Germany, and 150 in Korea. Each of these units was to receive the self-report drug use questionnaire. Based on the results of this questionnaire, 24 units were selected in each theater, 12 high use and 12 low use, to receive the social/organizational questionnaire and the interviews. (The procedure for this selection of units is outlined in the report referenced in footnote 7.) Data were eventually collected from 61 of the 72 designated units.[9] Of the 61 units, 31 were high use units and 30 were low. They were distributed as indicated in Table III-1.

Table III-1
Number of TO & E units in each cell of study design
(Total N = 61)

	Drug Use	
Location	High	Low
Germany	8	7
Korea	11	11
CONUS	12	12
TOTALS	31	30

[9]Because of mail delays encountered in shipping the use questionnaire results from Germany to CONUS for analysis, two of the commands in Germany had to be dropped from the study resulting in a loss of 9 units. Data could not be collected from two units in Korea because of reorganizations which occurred between the time the use questionnaires were administered and the S/O data were to be collected.

[10]Weighted drug use values were computed by assigning a 1/3 weight to cannabis use, and a unit weight to the use of other illegal drugs. Alcohol use was not included in the computation. (See report referenced in footnote 7.)

The drug use questionnaire was given a second time to a random sample of six units in CONUS, four in Germany, and to all 22 units in Korea. This re-administration of the use questionnaire provided for a check on the stability of reported drug use over time, and allowed for the comparison of individual personality and background factors with self-reports of drug use.

The test-retest correlation of the weighted drug use values[10] for the 10 units in CONUS and Germany combined was .81. For the 22 units in Korea it was .44. The test-retest interval in CONUS and Germany was about one month, while it was about four months in Korea. With a standard 13-month duty tour in Korea, the expected troop turnover there is about 30% over a 4-month period.

Because of the low stability of reported drug use in Korea, the units in Korea was reclassified into the high and low drug use groups prior to analysis on the basis of the second administration of the drug use questionnaire.

The median weighted drug use values for high and low units in each theater are indicated in Table III-2. The results for Korea show the regression toward the mean of the retest scores. Although the separation between high and low use units was not as great for Korea (Δ = .21) as for CONUS and Germany (Δ = .33 for each), the separation was considered large enough to yield meaningful analyses.

Table III-2
Median weighted use values for high and low use units selected in three theaters.

		CONUS	Korea	Germany
High Use	Median	.5207	.4471	.5072
	Range	.2776	.2059	.3255
Low Use	Median	.1872	.2318	.1768
	Range	.1731	.1830	.1726

D. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Dates of data collection are indicated in Table III-3. A research team administered the questionnaires at a place convenient to the selected unit to all E1-E5's available for duty on that day. On completion of the questionnaires, six enlisted men were chosen at random from the company roster to participate as a group in the EM interview. The interviewer attempted to arrive at a group consensus for questions pertaining to their unit. The CO was usually interviewed by a number of the research team while the enlisted men were completing the questionnaire. At no time during data collection did either the research team or the unit being tested know whether the unit had been designated as a high or low use unit.

Following data collection, each questionnaire and interview schedule was coded by other members of the research team who were also unaware of the designation of the unit. The questionnaire was mostly precoded, so very little judgment was required in processing it. Interviews were coded from cassette tapes onto pre-coded forms.

S/O questionnaire responses were processed through a two-stage program developed by HRB-Singer. Stage one was a scoring program for the 19 social/organizational scales. The output of this stage was a score on the personality and background items, and a scale score for the social/organizational scales for each individual. Stage two summarized the stage one output for each unit. The output of stage two consisted of unit scores on the social/organizational scales, and unit summaries of personality and background items. Unit scores on the S/O scales were computed by averaging individual scores in each unit.

Table III-3
Dates of Data Collection
(all months in 1973)

Locations	Use Questionnaire	S-O Questionnaire & Interviews
CONUS	March - April	April - June
Germany	May - June	June - July
Korea	April - May	August - September

The analysis of the S/O scales was performed at the Pennsylvania State University Computer Center. A generalized analysis program developed by the Brigham Young University Statistics Department was used. This program is capable of analyzing balanced and unbalanced univariate and multivariate analysis of variance problems as well as univariate and multivariate regression problems.

The interview data and the background data from the S/O questionnaire were analyzed at the Pennsylvania State University using SPSS routines[11]. SPSS is an integrated system of computer programs for the analysis of social science data.

---

[11] Nie, N.H., Bent, D.H., & Hull, C.H. SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

IV. RESULTS

The results are presented in three sections. The first section presents the results of the analysis of the 19 social/organizationa scales; the second section presents the results of the analysis of the CO and EM interview data; and the third section presents the results of the analysis of the personality and background questions.

A. THE SOCIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL SCALES

1. Discriminant analysis

The first step in the analysix of the 19 social/organizational (S/O) scales was to develop a discriminant function to see how well a weighted sum of these 19 variables would discriminate between high and low use units. (The S/O scales are defined in Appendix B.)

Table IV-1 shows the equation of the discriminant function and the standardized weight for each S/O scale indicating its relative importance. The predicted level of drug use for each unit was calculated with the discriminant function, and 46 of the 61 units (75%) were correctly assigned to the high or low use condition (predicted level = actual level).

Two of the S/O scales (Group Control and Group Potency) had significant weights in the discriminant function because they tended to suppress the influence of variables that were irrelevant in discriminating between high and low use units. This can be verified by comparing the low biserial correlation each of these scales had with the use criterion (Table IV-1) and their high correlations with irrelevant variables (as far as the criterion is concerned) indicated in the intercorrelation matrix of the 19 S/O scales (AppendixD). It should not be assumed, based on their significant weights in the discriminant function, that manipulation of group control or group potency would affect drug use rates.

Two scales which had high biserial correlations with the criterion (Job Satisfaction and Opinion of the Army) did not have significant weights in the discriminant function. The S/O scale intercorrelation matrix reveals that

Table IV-1 Discriminant analysis of level of drug use (high or low) using 19 S/O predictor variables.

S/O Scale	Biserial Correlation	Standardized Weight	t test of weight	P
Structure -CO	-.119	-.064	-0.78	
Consideration-CO	-.276	-.497	-2.37	.025
Structure- 1SGT	.152	.157	1.16	
Consideration-1SGT	-.054	-.228	-1.64	
Opinion of Officers	-.374	-.462	-2.40	.025
Opinion of NCO's	-.175	-.008	-0.44	
Living Conditions	-.181	-.144	-0.80	
Social Life	-.176	.132	0.61	
Job Satisfaction	-.449	-.289	-1.30	
Opinion of the Army	-.288	.288	0.90	
Group Control	.047	-.672	-3.58	.001
Group Intimacy	.121	-.089	-0.63	
Group Hedonic Tone	-.137	-.052	-0.16	
Group Potency	-.144	.720	2.49	.02
Group Viscidity	-.040	.179	0.89	
Group Participation	-.167	-.128	-0.79	
Group Polarization	-.156	-.038	-0.18	
Group Flexibility	.091	-.064	-0.46	
Morale	-.453	-.678	-3.22	.005

Discriminant function:[a] $Y' = 11.613 - .007S1 - .030S2 + .019S3 - .013S4 - .136S5 - .030S6 - .037S7 + .032S8 - .042S9 + .074S10 - .150S11 - .023S12 - .012S13 + .119S14 + .042S15 - .054S16 - .010S17 - .020S18 - .082S19$

a. S1 refers to Scale 1, Structure - CO; S2 to Consideration - CO; etc.

these scales had high correlations with the Consideration of CO, Opinion of Officers, and Morale Scales; thus adding little information to the discriminant function. This does not imply that job satisfaction and opinion of the Army are not important in characterizing high and low use units. It says only that the ability to predict whether a unit is high or low on drug use is not increased with knowledge of these factors if one has data on the consideration of the CO, opinion of the officers, and morale.

2. Multivariate analysis of variance

The discriminant analysis indicated that one can predict, with about 75% accuracy, whether a unit is a high or low drug use unit with the Consideration of CO, Opinion of Officers, and Morale scales of the S/O questionnaire. This is useful information for diagnostic purposes; but it gives an incomplete picture of how the 19 S/O factors used in the study relate to drug use in the Army. For example, in the preceding discussion of the results of the discriminant analysis, it was pointed out that the Job Satisfaction and Opinion of the Army scales had relatively high biserial correlations with the criterion. This suggests the existence of significant effects with these factors, but they did not have significant weights in the discriminant function.

Each of the 19 S/O factors was treated as a dependent variable in a 2 x 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine its relationship with reported drug use. Each factor was tested for level of use and theater main effects, and for a significant interaction with level of use and theater.

a. Main effect, level of drug use.

The biserial correlations of the S/O scales with the drug use criterion (Table IV-1) give an indication of the results anticipated with the tests for the level of drug use main effect (Table IV-2). For the most part these expectations were met in the ANOVA results. The exception was the Satisfaction with Social Life scale which had a marginally significant F ratio ($p < .07$), but a small biserial correlation ($r = -.176$). This is possibly a result of the low reliability of this scale ($r = .64$; see Appendix B). In view of the marginal level of significance, the low biserial correlation, and the low scale reliability, it is questionable whether satisfaction with social life is significantly associated with level of drug use.

Table IV-2 Analysis of variance summary table, S/O scales, main effect for level of use.

S/O Scale	High Use Mean	Low Use Mean	F	P
Structure-CO	54.6	55.8	1.16	
Consideration-CO	41.2	45.2	3.64	.06
Structure-ISGT	58.1	56.8	1.51	
Consideration-ISGT	45.0	46.1	0.24	
Opinion of Officers	12.2	13.3	8.40	.01
Opinion of NCO's	12.4	12.8	1.55	
Living Conditions	17.5	18.1	1.99	
Social Life	15.5	16.2	3.46	.07
Job Satisfaction	31.9	34.9	14.51	.0005
Opinion of Army	18.1	19.1	5.23	.05
Group Control	38.0	38.0	0.00	
Group Intimacy	39.6	39.2	0.85	
Group Hedonic Tone	24.0	24.4	0.74	
Group Potency	31.6	32.3	0.98	
Group Viscidity	28.5	28.5	0.00	
Group Participation	44.6	45.0	1.86	
Group Polarization	43.0	43.6	1.83	
Group Flexibility	26.3	26.2	0.12	
Morale	52.0	55.5	18.02	.0005

Five of the remaining S/O scales had significant F ratios, although the Consideration of CO scale was at a marginal level of significance ($p < .06$). The other scales that were statistically significant were Opinion of Officers, Job Satisfaction, Opinion of the Army, and Morale. These five scales also had the highest biserial correlations with the criterion.

b. Main effect, theater

A large number (13) of the S/O scales had significant F ratios for the theater main effect (Table IV-3). For those scales with a significant F ratio the mean scores for Germany and Korea were each compared with the mean score for CONUS with a two-tailed t test for individual comparisons.[12]

Compared to CONUS, the units in Germany had significantly higher scores on the Group Control and Group Intimacy scales, and significantly lower scores on the Opinion of Officers, Opinion of NCO's, Satisfaction with Living Conditions, Satisfaction with Social Life, Job Satisfaction, Opinion of the Army, Group Hedonic Tone, Group Viscidity, Group Polarization, and Morale Scales. On two scales, Satisfaction with Social Life and Group Participation, the units in Korea scored significantly higher than the units in CONUS; but the remainder of the CONUS-Korea comparisons were not significant.

c. Interaction, level of use and theater

None of the level of use and theater interactions was statistically significant (Appendix E). The S/O factors associated with drug use were independent of theater.

