

AD-A171 420

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM
AND NEW MANNING SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Trueman R. Tremble, Jr., Gary M. Brosvic
U.S. Army Research Institute

and

A.R. Mangiardi
Hawley Army Community Hospital

for

Personnel Utilization Technical Area
Paul A. Gade, Chief

MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL RESEARCH LABORATORY
Newell K. Eaton, Director

DTIC
ELECTE
SEP 03 1986
S D
D



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

July 1986

86 9 02 121

ENC FILE COPY

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

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Peer Reviews by:
Paul van Rijn
Wm. Darryl Henderson
Joel M. Savell
Paul A. Gade



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

This report, as submitted by the contractor, has been cleared for release to Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or other reference services such as the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ARI Research Note 86-84	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A171 420	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Attitudes Toward The New Manning System And New Manning System Characteristics		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report March 83 - May 85
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Trueman R. Tremble, Jr., Gary M. Brosvic (ARI) and Anthony R. Mangiardi (Hawley Army Community Hospital)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) - -
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS - -		12. REPORT DATE July 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 233
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) Cohesion Personnel Management Military Organizations Personnel Retention		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The personnel management system called the New Manning System (NMS) was set up by the Army to increase personnel stability both within units, and in the careers of individual soldiers. Soldiers in this test system and in the conventional Army personnel system were surveyed on their attitudes toward the "COHORT" system, under which units remain intact for a certain period of time. The "COHORT" system is one of the principal components of the NMS. The results of the survey are summarized and examined in this report. The results may provide guidance in developing programs to promote user (over)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

ARI Research Note 86-84

20. Abstract (continued)

acceptance of the NMS.

UNCLASSIFIED

11 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM (NMS) AND NMS SYSTEM
CHARACTERISTICS

CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	1
Research Problem	1
Attitudes toward COHORT	2
Characteristics of the NMS	3
Objectives	6
METHOD	7
Sample	7
Instruments	7
Questionnaires	7
Interview Guides	8
Procedures	8
Data Analysis	8
Attitude Scales	8
NMS Attitude Scales	8
Organizational Satisfaction	11
Content Analysis of Interview Protocols	11
Beliefs about NMS System Characteristics	11
NMS Attitudes and System Characteristics	16
RESULTS	16
Description of Sample	16
Attitudes Toward the NMS	19
Responses to NMS Attitude Scales	19
Supplementary NMS Attitudes	21
Satisfaction and Morale	22
NMS System Characteristics	25

Highly Affirmed Characteristics	25
Opportunity/Responsibility Structure	26
LDRs' relatively high affirmation	28
Supplementary beliefs	28
Informal Group Influence	29
Cohesiveness of FTs	29
Peer pressure	30
Other manifestations	30
Unit Developmental Cycle	30
Restricted Career Opportunities	31
Characteristics with Low Affirmation	31
Restricted but Predictable Assignments	31
Effect of present assignment on future assignments	33
Career opportunities in the regiment	33
Restricted Career Opportunities	33
Personnel turnover	33
Preference for present unit assignment	35
Career opportunities in the COHORT unit	35
Reordered Career Values	36
COHORT stabilization	36
COHORT assignment as a career experience	36
Regimental affiliation	37
Values affected by the NMS	38
Common Career Development of First Termers	38
Differences Between COHORT LDRs and FTs	39
Differences Between COHORT and Non-COHORT Soldiers	39
NMS Attitudes and Opinions About System Characteristics	40
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.	42
REFERENCES	50

APPENDIX A. OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEM CREATED BY THE PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OF THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM	A-1
B. INSTRUMENTS	B-1
C. SYSTEM FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS .	C-1
D. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	D-1
E. BELIEFS BY SYSTEM CHARACTERISTIC	E-1
F. INTERVIEW RESULTS	F-1
G. BELIEFS BY LEVEL OF NMS ATTITUDE	G-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. System characteristics of the NMS created by NMS management practices	4
2. Principal components analysis of NMS attitude items . . .	10
3. Classification of variables by NMS characteristics	13
4. Grouping of soldiers by level of attitude.	17
5. Size of responding sample	18
6. Description of sample	19
7. COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS .	20
8. Liking of COHORT idea	22
9. Overall opinion of COHORT	23
10. Satisfaction of COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers	24
11. Correlations between attitudes and satisfaction	25
12. System characteristics and level of affirmation by COHORT soldiers	26
13. Variables affirmed by 75% or more of COHORT soldiers . . .	27

14. Variables affirmed by less than 25% of the COHORT respondents	32
15. Perception of turnover in COHORT and Non-COHORT units . .	34
16. NMS variables differentiated by level of attitude	41

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM (NMS) AND NMS SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

The U.S. Army introduced the New Manning System (NMS) as a test to identify and fix problems that would interfere with its full-scale implementation. One developing concern has been that soldiers, especially career soldiers, are not favorably disposed toward NMS assignments. Unfavorable attitudes by careerists could be problematic given their leadership roles and the NMS goal of career-long stabilization.

To support decisions about programs for impacting on attitudes toward the NMS, there is a need for more complete identification of soldiers' attitudes. Also needed is information about NMS conditions that are related to existing attitudes and that can serve as a basis for program specification.

Procedure:

To approach these needs, this investigation adopted the premise that consistent implementation of the NMS personnel management policies creates an operational system with characteristics that markedly differ from the conventional system. Seven characteristics provided the final focus. These characteristics were: unit developmental cycle, opportunity/responsibility structure, informal group influence, restricted career opportunities, restricted but predictable assignments, reordered career values, and common career development of first-term soldiers.

Questionnaires and interview guides were designed to measure soldiers' beliefs as to whether 64 conditions representing the seven characteristics described or applied to their units. Also included were items measuring (1) attitudes toward the goals of the NMS, (2) organizational satisfaction, and (3) overall opinion of COHORT. The questionnaires were administered to a quota sample of 149 first-term soldiers and 152 leaders in 15 COHORT units. Leaders only were interviewed. First termers (n=58) and leaders (n=58) in six Non-COHORT units were similarly surveyed.

The questionnaire and interview data were analyzed to accomplish the following four research objectives:

1. Determine soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS.
2. Describe conditions in COHORT units in terms of the seven NMS characteristics.

3. Determine differences between COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers' beliefs that these conditions were descriptive of their units.
4. Determine relationships between beliefs about these conditions and attitudes toward the NMS.

Findings:

Data pertinent to the first objective supported two conclusions. First, COHORT soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS are somewhat positive. Second, career-long stabilization and the career restrictions associated with it appear to be the least favorably regarded aspect of the NMS by COHORT soldiers.

More specifically, factor analysis of the 10 attitude items produced three components which represented three central aspects of the NMS: unit members' staying together, career stability, and community involvement. Scores for the component attitudes and for a measure of overall NMS attitudes (based on all 10 items) were computed. Results showed that average attitude on the overall NMS attitude scale fell somewhat above the scale's mid-point and, as thereby expressed, was somewhat positive. The same pattern was obtained for attitude toward staying together and attitude toward community involvement. Attitude toward career stabilization was more neutral. Neutral attitudes were also expressed by beliefs about conditions representing system characteristics. Small percents of COHORT soldiers indicated that they wanted to remain in their current regiments of affiliation. Small percents also believed that continued regimental affiliation would improve their chances for any of the following: changing career fields, choosing the next unit of assignment, promotion, or attending military schools.

For the second and third objectives, three conclusions were reached. First, COHORT is most clearly distinguished by the conditions and associated system characteristics that directly pertain to personnel management. Second, COHORT is not clearly distinguished from Non-COHORT with respect to other operating conditions in a unit (e.g., opportunity/responsibility structure). Third, compared to first-term soldiers, COHORT leaders are more positive about NMS conditions except for career opportunities.

These conclusions were based on findings for the 64 conditions representing expected characteristics of the NMS and the extent to which COHORT soldiers believed that these conditions applied to them and their units, relative to Non-COHORT soldiers. That is, the percents of COHORT soldiers affirming--expressing agreement or other positive response--that each condition described their units were computed. Based on these percents, each condition was classified as affirmed at one of four levels: high (75% or more), relatively high (50-74%), relatively low (25-49%), or low (less than 25%). The conditions classified by level of affirmation and by the characteristics they represented were then assessed. Differences in the beliefs of COHORT leaders and first termers and in the beliefs of COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers were also tested. These data indicated:

1. Only eight of the 64 conditions were affirmed by a high level of the COHORT respondents. Most of these conditions were rated by leaders only.
2. Level of affirmation was low (less than 25%) for 20 conditions. These conditions tended to represent the following characteristics: restricted but predictable assignments, restricted career opportunities, reordered career values, and common career development of first termers.
3. Differences between the COHORT and Non-COHORT samples were obtained for only 16 variables. Most of these conditions represented unit developmental cycle, opportunity/responsibility structure, reordered career values, or restricted career opportunities. Except for conditions for the latter characteristic, the differences appeared to be such that COHORT soldiers expressed more favorable responses. In contrast, the conditions for restricted career opportunities elicited more negative views from the COHORT soldiers.
4. COHORT leaders and first termers differed on approximately three-fourths of the questionnaire items permitting comparison. Nearly all differences were such that leaders more frequently expressed a higher level of affirmation. Notable were the nine conditions without differences between COHORT leaders and first termers. Of these nine, six compared COHORT opportunities relative to other soldiers in the Army (changing career fields, choice in the next assignment, choice of next post or unit of assignment) or sought COHORT soldiers' desires for remaining their present regiments. These six variables were affirmed by low levels of both COHORT leaders and first termers.

With respect to the fourth objective, it was concluded that beliefs about conditions representing NMS characteristics are associated with attitudes toward the NMS, but the pattern of associations varies with the attitude measured.

This last conclusion was derived from data on the beliefs of soldiers classified, separately for each attitudes scale, by level (high, medium, low) of attitude. Soldiers classified in this manner reported significantly different beliefs about 42 of the 64 NMS conditions. Most of the differences (37 of 42) were obtained when soldiers were classified by level of overall NMS attitude or by level of attitude toward staying together. For these two attitudes, differences were obtained for conditions representing all NMS characteristics and were such that soldiers with higher attitudes more frequently expressed higher affirmation (or less frequently expressed lower affirmation). A different pattern of relationships was obtained for attitudes toward career stability and community involvement. Fewer differences in beliefs about NMS conditions were found. Moreover, most of the differences pertained to one NMS characteristic--reordered career values.

