Technical Report 607

12

AN INVESTIGATION OF LOST TIME AND UTILIZATION IN A SAMPLE OF FIRST-TERM MALE AND FEMALE SOLDIERS

Joel M. Savell, Carlos K. Rigby, and
Andrew A. Zbikowski

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

U. S. Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1982

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

L. NEALE COSBY
Colonel, IN
Commander

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-POT, 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.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 607	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A139 803	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) AN INVESTIGATION OF LOST TIME AND UTILIZATION IN A SAMPLE OF FIRST-TERM MALE AND FEMALE SOLDIERS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report April 1981-October 1982 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Joel M. Savell, Carlos K. Rigby, and Andrew A. Zbikowski		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (PERI-RL) 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22333		12. REPORT DATE October 1982 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 137
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) --		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

--

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

--

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Lost time	Male
Utilization	Female
Gender	Job
Absenteeism	Work

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

> This research investigated the length and frequency of male and female soldiers' absences from their jobs for reasons classified as "lost time" reasons, the extent to which male and female soldiers are given day-to-day experience in the various tasks that go with their MOS, and the implications of the findings for unit readiness. Data on lost time were obtained from a 5-day log kept by the soldier's supervisor. Data on day-to-day task experience were obtained from a questionnaire completed by the supervisor. Several additional measures were obtained including--to assess credibility-- (Continued)

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Item 20 (continued)

a measure of the supervisor's attitude concerning the role of women in the Army. Reasons for being away from one's job were categorized as (1) medical and health reasons, (2) home-and-family-care reasons, (3) discipline-related reasons, and (4) other. Reasons in the first three categories were considered lost-time reasons, and a score was computed for each of these categories as well as for all three categories combined. In addition, a score indicating the total amount of time a soldier had been away from the job, for whatever reasons, was computed by summing the scores in the four categories. Major findings were as follows: (1) Approximately two-thirds of the soldiers, both men and women, were away from their jobs for some time during the 5-day period, either for a lost-time reason or for some other reason. (2) In the lost-time category of medical and health reasons, proportionately more women than men were away from their jobs. (3) For all lost-time categories combined, the amount of time away from the job was about the same for the men and the women. (4) None of the other comparisons of lost time showed consistent male-female differences. (5) Supervisors tended to use their male and female soldiers in different and predictable (i.e., traditional) ways. These differences were extremely small, but they were consistent.

Technical Report 607

AN INVESTIGATION OF LOST TIME AND UTILIZATION IN A SAMPLE OF FIRST-TERM MALE AND FEMALE SOLDIERS

Joel M. Savell, Carlos K. Rigby, and
Andrew A. Zbikowski

Submitted by:
Thomas O. Jacobs, Chief
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

Approved by:
Joyce L. Shields, Director
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL
RESEARCH LABORATORY

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

October 1982

Army Project Number
2Q263731A792

Manpower and Personnel

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

FOREWORD

Over the years the Army Research Institute (ARI) and its predecessor organizations have conducted extensive research on women soldiers. In 1953 the Personnel Research Branch of the Adjutant General's Office performed research leading to the development of the Armed Forces Women's Selection Test. In 1970 the Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory investigated causes of attrition among WAC basic trainees. And in 1976-77 the Army Research Institute conducted "MAX WAC," a field experiment designed to find out if mission performance in a standard 3-day field exercise would be affected by including the percentages of women specified in recently announced Army quotas.

As suggested by these examples, ARI's research on women soldiers has varied widely in its objectives and sponsors. Since the mid-seventies, however, ARI's efforts in this area have had the same general purpose, viz., to answer questions raised directly or indirectly by the Secretary of the Army or the Chief of Staff regarding the consequences of assigning significant numbers of women to TOE units. One such effort was the 1976-77 field experiment mentioned above. Another--"REF WAC"--was an effort to determine whether women soldiers could sustain themselves in a field environment for an extended period.

The research reported here was of this sort also. It asked, first, how much time male and female soldiers lose from their regular jobs. The assumption was that losing time deprives soldiers of training and experience they need in order to be able to perform their jobs satisfactorily. The research also asked how these soldiers are utilized in the jobs to which they are assigned. The assumption here was that missing day-to-day experience in the full range of tasks in their MOS has the same effect--i.e., it deprives the soldiers of training and experience they need if they are to reach and then maintain themselves at a satisfactory level of performance. If soldiers do not reach or maintain themselves at a satisfactory level of performance, they are not ready to carry out their responsibilities, and the unit to which they are assigned is in a lesser state of readiness than it otherwise would be.

The results of this research were reported to the Chief of Staff's Women-in-the-Army Policy Review Group (WITA PRG), which used them along with the results of other efforts in formulating recommendations to the Chief of Staff as to how women soldiers should be used in the future.

JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the following persons who read part or all of an earlier draft of this report and gave us their critical comments: Jerome Adams, Nehama Babin, Ann Hoiberg, Jeffrey Kantor, Susanne Lipscomb, Glenda Nogami, Laurel Oliver, Robert Priest, Gail Rowan, Mady Segal, Judith Stiehm, and Patricia Thomas.

The authors are also indebted to Fumiyo Hunter for assembling, summarizing, and critiquing many of the reports cited under "Data From Other Studies."

The lieutenants who assisted with the data collection and quality control included: 1LT Charles Corbin, 1LT Steven Cottrell, 2LT Kenneth Fisher, 1LT George Fountain, 1LT Francis Harris, 1LT Jacob Haynes, 1LT Charles Johnson, 1LT Karl Kiehl, 1LT John Spiller, 1LT Terry Tatum, 1LT Mark Walsh, and 1LT Stewart Whitfield at Fort Hood; 1LT Peter Adler, CW2 Ralph Baumback, 1LT Mark Fouquier, 2LT Kathleen Hewitt, 1LT Duane Hughes, 1LT Robert Koval, 2LT Calvin Moore, 2LT Debra Noya, 1LT Martin Reyes, 2LT Susan Sparks, 1LT Keith Stafford, and 1LT Stephanie Williams in Germany; and 2LT Mark A. Becker, 2LT Sharan L. Daniel, 1LT Sadie B. Edgerst, 2LT Anthony V. Green, 2LT Albert Gonzalez-Castro, 1LT J. P. Houston, Maria A. Medine, 1LT D. Padute, 1LT Pedro Perez, 1LT John D. Philipkosky, and 1LT Stephen Talt in Korea.

Assisting in troop support requirements were LTC Roy Ray and MSGT Jaime Mendez-Perez at Fort Hood; MAJ John Doane, with CAPT Buckingham and 1LT Mark Souquier in Germany; and LTC Lee Wilson and CAPT Cynthia Ross in Korea.

In addition to the authors, ARI representatives involved in the data collection included David Ryan-Jones and MAJ Mike McClellan.

AN INVESTIGATION OF LOST TIME AND UTILIZATION IN A SAMPLE OF FIRST-TERM MALE AND FEMALE SOLDIERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

In April 1981, ARI was asked by the Chief of Staff's Women-in-the-Army Policy Review Group (WITA PRG) to collect empirical data on the following topics: the amount of time lost from their jobs by male and female soldiers, the extent to which these soldiers are given day-to-day experience in the various tasks that go with their MOSs, and the implications of the results of the investigation for unit readiness.

Procedure:

The individuals on whom the research focused were 738 first-term soldiers (393 men and 345 women) who were working in one of the following career management fields (CMFs): Administration (CMF 71), Electronics-Communication Operations (CMF 31), Supply and Service (CMF 76), Law Enforcement (CMF 95), Mechanical Maintenance (CMF 63), and Transportation (CMF 64). The primary source of data on each soldier was the soldier's supervisor. The supervisor provided these data by completing a 5-day time log on each of the participating soldiers and by responding to questionnaire items which asked how the soldier was utilized in the job to which he or she was assigned. Additional data on time away from job and utilization were obtained from the soldiers themselves. Supervisors also completed a questionnaire designed to measure attitudes regarding the role of women in the Army. Also, the soldiers' company commanders estimated the combat readiness of their companies. At each location (Fort Hood, Germany, and Korea) the ARI representative was assisted by a group of lieutenants who collected the soldier and supervisor data and provided a degree of quality control.

Findings:

With respect to the lost-time measures, reasons for being away from the job were categorized as (1) medical reasons, (2) home-and-family-care reasons, (3) discipline-related reasons, and (4) other. Reasons in the first three categories were considered lost-time reasons, and a score was computed for each of these categories as well as for the three categories combined. In addition, a score indicating the total time the soldier had been away from his or her job, for whatever reason, was computed by summing scores on all four categories.

Total Time Away From Job. Approximately two-thirds of the soldiers, both men and women, were away from their jobs for a period of time during the 5-day period, either for a lost-time reason or for some other reason.

Lost Time. Total lost time was about the same for men and women. In the category of medically related lost time, proportionately more women than men (24% vs. 11%) were away from their jobs, but none of the other comparisons showed consistent male-female differences.

Utilization. Men and women generally performed the same kinds of tasks on their jobs, but they tended to differ in the amount of time spent on particular kinds of tasks. For example, using a 9-point scale, supervisors said that women spent relatively more of their time on sedentary tasks than men (means of 4.9 and 4.2 respectively) and relatively less of their time on tasks that are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding (means of 3.4 and 4.3 respectively). These differences are small but consistent.

Implications for Unit Readiness. The data obtained on this topic were not sufficient for drawing conclusions.

Utilization of Findings:

WITA PRG will use the results of this research, along with the results of other efforts, in formulating recommendations to the Chief of Staff regarding the role of women in the Army.

AN INVESTIGATION OF LOST TIME AND UTILIZATION IN A SAMPLE OF FIRST-TERM MALE AND FEMALE SOLDIERS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

AN INVESTIGATION OF LOST TIME AND UTILIZATION IN A SAMPLE OF FIRST-TERM MALE AND FEMALE SOLDIERS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

In April 1981, ARI was asked by the Chief of Staff's Women-in-the-Army Policy Review Group (WITA PRG) to collect empirical data on the following topics: the amount of time male and female soldiers lose from their jobs, the extent to which these soldiers are given day-to-day experience in the various tasks that go with their Military Occupation Specialties (MOSs),[1] and the implications of the results of the investigation for unit readiness.

Data from Other Studies

Time Lost from Work

As used by the Army (and interpreted for us by members of WITA PRG), the term "lost time" refers to those hours and/or minutes during the soldier's duty day, except for ordinary leave, during which the soldier is unable to work at his or her regular job due to circumstances which are personal to the soldier or for which the soldier is ultimately responsible. The term is applied to such situations as taking sick leave, arriving late for work as a result of having taken a sick child to see a physician, and appearing before a civil or military court to answer a charge. The term is not applied to situations in which the soldier is absent from his or her regular job as a consequence of having been given special duty (SD) somewhere else. Because of the great variety of things that come under the heading of lost time and because a number of studies suggest that men and women tend to lose time for different reasons, it is useful to divide the various reasons into categories--medical, home-and-family-care, and discipline-related--and to ask what other studies have found regarding each of these categories.

Category 1: Medical and Health Reasons. With respect to this category, most studies report greater use of health care facilities by women than by men. This is the case both for studies of the military (Adams, 1979; Datel, Harrison, & Rothberg, 1977; Hoiberg, 1978a,[2] 1978b; Hoiberg & Thomas, 1980; Johnson, Cory, Day, & Oliver, 1978; Olson & Stumpf, 1977; Riolo, 1980; Schuckit & Gunderson, 1974; Treadwell, 1954; Vitters, 1978; Vitters & Kinzer, 1977) and for studies of civilians (Fitzgibbons & Moch, 1980; Taylor, 1979;

---

[1] There are a number of reasons why a particular soldier may fail to get this day-to-day experience in the various tasks that go with his or her MOS, and these reasons constitute a variable that is worth investigating systematically. Collecting and analyzing the data necessary for such an investigation, however, were beyond the scope of the present effort.

[2] Hoiberg (1978a) has reported data indicating that these gender differences tend to diminish at the higher grades.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981[3]). There are conditions (e.g., accidents and injuries) that are less often reported for women than for men, but it is not always clear how a particular difference should be interpreted.[4]

Category 2: Home-and-Family-Care Reasons. In the data on the percentage of soldiers who are married, the number of military sole parents, and the number of soldiers who are discharged for reasons of parenthood (Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1981[5]), there seems to be little direct evidence that time is lost as a result of these factors.[6] There are data (e.g., Taylor, 1979) that suggest that, among civilians, being married increases the

---

[3]These differences in morbidity rates contrast sharply with the well-known differences in mortality rates, which favor women (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1980). As Nathanson (1975) notes: "Women in the Western world live longer and have lower mortality rates for most causes of death, and there is strong evidence that these differences are due to greater constitutional resistance to degenerative and infectious diseases" (p. 57). See also Waldron (1976).

[4]Generalizations about particular conditions are difficult to make and usually need to be qualified to take into account the nature and location of the activity, the age of the participants, the extent of prior experience and/or training, the kind of equipment used, and the appropriateness and/or fit of the clothing (e.g., shoes) that the individual was wearing at the time of the accident. An example illustrates the difficulty in making generalizations: Some studies have found accidents to be more common among men than among women (Hoiberg, 1978a; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981), but others have found just the reverse (Adams, 1979; Vitters, 1978). Treadwell (1954), in her discussion of the Women's Army Corps during World War II, says that "All evidence indicated that the rates of accidents and nonbattle injuries were almost identical for enlisted men and women in the Army" (p. 626).

Discussions of why women have higher morbidity rates than men can be found in Gove and Tudor (1973), Greenberg and Fisher (1977), Nathanson (1975), and Treadwell (1954), for example. During World War II the Army's Surgeon General is said to have viewed the greater use of health care facilities by women soldiers as evidence of "good preventive medicine" (Treadwell, 1954, p. 611). For a nonmedical interpretation of disability during basic training, see Schneider (1956).

[5]Preliminary DoD analyses of these data indicated the following: (1) Among first-term enlisted personnel, the women were more likely to be married than the men, but among career soldiers, the pattern was the reverse. (2) There were proportionately more female than male sole parents, but overall there were more males. (3) In 1980 proportionately more women than men were discharged for reasons of parenthood, and the total number of women discharged was also greater.

[6]Soldiers discharged for reasons of parenthood would have been expected, had they remained in the service, to lose more than the average amount of time from their jobs. One could speculate, however, that parents who remain in the service (in contrast to those who leave) are individuals who have managed to balance their military and parental responsibilities.

absenteeism rate to a greater extent for women than for men, and one could speculate that a similar pattern would be found among military personnel.

Category 3: Discipline-Related Reasons. Nearly all studies have found rates of indiscipline (AWOL, less-than-honorable discharge, etc.) to be lower for women than for men (Calahan & Cisin, 1975; Hoiberg, 1978c; Hoiberg & Thomas, 1980; Olsen & Thomas, 1978; Thomas, 1980; Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1981; U.S. Army Judiciary, 1981). Such rates tend, however, to be correlated with demographic characteristics such as education (Angle, 1978; Bell, 1977; Hartnagel, 1974; Schor, 1978; Sullivan, 1971). With educational entrance requirements for women now the same as those for men, it is possible (cf. Binkin & Bach, 1977, pp. 63-64) that the gender differences in rates of indiscipline will diminish or disappear.

However, in a panel discussion at the 1981 meeting of the Military Testing Association, Mady Segal suggested that increasing the number of female soldiers who have not graduated from high school may not have the negative consequences for indiscipline rates that some have suggested. Segal pointed out that graduating from high school is more common for women than for men and that when women fail to graduate, it tends to be for different reasons. What this means, according to Segal, is that variables like education and indiscipline, which are correlated with each other for men, are not necessarily correlated with each other for women. In this connection, Patricia Thomas (personal communication) has recently analyzed some Navy data and says that, at nearly all mental category levels, proportionately fewer women than men were recorded as having had one or more unauthorized absences.

Utilization on the Job

Utilization can be viewed in at least three ways: from the standpoint of the individual soldier (Is the soldier performing tasks that he or she feels competent to perform and that he or she gets satisfaction from performing well?); from the standpoint of Army management (Is the Army getting a sufficient return on its investment in the soldier's training?); and from the standpoint of the unit commander, who must be concerned about the unit's readiness to carry out its mission (Is the soldier being used in a way that maximizes the probability that he or she will be able to perform satisfactorily if the unit is deployed to a combat zone?). In the present research the utilization question was approached from the standpoint of the commander, and the studies examined were those that investigated gender differences in the way the soldier is utilized in the position to which he or she has been assigned.

Studies investigating the amount of time that male and female soldiers spend working outside their MOSs (Hicks, 1978; Wood, Pappas, Lovely, & Johnson, 1979; Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1981) have produced conflicting results. However, these studies were not all conducted in the same way, and it is possible that the differences in results are more apparent than real. Of particular interest is an Air Force study (Christal, 1975) that investigated gender differences in the way that enlisted personnel are used in the job called "aircraft mechanic." The results indicated that the men and the women were performing the same set of tasks but that they differed in the proportion of time they spent on specific tasks: The women spent relatively more of their time on clerical and administrative tasks. Of interest also is a recent reanalysis of the REF WAC data (Oliver & Babin, 1978) which found

that during a field training exercise the women were more likely than the men to be put on special duty.

Individual Competence/Readiness

The other services have conducted several studies of gender differences in individual competence/readiness (e.g., Kantor, Noble, Leisey, & McFarlane, 1979; Nieva, Mallamad, Eisner, Mills, & Thomas, 1981), but the studies that are most relevant to the present effort are those that have been conducted with Army personnel. More specifically, the most relevant studies are those conducted with soldiers performing the kinds of tasks they would be expected to perform if their unit were deployed to a combat zone. The tasks would consist mainly of MOS tasks, but they would include tactical tasks of the type called for in rear-area-protection (RAP) missions. With respect to MOS tasks, only one Army investigation was found to provide data on gender differences in MOS field performance, and this was REF WAC (Johnson et al., 1978). In that investigation, "there was no consistent pattern of male-versus-female performance differences over the entire exercise" (p. I-1). No studies of gender differences in performance focusing specifically on the RAP missions were found, although there have been investigations of performance in a tactical environment (Adams, 1979; Larwood, Glasser, & McDonald, 1980; Oliver, 1981; Priest, Vitters, & Prince, 1978; Rumsey, 1981; Vitters, 1978; Vitters & Kinzer, 1977). The results of these investigations are mixed, but in general the performance of the women in these settings tended to be rated somewhat lower than that of the men.

Company Readiness

Only three studies were found that investigated company performance or readiness as a function of the number of women assigned (Johnson et al., 1978; Savell & Johnson, 1980; U.S. Army Military Personnel Center, 1977; U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1977). None of these studies found evidence that mission performance was impaired as a result of having women assigned to the company.

Discussion

What can be said regarding the results of these past studies as those results pertain to the three questions the Army asked at the start of the present research?

With respect to lost time, the studies cited here suggest that women lose more time for some reasons--mainly medical or health-related--than men do but that they lose less time than men lose for other reasons, mainly discipline-related. Beyond this, it is difficult to make a generalization.[7] One of the problems here is that most studies of lost time rely for their data on official records of one sort or another. If one assumes that at least some of the

[7]For contrasting pictures of male-female differences in absenteeism, see Olson and Stumpf (1977) and Polit, Nuttall, and King (1979).

soldier's time away from the job is arranged informally with the supervisor (a practice which is not uncommon according to several members of WITA PRG) the official records can be expected to underestimate the true amount of time away from the job by whatever amount goes unrecorded. It should be noted also that most military studies of lost time do not address the question of why one gender should lose more time from work than the other. This being the case, it is difficult to say whether differences observed in the past will persist in the future.

With respect to utilization on the job, the results of the studies cited here are mixed, and it is difficult to know what conclusion to draw from them. One possibility, suggested by the previously cited study by Christal (1975), is that men and women working together on a job are exposed to the same set of tasks but differ in the amount of time they spend on subsets of these tasks.

With respect to unit readiness, the studies cited suggest that women perform most MOS tasks as capably as their male counterparts and that field performance of the company's mission, with the enlisted women percentages that have been used, is not affected by the fact that women have been assigned. As noted above, however, there seem to have been no studies investigating the consequences of assigning women to rear-area-protection teams.

Research Strategy

The purpose of the research was to obtain empirical data bearing on three questions: Are there gender differences in the amount of time soldiers lose from their jobs? Are there gender differences in the extent to which soldiers are given day-to-day experience in the various tasks that go with their MOSs? If such differences exist, do they have implications for unit readiness? The strategy[8] adopted for examining these questions is summarized below.

To simplify data collection (and also data interpretation, although at the expense of reduced generalizability) a decision was made to focus on first-term soldiers and to use the supervisors of these soldiers as the primary source of data. With respect to the question about lost time, it seemed reasonable to suppose that, other than the soldier, the supervisor would be in the best position to know whether the soldier had been absent from duty, where (in the

---

[8]Development of a research strategy was constrained by several circumstances. Given the required reporting date, time available for collecting data would be at most 2 weeks after allowing time to formulate a research plan; prepare, pretest, modify, and print materials; travel to and from the data collection sites; train data collectors; prepare and analyze collected data; and draft a report and circulate it for peer review. One of the things specified by WITA PRG was that the data were to be collected from a sample stratified along a particular set of four dimensions, including the dimension of geographical location (CONUS, Germany, Korea), and that the results of the research were to provide information about each of these four dimensions as well as about dimension combinations. Finally, at the time the research was requested, funds for contractor assistance in collecting the data were unavailable; and in-house travel funds were sufficient to send only three staff members into the field, one to each site.

event of an absence) the soldier had been,[9] and for how long (if at all) the soldier had been away, and also to obtain or record this information unobtrusively. Arrangements were made to have the supervisors keep a 5-day time log on each of their participating soldiers.[10] Arrangements were also made to have the supervisors provide their recollections of the amount of time each soldier had been away during the preceding 4-week period. It was assumed that the recall data would be less reliable than those collected with the time log and would not be entirely independent.