---

[12] Winer, B. J. Statistical Principals in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Table IV-3 Analysis of variance summary table, S/O scales, main effect for theater

S/O Scale	Mean for CONUS	Mean for KOREA	Mean for GERMANY	F
Structure-CO	55.9	55.8	53.8	1.29
Consideration-CO	45.0	44.7	39.9	2.19
Structure-1SGT	58.2	58.5	55.7	2.42
Consideration-1SGT	44.5	49.1	42.9	2.70
Opinion of Officers	13.6	12.9	11.9**	5.75*
Opinion of NCO's	13.2	12.9	11.8***	7.13**
Living Conditions	19.1	18.3	16.0***	18.41***
Social Life	15.5	17.9***	14.2*	30.75***
Job Satisfaction	33.7	35.0	31.5*	6.12**
Opinion of Army	19.4	19.2	17.2***	8.75**
Group Control	37.3	37.6	39.2*	3.71*
Group Intimacy	38.6	39.6	40.0*	2.72
Group Hedonic Tone	25.0	25.0	22.5***	9.53***
Group Potency	33.0	33.2	29.8***	8.19***
Group Viscidity	29.2	29.2	27.1**	5.61**
Group Participation	20.6	21.4*	20.2	5.63**
Group Polarization	19.5	20.4	18.1*	8.62***
Group Flexibility	26.2	25.8	26.8	1.67
Morale	55.0	55.7	50.6***	13.17***

Note: The asterisks next to the means of the Korea and Germany units refer to the significance level of a two-tailed t test for individual comparisons.

* p .05

** p .01

*** p .001

d. Discussion of ANOVA results

Five of the S/O scales differentiated between level of drug use regardless of theater. These were Condideration of CO, Opinion of Officers, Job Satisfaction, Opinion of the Army, and Morale. This gives a social/organizational profile of high drug use Army units compared to low drug use units. High drug use Army units typically have a commanding officer who is perceived by the EM as not being very considerate of his men compared to perceptions of EM in low drug use units. He keeps to himself and doesn't find time to listen to them. He refuses to explain his actions and is seen as unfriendly and unapproachable. He rarely accepts suggestions. The EM in high use units generally have a lower opinion of their officers. They also express more dissatisfaction with their job. They feel that their jobs are not as important and that they will not be rewarded for good performance. The morale of the EM in high use units is generally lower than that in low use units. They are homesick and lonely, bored and unenergetic. They feel irritable, daydream a lot, and would like to be out of the Army. Finally, EM in high use units have a low opinion of the Army in general.

This profile of high drug use Army units emphasizes the importance of the quality of leadership provided by company-level commissioned officers. The implication is that the non-commissioned leadership, whether it is "good" or "bad" in a unit, does not compensate for the leadership of the commissioned officers. The Army company, by design, has centralized leadership giving a high degree of authority and responsibility to the commanding officer. It is, therefore, the commanding officer who sets the tone for a unit and is to a large degree responsible for the motivation and performance of the unit.

The particular quality of company-level leadership that is associated with drug use is consideration (see Appendix B for definition). Halpin [13] reported that the satisfaction of aircraft crews with their commanders is correlated

---

[13] Halpin, A. W. The leader behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders. in Stogdill, R. M. & Coons, A. W. (eds.) Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research Monograph No. 88, 1957.

significantly with consideration, while the ratings of the commander by his superiors are correlated significantly with initiating structure. Halpin's data suggested that leaders high on both consideration and initiating structure are likely to satisfy both subordinates and superiors.

In the present study, the correlation between the Consideration of CO and Opinion of Officers scores was .714 ($p. < .0005$); and the correlation between the Initiation of Structure and Opinion of Officers scores was .399 ($p < .005$). This supports Halpin's finding that the satisfaction of military subordinates with their leader is more strongly associated with consideration than with initiating structure, but that the direction of association is positive in both cases.

It must be emphasized that what are being discussed in this study are factors associated with drug use during a peace-time, garrison situation. The Army company, with its centralized leadership and concern with task accomplishment, is structured to function effectively under the stresses of combat. It is not structured to function effectively in a peacetime, garrison situation where it is easy to lose sight of the importance of one's job, where "make-work" situations abound, and where unresponsive leadership is less tolerable to the EM.

It is possible to train leaders to be more considerate; and this training can influence subsequent considerate behavior as long as such behavior is rewarded by the leader's superiors.[14] The question is whether leaders can be trained to behave differently depending on the situation. There is evidence[15] that a leader's considerate behavior is negatively related to a group's productivity under conditions of task-related stress. It is possible that, in combat, considerate

---

[14] Fleishman, E. A. Leadership climate, human relations training, and supervisory behavior. Personnel Psychology, 1953, 6, 205-222.

[15] Walizer, D.G. The relationship between leader behaviors and group productivity and morale under stress conditions. Unpublished Master thesis University of Cincinnati, 1971.

behavior from the leader would be disfunctional. If low consideration is required for combat effectiveness, and high consideration is required for peacetime effectiveness, can leaders be trained to behave appropriately in these vastly different situations?

Just as the ANOVA results made possible the development of a social/organizational profile for high drug use units, a S/O profile could be also developed for units in the three geographical areas. The results summarixed in Table IV-3 indicate that the units in Germany have a distinct social/organizational profile by comparison with the units in CONUS and Korea; and that this profile is a totally negative one.

In Germany the units have the characteristics of enclaves from which the troops rarely venture (by comparison with CONUS and Korea). The units have a great deal of control over the lives of the EM. The EM, through living in constant close contact with one another for a long period of time, know each other intimately, but have a considerable amount of interpersonal friction. Morale is low. The units are not oriented toward achieving specific goals. Opportunities for social life are lacking, and living conditions are unsatisfactory. EM opinions of the officers and of the Army in general are poor. Specialists in organizational behavior would call such a profile an "unhealthy" one.

This negative S/O profile in Germany is accompanied by a negative drug use profile (Table IV-4). When barbiturates and other sedatives are combined into a single cateogy for sedatives, the results are 16% reported use for CONUS and 23% for Germany (p of difference $\leq .001$). The units in Germany reported significantly more use of amphetamines, sedatives, and opiates than the units in CONUS. In terms of overall use of illegal drugs, the Drug Abuse Prevalence (DAP)[16] indices for Korea, CONUS, and Germany are, respectively, -1.63, 0.49, and 1.25. A minus DAP index indicates lower than average drug

---

[16] $DAP = (U_i - \overline{U})\sqrt{N_i}$

Where: U_i = use value for i^{th} theater

$\overline{U}$ = mean use value for all theaters

N_i = sampe size in i^{th} theater

See Hurst, et al., foot note 7.

Table IV-4 Percentages of drug use compared by location (Indicated comparisons are with CONUS)

Drug Category	CONUS (N = 7416)	Korea (N = 5065)	Germany (N = 4660)
Alcohol	80	84	82
χ^2		30.77***	7.42
Φ		.050	.025
Cannabis	41	40	39
χ^2		1.16	3.35
Hallucinogens	17	9	12
χ^2		149.69***	56.43***
Φ		.110	.069
Amphetamines	15	12	18
χ^2		26.28***	18.26***
Φ		.046	.039
Barbiturates	11	12	8
χ^2		3.50	24.84***
Φ			.045
Other Sedatives	5	3	15
χ^2		23.71***	360.63***
Φ		.044	.173
Cocaine	10	6	6
χ^2		48.45***	43.28***
Φ		.062	.060
Methadone	4	2	3
χ^2		26.42***	11.66***
Φ		.046	.031
Opiates	8	7	10
χ^2		0.58	31.23***
Φ			.051

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

use, and a positive index indicates higher than average use. In terms of both overall use (DAP index) and use of the more dangerous drugs (amphetamines, sedatives, and opiates) the units in Germany have the least favorable illegal drug profile.

Interviews with the EM suggested numerous contributing factors to the current S/O and drug situations in Germany. An important factor in the eyes of the EM is the length of the duty tour. Troops are presently being removed from a familiar culture and loved ones for a very long time. This by itself has a demoralizing effect. In addition, the troops are being placed in an environment which they consider undesirable, and which they must stay in for a long time. In the opinion of the EM they could cope with the environment more effectively if they didn't have to remain in it for such a long period of time.

Another factor contributing to low morale, in the opinion of the EM, is the current anti-drug campaign in Germany. Seventh Army is attempting to reduce drug use by not allowing EM in barracks to decorate and arrange their rooms as they like, by requiring that barrack rooms be kept unlocked, and by constant surveillance and search procedures. The EM report resentment at not having any privacy, for being constantly harrassed with searches for drugs and for not having the freedom to decorate and arrange their rooms in a manner in which they can be comfortable. They also report that theft has risen since personal articles can no longer be secured.

A Seventh Army survey in January, 1973[17] showed that 10 to 15 percent of the EM in Germany used hashish on a regular basis. The HRB-Singer survey in May-June, 1973 (see footnote 7) showed 11 percent of the EM using cannibis on a daily basis, and 21 percent using it on a regular basis (15-30 days in the last month). There is, therefore, reason to believe that the current Seventh Army durg counteroffensive has resulted in lower morale without reducing drug use. In fact, it may have increased the use of more dangerous drugs. A recent General Accounting Office report[18] concluded:

> "Moreover, the intensification of enforcement activities may have contributed significantly to the replacement of marijuana, which is bulky, easily detectable by smell, and not physically addictive, by more dangerous addictive drugs such as heroin and thereby may have contributed to a new, more serious problem."

---

[17] The New York Times, Monday, February 26, 1973

[18] The Cincinnati Enquirer, Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Since significantly more use of sedatives, amphetamines, and opiates was found in Germany along with a negative S/O profile, there is not much cause for optimism over the Seventh Army drug counteroffensive. The results of this study indicate that positive steps to improve troop morale in Germany would be more likely to have the desired effect of reducing the use of illegal drugs.

B. THE INTERVIEW DATA

A group of six randomly selected EM from each unit were interviewed following the S/O questionnaire administration. Group consensus was required for the answer to each question. The CO of each unit was also interviewed. Because the EM or CO's sometimes did not answer a particular question, or because the tape recording was not clear enough, the total number of coded responses was usually less than 61 (the number of units). In some cases, more than one answer was requested to a particular question and the number of responses was greater than 61. Where this was the case it is indicated in the appropriate table.

1. EM responses

Mean scores on 15 interview questions were compared by *t* tests across high and low use units. The results of these comparisons are summarized in Table IV-5. Except for cannabis and hallucinogens, the EM from high use units did not report more use of specific drugs in the interviews than the EM from low use units. They did, however, report higher overall use of drugs supporting the validity of the unit selection procedure.

Consistent with the S/O questionnaire results, EM from high use units reported significantly lower morale in the interviews. The reported frequency of unit social functions did not differentiate between high and low use units supporting the conclusion that satisfaction with social life is of doubious value in discriminating between high and low use units.

The interview results support the conclusion that the leadership of the CO rather than of the 1SGT is assoicated with drug use. Although the CO's perceived attitude towards drugs was not significantly different in the high

Table IV-5 EM interview data summary table of t tests

EM Perception of Unit	High Use Mean (N)	Low Use Mean (N)	t	P
% Alcohol Use	88.0 (26)	91.4 (24)	<1	
% Cannabis Use	86.0 (29)	71.1 (28)	3.16	.005
% Hallucinogen Use	28.1 (29)	12.6 (27)	3.10	.005
% Amphatainine Use	25.5 (28)	25.7 (28)	<1	
% Barbiurate Use	21.3 (27)	12.5 (25)	1.52	
% Cocaine Use	5.1 (28)	5.2 (25)	<1	
% Opiate Use	10.0 (28)	11.4 (25)	<1	
Overall Level of Drug Use	2.54 (28)	2.15 (27)	2.26	.05
CO's Attitude Toward Drugs	1.56 (25)	1.73 (26)	<1	
CO's Drug Knowledge	0.44 (25)	1.00 (25)	-3.06	.005
1 SGT's Attitude Toward Drugs	1.93 (28)	1.92 (24)	<1	
1 SGT's Drug Knowledge	0.44 (25)	0.68 (22)	<1	
Frequency of CI Classes	1.36 (28)	1.68 (28)	1.05	
Morale	1.19 (26)	1.61 (26)	-2.68	.02
Frequency of Social Functions	0.70 (27)	0.93 (28)	1.05	

and low use units, his perceived knowledge about drugs was. The significantly greater perceived drug knowledge of the low use unit CO's may be a result of more open communications between the CO and the EM on the subject of drugs; or it may be a result of the EM in low use units knowing little about drugs and seeing the CO as more knowledgeable by comparison.

