AD-A077 998 HUMAN SCIENCES RESEARCH INC MCLEAN VA F/G 5/9
AN ANALYSIS OF RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING IN USA--ETC(U)
JUL 78 M A GILBERT , P G NORDLIE DAHC19-76-C-0015
UNCLASSIFIED ARI-TR-78-B10 NL

1 OF 2
AD A077998



LEVEL II

ARI TECHNICAL REPORT
TR-78-B10

AD A077998

AN ANALYSIS OF RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING IN USAREUR

by

Marcia A. Gilbert and Peter G. Nordlie
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

July 1978

DDC FILE COPY

Contract DAHC 19-76-C-0015

James A. Thomas, Technical Monitor
ARI Field Unit
Presidio of Monterey, California

DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 12 1979
D

Prepared for

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
for the BEHAVIORAL and SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22333

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

79 22 5 093

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director (Designate)

WILLIAM L. HAUSER
Colonel, US Army
Commander

Research accomplished
under contract to the Department of the Army

Human Sciences Research, Inc.
McLean, VA 22101

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-P, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

ARI TECHNICAL REPORT

TR-78-B10

AN ANALYSIS OF RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING IN USAREUR

by

Marcia A. Gilbert and Peter G. Nordlie
Human Sciences Research, Inc
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

July 1978

Contract DAHC 19-76-C-0015

James A. Thomas, Technical Monitor
ARI Field Unit
Presidio of Monterey, California

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

Prepared for



U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
for the BEHAVIORAL and SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Army Project Number 2Q763744A769 Equal Opportunity

This report on an advanced development research project is designed to meet military management requirements for research bearing on a specific management problem. A limited distribution is made, primarily to the operating agencies directly involved.

173 250 LB

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Title:	**An Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in USAREUR**
Authors:	**Marcia A. Gilbert and Peter G. Nordlie**
Sponsor:	**U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**
Contract Number:	**DAHC 19-76-C-0015**
Contracting Officer's Technical Representative:	**Dr. James A. Thomas**

This is one of a series of reports from a study of Army race relations and equal opportunity training. The scope of this particular report is limited to race relations/equal opportunity training in USAREUR. The other reports prepared on this project are listed on pages 4-5.

The primary objective of this task in the project was to describe and analyze the RR/EO unit training program as it was being implemented in USAREUR and, to the extent possible, to assess the impact the training is having. In addition, as a substudy, it was possible to obtain some information on the impact of two courses taught at the USAREUR Race Relations School, namely the 20-day Part-Time Instructors Course and the 5-day Unit Commanders Course.

The research team visited seven communities in Germany in October of 1976 and again in May of 1977, and collected a variety of information from the following sources:

- A questionnaire survey to a 40 percent random sample of 75 companies at Time 1 and 70 companies at Time 2.
- Interviews with and questionnaires from company commanders of the units surveyed.
- Interviews with selected brigade and battalion commanders.
- Group interviews with and questionnaires from:
  - selected junior enlisted personnel;
  - senior enlisted personnel;
  - DRRI graduates;
  - URRS graduates.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

The report is organized around five major topics: (1) Racial Climate in USAREUR; (2) Attitudes toward and Perceptions of RR/EO Programs; (3) The Conduct of RR/EO Training; (4) Changes in Attitudes and Perceptions; and (5) USAREUR Race Relations School. Findings in each of these areas and the conclusions drawn from them are presented. The conclusions are summarized in the following sections.

Racial Climate in USAREUR

There is no evidence that the racial climate is improving and there is some evidence that it is, in fact, deteriorating. With respect to responses to a few global questions on the state of race relations, the response patterns of late 1976 and early 1977, are closer to those of 1972 than they are to those of the less tense period of 1974. Whites and non-whites are significantly different in their perceptions on almost every indicator. While whites and non-whites live and work in a common environment, the race relations/equal opportunity reality each group perceives has little in common. There is slightly greater polarity of opinions between whites and blacks in USAREUR than in CONUS.

It is our impression, drawn from the interviews and observations as well as from the questionnaire responses, that there are growing racial tensions in USAREUR but they are obscured by a surface calm inasmuch as the normal telltale signs of violent confrontations are not occurring. In general, we detect a strong current of feeling among whites that the RR/EO program has "overcorrected." Among blacks, the dominant feeling seems to be one of unmet expectations. Overall, we believe the racial climate in USAREUR is not improving and may, in fact, be worsening. This is occurring at the same time that the priority and emphasis on RR/EO training also appears to be waning.

The Conduct of RR/EO Training in USAREUR

The total amount of RR/EO training occurring in USAREUR is greater than anywhere else in the Army. The amount of unit training, however, appears to be declining under the new FY 77 program. The problems commanders experienced with the preceding

Phase III program are still present in the new program. There is some indication that the 12-hour Community-Level orientation training conducted by DRRI or URRS graduates may be the most effective block of instruction of its type. The Executive Seminar part of the program appears to hold promise of being useful, although too few had been held at the time of the survey to obtain much information.

Judging from the lower frequency of occurrence of unit training and from discussions with commanders and RR/EO personnel, it was concluded that, as it is being implemented at the unit level, RR/EO training is accorded a very low priority by chain-of-command personnel in general.

Attitudes toward and Perceptions of RR/EO Programs

There appears to be a general consensus at all levels and for all races that a *need* exists for RR/EO training. There is also a fairly high consensus that the unit training program—both Phase III and FY 77—is not meeting that need. RR/EO programs have a fairly negative image among both blacks and whites.

Many blacks feel that the Army is only interested in the program for public relations purposes or as a token gesture aimed at vocal minority groups. They believe that the Army is not really committed to equal opportunity and they distrust the motivations of commanders.

Many whites dislike the RR/EO program because too much emphasis is placed on minority history and culture and they are concerned that RR/EO programs only benefit minorities. They recognize that problems exist but they dislike the approach taken in training.

Changes in Attitudes and Perceptions

Data collected at the end of the six-month period under study, overall show signs of a slight improvement in the racial climate and in attitudes toward the RR/EO program

during that time period during which the FY 77 program was in effect—October 1976-May 1977. That improvement was small, and, with some indicators changing in the opposite direction, it was not interpreted as signaling a real upturn in what was believed to be a worsening racial climate.

The most striking finding is just how stable and resistant to change are the black-white differences in perceptions and attitudes. The inability to have much effect on these differences is testimony either to the fact that the training program is not being vigorously and effectively implemented or that the basic model on which the training program is based is inappropriate to the task. The basic unit training model which requires chain-of-command personnel to conduct training in subjects in which they are generally ill-prepared and uncomforatble is not likely to produce effective training even if it were vigorously and enthusiastically implemented. In addition to the inappropriateness of the basic model, its implementation by personnel who themselves are not persuaded of the importance and validity of the program's content and goals cannot help but communicate messages about the low priority, non-credible status of the program.

USAREUR Race Relations School

The school was seen as doing a good job in achieving its objectives in both the Part-Time Instructors Course and the Unit Commanders Course. It was thought that the Part-Time Instructors Course was the most effective training-of-trainers course observed in the Army in the course of this study. The major criticism was the lack of any content dealing with institutional discrimination and how it operates in the Army.

The Unit Commanders Course appeared to meet a real need and was doing so successfully. The primary criticism here, too, was the omission of content on institutional discrimination. Overall, however, the UCC appeared to be a successful pioneering effort to conduct training at a most critical level where the RR/EO education and training program as a whole has failed to reach.

Concluding Comments

The USAREUR command has clearly placed a high emphasis on RR/EO training and has initiated repeated and real efforts to make it more effective. That these efforts achieve so little is testimony to the virulence and ubiquity of the basic problem and its stubborn resistance to change. In the eyes of the people the program is intended to reach, the program suffers from a lack of credibility. *At the unit level where the program is* implemented, it has tended to acquire a strong negative image. This is not likely to be overcome as long as those responsible for implementing the program share that image. To change that fact, the chain-of-command personnel must first be trained such that they understand and accept the goals of the RR/EO program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ii

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW 3

Background 3

Relationship of USAREUR to the Total Study 4

Objectives 5

Research Approach 6

Research Design 6
The Sample 8

Organization of This Report 10

II. THE RACIAL CLIMATE IN USAREUR 11

Racial Attitudes and Perceptions 11

Equality of Treatment 11
Promotions 13
Punishment 14
Work Assignments 15
Training Opportunities 16
Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites 16

Behavioral Aspects of Racial Climate 18

Voluntary Racial Separation 18
Race-Related Verbal Behavior 20
Racial Conflict 22
Positive Interracial Interactions 23

Summary and Conclusions about the Racial Climate 27

III. CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE RR/EO PROGRAM 29

Attitudes about the RR/EO Program 29

Attitudes and Perceptions about Race Relations Training 34

Attitudes of Commanders, RR/EO Personnel and Selected Enlisted Perosnnel 38
Summary 41

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

IV. THE CONDUCT OF RR/EO SEMINARS IN USAREUR 43
The Phase III Training Model 43
Community-Level Seminars 44
Unit-Level Seminars 46
The FY 77 Training Model 50
Summary 53
V. ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS FROM THE SECOND SURVEY 55
Racial Climate 55
Attitudes toward the RR/EO Program 61
Summary 67
VI. THE USAREUR RACE RELATIONS SCHOOL 69
The URRS–Part-Time Instructors Course (URRS) 69
Unit Commanders Race Relations Course (UCC) 70
The Data Obtained 72
Impact of the URRS Course on Students 73
Unit Commanders Course (UCC) 77
General Conclusions on URRS and UCC Courses 80
VII. RR/EO TRAINING IN USAREUR–CONCLUSIONS 83
Racial Climate in USAREUR 83
The Conduct of RR/EO Training in USAREUR 84
Attitudes toward and Perceptions of RR/EO Programs 85
Changes in Attitudes and Perceptions 86
USAREUR Race Relations School 86
Concluding Comment 87
APPENDIX A: CHI-SQUARE TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE 89
APPENDIX B: MEASUREMENT SCALES USED IN USAREUR SURVEY 93

LIST OF TABLES

1	Racial Distribution of the Sample	8
2	Racial Distribution by Questionnaire Versions	9
3	Perception of Equality of Treatment	12
4	Perceptions of What It Takes to Make the Grade in the Army	13
5	Perceptions of Promotion Opportunities	14
6	Perceptions of Punishment for Breaking Rules	15
7	Perceptions of Assignment to Work Details	15
8	Perceptions of Opportunities for Training	16
9	Perceptions of the Effect of the Army's RR/EO Program on Whites	17
10	Perception of What is Happening to the Rights of White Middle-Class Americans	17
11	Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites	18
12	Perceptions of On-Duty Voluntary Separations	19
13	Perceptions of Off-Duty Voluntary Separations	20
14	Use of Racial Slurs	21
15	Racist Joke Telling	21
16	Interracial Harassment	22
17	Perceptions of Interracial Conflict	23
18	Helping Behavior	23
19	Racial Interaction	24
20	Perceived Quality of Race Relations	24
21	Perceived Changes in Quality of Race Relations	25
22	Changes in Perceptions of Army Race Relations	26
23	Changes in Perceptions of the Trend in Race Relations	26
24	Perceived Desire for Racial Equality by Whites	29
25	Perception of Commitment to Equal Opportunity	30
26	Perception of Enforcement of RR/EO Policies	31

27	Perceptions of Command Support	32
28	Seriousness of the RR/EO Program	32
29	Perceptions of the Necessity of the Army's RR/EO Programs	33
30	Perceptions of Potential Benefits of the RR/EO Program	33
31	Perceptions of Importance of RR/EO Training	34
32	Effectiveness of Training in Reducing Racial Tensions	35
33	Perception of RR/EO Seminars' Effect on Increasing Interest in Improving Race Relations	36
34	Perceptions of the Effect of Unit RR/EO Seminars in Improving Race Relations	36
35	Perceptions of RR/EO Seminars' Effectiveness in Improving Unit Interracial Communications	37
36	Perceptions of the Usefulness of Race Relations Seminars	37
37	Perceived Command Support	38
38	Groups Needing Training	39
39	Need for an RR/EO Program	40
40	Time Since Attending Last Community-Level Seminar	44
41	Avoidance of Community-Level Seminars	45
42	Frequency with Which Unit-Level Seminars are Held	46
43	Time Since Attending Last Unit-Level Seminar	47
44	Avoidance of Unit-Level Seminars	48
45	Instructors for Unit-Level Seminars	48
46	Subject Matter of Unit-Level Seminars	49
47	Comparison of RR/EO Training Programs	51
48	Number of Unit RR/EO Seminars Held	52
49	Instructors for Unit RR/EO Seminars	52
50	Perceptions of Equality of Treatment across Time	56
51	Perception of Promotion Opportunities across Time	56
52	Perception of Assignment to Work Details across Time	57
53	Perceptions of Opportunities for Training across Time	57

54	Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites across Time	58
55	Racist Joke Telling across Time	58
56	Open Racial Conflict across Time	59
57	Racial Interaction across Time	59
58	Perceived Quality of Race Relations across Time	60
59	Perceived Changes in Quality of Race Relations across Time	60
60	Perceived Desire for Racial Equality by Whites across Time	61
61	Perception of Enforcement of RR/EO Policies across Time	62
62	Perception of the RR/EO Program across Time	63
63	Perception of the Need for RR/EO Program across Time	63
64	Perceptions of Potential Benefits of the RR/EO Program across Time	64
65	Perceptions of the Usefulness of Race Relations Seminars across Time	64
66	Perceptions of Requirements of Race Relations Seminars across Time	65
67	Perceptions by Company Commanders of the Need for the Program across Time	66
68	Perceptions by Company Commanders of Command Support across Time	66

ANALYSIS OF
RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING
IN USAREUR

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Background

The development and implementation of race relations and equal opportunity programs within the Army during the late sixties and early seventies constituted one of the most massive change efforts of its type ever undertaken by any large organization. The creation of training programs, the development of race relations/equal opportunity (RR/EO) staffs, the formulation and enforcement of new policies, all required a tremendous investment of time and effort. At their very outset, the Army's race relations training programs were initiated quickly to meet urgent needs; there was little precedent on which to build and no experience with such training in the military. Methods were chosen and content formulated on the basis of limited experience, trial and error, and the best judgments of relatively few people.

The orginal Army-wide race relations and equal opportunity training program (RAP I) was a mandatory 18-hour block of instruction which was generally taught by graduates of the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI) at the post or community. By early 1974, that program was modified by a revised AR 600-42 to create RAP II which placed the primary responsibility for conducting RR/EO training on the chain of command and required seminars to be conducted within units in platoon-sized groups on a monthly basis. The basic RR/EO policy documents were revised again in September 1977.

A somewhat different model was developed for USAREUR and described in USAREUR Supplement 1 to AR 600-21 and USAREUR Supplement 1 to AR 600-42. The USAREUR versions of the training program called for more emphasis on centralized, community-level training. This USAREUR program was in turn revised in September 1976 in a new USAREUR Supplement 1 to AR 600-42.

The original Army training program was created and most of the subsequent changes in the program have been made with little input from evaluation research designed to measure the effectiveness of the training being given. A major impetus for the present research study is to obtain objective data on what impact the training is having. A further impetus is the desire to determine how, in fact, the present policy is actually being implemented in the field. These two needs for information provide the twin thrusts behind the present study—i.e., program analysis and impact assessment.

Relationship of USAREUR to the Total Study

In the unit training program analysis and assessment part of the total study, data were collected from locations in CONUS, USAREUR, and Korea. Because the overall situation is different in the three locations, somewhat different research designs were required in the three locations and it was decided to prepare separate reports on each. The present report of the USAREUR part of the study is one in a series of reports on the total study. There are four other reports which concern some aspect of the unit RR/EO training. These are:

An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army.

Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in Korea.

Analysis of Experimental Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training.

Analysis and Assessment of the Army Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Training Programs: Summary Report of Conclusions and Recommendations.

In addition, three other reports have been prepared on other aspects of the total project. These are:

An Analysis of the Training of Army Personnel at the Defense Race Relations Institute.

Analysis of Individual Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Training in Army Schools.

Commanders' Handbook for Assessing Institutional Discrimination in Their Units.

In this report the results from the USAREUR study are presented and, where appropriate, compared with similar data collected in CONUS.

Objectives

The objectives of this part of the study are to:

- describe how the training program is being implemented at the local level in USAREUR; and
- assess the impact of the training program.

The first objective involves a comparison between how the unit training program was *intended* to function and how it was *actually* functioning at those sites visited. In other words, how was the policy being translated into reality at the company level?

The second objective focused on measuring the impact of RR/EO training. The intent was to measure changes in knowledge, attitudes, perceptions, and behavior which can be attributed to the RR/EO training experience. The purpose was to determine what impact RR/EO training is having, and what aspects of variations appear most and least effective. In short, the assessment objective was to determine the extent to which RR/EO training is achieving its objectives.