With respect to the question about utilization, it was assumed that the supervisor was the individual in the best position to know whether the soldier was performing the various tasks called for by his or her duty position and which tasks, if any, were not being performed. Questionnaire items were constructed which asked, in various ways, how the soldier was utilized in the job to which he or she was assigned, and supervisors were asked to respond to these items. With respect to both lost time and utilization, it was assumed that additional data would be needed from the first-term soldiers themselves.

With respect to the more nebulous question concerning readiness, the best source of information on individual readiness was assumed to be a soldier's supervisor, and the best source of information on company readiness was assumed to be the company commander. A readiness item was constructed for the supervisor, and another was constructed for the company commander. The intention was to examine responses to the readiness items to see if they showed any relationship to the measures of lost time and utilization. It was understood that the data obtained concerning readiness would have a large degree of uncertainty attached.

Finally, several sets of data were collected for essentially methodological purposes. One set consisted of soldier responses to questionnaire items which asked many of the same things that had been asked of the supervisors. Here the idea was to be able to compare what the supervisors said about the soldiers with what the soldiers said about themselves. A second set consisted of supervisor responses to a four-item scale measuring attitude regarding the role of women in the Army. Here the idea was to be able to determine, for any discrepancies in the reported data that might be found, whether these discrepancies could be predicted from the supervisor's response to this scale. A third set consisted of soldier and supervisor responses to questionnaire items asking about the soldiers' awareness that they had been involved in a study. The idea here was to find out if this awareness was stronger in some soldier groupings than in others and to find out also if this awareness was statistically related to the amount of time lost from work during the data collection

---

[9] During the data collection we were reminded of the fact that when soldiers ask to go on sick call, it is not necessary for them to identify their ailment.

[10] It would have been desirable to obtain comparable data from Army records to see to what extent they agreed with the data obtained from the supervisors' time logs. However limited resources and the difficulty encountered in trying to locate data that were really comparable led us to drop this possibility.

period.[11] A fourth set consisted of soldier responses to questionnaire items asking about typing ability and level of formal education. Here the idea was to find out if these variables predicted soldiers' not working in their MOS for both men and women, for one but not the other, or for neither.

To deal with the practical problem of collecting the data and providing quality control, we requested and obtained at each location the assistance of a group of lieutenants. The tasks of these lieutenants were to make sure that the supervisors correctly filled out the soldier time logs each day, to make sure that, at a specified time, the supervisors completed a questionnaire on each of their participating first termers, and to administer the soldier questionnaire to the first termers on the day specified.

The last two weeks of June 1981 was designated as the data collection period at all three locations--Fort Hood, Germany, and Korea. One of the two weeks was to be used for collecting time-log data and the other was to be used for inbriefings and other location preparations, for completing the three questionnaires following the time-log data collection, and for arranging for all materials to be returned. (Though most data were collected by the end of June, it was another 4 weeks before the last of the data were in.)

METHOD

Individuals, Groups, and the Primary Unit of Analysis

The individuals on whom this research focused were 738[12] first-term soldiers (393 men and 345 women) who were working in one of six career management

---

[11] A related question is whether supervisor awareness affected the amount of time soldiers were away from their jobs. Of continuing concern to us was the possibility that, in spite of assurances to the contrary, the supervisors would believe that their leadership practices were being evaluated (cf. Rosenberg, 1965) and change their behavior in some systematic way, e.g., become less lenient in allowing soldiers to be away from their jobs. Though it would have been desirable to bring this variable under experimental control (e.g., by randomly assigning supervisors to keep or not keep a time log on their soldiers and comparing soldier-reported time away for the two groups), resources to do this were not available when the research began. Left with the necessity of trying to persuade the supervisors that they had nothing to be concerned about, we tried to enhance the credibility of our assurances by having the supervisors deliver their data to someone outside their chain of command, a lieutenant from another company who had been identified as one of the officers assisting with the study. Though in most instances we were allowed to "assign" lieutenants to companies other than the ones in which they normally worked, the several instances in which this was not the case completely filled one of the cells of the design, with the result that the assigned-to-own-company/assigned-to-different-company variable was confounded with another variable, and it was not possible to assess the variable's effects.

[12] Initially the subject soldiers numbered 903 (and the number of supervisors was 175). This number was reduced as a result of two kinds of eliminations from the data set, removing individuals who were found not to meet (continued)

fields (CMFs): Administration (CMF 71), Electronics-Communication Operations (CMF 31), Supply and Service (CMF 76), Law Enforcement (CMF 95), Mechanical Maintenance (CMF 63), and Transportation (CMF 64). For most of the analyses reported here, the unit of analysis is not the individual soldier but the work group, or a sample drawn from it, to which the soldier belonged. Each group included at least one enlisted man (EM) and one enlisted woman (EW), and altogether there were 164 such groups. The number of soldiers in these groups ranged from 2 to 12 ($\bar{X}$ = 4.2). For the men in the groups, n's ranged from 1 to 6 ($\bar{X}$ = 2.2), and for the women, the n's ranged from 1 to 9 ($\bar{X}$ = 2.0). Within each group, all of the soldiers, male and female, had the same supervisor and worked in the same CMF.[13]

Procedure

Forming the Groups

At each of three locations--Fort Hood, Germany, and Korea--a point of contact (POC) was designated by the Army to assist in obtaining the requested troop support. Using selection criteria provided by ARI (Appendix A), each POC identified six divisional and six nondivisional companies for inclusion in the sample.[14] For each of these 12 companies the POC requested a roster of first-term soldiers assigned to work groups (e.g., squads or sections) that had at least one first-term EM and EW working in one of the specified CMFs.[15]

---

[12](continued) all the criteria for inclusion (e.g., not being a first termer) and then dropping groups that no longer included both men and women and thus failed to meet one of the specifications of the design.

[13]After the data analyses had been completed, we discovered that in six cells of the design there was one individual whose CMF was different from that of the others although it was at the same level of CMF traditionality (see Table 2). The cases fell in cells 1, 4, 5, 8, 14, and 15. In each case it was a female member of the group whose CMF was different. To provide at least some evidence about the consequences of having included these discrepant-CMF individuals, we reconstituted the six groups and did three of the analyses again. The results of these analyses provided no evidence that including these individuals had made a difference.

[14]As indicated in Appendix A, the six types of company were Adjutant General/ Personnel Services, Signal, Supply and Services, Military Police, Maintenance, and Transportation. The reason for selecting companies of these types ("company" does not appear as a variable in the design) was our belief that in companies of these types would be found the greatest concentration of first-term enlisted women (EW) working in the six CMFs we had been asked to examine. As it happened, at one of the locations (Korea) there was only one nondivisional company of one of the requested types (transportation), and in that company there were no first-term EW working in the specified CMFs. The data from Korea were thus obtained from work groups in 11 companies rather than 12.

[15]In some cases the requested rosters had omitted the names of individuals who had been away from the company for an extended period of time (e.g., soldiers on special duty or in jail). When such cases were discovered, we had the names restored to the roster, but it is possible that some of these cases were missed.

Using a table of random numbers, the ARI representative constructed from each roster a sample of soldiers to be used in the research. For any given work group the sample consisted of all the first-term EW who were working in one of the specified CMFs and, depending on how many EM there were, up to three times that number of first-term EM working in that CMF.[16] After the data collection, groups not homogeneous with respect to CMF were made homogeneous by eliminating individuals whose CMF was discrepant from the modal CMF for their group.

Obtaining the Data

The primary source of data was the soldier's supervisor. For five consecutive working days the supervisor kept a time log (Appendix B) on each of the participating first termers and at the end of this period filled out a questionnaire (Appendix I) on each of these same soldiers. These two data sets, the time logs and the supervisor questionnaires, were given to a lieutenant who after a period of training (Appendix G) had been "assigned" to the supervisor's company to assist with the data collection. When the last of the supervisor's materials had been turned in, the lieutenant administered a "soldier version" of the supervisor questionnaire (Appendix J) to the participating first termers who were on post and available (see Table 1 for a summary of self-reported characteristics of these soldiers) and an attitude questionnaire (Appendix K) to the participating supervisors. Finally, at two of the locations (Fort Hood and Korea) the ARI representative interviewed the commander of each of the companies involved in the research. (We were not able to obtain company readiness judgments from the commanders in the Germany sample.) The last item in the interview was a question (Appendix D) asking the commander's judgment about the company's combat readiness.

Aggregating Data from the Time Log

In completing the time log for each day the supervisor was to indicate the reason for any absence recorded for the soldier on that particular day. Included in the materials that had been provided to the supervisor was a list of 29 reasons why a soldier might be absent. For any absence the supervisor was asked to select from the list the reason that applied and to write the corresponding number in the space provided. The 29 reasons had been grouped into five categories: (1) medical reasons, (2) home-and-family-care reasons, (3) discipline-related reasons, (4) Army-purpose reasons, and (5) other (see Appendix B). From the data collected, scores were calculated for each soldier, each score indicating the number of hours/minutes that he or she had been away during the week for reasons falling in a particular category. Reasons falling

---

[16] We oversampled to ensure at least as many EM as EW. In groups in which there were only one or two EW, we were concerned that, if we selected only one or two EM, one or both EM might drop out before the data collection was over, leaving a single-sex group which could not be easily accommodated by the research design.

in the first three categories were considered "lost time" reasons.[17] Each soldier was given three lost-time scores as well as a fourth score indicating the number of hours/minutes he or she had been away for all lost-time reasons combined.

Table 1

Self-Reported Characteristics of the First-Term Soldiers Who Completed a Questionnaire[a]

	Men[b] (N = 348)	Women[b] (N = 301)
Lives on post	81%	70%
Has high school diploma	77%	93%
Expects to be in the Army 5 years from now	39%	34%
Is married	22%	27%
Has children	22%	17%
Has children living with him or her now	10%	10%
Has spouse who is also in the service[c]	7%	21%
Mean age (in years)	20.8	21.5
Median grade	E3	E3

[a]Of the 738 soldiers reported on by their supervisors, a total of 88% (88.5% of the men and 87.5% of the women) completed a questionnaire themselves.

[b]The number of soldiers responding to questions concerning these characteristics varied between 338 and 342 for the men and between 288 and 291 for the women.

[c]Three percent of the men and 7% of the women said they were married to someone in their company.

Design

The major independent variables were geographical location (Fort Hood, Germany, Korea), divisional versus nondivisional affiliation of the company

[17]Reasons falling in the fourth category, "Army-purpose reasons," were excluded by definition. Reasons falling in the fifth, or "other," category were excluded as a result of the following considerations. First, reasons in this category (e.g., going to the barber/beauty shop) do not seem to meet the specification that the soldier be "unable" to work, at least not in the sense implied when a soldier goes on sick call following an injury or when a soldier stays away to tend to the needs of his or her sick child. Second, when a supervisor okays a soldier's leaving the unit for one of these reasons, the supervisor seems to be saying (at least in most cases) that the soldier is not really needed at the moment. In any event, the difference between the men and the women in time away from the job for these "other" reasons was not significant ($p > .01$).

in which the work group was located, degree of traditionality for women (high, medium, low) of the CMF in which the group members worked, and group-member gender. For the purposes of the research, CMFs 71 and 31[18] were classified as "high traditional," CMFs 76 and 95 were classified as "medium traditional," and CMFs 63 and 64 were classified as "low traditional." (This classification was provided to us by WITA PRG.) The design was thus a four-factor (3 × 2 × 3 × 2) mixed design with repeated measures on the last factor. The number of groups in each cell, and the number of individuals who made up these groups, are shown in Table 2.[19]

Primary Dependent Variables

Lost Time. Altogether there were 16 measures of lost time. There were eight measures for the lost time recorded by the supervisor over a 5-day period (four measures of amount of time and four measures of the number of soldiers involved), and there were eight measures for the lost time that the supervisor recalled for the preceding 4-week period (again four measures of amount of time and four measures of the number of soldiers involved). These 16 measures, four in each of the four categories, are listed below.

1. Number of hours and minutes of lost time recorded over 5 days

   a. Recorded lost time for medical/health reasons (Appendix B, p. B-4)

   b. Recorded lost time for home-and-family-care reasons (Appendix B, p. B-4)

   c. Recorded lost time for discipline-related reasons (Appendix B, p. B-4)

   d. Recorded lost time for all these reasons combined

---

[18] Most of the job specialties (MOSs) in CMF 31 are considered traditional for women, but there are four (36C, 36D, 36E, and 36K) that are not. We set aside the data for soldiers found to be working in one of these four MOSs.

[19] As can be seen in Table 2, the design has a cell with no groups in it: There were no female soldiers in the indicated category. To deal with this problem, we computed two unweighted-means ANOVAs for each variable--collapsing first on divisional/nondivisional affiliation and second on geographical location--and compared the results of the two analyses. In every case, the two F-values are either both significant or both nonsignificant. Where they both are significant, they are presented in the text. The descriptive statistics presented in the text are averages of the corresponding statistics, and the p-value of an effect was determined by averaging the p-values from the two ANOVAs. Time-log data were also analyzed with a 3 × 2 × 2 (location × divisional/nondivisional affiliation × soldier-gender) design, but no additional effects were found.

Table 2

Distribution of Groups (N = 164) and Individuals (N = 738) Across Cells of the Design

	Location																	
	Fort Hood						Germany						Korea					
	Company Affiliation						Company Affiliation						Company Affiliation					
	Division			Nondivision			Division			Nondivision			Division			Nondivision		
	CMF Traditionality			CMF Traditionality			CMF Traditionality			CMF Traditionality			CMF Traditionality			CMF Traditionality		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Groups	19	13	6	14	11	4	8	16	9	9	17	4	5	9	6	7	7	0
Individuals																		
Men	41	29	13	27	27	16	19	33	19	11	33	12	18	27	28	15	22	3
Women	50	18	13	37	19	6	27	34	10	22	31	4	20	19	8	19	8	0

2. Whether or not the soldier had any recorded lost time over the 5 days

   a. Whether there was any recorded lost time for medical/health reasons

   b. Whether there was any recorded lost time for home-and-family-care reasons

   c. Whether there was any recorded lost time for discipline-related reasons

   d. Whether there was any recorded lost time for any of these reasons

3. Number of days and hours of lost time recalled for the preceding 4-week period

   a. Recalled lost time for medical/health reasons (Appendix B, p. B-6, item 17)

   b. Recalled lost time for home-and-family-care reasons (Appendix B, p. B-6, item 16)

   c. Recalled lost time for discipline-related reasons (Appendix B, p. B-6, items 18, 20, and 21)

   d. Recalled lost time for all these reasons combined

4. Whether or not the soldier had any recalled lost time for the 4-week period

   a. Whether there was any recalled lost time for medical/health reasons

   b. Whether there was any recalled lost time for home-and-family-care reasons

   c. Whether there was any recalled lost time for discipline-related reasons

   d. Whether there was any recalled lost time for any of these reasons

Utilization. There were five measures of soldier utilization (Appendix C).

1. Proportion of MOS tasks the soldier performs[20]

2. Proportion of job time on sedentary-type tasks

---

[20]The questionnaire included one item (Appendix C, p. C-3, item 8) which asks how many of the setting-up/tearing-down tasks the soldier performs. Unfortunately, response alternatives for this item were omitted when the questionnaire was printed. Written-in responses were difficult to interpret and were not subjected to statistical analysis. With respect, however, to the question of whether there are gender differences in the number of (continued)

3. Proportion of job time on tasks that are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding

4. Proportion of job time on tasks in which there is a danger of being physically attacked

5. Proportion of job time working alone in an isolated place

Combat Readiness. There were two measures of judged readiness (Appendix D).

1. Supervisor confidence that soldier could perform satisfactorily under combat conditions

2. Company commander confidence that the company could perform satisfactorily under combat conditions

Other Variables

1. Attitude regarding the role of women in the Army (Appendix E)
2. Awareness of being involved in a study (Appendix F)
3. Typing ability (Appendix J, items 60-62 and 60 by itself)[21]
4. Educational status (Appendix J, items 51 and 56 plus 56 by itself)

A Variable Not Completely Controlled

Within the various work groups the variable of leader gender was controlled naturally in that the members of a given work group had the same (male or female) leader. Between the groups, however, this variable went uncontrolled. Of the 35 company commanders, 34 were male and 1 was female; of the 35 lieutenants, 28 were male and 7 were female; and of the 164 supervisors, 153 were male and 11 were female.

---

[20](continued)setting-up/tearing-down tasks the soldier performs, some data are available. Item 9 focuses on the subset of soldiers who were said not to be performing these tasks and asks the reason. The first response alternative is "NOT APPLICABLE. THIS SOLDIER DOES PERFORM THESE TASKS." The other response alternatives are reasons why the soldier might not be performing the tasks. Responses to this item were cast into a 2 × 2 matrix (male soldier/female soldier and does perform/does not perform) and subjected to a *chi*-square analysis. Female soldiers were disproportionately said not to be performing these setting-up/tearing-down tasks, and this was the case for both the supervisor ($p < .01$) and the soldier ($p < .01$) data sets. The pattern was somewhat less clear in the soldier data set, but the three-way interaction (adding soldier-data versus supervisor-data) is not significant ($p > .01$).

[21]Due to a printing error, the phrase "without error," which should have followed question 61, followed question 60.

RESULTS

We decided to use analysis of variance (ANOVA) rather than the most likely alternative, multiple regression, for analyzing the data presented here.[22] The text presents two F-values for each significant effect (see footnote 18). The first F is the value obtained when collapsing on divisional/nondivisional affiliation, and the second is the value obtained when collapsing on geographic location. A decision was also made to consider significant those effects in which the p-value is equal to or less than .01 and to consider nonsignificant those effects in which the p-value is greater than .01 but to identify those cases in which the p-value is greater than .01 but less than .05.

Lost Time

Measures of lost time can be expected to produce (and in this investigation did produce) a large number of zero responses and an overall distribution that is grossly nonnormal. Most soldiers, in other words, don't "lose" time, at least not over as brief a period as was encompassed by the present effort. To deal with this problem, the several amount-of-time scores were subjected to a log (X + 1) transformation, and the statistical computations were performed on the transformed scores. The untransformed scores, however, are the ones that were used as the basis of the descriptive statistics presented in this report. In the paragraphs below, the results of the 5-day-record and the 4-week-recollection analyses are presented separately[23] for the several categories of lost time.

Category 1: Medical and Health Reasons

Data from 5-Day Record. Of the 738 soldiers, 17.3% were recorded as having lost time for medical and health reasons. Proportionately more women than men (23.8% versus 11.2%) were said to have lost time in this category, and the difference is statistically significant, F (1, 155) = 21.91, F (1, 158) = 33.40, $p < .01$. The amount-of-time scores in this category were higher for women than for men (means of 1.71 and .84 hours respectively), and the difference is

---

[22] We felt that the statistics provided in an ANOVA were more likely to be usable by those who commissioned the research than the corresponding statistics provided in a regression analysis. We also felt that the way "other" variables are handled in an ANOVA (the effects are controlled statistically) was more in keeping with the real-world orientation of our client than the way these variables are handled in a regression analysis (the effects are partialled out). In preparing our preliminary briefing of WITA PRG on the results of the research, however, we supplemented the information obtained with ANOVAs with information obtained with some multiple regression analyses, and we are grateful to Frank O'Mara for performing these analyses.

[23] For the four lost-time variables, coefficients of correlation between recorded and recalled scores are as follows: medical and health reasons, $r = .33$; home-and-family-care reasons, $r = .17$; discipline-related reasons, $r = .20$; and for all lost-time reasons combined, $r = .32$.

significant, F (1, 155) = 13.48, F (1, 158) = 16.38, $p < .01$.[24] There is a main effect of CMF traditionality, F (2, 155) = 4.05, F (2, 158) = 7.97, $p < .01$, in which the greatest proportion of soldiers with lost time is found in the low-traditional-CMF cell. On inspection, however, this effect seems largely due to the relatively greater proportion of women in that cell (see Table 3). For the subset of soldiers recorded as responsible for the lost time in the unit (N = 128), the scores for the women and the men (means of 8.39 and 6.14 hours) are not significantly different ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).[25]

Data from 4-Week Recollection. Of these 738 soldiers, 39.7% were recalled as having lost time for medical and health reasons. Proportionately more women than men (52.5% versus 28.5%) were recalled as having had medically related lost time, and the difference is significant, F (1, 152) = 43.51, F (1, 155) = 45.02, $p < .01$. Amount-of-time scores were also higher for women than for men (means of 13.15 and 4.17 hours), and the difference is again significant, F (1, 152) = 8.82, F (1, 155) = 10.85, $p < .01$. For the subset of soldiers recalled as having been responsible for the lost time (N = 293), scores for the women and the men (means of 23.15 and 13.97 hours) differ

---

[24] Here, as well as elsewhere, we analyzed the untransformed scores in addition to the log (X + 1) transformed scores to identify instances (if any) in which the results were substantially different. For all significant ($p < .01$) as well as near-significant ($.05 > p > .01$) effects the data patterns and judgments of significance/nonsignificance were the same for the corresponding analyses. In the case of the 5-day record of medical lost time, however, the gender difference is not significant or even near-significant with the untransformed-score analysis although it is significant with the transformed-score analysis.