In the interviews the EM were asked why they thought people used drugs in the Army. Their responses to this question were coded into four categories: (1) Pleasure-seeking; (2) Personality problem; (3) Membership in drug-using culture; and (4) Cope with problems. Examples of responses in each of these categories are given in Appendix F. Note that there were essentially no differences in EM perceptions as to the reasons for drug use between the high and low use units (Table IV-6). In both cases, the EM though that the main reason people use drugs in the Army was to cope with their problems. The second most popular reason given was enjoyment. Few thought that the reason people used drugs was because they come from a sub-culture in which drugs were used, or because of personality factors.

The EM were also asked what they thought the Army could do to reduce drug use. Their suggestions are summarized in Table IV-7; and examples of the responses included in each suggestion category are given in Appendix E. The rank order correlation coefficient, rho, indicates high agreement between the EM of the high and low use units on the relative importance of each suggestion as determined by the number of times that suggestion was made. In order of their frequency, the main suggestions were: (1) Improve the quality of life in the Army; (2) Improve the quality of leadership in the Army, and communications between the leaders and the men; (3) Improve the Army job; and (4) De-emphasize the drug problem.

Suggestions (1) through (3) are congruent with the findings from the S/O scales. Suggestion (4) summarizes the opinions of many of the EM in the interviews who thought the Army was exaggerating the seriousness of drug use. In their opinion, cannabis use was no worse (and many thought less worse) than alcohol use. Further, they tended to consider drug use (including alcohol) as a problem only if it occurred on the job; or if an individual developed a dependence on a drug or used it excessively. This is a

Table IV-6 EM perceptions of why people use drugs in the Army (N = 207)[a]

Reasons	High Use %	Low Use %
Pleasure - seeking	16	18
Personality problem	1	0
Membership in drug - using culture	7	5
Cope with problems	76	77
Totals	100	100

a. EM could give more than one reason

Table IV-7 EM ideas about how Army can reduce use of drugs (N = 127)[a]

Suggestion	High Use %	Low Use %
Keep men busy	2	1
Improve quality of life	33	31
Emphasize detection & punishment	3	0
De-emphasize drug problem	18	13
Get honest recruiters	5	6
Allow users to resign	2	1
Improved leadership & communications	20	19
Job enrichment	17	19
Improved drug education	0	4
Improved rehabilitation system	0	3
rho= .758[b] Totals	100	100

a. EM could give more than one suggestion

b. Cell frequencies too small to perform chi-square analysis

logical response from a population which legitimizes the use of chemicals other than alcohol in its norm structure; and which must interface with a population that legitimizes only alcohol use in its norm structure.

Table IV-8 presents the perceptions of the EM regarding the usefulness of command information (CI) classes. Only 17% of the EM from high use units though CI classes were useful, while 48% of the EM from low use units thought they were. This would suggest a greater rapport between the EM and the CO in the low use units, and confirms the finding that considerate behavior of the CO is more apparent in low use units.

None of the remaining EM interview questions (Appendix G) discriminated between high and low use units. In summary, the EM interviews tended to reinforce the findings from the S/O scales that considerate behavior of the CO and high morale were more characteristic of low use units. In addition, the CO's of low use units were perceived as having more drug knowledge than CO's of high use units.

Table IV-8 EM perceptions of whether CI is usually worthwhile (N = 51)

	High Use %	Low Use %
Yes	17	48
No	83	52
	100	100

$\chi^2 = 5.66$ $p < .025$

2. CO responses

The mean scores of 14 items from the CO interview schedule were compared across high and low units (Table IV-9). The t tests applied to the means showed no significant differences between the CO's of high and low use units on any of these items.

It is interesting that the EM interviews differentiated between high and low use units on the two items relating to overall level of drug use and morale, while the CO interviews did not. Either the CO's did not have accurate perceptions of their units, or they were not admitting what they know to the interviewers; since the case of the high use units truthful responses to these items would be an indictment of their leadership. (If morale was low and drug use was high the leader would not look good in making such an admission).

Table IV-10 shows that the CO's tended to underestimate drug use while EM tended to overestimate drug use; although they were both relatively accurate with their estimates (with the exception of EM estimates of cannabis use). The conclusion is that the CO's tended to downplay the amount of drug use

Table IV-9 CO interview data, summary table of t tests

CO's Perception of Unit	High Use Mean (N)	Low Use Mean (N)	t
% Alcohol Use	77.5 (12)	79.9 (13)	<1
% Cannabis Use	49.5 (28)	44.5 (28)	<1
% Hallucinogen Use	7.2 (26)	4.4 (27)	1.14
% Amphetamine Use	9.8 (26)	6.1 (27)	1.34
% Barbiturate Use	8.4 (24)	7.3 (26)	<1
% Cocaine Use	0.8 (26)	1.7 (26)	1.43
% Opiate Use	2.8 (26)	2.5 (27)	<1
Overall Level of Drug Use	1.76 (29)	1.71 (28)	<1
Frequency of CI Classes	1.86 (28)	1.67 (27)	<1
Frequency of Social Functions	1.82 (28)	2.33 (24)	-1.59
CO's Time in Unit (Months)	6.72 (29)	6.89 (28)	<1
CO's Time in Army (Years)	6.62 (29)	8.07 (27)	1.24
1 SGT's Time In unit (Months)	12.15 (26)	12.04 (26)	<1
Morale	2.28 (29)	2.37 (27)	<1

in the interviews in an effort to look better in the eyes of the interviewers, while the EM tended to exaggerate the level of drug use (especially with cannabis) to justify their use of drugs to the interviewers (everybody's doing it).

The reasons given by CO's of high and low use units for why people use drugs in the Army are compared in Table IV-11. There was a significant difference between the responses of CO's of high and low use units. CO's of high use units were more likely than CO's of low use units to attribute drug use to personality problems and membership in a drug-using culture. CO's of low use units were more likely than CO's of high use units to attribute drug use to coping with problems. The reasons for drug use given by the CO's of the low use units were very similar to the reasons given by the EM (Table IV-6) which suggests that the CO's of low use units have better communications with their men.

The CO's ideas for reducing drug use in the Army, compared across use levels, are given in Table IV-12. The rank order correlation, rho, indicates only moderate agreement between the CO's of high and low use units on the popularity of each suggestion. CO's of low use units put more emphasis on improvements in leadership, drug education, and the rehabilitation system, while CO's of high use units placed more emphasis on improving the quality of life and job enrichment.

Table IV-13 presents the high-low comparison of CO opinions of the random urinalysis program. CO's of both high and low use units throught the program was a good idea (82% and 89% respectively); but the CO's of low use units were more critical of how the program was run. CO opinions of the drug exemption, education, and rehabilitation programs were not significantly different for high and low use units (Appendix G).

CO's were asked what they would do with a man caught using cannabis for the first time (either marijuana or hash). There were three typical responses: (1) punish the man, (2) punish him, but try also to help him, and (3) try to help him. The results (Table IV-14) were not statistically significant. In both high and low use units the most typical response was to punish the man,

Table IV-10 Comparison of CO and EM estimates of drug use rates (from interviews) with actual use rates (from drug use questionnaire)

	EM Estimates %	CO Estimates %	Actuals[a]
Alcohol	89.6	78.8	78
Cannabis	78.7	47.0	40
Hallucinogens	20.6	5.8	13
Amphetamines	25.6	7.9	15
Barbiturates	17.1	7.8	10
Cocaine	5.2	1.2	8
Opiates	10.6	2.6	8

a. Actuals represent self-reports of drug use in the last 30 days by 17,141 EM. The drug use items on the CO and EM interview schedules did not specify a time period, so the estimates would be expected to be somewhat higher than the actuals.

(Hurst, et al., footnote 7)

Table IV-11 CO's perceptions of why people use drugs in the Army (N = 150)[a]

Reasons	High Use %	Low Use %
Pleasure-seeking	19	17
Personality problem	12	2
Membership in drug-using culture	24	19
Cope with problems	45	61
Totals	100	100

$$\chi^2 = 7.45 \quad p<.06$$

a. CO's could give more than one reason

Table IV-12 CO's ideas about how Army can reduce use of drugs (N = 84)[a]

Suggestion	High Use %	Low Use %
Keep men busy	11	11
Improve quality of life	32	11
Emphasize detection & punishment	11	14
De-emphasize drug problem	2	5
Recruit better people	4	5
Discharge users	2	0
Improve leadership & communications	11	19
Job enrichment	11	5
Improved drug education	9	16
Improved rehabilitation system	9	14
Totals	100	100

rho = .50[b]

a. CO's could give more than one idea

b. Cell frequencies too small to do chi-square analysis

Table IV-13 CO's opinion of random urinalysis program. (N = 56)

Opinion	High Use %	Low Use %
Good idea but not run right	43	78
Good idea and of use to me	39	11
Bad idea, eliminate	18	11
Totals	100	100

$\chi^2 = 8.01$ $p<.02$

Table IV-14 What CO would do with man caught using cannabis for the first time (N = 55)

Procedure	High Use %	Low Use %
Punish	67	64
Punish and Help	22	32
Help	11	4
Totals	100	100

$\chi^2 = 1.58$

while the second most typical responses was to punish him but also try to help him. A relatively small percentage reported that they would try to help the man rather than punish him.

3. Comparison of CO and EM responses

Eleven items common to both the CO and EM interview schedules were analyzed for agreement between the CO's and the EM. Agreement was assessed with the Pearson P-M correlation coefficient; and correlations were computed separately for CO-EM pairs from high and low use units. These correlations are indicated in Table IV-15.

There were no significant differences between the high and low use units on the agreement (correlation) of the CO's and their EM. On the whole the correlations were small indicating a general lack of agreement between the interview responses of the CO's and the EM on these items.

The EM and CO's were compared on the reasons each gave for why people use drugs in the Army (Table IV-16). Three was a highly significant difference between the EM and the CO's. The CO's cited personality problems and membership in a drug-using culture more frequently than the EM, while the EM cited coping with problems more frequently than the CO's.

The EM and CO's were also compared on the suggestions each had for how to reduce drug use in the Army (Table IV-17). There was a moderate correlation between the ranked frequencies of the suggestions given by the CO's and EM. Both CO's and EM gave improving the quality of life and improving leadership and communications as the two most frequent suggestions. But the third and fourth most frequent reasons for the EM were job enrichment and de-emphasizing the drug problem; while CO's suggested keeping the men busy, emphasizing detection and punishment, and improving drug education and drug rehabilitation programs, all of which were rarely suggestions on the EM.

C. BACKGROUND AND PERSONALITY DATA

The self-report drug use questionnaire was administered with the S/O questionnaire to 1833 EM from 32 units. The primary purpose for re-administering the drug use questionnaire in these units was to obtain a check on the test-

Table IV-15 Comparison of CO-EM correlations for high and low use units (interview data)

Variable	High Use Units (N)	Low Use Units (N)	Z
Unit Morale	.311 (26)	.233 (25)	<1
% Alcohol Use	.336 (12)	.300 (11)	<1
% Cannabis	-.179 (28)	.268 (28)	-1.61
% Hallucinogen Use	-.195 (26)	.119 (26)	-1.10
% Amphetamine Use	-.001 (26)	.362 (27)	-1.30
% Barbiturate Use	.201 (22)	-.075 (23)	<1
% Cocaine Use	-.178 (25)	-.169 (23)	<1
% Opiate Use	.159 (25)	.329 (24)	<1
Overall Level of Use	.297 (28)	.269 (27)	<1
Frequency of CI Classes	.549 (27)	.485 (27)	<1
Frequency of Social Functions	.151 (26)	-.075 (24)	<1

Table IV-16 Comparison of CO and EM reasons for drug use

	EM% (N=207)	CO's % (N=150
Pleasure-seeking	17	18
Personality problem or membership in drug-using culture	6	28
Cope with problems	77	54
Totals	100	100

$\chi^2 = 35.2$ $p < .001$

Table IV-17 Comparison of CO and EM suggestions for reducing drug use

Suggestion	EM% (N=127)	CO% (N=84)
Keep men busy	2	11
Improve quality of life	32	23
Emphasize detection & punishment	2	12
De-emphasize drug problem	16	4
Recruit better people	0	5
Get honest recruiters	6	0
Discharge users	0	1
Allow users to resign	2	0
Improved leadership & communications	20	14
Job enrichment	18	8
Improved drug education	2	12
Improved rehabilitation system	2	11
Totals	100	100

rho = .430

retest stability of the Drug Abuse Prevalence Index. It also made possible the comparison of the background and personality items of the S/O questionnaire with each individual's self-report of drug use.