Findings of this research generally suggest the appropriateness of considering toward the NMS as a whole and its two components as separate but interrelated phenomena. Moreover, programs for influencing NMS attitudes should be tailored to the attitude(s) to be affected.

Utilization:

Results of this research were provided to the Soldier Advocacy Directorate, Soldier Support Center, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, for their development of a COHORT leader training program. This program was handed-off to various installations for use in training of COHORT leaders.

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM (NMS) AND NMS SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

BACKGROUND

The Army is testing a new personnel system, known as the New Manning System (NMS), to improve unit cohesion and unit training effectiveness through the stabilization of personnel. The two components of the NMS aim at separate but interrelated forms of personnel stabilization. One component is "COHORT"--a method of unit formation and rotation. According to this method, soldiers are assembled as a new unit which remains together intact for a predetermined period of time or life cycle. As part of the life cycle, some units rotate as wholes from one location to another (usually from one state-side location to another overseas). Through COHORT, unit composition is stabilized, and the unit is subject to less personnel turnover. The second NMS component is the U.S. Army Regimental System. Regimentalization seeks to stabilize the assignments of soldiers throughout their careers. That is, a small number of units (usually battalions) are treated as a group referred to as a regiment. To the extent possible, soldiers affiliated with a regiment will receive assignments within the units and locations of the regiment throughout their careers.

The Army introduced the NMS test to identify and fix conditions that would interfere with its full-scale implementation. One developing concern has been that soldiers, especially career soldiers, are not favorably disposed toward NMS assignments. Unfavorable attitudes by careerists is critical given, first, their leadership roles in COHORT units, and second, the NMS goal of stabilization throughout a career. It has been suggested that this problem should be addressed in a training program given to careerists before they serve as leaders in COHORT units. To support development of the training program, there is a need to identify soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS. Moreover, attitudes must be identified in such a way that the Army can determine whether and how to deal with them through training or some other initiative.

Research Problem

Available data on attitudes toward the NMS are limited to opinions about COHORT and do not provide a comprehensive view of soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS as a whole. Additional information is needed to specify a program for changing, reinforcing, etc., existing attitudes. This includes information about conditions in the NMS that cause or are otherwise related to attitudes toward the NMS.

Attitudes toward COHORT

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) has supported the Army's implementation of the NMS by tracking the opinions of soldiers in company-size COHORT units. The approach involved administration of questionnaires to the first-term soldiers (FTs) and leaders (LDRs) in COHORT companies at selected periods in their life cycles. Early in the evaluation, questionnaires were also administered to FTs and LDRs in Non-COHORT companies to obtain comparison or baseline data. Baseline data were collected at times yoked to the administration of questionnaires in COHORT units.

The primary focus of the questionnaires was cohesion. However, one item elicited an overall evaluation of COHORT. Specifically, the item asked soldiers to indicate their "feelings about the COHORT idea". Response options formed a five-point scale ranging from "I don't like it at all" (1) to "excellent idea" (5).

Data for this item have been presented in two reports. In the earlier report (Tremble, Kerner-Hoeg & Bell, 1983), soldiers in COHORT units who had completed the initial period of collective training were compared to soldiers in Non-COHORT units. It was found that both LDRs and FTs in COHORT companies expressed significantly less positive feelings about the COHORT idea than did their respective baseline counterparts. More specifically, the data revealed:

- (1) Average responses of LDRs and FTs in Non-COHORT units ($\bar{x}$ = 3.4 and 3.2, respectively) were either neutral or slightly higher than neutral.
- (2) The average response of COHORT LDRs was also neutral ($\bar{x}$ = 3.1), indicating that they were "not for it nor against it".
- (3) COHORT FTs tended to be slightly negative ($\bar{x}$ = 2.4).
- (4) Of the COHORT LDRs, 24% indicated that they "did not like it at all" in comparison to the 26% responding "like it" or "excellent idea."

A subsequent report (Tremble, Bell & Yuest, 1984) tracked responses of COHORT FTs from the period of initial entry collective training until their units were ready for rotation to overseas installations.¹ Average responses of FTs to this item were relatively unchanged and remained slightly negative.

The implications of these data for attitudes toward the NMS are somewhat unclear. The average attitude toward the COHORT idea was either neutral or slightly negative. This average possibly masked a considerable polarization of feelings since 50% of the LDRs expressed directional feelings. These

¹The report included data collected after the units had rotated overseas. However, only two units had rotated, and the stability of responses was considered questionable.

feelings were about evenly divided between the positive and negative directions. Even if accurately reflective of attitudes toward the idea of COHORT, these findings are not complete with respect to the overall NMS in that they concern COHORT only and do not take the regimental system into account. Finally, their representativeness is questionable. They tend to represent the feelings of soldiers in the first units formed according to the COHORT concept, and these units had completed less than half of their life cycles. It is possible that attitudes would be different for soldiers in units which had either been formed later in the NMS intervention or in existence for longer portions of their life cycles.

Characteristics of the NMS

Adequate and generalizable descriptions of attitudes toward the NMS are not alone sufficient for planning an initiative that deals with such attitudes. Also needed is information about conditions that are associated with both the NMS and attitudes toward it.

During this effort, the NMS model consisted of company-level COHORT companies within battalions that formed regiments. DA Circular 600-82-2 described the personnel management practices designed to create and implement this NMS model. Appendix A summarizes the management practices in the circular that appear to impact most directly on soldiers and units in the NMS. Examination of these practices suggests that if consistently implemented, they would create an operational system with characteristics that markedly differs from the conventional system based on the replacement of individual soldiers. Table 1 offers one vision of the characteristics that will adhere in a system of soldiers and units managed by the practices of the NMS. In Table 1, characteristics are identified for selected "elements" of the system--COHORT units, first-term soldiers in COHORT units, their leaders, and regimental communities--as well as for the NMS as a whole.

If the NMS characteristics in Table 1 are accepted as a framework, it is uncertain how they would be related to attitudes toward the NMS. The characteristics vary in the likelihood of receiving positive or negative evaluations. This suggests that attitudes toward the NMS are partially dependent on which characteristics actually materialize. Further, whether the characteristics apply to a particular instance is also indeterminant. That is, some characteristics tend to emanate directly from the personnel management practices of the NMS. These include characteristics of individual soldiers (e.g., restrictions on opportunities outside the COHORT unit of assignment). Other characteristics are more dependent on factors that are neither directly nor exclusively controlled by personnel management practices. For example, each COHORT unit has a developmental cycle; however, the nature of any unit's cycle is a function of unit conditions (e.g., leadership, organizational support) that are not created by personnel actions alone.

Table 1

System Characteristics of the NMS Created by
NMS Management Practices

Characteristics of COHORT Units

1. Unit Developmental Cycle. A COHORT unit has a developmental cycle --from a "beginning" to an "end"--which both provides opportunities for and imposes requirements on unit leaders and the larger organizational network.
2. Variance Properties. Phenomena linked to (unit) development tend to: (a) be more homogeneously descriptive or common to all members of a particular COHORT unit at any given time and (b) pulse with the unit's developmental cycle.
3. Organizational Synchrony. The life cycle of a COHORT unit unfolds within a larger and ongoing organizational system that does not share the life cycle characteristics of COHORT.
4. Contained Unit History. Each COHORT unit develops a unique organizational history which is contained within its life cycle.
5. Informal Group Influence. The potential for informal group influences among lower ranking soldiers is greater in COHORT units.
6. Sanctioned Period of Low Unit Readiness. COHORT units are not expected to be combat ready when initially formed.
7. Organizational Interchange. Units as wholes (as opposed to individual soldiers) pass into new operational/organizational contexts.
8. Training for Organizational Interchange. COHORT units have dedicated periods of training for performance in the organizational contexts into which they pass.
9. Personnel Stability. The membership of a COHORT unit is more stable and less open to turnover.

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics of First-Term Soldiers in COHORT Units

1. Organizational Entry of First-Termers. First-term soldiers with the predominant combat arms MOSs in a unit have a common history of organizational entry that differentiates them from other members of a COHORT unit.
2. Common Career Development. Career development levels and career progression needs are linked to time-in-service and tend to be similar for the first-term soldiers in COHORT units.
3. Restricted Extra-Organizational Career Experiences. Opportunities for career experiences outside the COHORT unit are restricted in comparison to those for first-term soldiers in non-COHORT units.

Characteristics of Career Soldiers in COHORT Units

1. Opportunity and Responsibility Structures. Circumstances in COHORT units are such that opportunities for affecting unit development and performance are greater and that responsibility for (influence over) achievement in these areas is more clearly identifiable.
2. Leader Rehearsal. Leaders who are career soldiers have the opportunity to train or to function together before the unit as a whole assembles and performs operationally.
3. Growth in Military Experience. The military experience of the leaders (collectively) in a COHORT unit grows from relatively less experienced to relatively more experienced as the unit's life cycle progresses.
4. Knowledge of Subordinates. Subordinates of first-term leaders have more (and possibly unique) knowledge of these leaders than do the leaders' supervisors.
5. Restricted Career Opportunities. Especially for those in the lower enlisted ranks, career/professional opportunities are restricted in comparison to the opportunities for careerists in Non-COHORT units.

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics of the Regimental System

1. Restricted but Predictable Assignments. With continued regimental affiliation, the possible assignments after leaving a COHORT unit (or other regimentally associated unit) are: (a) relatively restricted but (b) more predictable with respect to location and unit.
2. Unit Member Commonalities. With continued evolution of the NMS, a pool of regimentally affiliated soldiers will develop such that careerists with past experience in regimental units will be available for newly forming COHORT units in the regiment.

Characteristics of the Total NMS

1. Reordered Career Values. The conditions for retention and career progression are reordered in accordance with the values represented in and perpetuated by the NMS.
 2. Community Development. As soldiers remain in their regiments and receive repeated assignments to regimentally affiliated units, communities of soldiers or organizations will evolve whose members will have interdependent interests and destinies.
-

Objectives

The purpose of this effort was to extend the available data on attitudes toward the NMS. Additionally, a preliminary attempt was made to understand conditions in the NMS in relationship to characteristics expected of the NMS as a system. Specifically, opinions of soldiers in COHORT and non-COHORT units were surveyed to:

- (1) Determine soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS.
- (2) Describe conditions in the NMS in terms of the characteristics created by the management practices forming the NMS.
- (3) Determine differences between COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers' beliefs that these conditions are descriptive of their units.
- (4) Determine relationships between beliefs about these conditions and attitudes toward the NMS.