[25] Casual inspection of the time-log materials (Appendix B, p. B-3) suggests that men and women might be compared on medical and health conditions that are not female-specific--i.e., conditions other than pregnancy and menstrual GYN problems. As noted earlier, however, we discovered in the field that the supervisor often does not know the reason for a soldier's requesting to go on sick call (the soldier isn't required to say). If we had foreseen this, we would have included a "don't know" response category; but since we did not, the supervisor in such situations was prevented from indicating the uncertainty and had to pick one of the other alternatives. Our assumption is that, in most such cases, the supervisor used the category "all other reasons" to report the lost time. If this is indeed what happened, a category we had intended as a not-female-specific category includes an undetermined amount of female-specific lost time. Our not-very-satisfactory solution to the problem was to exclude the all-other-reasons category and perform an ANOVA on the data from the remaining categories. The results indicated that proportionately more women than men (18% versus 9% respectively) had been recorded as having lost time in this subcategory, and the difference is significant, F (1, 155) = 7.19, F (1, 158) = 7.91, $p < .01$. Amount-of-time scores were higher for the women than for the men (means of .59 and .36 hours respectively), but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$).

significantly from each other, t (291) = 2.58, $p < .01$.[26] None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).

Table 3

Percentage[a] of Soldiers Said To Have Lost Time from Work[b] for Medical and Health Reasons, by Soldier Gender and CMF Traditionality

Soldier gender	CMF traditionality			
	High	Medium	Low	Total
Male	14	8	13	11
Female	22	19	44	24
	19	13	23	

[a]For the number of groups and individual soldiers in each cell, see Table 2.

[b]Based on unweighted-means analysis of scores from the supervisor's 5-day record.

Data from the 5-day record and the 4-week recollection were converted to the common metric of minutes-per-day and subjected to a 2 (soldier gender) × 2 (source of information) within-groups ANOVA. The mean score was higher for women than for men (24.10 and 8.55 minutes respectively), and the difference is significant, F (1, 142) = 14.77, $p < .01$. The mean score was higher for the 4-week recollection than for the 5-day record (20.76 and 11.89 minutes respectively), and this difference is significant also, F (1, 142) = 7.20, $p < .01$. The gender × source interaction is not significant ($p > .01$). Cell means are shown in Table 4.

Category 2: Home-and-Family-Care Reasons

Data from 5-Day Record. Altogether, 4.1% of the soldiers were recorded as having lost time for home-and-family-care reasons. Proportionately more women than men (4.9% versus 3.3% respectively) were said to have lost time in this category, but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). Amount-of-time scores were higher for women than for men (means of .15 and .14 hours), but this difference is not significant either ($p > .01$). For the subset of soldiers recorded as responsible for the lost time in the unit (N = 30), scores for the women were higher than those for the men (means of 3.94 and 3.00 hours), but again the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).

[26]Although this difference is significant using transformed scores, it is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$) using untransformed scores.

Table 4

Mean Number of Minutes per Day Said To Have Been Lost from Work for Medical and Health Reasons, by Soldier Gender and Source of Information

Soldier gender	Source of information: Supervisor's 5-day record	Source of information: Supervisor's 4-week recollection
Male	6.14	10.97
Female	17.65	30.56

Note. Data are from the 145 groups for which male and female scores were available for both information sources.

Data from 4-Week Recollection. Altogether 10.3% of the soldiers were recalled as having lost time for home-and-family-care reasons. Proportionately more women than men (12.5% versus 8.4% respectively) were recalled as having lost time in this category, but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). Amount-of-time scores were higher for women than for men (means of 3.52 and 2.60), but again the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). For the subset of soldiers recalled as having been responsible for the lost time ($N = 76$), scores for the women were higher than those for the men (means of 32.16 and 30.21 hours), but again the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's $> .01$).

Category 3: Discipline-Related Reasons

Data from 5-Day Record. A total of 15.4% of the soldiers were recorded as having lost time for discipline-related reasons. Proportionately more women than men (15.9% versus 15.0%) were recorded as having lost time in this category, but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). The amount-of-time scores were higher for men than for women (means of .97 and 48 hours), but the difference is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$). For the subset of soldiers recorded as responsible for the lost time in the unit ($N = 114$), scores were higher for men than for women (means of 5.47 and 3.94 hours), but again the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's $> .01$).

Data from 4-Week Recollection. A total of 14.1% of the soldiers were recalled as having lost time for discipline-related reasons. Proportionately more women than men (16.2% versus 12.2%) were recalled as having lost time in this category, but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). Amount-of-time scores were higher for the women than the men (means of 2.26 and 1.61 hours), but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). There is, however, a gender × location interaction, $F(2, 153) = 5.16$, $p < .01$, in which the above-mentioned female-male difference is found only at the Korea location, with the reverse pattern appearing at the other two locations. For the subset

of soldiers recalled as having been responsible for the lost time (N = 104), scores for the women were higher than those for the men (means of 11.59 and 10.79 hours respectively), and again the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).

An effort was made to determine why the usual gender differences (men having more discipline-related lost time than women) did not appear. Soldiers were classified by gender and by whether they had graduated from high school, and two sets of analyses were performed. A three-way (gender × educational status × whether the soldier had any discipline-related lost time) contingency analysis was performed for the 5-day-record and also for the 4-week-recollection scores, and a two-way (gender × educational status) ANOVA was performed on the amount of discipline-related lost time the supervisor had reported from each of the two sources. Women had significantly higher educational levels than men, χ^2 (1) = 33.89, $p < .01$, but the three-factor interaction is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$) nor are any of the other effects (all p's > .01).

All Lost-Time Reasons

Data from 5-Day Record. A total of 31.8% of the soldiers were recorded as having lost time for at least one of the lost-time reasons. Proportionately more women than men (38.0% versus 26.5% respectively) were recorded as having at least some lost time, but the difference is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$). Amount-of-time scores were higher for women than for men (means of 2.34 and 1.94 hours respectively), but this difference is not significant either ($p > .01$). For the subset of soldiers recorded as responsible for the lost time in the unit (N = 235), scores were higher for the women than for the men (means of 7.42 and 6.07 hours), but again the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).

Data from 4-Week Recollection. A total of 48.8% of the soldiers were recalled as having lost time for at least one of the lost-time reasons. Proportionately more women than men (60.9% versus 38.2% respectively) were recalled as having lost time in this category during the preceding 4-week period, and the difference is significant, F (1, 152) = 38.97, F (1, 155) = 34.72, $p < .01$. Amount-of-time scores were higher for women than for men (means of 20.12 and 8.31 hours respectively), and the difference is significant, F (1, 152) = 8.84, F (1, 155) = 7.02, $p < .01$. For the subset of soldiers recalled as having been responsible for the lost time (N = 360), scores for the women were higher than those for the men (means of 29.63 and 20.53 hours), but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).

Comparison with Total Time Away from the Job

Approximately two-thirds (69.4%) of the soldiers (66.4% of the men and 72.8% of the women) were recorded as being away from the job during the 5-day period for some reason--a lost-time reason, some other reason (e.g., special duty, detail, or leave), or both. Approximately one-third (31.8%) of the soldiers (26.5% of the men and 38.0% of the women) were recorded as being away for lost-time reasons, and just over half (56.2%) of them (56.5% of the men

and 56.9% of the women) were recorded as being away for some other reason. Approximately one-fifth (19.0%) of the soldiers (18.9% of the men and 21.2% of the women) were away for both lost-time and other reasons.

On the average, soldiers were away from their jobs 12.52 hours during this period (12.33 hours in the case of the men and 13.55 hours in the case of the women). For lost-time reasons the average was 2.13 hours (1.94 hours in the case of the men and 2.34 hours in the case of the women). For other-than-lost-time reasons the average was 10.39 hours (10.36 hours in the case of the men and 10.46 hours in the case of the women).

Utilization

Five variables were constructed to measure soldier utilization. After responding to several introductory items the supervisor was asked whether the soldier was working in his or her MOS.[27] In those cases (88% of the men and 90% of the women) in which the answer was yes, the supervisor was directed to an additional set of items and asked to respond to them on a nine-step scale. These items were combined in the data analysis to produce the five variables.

Proportion of MOS Performed

Men were reported to be performing more of their MOS tasks than women (means of 6.29 and 6.00 respectively), but the difference is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$) nor are any of the other effects (all p's $> .01$).

Proportion of Job-Time Spent on Sedentary Tasks

With respect to the dependent variable of time spent on sedentary tasks, there is a main effect of soldier gender, F (1, 152) = 18.41, F (1, 155) = 15.74, $p < .01$, with women recorded as spending more of their time on these tasks than men (means of 5.22 and 4.47). There is also a main effect of CMF traditionality, F (2, 152) = 27.18, F (2, 155) = 21.09, $p < .01$, with the greatest amount of time spent on tasks of this kind by soldiers in high-traditional CMFs, the next greatest by soldiers in medium-traditional CMFs, and the least amount of time by soldiers in low-traditional CMFs (means of 6.26, 4.56, and 2.51). A Newman-Keuls test indicates that the difference between the high-traditional mean and the medium-traditional mean is significant ($p < .01$), that the difference between the high-traditional and the low-traditional mean is also significant ($p < .01$), but that the difference between the medium-traditional and the low-traditional mean is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$). Also, the soldier-gender × CMF-traditionality interaction

---

[27] The primary purpose of this "working-in-MOS" question was to identify a subset of soldiers who, because they were working in their MOSs, have at least the possibility of performing the tasks the Army assumes they are performing. The question could, however, be used to serve an additional purpose--viz., measure MOS mismatch--provided that the sample is sufficiently inclusive. Unfortunately, as noted earlier, the sample probably missed an unknown number of soldiers who were somewhere else.

is not significant ($p > .01$). There is a main effect of location, F (2, 152) = 7.24, $p < .01$, with the greatest amount of time reported being spent on these tasks by soldiers in Korea, next greatest amount of time by soldiers in Germany, and the least amount of time by soldiers at Fort Hood (means of 6.29, 4.59, and 4.33). A Newman-Keuls test found none of the three individual comparisons to be significant: Korea-Germany, $.05 > p > .01$; Korea-Fort Hood, $.05 > p > .01$; Fort Hood-Germany, $p > .01$. The other (main and interaction) effects are all nonsignificant, all p's > .01.

Proportion of Job-Time Spent on Dirty, Dangerous, or Demanding Tasks

With respect to the dependent variable of time spent on tasks that are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding, there is a main effect of soldier gender, with men recorded as spending more of their time than women on these tasks (means of 4.03 and 3.12), F (1, 152) = 41.12, F (1, 155) = 46.75, $p < .01$. Again there is the expected relationship with CMF traditionality--this time in the opposite direction. The amount of time recorded as being spent on these tasks was smallest when the soldier was in a high-traditional CMF, next smallest when the soldier was in a medium-traditional CMF, and greatest when the soldier was in a low-traditional CMF (means of 2.41, 3.80, and 5.50), F (2, 152) = 38.58, F (2, 155) = 28.30, $p < .01$. A Newman-Keuls test indicated that each of these means is significantly different from each of the others (all p's < .01). The soldier-gender × CMF-traditionality interaction is not significant ($p > .01$), nor are any of the other effects (all p's > .01).

Proportion of Job-Time Spent on Tasks with Danger of Physical Attack

Men were recorded as spending more of their time than women on tasks in which there is a danger of being physically attacked (means of 2.33 and 2.24), but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). There is a main effect of CMF traditionality, F (2, 153) = 11.35, F (2, 156) = 11.26, $p < .01$, with the greatest amount of time spent on these tasks by soldiers in medium-traditional CMFs (CMFs 76 and 95), next greatest amount of time by soldiers in low-traditional CMFs (CMFs 63 and 64), and the least amount of time by soldiers in high-traditional CMFs (CMFs 31 and 71). Means of the medium-traditional, low-traditional, and high-traditional soldiers were 3.39, 1.79, and 1.26. A Newman-Keuls test indicated that the difference between the medium- and the high-traditional mean is significant ($p < .01$) but that the other two differences, low-versus-high ($p > .01$) and low-versus-medium ($.05 > p > .01$), are both nonsignificant. The soldier-gender × CMF traditionality interaction is not significant ($p > .01$), nor are any of the other effects (all p's > .01). In an effort to determine whether the CMF traditionality pattern (more time on these tasks by soldiers in medium- than in high- or low-traditional CMFs) is explainable by the fact the medium-traditional CMFs include CMF 95 (military police), a set of ANOVAs was performed which at each traditionality level compared the two CMFs that made up that level. Each design was a two (soldier gender) × two (CMF) factorial, and there were three such designs: one for high-traditional CMFs, one for medium-traditional CMFs, and one for low-traditional CMFs. In the medium-traditional-CMF design there is a main effect of CMF, with soldiers in CMF 95 spending more time on tasks of this sort than soldiers in CMF 76 (means of 6.19 and 1.20 respectively), F (1, 143) = 291.44, $p < .01$. The gender × CMF

interaction is not significant ($p > .01$), nor are any of the other effects, either in the medium-traditional-CMF or the high- or low-traditional-CMF design.

Proportion of Job-Time Spent Working Alone

With respect to the dependent variable of time spent working alone in an isolated place, there is a main effect of soldier gender, with men recorded as spending more of their time than women on tasks of this kind (means of 2.03 and 1.77), F (1, 153) = 10.44, F (1, 156) = 6.19, $p < .01$. None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01).

Relationships to Judged Readiness

Supervisors expressed greater confidence in the combat readiness of their male than their female soldiers (means of 3.78 and 3.14 on a four-step scale), and the difference is significant, F (1, 151) = 40.29, F (1, 154) = 61.01, $p < .01$. Greater confidence was also expressed concerning the readiness of soldiers in divisional as compared with nondivisional companies (means of 3.58 and 3.30 respectively), and this difference is significant also, F (1, 154) = 11.26, $p < .01$. Finally, there is a soldier-gender $\times$ divisional-nondivisional interaction, F (1, 154) = 7.38, $p < .01$, in which the male-female difference is greater in nondivisional units ($\bar{X}$ = 3.75 for males, 2.85 for females) than in divisional units ($\bar{X}$ = 3.81 for males, 3.36 for females). None of the other effects is significant (all p's > .01). Data for individual readiness, as well as for soldier utilization and recorded lost time, are presented in Appendix H.

Product-moment correlations were computed for individual-soldier readiness and selected lost-time and utilization variables, and the resulting coefficients are shown in Table 5. For the total group, r's ranged from -.17 to .33 and are all in the expected direction. Each of these r's is statistically significant (p's < .01), and with two exceptions (see Table 5) this is the case when males and females are examined separately. In each case the coefficient is higher for the women than it is for the men.

Company commanders in nondivisional companies expressed greater confidence in their company's readiness than did company commanders in divisional companies (means of 8.1 and 7.6 respectively), but the difference is not significant ($p > .01$). Company divisionality was thus ignored in the next analysis. The 22 companies were listed in two (divisional and nondivisional) columns, with each divisional company being paired with a nondivisional company of the same type and (Fort Hood and Korea) location. For each pair of companies, the company with the higher percentage of EW was put in one category and the company with the lower percentage was put in the other category. (The two ties were resolved by a flip of a coin.) Higher percentage companies ($\bar{X}$ = 18%) were then compared with lower percentage companies ($\bar{X}$ = 10%) on commander confidence with respect to company readiness. Confidence ratings were higher in the lower percentage companies than in the higher percentage companies (means of 8.3 and 7.6 respectively), but the difference is not significant ($.05 > p > .01$).

Table 5

Correlation of Lost-Time and Utilization Variables with Individual-Soldier Readiness

	Men	Women	Total
Lost-time variables			
Lost time recorded over 5 days	-.08	-.17*	-.17*
Lost time recalled for preceding 4-week period	-.15*	-.24*	-.27*
Utilization variables			
Number of MOS tasks performed	.31*	.33*	.33*
Time on tasks that are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding	.08	.18*	.20*

Note: Ns for men vary between 324 and 386. Ns for women vary between 291 and 339.

*$p < .01$.

Finally, for the individual-level variable of soldier readiness and for five other individual-level variables (5-day record of lost time, 4-week recollection of lost time, judged value of the soldier to the work group, whether the soldier was working in his or her MOS, and proportion of MOS tasks performed), scores were aggregated[28] to provide a weighted score for the company as a whole. Companies (N = 35) that were high-versus-low on the variable were compared with respect to their commanders' confidence concerning company readiness. Companies that were high on the aggregated variable of individual-soldier readiness had higher company-readiness ratings than companies that were low on this variable ($p < .01$), but for none of the other comparisons was the difference significant (all p's > .01).

[28]The procedure used in aggregating these scores was as follows. For each variable a male and a female mean was computed for each squad. These male and female means were laid out in a distribution, and the median was identified as a cutting point for dividing scores into high-versus-low for the two distributions. Next, the company was identified that the squad belonged to, and male and female means were averaged across member squads to produce an aggregated male and an aggregated female mean for the company as a whole. These aggregated male and female means were weighted in accordance with the percentage of EW in the company and then combined to provide a single score for that company.

Credibility of the Data

Correlation of Supervisor and Soldier Data

Many of the questions asked of the soldiers' supervisors were later asked of the soldiers themselves. On selected variables the responses given by the participating soldiers who were on post and available (88.5% of the men and 87.5% of the women) were correlated with the responses given by the supervisors of these soldiers as a way of finding out how similar the two sets of responses were. Before examining these correlations, however, it is necessary to inquire about the comparability of the data subset on which these correlations are based and the larger data set from which it was taken.

Comparability of Data Set and Subset. As a way of indirectly assessing the comparability of the total data set (N = 738) and the subset that was used in the correlations (N = 649), distributions of supervisor data were compared for the 649 soldiers for whom soldier data were available and the 89 soldiers for whom soldier data were not available. Comparisons were made on five more-or-less-arbitrarily-selected variables: Army grade, whether the soldier was said to be working in his or her MOS, judged individual readiness, judged productivity on the job, and amount of trouble the soldier was said to cause. The Army-grade item is shown on page 1 of the supervisor questionnaire (Appendix I); and the other variables are shown in items 6, 15, 29, and 30. In each case, the two distributions were found to have the same pattern, and none of the comparisons is significant (all p's > .01).

Supervisor and soldier data were correlated for variables that had two characteristics: The variable combined scores from at least two measures and thus had a chance of being relatively stable; and the variable provided descriptive rather than evaluative information and thus had a chance of being relatively free from motivated distortion. There were five such variables (total lost time on day 5,[29] 4-week recollection of lost time for all reasons, number of MOS tasks performed, time on sedentary tasks, and time on tasks that

---

[29]The reason the supervisor-soldier lost-time correlations were computed for day 5 and not for the full period is that day 5 is the only day for which time-log data were requested from the soldiers. The soldiers had been given, as part of the soldier questionnaire, a set of time-log questions for a single day; and the standard instructions at the top of the page told the soldier to answer these time-log questions for the day specified. For each soldier, the day specified was the day immediately preceding the day he or she was filling out the questionnaire. Soldiers filling out the questionnaire on a Tuesday, for example, were instructed to answer the time-log questions for Monday. Of the 649 soldiers who completed the questionnaire, most (68% of the men and 70% of the women) completed it on a day corresponding to day 6, i.e., the day after the last day of the 5-day period during which the supervisor kept the time log. These soldiers (N = 436), along with their supervisors, are the ones who provided the data for the supervisor-soldier recorded-lost-time correlations. Data for this variable and for the 4-week-recollection variable were subjected to a log (X + 1) transformation before they were analyzed.

are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding);[30] and the correlation coefficients for males, females, and total group are shown in Table 6. For total group, r's range from .19 to .79, the median being .63.[31] Each of the r's is statistically significant (all p's < .01), and with one exception (see Table 6) this is the case for males and females considered separately.

Supervisor Attitude

Two efforts were made to examine supervisor attitude as a source of variance. One of these efforts began with the assumption that there would be discrepancies between the supervisor and soldier responses to the measures and inquired whether any of the variance could be predicted from supervisor attitude regarding the role of women in the Army. A four-item scale (Appendix E) was constructed and included in a more general questionnaire (Appendix K) that was administered to the supervisor. Based on responses from the 164 supervisors, estimated reliability of the scale (Cronbach alpha) is .63, and the item-total correlations range from .25 to .58. Data pertaining to scale validity were not obtained. For each of the 164 supervisors, the following scores were computed on each of the main lost-time and utilization variables: (a) mean discrepancy between the supervisor's and the male squad members' scores, (b) mean discrepancy between the supervisor's and the female squad members' scores, and (c) the difference between these two discrepancy scores. For each of the variables examined, the median male and female discrepancy scores were all approximately zero, and inspection of the distributions provided no evidence that lost time was being overstated or that utilization was being understated to a greater extent for one gender than the other. Coefficients of correlation between these difference scores and the supervisor-attitude

---

[30] For "number of tasks performed" (Appendix C, p. C-3), the correlation between the two items is .41 (.36 for males, .45 for females); for "job time on sedentary tasks" (Appendix C, p. C-4), the correlation is .83 (.80 for males, .85 for females); and for "job time on tasks that are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding" (Appendix C, p. C-5), the average inter-item correlation is .63 (.58 for males, .65 for females).