These comparisons are summarized in Table IV-18 and IV-19, and complete tables are given in Appendix H. In examining these tables it will be noted that the N's vary somewhat between drug categories and across background items. This was a result of incomplete data for background item - drug category pairs. In all, there were between 1300 and 1400 complete data pairs for the analysis of the background items in each drug category.

The background items which differentiated significantly between use and nonuse are discussed separately in the following sections. Three drug categories were used in the analyses: (1) alcohol; (2) cannabis; and (3) other drugs. The other drugs category included use in any of the drug categories of the drug use questionnaire except alcohol and cannabis. Individual analyses of these categories showed no substantial differences so they were collapsed into a single category.

1. Age, Vietnam service, marital status, and pay grade

The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse (Footnote 2) found illegal drug use to be an age-related phenomenon. The Commission found that marijuana use and the non-medical use of ethical psychoactive drugs rises through the teens, peaks in the young adult years (18-21), then drops continuously with age. This was precisely the finding of the current study (Tables IV-18, H-16, H17).

Since illegal drug use is an age-related phenomenon, it is possible that the significant results reported in Table IV-19 for several variables was a function of age rather than the variables in question. To test this possibility, new analyses for marital status, pay grade, and Vietnam service were performed controlling for the influence of age.

When age was controlled in the analysis, no significant difference between cannabis use and Vietnam service was found. Fewer EM under the age of 24 (the groups with highest cannabis use) have served in Vietnam. This accounts for the significant association between cannabis use and Vietnam service when age was not controlled in the analysis.

Table IV-18. Mean age, months in unit, and WEPS scores for three drug categories

	Alcohol		Cannabis		Other Drugs	
	Nonuse	Use	Nonuse	Use	Nonuse	Use
Age (years)	21.4	21.1	22.0	20.3***	21.5	20.2***
(N)	(220)	(1097)	(707)	(669)	(982)	(394)
Months in Unit	8.4	7.5*	8.1	7.2**	7.8	7.3
(N)	(222)	(1101)	(714)	(667)	(989)	(392)
WEPS	32.4	32.3	34.3	30.2***	33.6	29.0***
(N)	(226)	(1101)	(718)	(667)	(993)	(392)

Note: Asterisks next to means in use column indicate significance of two-tailed t test between means of users and nonusers.

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

Table IV-19 Summary table of chi-square analyses performed on background items from S/O questionnaire (N=1833).

Background Characteristic	Alcohol	Cannabis	Other Drugs
Education	9.60	8.09	12.26*
Marital Status	1.60	47.26***	32.31***
Parenthood	1.49	19.12***	5.96**
Wife and Duty Station?	1.02	0.43	0.13
Subject's Religion	3.40	36.35***	26.83***
Father's Religion	6.50	7.27	9.44
Mother's Religion	8.09	24.17***	34.73***
Social Class	4.03	20.93***	24.65***
Hometown Size	5.38	28.15***	21.66**
Pay Grade	4.98	121.33***	61.91***
Vietnam Service	1.28	10.83***	0.66
Drafted or Enlisted	0.41	1.47	2.07
MOS Match	0.75	0.71	1.54
Present Job	7.12*	10.88**	7.98**
Unit Type	1.57	0.37	1.92

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

When age was controlled for, the association between cannabis use and pay grade was still significant, with use decreasing as pay grade increased for each age group. A similar pattern was found with the association between other drug use and pay grade; but the association was significant only with the 20 and under group. In the remaining age groups use of other drugs tapered off very little as pay grade increased, and use of other drugs was not significantly associated with pay grade.

Two alternative hypotheses about drug use and pay grade, both of which predict less use in higher pay grades, come to mind. The first hypothesis states that those who attain higher pay grades are better adjusted to the Army and feel less need to alter their consciousness with chemicals. Since there was no significant difference in alcohol use across pay grades, and no significant difference in other drugs across pay grades for EM over 20, this hypothesis does not seem plausable. The second hypothesis states that individuals promoted into high grades either have or will adopt the Army's official norm system which allows the use of alcohol and discourages the use of illegal chemicals. This hypothesis appears to be plausible for cannabis users, and for the users of other drugs who are 20 and younger.

The association between illegal drug use and marital status was not significant for EM 24 and older when age was controlled in the analysis. The association remained significant for EM 23 and younger where a greater percentage of the people who had never been married reported use of both cannabis and other drugs. The National Commission reported that marijuana experience is more often found among those who had never been married. With Army E1-E5 enlisted men this association was found to be partly age-related.

2. Bureaucratic orientation

The central hypothesis of this study is that increased drug use is associated with social/organizational environments that are perceived as distressful of lacking in meaning. If this hypothesis is true, people with bureaucratic orientations should find the Army's organizational environment less distressful and should use less drugs. To test this hypothesis, Gordon's[18]

---

[18] Gordon, L. V. Measurement of bureaucratic orientation. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 1-11.

Work Environment Preference Schedule (WEPS) was administered to all E1- E5's in the study. For those EM who received the second administration of the drug use questionnaire it was possible to compare their WEPS scores with their self-reports of drug use (Table IV-18). As predicted, users of cannabis and other drugs had significantly lower WEPS scores, indicating less of a bureaucratic orientation, than nonusers.

3. Number of months in unit

It was hypothesized that illegal drug use increases with increased time in the unit. The rationale for this hypothesis is that it takes time to make contacts with drug suppliers and to establishe a trusting relationship with the other people in the unit. This hypothesis is rejected. It was found that alcohol and cannabis users had spent significantly less time in their units than nonusers (Table IV-18). An alternate hypothesis which might explain this finding is that alcohol and cannabis use are in part a result of anxiety induced by being new in a unit. Another hypothesis is that increases in alcohol and cannabis use during the early months of entry into a new unit are a function of the acquaintance process. (The new man is showing he's "ok" by drinking and smoking with the other guys.)

4. Social class

Hollingshead's two-factor index of social position[19] was used to determine the social class of the respondents. Hollingshead's index uses the father's education and occupation to locate each respondent in one of five social classes (Class I = highest; Class V = lowest). Social class differentiated between users and nonusers of cannabis and other drugs, with a smaller percentage of EM in the highest and lowest social classes (Classes I&V) reporting drug use, and a greater percentage of EM in the middle three social classes reporting drug use. The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse[20] concluded that marijuana use is "strikingly" a middle class phenomenon.

---

[19] Hollingshead, A. B., Two factor index of social position. New Haven, Author: 1965

[20] Marijuana: A signal of misunderstanding. The technical papers of the first report of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, Volume I. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

5. Religion

Each EM was asked to identify his religion, his father's religion, and his mother's religion. The father's religion did not differentiate between users and nonusers, but the subject's and his mother's religion did. In both cases a lower percentage of Protestants reported use and a higher percentag of Catholics reported use. Also, a higher percentage of EM who stated having no religion reported use. These results are consistent with the findings of the National Commission (footnote 20).

6. Hometown size differentiated between users and nonusers of cannabis and other drugs. In general, a smaller percentage of respondents from small towns (25, 000 or less inhabitants) reported drug use, while a greater percentage of respondents from large towns (25, 000 or more inhabitants) reported use. These results are consistent with the findings of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse (footnote 2).

7. Education

The National Commission (footnote 20) found that the greater number of years spent in school is positively associated with marijuana use. This finding was not replicated in the present study. There was an association between other drug use and education in the present study, with more individuals having less than a high school education reporting use of other drugs; but cannabis use was not associated significantly with level of education attained.

8. Present job

It was hypothesized that if a person is working in a job he requested, he is less likely to use drugs because his organizational environment will be more meaningful. It was found that a significantly greater percentage of people who got a different job than they asked for, or didn't have the opportunity to ask for a particular job, reported use of cannabis and other drugs. The situation was reversed for users of alcohol where a greater percentage of people who got the job asked for reported use. The hypothesis that fewer people working in the job of their choice report drug use is accepted for cannabis and other drugs, and rejected for alcohol.

9. Summary of individual differences

With the exception of the lack of association between cannabis use and level of education, the results of the present study were consistent with the findings of the National Commission. The illegal use of cannabis and other drugs is an age-related phenomenon, rising through the teens, peaking in the young adult years, then dropping continuously with age. For EM 23 and younger, never having been married is associated positively with illegal drug use. Social class, hometown size, and religion are also assoicated with drug use; with relatively more users from the middle social classes, from hometowns of more than 25, 000, and of the Catholic religion.

The individual background characteristics provided evidence that drug use is related to individual-environment interactions. Regardless of age group, cannabis use decreases with increasing rank. Increasing use of cannabis and other drugs is negatively associated with a soldier's bureaucratic orientation, and with his getting the job of his choice. Finally, the use of cannabis is highest in the initial months of entry into a unit.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TAB	TITLE	PAGE
A		Social/Organizational Questionnaire	
B		Scale Definitions for Social/ Organizational Questionnaire	
C	1	EM Interview Schedule	
	2	CO Interview Schedule	
D		Intercorrelations, S/O Scales	
E		S/O ANOVA Interaction Summary Results	
F	1	Examples of Responses Included in the "Reasons for Drug Use" Coding Categories	
	2	Examples of Responses Included in the "Ideas for Reducing Drug Use" Coding Categories	
G	1	Additional EM Interview Data	
	2	Additional CO Interview Data	
H		Tables for Individual Background and Personality Data	

APPENDIX A

SINGER
HRB-SINGER, INC.
SCIENCE PARK, STATE COLLEGE, PA. 16801

SOCIO-ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Card 1
(C-1-UC)_____

Part 1

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

In this section we would like to learn about your personal background. Please check the appropriate answer for each of the questions in this section. Some of the questions require a written response. For these questions, please write your answer in the space allowed. Be sure to answer all of the questions.