Research Approach

The research approach to the overall study was described in detail in the CONUS report and the reader is referred to that report for a detailed description.[1]

The original design envisioned a Time 1 measurement in a sample of companies in the Army and a Time 2 measurement several months later during which period training was presumed to occur. As a consequence of the Time 1 data collection in CONUS, it became evident that the amount of training actually occurring was insufficient for the original design to make any sense and accordingly the Time 2 data collection was cancelled in CONUS. Whereas most units did provide some sort of training experience to satisfy regulations, the content relevant to race relations was in many cases merely the title of the course. The general lack of race-related content meant that a Time 2 measurement would only over-document the obvious outcome of little or no change with respect to training objectives.

In USAREUR, the original Time 1/Time 2 data collection design was retained since there appeared to be sufficient training being done to justify it and because a new variation in the program was being initiated at the point of the Time 1 data collection visits (October 1976). In Korea, the original Time1/Time 2 data collection was also retained primarily because of the practical consideration that by the time it became evident that a change in design might be appropriate, it was too late to modify the design. For USAREUR, Time1/Time 2 data were collected in October 1976 and May 1977.

Research Design

Seven communities in USAREUR, all in West Germany, were chosen for study. From eight to twelve companies were selected at each community, varying according to the size of the community, and chosen according to the following procedures.

---

[1] Robert L. Hiett and Peter G. Nordlie, *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army* (McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., 1976).

Company-sized units were listed by major organizational grouping (brigade). Companies were then selected at random within each brigade. Sampling was performed in such a way as to insure that approximately one-fourth of the total companies selected were headquarters units. Thus, if the first company selected were a headquarters unit, the next three units were not allowed to be headquarters companies.

This procedure was followed to ensure appropriate representation of both headquarters and line units in the survey. For each company selected, a 40-percent sample of personnel was drawn from the total roster using a systematic random sampling technique.

At Time 1 (October 1976), some 75 companies were surveyed in USAREUR. At Time 2 (May 1977), a total of 70 companies were surveyed, of which 64 companies were the same at both administrations. These differences were due to substitutions and the unavailability of certain companies because of field exercises.

The data collection instruments obtained information in the following areas: background information on each respondent; measures of attitudes and perceptions in race-related areas; measures of race-related behaviors; and knowledge measures.[2] The surveys were administered in group settings and respondents were assured of anomymity and encouraged to give complete and frank answers. Completed questionnaires were returned to HSR's home offices, keypunched, data files established and edited, and data analyzed. Both surveys were administered by HSR personnel.

In addition, interviews were conducted with, and separate questionnaires administered to company commanders of the units surveyed, selected brigade and battalion commanders, groups of selected junior and senior enlisted personnel, DRRI graduates, URRS graduates, and untrained RR/EO staff members at Time 1. At Time 2, questionnaires were given to company commanders, senior commanders, and graduates of the Unit Commanders Course (UCC).

With this design, it was possible to compare the findings for the sample of personnel in USAREUR with findings from personnel in CONUS units. It was also possible to

---

[2]For a detailed discussion and description of the instrument, see Robert L. Hiett, Marcia A. Gilbert, Dale K. Brown, *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army—Technical Appendices* (McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., December 1976); and Appendix B to this report.

determine whether changes occurred between the first and second administrations. Since there was no control group, however, it was not appropriate to attribute changes directly to the race relations program.

The Sample

The samples obtained in USAREUR on the first and second survey are shown in Table 1. Although the sample sizes were slightly smaller in the second survey than in the first, there were no differences between the samples with respect to age, sex, and rank. The racial distribution of the two samples does not significantly differ from the CONUS sample.

Table 1
Racial Distribution of the Sample

	First Survey		Second Survey	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
USAREUR				
Black	721	24	632	25
White	2,065	68	1,739	68
Other	231	8	185	7
CONUS				
Black	948	24	No equivalent second survey in CONUS.	
White	2,785	69		
Other	296	7		

Two versions of the questionnaire were used in each administration, and the samples obtained for each are shown in Table 2.[3] Two equivalent versions were developed for use in USAREUR because the single version utilized in CONUS was felt to be too long, causing some problems of nonresponse. By using two versions in Europe, the individual items could be retained while allowing respondents to complete the survey with fewer fatigue effects. There were no significant differences between the samples on each version with respect to age, sex, rank, or race.

[3]For a complete discussion of the different versions of the questionnaire, see Appendix B.

Table 2
Racial Distribution by Questionnaire Version

	Black		White		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
First Survey						
Version A	360	24	1,052	69	116	8
Version B	361	24	1,013	68	115	8
Second Survey						
Version A	339	26	870	67	92	7
Version B	293	23	869	69	93	7

Data in this report were analyzed and are presented by race. Because personnel who identified themselves as neither white nor black were not from any single, homogeneous ethnic group in numbers sufficiently large to be meaningful in the analysis, their responses were excluded from any further investigation in this report. In the report on CONUS, where the samples were larger, the non-black minority responses were shown separately.

To facilitate reading the tables, the responses are shown in percentages reported in round numbers. The white and black N's for each question are also shown in each table so that the N's of individual responses can be reconstructed if there were reason for doing so. Whenever the same question was asked in CONUS as was asked in USAREUR, the data from CONUS are also shown in order to provide a comparison. The significance of the differences between the black/white, USAREUR/CONUS, and Time1/Time 2 response patterns to individual questions were tested by chi-square. The chi-square results and significance levels are tabled and presented in Appendix A.

Throughout the text, in describing the data tables, the term "significant difference" is used only when the chi-square results are significant at least at the .05 level. Because of the nature of the chi-square statistic, which examines differences in distributions across all cells, some seemingly small differences between percentages may be statistically significant. The term "significant difference" does not necessarily carry with it the implication of "important" difference. Significance, as used in this text, means that the differences

reported are unlikely to be due to chance, but rather are real differences. These real differences may sometimes be small in magnitude. It may also happen that some large differences in percentages are not significant, even though smaller percentage differences in other tables are significant, because of varying sample sizes and distributions.

Organization of This Report

This report presents the findings from the surveys of personnel in USAREUR. The report is addressed primarily to persons concerned with RR/EO policy and training.

Survey findings about the attitudinal and perceptual environment in which the equal opportunity and race relations training programs operate are presented in Chapter II. Chapter III presents the attitudes of military personnel toward race relations programs in general, and the training program in particular. The different training models in effect at Time 1 and Time 2 are described in Chapter IV, and information about the actual operation of these programs at the unit level is provided. An examination of the changes across time in USAREUR are presented in Chapter V. Chapter VI provides a description of the USAREUR Race Relations School (URRS) and the Unit Commanders' Course (UCC) training programs. The findings of the surveys in USAREUR are discussed and conclusions given in the final chapter. The appendices provide the significance levels for the data tables and a discussion of the scale scores developed.

CHAPTER II
THE RACIAL CLIMATE IN USAREUR

The first dimension to be considered in the assessment of race relations/equal opportunity training in USAREUR is the overall racial climate. Racial climate generally refers to the patterns of interactions, associations, perceptions, and behaviors between members of different races. In one sense, RR/EO training aims at creating a more positive tension-free racial climate. One way of evaluating the success of RR/EO training, therefore, is by examining the racial climate and changes which occur in it.

The racial climate in USAREUR is affected by many elements, only some of which are open to control by the Army. Many soldiers are separated from their families and are serving in countries where the civilian population has a somewhat different culture and speaks a different language from that of service personnel. The opportunities for positive off-duty cross-cultural exchange are therefore limited.

The assessment of the racial climate presented here is based on responses to questions concerning perceptions of and attitudes toward race relations and equal opportunity in the Army, and reports of respondents' own behavior and of the behavior of others in their companies.

Racial Attitudes and Perceptions

Equality of Treatment

One primary goal of the Army's RR/EO program is to insure that all Army personnel are treated equally, without regard to race. An important aspect of the racial climate, then, is Army members' perceptions concerning equal treatment. While perceptions of the equality of treatment may not perfectly correlate with the objective reality of treatment, prior research suggests that behavior is more related to how people perceive reality than the objective characteristics of that reality. Thus, perceptions of unequal treatment may lead to racial tension even if an objective assessment would demonstrate

no actual inequality. A basic and critical finding of this study is that most people do perceive differences in the treatment received by persons of different races in the Army. Table 3 shows that fewer than half of those surveyed believe that whites and non-whites are treated exactly the same. Whites tend to split between the belief that everybody is treated the same and that non-whites are treated better than whites. Only one-fourth of the blacks believe that everyone is treated the same, however, while two out of three blacks feel that non-whites are treated worse than whites. There are essentially no differences between whites and blacks in USAREUR and whites and blacks in CONUS in these perceptions.

Table 3

Perceptions of Equality of Treatment

Question: *Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,015)	% Blacks (N = 338)	% Whites (N = 2,705)	% Blacks (N = 109)	
44	6	45	8	In general, non-whites are treated better than whites in the Army.
48	25	48	26	In general, non-whites are treated exactly the same as whites in the Army.
7	69	7	66	In general, non-whites are treated worse than whites in the Army.

Responses to a related question are shown in Table 4 where there again is a significant difference between whites and blacks. While only 6 percent of whites feel that blacks in the Army must do more than the average white to make the grade, over 60 percent of the blacks hold this view. The whites in USAREUR and CONUS have very similar response patterns, but there are significant differences between the two black respondent groups, with blacks in USAREUR feeling even more strongly than blacks in CONUS that blacks must do more than whites.

Table 4

Perceptions of What It Takes to Make the Grade in the Army

Statement: *A black in the Army must do more than the average white to make the grade.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 686)	% Blacks (N = 246)	% Whites (N = 2,353)	% Blacks (N = 788)	
6	76	6	63	Strongly Agree/Agree
10	13	11	19	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
83	11	83	18	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Promotions

As shown in Table 5, with regard to the question of who is best qualified for promotion, it is interesting to note that both whites and blacks substantially agree that soldiers of all races are *equally qualified*. A somewhat surprising finding in USAREUR is that in contrast with CONUS, significantly more whites than blacks hold this view. Both races differ from their counterparts in CONUS: whites in USAREUR hold a more egalitarian point of view than whites in CONUS; but blacks in USAREUR hold a less egalitarian point of view than do blacks in CONUS.

When the question is asked in terms of who actually has the best chance of being promoted, however, the differences between USAREUR and CONUS disappear. The majority of whites still believe that chances are equal for all races, but with a fairly sizable percentage expressing the "reverse racism" feeling that blacks have a better chance than whites. This differs sharply from the views expressed by blacks in both USAREUR and CONUS. While one-fourth of the blacks feel that chances are equal for all races, the great majority express the opinion that whites have the best chance.

Table 5

Perceptions of Promotion Opportunities

Question: *As a general rule, which racial group is best qualified for promotion to higher enlisted grades in the Army?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,024)	% Blacks (N = 341)	% Whites (N = 2,730)	% Blacks (N = 922)	
80	69	72	74	On the average, soldiers of all races are qualified
16	25	26	19	On the average, white soldiers are best qualified.
4	6	2	7	On the average, non-white soldiers are best qualified.

Question: *As a general rule, which racial group has the best chance for promotion to higher enlisted grades?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 974)	% Blacks (N = 349)	% Whites (N = 2,721)	% Blacks (N = 924)	
68	25	67	29	Chances are equal for all races.
9	72	9	67	Whites have the best chance.
19	1	19	2	Blacks have the best chance.
4	1	4	2	Other minorities have the best chance.

Punishment

Another area of sharp differences in perception between blacks and whites is the question of who gets away with breaking rules. As shown in Table 6, approximately half the blacks agree that whites get away with breaking rules that non-whites are punished for, whereas 87 percent of the whites disagree. When the question is reversed, there is almost a mirror image with 44 percent of whites saying that non-whites get away with breaking rules, while 87 percent of the blacks disagree. The patterns are very similar for USAREUR and CONUS.

Table 6

Perceptions of Punishment for Breaking Rules

Statement: *In my unit, whites get away with breaking rules that non-whites are punished for.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 675)	% Blacks (N = 255)	% Whites (N = 2,344)	% Blacks (N = 780)	
3	53	3	47	Strongly Agree/Agree
10	17	7	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
87	30	90	30	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Statement: *In my unit, non-whites get away with breaking rules that whites are punished for.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 673)	% Blacks (N = 255)	% Whites (N = 2,347)	% Blacks (N = 781)	
44	6	48	7	Strongly Agree/Agree
23	6	18	11	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
33	87	34	82	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Work Assignments

Table 7 shows that a similar pattern exists in the perceptions of work assignments. Forty-five percent of the blacks feel that non-whites receive a disproportionate share of dirty details, while 72 percent of the whites disagree. The white response pattern in USAREUR is different from that in CONUS, however, with significantly more whites in Europe expressing the view that non-whites receive more dirty details.

Table 7

Perceptions of Assignment to Work Details

Statement: *Non-whites get more than their share of dirty details.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 676)	% Blacks (N = 256)	% Whites (N = 2,323)	% Blacks (N = 773)	
12	45	7	49	Strongly Agree/Agree
16	29	15	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
72	25	78	28	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Training Opportunities

In the area of opportunities for training, black-white differences in perceptions can once again be seen. Over half the blacks believe that whites have a better chance to get the best training opportunities, but over three-fourths of the whites disagree. Responses in USAREUR and CONUS are very similar.

Table 8

Perceptions of Opportunities for Training

Statement: *Whites have a better chance than non-whites to get the best training opportunities.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites	% Blacks	% Whites	% Blacks	
(N = 673)	*(N = 258)*	*(N = 2,351)*	*(N = 786)*	
6	52	6	51	Strongly Agree/Agree
16	25	17	24	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
78	23	77	25	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites

As the last several tables have shown, most whites see little evidence of discrimination against minorities, but a sizable number see discrimination in the opposite direction against whites, or "reverse discrimination." Several questions relating to this issue were asked in the survey.

Table 9 shows responses to a question about whether the Army's RR/EO program helps minorities at the expense of whites. Significantly more whites than blacks believe this is true in both USAREUR and CONUS, although the percentages agreeing are still lower than those disagreeing.

Table 9

Perceptions of the Effect of the Army's RR/EO Program on Whites

Statement: *The Army's RR/EO program helps minorities get ahead at the expense of whites.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 675)	% Blacks (N = 259)	% Whites (N = 2,351)	% Blacks (N = 798)	
27	10	28	7	Strongly Agree/Agree
32	19	33	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
42	71	39	70	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Again, in Table 10, we find significantly more whites than blacks expressing the opinion that whites are giving up too many of their rights for the rights of others. One-third of the whites hold this belief, while nearly two-thirds of the blacks disagree. Whites in USAREUR, however, are less likely to hold this view than whites in CONUS.

Table 10

Perceptions of What is Happening to the Rights of White Middle-Class Americans

Statement: *White middle-class Americans are giving up too many of their own rights for the rights of others.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 680)	% Blacks (N = 244)	% Whites (N = 2,431)	% Blacks (N = 781)	
33	8	38	11	Strongly Agree/Agree
31	30	31	27	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
36	62	31	62	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

When asked whether or not there is racial discrimination against *whites* at their community, over one-fourth of the whites agree (Table 11). This is a significantly higher percentage of whites than blacks reporting this view, but it is also significantly less than responses of whites in CONUS where over one-third of the whites held this view. Blacks

in USAREUR and CONUS also differ significantly on this question, with fewer blacks in USAREUR seeing discrimination against whites.

Table 11

Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites

Statement: *There is racial discrimination against whites at this community (post).*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 674)	% Blacks (N = 256)	% Whites (N = 2,350)	% Blacks (N = 785)	
26	13	37	23	Strongly Agree/Agree
33	27	29	30	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
41	59	34	47	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Thus, with both blacks and whites in Europe seeing less reverse discrimination, it seems safe to assume that if there are any such occurrences, there are fewer in USAREUR than in CONUS.

Behavioral Aspects of Racial Climate

Another important aspect of the racial climate is the extent to which racial tensions are manifested in behaviors. The following discussion is based on respondents' reports of their own behaviors and the behaviors of their own and other racial groups.

Voluntary Racial Separation

Both blacks and whites in USAREUR report high levels of voluntary racial separation. As shown in Table 12, approximately half the respondents felt that voluntary racial separation occurred on the job often or very often. Both whites and blacks in USAREUR felt that whites stuck together on the job significantly more often than did personnel in CONUS.

Table 12

Perceptions of On-Duty Voluntary Separations

Question: *How often do non-whites or minority personnel in your company or work unit stick together while on the job?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 989)	% Blacks (N = 352)	% Whites (N = 2,734)	% Blacks (N = 924)	
51	50	46	41	Very Often/Often
31	29	30	32	Sometimes
17	21	24	27	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often do white personnel in your company or work unit stick together while on the job?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,025)	% Blacks (N = 355)	% Whites (N = 2,727)	% Blacks (N = 928)	
45	58	35	47	Very Often/Often
32	28	30	27	Sometimes
23	14	35	25	Seldom/Never

Table 13 shows off-duty voluntary separations. Again, respondents indicate high levels of voluntary separation, with blacks in USAREUR reporting significantly less frequent segregation among non-white personnel and significantly more segregation on the part of white personnel than do blacks in CONUS.