[31] As indicated by the magnitude of the r's, there is a good deal of variance not accounted for. Several efforts were made to identify some of the sources of this variance. In one, supervisor-soldier correlations were computed separately for cases in which the soldier had and had not graduated from high school. For four of the five variables (all except 4-week recollection of lost time) the correlations were, as expected, higher for the group that included the graduates (median r = .65) than for the group that included the nongraduates (median r = .34). For males, the results were essentially repeated (this time the exception was time on sedentary tasks), the median r for graduates being .61 and the median r for nongraduates being .23. For females, however, there was no pattern at all: For two of the five variables the correlations were higher for the group that included the graduates while for the remaining three it was the other way around. Median r for the former group is .63 and for the latter group is .66. In a second effort, scale-item intercorrelations were computed separately for supervisor and soldier data sets. Contrary to expectations, there was no consistent trend for these correlations to be higher in the supervisor than in the soldier data set.

scores ranged from -.002 to .033, and none of them is significant (all p's > .01).

Table 6

Coefficient of Correlation Between Supervisor and Soldier Responses on Selected Variables

	Coefficient of correlation		
	Men	Women	Total
Lost-time variables			
Total lost time recorded on day 5	.54 (N = 234)*	.80 (N = 202)*	.67 (N = 436)*
4-Week recollection of lost time for all reasons	.29 (N = 346)*	.15 (N = 291)*	.19 (N = 637)*
Utilization variables			
Number of MOS tasks performed	.20 (N = 252)*	.13 (N = 223)[a]	.17 (N = 475)*
Time on sedentary tasks	.75 (N = 339)*	.83 (N = 285)*	.79 (N = 624)*
Time on tasks that are dangerous, difficult, or physically demanding	.62 (N = 342)*	.63 (N = 288)*	.63 (N = 630)*

*$p < .01$.

[a] $.05 > p > .01$.

A second effort to examine supervisor attitude as a source of variance involved trichotomizing this variable and including it in a 2 × 3 × 2 (gender × supervisor attitude × information source) mixed design. For this analysis also, supervisor attitude had no effect at all (all p's > .01).

Other Matters[32]

Soldier Awareness of Being Involved in a Study

According to reports by both supervisors and soldiers, soldiers were generally unaware that their lost-time behavior was being specially monitored as part of a study, and this was the case about equally for the men and the women ($p > .01$). The awareness scores were higher in nondivisional units than in divisional units, F (1, 155) = 7.86, $p < .01$, and higher also at Fort Hood and in Germany than in Korea, F (2, 152) = 5.74, $p < .01$, but none of the other effects are significant (all p's > .01). Product moment correlation coefficients were computed for the awareness and the five main lost-time and utilization variables, but none of the coefficients proved to be significant (all p's > .01).

Soldier Typing Ability and Educational Level

Product moment correlations were computed for the measure of whether the soldier was working in his or her MOS and two measures of typing ability, but neither of these correlations proved to be significant (both p's > .01). A correlation was also computed for the measure of whether the soldier was working in his or her MOS and two measures of educational achievement, but again neither of the coefficients proved significant (both p's > .01).

DISCUSSION

The present investigation was exploratory. Further research can examine the reliability of the relationships described here, provide evidence regarding the magnitude of these relationships, and explain, rather than just describe, the relationships that are observed. The findings reported here are thus to be viewed as tentative.

Lost Time

It was only in the medical and health category that clear and consistent differences appeared. The differences were clear, in that in most cases they were statistically reliable, and consistent, in that for all six comparisons that were examined, they were in the same direction. Furthermore, the data provide no evidence that these differences are simply distortions produced by negative supervisor attitudes. The primary hypothesis suggested by these data is not that women lose more time from work for these reasons than men do (though there appear to be some differences here) but that a larger

---

[32]Data not directly relevant to the purpose of the research have not been presented in this report. It may be of interest, however, to note that there is a significant effect (F (2, 153) = 7.31, F (2, 156) = 11.11, $p < .01$) of CMF traditionality on judged soldier troublesomeness (see Appendix H, p. H-4, item 30): The less traditional the CMF, the more trouble the soldier was said to cause (means of 2.13, 2.33, and 2.87 on a seven-step scale), F (2,153) = 7.31, F (2, 156) = 11.1, $p < .01$.

proportion of the women lose time. The finding that proportionately more women than men were said to lose time for medical and health reasons (and probably a greater average amount of time) is consistent with the results reported in most of the studies cited earlier. What is not clear is the exact meaning of such differences. Do the differences apply across the board or do they apply mainly to soldiers in less-traditional (for women) occupations? Are they large differences or are they generally small? And, assuming that at least some of the observed differences are empirically as well as statistically reliable, what do they mean? Implied here are a number of questions. For example, are there differences in the way men and women soldiers are managed that can account for observed differences in the proportion of men and women with medically related lost time? Are there differences for the two genders of those things which, when inadequate, can affect the need for medical care--e.g., clothing, equipment, and day-to-day experience on the job?

With respect to the home-and-family-care category, the scores are consistent (higher for women than men in every comparison), but none of the differences is statistically reliable. It may be that to study this category of lost time one must have a larger sample than was available for the present effort (in the obtained sample, only 30 of the 738 soldiers were said to lose time for these reasons) or a longer period of time in which to collect the data. With respect to the discipline-related category, the data are inconsistent: 5-day record data consistently show the men with higher lost-time scores and the 4-week-recollection data consistently show women with the higher scores. Moreover, none of the differences is statistically reliable. As noted earlier, most studies have found differences of the sort reported in the 5-day record (men losing more time for these reasons than women); and the possibility that such differences are real cannot be dismissed. In the present effort, however, evidence for the existence of such differences was not found.

Do female soldiers lose more time from work than male soldiers do? Or more specifically, do female first-term soldiers lose more time than first-term male soldiers? Here the differences are consistent but not clear. The two clearly reliable effects, amount of time and percentage of soldiers recalled as having lost time over the preceding 4-week period, seem largely driven by the similarly reliable difference in the medical category. Probably the most that can be said here is that until a satisfactory measure has been found for lost time in each of the categories (e.g., one with a large enough sample or a long enough period of time) one cannot make a prediction about the total. The existence of such an overall difference, however, is not supported by the present data.

Utilization

The present data are consistent with the data reported by Christal (1975) and suggest that women and men tend to be used on the job in somewhat different ways. The differences were small--i.e., male and female scores were, on the average, less than one step apart on a nine-point scale. They were, however, consistent in that they appear in most of the variables for which one might predict them.

Relationships to Judged Readiness

Correlations of lost-time and utilization variables with the one-item measure of individual-soldier readiness were in the expected direction, (i.e., correlations with lost time were negative and correlations with utilization were positive), but they were generally low. The largest of the correlations is with "number of MOS tasks performed," and this is a correlation that makes sense. The second largest, however, is with "lost time recalled over the preceding 4-week period," and this is the least reliable variable in the set. It is also not clear why the correlations are consistently lower for the women than for the men.

The t-tests comparing company-readiness ratings for companies grouped as high-versus-low on presumably relevant variables found none of these relationships to be statistically significant except for a weak, although reliable, relationship to aggregated individual readiness. Probably the most that can be said here is that the data relating lost time and utilization to combat readiness are not sufficient to permit the drawing of a conclusion.

Credibility of the Data

Soldier responses were not assumed to constitute a criterion against which to measure the supervisor's responses but simply to provide another source of information. The validity of this other source, however--either in absolute terms or in relation to the validity of the supervisor--is unknown. The magnitude of the supervisor-soldier correlations is only moderate and indicates a degree of uncertainty in the data. How much of this uncertainty derives from supervisor responses and how much derives from soldier responses cannot be determined from the available data.

The attitude scale was unsuccessful in identifying sources of variance in the data. One explanation is that the scale's validity (which is unknown) is too low for the scale to be useful in this population. Another possibility is that the supervisors were sufficiently careful in their reporting to render even a good scale useless. A third possibility is that the lost-time and utilization scores are insufficiently reliable to be predictable from the scale. Whatever the explanation, however, it is clear that a lot more work needs to be done before saying what influence, if any, such attitudes have on the reporting of data.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. Report of the admission of women to the U.S. Military Academy: Project Athena III. West Point, N.Y.: U.S. Military Academy, June 1, 1979.

Angle, D. C. The correlates of AWOL: 30 years of research into the problem of AWOL in the U.S. Army. ARI Research Problem Review 78-6, August 1978.

Bell, D. B. Summary of ARI research on military delinquency. ARI Research Report 1185, June 1977.

Binkin, M., & Bach, S. J. Women in the military. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1977.

Calahan, D., & Cisin, I. H. Final report on a service-wide survey of attitudes and behaviors of Navy personnel concerning alcohol and problem drinking, March 3, 1975. Cited in M. Binkin & S. J. Bach, Women in the military. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1977.

Christal, R. E. Studies relating to the utilization of women completed or planned by the Occupational and Manpower Division, AFHRL. Paper presented at the DOD Training and Personnel Technology conference, Washington, D.C., February 1975.

Datel, W. E., Harrison, J. J., & Rothberg, J. M. Psychiatric hospitalization of females in the Army. Washington, D.C.: Walter Reed Army Medical Center, 1977.

Fitzgibbons, D., & Moch, M. Employee absenteeism: A multivariate analysis with replication. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1980, 26, 349-372.

Gove, W. R., & Tudor, J. F. Adult sex roles and mental illness. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 812-835.

Greenberg, R. P., & Fisher, S. The relationship between willingness to adopt the sick role and attitudes toward women. Journal of Chronic Diseases, 1977, 30, 29-37.

Hartnagel, T. F. Absent without leave: A study of the military offender. Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 1974, 2, 205-220.

Hicks, J. M. A survey of the status and utilization of women in the Army. ARI Research Memorandum 78-22, October 1978.

Hoiberg, A. Causes of hospitalization for enlisted Navy women. Paper presented at the Southwest Regional IUS Conference, Dallas, Tex., April 1978. (a)

Hoiberg, A. Utilization, health, and performance of enlisted Navy women. Paper presented at the Training and Personnel Technology conference, Washington, D.C., February 1978. (b)

Hoiberg, A. Women in the Navy: Morale and attrition. Armed Forces and Society, 1978, 4, 659-671. (c)

Hoiberg, A., & Thomas, P. J. The economics of sex integration: An update of Binkin and Bach. Paper presented at the 20th annual IUS seminar on Armed Forces and Society (IUS), Chicago, Ill., October 1980.

Johnson, C., Cory, B., Day, R., & Oliver, L. Women content in the Army: REFORGER 77. ARI Special Report S-7, May 30, 1978. (REF WAC).

Kantor, J. E., Noble, B. E., Leisey, S. A., & McFarlane, T. Air Force female pilots program: Initial performance and attitudes. (AFHRL TR 98-7). Brooks Air Force Base, Tex.: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, February 1979.

Larwood, L., Glasser, E., & McDonald, R. Attitudes of male and female cadets toward military sex integration. Sex Roles, 1980, 6, 381-390.

Nathanson, C. A. Illness and the feminine role: A theoretical review. Social Science and Medicine, 1975, 9, 57-62.

Nathanson, C. A. Sex, illness, and medical care: A review of data, theory, and method. Social Science and Medicine, 1977, 11, 13-25.

Nieva, V. F., Mallamad, S. M., Eisner, E. J., Mills, S. J., & Thomas, P. J. Performance evaluation narratives of Navy women and men: An examination of bias in promotion. (NPRDC TR 81-14). San Diego, Calif.: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, July 1981.

Oliver, L. W. The effect of intergroup contact on attitudes toward women. Paper presented at the 89th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Calif., August 1981.

Oliver, L. W., & Babin, N. The relationship of gender to Army field assignment patterns. Paper presented at the meeting of the Military Testing Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., November 1978.

Olson, M. S., & Stumpf, S. S. Pregnancy in the Navy: Impact on absenteeism, attrition, and workgroup morale. San Diego, Calif.: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, December 1977.

Olson, M. S., & Thomas, P. J. Preenlistment drug experiences of Navy women and men: A comparison. (NPRDC TR 78-28). San Diego, Calif.: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, August 1978.

Polit, D., Nuttall, R. L., & King, E. Utilization of women in industrial career fields. (AFHRL TR 78-48). Brooks Air Force Base, Tex.: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, March 1979.

Priest, R. F., Vitters, A. G., & Prince, H. T. Coeducation at West Point. Armed Forces and Society, 1978, 4, 589-606.

Riolo, A. G. Women in the Army. Unpublished master's thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1980.

Rosenberg, M. When dissonance fails: On eliminating evaluation apprehension from attitude measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 28-42.

Rumsey, M. G. Gender influences on peer ratings in ROTC training platoons. Paper presented at the 89th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Calif., August 1981.

Savell, J. M., & Johnson, C. D. Predicting company performance from percent-female in support-type Army units: A second report from the "MAX WAC" study. Paper presented at the 88th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, September 1980.

Schneider, D. M. Social dynamics of physical disability in Army basic training. In C. Kluckhon, H. A. Murray, & D. M. Schneider (Eds.), Personality in nature, society, and culture. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1956.

Schor, F. D. Cost effectiveness of the enlisted female. Unpublished paper, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., April 1978.

Schuckit, M. A., & Gunderson, E. K. E. Psychiatric incidence rates for Navy women: Implications for an all-volunteer force. Military Medicine, 1974, 139, 534-536.

Sullivan, T. School dropouts and military crimes. American Benedictine Review, 1971, 22, 77-186.

Taylor, D. E. Absence from work--measuring the hours lost, May 1978. Monthly Labor Review, August 1979, 49-53.

Thomas, P. J. Attrition among Navy enlisted women. Defense Management Journal, Second Quarter 1980, 43-49.

Treadwell, M. United States Army in World War II. Special studies. The Women's Army Corps. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1954.

U.S. Army Judiciary, Office of Clerk of Court, Statistical and Coding Branch. Report of judicial and disciplinary activity in the Army. (JAG-2 report), April-June 1981.

U.S. Army Military Personnel Center. Utilization of women in the Army. (Final Task Force Report), July 1977.

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Women-content in Army force development test (MAX WAC), October 3, 1977.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Statistical abstracts of the United States, 1980.

U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics). Use of women in the military (Background study), May 1977.

U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics). Background review: Women in the military, October 1981.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Current estimates from the national health interview survey: United States, 1979, April 1981.

Vitters, A. G. Report of the admission of women to the U.S. Military Academy: Project Athena II. West Point, N.Y.: U.S. Military Academy, June 1, 1978.

Vitters, A. G., & Kinzer, N. S. Report of the admission of women to the U.S. Military Academy: Project Athena. West Point, N.Y.: U.S. Military Academy, September 2, 1977.

Waldron, I. Why do women live longer than men? Social Science and Medicine, 1976, 10, 349-367.

Wood, S. L., Pappas, L., Lovely, R., & Johnson, R. Migrations of women to and from nontraditional military occupations. (Report 1093 01 79 CR). McLean, Va.: General Research Corporation, July 15, 1979.

APPENDIX A

CRITERIA USED IN SELECTING COMPANIES AT EACH LOCATION

Divisional Company	Nondivisional Company
AG Company	Personnel and Administration Company
Lettered company with the most women assigned and working in CMF 31 in the divisional signal battalion	Lettered company with the most women assigned and working in CMF 31 in a nondivisional (corps) signal battalion.
Division MP company	Corps MP company that provides the same basic direct support to nondivisional units
Transport Motor Company in the Supply and Transportation Battalion (S&T)	Light medium truck company that provides direct support to division units
Main Supply and Services Company that does not support the brigades found in the S&T battalion	Direct support Supply and Services company that supports the nondivisional troops and backs up the division S&S companies
HQ and Main Support Maintenance Company. (The number of women is likely to be very small, and it may be necessary to ask for sections from other companies that have women working in CMF 63.)	A direct support maintenance company (corps forward) that provides direct support maintenance to nondivision units and acts as a back-up to the maintenance battalion in the division

APPENDIX B

MATERIALS USED IN MEASURING LOST TIME

1. Time log filled out each day by soldier's supervisor
2. How the 29 reasons for soldier's absence were categorized
3. Items used in assessing supervisor's 4-week recollection

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S) TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] 73

---

1. On the day indicated, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (USE A 24 HOUR CLOCK). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 74 75 76 77

2. At what time did it end? (INCLUDE ANY AFTER-DUTY HOURS THAT WERE REQUIRED FOR YOUR SECTION/SQUAD). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 78 79 80 81

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (WRITE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS AND MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 82 83 Minutes [ ][ ] 84 85

4. During this period, was there any time that this soldier was away from his/her regular job--or at his/her regular job but not actually working? For example, did this soldier arrive at work late? Did he/she have a profile that allowed him/her to rest part of the time? Or was this soldier somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT THIS SOLDIER WAS NOT WORKING AT HIS/HER REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "OO" HOURS AND "OO" MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 86 87 Minutes [ ][ ] 88 89

5. If this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or was not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the number of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] 90 91

Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

_____

_____

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

HOW THE 29 REASONS FOR SOLDIER'S ABSENCE WERE CATEGORIZED

1. MEDICAL REASONS

4. Sick call, in quarters, on appointment: accident or injury
5. " " " pregnancy
6. " " " menstrual/GYN problems
7. " " " ordinary dental problems
8. " " " all other reasons
9. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " pregnancy
11. " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " all other reasons
14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons
25. Attending drug & aocohol rehabilitation program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.

2. HOME-AND-FAMILY-CARE REASONS

17. Care of child or other family member (visit to doctor, drive to school, etc.)
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

3. DISCIPLINE-RELATED REASONS

21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling

4. ARMY-PURPOSE REASONS

1. Duty somewhere else (TDY, company training or detail, on duty education, etc.)
2. Ordinary leave or pass
3. Comp time or time off as reward
20. In/out processing

5. OTHER

27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (what was it?)
29. A reason not listed here (what was it?)

ITEMS USED IN ASSESSING SUPERVISOR'S 4-WEEK RECOLLECTION

During the past four weeks, how many days/hours has this soldier been away from his/her regular job (or unable to work) because he/she was:

	Days	Hours
16. taking care of his/her family?	☐☐	☐☐
17. meeting his/her own health needs?	☐☐	☐☐
18. involved in a civil or military court action?	☐☐	☐☐
20. late but not counted as AWOL?	☐☐	☐☐
21. AWOL?	☐☐	☐☐

Note: The items are presented following an introduction that explains the terms.

APPENDIX C

MATERIALS USED IN ASSESSING SOLDIER UTILIZATION

1. Proportion of MOS tasks performed
2. Job time on sedentary tasks
3. Job time on tasks that are dirty, dangerous, or physically demanding
4. Job time on tasks with other characteristics

PROPORTION OF MOS TASKS PERFORMED

Some soldiers perform (at one time or another or "as needed" nearly all the MOS tasks that go with their duty position. Other soldiers perform only some of these tasks. And still other soldiers (for one reason or another) perform almost none of these tasks.

7. How about this particular soldier? How many of the MOS (job book) tasks for his/her duty position do this soldier perform? CIRCLE ONE OF THE NUMBERS 1-9 BELOW. THEN WRITE THIS NUMBER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT. . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of these MOS tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these MOS tasks

8. When your section/squad goes into the field (say, for a three-day exercise), how many of the "setting-up/tearing-down" tasks does this soldier perform? IF THIS SOLDIER HAS NOT YET BEEN IN THE FIELD, ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF SETTING-UP/TEARING-DOWN TASKS HE/SHE WOULD PROBABLY PERFORM. . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of these setting-up/tearing-down tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these setting-up/tearing-down tasks

10. How about the other MOS tasks- the ones that have to be performed after the equipment has been set up? How many of these tasks does this soldier perform? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of these tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these tasks.

Note: Scoring of these items was reversed so that higher scores indicate more of the thing asked about.

JOB TIME ON SEDENTARY TASKS

<u>During a normal duty day</u>, how much of this soldier's time is spent:

22. working inside a building at a desk, table, or work bench? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

23. doing clerical or administrative tasks? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

Note: Scoring of these items was reversed so that higher scores indicate more of the thing asked about.

JOB TIME ON TASKS THAT ARE DIRTY, DANGEROUS, OR PHYSICALLY DEMANDING

During a normal duty day, how much of this soldier's time is spent:

24. doing things that get his/her hands and clothes dirty? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

25. doing things in which there is a danger of being injured accidentally? . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

28. performing tasks that require a lot of physical strength? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

Note: Scoring of these items was reversed so that higher scores indicate more of the thing asked about.

JOB TIME ON TASKS WITH OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

During a normal duty day, how much of this soldier's time is spent:

26. performing tasks in which there is a danger of being physically attacked? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

JOB TIME ON TASKS WITH OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

During a normal duty day, how much of this soldier's time is spent:

27. working alone in an isolated place? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

Note: Scoring of these items was reversed so that higher scores indicate more of the thing asked about.

APPENDIX D

MATERIALS USED IN OBTAINING JUDGMENTS ABOUT READINESS

1. Supervisor confidence about soldier's readiness
2. Company commander confidence about company's readiness

SUPERVISOR CONFIDENCE ABOUT SOLDIER'S READINESS

IMAGINE THE FOLLOWING SITUATION. The United States has been attacked by a foreign power. An infantry unit is preparing to go to the area where the attack was received and engage the enemy directly. Your company is one of those ordered in the combat zone to provide combat support/service support for this infantry unit. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Suppose this soldier was sent to the combat zone with the others in the company. Suppose also that he/she was assigned to the MOS duty position for which he/she was trained (PMOS or SMOS).

If this happened, could he/she perform the required tasks in a satisfactory manner? . . . . . ☐

1. Yes, I think so
2. Not sure, but probably
3. Not sure, but probably not
4. No, I don't think so.

Note: Scoring for this item was reversed so that higher scores indicate more of the thing asked about.