CARD 1

(C-6-ID) _____

(C-9) 1. Check the highest level of schooling you have completed:

___a. Less than seven years of school

___b. Junior high school

___c. Some high school

___d. High School graduate

___e. Some college training

___f. College or university graduate

___g. Completion of graduate school

(C-10) 2. What is your marital status:

___a. Single

___b. Married

___c. Separated

___d. Divorced

___e. Widowed

(C-11) 3. How many children do you have: _____

(C-12) 4. If married, is your wife with you at this duty station:

___a. Yes

___b. No

(C-13) 5. How old are you: _____

(C-15) 6. What is your religion:

___a. Protestant

___b. Catholic

___c. Jewish

___d. Muslim

___e. Other (Specify) _____

___f. None

(C-16) 7. What is (was) your father's religion:

___a. Protestant

___b. Catholic

___c. Jewish

___d. Muslim

___e. Other (Specify) _____

___f. None

(C-17) 8. What is (was) your mother's religion:

___a. Protestant

___b. Catholic

___c. Jewish

___d. Muslim

___e. Other (Specify) _____

___f. None

(C-18) 9. What is (was) your father's occupation: (Please explain fully, e.g.: "He is a Yard Supervisor for Penn Central Railroad")

_____

_____

(C-19) 10. What is (was) your father's income: (Estimate)

___a. Under $5,000

___b. Between $5,000 and $10,000

___c. Between $10,000 and $15,000

___d. Between $15,000 and $20,000

___e. Between $20,000 and $25,000

___f. Between $25,000 and $30,000

___g. Over $30,000

___h. Unknown

(C-20) 11. How much schooling did your father have:

___a. Less than seven years of school

___b. Junior high school

___c. Some high school

___d. High school graduate

___e. Some college training

___f. College or university graduate

___g. Completion of graduate school

(C-21) 12. In terms of population, what statement best describes your hometown:

___a. Population under 5,000

___b. Population between 5,000 and 10,000

___c. Population between 10,000 and 25,000

___d. Population between 25,000 and 50,000

___e. Population between 50,000 and 100,000

___f. Population between 100,000 and 250,000

___g. Population between 250,000 and 500,000

___h. Population between 500,000 and 1,000,000

___i. Population over 1,000,000

(C-22) 13. What is your pay grade:

___a. E1
___b. E2
___c. E3
___d. E4
___e. E5
___f. E6
___g. E7
___h. E8
___i. E9

(C-23) 14. How many months have you been in this company: _____

(C-25) 15. Have you served in Vietnam in the past two years:

___a. Yes
___b. No

(C-26) 16. What is your total length of active duty:

___a. Less than 3 months
___b. 3-6 months
___c. 7-9 months
___d. 10-11 months
___e. 1 year
___f. 2 years
___g. 3 years
___h. 4-5 years
___i. 6-8 years
___j. 9-11 years
___k. 12-15 years
___l. 16-19 years
___m. Twenty years or more

(C-28) 17. Were you drafted or did you enlist:

___a. Drafted
___b. Enlisted

(C-29) 18. Do you live on-post or off-post

___a. On-post

___b. Off-post

(C-30) 19. What is your primary MOS (Give number and title) _____

_____

(C-35) 20. What is your secondary MOS (Give number and title) _____

_____

(C-40) 21. What is your duty MOS (Give number and title) _____

_____

(C-45) 22. Which of the following applies to your present Army job:

___a. Asked for this job and got it

___b. Asked for a different job

___c. Did not get a chance to ask for a specific job

(C-46) 23. In what type of unit have you spent most of your time in the Army:

___a. Combat (Specify) _____

___b. Support (Specify) _____

Part 2

DESCRIPTION OF YOUR COMMANDING OFFICER

On the following pages is a list of statements that may be used to describe the behavior of your Commanding Officer. Each statement describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is good or bad. Although some of the statements may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each statement should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of your ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your CO.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each statement carefully.

b. THINK about how often the CO behaves the way the statement describes.

c. DECIDE whether he (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom, or (e) never acts as described by the statement.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the statement to show the answer you have selected.

Key: A--Always
B--Often
C--Occasionally
D--Seldom
E--Never

1.	The CO makes his attitude clear to the men.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-47)
2.	The CO tries out his new ideas in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-48)
3.	The CO rules with an iron hand.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-49)
4.	He criticizes poor work.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-50)
5.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-51)
6.	He assigns individuals to specific tasks.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-52)
7.	He works without a plan.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-53)
8.	He maintains definite standards of performance for the men.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-54)
9.	He emphasizes meeting deadlines.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-55)
10.	He encourages the following of standard procedures.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-56)
11.	He makes sure his role in the company is understood by the men.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-57)
12.	He insists that individuals follow standard operating procedures.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-58)
13.	He lets individuals know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-59)
14.	He sees to it that individuals do as good a job as they can.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-60)
15.	He sees to it that the work of the company is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-61)

Key: A--Always
B--Often
C--Occasionally
D--Seldom
E--Never

16.	He does personal favors for the men in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-62)
17.	He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-63)
18.	He is easy to understand.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-64)
19.	He finds time to listen to individuals in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-65)
20.	He keeps to himself.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-66)
21.	He looks out for the welfare of each individual in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-67)
22.	He refuses to explain his actions.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-68)
23.	He acts without consulting the men in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-69)
24.	He is slow to accept new ideas.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-70)
25.	He treats every member of the company as his equal.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-71)
26.	He is willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-72)
27.	He is friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-73)
28.	He makes members of the company feel at ease when talking with him.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-74)
29.	He puts suggestions by the members of the company into operation.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-75)
30.	He gets approval from the men in the company before going ahead.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-76)
							(C-80-1)

Part 3

DESCRIPTION OF YOUR FIRST SERGEANT

In this section you are asked to describe the behavior of your First Sergeant in the same manner that you described your CO in the previous section. Be sure to give an answer to each statement.

Key: A--Always
B--Often
C--Occasionally
D--Seldom
E--Never

CARD 2

(C-1-ID)

1.	The First Sergeant makes his attitude clear to the men.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-4)
2.	The First Sergeant tries out his new ideas in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-5)
3.	The First Sergeant rules with an iron hand.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-6)
4.	He criticizes poor work.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-7)
5.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-8)
6.	He assigns individuals to specific tasks.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-9)
7.	He works without a plan.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-10)
8.	He maintains definite standards of performance for the men.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-11)
9.	He emphasizes meeting deadlines.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-12)
10.	He encourages the following of standard procedures.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-13)
11.	He makes sure his role in the company is understood by the men.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-14)
12.	He insists that individuals follow standard operating procedures.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-15)
13.	He lets individuals know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-16)
14.	He sees to it that individuals do as good a job as they can.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-17)
15.	He sees to it that the work of the company is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-18)

Key: A--Always
B--Often
C--Occasionally
D--Seldom
E--Never

16.	He does personal favors for the men in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-19)
17.	He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-20)
18.	He is easy to understand.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-21)
19.	He finds time to listen to individuals in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-22)
20.	He keeps to himself.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-23)
21.	He looks out for the welfare of each individual in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-24)
22.	He refuses to explain his actions.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-25)
23.	He acts without consulting the men in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-26)
24.	He is slow to accept new ideas.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-27)
25.	He treats every member of the company as his equal.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-28)
26.	He is willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-29)
27.	He is friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-30)
28.	He makes members of the company feel at ease when talking to him.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-31)
29.	He puts suggestions by the members of the company into operation.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-32)
30.	He gets approval from the men in the company before going ahead.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-33)

Part 4

OPINIONS ABOUT YOUR

COMPANY OFFICERS AND NCO'S

On the following pages is a series of questions which ask you to give an opinion about the officers and NCO's in your company. With each question there is a set of answers lettered A, B, C, D. You are to choose the one answer which best reflects your opinion about your own officers. Then you should choose the one best answer which describes your opinion about your own NCO's. It is important that you answer every question, and that you give answers for both the officers and NCO's.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each question carefully.

b. THINK about which answer best reflects your opinion about the officers in your company.

c. PLACE the letter (A B C D) corresponding to the answer you select in the space next to the word OFFICERS following the question.

THEN:

d. THINK about which answer best reflects your opinion about the NCO's in your company.

e. PLACE the letter (A B C D) corresponding to the answer you select in the space next to the word NCO's following the question.

1. How much do you like the officers and NCO's in your company.

A. Very much	___OFFICERS	(C-34)
B. Pretty much		
C. Not so much	___NCO'S	(C-35)
D. Not at all		

2. How much do you respect the officers and NCO's in your company:

A. Very much	___OFFICERS	(C-36)
B. Pretty much		
C. Not so much	___NCO'S	(C-37)
D. Not at all		

3. How do you feel about the officers and NCO's that the Army has selected for your company:

A. They were the best ones that could have been selected	___OFFICERS	(C-38)
B. They were as good as any that could have been picked	___NCO'S	(C-39)
C. Somewhat better ones could have been picked		
D. Much better ones could have been picked		

4. When you are discharged from the Army, do you think you will go back to civilian life with a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the present officers and NCO's in your company:

A. Very favorable	___OFFICERS	(C-40)
B. Fairly favorable		
C. Fairly unfavorable	___NCO'S	(C-41)
D. Very unfavorable		

5. In general, how would you rate the officers and NCO's in your company:

A. Very good	___OFFICERS	(C-42)
B. Fairly good		
C. Pretty poor	___NCO'S	(C-43)
D. Very poor		

Part 5

SOCIAL LIFE AND LIVING CONDITIONS

In this section we want to learn your opinions about the social life and living conditions at this duty station. On the following pages is a series of statements about these conditions. You are to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each statement carefully.

b. THINK about whether you (A) strongly agree, (B) agree, (C) are undecided, (D) disagree, or (E) strongly disagree with the statement.

c. INDICATE how you feel by placing a circle around one of the 5 letters (A B C D E) following the statement.

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly disagree

1.	The food at this duty station is not so good as I would expect it to be under the circumstances.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-44)
2.	The housing and sanitation facilities at this duty station are as good as could be expected.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-45)
3.	It is usually impossible for me to find some privacy when I want it.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-46)
4.	If I had to go on sick call to the dispensary, I think I would get a careful examination and get whatever treatment might be necessary.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-47)
5.	If I had a personal problem other than financial or medical, there is no one at this duty station who I would want to go to for help.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-48)
6.	There aren't enough different recreation or hobby-type organizations and facilities at this duty station.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-49)
7.	I feel that this duty station has not done a good job in providing facilities for me to relax during my off-duty hours.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-50)
8.	The townspeople in the area around this duty station treat me and my buddies quite well when we go into town.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-51)
9.	One thing I like about this duty station is that I can almost always find someplace near to have a good time.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-52)
10.	A major problem at this duty station is that there are no girls to date.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-53)
11.	There are a lot of things to do at this duty station to keep me from getting bored during off-duty time.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-54)
12.	Townspeople and businessmen discriminate against soldiers.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-55)
13.	Offpost business places cater only to civilians.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-56)

Part 6

JOB ATTITUDES

In this section we want to learn how you feel about your present Army job. On the following pages is a series of statements about your job. Please indicate whether or not you agree with each statement.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each statement carefully.

b. THINK about whether you (A) Strongly agree, (B) Agree, (C) are undecided, (D) Disagree, or (E) Strongly disagree with the statement.

c. INDICATE the way you feel by placing a circle around the appropriate letter (A B C D E) following the statement.

Key: A--Strongly agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly disagree

1.	On the whole the Army gives me a chance to show what I can do.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-57)
2.	I would rather be in my present Army job than in any other Army job.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-58)
3.	My present job in the Army is not very important.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-59)
4.	I usually feel that what I am doing in the Army is worth while.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-60)
5.	I am interested in my present Army job.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-61)
6.	I would change to some other Army job if given a chance.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-62)
7.	I usually put all I have into my present Army duties.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-63)
8.	I have been receiving training and experience which will help me get a job when I leave the Army	A	B	C	D	E	(C-64)
9.	I use the civilian training and experiences I had before I came into the Army in my present Army job.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-65)
10.	I usually work just hard enough to get by on my present Army job.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-66)
11.	A soldier with ability has a good chance for promotion in the Army.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-67)
12.	When promotions are made in the Army, they usually go to the people who deserve them most.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-68)
13.	My present assignment gives me a good chance for promotion.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-69)

Part 7

OPINION OF THE ARMY

Soldiers differ in what they think about the Army. Following are a number of statements about the Army. You are asked to give your own personal opinion about each statement. Whether you agree or disagree with a statement, you can be sure that many other soldiers feel the same way you do. Please do not skip any statements.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each statement carefully.

b. THINK about the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

c. DECIDE whether you (A) strongly agree, (B) agree, (C) are undecided, (D) disagree, or (E) strongly disagree with the statement.

d. INDICATE how you feel by placing a circle around the appropriate letter (A B C D E) next to the statement.

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

1.	In general, the Army is pretty well run.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-70)
2.	In general, I have gotten a square deal from the Army.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-71)
3.	A lot of my duty and training time is spent in doing things that are not important.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-72)
4.	The military control and discipline in the Army is more strict than is necessary.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-73)
5.	The Army is trying its best to look out for the welfare of the enlisted man.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-74)
6.	In the Army I have often been ordered to do things that I don't see a good reason for doing.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-75)
7.	The Army pays too much attention to "spit and polish."	A	B	C	D	E	(C-76)
8.	In general I would say that I have a good attitude toward the Army.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-77)

(C-80-2)

Part 8

DESCRIPTION OF YOUR COMPANY/BATTERY/TROOP

On the following pages is a list of statements that may be used to describe your company. Each statement describes a specific characteristic, but does not ask you to judge whether the characteristic is good or bad. Although some of the statements may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of your company. Each statement should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible to describe, as accurately as you can, the characteristics of your company.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each statement carefully.

b. THINK about how well the statement describes your company.

c. DECIDE whether you (A) strongly agree, (B) agree, (C) are undecided, (D) disagree, or (E) strongly disagree with the statement.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the statement to show the answer you have selected.