METHOD

Sample

The sample was drawn from 7 company-size units at each of three installations. To account for change in NMS characteristics over the life cycle, two of the most recently formed, two of the oldest, and one unit at mid cycle were selected from the available COHORT units at each installation. Two Non-COHORT combat arms units also served per installation. A quota of 10 first-term soldiers (FTs) and 10 career soldiers holding leadership positions was targeted for selection from each unit. The targeted leaders (LDRs) in a unit were the company commander, company first sergeant, two platoon leaders, two platoon sergeants, two squad leaders, and two team leaders.

Instruments

Data were collected through parallel forms of questionnaires and interviews allowing comparisons among the four types of respondents (FTs and LDRs in COHORT and Non-COHORT units). The interview guide, used with COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs only, sought data that together complemented and supplemented the questionnaire data. Both instruments are summarized in Appendix B.

Questionnaires

The four forms of questionnaires yielded three types of data. The first type was background or demographic. All forms contained similar items of this type which included measures of career intent and perceived amounts of unit turnover by LDRs and FTs.

The second type of data was attitudinal. The goals of the NMS, as stated in DA Circular 600-82-2, were used to develop 10 items measuring attitudes toward the NMS concept. Also included were (1) five items measuring organizational satisfactions, (2) two items measuring a soldier's own morale and perceptions of unit morale, and (3) the item used in past research to describe overall attitudes toward the COHORT concept. These 18 items were identical for all questionnaire forms.

The third type of data was beliefs about NMS characteristics. The 35 to 43 items, depending on questionnaire forms, were developed to describe conditions representative of the NMS characteristics found in Appendix A. The items retained in the questionnaire (and interview) met three additional criteria. First, they either pertained to satisfactions reportedly expressed by COHORT soldiers or were believed to have implication for interventions for attitude change. Second, they were judged as pertinent to the project's objectives by in-house NMS experts. Third, discussions of the items with a pilot sample of COHORT FTs and LDRs (not included in the target sample) suggested that the items would have the intended meanings to the target sample. The last two criteria applied to the demographic and attitudinal items as well.

Questionnaire responses were made on standard mark-sensed answer sheets. With the exception of the background and demographic items, five response alternatives were provided for each item. These scales were usually anchored by labels ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) with higher numerical values indicating more positive responses to the items.

Interview Guides

The interview guides contained 12 items that were identical for COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs.² Of these items, 11 elicited responses about conditions representing NMS characteristics. One sought a respondent's overall opinion of COHORT.

Procedures

The participating units, LDRs, and FTs were selected by commanders of the three installations (or their representatives). Data were collected in each unit by teams of four researchers, typically during an unbroken period of about four hours. At the start of this period, the participating LDRs and FTs were assembled and informed about the purpose of the research as follows:

to obtain information on conditions in units as a basis for planning training that will be given leaders prior to a new unit assignment and that will prepare them for duty in the particular type of unit that they are about to enter. This training will initially be used in COHORT units.

The FTs and LDRs were administered the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire, LDRs were individually interviewed.

Data Analysis

Attitude Scales

All questionnaire forms contained two sets of attitude items intended to form multiple-item scales. Data analysis consisted of scale analysis and development.

NMS Attitude Scales

For each respondent, an overall NMS attitude scale score was computed as the mean response to the 10 items developed to measure attitudes towards the goals of the NMS. The dimensionality of this overall measure of NMS attitudes was examined through factor analysis (principal components with varimax rotation to simplify the pattern of factor loadings on components

²As Appendix B describes, the interview guides contained 13 items. Only the 12 common items were analyzed.

with eigenvalues exceeding 1). As Table 2 presents, three components emerged. When examined in terms of the items with rotated factor loadings of .50 or better on one component alone, the components seemed to represent three central aspects of the NMS. Accordingly, a separate attitude scale was computed for each component as the mean response to the items with such loadings. The component NMS attitude scales were labelled and interpreted as follows:

- (1) Staying together. The three items on this factor referred to outcomes of unit members' staying together or liking to stay together. More specifically, two items described outcomes expected from the stability of unit membership: mutual caring and respect and enhanced unit performance. The third concerned liking to spend off-duty time with fellow unit members. Thus, the first component scale seemed to concern the type of stability achieved by the COHORT component of the NMS.
- (2) Career stability. The three items in this scale concerned some aspect of career stability achieved by the regimental component of the NMS. One item in this scale suggested a preference for career assignments to a limited number of units. The second stated belief that career goals could be achieved if assignments were limited to one or two units. The third item concerned "homebasing" and its positive impact on the quality of family life.
- (3) Community involvement. The third component attitude consisted of one item. This item also pertained to a goal (or the desire for it) associated with the regimental system: involvement in the larger civilian community.³

The component scales and the overall 10-item scale were used to describe attitudes toward the NMS, the first objective of this effort.

³As Table 2 shows, two other items had loadings of .50 or higher on this third component: importance of mutual caring and respect and wanting a company that does a good job. These two items also loaded moderately high on the first component and, consequently, were not used to interpret either component. If these items had been considered for the third component, they would have added to and altered its interpretation. Together with the item on importance of involvement in the civilian community, the other two items would suggest the importance of group or organizational identification.

Table 2
Principal Components Analysis of NMS Attitude Items

Variable	<u>Unrotated factor loadings</u>			<u>Rotated factor loadings</u>		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Staying together--more mutual caring and respect	.715	-.188	-.365	.793	.221	-.047
Staying together--better unit performance	.753	-.118	-.314	.767	.303	-.007
Liking to spend off-duty time together	.459	-.329	-.133	.568	-.028	.115
Preference for remaining at same installation	.495	.566	.181	.030	.751	.184
Ability to achieve career goals if assigned to one or two units over career	.563	.505	-.118	.236	.726	-.051
Homebase--good for family life	.407	.595	.007	.021	.721	-.011
Importance of involvement in community	.340	.115	.758	-.110	.310	.771
Importance of mutual caring and respect	.491	-.517	.325	.493	-.152	.590
Wanting company that does good job	.545	-.485	.235	.557	-.098	.518
Unit leaders' staying together--better unit performance	.598	.078	-.022	.430	.392	.157
Eigenvalues	3.029	1.609	1.031	Sum=5.669		
Percentage of Variance Explained	30.3	16.1	10.3			
Cumulative Variance Explained	30.3	46.4	56.7			

Note. Except as indicated, entries are factor loadings.

Organizational Satisfaction

Five items provided ratings of overall satisfaction with the following aspects of the present organizational situation: the Army, post, company/battery, supervisor, and work group. A principal components analysis of responses to these items produced a single component accounting for 54% of the variance (with factor loadings ranging from .64 to .84). Based on the factor loadings, an aggregate measure of organizational satisfaction was formed. This was computed as the mean response to the five items.

Content Analysis of Interview Protocols

Appendix C describes the system used to analyze interview protocols. According to this system, protocols for the 12 items were analyzed twice to identify and codify two types of interview responses or variables. The first type was the general nature and/or direction of the responses to an item. For example, the first interview item sought description of the "ways in which the unit had changed or developed during the period of assignment to the unit". Response categories that captured the general directions of the change were derived (e.g., improvement, decline, fluctuations). From the 12 interview items, 22 general-level responses were identified and coded. Of these, 21 indicated beliefs about conditions representing NMS characteristics, and one provided an overall opinion of COHORT.

The second type of interview variable consisted of the explanations or fuller descriptions associated with a more general response. For the first item, for example, categories were developed to represent the ways in which units were described as having changed.

Several researchers examined a sample of interviews to develop the two types of response categories. A single researcher then conducted the content analysis. All responses to one item across all interviews were coded before responses to successive items were analyzed.

In later sections, results for the general-level responses are presented. The associated explanations and descriptions are also summarized to increase the data's richness for training development. However, the preliminary status of all interview data should be emphasized due to the lack of rigor of the content analysis procedures.

Beliefs about NMS System Characteristics

Three research objectives pertained to the 35 to 43 questionnaire items (depending on questionnaire form) and 21 general-level interview variables measuring beliefs about unit conditions that represented NMS characteristics. Analysis involved sorting the 64 variables according to system characteris-

tics.⁴ Assessment indicated that the following seven characteristics were best represented by the variables: unit developmental cycle, opportunity/responsibility structure, informal group influence, restricted career opportunities, restricted but predictable assignments, reordered career values, and common career development of first termers. Table 3 summarizes the variables identified as representing each characteristic.

The second research objective concerned COHORT soldiers' beliefs as to whether the sorted variables described their units. To accomplish this, the variables were further categorized according to the percent of COHORT soldiers who "affirmed" an item. As used here, affirmation refers to an opinion indicating that a variable or condition had been obtained or applied to the respondent's unit. Most questionnaire items produced responses about "agreement". For such items, responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" were defined as affirming responses. For the questionnaire items comparing the overall career opportunities in COHORT (one item) or specific opportunities in the regiment (five items), responses of "better" or "much better" were treated as affirming responses. For interview items, affirmation was defined on the basis of the response alternatives listed in Appendix B.

Variables were then placed into one of four categories or levels of affirmation based on the percents of COHORT soldiers affirming them. The four levels were:

- (1) High affirmation--affirmation by 75% or more.
- (2) Relatively high affirmation--affirmation by 50% to 74%.
- (3) Relatively low affirmation--affirmation by 25% to 49%.
- (4) Low affirmation--affirmation by fewer than 25%.

An item was placed at a level of affirmation on the basis of the total percent of COHORT LDRs and/or FTs who responded to it. For most questionnaire items, classification was based on the percent of COHORT LDRs and FTs together. The interview items and several questionnaire items, however, had been administered to only COHORT FTs or LDRs, and the responding COHORT sub-sample was used to determine level of affirmation. Percents of affirmation for interview items were computed on the basis of COHORT LDRs who expressed an opinion; thus, LDRs who provided no response or opinion were not included in the denominator.