Table 13

Perceptions of Off-Duty Voluntary Separations

Question: *How often do non-whites or minority personnel in your company spend time with just non-whites during off-duty hours?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 992)	% Blacks (N = 355)	% Whites (N = 2,716)	% Blacks (N = 918)	
53	36	54	50	Very Often/Often
28	33	27	28	Sometimes
19	31	19	22	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often do whites in your company or work unit spend time with just whites during off-duty hours?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,024)	% Blacks (N = 354)	% Whites (N = 2,732)	% Blacks (N = 922)	
61	71	62	60	Very Often/Often
31	21	28	25	Sometimes
8	8	10	15	Seldom/Never

Race-Related Verbal Behavior

The use of derogatory terms in referring to persons of other races is another important indicator of the racial climate. Table 14 shows the reported frequency of name-calling by whites and non-whites. There appears to be general agreement among all respondents that racial slurs are used with some frequency. Approximately one-fourth of both blacks and whites, in both USAREUR and CONUS, indicate that the terms are used often or very often, with an additional 25 to 30 percent replying that the terms are used "sometimes."

Table 14

Use of Racial Slurs

Question: *How often do white personnel in your company or work unit refer to blacks as "nigger," "coon," etc.?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,028)	% Blacks (N = 351)	% Whites (N = 2,732)	% Blacks (N = 919)	
22	26	25	25	Very Often/Often
27	23	25	24	Sometimes
52	51	50	51	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often do non-whites or minority personnel in your company or work unit refer to whites as "honky," "gringo," etc.?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 991)	% Blacks (N = 350)	% Whites (N = 2,708)	% Blacks (N = 923)	
28	28	31	24	Very Often/Often
29	31	28	33	Sometimes
44	41	41	43	Seldom/Never

Another question on racist joke telling again found only slight differences between whites and blacks and between USAREUR and CONUS. Table 15 shows that about 15 percent of the respondents felt such behaviors occurred often or very often.

Table 15

Racist Joke Telling

Question: *How often do people of your own race in your company or work unit tell racist jokes about other races?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 995)	% Blacks (N = 344)	% Whites (N = 2,750)	% Blacks (N = 916)	
18	15	20	15	Very Often/Often
42	37	41	35	Sometimes
40	48	39	50	Seldom/Never

Racial Conflict

An examination of behaviors relating to conflicts between persons of different races encompasses situations of harassment and actual physical confrontation. Black soldiers report with moderate frequency that white personnel harass non-whites and keep them away from facilities supposedly open to all soldiers (Table 16). Whites perceive a moderate degree of harassment of white personnel by non-whites. Whites perceive significantly more occurrences of such behaviors in USAREUR than in CONUS, but blacks perceive significantly fewer such occurrences. It may be true that there is more harassment in USAREUR because soldiers, and particularly black soldiers, perceive discrimination in the civilian community and therefore they spend more time at military facilities. Conflicts then arise over the use of these facilities.

Table 16

Interracial Harassment

Question: *How often do white personnel in your company or work unit get together in certain situations to harass or keep non-whites out of facilities which are supposed to be open to all?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 994)	% Blacks (N = 350)	% Whites (N = 2,732)	% Blacks (N = 923)	
4	18	5	12	Very Often/Often
9	16	10	20	Sometimes
87	67	85	68	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often do non-white or minority personnel in your company or work unit get together in certain situations to harass or keep whites out of facilities which are supposed to be open to all?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,020)	% Blacks (N = 350)	% Whites (N = 2,719)	% Blacks (N = 908)	
23	7	19	9	Very Often/Often
22	14	25	21	Sometimes
55	79	56	70	Seldom/Never

Actual physical confrontations were perceived to occur very infrequently. Less than 20 percent of either race report that such conflicts occur sometimes, often, or very often (Table 17).

Table 17

Perceptions of Interracial Conflict

Question: *How often do whites and non-whites in your company or work unit form groups and challenge each other to fights?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 992)	% Blacks (N = 349)	% Whites (N = 2,745)	% Blacks (N = 927)	
3	4	4	6	Very Often/Often
8	12	11	13	Sometimes
90	84	85	81	Seldom/Never

Positive Interracial Interactions

Many types of interactions are not negative, of course. Two questions which dealt with positive interracial interactions are presented below. As shown in Table 18, both whites and blacks report that helping behaviors between persons of different races occur with a slightly higher frequency in USAREUR than in CONUS. There are still significant differences between the perceptions of whites and blacks, however, with whites perceiving a more favorable view than blacks.

Table 18

Helping Behavior

Question: *How often do whites and non-whites in your company or work unit go out of their way to help each other?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 992)	% Blacks (N = 348)	% Whites (N = 2,740)	% Blacks (N = 915)	
27	18	23	16	Very Often/Often
42	33	40	35	Sometimes
32	49	37	49	Seldom/Never

When asked about the frequency with which people of different races go to service clubs together, both whites and blacks report fairly high frequencies of such behavior, and respondents in USAREUR report slightly higher frequencies than respondents in CONUS. The results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Racial Interaction

Question: *How often do whites and non-whites in your company or work unit go to Army clubs together (Enlisted Club, NCO Club, Officers Club)?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,024)	% Blacks (N = 351)	% Whites (N = 2,729)	% Blacks (N = 917)	
35	25	28	24	Very Often/Often
41	41	42	35	Sometimes
24	35	30	41	Seldom/Never

Quality of Race Relations in USAREUR

Two questions were asked about the general quality of race relations in the Army. There are some differences between the responses of blacks and whites and between USAREUR and CONUS on these questions.

Table 20

Perceived Quality of Race Relations

Question: *Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,000)	% Blacks (N = 357)	% Whites (N = 2,750)	% Blacks (N = 933)	
21	16	23	24	In general, race relations in the Army are good.
55	46	49	45	In general, race relations in the Army are fair.
24	38	28	31	In general, race relations in the Army are poor.

Table 20 shows that a majority of personnel in the Army would characterize the state of race relations as only "fair." There are significant differences between whites and blacks, with blacks believing things are less favorable than whites. There are also significant differences between USAREUR and CONUS, with both whites and blacks in USAREUR seeing the situation as less positive than in CONUS.

When asked about the direction of any change, approximately one-third of all respondents reply that race relations have been getting better over the past year; but one-half the respondents perceive no change (Table 21). There are similar patterns of response in CONUS.

Table 21

Perceived Changes in Quality of Race Relations

Statement: *Over the past year, race relations in the Army:*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,019)	% Blacks (N = 342)	% Whites (N = 2,720)	% Blacks (N = 950)	
34	39	30	39	have been getting better.
50	47	56	49	have not changed.
16	14	14	12	have been getting worse.

Since the questions in Tables 20 and 21 were also asked in Army-wide surveys in 1972 and 1974, it is possible to compare these responses to examine changes across time. These comparisons are shown in Tables 22 and 23.

Table 22

Changes in Perceptions of Army Race Relations

	Total Army		CONUS	USAREUR
	1972	1974	1976	1976
White Responses				
Race relations are good.	20%	23%	23%	21%
Race relations are fair.	55%	55%	49%	55%
Race relations are poor.	25%	22%	28%	24%
Black Responses				
Race relations are good.	10%	20%	24%	16%
Race relations are fair.	50%	52%	45%	46%
Race relations are poor.	39%	27%	31%	38%

Table 23

Changes in Perceptions of the Trend in Race Relations

	Total Army		CONUS	USAREUR
	1972	1974	1976	1976
White Responses				
Race relations are getting better.	39%	41%	30%	34%
Race relations have not changed.	36%	41%	56%	50%
Race relations are getting worse.	24%	18%	14%	16%
Blacks Responses				
Race relations are getting better.	42%	48%	39%	39%
Race relations have not changed.	39%	39%	49%	47%
Race relations are getting worse.	18%	11%	12%	14%

While it is not possible to compare the 1976 USAREUR responses with earlier data limited to USAREUR only, it can be seen that the responses from USAREUR are very similar to or slightly more negative than the responses in CONUS. Both sets of responses from 1976 show an overall decline from the more positive responses obtained in 1974.

Summary and Conclusions about the Racial Climate

The basic conclusion to be drawn about the racial climate in USAREUR is that it is very similar to the racial climate in CONUS. There are significant differences in perceptions between blacks and whites on almost every indicator. Blacks continue to see evidence of discrimination not perceived by whites, while whites report some occurrences of "reverse discrimination."

Just as in CONUS, both races perceive differences in treatment of some kind. It cannot be inferred from this, however, that the similarities in racial climate between USAREUR and CONUS are based on entirely similar causes. The confining aspects of living in a foreign country, where a majority of off-duty contacts are limited to other service members (because of the language barrier), could certainly contribute to increased racial tensions. More activity is focused around the military installation and it is difficult for soldiers to get away from any problems which do arise.

It is not possible to state that the racial climate in USAREUR is either "better" or "worse" than in CONUS. From the indicators discussed in this chapter the situation in USAREUR appears to be more positive in some areas and more negative in others. There is slightly more polarity between the opinions of whites and blacks in USAREUR than in CONUS, with whites in USAREUR generally being more positive and blacks more negative than respondents in CONUS. There are significant differences between whites and blacks on almost every item in both CONUS and USAREUR, indicating the continuing differences in perceptions.

There is a high frequency of voluntary racial separation in USAREUR, but less than in CONUS. This is probably another manifestation of the effects of being stationed

abroad: there is greater off-duty interaction between soldiers, rather than interactions with the civilian community.

Overall there is less backlash expressed and more perceived discrimination in USAREUR than in CONUS. Many white personnel, as well as blacks, are aware of discrimination against blacks which occurs in the German community. This heightened awareness of minority problems can counteract white perceptions that "reverse discrimination" is occurring, and sensitize them to any acts of discrimination against non-whites. A possible explanation of the finding that personnel in USAREUR hold a less favorable impression of the general state of race relations in the Army than personnel in CONUS may be that this awareness has sensitized them to problems. Because personnel in USAREUR may be more sensitive to any problems which occur they may interpret such occurrences as indicating racial tension, whereas personnel at other locations might not even be aware of such problems.

It is clear that some racial tensions still exist in USAREUR. Even though many of the differences are small the aggregate picture shows that there are many problems still. The extent to which the racial climate can be and has been affected by race relations training is a matter for discussion. If such a training program is to have *any* impact it must function well. The next chapter focuses on this program in USAREUR.

CHAPTER III

CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE RR/EO PROGRAM

The attitudes and perceptions of personnel toward the RR/EO program can have a great impact on its chances for success. For the program to work, it is necessary that service members feel the Army places some importance on the training and follows through stated Army policies.

Several questions addressing these issues were asked in USAREUR and the results are presented below in three sections. The first section deals with the generalized attitudes about the overall RR/EO program; the second section focuses more specifically on unit training; and the final section covers the attitudes of commanders, RR/EO personnel, and selected unit personnel toward the training program.

Attitudes about the RR/EO Program

Whites and blacks in USAREUR differ in their attitudes and perceptions about the RR/EO program, just as they differ in their perceptions of the racial climate. An important indicator of these differences is shown in Table 24. Over half the blacks feel that whites don't really want racial minorites to be treated equally, a perception which differs markedly from that of whites. That blacks doubt the motivations of whites to such a large extent has real implications for the Army's program, for this distrust can extend to a distrust of the equal opportunity system. They apparently feel that the Army is not really committed to the RR/EO program.

Table 24

Perceived Desire for Racial Equality by Whites

Statement: *Most whites in the Army don't want racial minorities to be treated equally.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 685)	% Blacks (N = 245)	% Whites (N = 2,354)	% Blacks (N = 787)	
11	56	12	49	Strongly Agree/Agree
18	29	23	33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
72	15	65	18	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Perceptions of the Army's commitment were assessed through the question shown in Table 25. Only one-third of the blacks in USAREUR, significantly fewer than in CONUS, feel that the Army is firmly committed to equal opportunity. Additionally, in both USAREUR and CONUS, only half the whites perceive a firm commitment on the part of the Army. Considering the RR/EO activities which have occurred, these appear to be small percentages and point to a basic problem in the credibility of the program.

Table 25

Perception of Commitment to Equal Opportunity

Statement: *The Army is firmly committed to the principle of equal opportunity.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 686)	% Blacks (N = 240)	% Whites (N = 2,352)	% Blacks (N = 786)	
51	32	52	41	Strongly Agree/Agree
23	23	28	28	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
26	46	20	32	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

One area in which perceptions of commitment are related to actions is the extent to which RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced. A lack of enforcement can be seen as an indicator of a lack of real commitment. As Table 26 shows, blacks are more likely than whites to perceive that policies and regulations are not being enforced. Neither officers nor NCO's are perceived as enforcing the regulations. The white respondents are more likely to feel that policies are enforced; however, only about half of the whites report that officers enforce the regulations, and fewer than half report that NCO's do so.

Table 26

Perception of Enforcement of RR/EO Policies

Statement: *Most NCO's usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,354)	% Blacks (N = 493)	% Whites (N = 2,349)	% Blacks (N = 785)	
42	34	44	29	Strongly Agree/Agree
31	29	28	24	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
27	37	28	47	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Statement: *Most officers usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 676)	% Blacks (N = 256)	% Whites (N = 2,352)	% Blacks (N = 787)	
51	34	49	34	Strongly Agree/Agree
30	33	34	35	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
20	33	17	31	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

The question of command support is always important, but it becomes even more important if officers and NCO's are not seen as enforcing RR/EO policies and regulations. Table 27 shows that blacks and whites also differ in their perceptions of command support. While over half the white respondents in USAREUR perceive a great deal of command support, less than one-third of the blacks hold this view. Respondents in USAREUR were somewhat more likely to perceive command support than were respondents in CONUS. Clearly, command support is another area in which blacks doubt the commitment of the Army to the RR/EO program. Considering the great emphasis and strong support that has been placed on this program by the highest commanders in USAREUR, it would appear that the emphasis is not filtering down effectively to community commanders, the community commanders are not placing the same emphasis on the program as higher commanders, or the emphasis is not being transmitted by the officers to their troops. Some or all of these possibilities may be occurring to result in the current perceptions. Perceived command support cannot be directly equated with the actual conduct of training, covered in the next chapter.

Table 27

Perceptions of Command Support

Question: *How much command support does the Race Relations/ Equal Opportunity (RR/EO) program receive at this community (post)?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 973)	% Blacks (N = 347)	% Whites (N = 2,694)	% Blacks (N = 920)	
55	31	44	27	A great deal.
39	52	48	57	Some.
6	18	8	16	No command support.

An extension of the question of commitment is presented in Table 28. This is one item on which blacks and whites agree. Slightly less than one-half of both whites and blacks in USAREUR felt that the RR/EO programs in their communities were just for show. These percentages are somewhat higher than those found in CONUS. The respondents, then,

Table 28

Seriousness of the RR/EO Program

Statement: *RR/EO programs in this community (post) are mostly just for show.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 676)	% Blacks (N = 256)	% Whites (N = 2,350)	% Blacks (N = 787)	
44	43	39	36	Strongly Agree/Agree
28	30	33	33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
28	27	28	31	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

both blacks and white, appear to doubt the sincerity of the RR/EO activities which do occur. Once again, this points to the program's lack of credibility among respondents and leads to questions on the need for the program and possible benefits to be derived from it. Responses to these questions are shown below.

When asked about the necessity of the RR/EO programs, a significantly larger percentage of whites than blacks believe that the programs are unnecessary (Table 29). This may be tied to the perceptions by whites that fewer problems exist. Whites in USAREUR are more likely than whites in CONUS to feel that the programs are unnecessary.

Table 29

Perceptions of the Necessity of the Army's RR/EO Programs

Statement: *Most of the Army's RR/EO programs are unnecessary.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 672)	% Blacks (N = 256)	% Whites (N = 2,330)	% Blacks (N = 776)	
43	29	38	23	Strongly Agree/Agree
28	29	32	29	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
29	42	30	48	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Whites and blacks in USAREUR differ only slightly in their perceptions of potential benefits from the RR/EO programs (Table 30). However, both whites and blacks in USAREUR see slightly significantly fewer benefits than do whites and blacks in CONUS.

Table 30

Perceptions of Potential Benefits of the RR/EO Program

Statement: *In the long run, everybody in the Army will benefit from race relations and equal opportunity programs.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 686)	% Blacks (N = 246)	% Whites (N = 2,349)	% Blacks (N = 774)	
32	39	40	58	Strongly Agree/Agree
35	30	33	28	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
33	31	27	13	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

There nevertheless are at least one-third of all respondents to this question and the preceding question in Table 29 who feel that the RR/EO program is necessary and serves a purpose.

Attitudes and Perceptions about Race Relations Training

The Race Relations Education Program operates within the broader context of the Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Program. The discussion above has noted the diversity of views about the value of the RR/EO program in general, including the negative opinions expressed. This section will deal with attitudes and perceptions relating more specifically to the race relations *training program in the units.*

Questions were asked in a number of areas relating to the nature and value of race relations training. Table 31 shows the responses to a question on how important such training is compared to all the different kinds of training the Army conducts. As one might expect, two-thirds of the blacks saw the training as extremely important or important. While a smaller percentage of whites expressed this view, still nearly half felt that the training was important. So despite the fact that in many ways the respondents do not like the program, a majority of soldiers still feel that the training is of value.