COMPANY COMMANDER CONFIDENCE ABOUT COMPANY'S READINESS

IMAGINE THE FOLLOWING SITUATION: The United States has been attacked by a foreign power. An infantry unit is preparing to go to the area where the attack was received and engage the enemy directly. Your company is one of those ordered into the combat zone to provide combat support/service support for this infantry unit. On a scale from 1 to 10, how confident are you that--in that situation--your company would be able to perform its mission satisfactorily? (Higher numbers mean greater confidence)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

APPENDIX E

SCALE USED IN ASSESSING SUPERVISOR ATTITUDE REGARDING THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE ARMY

WHEN WOMEN ARE ASSIGNED TO COMPANIES LIKE YOURS. . . .

*6. What happens to morale? . . . . . ☐

1. It goes way up
2. It goes up a little
3. It stays about the same
4. It goes down a little
5. It goes way down

*7. How much group spirit does one see--compared with before? . . . . . ☐

1. A lot more group spirit than before
2. A little more group spirit than before
3. Just as much group spirit as before
4. A little less group spirit than before
5. A lot less group spirit than before

8. How often does pregnancy become a serious problem? . . . . . ☐

1. Almost always
2. Very often
3. Sometimes
4. Not very often
5. Almost never

*9. How well does the company carry out its mission? . . . . . ☐

1. A lot better than before
2. Somewhat better than before
3. Just as well as before
4. Somewhat worse than before
5. A lot worse than before

---

*Scoring for these items was reversed so that higher scores indicated a more favorable attitude.

APPENDIX F

ITEMS USED IN ASSESSING SOLDIER AWARENESS OF BEING INVOLVED IN A STUDY

1. Items from the supervisor questionnaire
2. Items from the soldier questionnaire

ITEMS USED IN ASSESSING SOLDIER AWARENESS OF BEING INVOLVED IN A STUDY
(FROM THE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE)

*31. In your opinion, how many of the first-term soldiers in your section/squad knew that you were keeping a time log on them during this past week? . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of them knew
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of them knew

32. If some of them knew, when do you think they found out? . . . . . ☐

0 NOT APPLICABLE--NONE OF THEM KNEW
1. Yesterday
2. Two days ago
3. Three days ago
4. Four days ago
5. Five days ago
6. Six days ago
7. Seven days ago
8. Eight days ago
9. More than eight days ago

---

*Scoring of this item was reversed so that higher scores indicated more of the thing asked about.

ITEMS USED IN ASSESSING SOLDIER AWARENESS OF BEING INVOLVED IN A STUDY
(FROM THE SOLDIER QUESTIONNAIRE)

*40. In your opinion, how many of the first-term soldiers in your section/squad knew that their supervisor was keeping a time log on them last week? (MAKE A GUESS) . . . . . ☐

1. Most (or all) of them knew
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of them knew

41. If some of them knew this, when do you think they found out? (MAKE A GUESS) . . . . . ☐

0. NOT APPLICABLE--NONE OF THEM KNEW
1. Yesterday
2. Two days ago
3. Three days ago
4. Four days ago
5. Five days ago
6. Six days ago
7. Seven days ago
8. Eight days ago
9. More than eight days ago

---

*Scoring of this item was reversed so that higher scores indicated more of the thing asked about.

APPENDIX G

MATERIALS USED IN TRAINING THE LIEUTENANTS

1. Information briefing of company commanders and/or company first sergeants regarding the lost-time/utilization study
2. ARI representative's guide for training the lieutenants
3. Lieutenant's guide for training the section chiefs/squad leaders
4. Lieutenant's guide for administering the soldier questionnaire
5. Information for the ARI representative

INFORMATION BRIEFING OF COMPANY COMMANDERS
REGARDING THE LOST-TIME/UTILIZATION STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background:

1. There has been a great expansion in the role of women over the past decade or so. This increase has been both in the total number of women and also in the range of jobs these women are allowed to hold. Some people have thought this was a good idea, some people have thought it was a bad idea, and some people have been uncertain how they felt or have had mixed feelings.

2. The new administration directed that the several services review their policies regarding use of women and make recommendations as to which policies, if any, should be changed. All the services are doing this, including the Army. The Army Group was formed recently under the direction of MG Wetzel at the Pentagon and is called the Women-in-the-Army - Policy Review Group (WITA PRG). MG Wetzel and his study group are conducting a thorough review of all Army policies regarding the use of women, and where information is not available in the regular reports, the group has arranged to have that information collected. The research being conducted here is an effort to obtain information in two areas of interest, time lost from work and utilization of individuals once they have been formally trained. In order to provide a broad picture of the problems involved, soldiers from three parts of the world, Korea, Germany, and Ft. Hood, Texas, are being asked to contribute their time and knowledge. In order to control the variable of time, the information needed by the WITA PRG will be collected at all three locations starting on 16 June and ending on 22 June. Utilization data will be collected on the days following the 22d of June.

B. Purpose:

As already mentioned, the focus of this research is on lost time and utilization.

1. In this case "lost time" refers to time that the soldier is not working for reasons that are personal to the soldier and not to the Army. It refers to the time that the soldier is not working and there is not much the Army can do about it. It does not refer to things like ordinary leave because (1) the Army wants the soldier to take this leave; and (2) if the Army needed the individual in the case of an emergency, it could easily cancel the leave. It does not refer to TDY, special details, or company training which takes the soldier away from his/her regular work activities to perform tasks which at the moment need to be done. In other words leaders retain control over the activities of their soldiers. It is only when the Army no longer has control of the activities of the soldier that lost time actually occurs. During the period of time that we collect this information, we hope to record lost time for one week during June for 36 company-size units around the world, and be able to estimate the amount of time that the Army lost because soldiers had to leave their work places (or otherwise stop working) for medical or personal reasons.

2. "Utilization" compares the military occupation the soldier was trained to perform with the soldier's actual duties. In this case we want to go beyond the slotting of individuals to spaces in the table of organization and equipment (TOE), although getting this information is a first step. What we want to do is identify the range of tasks that soldiers actually perform.

C. The role of The U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI):

ARI is a behavioral and social science research institute with a general mission to conduct empirical research for the Army. ARI has no ax to grind, and we have nothing whatever to do with policy. It is the PRG's task to review Army policies, and ARI's job is to provide that work group with as accurate information as possible. How the PRG uses the information is up to them.

D. Possible Sensitizing Effect of Knowing what the Study is About:

It is possible that focusing on the "Women-in-the-Army" aspects of the study will make the people more sensitive to this issue, and as a result lead them to behave differently from the way they ordinarily would. For example, focusing on this could lead some section chiefs (perhaps unconsciously) to exhibit a positive or a negative bias in recording lost time or in describing how his/her soldiers are utilized that would distort the data. For this reason, we are trying not to focus on the "Women-in-the-Army" aspects. Instead, we are saying (and this is true) that the study is about lost time generally, that an unknown amount of it goes unrecorded, and that the Chief of Staff of the Army wants to know about how much time really is lost for various reasons. With respect to utilization, we are saying (and again this is true) that the study is about how soldiers are utilized and how many of the duty-position tasks soldiers get day-to-day experience working in. If you can help by discussing the study in its more general aspects (at least until the end of next week), I will appreciate it.

II. HOW THE STUDY WILL BE CONDUCTED

A. "Subjects" of the Study:

At each of three locations--Ft. Hood, Texas, USAREUR, and Korea--we have identified 12 companies to take part in the study, making a total of 3x12=36 companies in all. These 12 companies consist of one divisional and one non-divisional company of each of the following six types: AG, Signal, S&S, MP, Maintenance, and Transportation. What we have done is go to each of these 36 companies and identify those work sections of squads which have one or more first-term EW in them. These are the sections/squads that we will be concerned with in the study.

What we are doing in each of these sections/squads that have first-term women in them is identifying all the women in the section/squad plus about twice that number of men. In other words, if a section has two first-term women in it we will include these two women plus four first-term men. These, then, are the people we are studying: first-term EM and EW, selected from work sections/squads that include both. And we are doing this at a total of 36 companies in three widely dispersed areas of the globe.

B. The Data Collectors for the Study:

It is obvious that no one person would be able to collect all these data by himself. What we have done is send one of us to Ft. Hood (that's me), one of us to Korea, and one of us to USAREUR. And what we are doing at each of these three locations is exactly the same thing. We are asking certain people on the post to collect the data for us, using a data-collection procedure that we have written down and will describe in our training sessions in considerable detail. One group of people who will be collecting data for us are the section chiefs/squad leaders of the sections and squads that we have identified to be included in the study. They have an important job, a difficult job, and one that we will want to train them in carefully--both so that they will be confident in what they are doing and so that we will feel confident that the data they collect for us will be good data. The other group of people who will be collecting data for us (and these people will be helping us in other ways too) are a group of lieutenants. There are 12 of these lieutenants, and one of them will be working with each of your companies. They will be introduced to you later, and I hope you will get to know them well. They will be working in your company, collecting data for this study, for about ten days, and both we and they know that they cannot do this without your full support.

C. What the Data Collection Consists of:

The questionnaires we will be administering ask questions about a lot of different things, but mainly they concern "lost time" and "utilization."

Lost time. We are collecting data about lost time in two ways. One way consists of having the section chiefs/squad leaders keep a record (HOLD UP A COPY OF THE TIME LOG) of the time the duty day started (POINT TO THE SPACE ON THE TIME LOG), the time the duty day ended, the total number of hours that were in the duty day that day, the number of hours/minutes (if any) that the soldier was away from his/her job or not working, find the reason on the opposite page (POINT TO THIS) and write the number of this reason in the space that is provided. Finally, the section chief/squad leader is to write in the reason in his/her own words.

We are asking the section chiefs/squad leaders to fill out one of these time logs on each of their participating first-termers for five days--Tuesday, (TURN PAGES AND POINT), Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Monday. This may sound like a simple job, but it is not. It is important, for example, that

many different kinds of lost time be recorded--being late for formation, stopping to rest during the day because of the requirements of a medical profile, leaving for a short while to do some personal errand, etc., in addition to the usual reasons for being away like ordinary leave, special duty or detail, etc. And it is important that the right numbers--that is, the right numbers for the reasons they are thinking about--be put down and that there not be errors of recording. We want to train the section chiefs/squad leaders very carefully and spend enough time with this to make sure the person doing the recording feels confident about what he/she is doing.

The other way we are collecting lost-time data is in some ways better and in some ways worse than the method I have just described. We are asking the section chiefs/squad leaders to fill out a soldier-utilization questionnaire on each of their participating first-termers; and I'll have more to say about this questionnaire in just a minute. Included in the questionnaire, however, are several questions that ask about the amount of time, if any, that the soldier has been away from his/her job for various reasons during the past four weeks. In other words, we are asking the section chiefs/squad leaders to think back over the previous four weeks and estimate the number of hours/minutes that the soldier has been away from his/her job for various reasons. The plus aspect of this method is that it provides data for four weeks rather than just one; the minus aspect is that relies entirely on the supervisor's ability to recall these things.

Utilization. A few minutes ago I mentioned the soldier-utilization questionnaire that we are asking the section chief/squad leader to complete for each of his/her first-termers. (HOLD UP COPY). The soldier-utilization questionnaire is simply the second part of the booklet that contains the five daily time logs. What we have in this questionnaire are various questions about how the soldier is utilized--whether or not the soldier works in his/her MOS, what proportion of the tasks that go with the MOS does the soldier perform, how much of the soldier's job time is spent doing such things as doing clerical tasks, working alone in an isolated place, doing things in which there is a danger of getting injured accidentally, etc.

D. Data Collection Instruments:

Section Chief/Squad Leader Questionnaire. As I mentioned before, the section chief/squad leader will be asked to complete a two-part questionnaire. The first part consists of the daily time logs, and the other part consists of what we have referred to as the "soldier utilization questionnaire (HOLD Up COPY)

Soldier Questionnaire. In addition to the questionnaire that we are administering to the section chiefs/squad leaders, we are administering a first-termer version of this questionnaire to the first term soldiers themselves; and this questionnaire will be administered next week--after the lost-time data collection period is over. This questionnaire (HOLD UP COPY) will be administered to the first termers by the lieutenants who are serving as research assistants with the study and whom I referred to earlier. I have a copy of the questionnaire here, and you are welcome to look at it after the meeting if you wish.

III CONCLUDING COMMENTS

We hope we will have your support in conducting this study. We want the section chiefs/squad leaders in your company to take their responsibilities seriously; and I think they will do this if they believe you are behind the study and that you take it seriously.

I think that covers most of the things I wanted to say. What questions do you have?

ARI REPRESENTATIVE'S GUIDE
FOR TRAINING THE LIEUTENANTS
IN THEIR RESEARCH ROLE

1. Have the Lieutenants fill out the questionnaires on themselves and then for someone they know. This will facilitate the learning of the contents of the questionnaire and generally what questions the research is trying to explain. The idea here is to have the Lieutenants role play, i.e., to put themselves in the position of a supervisor who is providing information about several of his/her subordinates and to complete the supervisor questionnaire in that role. Explain to the Lieutenants how important it is to have the items circled and the blocks on the right hand side filled properly. At the end of each of the questionnaire administrations each of the items for each individual should be checked and filled out properly. If it is not, it is the responsiblity of the lieutenant to fill it out himself or to ask the participant to do it.

a. Start with the supervisor questionnaire. Go through the list of reasons for absence/lateness, and point out that the log is for five days in a row. Have them do this and then stop for discussion. Then go into the questionnaire itself. Heve them play the role of a supervisor and complete the questionnaire in that role. Have them mark in the margins any questions they have, and tell them the questions will be discussed later. Then, when all have finished, engage the group members in discussion.

b. Do the same with the First Termers Questionnaire and with the Supervisor's Opinion Questionnaire.

2. Explain the role of the Lieutenants.

a. To train the section chiefs/squad leaders (using role playing techniques in the same manner which they learned about the questionnaires).

b. To give the Supervisor's Questionnaire materials to the section chiefs/squad leaders and then to meet with them each day (at a mutually agreeable time) insure that the daily time logs are filled out accurately and completely and to answer any questions that might arise for that particular day.

c. Ask the section/squad leaders to answer questions 1-62 in the Supervisor's Questionnaire and to have it completed by COB Monday, 22 June.

d. Administer the Supervisor's Opinion Questionnaire to the Section/Squad Leaders on 23-24 June.

e. Coordinate with the 1st Sergeant and the Section/Squad Leaders to administer the First Termers Questionnaire to all of the designated participants on 23 June. If there are make-ups this will be completed on the 24th or as soon thereafter as possible. The setting for this session should be in a place where there are tables or chairs that can be used for writing, it is quiet and away from other members of the section/squad who are not participating in the study. If there is more than one session (makeup) the Lieutenants should administer the questionnaire for each section/squad in the same place and in the same manner as it was done originally.

f. Thursday,25 June turn the master control sheet and the completed questionnaires over to the ARI representative. The time for this turnover will be coordinated at the time of the training session
Note: The daily log sheet should be filled in by the First Term Soldiers using the activities of Monday, 22 June as the referent day, regardless of the day the log sheet was completed.

3. Explain the role of the Section Chiefs/Squad Leaders. Make sure the Section Chiefs/Squad Leaders know that they are not being tested and the way they give time off is not being examined. Make sure that they understand that the 1st Sergeant and the Company Commander are not looking over their shoulders and that none of the information gathered will be used in any adverse manner. The requirement is to provide information as to what actually happens. In other words, they should not change the way they make decisions on giving people time off just because the research is being conducted at this time.

a. To keep the five-day time logs faithfully and conscientiously, one day at a time, for five days, and asking questions whenever they are not clear about something. These logs should be kept as inconspicious as possible

with regard to the First Term Soldiers. We think that if the soldiers know there behavior is being recorded that it will change during the time of the research. ARI does not want this to happen.

b. To arrange a brief meeting with the Lieutenant each day to allow him to check the daily time logs and to answer any questions.

c. To arrange a time mutually convenient for the section chief/squad leader and the lieutenant to administer the soldier questionnaire to the soldiers in his/her group, and to attend and assist as requested by the lieutenant.

d. To insure that the designated members of his section/squad are present to complete the soldiers questionnaire on Tuesday, 23 June and to arrange for a make up time on Wednesday, 24 June, if necessary.

e. To meet with the ARI representative, as required, to provide insights into the problems that they experience and to give opinions on the limitations on how the data they gathered could be interpreted.

LIEUTENANTS' GUIDE
FOR TRAINING THE SECTION CHIEFS/SQUAD LEADERS
IN THEIR RESEARCH ROLE

I. INTRODUCTION

As many of you know, the Army has been asking a lot of questions lately about the readiness of its units; and one of the questions it has been asking is whether soldiers spend too much time away from their regular job (for whatever reason--special detail, sick call, simply being late, etc.) and, as a result of being away from their regular job, they don't get as much training as they need. One of the purposes of the present study is to find out to what extent, if any, this is true.

What the Army has done is identify about 2000 first-term soldiers from a lot of different companies (36 in all) located in various places around the world--CONUS, Germany, Korea. The Army is now asking that the supervisors of these soldiers to keep a time log for five days, showing how much time (if any) that these soldiers are away from their regular job (or unable to work because of a profile) and in each case to write down the reason. The reason you are here today is that some of the soldiers who were selected for the study are in the sections/squads that you are in charge of. And one of the things you will be doing is keeping a time log for five days--Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Monday--on each of these soldiers.

I said a minute ago that one of the questions the Army is asking is whether soldiers spend so much time away from their regular job that they don't get as much training as they ought to get. Another question the Army is asking is whether soldiers are getting enough experience in the full range of tasks that go with their MOS or whether, instead, the day-to-day exeprience they get is mainly in just a few of these tasks. So another one of the things you will be doing is answering some questions about how these soldiers are utilized: for example, how much of their time on the job is spent doing this, that, or the other type of task? Things of that sort.

Now at this point some of you may be thinking that what the Army is really doing is checking up on you personally--trying to find out if you are too strict or lenient in giving soldiers time off or trying to find out if you utilize your soldiers properly. Let me assure you that this is not the case. Nothing you say in this study will ever get into your file, the soldier's file, or indeed any one's file. No one at this post will see it except me; and when I get it I will give it immediately to the representative of the research institute (ARI) that is conducting this study for the Army. And ARI, the Army Research Institute, has nothing whatever to do with personnel records, nothing whatever to do with Army policy, and indeed nothing to do with anything that can affect you personally. All it does is collect data, do statistical analysis of these data, try to interpret the results of the statistical analysis, and then write up the results of this analysis for the Army. No one that provides data for this study will ever be identified personally and I can promise you that.

Now at this point, I want to move to the question of what your role in this study is.

II ROLE OF THE SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER IN THIS STUDY

A. Collect Time-Log Data for Five Days:

In just a minute I will pass out the time-log forms that you will be using, but first I want to say a few things about these forms. These time-log forms are simply the first part (POINTING) of a larger questionnaire you will be filling out on your soldiers called the SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE. These time-log forms may look complicated, but actually they are very simple. In fact, there are just six questions (sometimes seven) that you have to answer, although you'll have to answer these six or seven questions about each of your soldiers who are in the study.

The first thing you will do is write down is the time on that particular day (you see that the day is circled at the top of the page) that the duty day began for the soldiers in your section/squad. (POINT TO PLACE ON PAGE 3). If you had a morning formation at 0700, then your duty day began at 0700. If you did not have a morning formation, your duty day began at whatever time your soldiers were expected to be at work; and that is the time you write in the boxes here on the right (POINTING). That is the first thing you have to do; and if the duty day began at the same time for all your soldiers, then the time you write down will be the same in every case.

The second thing you will do is write down the time on that particular day that the duty day ended for the soldiers in your section/squad (POINT TO PLACE ON PAGE 3). If your duty day (including any extra hours your soldiers were expected to work) ended at 1800 hours, then write that down. If it didn't end until 2000 hours, write that down. That is the second thing you have to do; and if the duty day ended at the same time for all your soldiers, then the time you write down for this will be the same for all of them.

The third thing you will do is write down the number of hours and minutes your duty day was on that particular day; and for this you simply subtract the starting time from the ending time. If the total number of hours and minutes (including any extra hours your soldiers were expected to work) was 11 hours and 20 minutes, then write 11 hours and 20 minutes in the boxes at the right (POINTING).

The fourth thing you will do is write down the number of hours, if any, that this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or not working full time because of a profile) on that particular day. Now if you rely just on your memory, you may find that you are not sure about some things; and we want you to be sure about what you write down. So what I want you to do is take a pencil and write yourself a note whenever one of your participating soldiers is away from the job or not able to work. Write the name of the soldier, the length of -time he/she was away or not working, and what the reason was. Then, at the end of the day when you fill out these time logs, you can look at your notes and be sure that what you put down is accurate. And you'll feel good, knowing that what you have put down is good solid data and not just guess work.

So the fourth thing you'll write down is the number of hours/minutes, if any, that the soldier was away from his/her job or not able to work or whatever. And if the soldier was not away from the job and in fact worked full time the entire day, then write down that the soldier was away from the job "00" hours and "00" minutes.