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

Card 3

(C-1-10)

1.	The company has some unwritten rules concerning individual conduct.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 4)
2.	Individuals in the company are afraid to express their real opinions.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 5)
3.	It is difficult to get transferred out of the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 6)
4.	You can come and go pretty much as you please in the company when you are not on duty.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 7)
5.	Individuals in the company work under close supervision.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 8)
6.	Only certain kinds of ideas may be expressed freely in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 9)
7.	Requests for transfer from the company are usually approved.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-10)
8.	An individual has to think twice before speaking his mind in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-11)
9.	Individuals are occasionally transferred from the company against their will.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-12)
10.	The individuals in this company are subject to strict discipline.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-13)
11.	It goes pretty hard on an individual who goes AWOL from the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-14)
12.	Each individual's personal life is known to other members of the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-15)

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

13.	Individuals in the company lend each other money.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-16)
14.	An individual has the chance to get to know all the other individuals in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-17)
15.	Individuals are not in close enough contact to learn to like or dislike another.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-18)
16.	Individuals in the company do small favors for one another.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-19)
17.	Everybody in the company knows each other very well.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-20)
18.	Everybody in the company knows each other by first names.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-21)
19.	Individuals in the company generally stick together, even off-duty.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-22)
20.	The individuals in the company are personal friends.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-23)
21.	Individuals in the company know the family backgrounds of other individuals in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-24)
22.	Individuals call each other by their first names.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-25)
23.	The company is made up of individuals who do not know each other very well.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-26)
24.	Personal dissatisfaction with the company is too small to be brought up.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-27)

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

25.	Individuals continually grumble about the work they do for the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-28)
26.	The company does its work with a lot of esprit de corps.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-29)
27.	A feeling of failure prevails in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-30)
28.	There are frequent intervals of laughter during work.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-31)
29.	The atmosphere in the company is gloomy.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-32)
30.	The individuals in the company are friendly.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-33)
31.	The company is not efficient in the things it does.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-34)
32.	The atmosphere in the company is pleasant.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-35)
33.	There are a lot of fights in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-36)
34.	Individuals feel honored when they are recognized as a member of this company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-37)
35.	Belonging to this company is a way of acquiring general social status.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-38)
36.	Failure of the company would mean little to individual members.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-39)
37.	The individuals in this company allow nothing to interfere with the company's progress.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-40)

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

38.	Individuals gain prestige among outsiders by joining this company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-41)
39.	A mistake by one member of the company might result in hardship for all.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-42)
40.	Failure of the company would mean nothing to most of the individuals in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-43)
41.	Each individual would lose his self-respect if the company should fail.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-44)
42.	Being in this company gives individuals a feeling of superiority.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-45)
43.	The activities of the company take up over half the time each individual is awake.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-46)
44.	Failure of the company would embarrass its members.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-47)
45.	Individuals are not rewarded for effort put out for the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-48)
46.	Certain individuals are mean to other members.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-49)
47.	There is constant bickering among individuals in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-50)
48.	Every man in this company looks out for the other guy as well as for himself.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-51)
49.	Certain members of the company have no respect for other members.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-52)

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

50. Certain members of the company are uncooperative. A B C D E (C-53)

51. There is a constant tendency toward plotting against one another in this company. A B C D E (C-54)

52. Individuals in the company work together as a team. A B C D E (C-55)

53. Certain members of the company are responsible for petty quarrels and some hard feelings among other members. A B C D E (C-56)

54. There are tensions between groups of people in the company which tend to interfere with the company's activities. A B C D E (C-57)

55. Certain members appear to be incapable of working as part of the company. A B C D E (C-58)

56. There are hard feelings among individuals which tends to pull the company apart. A B C D E (C-59)

57. There is a high degree of participation on the part of members. A B C D E (C-60)

58. If a member of the company is not productive he is not encouraged to remain. A B C D E (C-61)

59. Work of the company is left to those who are considered most capable for the job. A B C D E (C-62)

60. Individuals are interested in the company but not everyone wants to work. A B C D E (C-63)

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

61.	The company has a reputation for not getting much done.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-64)
62.	The work of the company is well divided among individuals.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-65)
63.	There are long periods during which the company does nothing.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-66)
64.	The company is directed toward one particular goal.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-67)
65.	The company knows exactly what is to get done.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-68)
66.	The company does many things that are not directly related to its main purpose.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-69)
67.	Each member of the company has a clear idea of the unit's goals.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-70)
68.	The objective of the company is specific.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-71)
69.	The company has major purposes which to some degree are in conflict.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-72)
70.	The objectives of the company have never been clearly realized.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-73)
71.	The company is very informal.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-74)

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

72.	A list of rules and regulations is posted for all to see.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-75)
73.	The company has formations at regularly scheduled times.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-76)
74.	The company's formations are not planned or organized.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-77)
75.	The company has an organization chart.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-78)
76.	The company has rules to guide its activities.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-79)
							(C-80-3)
							Card 4
							(C-1-ID)
77.	The company is staffed according to a table of organization.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-4)
78.	There is a recognized right and wrong way of going about company activities.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-5)
79.	Individuals don't have much say about what happens in the company.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-6)
80.	The company formations are held any place that happens to be handy.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-7)

Part 9

PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT/MORALE

Some soldiers adjust to the Army better than others. In this section we want your own opinion about your personal adjustment to the Army. You are to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements on the following pages. Be sure you respond to each statement.

INSTRUCTIONS:

a. READ each statment carefully.

b. DECIDE whether you (A) strongly agree, (B) agree, (C) are undecided, (D) disagree, or (E) strongly disagree with the statement.

c. INDICATE how you feel by circling the appropriate letter (A B C D E) next to the statement.

Key: A--Strongly Agree
B--Agree
C--Undecided
D--Disagree
E--Strongly Disagree

1.	I am interested in the duties I must perform.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 8)
2.	It takes me a long time to wake up.	A	B	C	D	E	(C- 9)
3.	I have felt rather irritable.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-10)
4.	My duties are boring.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-11)
5.	I am homesick.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-12)
6.	There is something here to cheer me up.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-13)
7.	I would like to stay in the Army.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-14)
8.	I feel like going to sleep earlier than I did in civilian life.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-15)
9.	I am in good humor and happy	A	B	C	D	E	(C-16)
10.	I find Army life dull.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-17)
11.	I feel like quitting the Army.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-18)
12.	I feel lonely.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-19)
13.	I am full of pep and energy.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-20)
14.	I don't like my current condition.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-21)
15.	I do not feel like talking to anyone.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-22)
16.	I am daydreaming more than usual.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-23)
17.	I wish people would let me alone.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-24)
18.	I have unpleasant feelings in my stomach.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-25)
19.	I am not pleased with myself.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-26)
20.	I feel sluggish a great deal of the time.	A	B	C	D	E	(C-27)

(C-28-___)

(C-80-4)

Part 10

WORK ENVIRONMENT PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

In this next part you will notice that questions are asked on <u>both</u> sides of the page. Be sure you answer the questions on both sides.

Ignore the spaces asking for your name, age, etc. Do not put your name on this questionnaire! Simply read the instructions on the next page and mark your answers as directed.

APPENDIX B

SCALE DEFINITIONS FOR

SOCIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 1. Initiation of Structure - CO.

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 9, Items 1-15

RELIABILITY:[1] .92

DESCRIPTION: Modification of Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) developed by Halpin & Winer.[2] The enlisted man describes the behavior of his CO by responding to 15 items which are summed to obtain a total score on the Initiation of Structure dimension which Halpin and Winer describe as follows:

> Initiation of Structure behaviors are those which indicate that the commander organizes and defines the relationship between himself and the members of his unit. He tends to define the role which he expects each member of the units to assume, and endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs done.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 2. Consideration - CO.

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 10, Items 16-30

RELIABILITY: .95

DESCRIPTION: Modification of LBDQ (See Initiation of Structure - CO). Halpin and Winer describe the consideration dimension as follows:

> Consideration behaviors are those indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationships between the commander and the men in his unit.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 3. Initiation of Structure - 1 SGT.

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 12, Items 1-15

RELIABILITY: .93

DESCRIPTION: See Initiation of Structure - CO

AD-A076 796 HRB-SINGER INC STATE COLLEGE PA F/G 5/11
SOCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS RELATED TO DRUG USE IN THE AR--ETC(U)
DEC 73 D G WALIZER DAHC19-73-C-0008
UNCLASSIFIED 4664-F-VOL-3 NL

2 OF 2
AD
A076796

END
DATE
FILMED
12-79
DDC

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 4. Consideration - 1 SGT.

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 13, Items 16-30

RELIABILITY: .90

DESCRIPTION: See Consideration - CO

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 5. Opinion of Officers

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 15, Items 1-5

RELIABILITY: .91

DESCRIPTION: A summative scale of five items adapted from The American Soldier[3] to assess, EM's overall opinion of the quality of the commissioned officers in the company.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 6. Opinion of NCO's

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 15, Items 1-5

RELIABILITY: .87

DESCRIPTION: A summative scale of five items adapted from The American Soldier to assess EM's overall opinion of the quality of the noncommissioned officers in the company.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 7. Living Conditions

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 17, Items 1-7

RELIABILITY: .64

DESCRIPTION: A summative scale of seven items designed to assess overall satisfaction with the living conditions (food, housing, medical treatment, etc.) at the present duty station.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 8. Social Life

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 17, Items 8-13

RELIABILITY: .64

DESCRIPTION: A 6-item summative scale designed to assess the soldier's satisfaction with opportunities for social life at his present duty station.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 9. Job Satisfaction

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 19, Items 1-13

RELIABILITY: .86

DESCRIPTION: A 13-item summative scale designed to assess the soldier's satisfaction with his present Army job. Most items were adapted from The American Soldier.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 10. Opinion of the Army.

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 21, Items 1-8

RELIABILITY: .81

DESCRIPTION: An 8-item summative scale designed to assess the overall opinion of the soldier about the Army. Items were adapted from The American Soldier.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 11 Group Control

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 23, Items 1-11

RELIABILITY: .82

DESCRIPTION: An 11-item summative scale adapted from Hemphill's[4] Group Dimensions Description Questionnaire (GDDQ). Hemphill's describes his original Control dimension as follows:

> Control is the degree to which a group regulates the behavior of individuals while they are functioning as group members. It is reflected by the modifications which group membership imposes on complete freedom of individual behavior and by the amount of intensity of group-derived government.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 12. Group Intimacy

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 23-24, Items 12-23

RELIABILITY: .84

DESCRIPTION: A 12-item summative scale adapted from Hemphill's GDDQ. Hemphill describes his original Intimacy dimension as follows:

> Intimacy is the degree to which members of a group are mutually acquainted with one another and are familiar with the most personal details of one another's lives. It is reflected by the nature of topics discussed by members, by modes of greeting, forms of address, and by interactions which presuppose a knowledge of the probable reaction of others under widely differing circumstances, as well as by the extent and type of knowledge each member has about other members of the group.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 13. Group Hedonic Tone

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Pages 24-25, Items 24-33

RELIABILITY: .85

DESCRIPTION: A 9-item summative scale based on Hemphill's GDDQ. Some items are adaptations from Hemphill, with in-house items added to increase the scale's reliability. Hemphill describes his original Hedonic Tone dimension as follows:

> Hedonic Tone is the degree to which group membership is accompained by a general feeling of pleasantness or agreeableness. It is reflected by the frequency of laughter, conviviality, pleasant anticipation of group meetings, and by the absence of griping and complaining.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 14. Group Potency

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Pages 25-26, Items 34-45

RELIABILITY: .90

DESCRIPTION: A 12-item summative scale adapted from Hemphill's GDDQ. Hemphill describes his original Potency dimension as follows:

> Potency is the degree to which a group has primary significance for its members. It is reflected by the kind of needs which a group is satisfying or has the potentiality of satisfying, by the extent of readjustment which would be required of members should the group fail, and by the degree to which a group has meaning to the members with reference to their central values.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 15. Group Viscidity

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Pages 26-27, Items 46-56

RELIABILITY: .93

DESCRIPTION: An 11-item summative scale adapted from Hemphill's GDDQ. Hemphill describes his original Viscidity dimension as follows:

> Viscidity is the degree to which members of the group function as a unit. It is reflected by absence of dissension and personal conflict among members, by absence of activities serving to advance only the interests of individual group members, by the ability of the group to resist disrupting forces, and by the belief on the part of the members that the group does function as a unit.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 16. Group Participation

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Pages 27-28, Items 57-63

RELIABILITY: .73

DESCRIPTION: A 7-item summative scale adapted from Hemphill's GDDQ. Hemphill describes his original Participation dimension as follows:

Participation is the degree to which members of a group apply time and effort to group activities. It is reflected by the number and kinds of duties members perform, by voluntary assumption of non-assigned duties and by the amount of time spent in group activities.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 17. Group Polarization

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 28, Items 64-70

RELIABILITY: .86

DESCRIPTION: A 7-item summative scale adapted from Hemphill's GDDQ.