Table 31

Perceptions of Importance of RR/EO Training

Question: *Compared to all the different kinds of training the Army conducts, how important do you think race relations training is?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 2,047)	% Blacks (N = 713)	% Whites (N = 2,765)	% Blacks (N = 943)	
47	68	51	79	Extremely Important/Important
53	32	49	21	Not Very Important/Not Important At All

When compared with CONUS, significantly fewer blacks and whites in USAREUR saw the training as important. This may be due to the perception that USAREUR duty stations are more "front-line" and therefore other readiness training takes on a greater

importance in the minds of the soldiers. Many soldiers do not view race relations training as a part of overall readiness training.

Another question relating to the value of race relations training is shown in Table 32. Respondents tend to feel that the training is at least somewhat effective in reducing racial tensions, with more than 45 percent falling into this category. However, there is a large number who feel the training was not effective. While many blacks feel the training is not effective, blacks still are twice as likely as whites to state that the training is very effective. Whites in USAREUR and CONUS do not differ substantially on this item, but blacks in USAREUR are much less likely to feel the training is effective than are blacks in CONUS. This may be related to the view of many blacks in USAREUR that the RR/EO program is just for show.

Table 32

Effectiveness of Training in Reducing Racial Tensions

Question: *In general, what is your opinion about the value of race relations training for reducing racial tensions in the Army?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 2,050)	% Blacks (N = 714)	% Whites (N = 2,766)	% Blacks (N = 940)	
4	10	5	17	Very effective in reducing racial tensions.
42	45	41	45	Somewhat effective in reducing racial tensions.
41	33	42	25	Not effective at all in reducing racial tensions.
14	12	12	13	No opinion.

Since the purpose of the seminars is to increase awareness and promote interest in race relations, a number of questions were asked to determine how well they were meeting these objectives. Table 33 shows the responses to the question of whether the seminars increased one's interest in improving race relations. Blacks gave more positive answers than whites in both USAREUR and CONUS. It would appear that the seminars are succeeding much better with blacks than with whites on this dimension; but blacks already have a

greater expressed interest in the subject area than do whites. A comparison of the USAREUR responses with those found in CONUS show that both whites and blacks in CONUS gave more positive responses than did blacks and whites in USAREUR.

Table 33

Perception of RR/EO Seminars' Effect on Increasing Interest in Improving Race Relations

Question: *Did the seminar(s) you attended increase your interest in improving race relations?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,262)	% Blacks (N = 427)	% Whites (N = 2,042)	% Blacks (N = 709)	
39	53	42	64	Yes, A Lot/Yes, Somewhat
62	47	57	36	No, Not At All/It Decreased My Interest

Tables 34 and 35 show the responses to two related questions about the helpfulness of the seminars. The patterns are quite similar. About two-thirds of the blacks say they are helpful compared with about one-half of the whites. The white responses in USAREUR and CONUS do not differ, but once again the blacks in USAREUR are less positive than the blacks in CONUS. These questions illustrate what seems to be an overall pattern on questions relating to the value of RR/EO training, with whites about evenly split while a majority of blacks respond favorably.

Table 34

Perceptions of the Effect of Unit RR/EO Seminars in Improving Race Relations

Question: *Have seminars helped you know how you can work to improve race relations in your unit?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,262)	% Blacks (N = 427)	% Whites (N = 2,044)	% Blacks (N = 708)	
53	61	53	70	A Great Deal/Somewhat
47	39	47	30	Not At All

Table 35

Perceptions of RR/EO Seminars' Effectiveness in Improving Unit Interracial Communications

Question: *In your opinion, did unit RR/EO seminars help to improve communications between soldiers of different races in your unit?*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 1,263)	% Blacks (N = 428)	% Whites (N = 2,036)	% Blacks (N = 709)	
53	64	52	66	A Lot/Somewhat
47	36	48	34	Not At All

A final question on the value of race relations seminars is shown in Table 36. Less than half of all respondents are willing to assert that race relations seminars either are or are not a waste of time; many respondents are simply reserving judgment. While blacks are more favorable than whites toward the seminars, it is interesting to note that as many blacks in USAREUR are unfavorable as are favorable. Also notable is the comparison of USAREUR with CONUS. Again the black responses are less favorable in USAREUR than in CONUS, but the white responses in USAREUR are more favorable than those found in CONUS. This is another example of a pattern frequently found in the questions on racial climate.

Table 36

Perceptions of the Usefulness of Race Relations Seminars

Statement: *Race relations seminars are a waste of time.*

USAREUR		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 682)	% Blacks (N = 242)	% Whites (N = 2,350)	% Blacks (N = 786)	
46	34	39	19	Strongly Agree/Agree
29	33	27	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
25	34	34	58	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Attitudes of Commanders, RR/EO Personnel and Selected Enlisted Personnel

It is clear from the findings discussed in the previous section that there is a substantial element of the population with negative attitudes about the RR/EO program in general, and the training program in particular. In interviews with commanders, RR/EO personnel, and selected junior and senior enlisted personnel an attempt was made to determine the differing viewpoints of these groups. These interviews covered many of the same areas discussed above, such as command support and the perceived need for the race relations education program. The RR/EO personnel interviewed included DRRI graduates, URRS graduates, and non-trained RR/EO staff members. Separate questionnaires were administered to these groups and to the selected company commanders and enlisted personnel.

There was very little consensus about the program between commanders and RR/EO personnel. Table 37 illustrates the differences in perception of command support for the program, with DRRI graduates at one extreme and company commanders at the other. The company commanders almost unanimously assert that the program receives good command support, belying the assertion expressed earlier that perhaps USAREUR command emphasis was not reaching the lower levels of command. Clearly, the company commanders are perceiving that the program is supported by their superiors. The differences in perception between the commanders and the RR/EO personnel are probably due to differing definitions of what is meant by "command support." Company commanders

Table 37

Perceived Command Support

Question: *What kind of command support does the unit RR/EO seminar program receive on this post?*

% Company Commanders (N = 54)	% DRRI Graduates (N = 47)	% URRS Graduates (N = 64)	% Non-Trained RR/EO Staff (N = 16)	
97	26	50	50	Excellent/Good
2	38	17	44	Fair
2	36	33	6	Poor/Very Poor

seem to feel that the program is supported because they are told that it is supported and they are aware that reports are made out on the number of troops receiving training. RR/EO personnel, on the other hand, do not see these things as sufficient signals of command support. They point to the failure of many commanders to hold unit seminars on a regular basis and the failure of officers and senior enlisted personnel to attend the seminars.

The issue of attendance at seminars is a particular sore point for RR/EO personnel. They state that when officers and senior NCO's avoid attending seminars it signals to the troop that the training is not really important in the eyes of their superiors. The differing opinions of who needs training are shown in Table 38. Company commanders and senior enlisted personnel state that it is the junior enlisted personnel who most need race relations training. That the officers and senior enlisted personnel do not see themselves as particularly in need of training may be an explanation of why they fail to attend such training.

Table 38

Groups Needing Training

Question: *What group within the Army do you think needs race relations education the most?*

Group Needing Training	Respondent Groups					
	% Company Commanders (N = 55)	% Sr. Enlisted Personnel (N = 78)	% Jr. Enlisted Personnel (N = 132)	% DRRI Graduates (N = 46)	% URRS Graduates (N = 60)	% Non-Trained RR/EO Staff (N = 14)
E1 - E4	49	63	33	4	13	43
E5 - E6	33	5	13	2	7	0
E7 - E9	13	12	30	50	58	29
O1 - O3	4	9	17	11	13	29
O4 - O6	2	10	2	26	7	0
O7 - O1	0	1	5	7	2	0

The RR/EO personnel, and particularly trained personnel, state that senior NCO's and officers are most in need of race relations education. RR/EO personnel give two reasons for their assertions: (1) the officers and senior NCO's are the groups already receiving the least training, and more importantly, (2) the officers and senior NCO's are the people in

positions of authority whose decisions affect the operation of the unit, and who through these decisions can set patterns of either institutional discrimination or equal opportunity, fair or unfair treatment of racial problems, and openness or hostility to the expression of problems by their personnel. To the RR/EO personnel it is more important that persons with the power to discriminate receive the training than that troops with perhaps more prejudices but less power be trained; of course, they state that *everyone* should receive the training, but given the choice of only one group, the majority of RR/EO staff members would choose the former over the latter.

There does appear to be a general agreement between all the respondents on one issue, however: the need for some kind of race relations education program. Table 39 shows that a majority of all groups interviewed felt there was a definite need for the program. The problems, then, seem to be problems with the ways in which the RR/EO program in general, and the Phase III program in particular, have been set up and implemented, and not with the basic concept of a race relations program.

Table 39

Need for an RR/EO Program

Question: *Which of the following comes closest to your opinion?*

% Company Commanders (N = 56)	% Enlisted Personnel (N = 228)	% DRRI Graduates (N = 48)	% URRS Graduates (N = 64)	% Non-Trained RR/EO Staff (N = 16)	
86	50	100	97	75	I believe that there is a definite need for a race relations education program in the Army.
11	32	0	3	25	I don't really know whether there is a real need or not.
4	19	0	0	0	I believe that there is insufficient need to have a race relations education program in the Army.

Summary

Overall there appears to be a relatively high percentage of respondents, both black and white, who express negative attitudes toward the RR/EO program. Blacks mistrust the motivations of whites, feeling that whites don't really want racial equality and doubting the sincerity of the RR/EO program. Whites on the other hand assert that whites do want minorities to be treated equally, but also express doubts about the Army's commitment to the RR/EO program. Whites see less need for the programs, but this may be due to the fact that whites believe that equality already exists to a greater extent than do blacks. The tendency for more whites in USAREUR to think equality already exists may be another factor in their seeing training as less important than do personnel in CONUS.

With regard to the unit RR/EO seminars, most blacks tend to see a need for an EO training program, primarily because they feel that there is a great deal of discrimination against minorities. In contrast, only about half the whites see a need for the training program. Both groups seem to feel that the "Phase III" training program (described in the next chapter) has been of limited effectiveness. If changes in the attitudes and behavior of the group in power are a primary goal of training, the long-run effects leave much to be desired: many whites report experiencing no effects or negative effects from the program.

RR/EO personnel raise another important issue in affecting the attitudes and behaviors of those in power, namely, that often those in power avoid receiving the training. Company commanders and NCO's seem to feel that they do not need the training.

Regardless of all the negative attitudes about the program there appears to be a general consensus that there is a need for some kind of RR/EO program. The program in effect in USAREUR was undergoing revision at the Time 1 surveys so that the examination at Time 2 was of the new program (Phase III). Whether or not the new program resulted in any beneficial changes in outlook is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONDUCT OF RR/EO SEMINARS IN USAREUR

The major element of the Army's race relations/equal opportunity program is the RR/EO training seminar. The training model utilized in USAREUR is different in many aspects from that used in CONUS. USAREUR supplements to AR 600-21 and AR 600-42 specify the requirements for all personnel assigned to USAREUR.

Because the requirements for training in USAREUR are very different from the CONUS requirements, few comparisons between data collected in the two commands were possible. This chapter will focus on describing the data collected on the "Phase III" model, just ending at the time of the first visit, and the data collected six months later on the "FY 77" program.

The Phase III Training Model

The FY 76 or "Phase III" model was outlined in USAREUR Supplement 1 to AR 600-42, dated 19 August 1975. It calls for all personnel assigned to USAREUR to receive training in race relations. Two types of training sessions were specified: a 14-hour Community-Level Seminar and quarterly Unit-Level Seminars.

The Community-Level Seminars are to be conducted by trained race relations instructors, and are the responsibility of the community RR/EO office. These seminars are to include personnel drawn from different units; they must be given at the battalion level or higher. All personnel are required to attend one of these seminars annually.

The quarterly Unit-Level Seminars are to be given by the company commander, with help available from the RR/EO staff as needed. The unit commanders are responsible for ensuring that all personnel in their company receive this training. Suggested topics for the seminars and lesson plans were provided by USAREUR to each company commander.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

Community-Level Seminars

The requirement of the regulation is that all personnel attend a 14-hour Community-Level Seminar once a year. These seminars definitely were being held at all the installations visited in USAREUR. The community RR/EO office has responsibility for the conduct of these seminars and RR/EO personnel emphasized that the seminars were one of their major concerns. There was general agreement that a majority of personnel was receiving the training, and 75 percent of the respondents, both black and white, reported that they had attended a Community-Level Seminar.

For the 75 percent who answered questions about the seminars, Table 40 shows the time since last attending.[4] An additional 8 percent of the respondents to this item, or 6 percent of all black and white respondents, stated that they had never attended such a seminar. This reduces the percentage to approximately 70 percent of respondents who had attended a Community-Level Seminar. Eighty-five percent of the respondents to this question had been to a session within the required twelve-month period.

Table 40

Time Since Attending Last Community-Level Seminar
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How long ago did you last attend a Community-Level race relations training class?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 2,102)	
5	Less than 1 month ago.
7	1 - 2 months ago.
38	3 - 6 months ago.
35	7 - 12 months ago.
8	Longer than 12 months ago.
8	Never attended a Community-Level race relations training class.

[4]The questions about the conduct of these seminars were contingent upon having attended a seminar, so only those respondents who had attended answered the remaining questions in the section. The percentages in the tables on Community-Level training, therefore, reflect only the reponses of those 75 percent who reported attending, and may thus present a more favorable situation than exists.

Many RR/EO personnel and junior enlisted personnel interviewed complained that officers and senior NCO's avoided attending these seminars. Table 41 shows that 67 percent of the respondents felt it was either somewhat hard or very hard to avoid attending the training; but it must be remembered that 88 percent of the respondents were grade E-6 or below.

Table 41

Avoidance of Community-Level Seminars
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How easy or difficult is it to avoid going to Community-Level race relations training classes?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,933)	
4	Very easy to avoid.
5	Somewhat easy to avoid.
12	Neither easy nor hard.
19	Somewhat hard.
48	Very hard.
12	Don't know.

One method cited by which officers and NCO's avoided the training was by sending a few soldiers to the sessions repeatedly. Because in many cases the reporting on company personnel who have received the training is done only in numbers and *not by name*, the company reports can show that, for example, they have 120 people assigned to the unit and, in the course of the year, 120 people have been sent to the training. This would not reflect the fact that some people had attended more than once, and others not at all. RR/EO personnel also stated that the soldiers who were sent repeatedly were often those the NCO's considered "troublemakers" or "goof-offs" and the classes were used as a dumping ground to get these soldiers out of the NCO's hair for a couple of days.

All these problems aside, however, there still remained a substantial proportion of the personnel who were receiving Community-Level training. These sessions were almost

always conducted by either DRRI or URRS graduates and most people seemed to feel that the training was of a fairly high quality. Just as was found in CONUS, many soldiers complained that they focused too much on history and not enough on current problems, but the material covered was always pertinent to race relations. Another complaint was that the sessions centered too much on race relations; many whites wanted the focus, and the program title, changed to human relations.

Unit-Level Seminars

The second type of training called for in the regulations is the Unit-Level Seminar. Quarterly seminars are required to be conducted during the year by the company commander. There is some evidence that many units are not meeting this requirement. A majority of units do have some race relations seminars, but many company commanders stated that they often have difficulty in scheduling the training, and consequently have fewer than the required number of training sessions.

Some 63 percent of the black and white respondents (N = 2,711) stated that they had attended a race relations seminar in their unit. Of those who had attended a seminar, some 50 percent reported that seminars were held quarterly or more often in their units, as shown in Table 42.

Table 42

Frequency with Which Unit-Level Seminars are Held (Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How often are Unit-Level race relations classes held in your company or work unit?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,692)	
5	More than once a month.
11	Once a month.
4	Once every two months.
30	Quarterly.
13	Less often than quarterly, but more often than once a year.
13	Once a year.
23	Don't know.

Table 43 is also based on the 63 percent of respondents who stated at one point that they had attended a Unit-Level Seminar, however an additional 2 percent of these respondents (or 1 percent of the total) replied to this question that they had *not* attended such a seminar.[5] This would reduce the number of respondents receiving this training to approximately 60 percent of the sample. Only 69 percent of those answering this question had received any Unit-Level training within the preceding six months, and only 25 percent within the two months preceding. This confirms the view that some training is being conducted but often not according to the required schedule, and often not reaching all personnel assigned to the unit.

Table 43

Time Since Attending Last Unit-Level Seminar
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How long ago did you last attend a Unit-Level race relations class?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,699)	
9	Less than 1 month ago.
16	1 - 2 months ago.
44	3 - 6 months ago.
24	7 - 12 months ago.
5	Longer than 12 months ago.
2	Never attended a Unit-Level race relations class.

Company commanders complain of problems in setting a time for the sessions when a majority of assigned personnel are free to attend. They state that there often is not room on their crowded training schedules to fit in something which many do not see as "mission-related."