⁴This categorization was necessitated by the approach used for instrument development. That is, the NMS characteristics in Appendix A had served as a framework for initial instrument development. However, the items retained in the final versions were not to represent the characteristics alone. Rather, they were also retained because of their likely relevance to expressed levels of satisfaction with COHORT or to interventions dealing with soldiers' attitudes.

Table 3
Classification of Variables by NMS Characteristics

Unit Developmental Cycle	Responsibility/Opportunity Structures
Greater workload	Helping to identify training needs
NCOs' caring	Helping to set standards
Officers' caring	Ability to reward soldiers
Satisfaction with predictability of duty hours	Felt responsibility for soldiers' performance
Satisfaction with predictability of daily assignments	Felt responsibility for unit performance
Predictability of assignments	Dependency of reputation on soldiers' performance
Unit change*	Responsibility for helping soldiers adjust
Prevalence of personnel problems	Adjustment helped by unit members
Reasonable performance standards	Respondent influenced unit change*
Acceptance of unit	Pressure to excel*
Unit respected	Feeling pressure to excel*
	Uncertainty about meeting soldiers' expectations
Informal Group Influence	Common Career Development of First-Termers
Job helped by cooperation of work group	Opportunity for professional development assignments
Respect given to leaders	First termers' satisfaction with career development
Much peer pressure*	Opinion of first-term leaders*
Cohesion of first termers*	
Leadership and cohesion*	

Table 3

(Continued)

Restricted Career Opportunities	Reordered Career Values
Difficulty of transferring*	Want repeated assignment to unit*
Unit permits transfers*	Tour good career experience*
Choice of assignment considered	Transfer policies fair*
Chances for changing career fields	Assignment impacts on career intent*
Chances for military schooling	Opinion about three-year tour*
Chances for changing units	Opinion about regimental assignments*
Chances for changing posts	Liking of local civilian community
Promotion opportunities	Attraction of differing foreign assignments
Careerists' desire for unit assignment	Attraction of meeting new people
Comparative COHORT career opportunities	Attraction of differing US assignments
Wanted assignment to unit*	Involvement in local civilian community
Assignment affects promotions*	Transfer policies in Army's best interests*
Assignment affects opportunities for military schools*	Desire to remain in regiment

Table 3
(Continued)

Restricted but Predictable Assignments

Freedom to choose next assignment
 Assignment affects future assignment available*
 Chances in regiment for changing career fields
 Choice in regiment of next unit of assignment
 Choice in regiment of next post of assignment
 Promotion opportunities in regiment
 Chances in regiment for attending military schools

*Variables derived from interviews with leaders.

For the third objective, chi-square tests were used to determine the statistical significance of differences in the distributions of responses by COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers. As possible, tests were performed for differences between the following groups: all COHORT soldiers vs all Non-COHORT soldiers; COHORT LDRs vs Non-COHORT LDRs; COHORT FTs vs Non-COHORT FTs; and COHORT FTs vs COHORT LDRs. Differences with probability levels of .05 or smaller are reported here as statistically significant.

NMS Attitudes and System Characteristics

The fourth objective concerned relationships between NMS attitudes and beliefs about conditions linked to the NMS. To meet this objective, response distributions on the four attitudes scales were examined to identify the cut-off scores that would permit the following: (1) dividing scores into groups that represented ordinal levels on a continuum of "low" to "high" attitudes and (2) creating groupings that were as equal as possible within and across attitude scales. Examination indicated that cluster of thirds provided the best fit. Accordingly, scores for each scale separately were rank-ordered and divided into rough groups of thirds representing "high", "medium", and "low" attitudes. Table 4 contains the boundaries and number of soldier in the groupings for each scale. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine differences in beliefs about NMS conditions by soldiers classified at the three attitude levels. Differences with probability levels of .05 or smaller are reported here as statistically significant.

RESULTS

Description of Sample

The numbers of COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs and FTs returning instruments are summarized in Table 5. COHORT returns are grouped by the life-cycle "phase" of participating COHORT units. Phase was defined in terms of the length of time since a COHORT unit had been formed, that is, as the amount of time that a unit's LDRs and FTs had been performing together as an operational unit. Three phases were defined as follows: new--1 to 5 months; middle--10 to 17 months; and old--30 to 31 months. As Table 5 shows, the numbers of new (and to a lesser extent old) COHORT units and responding soldiers tended to be smaller than targeted. However, the obtained sample closely approximated the targeted sample.⁵

⁵One "COHORT" unit was not classified according to phase because the assignment of LDRs and FTs to the unit did not actually fit the COHORT model of unit formation.

Table 4
Grouping of Soldiers by Level of Attitude

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Attitude Level</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Overall NMS Attitude	low	0-2.20	143	1.82
	medium	2.21-2.70	142	2.47
	high	2.71-4.00	130	3.08
			<u>415</u>	
Career Stability	low	0-1.33	77	.60
	medium	1.34-2.00	175	1.67
	high	2.01-4.00	164	2.91
			<u>416</u>	
Togetherness	low	0-2.33	145	3.27
	medium	2.34-3.00	122	2.48
	high	3.01-4.00	149	1.47
			<u>416</u>	
Community Involvement*	low	0-1.00	87	.49
	medium	2.00	128	2.00
	high	3.00-4.00	202	3.26
			<u>417</u>	

Note. Entries identify the following for the thirds on each scale:
(1) range of responses in the grouping, (2) N or number of respondents and
(3) the mean response of the respondents in the grouping.

*1 item scale.

Table 6 and Appendix D summarize demographic and background variables of the obtained sample. Based on Table 6, COHORT LDRs and FTs were generally similar to their Non-COHORT counterparts on the following variables: age, completion of high school (to include GED), marital status, rank, and career intent. Number of months of service was also similar for COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs. The differences obtained for other variables seem to reflect NMS stabilization. Specifically, COHORT LDRs had been stationed at their installations and in their units relatively longer than Non-COHORT LDRs. This pattern was also obtained for COHORT FTs. Despite longer tenures in their units, COHORT FTs had relatively fewer months of service than Non-COHORT FTs had.

Table 5
Size of Responding Sample

<u>Type of Soldier</u>	<u>COHORT</u>				<u>Non-COHORT</u>
	<u>New</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>Other^a</u>	
Leader	29	63	48	9	58
First Termer	30	62	50	10	58

Note. Entries are numbers of LDRs and FTs returning usable questionnaires. Except for two fewer Non-COHORT returns, LDRs' interview returns equalled their questionnaire returns.

^a One COHORT unit could not be classified according to life-cycle phase, see Footnote 4.

Table 6
Description of Sample

Variable	COHORT		Non-COHORT	
	Leaders n=149	First Termers n=152	Leaders n=58	First Termers n=58
Months in Service ^a	106.8 (62.0)	16.7 (10.2)	105.1 (69.7)	22.8 (12.6)
Months at Installation ^a	23.7 (13.6)	13.3 (10.5)	16.7 (13.9)	9.9 (6.9)
Months in Unit ^a	12.00 (10.4)	12.00 (10.3)	9.1 (7.2)	7.65 (4.5)
Age (in years) ^a	29.3 (5.3)	20.66 (2.3)	29.7 (6.0)	21.5 (3.3)
Rank ^b	E5	E3	E5	E4
Married	83.0%	28.3%	70.2%	25.9%
High School Diploma/GED ^c	99.32%	96.05%	100%	93%
Career Intent ^{a,c}	.76 (1.10)	2.66 (1.22)	.72 (1.21)	2.46 (1.24)

^a Mean response, with standard deviations in parentheses.

^b Modal or most frequent response.

^c Scored from 0 (stay until retirement) to 4 (definitely leave at end of present obligation).

Attitudes Toward the NMS

Responses to NMS Attitude Scales

Table 7 summarizes soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS as measured by the four NMS attitude scales. For each measure, an analysis of variance was performed to identify differences associated with type of unit (COHORT vs Non-COHORT), career status of soldiers (LDRs vs FTs), and their interaction. Table 7 and the results of the analyses of variance can be described as follows:

Table 7
COHORT and Non-COHORT Soldiers' Attitudes toward the NMS

<u>Type of Soldier</u>	<u>Attitude Scale</u>			
	<u>Staying Together</u>	<u>Career Stability</u>	<u>Community Involvement</u>	<u>Overall Attitude</u>
<u>COHORT</u>				
Leader n=149	2.50 (.84)	1.86 (1.06)	2.36 (1.06)	2.46 (.61)
First Termer n=152	2.41 (.84)	2.04 (.82)	2.35 (1.13)	2.42 (.56)
All COHORT n=301	2.45 (.84)	1.95 (.95)	2.35 (1.09)	2.46 (.95)
<u>Non-COHORT</u>				
Leader n=58	2.35 (.85)	1.97 (.93)	2.29 (1.06)	2.42 (.56)
First Termer n=58	2.25 (.93)	2.04 (1.01)	2.21 (1.18)	2.33 (.62)
All Non-COHORT n=116	2.29 (.89)	2.00 (.97)	2.25 (1.12)	2.38 (.59)
Total Sample n=417	2.41 (.86)	1.96 (.95)	2.32 (1.10)	2.44 (.58)

Note. Entries are means, with standard deviations in parentheses.

- (1) Mean attitudes tended to fall above the middle of the scales (a value of 2) and, therefore, were somewhat positive for all attitudes except for attitude toward career stability. The career stability scale yielded more neutral ratings.
- (2) For all attitude measures, differences for unit type and career status were non-significant.

Based on findings with these measures, COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs and FTs do not differ in attitudes toward the NMS. Moreover, attitudes toward the NMS vary by the measure used but remain within the range of neutral to slightly positive.

Supplementary NMS Attitudes

Two additional items elicited summary opinions about the NMS. One was the questionnaire item measuring "liking of the COHORT idea". As Table 8 suggests, mean responses to this item were neutral to slightly positive for all groups of respondents except for Non-COHORT FTs. The latter were relatively less favorable to the COHORT idea. This difference for Non-COHORT FTs appeared in results of an analysis of variance in which the interaction between (but not the main effects for) type of unit and soldier status was statistically significant.