Hemphill describes his original Polarization dimension as follows:

Polarization is the degree to which a group is oriented and works toward a single goal which is clear and specific to all members.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 18. Group Flexibility

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Pages 28-29, Items 71-80

RELIABILITY: .87

DESCRIPTION: A 10-item summatice scale adapted from Hemphill's GDDQ.

Hemphill describes his original Flexibility dimension as follows:

Flexibility is the degree to which a group's activities are marked by informal procedures rather than by adherence to established procedures. It is reflected by the extent to which duties of members are free from specification through custom, tradition, written rules, regulations, codes of procedure, or even unwritten but clearly prescribed ways of behaving.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 19. Personal Adjustment/Morale

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Page 31, Items 1-20

RELIABILITY: .91

DESCRIPTION: A 20-item summative scale with items adapted from Waybrew,[5] The American Soldier, and several in-house items. The Personal Adjustment/ Morale scale purports to measure the short-term, situational, affective reactions of the individuals in the unit.

NAME OF SCALE: Scale 20. Work Environment Preference Schedule

LOCATION IN QUESTIONNAIRE: Attached, no page numbers

RELIABILITY:

DESCRIPTION: Gordon's Work Environment Preference Schedule (WEPS).[6] According to the author:

> His scores typify individuals who are accepting of and acquiescent to authority, who prefer to have specific rules and guidelines to follow, who prefer impersonalized work relationships, and who seek the security of organizational and in-groups identification. Low scores are made by individuals who do not so characterize themselves.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX B

1. All reliabilities reported for scales of the social/organizational questionnaire are based on coefficient alpha calculated from the data from the pretest administration (135 enlisted men, CONUS post, January, 1972). Scales 7 and 8 were combined in the pretest; thus the reliability shown is the same for each scale. This fact may account for the low reliabilities found for these two scales.

2. The LBDQ is described in Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.D. (Eds.) Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Ohio State University: Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.

3. Stouffer, S.A., Suchman, E.A., DeVinney, L.C., Star, S.A., & Williams, R.M. The American Solider: Volumes I & II. New York: Wiley, 1965.

4. Hemphill, J.K. Group dimensions: A manual for their measurement. Ohio State University: Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 87, 1956.

5. Waybrew, B.B. Psychological problems of prolonged marine submergence. In Burns, N.M., Chambers, R.M., and Hendler, E. (Eds.) Unusual environments and human behavior. Free Press, 1963.

6. Gordon, L.V. Measurement of bureaucratic orientation. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 1-11.

APPENDIX C

TAB 1

EM INTERVIEW SCHEDULE CODING SHEET

(C-1) UNIT ID_____

QUESTION 1: SEVERAL WEEKS AGO YOUR UNIT WAS GIVEN A DRUG USE QUESTIONNAIRE TO FILL OUT. HOW MANY OF THE MEN COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE ACCURATELY, MOST, SOME, OR FEW?

(C-6) 1 MOST

2 SOME

3 FEW

_ OTHER

QUESTION 1a: (IF QUESTIONNAIRE WAS GIVEN A SECOND TIME) HOW MANY OF THE MEN COMPLETED THE DRUG USE QUESTIONNAIRE ACCURATELY THIS TIME, MORE, THE SAME, OR LESS?

(C-7) 1 WAS NOT GIVEN SECOND TIME

2 MOST

3 SOME

4 FEW

_ OTHER

QUESTION 2: HOW ACCURATELY DID THE MEN COMPLETE THE LARGE QUESTIONNAIRE YOU JUST FINISHED?

(C-8) 1 MOST

2 SOME

3 FEW

_ OTHER

QUESTION 2b: WHAT SPECIFICALLY DID YOU LIKE ABOUT IT?

(C-9) ___

(C-10) ___

(C-11) ___

QUESTION 2c: WHAT SPECIFICALLY DIDN'T YOU LIKE ABOUT IT?

(C-12) ___

(C-13) ___

(C-14) ___

QUESTION 2d: WHAT OTHER QUESTIONS SHOULD WE HAVE ASKED THAT MIGHT RELATE TO WHY PEOPLE USE DRUGS IN THE ARMY?

(C-15) ___

(C-16) ___

(C-18) ___

QUESTION 3: WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAIN REASONS PEOPLE USE DRUGS, INCLUDING ALCOHOL, IN THE ARMY?

(C-18) ___

(C-19) ___

(C-20) ___

(C-21) ___

(C-22) ___

QUESTION 4: GIVEN THAT (PARAPHASE THEIR REASONS) ARE THE REAL REASONS, WHAT COULD THE ARMY DO TO REDUCE DRUG USE IN THE ARMY?

(C-23) ___

(C-24) ___

(C-25) ___

(C-26) ___

(C-27) ___

QUESTION 5: I HAVE HERE A LIST OF DRUGS. IN YOUR ESTIMATION, WHAT PERCENT OF E1's - E5's IN THIS UNIT USE EACH OF THESE DRUGS?

(C-28) ___ALCOHOL

(C-30) ___CANNABIS

(C-32) ___HALLUCINOGENS

(C-34) ___AMPHETAMINES

(C-36) ___BARBITURATES

(C-38) ___MANDRAX

(C-40) ___COCAINE

(C-42) ___OPIATES

(C-44) ___METHADONE

QUESTION 7: WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE OVERALL LEVEL OF DRUG USE IN THIS UNIT AS LOW, AVERAGE, OR HIGH COMPARED TO OTHER UNITS?

(C-46) 1 LOW

2 AVERAGE

3 HIGH

_ OTHER

QUESTION 8: WHAT IS YOUR CO'S ATTITUDE ABOUT DRUGS?

(C-47) 1 STRONG ANTI

2 MIDDLE ANTI

3 NO HASSLE

4 PRO

_ OTHER

QUESTION 9: DOES YOUR CO KNOW MUCH ABOUT DRUGS?

(C-48) 1 A LOT

2 SOME

3 LITTLE OR NONE

_ OTHER

QUESTION 10: IF YOU HAD A DRUG PROBLEM AND YOU WENT TO YOUR CO ABOUT IT, WOULD HE BE MORE INTERESTED IN HELPING YOU OR IN PUNISHING YOU?

(C-49) 1 HELPING

2 PUNISHING

3 OTHER

QUESTION 11: WOULD YOU GO TO THE CO IF YOU HAD A PERSONAL PROBLEM, NOT NECESSARILY DRUG-RELATED?

(C-50) 1 YES

2 NO

_ OTHER

QUESTION 13: WHAT IS YOUR FIRST SERGEAN'T ATTITUDE ABOUT DRUGS?

(C-51) 1 STRONG ANTI

2 MILDLY ANTI

3 NO HASSLE

4 PRO

_ OTHER

QUESTION 14: DOES YOUR FIRST SERGEANT KNOW MUCH ABOUT DRUGS? (HOW MUCH?)

(C-52) 1 A LOT

2 SOME

3 LITTLE OR NONE

_ OTHER

QUESTION 15: HOW MUCH PRESSURE DO YOU GET FROM OTHER MEN IN THE COMPANY TO USE DRUGS?

(C-53) 1 A LOT OR SOME

2 NONE (LIVE AND LET LIVE)

_ OTHER

QUESTION 16: HOW MUCH PRESSURE DO YOU GET FROM OTHER MEN IN THE COMPANY TO STOP USING DRUGS?

(C-54) 1 A LOT OR SOME

2 NONE (LIVE AND LET LIVE)

_ OTHER

QUESTION 17: WHO USUALLY GIVES COMMAND INFORMATION CLASSES IN YOUR UNIT?

(C-55) 1 CO

2 XO OR OTHER OFFICER

3 1ST SGT. OR OTHER NCO

_ OTHER

QUESTION 17a: HOW OFTEN DO YOU HAVE CI CLASSES:

(C-56) 1 ONCE A WEEK (USUALLY)

2 ONCE A MONTH (USUALLY)

3 LESS THAN MONTHLY

4 ALMOST NEVER

_ OTHER

QUESTION 17b: IS CI USUALLY WORTHWHILE?

(C-57) 1 YES, USUALLY

2 YES, SOMETIMES

3 NO, NEVER

_ OTHER

QUESTION 18: IN YOUR OPINION IS THIS UNIT COMBAT READY?

(C-58) 1 YES, UNQUALIFIED

2 NO, UNQUALIFIED

3 MEN ARE, EQUIPMENT IS NOT

4 EQUIPMENT IS, MEN ARE NOT

_ OTHER

QUESTION 19: IF YOUR UNIT HAD TO GO INTO COMBAT TOMORROW, HOW WOULD IT DO?

(C-59) _____

(C-60) _____

(C-61) _____

QUESTION 20: WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE MORALE OF YOUR UNIT AS LOW, AVERAGE, OR HIGH?

(C-62) 1 LOW

2 AVERAGE

3 HIGH

_ OTHER

QUESTION 22a: WHAT ARE YOUR COMPANY'S SOCIAL FUNCTIONS LIKE?

(C-63) _____

(C-64) _____

QUESTION 22b: HOW OFTEN DO COMPANY SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OCCUR?

(C-65) 1 OFTEN (3 OR MORE PER YEAR)

2 SOMETIMES (1 OR 2 PER YEAR)

3 RARELY OR NEVER

_ OTHER

(C-66) 1 IDENTIFIER FOR EM SCHEDULE

(C-67) _ IDENTIFIER FOR HIGH OR LOW USE UNIT

TAB 2

CO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE CODING SHEET

(C-1) UNIT ID _____

(C-6) 1 I AM CO

2 I AM XO

(C-7) _ MONTHS

QUESTION 2: HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN IN THE ARMY?

(C-9) _ YEARS

QUESTION 3: HOW LONG HAS YOUR FIRST SERGEANT BEEN IN THIS UNIT?

(C-11) _ MONTHS PRESENT 1ST SGT.

(C-13) _ MONTHS PREVIOUS 1ST SGT.

QUESTION 5: WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE MORALE OF YOUR UNIT AS LOW, AVERAGE, OR HIGH?

(C-15) 1 LOW

2 AVERAGE

3 HIGH

_ OTHER

QUESTION 6: I HAVE HERE A LIST OF DRUGS. IN YOUR ESTIMATION, WHAT PERCENT OF THE E1'S THROUGH E5'S IN THIS UNIT USE EACH OF THESE DRUGS? (GROUP CONSENSUS)

(C-16) ___ALCOHOL

(C-18) ___CANNABIS

(C-20) ___HALLUCINOGENS

(C-22) ___AMPHETAMINES

(C-24)___ BARBITURATES

(C-26) ___MANDRAX

(C-28) ___COCAINE

(C-30) ___OPIATES

(C-32) ___METHADONE

QUESTION 7: WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE OVERALL LEVEL OF DRUG USE AMONG THE EI'S IN YOUR UNIT AS LOW, AVERAGE, OR HIGH, COMPARED TO OTHER UNITS?