When the sessions are held most enlisted personnel are required to attend. Table 44 shows that 60 percent of the respondents felt it was somewhat hard or very hard

[5] The questions about the conduct of these seminars were contingent upon having attended a seminar, so only those respondents who had attended answered the remaining questions in the section. The percentages in the tables on Unit-Level training, therefore, reflect only the responses of those 61 percent who reported attending, and may thus present a more favorable situation than exists.

to avoid attending a Unit-Level Seminar; but again, this is 61 percent of those respondents who *did* attend at least one such seminar.

Table 44

Avoidance of Unit-Level Seminars
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How easy or difficult is it to avoid going to Unit-Level race relations classes in your unit?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,691)	
7	Very easy to avoid.
9	Somewhat easy to avoid.
15	Neither easy nor hard.
21	Somewhat hard.
40	Very hard.
8	Don't know.

The sessions are supposed to be conducted by the company commander, with assistance as needed by RR/EO personnel. Many URRS graduates reported that they had aided company commanders in the presentation of these seminars. Generally, the sessions were being led by the company commander, as required (Table 45). In some

Table 45

Instructors for Unit-Level Seminars
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *Who was in charge of the last Unit-Level race relations class you attended?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,667)	
50	Officer O1 - O3
7	Officer O4 - O6
0	Enlisted E1 - E3
32	Enlisted E4 - E6 or Spec 4 - Spec 6
10	Enlisted E7 - E9
1	Other

instances another member of the unit chain of command would give the training, or the commander would introduce the topic but a trained discussion leader would be perceived as the actual instructor.

One important problem cited for the Unit-Level Seminars is that they often do not deal with race relations. Table 46 shows the responses to a question on this issue, and it can be seen that only about 40 percent of the respondents feel the sessions always deal with race relations, while an additional 40 percent state that they sometimes deal with race relations. A number of people interviewed said that the seminars frequently degenerate into "bitch sessions" where grievances totally unrelated to racial topics are brought up for discussion. This is a problem if company commanders feel that any seminar which they label a "race relations seminar" will fulfill the requirements, regardless of the material covered. It may be that the company commanders cover other topics because they do not feel adequately prepared to give race relations training. Several company commanders stated that they felt they had an insufficient background to serve as race relations instructors.

Table 46

Subject Matter of Unit-Level Seminars
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How often do the topics covered in the Unit-Level race relations classes deal with race relations?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,681)	
41	Always deal with race relations.
42	Sometimes deal with race relations.
14	Seldom deal with race relations.
4	Never deal with race relations.

Whatever the reasons given for the kinds of training and the frequency of training which occurs, it seems clear that the requirements for Unit-Level training are not being fully met.

The FY 77 Training Model

At the time of the first data collection visit (October 1976), a new training model, called the "FY 77" model, was just going into effect in USAREUR. The second data collection visit was scheduled for six months later specifically to examine this program and its effects in a sort of "pre-/post-" design. The new training model is outlined in the 7 September 1976, USAREUR Supplement 1 to AR 600-42, superceding the FY 76 program. It calls for (1) a 12-hour orientation seminar in race relations for personnel newly assigned to USAREUR, (2) eight hours of unit-level race relations training annually for all personnel, and (3) semi-annual Executive Race Relations Seminars for selected officers, senior NCO's, and senior civilian personnel.

The sample of respondents in the Time 2 data collection included very few newly arrived personnel so no data can be presented. From discussions with personnel during the Time 2 visit, there seemed to be a general consensus that these seminars were of a high quality and that they were even an improvement over the Phase III Community-Level Seminars because they focused less on history and more on current race relations

The Time 2 sample also included very few officers or senior NCO's so the data on the Executive Seminars could not be meaningfully analyzed. In informal discussions, these personnel indicated that they felt the seminars could be well conducted and could serve a useful purpose so long as the commander in charge made it a truly open forum and did not open the discussion by stating his/her views and then asking for those who had other opinions. Such an approach ensured that no contrary opinions surfaced and essentially invalidated the whole purpose of the Executive Seminars.

Because no quantitative data can be presented on these two aspects of the program, the discussion below will center on the unit training required.

Unit Training

Many of the company commanders interviewed at Time 1 felt that the new program's shift in responsibility for the training to a greater involvement by the unit commander was a positive change. They looked forward to having more control over the

scheduling and conduct of the seminars. Table 47 shows that the respondents at Time 2 did not really share this perception with the company commanders. The majority of personnel had no opinion about the comparison between the two training models. This is probably because many soldiers were not made aware of the differences in the programs if, in fact, they even knew that a new program had gone into effect.

Table 47

Comparison of RR/EO Training Programs (Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How would you compare the new USAREUR race relations training program (which began in October 1976) with the previous program?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 2,343)	
11	I like it better.
24	It's about the same.
6	I prefer the old program.
60	No opinion or don't know.

The responses shown in Table 48 are from the Time 2 data collection visit. Because the requirement for eight hours annually of unit race relations training does not include any specification of how many sessions or how frequently the sessions must be given, it is difficult to evaluate the companies surveyed as either meeting or not meeting the requirements. However, this data was collected six months into the program, so it would be expected that some training, and probably at least two sessions, should have occurred by this point. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that at least one training session had been held in their company. And 38 percent reported that two or more sessions had been held. Thus some compliance with the requirements was occurring, but a substantial proportion of the respondents did not know how much training had occurred in the fist six months of the new program, and 11 percent were certain that no training had occurred.

Table 48

Number of Unit RR/EO Seminars Held
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *How many race relations education seminars have been held in your company since 1 October 1976?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 2,339)	
12	One.
13	Two.
9	Three.
16	Four or more.
40	Don't know.
11	None.

Table 49 shows that the company commanders and/or trained RR/EO personnel are leading the majority of those sessions which are held. This is in accordance with the requirements of the FY 77 program.

Table 49

Instructors for Unit RR/EO Seminars
(Whites and Blacks Combined)

Question: *Did the company commander lead any of the race relations classes held in your company since 1 October 1976?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,580)	
68	Yes.
32	No.

Question: *Have trained race rleations/equal opportunity personnel from outside your company conducted any of the seminars you have attended since 1 October 1976?*

Percent of Respondents (N = 1,599)	
41	Yes.
38	No.
21	Don't know.

Summary

There has been a substantial amount of race relations training occurring in USAREUR, both under the old Phase III program and under the new FY 77 program. The requirements call for 100 percent of assigned personnel to receive training, however, and this goal is far from being met.

Under the phase III program, only about 70 percent of personnel reported receiving the Community-Level training, and only about 60 percent stated that they had attended *any* Unit-Level Seminars. When the training does take place, though, the requirements for instructors and content seem to be fairly well met. The Community-Level training particularly is seen as being of a high quality. However, there is some indication that many Unit-Level seminars deal with topics outside the race relations area.

While the data collected on the FY 77 program covered only a six-month period instead of a year, and thus definitive statements about annual requirements cannot be made, it seems clear from the data that many of the problems found with the Phase III Unit-Level training are continuing to occur in FY 77. Company commanders at Time 1 had complained that they had difficulty finding time in their training schedule for the race relations seminars. The FY 77 model calls for more hours of unit training than did the Phase III model, so this problem may still be occurring. The data show that only 50 percent of the respondents reported that there had been at least one race relations seminar in their unit in the six-month period.

There was a smaller percentage of respondents who received the Unit-Level training than received the Community-Level training under the Phase III program. If this lower percentage is a function of the company commander being responsible for the training rather than the RR/EO officer, then it seems likely that under the FY 77 program fewer personnel will be trained according to the requirements than under the Phase III program, because the FY 77 program places the major responsibility for the training on the company commanders.

The FY 77 program is much more similar than the Phase III program to the training model which exists in CONUS, where monthly unit race relations seminars are required.

Under the Phase III program substantially higher percentages of personnel in USAREUR were receiving training than in CONUS.[7] In the first six months of the FY 77 program, lower percentages of respondents were receiving training than under the Phase III program, a level more similar to that found in CONUS.

Clearly more training is occurring in USAREUR than in CONUS. However, well below 100 percent of personnel are receiving training and several other aspects of the requirements are not being fully met. The FY 77 program does not appear to be a significant improvement over the Phase III program in the eyes of the soldiers, and in fact may be worse in terms of the percentage of personnel who receive training.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS FROM THE SECOND SURVEY

The original research design of the total study called for a Time 1/Time 2 administration of the survey instrument with a period of time intervening to permit assessing the impact of particular training modules which occurred after the Time 1 administration. As the study developed, it became evident that the original design was inadvisable and a number of modifications were made in it. Because of practical requirements of different time schedules and programs in existence, the design was modified differently in CONUS, USAREUR, and Korea, creating, in essence, three different partially overlapping studies.

The data collections in USAREUR most closely followed the original design. At the time of the first data collection (October 1976), a new modification of the training program was just going into effect, so that the original data collection provided information relevant to the old program and the second data collection scheduled for six months after the first provided comparative information relevant to the new program. Data from this Time 2 visit (May 1977) then, can serve both as an assessment of the new training program, and as a source of data to examine changes across time.

This chapter will examine the attitudes and perceptions data from the Time 2 visit and any changes which occurred during that period. The tables are based on the data from the 64 companies surveyed at both Time 1 and Time 2.

Racial Climate

There appears to be very little change in the racial climate during the six months interval between the data collections. There are some indications of improvement, and a few indicators of slight changes for the worse. Large differences still exist in the perceptions of blacks and whites.

Table 50 shows that only minor changes have occurred in the perceptions of equality of treatment; blacks are not significantly more likely to see equal treatment at Time 2 than at Time 1.

Table 50

Perceptions of Equality of Treatment across Time

Question: *Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion?*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 858)	% Blacks (N = 289)	% Whites (N = 752)	% Blacks (N = 287)	
44	6	42	9	In general, non-whites are treated better than whites in the Army.
49	27	50	28	In general, non-whites are treated exactly the same as whites in the Army.
8	68	8	63	In general, non-whites are treated worse than whites in the Army.

It can be seen in Table 51 that blacks do see a significant improvement in the opportunities for promotion, but there are still extreme differences between the perceptions of blacks and whites. A majority of black respondents still assert that blacks must do more than the average white to make the grade.

Table 51

Perception of Promotion Opportunities across Time

Statement: *A black in the Army must do more than the average white to make the grade.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 582)	% Blacks (N = 212)	% Whites (N = 801)	% Blacks (N = 266)	
7	75	3	60	Strongly Agree/Agree
10	13	13	20	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
83	12	84	21	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Blacks also continue to state that non-whites get more than their share of dirty details (Table 52). Whites, however, are less likely to agree that this is true at Time 2; there is a significant shift among white respondents from agreement with the statement to a position of neutrality.

Table 52

Perception of Assignment to Work Details across Time

Statement: *Non-whites get more than their share of dirty details.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 572)	% Blacks (N = 217)	% Whites (N = 799)	% Blacks (N = 310)	
12	45	9	44	Strongly Agree/Agree
16	30	19	28	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
72	26	72	27	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

There is a slight, but non-significant, increase at Time 2 in the percentage of blacks who feel that whites have a better chance than non-whites to get the best training opportunities (Table 53). There are significant differences between the white responses to this item at Time 1 and Time 2, with whites at Time 2 shifting to a more neutral position.

Table 53

Perceptions of Opportunities for Training across Time

Statement: *Whites have a better chance than non-whites to get the best training opportunities*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 568)	% Blacks (N = 219)	% Whites (N = 796)	% Blacks (N = 310)	
7	50	5	55	Strongly Agree/Agree
16	24	21	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
78	26	73	22	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

There are no differences in the perceptions of "reverse discrimination" from Time 1 to Time 2. Table 54 shows that such perceptions continue at relatively low levels, with whites perceiving more of such discrimination than do blacks.

Table 54

Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites across Time

Statement: *There is racial discrimination against whites at this community.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 569)	% Blacks (N = 216)	% Whites (N = 800)	% Blacks (N = 313)	
27	13	27	16	Strongly Agree/Agree
33	28	33	27	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
41	59	40	57	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

There also are no differences across time in the reported incidence of racist joke telling (Table 55). Both whites and blacks state that it occurs fairly infrequently in their companies and work units.

Table 55

Racist Joke Telling across Time

Question: *How often do people of your own race in your company or work unit tell racist jokes about other races?*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 850)	% Blacks (N = 304)	% Whites (N = 801)	% Blacks (N = 266)	
17	14	15	21	Very Often/Often
43	38	41	34	Sometimes
40	48	44	45	Seldom/Never

Another reported behavior which showed no changes across time is shown in Table 56. There is general agreement between blacks and whites that the overt racial conflict is an infrequent occurrence. However, approximately 10 percent of the respondents

continue to report that such racial conflict does occur sometimes, a view that was supported in interviews with RR/EO personnel.

Table 56

Open Racial Conflict across Time

Question: *How often do whites and non-whites in your company or work unit form groups and challenge each other to fights?*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 848)	% Blacks (N = 307)	% Whites (N = 801)	% Blacks (N = 266)	
3	4	3	5	Very Often/Often
8	11	8	11	Sometimes
90	85	89	85	Seldom/Never

Another behavior examined at both Time 1 and Time 2 is the frequency of off-duty racial interaction. Blacks show no differences across time in the reported frequency of interaction, but whites at Time 2 show a significant shift toward less frequent interaction with non-whites (Table 57).

Table 57

Racial Interaction across Time

Question: *How often do whites and non-whites in your company or work unit go to Army clubs together (Enlisted Club, NCO Club, Officers Club)?*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 861)	% Blacks (N = 300)	% Whites (N = 791)	% Blacks (N = 309)	
36	27	31	27	Very Often/Often
40	40	46	40	Sometimes
24	33	23	33	Seldom/Never

When asked about the overall racial climate, whites at Time 2 give much the same responses as whites at Time 1, again seeing the state of race relations as generally "fair" (Table 58).

Table 58

Perceived Quality of Race Relations across Time

Question: *Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion?*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 853)	% Blacks (N = 314)	% Whites (N = 768)	% Blacks (N = 256)	
22	17	21	16	In general, race relations in the Army are good.
55	43	58	54	In general, race relations in the Army are fair.
24	40	22	31	In general, race relations in the Army are poor.

Blacks at both Time 1 and Time 2 give a somewhat less optimistic view than whites. Blacks at Time 2, however, are substantially more optimistic than blacks at Time 1, with a significant reduction in the percentage of respondents seeing race relations as "poor" and a consequent increase in the percentage of respondents reporting race relations as "fair."

An associated question shows no differences across time for either whites or blacks. Table 59 shows the responses to a question on changes in the racial climate. There is a slight, but non-significant increase in the percentage of blacks who state that race relations have been getting better. Overall, however, there is general agreement between whites and blacks that race relations in the Army have not changed in the past year.

Table 59

Perceived Changes in Quality of Race Relations across Time

Statement: *Over the past year, race relations in the Army:*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 858)	% Blacks (N = 294)	% Whites (N = 758)	% Blacks (N = 289)	
35	40	34	45	have been getting better.
50	47	53	43	have not changed.
15	13	13	13	have been getting worse.

Attitudes toward the RR/EO Program

Changes in attitudes toward the RR/EO program were expected across the six-month interval since the program itself was changed at the beginning of this period. While few dramatic changes were found, there were signs of an improved attitude, particularly among white respondents, where there was more room for improvement, but also among black respondents.

One important change in the responses of blacks is shown in Table 60. Significantly fewer blacks at Time 2 felt that whites in the Army don't really want minorities to be treated equally. While a very substantial percentage still do hold this view, this percentage has fallen below the halfway mark. White responses to the item were essentially unchanged.

Table 60

Perceived Desire for Racial Equality by Whites across Time

Statement: *Most whites in the Army don't want racial minorities to be treated equally.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 582)	% Blacks (N = 211)	% Whites (N = 800)	% Blacks (N = 265)	
11	57	11	42	Strongly Agree/Agree
18	27	21	34	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
72	16	68	25	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

One area in which both whites and blacks see some deterioration is in the enforcement of RR/EO policies and regulations. Table 61 shows the responses to two questions dealing with enforcement. Significantly fewer blacks at Time 2 agree with the statement that most NCO's usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced. While there are no changes in white responses to the question about NCO's, when the same statement is made about officers there is a change in the white responses.

At Time 2, significantly fewer whites are willing to assert that most officers usually see to it that policies are enforced. There also is some reduction in the already lower levels of blacks agreeing with this statement. This could have very important consequences for the new version of the program because it places greater responsibility for the conduct of the program on the unit commander and staff.

Table 61

Perception of Enforcement of RR/EO Policies across Time

Statement: *Most NCO's usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 1,146)	% Blacks (N = 423)	% Whites (N = 1,603)	% Blacks (N = 578)	
41	35	42	31	Strongly Agree/Agree
32	28	30	24	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
27	37	28	45	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Statement: *Most officers usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 571)	% Blacks (N = 216)	% Whites (N = 796)	% Blacks (N = 314)	
51	36	44	28	Strongly Agree/Agree
29	32	39	39	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
20	32	18	33	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Even with the changes which occurred in the structure of RR/EO training, there are no significant changes in the perception that RR/EO programs are mostly just for show (Table 62). Nearly half of both the black and white respondent groups hold this opinion.