The second item was the final interview question asking LDRs for their overall opinion of COHORT. Responses to this item were coded as follows (see Appendix C):

- (1) Favorable--An explicitly positive and unqualified evaluation of COHORT.
- (2) Qualified endorsement--An explicitly favorable evaluation of COHORT qualified, for example, by description of conditions under which the favorable evaluation would hold.
- (3) Perception of problems--No direct statement about the program's favorability. Only problems or conditions under which the program would work (or be favorable) were provided.
- (4) Unfavorable--An explicitly negative and unqualified evaluation of the program.
- (5) No opinion--No opinion given.

Table 8
Liking of COHORT Idea

<u>Unit Type</u>	<u>Status of Soldier</u>		
	<u>Leader</u>	<u>First-Termer</u>	<u>All</u>
COHORT n=294	2.19 (1.47)	2.39 (1.13)	2.30 (1.31)
Non-COHORT n=104	2.10 (1.43)	1.44 (1.17)	1.76 (1.34)

Note. Entries are means, with standard deviations in parentheses.

As Table 9 indicates, COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs responded similarly with most providing positive but qualified evaluations of COHORT. These evaluations were analyzed further to summarize the problems identified by respondents. The categories of problems and percent of respondents mentioning each are presented in Table 9 (see Appendix C for complete definitions of problem categories).

Satisfaction and Morale

The questionnaire contained two items measuring perceptions of own and unit morale. A third was the five-item scale measuring organizational satisfaction. Table 10 summarizes results for these measures, each of which was examined with an analysis of variance. Results were generally parallel for all measures. These can be described as follows:

- (1) LDRs in COHORT and Non-COHORT units tended to agree that they were satisfied and that their morale was high.
- (2) LDRs' ratings of satisfaction and morale were significantly higher than FTs' ratings.
- (3) FTs were neutral with respect to organizational satisfaction. However, they expressed some disagreement that either their own or their unit's morale was high.
- (4) COHORT LDRs and FTs did not significantly differ from their respective Non-COHORT counterparts.

Table 9
Overall Opinion of COHORT

	<u>Overall Opinion^a</u>				
	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Qualified Positive</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>N/A</u>
COHORT n=135	22.2	55.6	9.6	8.9	3.7
Non-COHORT n=50	24.0	40.0	14.0	12.0	10.0

<u>COHORT Problems^b</u>	<u>COHORT (N=93)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (N=22)</u>
Unit formation problem	19%	0%
Choice of assignment location limited	17%	27%
Career progression limited	16%	27%
Need to screen unit members	15%	0%
Inter-organizational incompatibility	15%	5%
Better orientation needed	12%	9%
Assign volunteers only	10%	14%
Contempt bred by familiarity	9%	5%
Rank structure problem	9%	0%
Better family support needed	5%	0%
Repeated assignments unattractive	4%	9%
Broken promises	4%	0%
Other	27%	23%

^a Entries are percents of leaders coded as giving the response indicated.

^b Entries are the problem categories identified and percent of leaders who mentioned each (with percents based on leaders having described a problem).

Table 10
Satisfaction of COHORT and Non-COHORT Soldiers

<u>Type of Soldier</u>	<u>Organizational Satisfaction</u>	<u>Own Morale</u>	<u>Perceived Unit Morale</u>
<u>COHORT</u>			
Leader n=148	2.76 (.74)	3.08 (.72)	2.41 (1.12)
First-Termer n=152	1.98 (.92)	1.66 (1.35)	1.61 (1.29)
All COHORT n=300	2.28 (.91)	2.03 (1.29)	1.97 (1.30)
<u>Non-COHORT</u>			
Leader n=58	2.87 (.71)	3.07 (.79)	2.50 (1.16)
First-Termer n=58	1.89 (.85)	1.53 (1.23)	1.60 (1.26)
All Non-COHORT n=116	2.30 (.88)	2.02 (1.29)	1.95 (1.31)
Total Sample n=146	2.29 (.90)	2.03 (1.29)	1.97 (1.30)

Note. Entries are means, with standard deviations in parentheses. Scale values ranged from 0 to 4.

Correlations between the measures of NMS attitudes and the measures of morale and satisfaction are presented in Table 11 for the total sample. Correlations within the types of measures (i.e., NMS attitudes vs morale and satisfaction) tended to be greater than correlations across the sets. Regardless, correlations among overall NMS attitude, staying together, and the measures of satisfaction and morale were both positive and statistically significant.

Table 11
Correlations between Attitudes and Satisfaction

Scale	Scale						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(1) Staying Together		.28	.13	.77	.42	.31	.33
(2) Career Stability			.21	.73	.14	.07	.08
(3) Community Involvement				.42	.08	.07	.05
(4) Overall NMS Attitude					.38	.27	.25
(5) Organizational Satisfaction						.68	.62
(6) Own Morale							.69
(7) Perceived Unit Morale							

Note. Correlation coefficients of .13 or greater are statistically significant ($p < .01$). Number of respondents per correlation was approximately 415.

NMS System Characteristics

Appendix E summarizes the percents of respondents affirming the variables representing each NMS system characteristic and the results of the chi-square tests computed for each variable. Appendix F presents the raw response distributions to the interview items.

Highly Affirmed Characteristics

As presented in Table 12, only eight of the 64 variables were affirmed by 75% or more of the responding COHORT sample. These highly-affirmed variables are summarized in Table 13. Seven of the eight variables were based on interview items or on questionnaire items administered to LDRs only. Table 13 describes five additional variables (questionnaire items) that, while not highly affirmed by the total sample, were highly affirmed by COHORT LDRs. Thus, only a small number of variables were highly affirmed by COHORT soldiers. Moreover, high affirmation of these variables largely reflected the opinions of COHORT LDRs.

Table 12

System Characteristics and Level of Affirmation by COHORT Soldiers

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>No. Variables</u>	<u>Level of Affirmation</u>			
		<u>75% or more</u>	<u>50% to 75%</u>	<u>25% to 50%</u>	<u>25% or Less</u>
Unit Developmental Cycle	11	1	4	5	1
Informal Group Influence	5	1	4	0	0
Common Career Development (First-Termers)	3	0	0	2	1
Opportunity and Responsibility Structures	12	5	3	3	1
Restricted Career Opportunities	13	1	3	3	6
Restricted but Predictable Assignments	7	0	0	0	7
Reordered Career Values	13	0	4	5	4
Number Separate Variables	64	8	18	18	20

Note.--Entries are the number of variables classified as representing each NMS characteristic and receiving each level of affirmation by the total COHORT sample responding to the variable.

Table 12 and Appendix E indicate further that the highly affirmed variables represented the following characteristics: opportunity/responsibility structure, informal group influence, unit developmental cycle, and restricted career opportunities. These characteristics and the variables representing them are addressed next.

Opportunity/Responsibility Structure

This characteristic tended to receive a high or relatively high level of affirmation by the soldiers to whom it most applies--COHORT LDRs (see Table E3). Interview responses provide a fuller view of the conditions associated with the opportunities and responsibilities of COHORT LDRs.

Table 13

Variables Affirmed by 75% or More of COHORT Soldiers

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Percent Affirming</u>		
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Unit Developmental Cycle</u>			
Unit Change*	90%	--	90%
Reasonable Performance Standards	75%	55%	65%
Officers' Caring	80%	45%	62%
<u>Informal Group Influence</u>			
Cohesion of First-Termers*	83%	--	83%
<u>Responsibility/Opportunity Structures</u>			
Helping to Set Standards	87%	--	87%
Felt Responsibility for Soldiers Performance	92%	--	92%
Responsibility for Helping Soldiers Adjust	85%	--	85%
Respondent Influenced Unit Change*	78%	--	78%
Feeling Pressure to Excel*	85%	--	85%
Dependency of Reputation on Soldiers' Performance	75%	68%	71%
<u>Restricted Career Opportunities</u>			
Difficulty of Transferring	80%	78%	79%
<u>Reordered Career Values</u>			
Attraction of Differing Foreign Locations	75%	58%	66%
Attraction of Meeting New People	84%	58%	71%

*Interview items.

LDRs' relatively high affirmation. Of the 12 variables for this characteristic, three-fourths were affirmed by a high or relatively high frequency. More specifically, five were highly affirmed. These five, which follow, were specific to LDRs: (1) helping to set standards, (2) felt responsibility for soldiers' performance, (3) responsibility for helping soldiers adjust, (4) having influenced unit change, and (5) feeling pressure to excel. In combination, COHORT LDRs and FTs affirmed three additional variables with a relatively high frequency.

With closer inspection, results for three of the four variables with low or relatively low levels of affirmation are also compatible with a pattern of at least relatively high affirmation by COHORT LDRs. The single variables with low affirmation, for example, concerned uncertainty about meeting the performance expectations of the soldiers in a unit.⁶ Sizable percents of both COHORT LDRs (55%) and FTs (49%) disagreed with this item. Lack of agreement coupled with high disagreement seems to indicate that uncertainty about meeting soldiers' expectations was not a prevalent concern. Indeed, these data may imply the opposite, that is, certainty. Results for two variables affirmed by relatively low frequencies also fit this pattern. For both variables, the relatively low affirmation was due to COHORT FTs. One variable was derived from an item specific to FTs (feeling personally responsible for the successes and failures of the unit). The second variable concerned ability to reward soldiers. The relatively low endorsements were due to FTs' responses when combined with their LDRs' responses to somewhat different items. That is, relatively few FTs (29%) believed that they had been rewarded for good performance whereas a relatively high frequency of COHORT LDRs affirmed (66%) their ability to insure reward for good performance.

This pattern was reversed for the fourth variable affirmed with a relatively low frequency. Relative to FTs (54%), fewer COHORT LDRs (44%) affirmed that they could depend on other unit members to help them adjust when they first relocated to their present installation.

Supplementary beliefs. Several of the conditions representing opportunity/responsibility structure were based on the interviews of LDRs.

As presented earlier, COHORT LDRs highly affirmed having influenced change in their units. Ways in which LDRs reported having exerted this influence were coded and are presented in Appendix F (Table F1). LDRs most frequently reported having exerted influence through the training of either soldiers or of the whole unit. This category entailed all activities (definition of specific needs, planning, or conduct) that contributed to improvement in the knowledges, skills, or performance of the unit or its members

⁶This variable was measured by slightly different items for LDRs and FTs. For FTs, the item read: "Sometimes I am not sure that I can perform as well as the other soldiers in this unit think I should". The wording for leaders was: "Sometimes I am not sure that I can live up to the expectations of the soldiers I lead."