(C-34) 1 LOW

2 AVERAGE

3 HIGH

_ OTHER

QUESTION 8: WHAT WOULD YOU DO WITH AN EM WHO WAS CAUGHT USING MARIJUANA FOR THE FIRST TIME? (WHAT FACTORS WOULD YOU TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION?)

(C-35) _____

(C-36) _____

QUESTION 9: WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAIN REASONS PEOPLE USE DRUGS, INCLUDING ALCOHOL, IN THE ARMY?

(C-37) _____

(C-38) _____

(C-39) _____

(C-40) _____

(C-41) _____

QUESTION 10: GIVEN THAT (PARAPHASE THEIR REASONS) ARE THE REAL REASONS, WHAT COULD THE ARMY DO TO REDUCE DRUG USE IN THE ARMY?

(C-42) _____

(C-43) _____

(C-44) _____

(C-45) _____

(C-46) _____

QUESTION 11: WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE RANDOM URINALYSIS PROGRAM? IS IT EFFECTIVE OR INEFFECTIVE? SHOULD IT BE CONTINUED, DISCONTINUED, OR CHANGED (IF SO HOW)?

(C-47) 1 GOOD IDEA BUT NOT RUN RIGHT

2 GOOD IDEA AND OF USE TO ME

3 BAD IDEA, ELIMINATE

_ OTHER

QUESTION 12a: WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE REHABILITATION PROGRAM AT THIS POST?

(C-48) 1 GOOD IDEA BUT NOT RUN RIGHT

2 GOOD IDEA AND SEEMS OF BENEFIT

3 BAD IDEA, ARMY SHOULDN'T BE IN REHAB BUSINESS

_ OTHER

QUESTION 12b: WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE EXEMPTION PROGRAMS AT THIS POST?

(C-49) 1 GOOD IDEA, BUT NOBODY USES IT

2 GOOD IDEA, HELPS PEOPLE

3 BAD IDEA, TROOPS ABUSE IT

4 BAD IDEA, TROOPS ARE ABUSED

_ OTHER

QUESTION 12c: WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAM AT THIS POST?

(C-50) 1 GOOD FOR OFFICERS AND EM'S

2 GOOD FOR OFFICERS, BAD FOR EM'S

3 BAD FOR OFFICERS, GOOD FOR EM'S

4 BAD FOR EVERYBODY

_ OTHER

QUESTION 15: WHO USUALLY GIVES THE COMMAND INFORMATION CLASSES IN YOUR UNITS?

(C-51) 1 CO

2 XO OR OTHER OFFICER

3 1ST SRGT. OR OTHER NCO

_ OTHER

QUESTION 16: HOW OFTEN DOES YOUR UNIT HAVE CI?

(C-52) 1 ONCE A WEEK (USUALLY)

2 ONCE A MONTH (USUALLY)

3 LESS THAN MONTHLY

4 ALMOST NEVER

_ OTHER

QUESTION 17: WHAT IS DONE TO INSURE MAXIMUM ATTENDANCE AT THE CI CLASSES?

(C-53) 1 ATTENDANCE MANDATORY

2 ATTENDANCE NOT MANDATORY

_ OTHER

QUESTION 19: WHAT ARE SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECTS THAT SHOULD BE PRESENTED AT CI?

(C-54) _____

(C-55) _____

(C-56) _____

(C-57) _____

(C-58) _____

QUESTION 20: WHAT FORM DO THE CI CLASSES USUALLY TAKE? (LECTURE, DISCUSSION, MOVIES, ETC.)

(C-60) 1 LECTURE

2 DISCUSSION

3 LECTURE/DISCUSSION

_ OTHER

QUESTION 21a: WHAT ARE YOUR COMPANY'S SOCIAL FUNCTIONS LIKE?

(C-60) _____

(C-61) _____

QUESTION 21b: HOW OFTEN DO COMPANY SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OCCUR?

(C-62) 1 OFTEN (3 OR MORE PER YEAR)

2 SOMETIMES (1 OR 2 PER YEAR)

3 RARELY OR NEVER

_ OTHER

(C-66) 2 IDENTIFIER FOR CO SCHEDULE

(C-67) _ IDENTIFIER FOR HIGH OR LOW USE

APPENDIX D

Table D-1 S/O Scale Intercorrelations

Scale No.	Scale 1	Scale 2	Scale 3	Scale 4	Scale 5	Scale 6	Scale 7	Scale 8	Scale 9	Scale 10	Scale 11	Scale 12	Scale 13	Scale 14	Scale 15	Scale 16	Scale 17	Scale 18
2	0.49																	
3	0.43	0.67																
4	0.33	0.16	0.33															
5	0.40	0.71	0.09	0.14														
6	0.46	0.41	0.17	0.48	0.59													
7	0.40	0.54	0.22	0.29	0.53	0.55												
8	0.30	0.26	0.17	0.39	0.29	0.39	0.47											
9	0.46	0.54	0.12	0.37	0.62	0.63	0.58	0.62										
10	0.46	0.55	0.20	0.38	0.69	0.74	0.72	0.58	0.84									
11	-0.19	-0.66	0.01	-0.34	-0.59	-0.52	-0.64	-0.35	-0.52	-0.57								
12	-0.14	-0.12	0.08	-0.08	-0.25	-0.34	-0.28	-0.12	-0.33	-0.49	0.22							
13	0.52	0.74	0.25	0.42	0.61	0.56	0.69	0.36	0.54	0.61	-0.67	-0.02						
14	0.62	0.71	0.32	0.43	0.65	0.67	0.67	0.52	0.68	0.80	-0.53	-0.20	0.81					
15	0.37	0.50	0.28	0.18	0.40	0.19	0.44	0.19	0.22	0.21	-0.39	0.24	0.74	0.44				
16	0.52	0.42	0.39	0.35	0.29	0.34	0.36	0.38	0.48	0.46	-0.19	-0.05	0.57	0.61	0.49			
17	0.61	0.60	0.23	0.46	0.49	0.52	0.58	0.50	0.61	0.63	-0.54	-0.18	0.78	0.77	0.53	0.68		
18	-0.48	-0.22	-0.49	-0.39	-0.26	-0.36	-0.28	-0.17	-0.29	-0.32	0.14	-0.01	-0.40	-0.42	-0.22	-0.31	-0.42	
19	0.37	0.45	0.11	0.30	0.55	0.54	0.68	0.64	0.78	0.79	-0.54	-0.35	0.57	0.64	0.26	0.38	0.56	-0.34

APPENDIX E

Table E-1 Analysis of variance summary table, S/O scales, interaction of level of use and theater

S/O Scale		Distribution		F
		H	L	
Structure - CO	C	55.3	56.5	1.07
	K	56.3	55.4	
	G	52.1	55.5	
		H	L	
Consideration - CO	C	42.2	47.8	<1
	K	41.8	47.4	
	G	39.7	40.1	
		H	L	
Structure - 1SGT	C	58.1	58.3	1.12
	K	60.2	56.8	
	G	56.0	55.3	
		H	L	
Consideration - 1SGT	C	42.7	46.3	1.57
	K	51.2	46.9	
	G	40.9	45.0	
		H	L	
Opinion of Officers	C	12.9	14.2	1.44
	K	11.9	13.7	
	G	11.8	12.0	
		H	L	
Opinion of NCO's	C	12.8	13.6	<1
	K	12.8	13.0	
	G	11.7	11.9	
		H	L	
Social Life	C	18.6	19.6	<1
	K	18.0	18.5	
	G	16.0	16.1	
		H	L	
Living Conditions	C	15.2	15.8	<1
	K	17.7	18.1	
	G	13.6	14.7	

Table E-1 (cont.)

S/O Scale		Distribution		F
		H	L	
Job Satisfaction	C	32.0	35.4	<1
	K	33.3	36.6	
	G	30.5	32.6	
		H	L	
Opinion of Army	C	18.7	20.1	<1
	K	18.7	19.8	
	G	16.9	17.6	
		H	L	
Group Control	C	38.0	36.6	1.67
	K	37.5	37.7	
	G	38.6	39.7	
		H	L	
Group Intimacy	C	39.0	38.2	<1
	K	39.6	39.7	
	G	40.3	39.6	
		H	L	
Group Hedonic Tone	C	24.8	25.3	<1
	K	24.4	25.6	
	G	22.7	22.3	
		H	L	
Group Potency	C	32.6	33.4	<1
	K	32.5	33.8	
	G	29.7	29.8	
		H	L	
Group Viscidity	C	28.9	29.4	<1
	K	28.9	29.5	
	G	27.7	26.6	
		H	L	
Group Participation	C	20.5	20.8	<1
	K	21.3	21.6	
	G	19.9	20.5	

Table E-1 (cont.)

S/O Scale		Distribution		F
		H	L	
Group Polarization	C	19.4	19.5	<1
	K	20.1	20.7	
	G	17.6	18.6	
		H	L	
Group Flexibility	C	26.6	25.8	1.12
	K	26.1	25.6	
	G	26.4	27.2	
		H	L	
Morale	C	53.2	56.9	<1
	K	53.7	57.7	
	G	49.2	52.0	

APPENDIX F

TAB 1

EXAMPLES OF RESPONSES INCLUDED IN THE

"REASONS FOR DRUG USE" CODING CATEGORIES.

CATEGORY 1. PLEASURE - SEEKING

availability
enjoyment
experimentation
independence from home, increased freedom

CATEGORY 2. PERSONALITY PROBLEM

person is immature
person lacks will power
person has no self-discipline

(Note: No reference ever made to environment)

CATEGORY 3. DRUG USING SUBCULTURE

peer pressure
used drugs before entering Army
not Army's problem (fault)
identify with civilian way of life
everybody does it

CATEGORY 4. COPE WITH PROBLEMS

personal
job
Army leadership, rules & regulations
boredom
army facilities
off-post environment
general

TAB 2

EXAMPLES OF RESPONSES INCLUDED
IN THE "HOW TO REDUCE DRUG USE"
CODING CATEGORIES.

CATEGORY 1. IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

better medical facilities
better food
more privacy, let private possessions be secured
better pay, overseas compensation
hair length
rotate units
station EM closer to home
make Army life less monotonous
relax pass policy
shorter tours
provide transportation to get home
more personal freedom (off-duty), relax stringent regulations
make it easier to continue education in the Army
more liberal transfer policies
provide government housing for all maried EM
provide cultural exchange programs

CATEGORY 2. EMPHASIZE DETECTION & PUNISHMENT

make frequent rounds through barracks
keep urinalysis program
make discipline more strict
tighten up security on post
disciplinary action
make drug laws harsher
separate known users from other men

CATEGORY 3. DE-EMPHASIZE DRUG PROBLEM

up to the individual
stop shake downs at night
stop making such an issue of drug use
less attention to drugs
individual's own thing
legalize marijuana

CATEGORY 4a. RECRUIT BETTER PEOPLE

improve Army recruiting program

CATEGORY 4b. GET HONEST RECRUITORS

CATEGORY 5a. DISCHARGE USERS AND INCOMPETENTS

get users out of Army
remove irresponsible men

CATEGORY 5b. ALLOW USERS TO RESIGN

CATEGORY 6. IMPROVED LEADERSHIP & COMMUNICATIONS

cut harrassment by officers and NCO's
need a go-between between CO & EM
eliminate discrimination between ranks
more equitable discipline
make officers more human
increased attention to needs and interests of EM
counsel men
improve communications

CATEGORY 7. JOB ENRICHMENT

make promotions fair
put men in MOS they want
allow change in MOS if not satisfied
more interesting and realistic training
give man usable skill
more well-defined missions
more responsibilities for men

CATEGORY 8. IMPROVED DRUG EDUCATION

CATEGORY 9. IMPROVED REHABILITATION SYSTEM

clean record after rehabilitation
qualified staff on rehabilitation
not concern of CO - concern of rehabilitation
sensible handling of drug users

CATEGORY 10. KEEP MEN BUSY

work harder in the day
keep them constantly occupied
demand more from troops