Table 62

Perception of the RR/EO Program across Time

Statement: *RR/EO programs in this community are mostly just for show.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 571)	% Blacks (N = 216)	% Whites (N = 800)	% Blacks (N = 315)	
43	41	46	41	Strongly Agree/Agree
28	31	31	33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
29	28	24	25	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

There also were only non-significant changes in responses to a question on the perceived need for the program (Table 63). Slightly fewer whites and blacks at Time 2 agreed with the statement that most of the Army's RR/EO programs are unnecessary. Once again blacks held a more favorable view of the program than whites.

Table 63

Perception of the Need for RR/EO Program across Time

Statement: *Most of the Army's RR/EO programs are unnecessary.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 567)	% Blacks (N = 216)	% Whites (N = 800)	% Blacks (N = 312)	
43	29	38	23	Strongly Agree/Agree
28	28	31	30	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
29	43	31	47	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Responses to an item on the potential benefits of the RR/EO program showed no changes across time. It can be seen in Table 64 that both whites and blacks continue to be split on the question of whether or not everybody in the Army will benefit in the long run from the program.

Table 64

Perceptions of Potential Benefits of the RR/EO Program across Time

Statement: *In the long run, everybody in the Army will benefit from race relations and equal opportunity programs.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 582)	% Blacks (N = 212)	% Whites (N = 800)	% Blacks (N = 267)	
33	39	33	41	Strongly Agree/Agree
35	29	39	35	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
32	32	28	24	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Both whites and blacks also continue to be split on the question of whether or not race relations seminars are a waste of time. Approximately 40 percent of all respondents continue to agree with this statement, as shown in Table 65. However, the increases in the percentage of whites disagreeing with this statement are sufficiently large to reach statistical significance. This indicates some improvement by whites in their attitudes toward the training.

Table 65

Perceptions of the Usefulness of Race Relations Seminars across Time

Statement: *Race relations seminars are a waste of time.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 578)	% Blacks (N = 209)	% Whites (N = 797)	% Blacks (N = 265)	
45	35	42	38	Strongly Agree/Agree
29	33	26	28	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
26	32	32	35	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Table 66 shows an item in which there was a change in the attitudes of whites across time. Significantly more whites at Time 2 agreed that everybody in the Army should be required to attend race relations seminars. There were also increases in the percentage of blacks agreeing with this statement. This may signal a more positive attitude toward the training and perhaps a greater perceived need. Blacks continue to be much more favorable than whites toward the program, but the differences in attitudes are narrowing.

Table 66

Perceptions of Requirements of Race Relations Seminars across Time

Statement: *Everybody in the Army should be required to attend race relations seminars.*

Time 1		Time 2		
% Whites (N = 570)	% Blacks (N = 217)	% Whites (N = 803)	% Blacks (N = 312)	
37	61	47	69	Strongly Agree/Agree
23	21	20	14	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
40	18	34	17	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Another group directly affected by the changes in the program is the company commanders. They have greater responsibilities for the conduct of training under the new program, and thus should be in closer contact with the current state of race relations in their units. Table 67 shows the responses to a question on the need for the program. This question was asked of company commanders at Time 1 and Time 2. There was a slight, non-significant increase across time in the percentage of company commanders who saw a definite need for a race relations education program. This continued the already high level of commanders who perceive that the program is necessary.

Table 67

Perceptions by Company Commanders of the Need for the Program across Time

Question: *Which of the following comes closest to your opinion?*

Company Commanders		
Time 1 (N = 56)	Time 2 (N = 35)	
86	91	I believe that thre is a definite need for a race relations education program in the Army.
11	6	I don't really know whether there is a real need or not.
4	3	I believe that there is insufficient need to have a race relations education program in the Army.

When asked about command support for the race relations education program, company commanders gave very different answers at Time 2 than at Time 1 (Table 68). There was a significant decrease at Time 2 in the percentage of company commanders who felt that the program received "excellent" or "good" command support; many commanders classified the support as only "fair." There still were over two-thirds of the respondents who rated the support highly, but the substantial change from Time 1 signals a change in perception.

Table 68

Perceptions by Company Commanders of Command Support across Time

Question: *What kind of command support does the race relations education program receive at this community?*

Company Commanders		
Time 1 (N = 54)	Time 2 (N = 35)	
97	69	Excellent/Good
2	26	Fair
2	6	Poor/Very Poor

A number of explanations for this change are possible. It may be that when the company commanders become more closely involved in the program they see that the program is not

as well supported as they had thought. Another possibility is that the amount of command support did actually decrease in the six-month interval. Or, it may be that the changes in the program are themselves seen as signs of a decreased emphasis because the seminars require less involvement by the specially-trained personnel of the RR/EO office.

In interviews, the company commanders seemed generally pleased to have the program changed to give them more control over the RR/EO training. Several commanders expressed a desire to have more instruction on how to conduct such training because they felt unprepared to handle their responsibilities in this area. Included in the next chapter is a discussion of the Unit Commanders Course (UCC) which aims at providing some further preparation to new commanders.

Summary

The data collected at the end of the six-month period under study overall show some signs of a *slight improvement* in the racial climate and attitudes toward the RR/EO program. A very few items show negative changes, but the positive changes appear to outweigh these. The majority of items examined, however, show little or no change across time, so the general conclusion is that improvements can only be considered as slight.

A general characterization of the racial climate for the six-month interval under study is that overall race relations have not changed. Therefore, the conclusions of Chapter II still hold true six months later. There continue to be signs of a high frequency of voluntary racial separation in USAREUR and a high degree of perceived discrimination by minorities. The views of whites and blacks are still widely different on most questions involving equal opportunities and discrimination, with whites perceiving many fewer problems than do blacks.

There is some improvement in attitudes toward the RR/EO program, particularly among whites, but there are also indications that the policies and regulations are not even being as well enforced as they were at Time 1. There also continue to be differences between whites and blacks in their attitudes and perceptions of the RR/EO program, although these differences are decreasing.

CHAPTER VI

THE USAREUR RACE RELATIONS SCHOOL

Although the primary focus of the study was on RR/EO training, it was considered desirable to include a substudy of the USAREUR Race Relations School at Munich. This school, unique in the Army, provided two courses of instruction: (1) a four-week, part-time instructors course; and (2) a one-week company commanders course. One of the objectives of the USAREUR part of the study, in addition to an analysis and assessment of RR/EO unit training, was to examine these two courses and, to the extent feasible, to assess their effectiveness. In this chapter, the information obtained regarding these two courses is discussed.

The URRS–Part-Time Instructors Course (URRS)

The Part-Time Instructors Course was instituted because there was not a sufficient supply of trained instructors to meet the needs in USAREUR. The purpose of this 20-day course was:[6]

> *To train qualified military personnel how to teach and resolve racial/ethnic problems by non-violent procedures and increase the number of Race Relations Officers/Non-Commissioned Officers in the USAREUR command by graduating personnel who would be utilized on a part-time basis.*

Class size was approximately 50 and the methods of instruction included: conference; discussion; lecture; demonstrations; large-group participation; structural experiences; small group; field trips; and films. The program of instruction was organized into six modules:

---

[6]From P.O.I., USAREUR Part-Time Race Relations Instructor Course.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

Module	Hours
I. Communication Skills	19
II. Racism and Sexism	22
III. Individual and Group Behavior	14
IV. Methods of Instruction	65
V. General Subjects	26
VI. Administration	13
	159

Terminal goals of the course were stated as follows:

> *Individuals completing this course should be able to assist in the conduct of the USAREUR Race Relations Education Program by serving as part-time instructors. Individuals will be able to conduct research, prepare and select training aids, and conduct lectures, conferences, practical exercises, guided discussions, seminars, and structured experiences.*

As a training of trainers course of instruction, the URRS course is less extensive than DRRI but more extensive than the typical unit discussion leaders course.

Unit Commanders Race Relations Course (UCC)

The Unit Commanders Race Relations Course is a unique training experience in the Army. It is the only one of which we are aware that is specifically designed to provide training in RR/EO to unit commanders as unit commanders. Its purpose is:[7]

> *To provide a progressive, appropriate race relations/equal opportunity module of instruction for unit commanders in the U.S. Army Europe, in order to maintain the highest degree of organizational and combat readiness by fostering harmonious relations among all personnel under his/her control.*

[7] From P.O.I., Unit Commanders Race Relations Course.

Individuals who attend should be in command positions or designated to assume command. Class size was generally between 40 and 50 and methods of instruction were essentially the same as those indicated for URRS. The five-day program of instruction was organized as follows:

Module	Hours
I. General Subjects	14
II. Communication Skills	11
III. Individual and Group Behavior	4
IV. Racism, Sexism	9
V. Administration	1
	39

The General Subjects (Block I) included:

1. the experiential learning model;
2. group norms that are most supportive of learning;
3. patterns of organizational communication;
4. the effects of vested interests on intragroup and intergroup interaction;
5. the situationality of leadership effectiveness;
6. the concept of non-directive counseling;
7. the role of the unit commander in the implementation of the Race Relations Education Program FY 77, and the Affirmative Actions Plan as an effective management tool.

Terminal goals of this course were stated as follows:

Individuals completing this course should:

1. *be able to apply viable leadership techniques for effective unit management.*
2. *apply communications skills.*

3. *Identify the commander's responsibilities inherent in the implementation of the U.S. Army Europe's Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Program.*

4. *apply race relations/equal opportunity management techniques.*

The faculty and facilities for the two courses were essentially the same.

The Data Obtained

A considerable array of information was obtained pertinent to the URRS and the UCC course. The school at Munich was visited in September 1976, by a member of the research team and interviews were held with some faculty and URRS students and a few instructional periods were observed. Arrangements were made to obtain pre- and post-training questionnaires from three UCC classes and one URRS class scheduled in the December through February time period. In addition, during the primary data collection visits to the seven communities in USAREUR, interviews and questionnaires were obtained from a number of graduates of URRS and UCC in the field. Thus, in addition to an on-site visit and review of materials obtained at the school, the sources of information used in this chapter are:

A.	Questionnaires from URRS Students—pre- and post-training	N = 48
B.	Questionnaires from UCC Students—pre- and post-training	N = 115
C.	Questionnaires from URRS Graduates in the field	N = 64
D.	Questionnaires from UCC Graduates in the field	N = 33
E.	Interviews with URRS Students	N = 7
F.	Interviews with and interviews from URRS Faculty	N = 5

No useful purpose would be served by presenting all of the data obtained from these different sources. The sheer volume of data from all of the different questionnaires, different respondent groups, and different times of responding would require more than 100 pages of tables just to present. Since much of these data represent questions that were

were pursued for exploratory purposes and many of the findings are suggestive but not definitive, it seemed appropriate to attempt to prepare for this chapter a more interpretive writeup of the findings concerning URRS and UCC. There will be no attempt, therefore, to present all of the data collected, but rather, the effort will be made to select what appear to be the most interesting and informative findings and to condense and summarize the interpretation of the total array of data in prose form.[8]

Impact of the URRS Course on Students

From the changes in questionnaire responses from pre- to post-training, it is clear that the experience of the URRS course affected students in a large number of ways. There were six scales in the questionnaire which measured different aspects of racial attitudes and perceptions.[9] On two of these, Perceived Discrimination against Blacks and Interracial Behavior, scores were significantly higher after training than before. This means that students saw more discrimination against blacks occurring and reported more interracial interaction than they did before training. On three scales, Behavioral Intentions, Feelings of Reverse Discrimination, and Racial Climate, there were no before and after differences. On one scale, Attitudes toward Integration, scores were lower which appears to signify more negative attitudes toward integration after training. However, this is probably an artifact since the pre-scores on this scale were already near maximum, they could only change in one direction. A regression toward the mean in this instance would produce the apparently more negative attitudes. It is of some interest that the pattern of results obtained on the six scales was identical to that obtained for DRRI students.[10]

Three knowledge scales were also included on the questionnaire. They were:

- General Knowledge of Racial History
- Knowledge of Contemporary Racial Issues
- Knowledge of Behavioral Science and Racial Terms and Concepts.

[8] The actual questionnaire results from the UCC and URRS students have been provided to [illegible] in March.

[9] For a description of and further data on these scales, see the Technical Appendix in Byron G. [illegible], *An Analysis of the Training of Army Personnel at the Defense Race Relations Institute* [illegible] Human Sciences Research, Inc., April 1977).

[10] [illegible], p. 118.

On the first scale, scores increased after training although the differences were not statistically significant. One reason is that scores on the scale were initially quite high and so the possible range was restricted. On the second two scales there was a significant increase after training. Thus, to the extent change was occurring on these scales, it was all in the desired direction with the one exception noted. The changes were roughly comparable to those found at DRRI, a course nearly three times longer than the one at URRS.

As has been mentioned earlier, there were large pre-post differences on the interracial behavior items. This scale consisted of six items which asked how often one engaged in various activities with people of other races. On the pre-training questionnaire, the average percentage who responded "Very Often," to these questions was 14 percent; while the average on the post-training questionnaire was 40 percent. Observations, interviews and other data were all highly consistent in reflecting that one very strong impact of the school was to increase interracial behavior. The extent to which this change in behavior continued once students returned to their own communities is unknown, however.

Students rated the training they received in the URRS course very highly. On a five-alternative rating, nearly 70 percent gave the highest rating and the remainder gave the next to the highest; none gave the lowest three alternatives. Students said the training had changed very much their attitudes toward: themselves; people of other races; racism; and sexism; but not their attitude toward the Army. When asked about 12 different aspects of URRS training, the four they rated highest and the four they rated lowest were:

	Rated Highest		Rated Lowest
1.	small group discussions	9.	administration
2.	knowledge of instructors	10.	minority studies
3.	presentation of instructors	11.	EOSO/NCO
4.	behavioral science	12.	audiovisual aids.

It is of some interest to note that minority studies, meaning primarily history and culture of different minority groups, was rated among the lowest. It is also of interest that the aspect they rated highest in an experience which they generally rated as extremely positive was small-group discussions.

When asked about redistribution of training time at URRS in the future, the majority favored more time devoted to Behavioral Science and about the same for Minority Studies, Task Work Groups, Examination/Critiques, Administration and EOSO/NCO. In rating the effectiveness of URRS in accomplishing its mission, three-quarters rated it very effective and the remainder rated it effective, none choosing the lowest three categories.

About one-third of the students said the URRS experience increased their intention to stay in the Army, while the remaining two-thirds said it had no effect. Over 80 percent believed attendance at URRS would have a positive effect on their military career with less than three percent believing it would have a harmful effect. It is of interest that this view was substantially more optimistic than was the view of URRS graduates actually working in the field. Among this latter group, about 50 percent thought their URRS experience would have a positive effect and 50 percent thought it would be negative. Nearly half of the students said that the experience improved their attitude toward the military.

A list of 41 subjects taught during the course was presented and students were asked how effectively each was taught and how useful they felt the subject matter would be in their present assignment. As might be expected, the responses to the two questions are highly correlated. For the purpose of gaining a sense of the types of content thought to be effectively taught and useful on the job, the ten subjects most students thought were effectively taught and the ten they thought least effectively taught are listed below.

Subjects Taught Most Effectively	**Subjects Taught Least Effectively**
Group Dynamics	Hispanics
Group Goals, Cohesiveness Pressure	Puerto Ricans
Stereotypes and Self-Fulfilling Prophesy	Native Americans
Polarization and Separation	Conceptual Systems
Task Group Exercise–Communications	Training Aids
Task Group Exercise–Group Dynamics	Appalachian Exploitation
Trust Collaboration and Teamwork	White Working Class
Art of Communication	Military Correspondence
Psychology of Rumor	Film–"Montgomery to Memphis"
BIA (Experiential Exercises)	New White Consciousness

The overlap of subjects thought to be most and least effectively taught and most and least useful is very high—seven of the ten most effectively taught are also perceived as most useful, and six of ten least effectively taught were perceived as least useful. The one subject perceived to be highly useful on the job which was not perceived to be among the most effectively taught was Civilian and Military RR/EO Policy and Doctrine.

The lists above show some interesting consistencies. Among those subjects perceived as effectively taught are the subjects dealing with group process and interrelationships and with some behavioral science subjects like Psychology of Rumor, Stereotypes and the Self-Fulfilling Prophesy. The least effectively taught subjects are more varied but they tend to include the history and culture of the different minorities, ideological or conceptual content as for example, New White Consciousness and Conceptual Systems. The single film in the list, "From Montgomery to Memphis" was decidedly rejected. It is fairly clear that the faculty at URRS was most successful with content that dealt with group dynamics and intergroup processes.

This conclusion is further supported by the responses to two additional questions which asked students to list the three most positive and the three most negative aspects of the training. Overwhelmingly, the positive responses dealt with self-awareness, group dynamics, and communications skills. Relatively few negative aspects were listed and they tended to be highly specific and idiosyncratic points. From the responses listed to these qeustions, one cannot escape the impression that the majority of URRS students had an extraordinarily positive and personally meaningful experience.