(other than LDRs only) through training. LDRs described five other ways of having influenced change: (1) developing unit organization or integration, (2) dealing with personnel matters, (3) applying leadership techniques, (4) training specifically targeted for LDRs, and (5) performing the routine jobs or tasks of their positions.

Responses describing more pressure to excel were coded to identify the source of the pressure (see Table F2). Two sources were most commonly cited by COHORT LDRs. One was the image or reputation of the unit, that is, generalized beliefs about the way the unit was or should be because of its past performance or because of the type of unit (e.g., COHORT) that it was. The second was closely associated with unit image and pertained to expectations about present performance levels. Less frequently mentioned sources of pressure were as follows: (1) office/office holder in the chain of command, (2) qualifications or experiences of personnel, (3) load of details or special assignments, (4) family issues, and (5) COHORT program characteristics (e.g., its newness).

How LDRs felt (or were affected by) the increased pressure to excel was also coded (see Table F3). One of the three most frequent responses was positive. That is, LDRs felt professionally motivated in that the pressure was appealing or stimulating. The other two effects with high frequency were more negative: long duty hours and adverse effects on personal/family lives. Three less frequently reported effects were as follows: (1) restriction of professionalism, (2) impetus for personnel turnover, and (3) general dissatisfaction (e.g., low morale).

Informal Group Influence

The five variables representing this characteristic received high or relatively high affirmation (see Table E2). Results for these variables and for supplementary interview items concern the cohesiveness of FTs, peer pressure among FTs, or other manifestations of group influence.

Cohesiveness of FTs. With respect to this characteristic, COHORT LDRs assessed the cohesiveness of their FTs. Responses were coded as purely positive (that is, cohesive), mixed (or limited cohesiveness), or low. As Table 13 indicates, a high percent of COHORT LDRs positively described the cohesiveness of their FTs. These positive descriptions were analyzed to codify the indicators of cohesiveness used by LDRs (see Table F4). COHORT LDRs most frequently described FT cohesiveness in terms suggesting the unity or groupness of FTs. Such descriptions referred to the presence of a group identity, a sense of group belonging and loyalty, or the performance of FTs as a recognizable group (e.g., the group's helping to solve its members' problems or approaching the leaders). Statements indicating good work relationships among FTs (work well together, push each other to perform, or help each other to perform) was the second most frequent description of FTs' cohesiveness. The two remaining categories described FTs as taking care of each other on- and off-duty or in terms of free-time interaction.

One interview variable pertained to FTs' cohesiveness and its overall effects on the respondent's leadership. Most COHORT LDRs reported positive effects (55%) or positive effects mixed with negative effects (9%). LDRs' descriptions of positive effects were also coded (see Table F5). COHORT LDRs most frequently indicated that FTs' functioning as a group (as opposed to separately as individuals) had facilitated their leadership. This was seconded by beliefs of reduced needs for supervision by LDRs (due to fewer problems or self monitoring by FTs). Reduced supervisory needs were related to a third effect frequently reported: display of disciplined attitudes by FTs. Other effects were reported less frequently: (1) leader motivation, (2) clarity of expectations by FTs, (3) performance energized by group functioning, and (4) clarity of expectations by LDRs.

Peer pressure. Interviews elicited beliefs about peer pressure among the FTs in a unit. Most COHORT LDRs (64%) affirmed that there was much peer pressure among their FTs. Descriptions of the manifestations of peer pressure (see Table F6) tended to be similar to those obtained for FT cohesiveness. These descriptions were placed into the following categories: (1) pressure by group for performance of individuals, (2) group provision of aid to the performance of individuals, (3) sense of unity, and (4) caring and closeness. One manifestation was not found for cohesion: friendly competition that stimulates performance.

Responses about the positive effects of peer pressure on leadership were also similar to and yet different from those obtained for cohesion (see Table F6). The similar categories of positive effects were as follows: (1) reduced need to supervise, (2) functioning of soldiers as a unit, (3) fewer problems for the leader to solve, and (4) support of the leader by the group of soldiers led. Somewhat different categories of positive effects suggested that peer pressure either (1) had produced positive motivational effects often linked to competition (among individuals or units) or (2) was a condition or resource that could be manipulated to accomplish organization goals.

Other manifestations. The final two variables for this characteristic elaborate further on informal group influence and performance. Most COHORT soldiers (54%) agreed that their job performance had been helped by the work groups' trying to help its members to perform well. Most COHORT respondents (55%) also agreed that LDRs in their units were shown respect by their followers. The relatively high affirmation of these two questionnaire variables was due to COHORT LDRs who responded positively more frequently than did COHORT FTs.

Unit Developmental Cycle

Of the 11 variables for this characteristic, one interview variable was affirmed by a high frequency. According to this variable, most COHORT LDRs (81%) believed that their units had changed during their assignments. Response distributions are presented in Appendix F (see Tables F7 and F8). Many COHORT LDRs (47%) described the change as an "improvement." However, a comparable frequency (43%) described other change patterns, that is, decline, a mixture of declines and improvements, or fluctuation between decline and

improvement. COHORT LDRs also described the nature of change in their units. These were grouped as follows (in descending frequency): (1) performance capability of the unit or its members, (2) motivation of soldiers, (3) organization or integration of the unit or its members, (4) maintenance of equipment or facilities, and (5) non-specific generalized perceptions of unit change.

Relatively high frequencies of the total COHORT sample affirmed four variables. For LDRs, however, affirmation was higher than for FTs. The variables were as follows: (1) greater workload in present unit (relative to comparable units) (53%), (2) caring shown by the unit's NCOs (57%), (3) caring shown by the unit's officers (62%), and (4) reasonableness of the unit's performance standards (65%).

The five variables affirmed by relatively low frequencies fell into two groups. One group pertained to the actual predictability of mission assignments (46%) and satisfaction with the predictability of mission assignments (31%) and duty hours (37%). The remaining two variables concerned inter-organizational functioning. These were acceptance of the unit (40%) and respect given to the unit by the other units (48%).

The final variable for this characteristic was affirmed by a low frequency. Small percents of LDRs and FTs (19%) agreed that when one soldier in a unit had a problem, other soldiers tended to experience similar problems at the same time.

Restricted Career Opportunities

Of the 13 variables for this characteristic, one was affirmed at a high level. As Table 13 shows, most COHORT LDRs and FTs agreed that it would be difficult for soldiers to transfer from their units. This finding is treated later in the context of other results for restricted career opportunities.

Characteristics with Low Affirmation

Of the 64 variables, 20 were affirmed by fewer than 25% of all COHORT respondents. These are summarized in Table 14. This table presents another three variables affirmed by low frequencies of either COHORT LDRs or COHORT FTs. Of the 23 variables, 20 represented four system characteristics: (1) restricted but predictable assignments, (2) common career development for first termers, (3) restricted career opportunities, or (4) reordered career values. The other three variables (uncertainty about meeting soldiers' expectations, satisfaction with the predictability of duty assignments, and prevalence of personnel problems) were discussed earlier with respect to the more highly affirmed characteristics.

Restricted but Predictable Assignments

This characteristic generally concerns the career assignment patterns in the regimental system. As Tables 12 and E6 indicate, all seven variables for this characteristic were affirmed by less than 25% of the COHORT respondents.

Table 14

Variables Affirmed by Less than 25% of the COHORT Respondents

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Percent Affirming</u>		
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Unit Developmental Cycle</u>			
Prevalence of Personnel Problems	19%	18%	19%
Satisfaction with Predictability of Daily Assignments	38%	24%	31%
<u>Responsibility/Opportunity Structures</u>			
Uncertainty about Meeting Soldiers' Expectations	21%	24%	23%
<u>Common Career Development of First Termers</u>			
First Termers' Satisfaction with Career Development	30%	12%	21%
<u>Restricted Career Opportunities</u>			
Chances for Changing Career Fields	20%	21%	21%
Chances for Changing Units	--	11%	11%
Chances for Changing Posts	18%	11%	15%
Careerists' Desire for Unit Assignment	29%	12%	20%
Assignment Affects Opportunities for Military Schooling*	8%	--	8%
Assignment Affects Promotions*	20%	--	20%
Comparative COHORT Career Opportunities	21%	38%	30%
<u>Restricted but Predictable Assignments</u>			
Freedom to Choose Next Assignment	27%	21%	24%
Chances in Regiment for Changing Career Fields	9%	11%	10%
Choice in Regiment of Next Unit of Assignment	9%	14%	12%
Choice in Regiment of Next Post of Assignment	9%	12%	11%
Promotion Opportunities in Regiment	18%	26%	22%
Chances in Regiment for Attending Military Schools	24%	12%	18%
Assignment Affects Future Assignments Available*	7%	--	7%
<u>Reordered Career Values</u>			
Desire to Remain in Regiments	25%	21%	23%
Assignment Impacts on Career Intent*	14%	--	14%
Opinion about Three-Year Tour*	19%	--	19%
Opinion about Regimental Assignments*	21%	--	21%
Attraction of Differing US Assignments	67%	12%	40%

*Variables derived from interviews with leaders.

These responses indicated beliefs by COHORT soldiers that their COHORT assignments did not improve chances for choosing future assignments and that regimentalized soldiers' career opportunities were not as good as those of other soldiers in the Army.

Effect of present assignment on future assignments. Of the seven variables, two concerned effects of the present assignment on future assignments. Small percents of COHORT LDRs and FTs agreed that in their present assignments, freedom to choose their next assignment was as good as other soldiers in the Army. This finding was congruent with the small percent of COHORT LDRs believing that their present assignment increased the assignments available for future choice.

Career opportunities in the regiment. With five questionnaire items, COHORT soldiers assessed the effects of continuation in their regiments on the following career opportunities: (1) chances for changing career fields, (2) promotions, (3) next unit and post assignment, and (4) attending military schools. No more than 22% (Table 14) believed that any of these opportunities would be better relative to other soldiers in the Army. Closer examination revealed belief by COHORT soldiers that their chances would be worse than other soldiers for changing career fields (60%) or for having choice in either the next unit (58%) or post (58%) of assignment. Beliefs about opportunities for military schools differed for COHORT LDRs and FTs with relatively more FTs (53%) than LDRs (20%) believing that opportunities in the regiment would be relatively worse. Also, more COHORT FTs (38%) than COHORT LDRs (21%) negatively assessed their chances for promotion.