The fifth thing you will write down is the reason this person was not working at his/her regular job--or, more accurately, the fifth thing you will write down is the number of the reason from this list (POINTING) of reasons on the opposite page. If the reason the soldier is not working at his/her regular job that day is that this soldier is on detail somewhere else (REASON # 1--POINTING), then write "01" two boxes here. If the reason is that the soldier had a dental appointment (REASON # 7--POINTING) then write "07" in the boxes here. If the soldier had to take a sick child to the doctor (REASON # 17--POINTING), write "17" here. If the soldier was simply late, write # 21, which is AWOL or "failure to repair." If the soldier is on the job but is given frequent rest periods related to an accident or injury (REASON # 14--POINTING), write "14" in the two boxes. And so it is with all the other reasons. In each case, just pick out the reason that comes closest to saying why the soldier was away or unable to work and write the number of that reason. If he/she was not away, write "00".

Now suppose the soldier has gone on sick call, but you don't know why. What do you write in that case? What you write is a new number that we don't have on here: number 30. If you know that the soldier is on sick call but don't know why, write # 30 in the boxes and then explain in the space at the bottom of the page. If you later find out why the soldier went on sick call, then you can go back and change the "30" to whatever the correct reason is. But until that time, use the number "30" for such cases.

The sixth thing you will do is write out the reason in your own words, and down here at the bottom of the page a space is provided for that purpose.

The seventh thing you will do is recall whether--on that particular day--the soldier happened to put any voluntary overtime--for example, working through the lunch hour just to finish some work that he/she wanted to get finished. Remember that the question here is asking about overtime work that is genuinely voluntary, not overtime work that is simply agreed to when the boss asks whether the soldier would be willing to work overtime.

Now before passing out the time logs I want to make a few general comments.

1. The focus of this part of the study is not the amount of time the soldier is not working at his regular job but the amount of time he/she is <u>not able</u> to work -- either because he/she is somewhere else or because he/she has a profile that prevents him/her from working full time. Thus if a soldier is not given any work to do and, as a result, is just "standing around," he/she is not counted as unable to work. The soldier is counted as unable to work at the regular job only if something prevents him/her from doing so.

2. In keeping the time logs, pay particular attention to lateness. Remember, these data do not go into anyone's file: the study simply wants to know how much lateness (among other things) there is. Being one minute late to formation is not being terribly late, but it is being a little late; and we want to include it in the study. So count any lateness, no matter how little.

3. If a soldier gets rest periods during the day because of a profile that the other soldiers don't get, add up the total number of minutes and write that down as time not able to work.

4. If the soldiers realize that you are keeping a time log on them, they may behave differently from the way they usually behave (for example, they may be less inclined to ask for time off). We do not want this to happen. We don't want to find out how much time soldiers spend away from their job when they think they are being watched--we want to find out how much time soldiers spend away from their job under ordinary everyday circumstances. For this reason, I want you to try to do this recording as inconspicuously as you can. And at the end of the day, when you sit down to fill out the time logs for that day, be sure that no one else is around.

5. At the end of each day, at a time that is most convenient for you, I will stop by your room (or meet you somewhere else, which would be better) and check your time logs for that day. At that time I will try to answer any questions you have about things that came up during the day.

Do you have any questions about any of this before I pass out the forms? (RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS THAT ARE ASKED). Okay, I will pass out the time log forms now (PASS THEM OUT).

Turn to page 2 in your questionnaire booklet. If a soldier went on sick call as a result of an accident or injury, what number would you write down as the reason? (WAIT UNTIL SOMEONE SAYS # 4, AND THEN ASK IF THE OTHERS SEE THAT THIS IS THE CORRECT NUMBER). Okay, suppose some one asked for and received time off to go get a hair cut. What number would you write down for that? (WAIT UNTIL SOMEONE SAYS # 27, AND THEN ASK IF THE OTHERS SEE THAT THIS IS THE CORRECT NUMBER). What about if someone left to get a paycheck

cashed? (WAIT UNTIL SOMEONE SAYS # 27, AND THEN ASK IF THE OTHERS SEE THAT THIS IS THE CORRECT NUMBER). Suppose a soldier is simply late to work, with no particular reason given. What would you put down for that? (WAIT UNTIL SOMEONE SAYS # 21, AND THEN ASK IF THE OTHERS SEE THAT THIS IS THE CORRECT NUMBER). What I want you to do is learn these reasons so well that you will not confuse them with each other--so that when you write down a number, the number you write down will mean the same thing the number means when it is written down by some other supervisor in some other part of the world.

Practice session. Okay, what I want to do now is have a practice session. Think of a soldier in your section/squad who is NOT a first-term soldier. Pick someone whose schedule during the past week you are familiar with, but don't worry if you can't recall every detail. This is just for practice. Now, while thinking about this soldier, fill out a daily time log on that soldier for each of the days indicated at the top of the pages. There are five of these daily time logs, one for each day of the week. Okay, begin. (AFTER EVERYONE HAS FINISHED, GO AROUND THE ROOM AND ASK EACH PERSON TO TELL WHAT HE PUT DOWN EACH DAY AND WHY. IF ANY QUESTIONS ARE ASKED, MAKE SURE THEY ARE ANSWERED TO THE QUESTIONER'S SATISFACTION BEFORE LEAVING THEM. IF YOU ARE UNSURE ABOUT SOMETHING, TELL THE PERSON YOU WILL FIND OUT THE ANSWER AND GET BACK TO HIM).

B. Complete the Soldier-Utilization Questionnaire on each Soldier in the Study:

If there are no more questions about the time logs, let's turn to the second part of the questionnaire. This begins on page 13. Think again about the soldier you completed the time log for (remember: this is NOT a first term soldier). Keeping this soldier in mind, answer the questions which begin on page 13. And if you have any questions, please feel free to ask them. Okay begin.

(WHEN EVERYONE HAS FINISHED, ASK IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS AND PROCEED TO ANSWER THEM. IF YOU ARE UNSURE ABOUT SOMETHING TELL THE PERSON THAT YOU WILL FIND OUT WHAT THE ANSWER IS AND GET BACK TO HIM. PROCEED THEN AS FOLLOWS)

Okay, let's take the first three questions. Did anyone have any trouble answering these questions?

Okay, take a look at question 4. What number did you put down for question 4? (GO AROUND THE ROOM AND HAVE THE SUPERVISORS CALL OUT THEIR ANSWERS. SEE IF THEY REMEMBERED TO BOTH CIRCLE THE NUMBER IN FRONT OF THEIR ANSWER AND ALSO WRITE THE NUMBER IN THE BOX. SEE OF THEY TENDED TO USE ONLY THE NUMBERS WITH THE WORDS NEXT TO THEM RATHER THAN ALL THE NUMBERS. AND AFTER EVERYONE HAS CALLED OUT HIS NUMBER, SUMMARIZE IN WORDS THE ANSWER THE SUPERVISORS HAVE CONVEYED TO YOU IN NUMBERS. FOR EXAMPLE: "EACH OF THE SOLDIERS YOU ARE DESCRIBING LEARNED MOST OF HIS MOS TASKS IN AIT--IS THAT RIGHT?" OR "IT LOOKS LIKE, IN MOST CASES, THE SOLDIER YOU ARE DESCRIBING LEARNED MOST OF HIS MOS TASKS AFTER AIT--IS THAT RIGHT?")

CONTINUE IN THIS MANNER UNTIL BOTH YOU AND THE SUPERVISORS ARE CONFIDENT THAT THEY UNDERSTAND THE QUESTIONS AND HOW THEY SHOULD GO ABOUT ANSWERING THEM.

<u>When are these soldier-utilization questionnaires to be filled out</u>? As I indicated earlier, the time logs are to be filled out each day for five days--Tuesday through Monday. The rest of the questionnaire, however, is not to be filled out before the weekend--i.e., before Saturday, June 20. I will pick them up from you on Monday night, at the same time I pick up your time log for Monday. So you can fill them out Saturday, on Sunday, or on Monday. But don't start on them until Saturday at the earliest.

C. Arrange for Your Soldiers to Attend a Questionnaire Session:

Next Tuesday, I want to meet with all your participating soldiers to administer a questionnaire to them. The questionnaire asks about a number of different things (including some of the things you were asked about) and has 62 questions in it. The questionnaire should take 30-45 minutes to complete, and I want to schedule a time next Tuesday with each of you and have your soldiers fill out their questionnaires at that time. It is important that we get every one to attend this session; but if some one really cannot be there, then I want you to reschedule that person for a different time and let me know. You will need to attend the session yourself, partly to help me administer the questionnaire and partly also to check the roster to see who, if anyone, did not show up and will thus need to be rescheduled.

D. Complete a brief (9-item) Questionnaire:

This is a brief questionnaire which asks your opinion about several things--e.g., how the morale is in your section. It shouldn't take you more than about five minutes, if that long. I think perhaps next Tuesday, while your soldiers are working on their much longer questionnaire, I'll ask you to take a few minutes and complete it for me.

E. Participate in a final de-briefing:

Afeer the study is over and all the materials have been turned in, the ARI representative wants to meet with you and get your ideas on how the study went. I'll give you the date and time on this later.

Okay, are there any questions?

LIEUTENANTS' GUIDE
FOR ADMINISTERING THE SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

I. General Comments:

1. The soldiers who will be filling out this questionnaire will vary greatly in their ability to read and understand the questions that are included in the questionnaire. Some of them, in fact, will be unable to understand just what is being asked of them; and one of the most important of your roles in this research is to provide the help these soldiers need in order to answer the questions correctly.

2. You will need to tell the soldiers what the questionnaire is about, help them understand the several parts, and then "walk" them through the various questions. To the more able of the soldiers in the room (and to you) this will be boring; but the alternative is to get meaningless answers to the questions by a significant fraction of the soldiers present.

3. On page 3 of the questionnaire, the first three of the questions require information that you will need to get from the soldiers' supervisor. So tell him in advance that you will want him to supply this information at the appropriate time.

II. Page 1.

Ask the soldiers to fill in the answers on page one, and then tell them how to do it. Tell them to write in their name where it is asked for, and then enter the last four digits of their social security number. Have them circle male or female (i.e., the number in front of it), and then write the "1" or "2" in the box at the right. Likewise the number in front of their grade. Finally, have them write in the name of the company and battalion, the name of their section or squad, and the name of their section chief/ squad leader.

III. Time log for Tuesday:

Tell them that the first question asks what time their duty day began on the day circled at the top, and then ask the section chief/squad leader to supply that information. Ask the soldiers to write in the space the time the section chief/squad leader tells them. Do the same thing with questions 2 and 3. Walk around the room while they are doing this to make sure they are filling out the form correctly. Then stop to explain question 4. Ask each person whether they were working at their regular job full time all day that day, or whether they were away from their regular job (or not working full time because of a profile) for any reason. Go around the room and ask the soldiers to say for how long a period they were away or unable to work and why. Then help them look over the reasons on the opposite page and find the appropriate reason. Then write that number in the box. In other words, for this section, help each soldier individually decide how many hours/minutes (if any) he/she was away or not working, to decide which reason is the correct one, and what to write in the spaces at the bottom. When you are satisfied that everyone has answered the first five questions correctly, ask the group about question 6, voluntary overtime, and have them circle the <u>yes</u> or the <u>no</u> and write the corresponding number in the box at the right.

IV. Three questions about the soldier's MOS Iquestions 1-3)

Tell the soldiers what these three questions ask about, and tell them what is to be writeen in the boses at the right. Ask for a show of hands as to how many are working in their MOS, and make the comment that the answers to questions 1 and 3 should be the same for them. And then ask whether thás is indeed the case.

V. Three questions about the job the soldier is working in now: (questions 4-6)

Start by telling the soldiers that the printer had made an error on question 4 and had left out the list of answers the soldier was to choose from. Tell them that the list of answers to question 5 are the same answers that go with question 4, and then read question 4 aloud--concluding with the 9 alternative answers found after question 5. Go around the room and ask each soldier how many of his present MOS (job book) tasks he learned in AIT, and help the soldier find the correct answer and write it in box # 42 at the right. Then do the same with question 5. Finally, ask again for a show of hands as to who is and is not working in their MOS. Then tell them to circle the number and then write that number in the box at the right.

VI. Separate set of Questions for those who said Yes to question 6:

Identify again those who are working in their MOS and who said yes to number 6 (confirm this), and tell the others to just sit quiet for a few minutes. Then proceed to walk these soldiers through questions 7-10. Explain what these four questions are about, see if the soldiers understood what you said, and then read these questions aloud one at a time--in each case pausing while the soldiers mark their answers. Continue to remind the soldiers that if they have any questions--any at all--to ask you.

VII Separate set of questions for those who said no to question 6:

Identify again those who are not working in their MOS and who said no to number 6 (confirm this), and tell the others just to sit quiet for a few minutes. Then proceed to walk these soldiers through questions 11-13. Exaplain what these three questions are about, see if the soldiers understood what you said, and then read the questions aloud one at a time--in each case pausing while the soldiers mark their answer. Again, continue to remind soldiers to ask you if they have any questions.

VIII Two questions that ask the soldier to imagine that his/her until was being sent into the combat zone (questions 14-15)

Explain the meaning of these two questions, and then read them aloud.

(16-21)

IX Six questions/asking the soldier to recall his/her time away from the job for various reasons during the past four weeks. Explain this set of questions carefully. In particular, make sure the soldiers understand the six categories and can make the connection between the categories and the brief summary statement that is included in the question stem. Ask for a show of hands of those who have had any time away from the job during the past four weeks to take care of their family, reminding them of what is included in this category. Then ask them to write in the number of hours/minuees altogether--and to write "00" hours and "00" minutes if they have not been away from their job for this reason during the past four weeks. Do the same with each of the next five categories, taking them one at a time. (DURING THIS TIME YOU SHOULD CIRCULATE AROUND THE ROOM TO MAKE SURE THE FORMS ARE BEING FILLED OUT IN THE CORRECT MANNER AND QUESTIONNING THE INDIVIDUAL IF THE NUMBER OF HOURS SEEMS UNREASONABLE).

XI. Seven questions asking how much of the soldier's job time is spent on various kinds of activities(Questions 22-28)

Explain what these questions are about, and then read them aloud one at a time.

XII. Ask the soldiers to jump ahead to questions 40 and 41. Explain these two questions, and then read the two questions.

XIII. 21 questions about the individual soldier (42-62)

Read each of these questions to the soldiers, and tell them how to mark their answers.

XIV. 11 questions about the soldier's work environment and about Army life(29-39)

Ask the soldiers, after they have finished questions 42-62), to go back to question 29. Tell them what these questions are about, and then ask them to work on their own until they have finished. Tell them to ask if they have any questions about what something means, if they are not sure about some word, or anything else.

When they have finished, ask them to look back over theirquestionnaire to make sure they haven't left out anything. Then ask them to turn in their questionnaire to you one at a time, with you checking each one to make sure it is complete and correctly filled out. (REMEMBER THAT IT WILL BE TOO LATE LATER TO FIND AN ERROR).

XV. Somewhere during this time, ask the supervisor to fill out the SUPERVISOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IT TO YOU.

INFORMATION FOR THE ARI REPRESENTATIVE

1. Summary of Procedures:

a. The Army identifies a set of work sections/squads from 12 companies, using criteria stated in the DA message. Then, for each first-term soldier in these sections/squads, the Army provides the following information: first and last name, SSN, sex, grade, PMOS, SMOS (if any), DMOS and (if different) the MOS or job in which the soldier is actually working.

b. Using procedures described below, the ARI representative identifies the particular set of EM and EW from these sections/squads who will be taking part in the study. The names of these EM and EW are then communicated to the first sergeant and section chief/squad leader (supervisor) in the companies to which these individuals belong.

c. For five days in a row--Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Monday (June 16-22)--the supervisors keep a standard time log on each of their participating soldiers. (These time logs are found in the first part of the SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE.)The logs are checked each evening, at the end of the duty day for the section/squad, to make sure they are filled out completely and accurately.

d. Starting no earlier than Saturday morning (June 20) the supervisor begins the task of filling out the second (soldier utilization) part of the SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE for each of his participating soldiers.

e. On Monday evening (June 22) the lieutenant meets with his section chief/squad leader (supervisor) as usual to check the latter's time log for that day; but this evening the lieutenant has an additional task: checking the questionnaires which the supervisor has filled out on his participating first termers. When the lieutenant is satisfied that these questionnaires have been filled out completely and accurately, he takes the questionnaires (which include the daily time logs) and leaves.

f. On Tuesday (June 23), at a time agreed upon by the lieutenant and the supervisor, the lieutenant administers the SOLDIER QUESTIONNAIRE to each of the participating members of the section/squad. The supervisor, who is present at this session, does the following things: (a) make a list of members who are and (if any) are not present and who thus will need to be rescheduled, (b) provide certain information which the members will need in answering three of the time-log questions, (c) provide any additional information which the members need as they fill out their questionnaire, and (d) fill out the SUPERVISOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE himself. (In the event that a supervisor is unable to attend this session, the assistant section chief/squad leader may attend in the supervisor's place. The person who fills out the SUPERVISOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE, however, is the person who filled out the SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE on the participating first termers.

g. On Wednesday (June 24) the lieutenant (again, at a mutually satisfactory time) administers the SOLDIER QUESTIONNAIRE to those first termers who were unable to attend the previous day, again with the first termers' supervisor present and assisting. (Likewise for any supervisors who were unable to attend) It is desirable to have questionnaires completed by (and for) every soldier included in the sample; and the ARI representative should remain as long as necessary

to obtain these data but using the following Saturday (June 27) as a cut-off date.

h. Starting Tuesday, June 23, when the three sets of questionnaires start coming in, the ARI representatives looks at responses to matching items on the supervisor and soldier questionnaires to see if there are any items with widely discrepant responses--that is, to see whether there are any cases in which what the soldier says about himself/herself is greatly different from what the supervisor says about him/her. If any such discrepancies are found, the ARI representative discusses them with the lieutenant to see if some explanation can be found as to why the discrepancies exist. If a ready explanation cannot be found, the ARI representative makes a judgment as to which individual, the supervisor or the soldier, should be visited first. The lieutenant then visits one or both these individuals and, in a friendly and interested fashion, inquires into the relevant facts. The purpose of the visit is <u>not</u> to challange either the soldier or the supervisor but merely to find out how confident one or both are with respect to the response given. It is entirely possible that the discrepancy is due simply to an inadvertant error on the part of one of the two respondents; and where this is the case, a simple discussion of the item should be sufficient to get the individual to volunteer to change the answer given previously. If, however, both individuals are confident about their response, the response should be accepted. Then when the lieutenant believes he has learned as much as he can about this matter, he reports his findings to the ARI representative.

i. When all the (other) data have been collected, the ARI representative meets with the supervisors for a de-briefing, the main purposes of which are as follows: (a) to thank them for their assistance, (b) to find out which parts of the study they think went well and not so well, and (c) to obtain any other information the ARI representative thinks it important to have when the data are analyzed and (in particular) when the data are interpreted.

j. A similar meeting is held with the lieutenants.

k. When all this is finished, the ARI representative writes a descriptive summary of the study as it took place at his location (Ft. Hood, Germany, Korea). Included in the summary should be information about departures (if any) from the prescribed procedures, the reason for these departures, and the known or anticipated consequences of these departures for the study. Included also should be any informatio: needed for accurate keypunching and/or coding. The data (unused questionnaires may be destroyed) should be returned to ARI no later than July 1.

l. Some concluding comments. The success of this study, once the study is under way, depends in large measure on how well the lieutenant research-assistants do their job. And this in turn depends largely on how well the ARI representative does <u>his</u> job of training these individuals. Every effort should be made therefore (before they are sent out to collect data and to train others to collect data) to make sure that these lieutenants have all the information and understanding they need in order to perform their job <u>well</u>.

2. Selecting the First-Termer Participants:

As indicated in the DA message, the starting point is a set of work sections/squads found in 12 companies identified in accordance with instructions given in the message. (The 12 companies consist of one divisional and one nondivisional company of each of the following types: AG, Signal, S&S, MP, Maintenance, and Transportation. These company types were asked for because they are believed to contain a maximum number of first-term EW with the CMFs specified by the sponsoring group--viz., CMFs 31, 71, 76, 95, 63, and 64.)

The sections/squads identified by the Army for inclusion in the study are the set of sections/squads which have one or more first-term EW in them who are trained and/or currently working in one of the six CMFs specified. When the Army has provided the additional information requested about the first-term soldiers who are in these sections/squads (name, SSN, sex, grade, PMOS, SMOS (if any), DMOS and (if different) the MOS or job in which the soldier is actually working), the ARI representative proceeds to identify the particular EM and EW who will be involved in the study--conferring by telephone as needed with the Principal Investigator, who (at least until June 11 and probably until June 14) can be reached at ARI, Alexandria.

The first step is to confirm that each EW member of the identified sections/squads either has or is working in an MOS that is part of one of the specified CMFs (see accompanying booklet). An EW who is not in one of the six specified CMFs is excluded; and if this EW happens to be the only EW in the section/squad, the section/squad is excluded also.

The second step is the threefold one of (a) identifying the MOS in which each EW is working, (b) identifying the set of first-term EM in her section/squad who are working in the same MOS she is working in, and (c) randomly selecting two EM (or one, if only one is available) for each of the aforementioned EW. (A table of random numbers is provided for use in making this selection.) Thus if a section/squad includes two first-term EW working in 95B (say), the ARI representative randomly selects four first-term EM who are working in this MOS. If the section/squad includes one first-term EW in 95B and one in 76W, the ARI representative randomly selects two first-term EM who are working in 95B and two who are working in 76W. (If a section/squad includes a first-term EW who is working in an MOS in which there are no EM from her section working, include her in the sample, but mark her questionnaires in a way that makes this point clear.