A possibly related fact is that, as a group, URRS graduates are far more positive and optimistic about the state of race relations in the Army and the effectiveness of RR/EO training in reducing tensions as compared to Army personnel in USAREUR in general. For example, only one-third of Army personnel say they think that race relations have been getting better over the past year, whereas two-thirds of URRS graduates express this view. The data is not available to determine whether URRS graduates had such positive views before going to URRS or not.

The URRS graduates were asked their opinion of how the performance of DRRI graduates compared with that of URRS graduates, both in terms of RR/EO instructor and RR/EO staff work. The group split about evenly on whether DRRI graduates were more effective instructors. However, nearly two-thirds of URRS graduates saw DRRI graduates as performing staff roles more effectively. The URRS mission is narrower than DRRI and focuses solely on producing part-time instructors. This difference is at least reflected in the views of URRS graduates who saw themselves primarily as RR/EO instructors and not particularly effective in a staff role. The P.O.I. also reflects this difference and there is relatively little in it that provides training for performance of staff functions.

Seven URRS students who were about two-thirds through the course were individually interviewed. Although of different ages, races, sexes, and rank, the students expressed highly similar views. All felt they had had a truly important learning experience. They expressed the highest regard for the school instructors and most remarked on how dedicated the instructors were. They felt they were far better prepared to deal with issues of racism and sexism in their units but they still needed more preparation. All in all there was no doubt that, at least for those interviewed, the URRS experience was having a profound impact both on their understanding of the RR/EO problem in the Army and also in their motivation and capability to work to resolve it.

Unit Commanders Course (UCC)

In general, the findings concerning URRS are closely paralled by those for UCC. For the most part, the responses to questionnaire items were similar in pattern but less intense than the URRS responses. The UCC is, of course, only five days as compared with 20 for URRS. One question asked on the pre-training questionnaire was how much the commander thought UCC training would affect his attitudes toward himself, people of other races, racism, sexism, and the Army. For the most part, the responses indicated that they expected very little change. (The comparable question for URRS students showed that in comparison they expected a great deal of change.) A similar question was asked

post training about how much change had occurred in these areas. There was a large shift in responses indicating that they had experienced far more change in their attitudes than they had expected. The changes were least regarding attitudes toward the Army, but quite large on all others. This would seem to indicate that the school experience was having a decided impact.

Examining the same six scale scores discussed with regard to URRS students, one observes that there was a statistically significant increase on only one scale, Perceived Discrimination against Blacks (PDB). This is consistent with findings throughout the Army that almost any training in RR/EO leads to an increase in PDB as people become more aware of how discrimination functions. Even though the UCC students showed a significant increase in PDB scores, these post-training mean scores were far below the mean scores of URRS graduates.

All other scales scores showed no pre-post differences except for Interracial Behavior (IB). This scale score *decreased* significantly indicating that commanders were *less* likely to engage in interracial activity after training than before. In contrast, both DRRI and URRS students showed significant increases in Interracial Behavior scores post training. This finding may relate to differences in the groups' composition in that the DRRI and URRS groups were nearly evenly divided between whites and minorities compared with the UCC group which was 91 percent white. Another factor could be that an initial intense exposure to some aspects of RR/EO training content could result in at least a temporary withdrawal from attempts at interracial interaction as one digests and considers somewhat altered perspectives.

In terms of the same three scales of knowledge discussed in regard to the URRS students:

- General Knowledge of Racial History;
- Knowledge of Contemporary Racial Issues;
- Knowledge of Behavioral Science and Racial Terminology and concepts

commanders scored significantly higher after training than they did before training on all three. The course, therefore, appeared effective at least in imparting cognitive knowledge.

When asked how satisfactory the UCC course had been in preparing commanders for their future jobs, the response was mixed. Over 55 percent said it was either satisfactory or very satisfactory, but 24 percent said it was unsatisfactory or very unsatisfactory. Compared with the earlier cited findings about commanders' experience of rather large changes in attitudes, one might conclude that commanders are acknowledging that the school experience is having a large impact on many attitudes and perceptions but they are less certain that this will help them in their job.

Like the URRS students, when asked about the quality of six aspects of the training experience, the small group discussion format and the knowledge of the instructors were most highly rated. The audiovisuals, handouts, and printed materials, and the straight lectures were generally downgraded.

In terms of the effect of UCC on intent to stay in the military, 86 percent said it had no effect, 4 percent said it increased their intentions, and 10 percent said it decreased theirs. With respect to the probable impact of UCC on their military career, 55 percent said it would be positive, 45 percent said it would have no effect, and no one believed it would have an adverse effect. In response to a question about the impact of the UCC experience on attitude toward the military, 74 percent said it had none, while about 13 percent claimed a more favorable attitude and 13 percent claimed a less favorable attitude.

The UCC students were given a list of 23 subjects taught during the five days and asked to rate them in two ways: first, how effectively were they taught, and second, how useful this subject matter would be in their present command.

Five Subjects Taught Most Effectively	Five Subjects Taught Least Effectively
Personal Racism and Sexism	Drug and Alcohol Abuse
Opening Channels of Communication	Influencing Behavior–Film
Group Dynamics	Diagnostic Exam
Listening and Vested Interests	Starpower–Game, Exercise
Racism, Sexism, Prejudice and Discrimination	Intervention Management

Four of the five most effectively taught were also perceived to be most useful and three of the five least effectively taught were perceived to be least useful. The patterns

are similar to those from URRS students although the number of subjects taught in UCC was much smaller. Subjects dealing with listening, group dynamics, communications and sexism/racism were seen as taught most effectively while those seen as least effectively taught were a mixed bag of films, exercises, drug and alcohol abuse and a subject called Intervention Management. The whole issue of communication seems to stand out as an issue of the highest concern to commanders. It appears no accident that by far and away the highest rated subject in terms of usefulness to commanders was the one entitled Opening Channels of Communication.

In the interviews with unit commanders who had attended UCC, the most frequently expressed view was that commanders did not want to take the time to attend UCC but once they did attend, they were glad that they had. The felt that the UCC training helped them in a number of ways with respect to the "people" problems that commanders typically face. They most frequently mentioned the value of the training on learning to "listen"—to really hear what the other person is trying to say or ask. Commanders recognized that UCC was dealing with a whole set of issues in which they had had little training and which they were coming to realize played large roles in their ability to do their job effectively as a commander of troops. The overwhelming majority of unit commanders interviewed who had attended UCC felt it was a worthwhile experience and they would have liked to have had more of it.

General Conclusions on URRS and UCC Courses

These comments refer to the schools as they were staffed and operated in late 1976 and early 1977. Personnel, organization, and curricula changes have occurred since then and there is no way of knowing whether the conclusions drawn are still applicable.

It is our conclusion that most of the data available from all the varied sources from which they were collected indicate that the school was doing a good job in achieving its objectives in both courses. We felt that the Part-Time Instructors Course was the most effective training of trainers course we have observed in the Army. It appeared to be highly

successful in making students aware of what personal racism and sexism is and how it expresses itself. It appeared highly effective in teaching about interpersonal communications and what facilitates and blocks it. It was clear that most all students were intensely and positively affected by the school experience.

The Part-Time Instructors Course aimed at producing trained RR/EO instructors and it appeared to achieve this objective pretty well. In short, the school was achieving what it was trying to do. The school's emphasis on group processes and the conditions for effective communications, and its general de-emphasis on minority history and cuture appear to have been effective choices.

Our major criticism has to do with what was not included in the course of instruction. The content was heavily oriented toward individual and personal racism and sexism and did not deal with the concept of institutional discrimination and how it operates in the Army. This is an important omission in content and its absence does not reflect the Army's current policy and doctrine which definitely stresses the importance of institutional discrimination.

The same general conclusions appeared appropriate for the Unit Commanders Course. That course appeared to meet a real need and was doing so successfully. It was our observation from the total study of Army RR/EO training that the most significant omission in the whole RR/EO training program is the lack of effective training for unit commanders. The UCC is a unique attempt to meet this need and appears to be a successful effort which could well be emulated elsewhere. It also falls short in its failure to deal with institutional discrimination and to sensitize commanders to the ways in which leaders can inadvertently perpetuate and contribute to it. But this omission does not diminish the value of what the course does impart. Overall, the UCC appeared to be a successful pioneering effort to conduct training at a most critical level where the RR/EO education and training program as a whole has failed to reach.

CHAPTER VII

RR/EO TRAINING IN USAREUR–CONCLUSIONS

The research aimed at determining how RR/EO training was actually being conducted and, to the extent possible, assessing the impact that training was having. Findings have been presented concerning: the racial climate in USAREUR; attitudes toward and perceptions of RR/EO programs in general and RR/EO training in particular; the actual conduct of RR/EO training; changes in attitudes and perceptions over a six-month time interval; and some findings concerning the USAREUR Race Relations School. In this chapter, we discuss the major conclusions we believe are warranted by the information obtained in the study.

Racial Climate in USAREUR

The racial climate in USAREUR in the spring of 1977, was roughly comparable to that found in CONUS in late summer, 1976. Whites and non-whites are significantly different in their perceptions on almost every indicator. While whites and non-whites live and work in a common environment, the race relations/equal opportunity reality each group perceives has little in common. There is slightly greater polarity of opinions between whites and blacks in USAREUR than in CONUS.

There is no evidence that the racial climate is improving and there is some evidence that it is, in fact, deteriorating. With respect to responses to a few global questions on the state of race relations, the response patterns of late 1976 and early 1977 in USAREUR are closer to the Army-wide patterns of 1972 than they are to the less tense period of 1974.

It is our impression, drawn from the interviews and observations as well as from the questionnaire responses, that there are growing racial tensions in USAREUR but they are obscured by a surface calm inasmuch as the normal telltale signs of violent confrontations are not occurring. While white backlash feelings appear to be less in USAREUR than in CONUS, we would expect that source of racial tensions to continue to increase. In general

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

we detect a strong current of feeling among whites that the RR/EO program has "over-corrected."

Among blacks, the dominant feeling seems to be one of unmet expectations. Although most blacks acknowledge progress in reducing discrimination, they tend to express frustration and anger at what they see as continued foot-dragging by many white leaders. They feel that promises to eliminate discrimination and to create true equality of opportunity have been only half kept.

Thus, the overall attitudinal climate in which RR/EO training is being undertaken is hardly conducive to its success. Both whites and blacks distrust the motivations behind the program, although for different reasons, and both groups are having difficulty perceiving the program as credible, again, for different reasons. This situation can only contribute further to the difficulties the training program must overcome.

If one takes the reduction of racial tensions as a measure of the effectiveness of the training program, then the training cannot be termed effective except, perhaps, to the extent that the tensions might have been still higher had there not been any training and we do believe this to be the case. Overall, we believe the racial climate in USAREUR is not improving and in fact may be worsening. This is occurring at the same time that the priority and emphasis on RR/EO training also appears to be waning.

The Conduct of RR/EO Training in USAREUR

Substantially higher percentages of personnel were receiving RR/EO unit training under the Phase III program in USAREUR than were receiving RR/EO training in CONUS. This percentage appeared to decline, however, under the FY 77 program to a level closely resembling that in CONUS. Nonetheless, with the Community-Level orientation training and the Executive Seminars in addition to the unit training, there is more RR/EO training occurring in USAREUR than anywhere else examined in the study.

The problems commanders had with the Phase III unit training were still present in the FY 77 program. The FY 77 program calls for more hours of unit training than the

previous program and commanders already complained that they were unable to schedule the hours required in Phase III. Enlisted personnel were not in general aware of any difference in the Phase III and FY 77 programs.

There is some indication that the Community-Level orientation training may be the most effective block of instruction of its type. It appears to be generally well-conducted and well-received and, although similar in many respects, appears to be an improvement over the Phase III block of instruction it replaces. There had been too few Executive Seminars in the first six months of the FY 77 program to draw many conclusions about them. It did appear, however, that in some commands they were being conducted and were perceived as useful and effective. The chief criticism of Executive Seminars that surfaced was that some commanders tended to inhibit open discussion of issues by declaring their own views at the outset and thus discouraging the presentation of other views.

Judging from the lower frequency of occurrence of unit training and from discussions with commanders and RR/EO personnel, we conclude that, as it is implemented at the unit level, RR/EO training is accorded an extremely low priority by chain-of-command personnel in general.

Attitudes toward and Perceptions of RR/EO Programs

There appears to be a general consensus at all levels and for all races that a *need* exists for RR/EO training. There is also a fairly high consensus that the unit training program—both Phase III and FY 77—is not meeting that need. RR/EO programs have a fairly negative image among both blacks and whites.

Many blacks feel that the Army is only interested in the program for public relations purposes or as a token gesture aimed at vocal minority groups. They believe that the Army is not really committed to equal opportunity and they distrust the motivations of commanders.

Many whites dislike the RR/EO program because too much emphasis is placed on minority history and culture and they are concerned that RR/EO programs only benefit minorities. They recognize that problems exist but they dislike the approach taken in training.

Changes in Attitudes and Perceptions

Data collected at the end of the six-month period under study, overall show signs of a slight improvement in the racial climate and in attitudes toward the RR/EO program during that time period during which the FY 77 program was in effect—October 1976-May 1977. That improvement was small, and with some indicators changing in the opposite direction we did not interpret it as signaling a real upturn in what we believe to be a worsening racial climate.

The most striking finding is just how stable and resistant to change are the black-white differences in perceptions and attitudes. The inability to have much effect on these differences is testimony either to the fact that the training program is not being vigorously and effectively implemented or that the basic model on which the training program is based is inappropriate to the task. It is our conclusion that both are true. The basic unit training model which requires chain-of-command personnel to conduct training in subjects in which they are generally ill-prepared and uncomfortable is not likely to produce effective training even if it were vigorously and enthusiastically implemented. In addition to the inappropriateness of the basic model, its implementation by personnel who themselves are not persuaded of the importance and validity of the program's content and goals cannot help but communicate messages about the low priority, non-credible status of the program.

USAREUR Race Relations School

Our conclusion was that the school was doing a good job in achieving its objectives in both the Part-Time Instructors Course and the Unit Commanders Course. We felt that the Part-Time Instructors Course was the most effective training-of-trainers course we had observed in the Army. The major criticism was the lack of any content dealing with institutional discrimination and how it operates in the Army.

The Unit Commanders Course appeared to meet a real need and was doing so successfully. The primary criticism here, too, was the omission of content on institutional

discrimination. Overall, however, the UCC appeared to be a successful pioneering effort to conduct training at a most critical level where the RR/EO education and training program as a whole has failed to reach.

Concluding Comment

The USAREUR command has clearly placed a high emphasis on RR/EO training and has initiated repeated and real efforts to make it more effective. That these efforts achieve so little is testimony to the virulence and ubiquity of the basic problem and its stubborn resistance to change. In the eyes of the people the program is intended to reach, the program suffers from a lack of credibility.

It is clear that at the highest level in USAREUR, the program has now, and has had, a high level of support and sustained commitment on the part of leadership. However, as the program filters down through the chain of command, it tends to lose those characteristics because it is being implemented by leaders who, although they will mechanically follow directives, do not subscribe to the goals of the program or perceive its importance to the accomplishment of their mission. At the unit level where the program is implemented, it has tended to acquire a strong negative image. This is not likely to be overcome as long as those responsible for implementing the program share that image. To change that fact, the chain-of-command personnel must first be trained such that they understand and accept the goals of the RR/EO program.

AD-A077 998 HUMAN SCIENCES RESEARCH INC MCLEAN VA F/G 5/9
AN ANALYSIS OF RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING IN USA--ETC(U)
JUL 78 M A GILBERT , P G NORDLIE DAHC19-76-C-0015
UNCLASSIFIED ARI-TR-78-B10 NL

2 OF 2
AD A077998



END
DATE FILMED
1-80
DDC

APPENDIX A

CHI-SQUARE TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

CHI-SQUARE TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Table	Whites vs. Blacks USAREUR			Whites vs. Whites USAREUR/CONUS			Blacks vs. Blacks USAREUR/CONUS		
	X^2	df	p	X^2	df	p	X^2	df	p
3	559.9	2	<.001	0.2	2	n.s.	1.3	2	n.s.
4	502.9	2	<.001	0.7	2	n.s.	14.2	2	< .001
5a	17.6	2	<.001	39.8	2	< .001	6.7	2	< .05
5b	537.7	3	<.001	0.8	3	n.s.	3.7	3	n.s.
6a	362.6	2	<.001	7.2	2	< .05	3.8	2	n.s.
6b	218.4	2	<.001	8.4	2	< .02	4.6	2	n.s.
7	186.0	2	<.001	18.9	2	< .001	4.5	2	n.s.
8	305.8	2	<.001	0.5	2	n.s.	0.4	2	n.s.
9	64.9	2	<.001	1.5	2	n.s.	4.8	2	n.s.
10	70.6	2	<.001	10.0	2	< .01	2.3	2	n.s.
11	29.7	2	<.001	26.6	2	< .001	14.6	2	< .001
12a	2.7	2	n.s.	18.4	2	< .001	7.6	2	< .05
12b	20.0	2	<.001	54.1	2	< .001	20.6	2	< .001
13a	33.3	2	<.001	0.4	2	n.s.	21.3	2	< .001
13b	13.6	2	<.01	4.7	2	n.s.	13.6	2	< .01
14a	3.1	2	n.s.	5.7	2	n.s.	0.1	2	n.s.
14b	1.3	2	n.s.	4.4	2	n.s.	2.8	2	n.s.
15	7.6	2	<.05	2.2	2	n.s.	0.4	2	n.s.
16a	94.0	2	<.001	5.3	2	n.s.	8.2	2	< .02
16b	72.7	2	<.001	10.5	2	< .01	10.9	2	< .01
17	7.2	2	<.05	14.7	2	< .001	2.0	2	n.s.
18	37.2	2	<.001	13.1	2	< .01	0.6	2	n.s.
19	3.1	2	n.s.	20.4	2	< .001	4.2	2	n.s.
20	24.2	2	<.001	11.7	2	< .01	10.3	2	< .01
21	3.5	2	n.s.	9.3	2	< .01	0.4	2	n.s.
24	279.9	2	<.001	10.9	2	< .01	3.2	2	n.s.
25	36.8	2	<.001	17.0	2	< .001	15.1	2	< .001
26a	14.9	2	<.001	3.9	2	n.s.	12.7	2	< .01
26b	25.1	2	<.001	4.6	2	n.s.	0.4	2	n.s.
27	78.5	2	<.001	33.0	2	< .001	3.1	2	n.s.