Restricted Career Opportunities

This characteristic pertained to career opportunities associated with assignment to a COHORT unit. Of the 13 variables for this characteristic, six were affirmed by fewer than 25% of the COHORT respondents (see Tables 14 and E5). One was affirmed by a high frequency. The remaining six were equally divided between relatively high and relatively low levels of affirmation. These 13 variables concerned personnel turnover, preference for (or choice of) present assignment, and career opportunities in a COHORT unit.

Personnel turnover. The variable with high affirmation concerned personnel turnover. Most COHORT soldiers agreed that it was difficult for soldiers to transfer even if they had good reasons. Despite this belief, about half of COHORT LDRs (or 51% of those indicating that unit members had tried to transfer)⁷ responded that their units had permitted transfers.

Ratings of the amount of LDR and FT turnover revealed two factors related to perceptions of turnover. Table 15 summarizes these ratings with respect to the two factors, that is, phase of unit life cycle and soldier status (or LDR vs FT). As Table 15 shows, COHORT soldiers in units at later life-cycle phases perceived more turnover by LDRs and FTs than did COHORT soldiers in

⁷Most COHORT LDRs (109 of 132) indicated that unit members had tried to transfer (see Table F9).

Table 15

Perception of Turnover in COHORT and Non-COHORT Units

Unit Type	Type of Soldier Leaving ^a	Perceived Number Leaving					
		0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26 +
<u>COHORT</u>							
<u>New</u>	FT n=59	98%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
	LDR n=59	95%	3%	0%	2%	0%	0%
<u>Middle</u>	FT n=124	59%	16%	7%	5%	4%	9%
	LDR n=123	74%	24%	2%	1%	0%	0%
<u>Old</u>	FT n=94	32%	10%	7%	7%	8%	35%
	LDR n=97	44%	29%	11%	8%	2%	5%
<u>All</u>	FT n=280	58%	11%	6%	5%	5%	16%
	LDR n=279	68%	21%	5%	4%	1%	2%
<u>Non-COHORT</u>							
	FT n=115	33%	31%	13%	10%	1%	11%
	LDR n=114	68%	23%	5%	1%	0%	4%

Note. Percent perceiving each number of first-term soldier (FT) or leader (LDR) leaving the unit since the respondent has been in the unit.

^a Entries are (1) type of soldier rated and (2) number of respondents rating the designated soldier type.

relatively younger units. Comparisons of COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers' ratings yielded a difference for FT turnover only. That is, soldiers in COHORT units indicated lower amounts of turnover by FTs than did Non-COHORT soldiers, but ratings of LDR turnover did not differ.

Preference for present unit assignment. COHORT LDRs (61%) and, to a lesser extent, FTs (43%) agreed that at the time of assignment to the unit, their preferences had been adequately considered. Despite this consideration, it seems that more had received COHORT assignments than had actually preferred. Only a small number of the COHORT respondents (20%) believed that the career soldiers in their units actually desired to be in the units. Moreover, interview responses indicated (see Table F10) that slightly less than half of the COHORT LDRs (48%) had originally wanted their assignments, with an equal percent expressing views of either not having wanted (24%) or not having had a choice (23%). These interview responses were further analyzed for positive expectations which may have been held for the assignment.⁸ As presented in Appendix F (see Table F11), nine groupings of positive expectations were derived. Most frequently cited was perceived opportunity to develop one's own unit. The other eight were: (1) improved training conditions, (2) quality personnel, (3) prospect of good career opportunities, (4) positive relationships among unit members, (5) opportunity for stabilized tours, (6) opportunity for assignment at a preferred location, (7) greater personnel stability (or less personnel turnover), (8) and desirable terms for foreign tours.

Career opportunities in the COHORT unit. The remaining eight variables for this characteristic described career opportunities or options (summarized in Table 14 and Table E5). These data suggest four patterns. First, a low frequency of COHORT (FTs and LDRs) agreed that chances in their units were as good as those of other soldiers for changing either career fields or posts and for choosing their next assignments. This list is extended to chances for changing units based on the frequency of agreement by COHORT FTs.⁹ Second, agreement was somewhat higher (that is, relatively low as opposed to low) about opportunities in the unit for either promotion (53%) or attending military schools (39%). Except for chances of changing career fields, COHORT LDRs more frequently agreed than FTs that these opportunities were good. Third, COHORT LDRs were not prone to believe that the COHORT assignment had improved their chances for either promotion or for military schooling. Rather, 62% to 73% believed that these opportunities had not been affected by assignment to a COHORT unit. Fourth, a relatively small frequency (30%) believed that COHORT soldiers' career opportunities were better than those of other soldiers in the Army. COHORT FTs (38%) more frequently than LDRs (21%) affirmed this view. In contrast, COHORT LDRs more frequently indicated than FTs (46% to 28%) that opportunities were about the same for COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers. Approximately equal percents of COHORT LDRs (33%) and FTs (34%) indicated relatively poorer opportunities for COHORT soldiers.

⁸Positive expectations were coded even if LDRs felt they had neither a choice nor desire for their present assignments.

⁹The item providing these responses was administered to FTs only.

Reordered Career Values

The number of variables receiving low affirmation (n=4) was smaller for this characteristic than for the characteristics concerning career restrictions. Nevertheless, 9 of the 13 representing variables were affirmed by no more than a relatively low frequency (see Table E7). The 13 variables together provided summary opinions about COHORT stabilization and evaluations of the COHORT assignment as a career experience. They also elicited beliefs about regimental affiliation and values--assignment variation and community integration--impacted by it.

COHORT stabilization. Beliefs as to whether transfer policies were fair and in the Army's best interests add to the opinions reported earlier on difficulty of transferring and amount of unit turnover. As summarized in Tables F12 and F13, slightly less than half (about 43%) of the COHORT LDRs, who reported that unit members had tried to transfer, expressed unqualified affirmative beliefs that their unit's transfer policies were either fair or in the Army best interests. Tables F12 and F13 also summarize the reasons associated with such beliefs.

These results on transfers were embellished by LDRs' overall opinions about the COHORT policies restricting transfer for three years. As Tables 14 and F14 show, only 19% expressed unqualified favorable opinions (explicit positive evaluations or description of only positive outcomes of the policy). However, an additional 34% provided mixed evaluations by expressing a combination of favorable and unfavorable opinions about three-year stabilized tours.

Beliefs associated with the favorable and unfavorable evaluations of three-year stabilized tours are summarized in Tables F15 and F16, respectively. The three most frequent favorable beliefs suggested that such tours provide opportunities for good interpersonal functioning, development of effective combat units, or improved training. Less frequently mentioned were the benefits associated with a stabilized environment and the favorability of such a tour only when the assignment's location is desirable. The types of unfavorable beliefs about stabilized tours were larger in number. In descending frequency of occurrence, these beliefs characterized three-year tours as: (1) lacking flexibility, (2) insensitive to need for rehabilitation transfers, (3) restricting opportunities for developmental assignments, (4) producing performance degradations (by individuals or of the unit as a whole) when transfers are not permitted, (5) creating inequities in the Army personnel system with respect to transfers, (6) inducing resistance to reductions in choice over assignments, (7) restricting opportunities for schools, (8) limiting the choices of locations available, (9) limiting promotion opportunities, and (10) being too long for assignment to one unit.

COHORT assignment as a career experience. Despite these opinions about COHORT stabilization, a stabilized tour in a COHORT unit was not necessarily regarded as an unfavorable career experience. For example, few COHORT LDRs (12%) believed that the COHORT assignment had negatively affected career

intention (see Table F17).¹⁰ When asked if they would now choose their present assignment, slightly more than half of the COHORT LDRs (56%) responded affirmatively (see Table F18). Table F19 summarizes the various reasons associated with such a response as follows: (1) high quality relationships that had developed among unit members, (2) unit achievements with respect to training or development, (3) LDR's identification with the present unit, (4) positive effects of personnel stability, (5) good career opportunities offered by the assignment, and (6) quality of the leadership in the present unit. The smaller percent (36%) who would not want to repeat the assignment experience expressed the following reasons: (1) confined opportunities, (2) existence of leadership problems, (3) poor quality of NCOs, and (4) the pressures of the assignment.

These findings are compatible with LDRs' interview responses as to whether the present unit assignment had been a good career experience (see Table F20). A relatively high percent of COHORT LDRs responded affirmatively (55%) either by explicitly describing the tour as a good experience or by describing what appeared to be desirable outcomes. Another 16% provided mixed evaluations. Only 16% gave exclusively negative evaluations of their COHORT tours. Table F21 summarizes ways that the assignment was described as having been a good or bad career experience. The most frequent positive descriptions were that career records had been helped or that the assignment had been a good leadership experience. The following positive aspects were reported by relatively fewer COHORT LDRs: (1) good unit training, (2) receipt of a promotion, (3) opportunity to develop soldiers, (4) benefits stemming from personnel stability, and (5) realization of a positive idiosyncratic effect. Having to remain in an undesired location was most frequently expressed by the COHORT LDRs who described negative aspects of the assignment. Negative aspects identified less frequently were as follows: (1) promotion problems, (2) reduced opportunities for military schools, (3) poor leader preparation, and (4) prospects of personality clashes.

Regimental affiliation. Opinions of regimental affiliation were measured by two variables representing reordered career values. There was low agreement by both COHORT LDRs and FTs that they wanted to remain in their current regiment (see Table 14). Such a negative view was also represented in LDRs' opinions about career-long regimental assignments, that is, the COHORT policies according to which soldiers would always be assigned to the same locations stateside and/or overseas for most of their careers. Such opinions were treated as positive affirmation only if a favorable view without qualification was given in the interviews. Only 20% of the responding COHORT LDRs provided such responses (see Table F22). An appreciably larger percent of COHORT LDRs (49%) provided unfavorable opinions without qualification.

The reasons associated with these opinions about regimental assignments are also presented in Table F22. Three groups of positive reasons were identified. The most frequently cited group concerned opportunities for a predictable and stable homebase. This was followed by belief that such a career

¹⁰Indeed most (71%) report that assignment to a COHORT unit had had no effect on career intention.

pattern would not be bad (or alternatively, more acceptable) if a soldier liked the location of continued assignment. Relatively smaller percents believed that the regimental career pattern affords better opportunities for training. Five groups of reasons were associated with negative opinions of the regimental pattern. The most frequent reasons were as follows: (1) preference for greater variation in locations of assignment (to include more opportunities for travel), (2) the importance of liking the location of assignment, and (3) dislike of restricted choice. Smaller portions of the COHORT LDRs with negative opinions either (1) indicated that greater variation in location of assignment is needed for career development or (2) expressed dissatisfaction with the prospect of career-long association with the same unit or group of soldiers.