The third step is to count the number of participating sections/squads in each of the 12 companies and telephone this information to the Principal Investigator. The Principal Investigator will discuss these figures with the ARI representative; and, depending on the overall and individual-company numbers, he will make a decision as to whether all the eligible sections/squads will be included or whether in some companies (perhaps in the AG companies) only a subset of the eligible sections/squads will be included.

APPENDIX H

DATA

1. Mean number of hours of lost time recorded over five-day period, by category of lost time reasons
2. Proportion of soldiers with any lost time recorded over five-day period, by category of lost-time reasons
3. Proportion of soldier's MOS tasks that the soldier performs
4. Proportion of soldier's job time that is spent doing various things
5. Supervisor confidence that the soldier could perform satisfactorily under combat conditions

Mean Number of Hours of Lost Time Recorded over Five-Day Period, by Category of Lost-Time Reasons

	LOCATION																	
	FORT HOOD COMPANY AFFILIATION						GERMANY COMPANY AFFILIATION						KOREA COMPANY AFFILIATION					
	DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION		
	CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Category 1: Medical and Health Reasons																		
MEN	.25	.22	.31	.24	.85	7.04	1.24	.50	.11	.35	.51	.00	.24	.23	.99	.41	.00	.00
WOMEN	1.20	1.28	.93	5.11	3.24	3.19	2.66	2.24	2.12	1.91	.56	.44	1.95	1.03	.47	.79	1.95	--
Category 2: Home-and-Family-Care Reasons																		
MEN	.20	.03	.00	.04	.06	.00	.00	.52	.26	.00	.00	.29	.00	.00	.00	.09	.00	.00
WOMEN	.19	.03	.77	.15	.07	.00	.00	.78	.00	.00	.11	.00	.40	.03	.00	.02	.19	--
Category 3: Discipline-Related Reasons																		
MEN	.75	.57	.60	3.22	.44	.00	1.16	.18	1.30	.14	.00	5.17	.13	.25	.05	.48	1.59	.00
WOMEN	.71	.31	1.49	1.75	.05	.75	.63	.79	.65	.42	.05	.00	.00	.37	.00	.77	.44	--
Category 4: All these Lost-Time Reasons Combined																		
MEN	1.20	.83	.90	3.50	1.35	7.04	2.40	1.20	1.67	.48	.51	5.46	.36	.48	1.04	.99	1.59	.00
WOMEN	2.10	1.61	3.19	7.01	3.36	3.94	3.28	3.81	2.77	2.33	.72	.44	2.34	1.42	.47	1.58	2.57	--

Proportion of Soldiers with Any Lost Time Recorded During Five-Day Period, by Category of Lost-Time Reasons

	LOCATION																	
	FORT HOOD COMPANY AFFILIATION						GERMANY COMPANY AFFILIATION						KOREA COMPANY AFFILIATION					
	DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION		
	CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Category 1: Medical and Health Reasons																		
MEN	.10	.10	.08	.07	.04	.25	.26	.09	.05	.18	.15	.00	.17	.07	.21	.13	.00	.00
WOMEN	.16	.28	.38	.30	.24	.83	.15	.26	.50	.23	.06	.50	.30	.16	.13	.26	.25	--
Category 2: Home-and-Family-Care Reasons																		
MEN	.10	.03	.00	.04	.04	.00	.00	.00	.05	.00	.00	.08	.00	.00	.00	.07	.07	.00
WOMEN	.06	.06	.15	.08	.05	.00	.00	.03	.00	.00	.03	.00	.10	.05	.00	.05	.13	--
Category 3: Discipline-Related Reasons																		
MEN	.20	.14	.31	.22	.11	.00	.26	.03	.26	.27	.00	.33	.11	.15	.07	.13	.27	.00
WOMEN	.20	.22	.38	.19	.05	.17	.30	.09	.10	.18	.06	.00	.00	.21	.00	.21	.13	--
Category 4: All these Lost-Time Reasons Combined																		
MEN	.27	.24	.38	.26	.18	.25	.47	.18	.26	.45	.15	.42	.28	.22	.29	.27	.32	.00
WOMEN	.34	.44	.69	.49	.32	.83	.41	.32	.50	.36	.16	.50	.35	.32	.13	.47	.38	--

Proportion of Soldier's MOS Tasks (9-Point Scale) That the Soldier Performs

	LOCATION																			
	FORT HOOD COMPANY AFFILIATION						GERMANY COMPANY AFFILIATION						KOREA COMPANY AFFILIATION							
	DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION				
	CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY				
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18		
MEN	6.4	6.3	6.1	6.1	7.3	5.4	6.6	6.1	5.8	5.7	6.1	5.6	5.8	7.5	7.2	7.1	5.5	8.0		
WOMEN	6.0	5.4	5.0	6.2	7.1	4.2	6.1	5.8	5.8	5.3	5.3	3.9	5.6	6.1	6.6	7.7	6.2	--		

Proportion of Soldier's Job Time (9-Point Scale) That Is Spent Doing Various Things

	LOCATION																	
	FORT HOOD COMPANY AFFILIATION						GERMANY COMPANY AFFILIATION						KOREA COMPANY AFFILIATION					
	DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION		
	CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Working on Sedentary-Type Tasks																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
MEN	4.9	3.6	1.6	5.6	3.4	1.6	5.4	3.7	2.6	7.4	3.1	3.2	8.2	4.8	2.9	8.7	5.1	5.0
WOMEN	6.5	4.6	1.5	5.0	5.1	4.0	7.1	5.2	2.7	7.1	5.5	2.3	8.3	6.3	3.8	8.8	5.9	--
Working on Tasks that are Dirty, Dangerous, or Physically Demanding																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
MEN	3.2	4.2	5.5	3.1	3.9	5.3	3.1	5.6	6.3	2.2	4.4	5.6	1.6	3.7	6.8	1.8	3.0	6.6
WOMEN	1.8	3.2	5.4	3.2	3.1	3.7	2.4	5.1	4.9	1.8	3.0	3.8	1.4	3.1	5.4	1.2	3.3	--
Working on Tasks in which There is a Danger of Being Physically Attacked																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
MEN	1.4	4.1	1.3	1.6	4.6	1.4	1.4	3.1	1.7	1.0	2.9	1.8	1.6	2.9	1.8	1.1	3.3	1.7
WOMEN	1.1	3.6	1.9	1.8	3.6	1.7	1.6	2.1	2.0	1.1	2.5	1.0	1.5	2.5	1.3	1.0	4.0	--
Working Alone in an Isolated Place																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
MEN	1.7	2.0	3.3	1.2	2.2	1.3	2.1	2.4	1.9	1.2	2.3	1.5	1.4	2.9	3.1	1.3	1.9	1.7
WOMEN	1.1	1.8	2.7	1.1	1.8	2.8	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.3	2.1	1.0	1.1	2.4	2.6	1.1	1.0	--

Supervisor Confidence (4-Point Scale) That the Soldier Could Perform Satisfactorily Under Combat Conditions

	LOCATION																	
	FORT HOOD COMPANY AFFILIATION						GERMANY COMPANY AFFILIATION						KOREA COMPANY AFFILIATION					
	DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION			DIVISION			NON-DIVISION		
	CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY			CMF TRADITIONALITY		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
MEN	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	9.00
WOMEN	2.9	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.3	3.7	3.0	2.5	3.3	2.3	3.0	3.4	3.9	3.3	2.7	--

APPENDIX I

SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER - QUESTIONNAIRE

PT 5415

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE
PT 5415, Section Chief/Squad Leader - Questionnaire	AR 70-1

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM Privacy Act Statement - 28 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

F L C S

01 02 03 04 05 06

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S)

SET OF RESEARCH MATERIALS (5 TIME LOGS, 1 QUESTIONNAIRE) ON

(Last 4 Digits SSN)

07 08 09 10

_____

(Soldier's Name)

SEX: 1. Male
2. Female

11

GRADE: 1. E1
2. E2
3. E3
4. E4
5. E5

E

12

Co/Bn: _____

SECTION/SQUAD: _____

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S) TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] 13

---

1. On the day indicated, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (USE A 24 HOUR CLOCK). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 14 15 16 17

2. At what time did it end? (INCLUDE ANY AFTER-DUTY HOURS THAT WERE REQUIRED FOR YOUR SECTION/SQUAD). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 18 19 20 21

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (WRITE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS AND MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 22 23 Minutes [ ][ ] 24 25

4. During this period, was there any time that this soldier was away from his/her regular job--or at his/her regular job but not actually working? For example, did this soldier arrive at work late? Did he/she have a profile that allowed him/her to rest part of the time? Or was this soldier somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT THIS SOLDIER WAS NOT WORKING AT HIS/HER REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "00" HOURS AND "00" MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 26 27 Minutes [ ][ ] 28 29

5. If this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or was not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the number of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] 30 31

Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

_____

_____

6. On the day indicated, did this soldier put in any voluntary overtime? . . [ ] 32

1. Yes
2. No

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S) TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] 33

---

1. On the day indicated, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (USE A 24 HOUR CLOCK). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 34 35 36 37

2. At what time did it end? (INCLUDE ANY AFTER-DUTY HOURS THAT WERE REQUIRED FOR YOUR SECTION/SQUAD). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 38 39 40 41

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (WRITE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS AND MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 42 43 Minutes [ ][ ] 44 45

4. During this period, was there any time that this soldier was away from his/her regular job--or at his/her regular job but not actually working? For example, did this soldier arrive at work late? Did he/she have a profile that allowed him/her to rest part of the time? Or was this soldier somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT THIS SOLDIER WAS NOT WORKING AT HIS/HER REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "OO" HOURS AND "OO" MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 46 47 Minutes [ ][ ] 48 49

5. If this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or was not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the number of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] 50 51

Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

_____

_____

6. On the day indicated, did this soldier put in any voluntary overtime? . . [ ] 52

1. Yes
2. No

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S) TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] (53)

---

1. On the day indicated, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (USE A 24 HOUR CLOCK). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] (54 55 56 57)

2. At what time did it end? (INCLUDE ANY AFTER-DUTY HOURS THAT WERE REQUIRED FOR YOUR SECTION/SQUAD). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] (58 59 60 61)

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (WRITE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS AND MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] (62 63) Minutes [ ][ ] (64 65)

4. During this period, was there any time that this soldier was away from his/her regular job--or at his/her regular job but not actually working? For example, did this soldier arrive at work late? Did he/she have a profile that allowed him/her to rest part of the time? Or was this soldier somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT THIS SOLDIER WAS NOT WORKING AT HIS/HER REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "OO" HOURS AND "OO" MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] (66 67) Minutes [ ][ ] (68 69)

5. If this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or was not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the number of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] (70 71)

Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

_____

_____

6. On the day indicated, did this soldier put in any voluntary overtime? . . [ ] (72)

1. Yes
2. No

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S) TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] 73

---

1. On the day indicated, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (USE A 24 HOUR CLOCK). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 74 75 76 77

2. At what time did it end? (INCLUDE ANY AFTER-DUTY HOURS THAT WERE REQUIRED FOR YOUR SECTION/SQUAD). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 78 79 80 81

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (WRITE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS AND MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 82 83 Minutes [ ][ ] 84 85

4. During this period, was there any time that this soldier was away from his/her regular job--or at his/her regular job but not actually working? For example, did this soldier arrive at work late? Did he/she have a profile that allowed him/her to rest part of the time? Or was this soldier somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT THIS SOLDIER WAS NOT WORKING AT HIS/HER REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "OO" HOURS AND "OO" MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 86 87 Minutes [ ][ ] 88 89

5. If this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or was not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the <u>number</u> of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] 90 91

Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

_____

_____

6. On the day indicated, did this soldier put in any voluntary overtime? . . [ ] 92

1. Yes
2. No

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

SECTION CHIEF'S (SQUAD LEADER'S) TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] 93

---

1. On the day indicated, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (USE A 24 HOUR CLOCK). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 94 95 96 97

2. At what time did it end? (INCLUDE ANY AFTER-DUTY HOURS THAT WERE REQUIRED FOR YOUR SECTION/SQUAD). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 98 99 100 101

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (WRITE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS AND MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 102 103 Minutes [ ][ ] 104 105

4. During this period, was there any time that this soldier was away from his/her regular job--or at his/her regular job but not actually working? For example, did this soldier arrive at work late? Did he/she have a profile that allowed him/her to rest part of the time? Or was this soldier somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT THIS SOLDIER WAS NOT WORKING AT HIS/HER REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "OO" HOURS AND "OO" MINUTES. . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 106 107 Minutes [ ][ ] 108 109

5. If this soldier was away from his/her regular job (or was not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the number of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] 110 111

Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

_____

_____

6. On the day indicated, did this soldier put in any voluntary overtime? . . [ ] 112

1. Yes
2. No

SOLDIER UTILIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM SU)

1. What is this soldier's Primary MOS? WRITE PMOS NAME AND NUMBER.

PMOS Name: _____ PMOS Number: [ ][ ][ ] 113 114 115

2. If this soldier has a Secondary MOS, what is it?
IF NO SECONDARY MOS, WRITE "NONE".

SMOS Name: _____ SMOS Number: [ ][ ][ ] 116 117 118

3. What is this soldier's Duty MOS? WRITE DMOS NAME AND NUMBER.

DMOS Name: _____ DMOS Number: [ ][ ][ ] 119 120 121

FOR EACH OF THE QUESTIONS BELOW, PICK THE ANSWER YOU WANT AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER IN FRONT OF THAT ANSWER. THEN, WRITE THAT NUMBER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT.

4. Think for a moment of the various MOS (job book) tasks that this soldier performs in his/her present duty position. How many of these tasks did he/she learn in AIT? . . . . . [ ] 122

1. All (or almost all) of these tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. None (or almost none) of them

5. How many of these tasks did he/she learn after AIT--either in this company or in some other company? . . . . . [ ] 123

1. All (or almost all) of these tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. None (or almost none) of them

6. Is this soldier currently working in his/her MOS (either PMOS or SMOS)? 124

1. Yes
2. No

IF NO, SKIP THE NEXT FOUR QUESTIONS AND GO TO QUESTION #11.

IF YES, ANSWER THE NEXT FOUR QUESTIONS (#7, 8, 9, & 10).

7. Some soldiers perform (at one time or another or "as needed" nearly all the MOS tasks that go with their duty position. Other soldiers perform only some of these tasks. And still other soldiers (for one reason or another) perform almost none of these tasks.

How about this particular soldier? How many of the MOS (job book) tasks for his/her duty position does this soldier perform? CIRCLE ONE OF THE NUMBERS 1-9 BELOW. THEN WRITE THIS NUMBER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT. . . . 125

1. Most (or all) of these MOS tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these MOS tasks

8. When your section/squad goes into the field (say, for a three-day exercise), how many of the "setting-up/tearing-down" tasks does this soldier perform? IF THIS SOLDIER HAS NOT YET BEEN IN THE FIELD ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF SETTING-UP/TEARING-DOWN TASKS HE/SHE WOULD PROBABLY PERFORM. 126

9. If this soldier does not (or probably would not) perform all the setting up-tearing down tasks, what is the reason? 127

0. NOT APPLICABLE--THIS SOLDIER PERFORMS ALL THESE TASKS
1. Not strong/large enough
2. Pregnancy profile
3. Profile related to accident or injury
4. Other profile
5. A reason not listed her. (What is it?):

---

10. How about the other MOS tasks--the ones that have to be peformed after the equipment has been set up? How many of these tasks does this soldier perform? . . . . . [ ] 128

1. Most (or all) of these tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these other tasks

NOTE: SKIP THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS AND GO TO QUESTION 14.

NOTE: THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS (#11, 12, & 13) ARE TO BE ANSWERED FOR SOLDIERS WHO ARE NOT WORKING IN THEIR MOS.

11. Why isn't this soldier working in his/her MOS? . . . . . [ ] 129

0. NOT APPLICABLE--THIS SOLDIER IS WORKING IN HIS/HER MOS
1. Soldier is needed in another MOS
2. Soldier does not have the required strength
3. Soldier has a pregnancy profile
4. Soldier has a profile related to accident or injury
5. Soldier has some other profile
6. Soldier is on special duty somewhere else
7. Soldier's MOS is DA-controlled, and he/she does not have an exception
8. A reason not listed here. (What is it?):

_____

12. Who first asked that this soldier work outside his/her MOS? . . . . . [ ] 130

0. NOT APPLICABLE--THIS SOLDIER IS WORKING IN HIS/HER MOS
1. The soldier himself/herself
2. I (or someone else in the company) did
3. The soldier was reassigned by the Classification Board
4. Someone else did
5. I don't know

13. How does this soldier feel about working outside his/her MOS? . . . . . [ ] 131

0. NOT APPLICABLE--THIS SOLDIER IS WORKING IN HIS/HER MOS
1. He/she likes it
2. He/she doesn't like it
3. His/Her feelings are mixed

CONTINUE NOW WITH QUESTION 14 ON THE NEXT PAGE.

14. IMAGINE THE FOLLOWING SITUATION: The United States has been attacked by a foreign power. An infantry unit is preparing to go to the area where the attack was received and engage the enemy directly. Your company is one of those ordered into the combat zone to provide combat support/service support for this infantry unit.

In this situation, would the soldier named above be sent to the combat zone with the others in your company? . . . . . [ ] 132

1. Yes, I think so
2. Not sure, but probably
3. Not sure, but probably not
4. No, I don't think so

IF NO, OR PROBABLY NOT, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY:

_____

_____

15. Suppose this soldier <u>was</u> sent to the combat zone with the others in the company. Suppose also that he/she was assigned to the MOS duty position for which he/she was trained (PMOS or SMOS).

If this happened, could he/she perform the required tasks in a satisfactory manner. . . . . [ ] 133

1. Yes, I think so
2. Not sure, but probably
3. Not sure, but probably not
4. No, I don't think so

NOTE: BEFORE ANSWERING QUESTIONS 16-21, PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING CAREFULLY:

In addition to ordinary leave, details, special duty, etc., there are many things that can take or keep a soldier away from his/her job during the day (or prevent him/her from working full time while at the job). The soldier may be:

- taking care of his/her family. (For example, the soldier may be staying home with a sick child, driving the children to school, or taking his/her turn in the car pool.)
- meeting his/her own health needs. (For example, the soldier may be on sick call, in quarters, in the hospital, or on convalescent leave. Or the soldier may have a profile that allows him/her to rest from time to time.)
- involved in a civil or military justice action. (For example, the soldier may be in court, confined, or going through an administrative separation.)
- doing ordinary personal errands. (For example, the soldier may be getting his/her car fixed, getting a paycheck cashed, or going to the barber or beauty shop.)
- simply late in arriving at work but not counted as AWOL.
- AWOL

The next six questions ask about <u>these</u> reasons for being away from the job (or unable to work). In answering each question, try to remember the number of days/hours this soldier has been away from his/her job (or unable to work) for each of these reasons <u>during the past four weeks</u>. For example, if the soldier was away from his/her job 2 days and 4 hours, answer:

Days		Hours	
0	2	0	4

If the soldier was not away at all, enter: "00" Days and "00" Hours.

Days		Hours	
0	0	0	0

During the past four weeks, how many days/hours has this soldier been away from his/her regular job (or unable to work) because he/she was:

	Days		Hours	
16. taking care of his/her family?	134	135	136	137
17. meeting his/her own health needs?	138	139	140	141
18. involved in a civil or military court action?	142	143	144	145
19. doing ordinary personal errands?	146	147	148	149
20. late but not counted AWOL?	150	151	152	153
21. AWOL?	154	155	156	157

Army jobs differ from each other in many ways. Some jobs are performed mainly indoors, while other jobs are performed mainly outdoors. Some jobs require a lot of physical strength. Some require almost none.

For each of the things listed below, think of the soldier named above and the kinds of MOS (job book) tasks he/she performs in his/her duty position. Then try to estimate how much of the soldier's time is spent doing each of these things.

<u>During a normal duty day</u>, how much of this soldier's time is spent:

22. Working inside a building at a desk, table, or work bench? . . . . . ☐ 158

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) or this soldier's job time

23. doing clerical or administrative tasks? . . . . . ☐ 159

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

24. doing things that get his/her hands and clothes dirty? . . . . . ☐ 160

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

25. performing tasks in which there is a danger of being injured accidentally? . . . . . ☐ 161

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

26. performing tasks in which there is a danger of being physically attacked? . . . . . ☐ 162

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

27. working alone in an isolated place? . . . . . ☐ 163

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

28. performing tasks that require a lot of physical strength? . . . . . ☐ 164

1. Most (or all) of this soldier's time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of this soldier's job time

The next two questions ask about this soldier's productivity on the job.

29. On a normal working day, how much of the day does this soldier spend working productively? 165

1. Most (or all) of the day
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of the day

30. How much trouble does this soldier cause you--compared to other first-term soldiers you have known? 166

1. Less trouble than almost any other soldier I have known
2. A lot less trouble than most
3. Somewhat less trouble than most
4. About the same amount of trouble as most--neither more nor less
5. Somewhat more trouble than most
6. A lot more trouble than almost any other soldier I have known
7. More trouble than almost any other soldier I have known

And now, two questions about the study you have been helping with.