Table	Whites vs. Blacks USAREUR			Whites vs. Whites USAREUR/CONUS			Blacks vs. Blacks USAREUR/CONUS		
	X^2	df	p	X^2	df	p	X^2	df	p
28	0.3	2	n.s.	7.7	2	<.05	3.6	2	n.s.
29	20.2	2	<.001	6.3	2	<.05	3.9	2	n.s.
30	4.0	2	n.s.	14.9	2	<.001	41.4	2	<.001
31	94.2	1	<.001	7.9	1	<.01	26.6	1	<.001
32	44.9	3	<.001	3.3	3	n.s.	22.1	3	<.001
33	27.5	1	<.001	4.3	1	<.05	12.7	1	<.001
34	8.2	1	<.01	0.0	1	n.s.	8.9	1	<.01
35	14.5	1	<.001	0.1	1	n.s.	0.6	1	n.s.
36	11.6	2	<.01	21.1	2	<.001	44.8	2	<.001

[No chi-squares are presented for Tables 40-49 where the responses of blacks and whites are combined.]

	USAREUR Whites Time 1 vs. Time 2			USAREUR Blacks Time 1 vs. Time 2		
50	0.3	2	n.s.	2.8	2	n.s.
51	9.7	2	<.01	12.5	2	<.01
52	6.5	2	<.05	0.2	2	n.s.
53	6.6	2	<.05	1.7	2	n.s.
54	0.0	2	n.s.	1.5	2	n.s.
55	3.5	2	n.s.	4.8	2	n.s.
56	0.2	2	n.s.	0.1	2	n.s.
57	7.0	2	<.05	0.0	2	n.s.
58	1.5	2	n.s.	6.9	2	<.05
59	3.0	2	n.s.	1.5	2	n.s.
60	2.5	2	n.s.	11.9	2	<.01
61a	1.3	2	n.s.	7.8	2	<.05
61b	12.3	2	<.01	4.0	2	n.s.
62	3.8	2	n.s.	0.5	2	n.s.
63	3.0	2	n.s.	2.8	2	n.s.
64	2.5	2	n.s.	4.2	2	n.s.
65	7.1	2	<.05	1.4	2	n.s.
66	12.6	2	<.01	4.5	2	n.s.

[Time 1 vs. Time 2–Blacks and Whites combined for Tables 67 and 68.]

67	0.7	2	n.s.
68	13.9	2	<.001

APPENDIX B

MEASUREMENT SCALES USED IN USAREUR SURVEY

Robert L. Hiett

MEASUREMENT SCALES USED IN USAREUR SURVEY

During the data collection in CONUS, it became apparent that a large number of respondents were failing to answer all of the questions in the data collection instrument. Out of a total of 5,299 questionnaires collected during field administrations, 959 could not be analyzed because of missing data (18.1%).[1]

The length of the questionnaire was thought to be an important factor resulting in the large number of incomplete questionnaires. It was therefore determined, prior to the initial USAREUR survey, to reduce the length of the questionnaire. There were two possible ways to do this:

1. Eliminate items from the instrument, reducing its length.

2. Split the items into two forms, each being administered to half of the respondents in a random fashion.

The major deficiency with the first option was that there would be items asked in CONUS which were not asked in USAREUR, making comparisons across the two commands on all items impossible. The second option would make it possible to get information on every item but with a reduced sample size per item and a more complex data analysis problem. In order to avoid the loss of information which would occur with the elimination of items, it was decided to split the questionnaire into two forms.

The basic steps involved in developing alternate versions of the same instrument included:

1. Identification of all items which had to be responded to by all personnel. Demographic items and items regarding RR/EO training activities fell into this category.

2. Selection of scales and subscales which were to be the basis of item division. The four attitude and perception measurement scales, the behavior subscales, and the knowledge scales constituted this set.

[1] Data editing procedures are described in detail in, Robert L. Hiett, Marcia A. Gilbert, Dale K. Brown, *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army–Technical Appendices* (McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., December 1976).

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

(a) Those scales which were defined by factor analysis procedures were split on the basis of factor loadings: the item with the highest loading went to Version A, the item with the next highest loading went to Version B, and so on until all items were assigned to one of the two versions. Where there were an uneven number of items, one item was used in both versions.

(b) Those sets of items considered to be face valid scales were divided by random assignment of items within each subscale to the two versions. Where there was an odd number of items on the subscale, one item was used on both versions.

3. Division of individual items which were not part of a scale into two sets. This division was done by random assignment to the two versions.

The results of these steps were the two instruments shown at Appendix C.

For the most part, there were no problems associated with splitting the behavior and knowledge items. The analyses of these were based on individual items rather than scale scores. The exception was the attitude and perception items which had been scaled using factor analytic procedures. There were initially four scales:

Factor 1: Perceived Discrimination against Minorities

Factor 2: Feelings of Reverse Racism

Factor 3: Attitudes toward Army RR/EO Programs

Factor 4: Army Commitment to RR/EO Goals.

After splitting, the items in each version were as follows.

Factor 1–Version A

18. White enlisted personnel and supervisors act as though minority soldiers have to "earn the right" to be treated equally.

20. Non-Whites have had to become "militant" in order to have their complaints taken seriously.

24. Most Whites in the Army seem to think that Blacks aren't very intelligent.

26. Non-Whites get more than their share of dirty details.

27. In my unit, Whites get away with breaking rules that non-Whites get punished for.

34. White soldiers get hassled by the Army as much as minority soldiers do.

35. In my unit, non-Whites get worse jobs and details than Whites.

38. Whites have a better chance than non-Whites to get the best training opportunities.

Factor 1–Version B

19. Whites try to force their attitudes and ways upon minorities.

20. Whites assume that non-Whites commit any crime that occurs, such as thefts in living quarters.

22. Whites do not show proper respect for Blacks with higher rank.

26. Most Whites in the Army don't want racial minorities to be treated equally.

30. A Black in the Army must do more than the average White to make the grade.

31. Any time a minority soldier acts like he's proud of his race, he can expect to get treated badly by his CO.

37. Many Army supervisors try to make it difficulty for minority personnel to go through the chain of command to present a complaint of discrimination.

41. Army officers get back at Blacks they think are "militant" by not recommending them for promotions.

Factor 2—Version A

22. Non-Whites get away with breaking rules that Whites are punished for.

30. The Army's RR/EO program helps minorities get ahead at the expense of Whites.

37. Most non-Whites tend to be loud and boisterous.

40. There is racial discrimination against Whites on this post.

Factor 2—Version B

24. Many non-Whites have begun to act as if they are superior to Whites.

27. Most minority group members haven't worked as hard to succeed as most Whites have.

38. White middle-class Americans are giving up too many of their own rights for the rights of others.

43. Most non-Whites don't really want to be promoted to positions of responsibility.

Factor 3—Version A

23. Everybody in the Army should be *required* to attend race relations seminars.

25. Race relations seminars are a waste of time.

36. Most of the Army's RR/EO programs are unnecessary.

Factor 3—Version B

23. Race relations seminars are a waste of time.

29. I understand people of different races better since I've taken part in race relations education programs.

32. In the long run, everybody in the Army will benefit from race relations and equal opportunity programs.

Factor 4–Version A

19. Most NCO's usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.

39. Most officers usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.

Factor 4–Version B

18. Most NCO's usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.

25. The Army is firmly committed to the principle of equal opportunity.

Based on the initial data collection in CONUS on which these scales were based, it was possible to develop reliability estimates (coefficient alpha). These were:

	Version A	Version B
Factor 1	.88	.87
Factor 2	.73	.70
Factor 3	.77	.76

A coefficient could not be calculated for the fourth factor because there were only two items on each set. The zero order correlations were:

Version A	.408
Version B	.322

Since half of the respondents in each of the companies in USAREUR filled out Version A and half filled out Version B, it was possible to compare the mean scores for these two groups on each of the four scales. This was done using analysis of variance procedures.

The results of these analyses are shown in Tables 1 through 4. As can be seen, there were, for some scales, significant differences in the mean scores for the two versions. This, plus the lower reliability of the scales, suggests that the splitting of the scales for USAREUR was not entirely successful. This was true even though the objective of obtaining a higher response rate was achieved. During the CONUS survey, the proportion of unusable questionnaires was 18.1 percent. This decreased to 10.2 percent in USAREUR.

Because of the results obtained from the split scales, the major focus of the data analysis for USAREUR was on individual items rather than scales. The data in the USAREUR report reflects this approach. However, some scale score analyses were carried out. The results are shown in Tables 5 through 8.

These tables support the general finding that there are large black/white differences in USAREUR. In addition, the data suggest that there are some differences between attitudes and perceptions in USAREUR as compared to CONUS. Comparisons between CONUS and USAREUR are discussed in detail in the body of the report.

Table 1

Comparison of Versions A and B for Factor 1

Blacks

Version	$\overline{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	20.66	6,344	140,873	307
B	18.77	5,931	120,001	317

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	559	1	559	18.80
Within	18,468	621	29.74	
Total	19,027	622		

Whites

Version	$\overline{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	31.70	28,118	903,068	887
B	31.62	27,380	880,809	866

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	1	3	.20
Within	26,915	1,751	15.37	
Total	26,918	1,752		

Table 2

Comparison of Versions A and B for Factor 2

Blacks

Version	$\overline{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	15.40	4,728	74,439	307
B	15.18	4,795	74,667	316

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	8	1	8	1.416
Within	3,511	621	5.65	
Total	3,519	622		

Whites

Version	$\overline{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	11.69	10,367	128,202	887
B	12.69	10,988	145,528	866

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	438	1	438	58.32
Within	13,147	1,751	7.51	
Total	13,585	1,752		

Table 3

Comparison of Versions A and B for Factor 3

Blacks

Version	$\overline{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	10.11	3,104	33,185	307
B	8.89	2,810	26,664	316

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	230	1	230	41.07
Within	3,480	621	5.60	
Total	3,710	622		

Whites

Version	$\overline{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	8.32	7,380	67,468	887
B	8.28	7,174	64,434	866

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	1	1	1	.20
Within	11,068	1,751	6.32	
Total	11,069	1,752		

Table 4

Comparison of Versions A and B for Factor 4

Blacks

Version	$\bar{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	6.04	1,854	11,941	307
B	5.53	1,746	10,525	316

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	41	1	41	15.77
Within	1,615	621	2.6	
Total	1,656	622		

Whites

Version	$\bar{X}$	ΣX	ΣX^2	N
A	6.48	5,746	39,132	887
B	6.44	5,574	37,815	866

Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	1	1	1	.46
Within	3,847	1,751	2.2	
Total	3,848	1,752		

Table 5

Perceptions of Discrimination against Non-Whites

(The lower the score, the greater the perception of discrimination.
Range of possible scores is 8 to 40.)

	USAREUR			CONUS*		
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s
Blacks						
Version A	307	20.66	5.65	948	20.62	5.81
Version B	316	18.77	5.24	948	19.95	5.78
Whites						
Version A	887	31.70	3.64	2,785	31.32	4.25
Version B	866	31.62	4.18	2,785	31.26	4.45

	Version A		Version B	
Black/white differences in USAREUR	Z = - 32.01	p< .001	Z = - 39.27	p< .001
Black differences in USAREUR/CONUS	Z = - 1.07	ns	Z = 3.38	p< .001
White differences in USAREUR/CONUS	Z = - 2.62	p< .01	Z = - 2.13	p< .05

*Scores for CONUS were calculated by scoring each individual separately on the items contained in Version A of the scale and Version B of the scale.

Table 6

Feelings of Reverse Racism

(The lower the score, the higher the feelings of reverse racism.
Range of possible scores is 4 to 20.)

	USAREUR			CONUS		
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s
Blacks						
Version A	307	15.40	2.30	948	14.87	2.34
Version B	316	15.18	2.45	948	14.69	2.66
Whites						
Version A	887	11.69	2.81	2,785	11.31	3.33
Version B	866	12.69	2.66	2,785	11.73	2.87

	Version A		Version B	
Black/White differences in USAREUR	$Z = 22.94$	$p < .001$	$Z = 15.33$	$p < .001$
Black differences in USAREUR/CONUS	$Z = -3.50$	$p < .01$	$Z = -3.00$	$p < .01$
White differences in USAREUR/CONUS	$Z = -3.35$	$p < .01$	$Z = -9.06$	$p < .001$

Table 7

Attitudes toward Army RR/EO Programs

(The higher the score, the more favorable the attitudes toward the programs. Range of scores is from 3 to 15.)

	USAREUR			CONUS		
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s
Blacks						
Version A	307	10.11	2.43	948	10.87	2.43
Version B	316	8.89	2.30	948	10.46	2.35
Whites						
Version A	887	8.32	2.62	2,785	8.62	2.98
Version B	866	8.28	2.40	2,785	8.81	2.76

	Version A		Version B	
Black/white differences in USAREUR	$Z = 10.90$	$p < .001$	$Z = 3.99$	$p < .001$
Black differences in USAREUR/CONUS	$Z = 4.76$	$p < .001$	$Z = 10.42$	$p < .001$
White differences in USAREUR/CONUS	$Z = 2.87$	$p < .01$	$Z = 5.45$	$p < .001$

Table 8

Perceptions of the Army's Commitment to the Principle of Equal Opportunity

(The higher the score, the stronger the perception that the Army is committed to equal opportunity. Range of scores is from 2 to 10.)

	USAREUR			CONUS		
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s
Blacks						
Version A	307	6.04	1.55	948	5.70	1.68
Version B	316	5.53	1.66	948	5.76	1.73
Whites						
Version A	887	6.48	1.47	2,785	6.47	1.62
Version B	866	6.44	1.50	2,785	6.55	1.62

	Version A		Version B	
Black/white differences in USAREUR	$Z = -4.34$	$p < .001$	$Z = -8.55$	$p < .001$
Black differences in USAREUR/CONUS	$Z = -3.27$	$p < .01$	$Z = 2.14$	$p < .05$
White differences in USAREUR/CONUS	$Z = -0.06$	ns	$Z = 1.88$	ns

It was also possible to compare the scale scores for each version from the first administration to the second. This provides an idea about possible changes over time. Tables 9 and 10 show the results. Even though some of the differences are statistically significant, the differences from a practical viewpoint are very small.

Table 9

Comparisons of Changes over Time for Blacks

Version A

Factor	Time 1 $\bar{X}$	Time 2 $\bar{X}$	Z-Value
Perceptions of discrimination against non-whites	20.66	20.73	- .14
Feelings of reverse racism	15.40	14.98	2.06
Attitudes toward RR/EO program	10.11	10.53	-2.04
Perceptions of commitment to RR/EO	6.04	5.69	2.42

Version B

Perceptions of discrimination against non-whites	18.77	20.61	-3.82
Feelings of reverse racism	15.18	14.74	1.93
Attitudes toward RR/EO program	8.89	9.04	- .78
Perceptions of commitment to RR/EO	5.53	5.68	-1.03

Table 10

Comparisons of Changes over Time for Whites

Version A

Factor	Time 1 $\bar{X}$	Time 2 $\bar{X}$	Z-Value
Perceptions of discrimination against non-whites	31.70	31.31	1.83
Feelings of reverse racism	11.69	11.96	-1.73
Attitudes toward Army RR/EO programs	8.32	8.96	-4.45
Perceptions of Army's commitment to RR/EO	6.48	6.50	- .27

Version B

Perceptions of discrimination against non-whites	31.62	31.01	2.64
Feelings of reverse racism	12.69	12.24	3.17
Attitudes toward Army RR/EO programs	8.28	8.52	-1.82
Perceptions of Army's commitment to RR/EO	6.44	6.34	1.16