31. In your opinion, how many of the first-term soldiers in your section/squad knew that you were keeping a time log on them this past week? 167

1. Most (or all) of them knew
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of them knew

32. If some of them knew, when do you think they found out? . . . . . [ ] 168

0. NOT APPLICABLE-- NONE OF THEM KNEW
1. Yesterday
2. Two days ago
3. Three days ago
4. Four days ago
5. Five days ago
6. Six days ago
7. Seven days ago
8. Eight days ago
9. More than eight days ago

NAME OF SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER (PLEASE PRINT)

GRADE? . . . . . E [ ] 169

SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER'S SIGNATURE

SEX? . . . . . [ ] 170

1. Male
2. Female

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE. IF YOU WISH TO MAKE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO USE THE SPACE BELOW AND/OR THE SPACE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

APPENDIX J

SOLDIER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

PT 5416

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE
PT 5416, Soldier's Questionnaire	AR 70-1

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM Privacy Act Statement - 28 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

F	L	C		S	
1	2	3	4	5	6

SET OF RESEARCH MATERIALS (ONE TIME LOG, ONE QUESTIONNAIRE) TO BE COMPLETED BY:

Last 4 Digits SSN

7	8	9	10

_____
(Soldier's Name)

SEX: 1. Male
2. Female

11

GRADE: 1. E1
2. E2
3. E3
4. E4
5. E5

E | |
|---|
| |
| 12 |

Co/Bn: _____

SECTION/SQUAD: _____

SECTION CHIEF/SQUAD LEADER: _____

LIST OF REASONS WHY A SOLDIER MAY BE AWAY FROM HIS/HER REGULAR JOB (OR NOT WORKING AT ALL) DURING PART OR ALL OF A DUTY DAY

A. The most common nonmedical reasons

01. Duty somewhere else (TDY, on-duty education, company training or detail, CQ/CQ runner, funeral detail, FTX, A&R, etc.)
02. Ordinary leave or pass
03. Comp time or time off as reward

B. Medical, dental, and health reasons

04. Sick call, in quarters, or appointment: accident or injury
05. " " " " pregnancy
06. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
07. " " " " ordinary dental problems
08. " " " " all other reasons

09. In hospital or on convalescent leave: accident or injury
10. " " " " pregnancy
11. " " " " menstrual/GYN problems
12. " " " " ordinary dental problems
13. " " " " all other reasons

14. Profile: accident or injury
15. " pregnancy
16. " all other reasons

C. Home-and-family-care reasons

17. Care of child or other family member: visit to doctor, drive to school, car pool, etc.
18. Care of personal property: problems with car, appliances, etc.
19. Meeting routine family needs: shopping at commissary, etc.

D. Other nonmedical reasons

20. In/out processing
21. AWOL/FTR
22. Civil or military justice actions
23. Confinement (civil or military)
24. Commander/NCO counseling
25. Attending Drug & Alcohol Rehabilitation Program
26. Attending other special program: physical therapy, weight reduction, etc.
27. Barber shop/beauty shop
28. Other personal errands (What was it?): _____
29. A reason not listed here (What was it?):

_____

_____

SOLDIER'S TIME LOG FOR:

1. Monday 2. Tuesday 3. Wednesday 4. Thursday 5. Friday [ ] 13

---

1. On the day indicated above, at what time did the duty day begin for your section/squad? (NOTE: THIS INFORMATION WILL BE PROVIDED TO YOU) . . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 14 15 16 17

2. At what time did it end? (THIS INFORMATION WILL BE PROVIDED TO YOU ALSO). . . . . Time [ ][ ][ ][ ] 18 19 20 21

3. Altogether, how long a duty day was this? (SOMEONE WILL GIVE YOU THIS INFORMATION ALSO) . . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 22 23 Minutes [ ][ ] 24 25

4. During this period, was there any time that you were away from your regular job--or at your job but not actually working? For example, did you arrive at work late? Do you have a profile that allowed you to rest part of the time? Or were you somewhere else--say, on leave or pass, on special duty, or doing a personal errand? (WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES, IF ANY, THAT YOU WERE NOT WORKING AT YOUR REGULAR JOB. IF NONE, WRITE "00" HOURS and "00" MINUTES). . . . . Hours [ ][ ] 26 27 Minutes [ ][ ] 28 29

5. If you were away from your regular job (or were not actually working) for some or all of this period, find the reason (see list on opposite page) that most nearly explains why. Then write the <u>number</u> of that reason in the box. . . . . [ ][ ] 30 31

   Now, in the space below, state the reason in your own words. IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE REASON, STATE THE OTHER REASONS ALSO AND THEN WRITE THE NUMBER OF HOURS/MINUTES INVOLVED.

   _____

   _____

6. On the day indicated, did you put in any <u>voluntary</u> overtime? . . . . . [ ] 32

   1. Yes
   2. No

SOLDIER UTILIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM FT)

1. What is your Primary MOS? (WRITE PMOS NAME AND NUMBER)

PMOS Name: _____ PMOS Number: [ ][ ][ ] 33 34 35

2. If you have a Secondary MOS, what is it?
(IF NO SECONDARY MOS, WRITE "NONE")

SMOS Name: _____ SMOS Number: [ ][ ][ ] 36 37 38

3. What is your Duty MOS? (WRITE DMOS NAME AND NUMBER)

DMOS Name: _____ DMOS Number: [ ][ ][ ] 39 40 41

FOR EACH OF THE QUESTIONS BELOW, PICK THE ANSWER YOU WANT AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER IN FRONT OF THAT ANSWER. THEN, WRITE THAT NUMBER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT.

4. Think for a moment of the various MOS (job book) tasks that you perform in your present duty position. How many of these tasks did you learn in AIT? . . . . . [ ] 42

5. How many of these tasks did you learn after AIT--either in this company or in some other company? . . . . . [ ] 43

1. Most (or all) of these tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these tasks

6. Are you currently working in your MOS (either PMOS or SMOS)? . . . [ ] 44

1. Yes
2. No

IF YES, ANSWER THE NEXT FOUR QUESTIONS (#7, 8, 9, & 10).

IF NO, SKIP THE NEXT FOUR QUESTIONS AND GO TO QUESTION #11.

NOTE: THE NEXT FOUR QUESTIONS (#7, 8, 9, & 10) ARE TO BE ANSWERED BY SOLDIERS WHO ARE WORKING IN THEIR MOS.

For each question, pick the answer you want. Circle the number in front of the answer. Then write this number in the box at the right.

7. Some soldiers perform (at one time or another or "as needed") nearly all the MOS tasks that go with their duty position. Other soldiers perform only some of these tasks. And still other soldiers (for one reason or another) perform almost none of these tasks.

   How about you? How many MOS (job book) tasks for your duty position do you perform? . . . . . [ ] 45

   1. Most (or all) of these MOS tasks
   2.
   3. More than half
   4.
   5. About half
   6.
   7. Less than half
   8.
   9. Few (or none) of these tasks

8. When your section/squad goes into the field (say, for a three-day exercise), how many of the "setting-up/tearing-down" tasks do you perform? (IF YOU HAVE NOT YET BEEN IN THE FIELD, ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF SETTING-UP/TEARING-DOWN TASKS YOU WOULD PROBABLY PERFORM) . . . . . [ ] 46

   1. Most (or all) of these setting-up/tearing-down tasks
   2.
   3. More than half
   4.
   5. About half
   6.
   7. Less than half
   8.
   9. Few (or none) of these setting-up/tearing-down tasks

9. If you do not (or probably would not) perform all the setting-up/tearing-down tasks, what is the reason?. . . . . [ ] 47

   0. NOT APPLICABLE--I PERFORM ALL THESE TASKS
   1. Not strong/large enough
   2. Pregnancy profile
   3. Profile related to accident or injury
   4. Other profile
   5. A reason not listed here (What is it?):

      _____

10. How about the <u>other</u> MOS tasks--the ones that have to be performed <u>after</u> the equipment has been set up? How many of <u>these</u> tasks do you perform? 48

1. Most (or all) of these other tasks
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of these other tasks

SKIP THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS (#11, 12, & 13) AND CONTINUE ON WITH QUESTION #14.

NOTE: THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS (9,10,11) ARE TO BE ANSWERED BY SOLDIERS WHO ARE NOT WORKING IN THEIR MOS.

For each question, pick the answer you want. Circle the number in front of the answer. Then write this number in the box at the right.

11. Why aren't you working in your MOS?. . . . . [ ] 49

0. NOT APPLICABLE--I AM WORKING IN MY MOS
1. I was needed in another MOS
2. I do not have the required strength
3. I have a pregnancy profile
4. I have a profile related to accident or injury
5. I have some other profile
6. I am on special duty somewhere else
7. My MOS is DA-controlled, and I do not have an exception
8. A reason not listed here (What is it?):

_____

12. Who first asked that you work outside your MOS? . . . . . [ ] 50

0. NOT APPLICABLE--I AM WORKING IN MY MOS
1. I did
2. My supervisor (or someone else in the company) did
3. I was reassigned by the Classification Board
4. Someone else
5. I don't know

13. How do you feel about working outside your MOS?. . . . . [ ] 51

0. NOT APPLICABLE--I AM WORKING IN MY MOS
1. I like it
2. I do not like it
3. I have mixed feelings

CONTINUE ON NOW WITH QUESTION 14.

14. IMAGINE THE FOLLOWING SITUATION: The United States has been attacked by a foreign power. An infantry unit is preparing to go to the area where the attack was received and engage the enemy directly. Your company is one of those ordered into the combat zone to provide combat support/service support for this infantry unit.

In this situation, would you be sent to the combat zone with the others in your company? . . . . . ☐ 52

1. Yes, I think so
2. Not sure, but probably
3. Not sure, but probably not
4. No, I don't think so

If no or probably not, please explain why:

_____

_____

15. Suppose you were sent to the combat zone with the others in the company. Suppose also that you were assigned to the MOS duty position for which you were trained (PMOS or SMOS).

If this happened, could you perform the required tasks in a satisfactory manner? . . . . . ☐ 53

1. Yes, I think so
2. Not sure, but probably
3. Not sure, but probably not
4. No, I don't think so

NOTE: BEFORE ANSWERING QUESTIONS 16-21, PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING CAREFULLY:

In addition to ordinary leave, details, special duty, etc., there are many things that can keep a soldier away from his/her job during the day (or prevent him/her from working full time while at the job). The soldier may be:

- taking care of his/her family. (For example, the soldier may be staying home with a sick child, driving the children to school, or taking his/her turn in the car pool.)
- meeting his/her own health needs. (For example, the soldier may be on sick call, in quarters, in the hospital, or on convalescent leave. Or the soldier may have a profile that allows him/her to rest from time to time.)
- involved in a civil or military justice action. (For example, the soldier may be in court, confined, or going through an administrative separation.)
- doing ordinary personal errands. (For example, the soldier may be getting his/her car fixed, getting a paycheck cashed, or going to the barber or beauty shop.)
- simply late in arriving at work but not counted as AWOL.
- AWOL.

The next six questions ask about <u>these</u> reasons for being away from the job (or unable to work). In answering each question, try to remember the number of days/hours you have been away from your job (or unable to work) for each of these reasons <u>during the past four weeks</u>. For example, if you were away from your job 2 days and 4 hours, answer:

Days		Hours	
0	2	0	4

If you were not away at all, enter: "00" Days and "00" Hours:

Days		Hours	
0	0	0	0

<u>During the past four weeks</u>, approximately how much time have you been away from your regular job (or not working) because you were:

	Days		Hours	
16. taking care of your family?				
	54	55	56	57
17. meeting your own health needs?				
	58	59	60	61
18. involved in a civil or military court action?				
	62	63	64	65
19. doing ordinary personal errands?				
	66	67	68	69

	Days	Hours
20. late but not counted as AWOL?	70 71	72 73
21. AWOL?	74 75	76 77

Army jobs differ from each other in many ways. Some jobs are performed mainly indoors, while others are performed mainly outdoors. Some require a lot of physical strength, while others require almost none.

For each of the things listed below, think of the kinds of MOS (job book) tasks you perform in your duty position. Then try to estimate how much of your job time is spent doing each of these things.

<u>During a normal duty day</u>, how much of your job time is spent:

22. Working inside a building at a desk, table, or work bench? . . . . . [ ] 78

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time

23. Doing clerical or administrative tasks?. . . . . [ ] 79

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time

24. Doing things that get your hands and clothes dirty? . . . . . □ 80

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time

25. Performing tasks in which there is a danger of being injured accidentally? . . . . . □ 81

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time

26. Performing tasks in which there is a danger of being physically attacked? . . . . . □ 82

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time

27. Working alone in an isolated place? . . . . . □ 83

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time

28. Performing tasks that require a lot of physical strength?. . . . . [ ] 84

1. Most (or all) of your job time
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Little (or none) of your job time.

---

29. How well do the members of your work section or squad get along together as a group? . . . . . [ ] 85

1. We get along very well as a group
2. We get along fairly well
3. We get along in some ways but not in others
4. We don't get along too well
5. We don't get along at all

30. On the whole, how would you rate the morale of your work section or squad?. . . . . [ ] 86

1. Very high
2. Fairly high
3. Just so-so
4. Fairly low
5. Very low

31. How often do you do extra work on your job that isn't really required of you? . . . . . [ ] 87

1. Very often
2. Fairly often
3. Once in a while
4. Hardly ever

32. How important is your present job to the general mission of the Army?. . . . . [ ] 88

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not so important
4. Not important at all

33. How much pride do you take in being a member of the Army? 89

1. A great deal
2. A fair amount
3. Only a little
4. None at all

34. How important is it to you personally to be able to feel that you are a good soldier? 90

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not so important
4. Not important at all

35. When you are off-post and not in uniform, would you say you think of yourself as just like any worker away from his/her job, or do you still think of yourself as a soldier? 91

1. Like any worker
2. As a soldier
3. Undecided, not sure

36. How satisfied are you with the way things have been going for you in the Army? 92

1. Very well satisfied
2. Fairly well satisfied
3. Rather dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

37. On the whole, how well adjusted are you to Army life? 93

1. Very well adjusted
2. Fairly well adjusted
3. Not so well adjusted
4. Not well adjusted at all

38. How many of your officers really care about the soldiers in the unit? 94

1. All (or nearly all) of them
2. About half
3. Less than half
4. None (or almost none) of them

39. How about your NCOs? How many of them would be willing to help you with a personal problem if you went to them? . . . . . [ ] 95

1. All (or nearly all) of them
2. More than half
3. About half
4. Less than half
5. None (or almost none)

And now, two questions about the study itself--the one you are taking

40. In your opinion, how many of the first-term soldiers in your section/squad knew that their supervisor was keeping a time log on them last week? (MAKE A GUESS) . . . . . [ ] 96

1. Most (or all) of them knew
2.
3. More than half
4.
5. About half
6.
7. Less than half
8.
9. Few (or none) of them knew

41. If some of them knew this, when do you think they found out? (MAKE A GUESS) . . . . . [ ] 97

0. NOT APPLICABLE--NONE OF THEM KNEW
1. Yesterday
2. Two days ago
3. Three days ago
4. Four days ago
5. Five days ago
6. Six days ago
7. Seven days ago
8. Eight days ago
9. More than eight days ago

And now, to finish up, some questions about you--to allow for individual differences.

42. How long have you been in the Army?. . . . . [ ] 98

1. Less than 6 months
2. 6-9 months
3. More than 9 months

43. How long have you been in this section/ squad? . . . . . Years [ ][ ] (99 100) Months [ ][ ] (101 102) Weeks [ ][ ] (103 104)

_____ years _____ months _____ weeks

44. Do you live off-post or on-post? . . . . . [ ] 105

1. Off-post
2. On-Post

45. What kind of company/detachment are you in?. . . . . [ ] 106

1. Adjutant General (AG)
2. Maintenance
3. Military Police
4. Quartermaster (supply)
5. Signal
6. Transportation
7. Other (Please write it here): _____

46. Is this your first or your second (or later) enlistment? . . . . . [ ] 107

1. First enlistment
2. Second (or later) enlistment

47. How many years is your present enlistment for-- 2, 3, 4, or 6 years? . . . . . Years [ ] 108

48. Are you a supervisor?. . . . . [ ] 109

1. Yes (What is your position?) _____
2. No

49. What are your plans about staying in or leaving the Army?. . . . . [ ] 110

1. I won't be able to finish my present enlistment
2. Finish present term and then leave
3. Decide later whether to reenlist
4. Reenlist when present term is up--not sure after that
5. Stay until retirement

50. Do you think you will be in the Army five years from now? . . . . . ☐ 111

1. Yes, I think so
2. Not sure--but probably
3. No idea at all
4. Not sure--but probably not
5. No, I don't think so

51. Before you came into the Army, how many years of formal school had you had? . . . . . ☐ 112

1. Fewer than 10 years
2. 10 years
3. 11 years
4. 12 years
5. 13 years
6. 14 years
7. 15 years
8. 16 years
9. More than 16 years

52. What is your marital status? . . . . . ☐ 113

1. I am married
2. I am legally separated
3. I have never been married
4. I am divorced (or my marriage was annulled), and I have not remarried
5. I am widowed

53. How many children do you have? . . . . . ☐ 114

0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four or more

54. How many children do you have living with you *now*? . . . . . ☐ 115

0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four or more

55. If you are married, is your spouse a member of the Armed Forces?. . . . . [ ] 116

0. I'm not married
1. Yes--assigned to the same company I am in
2. Yes--but not assigned to the same company I am in (or is in another service)
3. No

56. What is the highest educational diploma or degree you have received?. . . . . [ ] 117

1. No diploma or degree
2. G.E.D.
3. High school diploma
4. Vocational/technical certificate or diploma
5. Associate's degree
6. Bachelor's degree
7. Graduate or professional degree

57. How old were you on your last birthday? _____ years old . . . . . [ ][ ] 118 119

58. How tall are you (without shoes)?. . . . . [ ][ ] 120 121

00. 5 feet or less
01. 5 feet, 1 inch
02. 5 feet, 2 inches
03. 5 feet, 3 inches
04. 5 feet, 4 inches
05. 5 feet, 5 inches
06. 5 feet, 6 inches
07. 5 feet, 7 inches
08. 5 feet, 8 inches
09. 5 feet, 9 inches
10. 5 feet, 10 inches
11. 5 feet, 11 inches
12. 6 feet
13. 6 feet, 1 inch
14. 6 feet, 2 inches
14. 6 feet, 3 inches or more

59. How much do you weigh? . . . . . [ ][ ] 122 123

00. 100 pounds or less
01. 101-110 pounds
02. 111-120 pounds
03. 121-130 pounds
04. 131-140 pounds
05. 141-150 pounds
06. 151-160 pounds
07. 161-170 pounds
08. 171-180 pounds
09. 181-190 pounds
10. 191-200 pounds
11. 201 pounds or more

60. Can you type (without errors)? . . . . . [ ] 124

1. Yes
2. No

61. If yes, how fast can you type? . . . . . [ ] 125

0. Not applicable--I can't type
1. Less than 30 words per minute
2. 31-40 words per minute
3. 41-50 words per minute
4. 51-60 words per minute
5. 61-70 words per minute
6. More than 70 words per minute

62. If yes, how would you rate your skill as a typist?. . . . . [ ] 126

0. Not applicable--I can't type
1. Not good at all
2. Not very good
3. Fairly good
4. Very good
5. Excellent

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE. IF YOU WISH TO MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO USE THE SPACE BELOW AND/OR THE SPACE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

APPENDIX K

SUPERVISOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

PT 5417

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974
(5 U.S.C. 552a)

TITLE OF FORM	PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE
PT 5417 Supervisor Opinion Questionnaire	AR 70-1

1. AUTHORITY

10 USC Sec 4503

2. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S)

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

3. ROUTINE USES

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals for not providing all or any part of the information. This notice may be detached from the rest of the form and retained by the individual if so desired.

FORM Privacy Act Statement - 26 Sep 75

DA Form 4368-R, 1 May 75

F	L	C		S		X
01	02	03	04	05	06	07

NAME: _____

FOR EACH QUESTION, PICK THE ANSWER YOU WANT AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER IN FRONT OF THAT ANSWER. THEN WRITE THAT NUMBER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT.

1. What sort of cooperation and teamwork is there among the members of your section/squad? . . . . . [ ] 08

   1. Very good
   2. Fairly good
   3. Not very good
   4. Not good at all

2. How well do the members of your section/squad get along together as a group? . . . . . [ ] 09

   1. They get along very well as a group
   2. They get along fairly well
   3. They get along well in some ways but not in others
   4. They don't get along very well
   5. They don't get along well at all

3. On the whole, how would you rate the morale of your section/squad? . . [ ] 10

   1. Very high
   2. Fairly high
   3. So - So
   4. Fairly low
   5. Very low

4. How much pride do your first-term soldiers take in being a member of the Army? . . . . . [ ] 11

   1. A great deal
   2. A fair amount
   3. Only a little
   4. None at all

5. How many of your first-term soldiers have adjusted to Army life? . . . [ ] 12

   1. All (or almost all) of them
   2. More than half
   3. About half
   4. Fewer than half
   5. None (or almost none) of them

WHEN WOMEN ARE ASSIGNED TO COMPANIES LIKE YOURS .....

6. What happens to morale? . . . . . [ ] 13

1. It goes way up
2. It goes up a little
3. It stays about the same
4. It goes down a little
5. It goes way down

7. How much group spirit does one see--compared with before? . . . . . [ ] 14

1. A lot more group spirit than before
2. A little more group spirit than before
3. Just as much group spirit as before
4. A little less group spirit than before
5. A lot less group spirit than before

8. How often does pregnancy become a serious problem? . . . . . [ ] 15

1. Almost always
2. Very often
3. Sometimes
4. Not very often
5. Almost never

9. How well does the company carry out its mission? . . . . . [ ] 16

1. A lot better than before
2. Somewhat better than before
3. Just as well as before
4. Somewhat worse than before
5. A lot worse than before