Values affected by the NMS. The last five variables pertained to values or outcomes that are affected by the NMS but that tend to lie outside of the system itself. Of the five, three concerned sources of attraction associated with "variation". They were as follows: (1) assignment to different foreign locations, (2) opportunity to work with new people, and (3) assignment to different stateside locations. For COHORT LDRs and FTs, combined frequency of positive affirmation was relatively high for the first two sources of attraction and relatively low for the third source. More COHORT LDRs (67% to 84%) expressed attraction to these values than did COHORT FTs (12% to 58%).

The other two variables concerned liking of and involvement in the civilian community around the Army post of assignment. Frequency of agreement was relatively low for both variables, with COHORT soldiers somewhat more frequently indicating liking the civilian community (45%) than being involved in it (31%).

Common Career Development of First Termers

Of the three variables for this characteristic, two were questionnaire items concerning professional development opportunities for FTs (see Table E4). As Table E4 shows, a relatively low (27%) percent of COHORT FTs reported having good opportunities for professional development assignments. The percent of FTs expressing satisfaction with career development opportunities was relatively smaller (12%). COHORT LDRs' views were more positive with 58% expressing the availability of good opportunities for FTs and 27% believing that FTs were satisfied with the available opportunities.

The third variable for this characteristic was LDRs' opinions of the leadership of FTs who had held positions as LDRs. Analysis of interview responses indicated that 40% of the COHORT LDRs had positive opinions and that only 16% expressed an exclusively negative view (see Table F23). LDRs identified three areas in which FTs had demonstrated problems as LDRs. Two areas concerned interpersonal relationships, that is, FTs' differentiating themselves from peers and receiving respect as LDRs by others in the unit. The third area highlighted the novice status of FTs and covered a variety of skill deficiencies.

Differences Between COHORT LDRs and FTs

Of the questionnaire items, 37 were similar for COHORT LDRs and FTs. For 28 of these items, response distributions of COHORT LDRs and FTs significantly differed (see Appendix E). The pattern of difference was identical for all but three variables. According to this pattern, COHORT LDRs more frequently affirmed a variable. This tendency was manifested regardless of an item's content, that is, whether the item described an apparently favorable (e.g., promotion opportunities in the unit) or unfavorable (e.g., having to work more) condition or whether it described a condition concerning LDRs (e.g., unit leaders are respected) or FTs (e.g., satisfaction with opportunities for developmental assignments).

In one exception to this pattern, COHORT FTs expressed more favorable opinions. Specifically, FTs more frequently indicated that they were able to depend on other unit members for help in settling into and adjusting to the installation. The remaining two exceptions concerned opportunities relative to other soldiers in the Army: overall comparative career opportunities and opportunities for promotion if the respondent were to remain in the present regiment of assignment. For both of these variables, COHORT LDRs more frequently responded that opportunities were about the same as those of other soldiers in the Army. In contrast, COHORT FTs' views tended to be polarized and indicated more frequently than LDRs that their opportunities were both relatively better and worse than those of other soldiers in the Army.

Three NMS characteristics were represented by the nine variables for which responses of COHORT LDRs and FTs did not differ. Three variables represented unit developmental cycle: satisfaction with predictability of duty hours, satisfaction with the predictability of duty assignments, and uncertainty about meeting the expectations of FT soldiers. The remaining six variables represented NMS characteristics concerning the careers of soldiers. Five variables concerned opportunities "relative to other soldiers" for changing career fields (both in the present unit and in the regiment) and for controlling future assignments (freedom to choose next assignment and choice in the regiment for next post and unit of assignment). The sixth measured desire to remain in the present regiment of assignment. As described earlier (Table 14), these six variables were affirmed by low frequencies of both LDRs and FTs.

Differences Between COHORT and Non-COHORT Soldiers

Differences between the COHORT and Non-COHORT samples were obtained for only 16 variables. Of these 16, nine (all questionnaire variables) represented differences between the total COHORT and Non-COHORT samples, six differences between COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs (five interview and one questionnaire variables), and one difference between COHORT and Non-COHORT FTs (a questionnaire variable). This small number of differences possibly represents chance occurrences due to the number of tests conducted. This possibility is especially likely since a difference was obtained for at least one variable for most NMS characteristics. Despite this distribution, four NMS characteristics captured most (15 of 16) of the differences.

Of the 16 variables, five represented unit developmental cycle. For four of these variables, COHORT soldiers provided more positive views as follows: (1) relatively more frequent agreement by COHORT LDRs and FTs that the unit's NCOs and officers really cared about the welfare of their soldiers (two variables), (2) less uncertainty by COHORT LDRs of meeting their subordinates' expectations, and (3) more frequent descriptions by COHORT LDRs that their units had changed during the period of their assignment. The direction of differences is less certain for the fifth variable. That is, COHORT LDRs and FTs more frequently agreed that their workloads were greater than those of soldiers in other units.

Uncertainty about valence applies to two variables that represented opportunity/responsibility structure. More COHORT described pressure to excel and feeling this pressure.

Restricted career opportunities was described by six variables with differences. All but one difference suggested less belief by COHORT soldiers that assignment to a COHORT unit is advantageous. That is, COHORT LDRs and FTs more frequently expressed negative views of ability to transfer, chances for changing career fields and posts, and comparative career opportunities of COHORT soldiers. In the interviews, COHORT LDRs more frequently indicated that their present assignment would reduce their influence (choice) over the next assignment. The exception was that COHORT LDRs more frequently indicated having wanted or having chosen their present COHORT assignment.

Significant differences were also obtained for two variables representing reordered career values: the attractions of Army life derived from assignments to differing foreign locations and from the meeting of new people. For both variables, Non-COHORT soldiers (and especially Non-COHORT LDRs) expressed more agreement.

NMS Attitudes and Opinions About System Characteristics

Table 16 indicates for each NMS characteristic the number of variables about which opinions differed by level (low, medium, and high) of the four NMS attitude scales. In this table, distinctions are drawn between statistically significant differences obtained for only one attitude scale (labelled "unique") and differences obtained for two or more scales (labelled "common").

As presented in Table 16, most of the significant differences were obtained for two or more scales and were, therefore, common. These common differences usually involved one of the component scales (staying together, career stability, or involvement in the civilian community) and overall NMS attitude. This result could be expected as items in the component scales were also included in the overall measure.

Attitudes toward both staying together and the overall NMS measure produced most of the differences (see Table 16 and Appendix G). These differences tended to be both common and to follow one of two patterns. Most

Table 16

NMS Variables Differentiated by Level of Attitude

NMS Characteristic	NMS Attitude							
	Staying Together		Career Stability		Community Involvement		Overall Attitude	
	Uni ^a	Com ^b	Uni	Com	Uni	Com	Uni	Com
Unit Developmental Cycle (8 of 11)	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	6
Informal Group Influence (3 of 5)	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2
Responsibility/Opportunity Structure (6 of 12)	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	3
Common Career Development of First Termers (2 of 3)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Restricted Career Opportunities (9 of 13)	1	6	0	0	0	1	2	6
Restricted but Predictable Assignments (3 of 7)	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Reordered Career Values (11 of 13)	0	5	4	3	0	2	2	5
All Variables (42 of 64)	4	25	5	5	0	4	8	24

Note.--Number of variables representing each characteristic for which response distributions differed by level of each of the NMS attitudes.

^a Unique

^b Common

prevalent was the pattern of relatively more frequent affirmation for soldiers with high (positive) attitudes in contrast to more frequent uncertainty or disagreement for soldiers holding lower attitudes. The second pattern involved differences in the frequency of disagreement only, with soldiers holding lower attitudes more frequently expressing disagreement. Differences for staying together and overall NMS attitude were obtained for all of the NMS system characteristics defined in this effort. This distribution suggests that all NMS characteristics (and the conditions representing them) are together related to these attitudes.

The measures of career stability and community involvement yielded somewhat different results. As seen in Table 16, appreciably fewer differences were obtained for these measures. In addition, most of these differences were confined to one NMS characteristic, reordered career values. Of the 10 variables differentiated by career stability, seven represented this characteristic. These were as follows: opinion of stabilized tours; opinion of regimental assignments; liking of the local civilian community; desire to remain in current regiment of assignment; and the career attractiveness of varying foreign assignments, varying U.S. assignments, and meeting new people. Soldiers with higher attitude toward career stability more frequently expressed positive views about these variables with three exceptions. Soldiers with higher attitudes toward career stability less frequently agreed that differing foreign and U.S. assignments and the meeting of new people during reassignments were attractive features of a military career.

Liking of and involvement in the local civilian community were the two variables representing reordered career values and differentiated by attitude toward community involvement. For these variables, soldiers with higher attitudes expressed more positive views.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Results of this research effort support several conclusions with respect to the four research objectives. The conclusions are regarded as "preliminary" for two reasons. First, the effort was intended to be a "first step" which, depending on results, would lead to refinement of present measures and concepts and to use of a more representative sample of NMS units. The second reason concerns the NMS itself. As indicated earlier, the Army is "testing" the NMS as a personnel management system. Thus, the system is not yet firmly established and is open to revision based on experiences gained with its implementation. Major changes have occurred since this effort was conducted. Most notable, COHORT units are now battalion-level as well as company size. This change alone would alter the characteristics of the NMS as a system (e.g., unit developmental cycle). Thus, system changes and their effects on system characteristics deserve consideration in reviewing the conclusions discussed next.

NMS Attitudes

The first objective was to determine soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS. To do so, 10 items were developed to measure attitudes toward goals of the NMS. Factor analysis revealed that these 10 items did not represent a single dimension. Rather, three component attitudes were identified. Later inspection suggested that the component attitudes pertained to NMS goals that are more or less achieved by the two subsystems of the NMS. One component attitude concerned staying together in a unit which is achieved by COHORT. Career-long stability is achieved by the regimental system, and attitudes toward effects of career stability were measured by a second component attitude. The third component attitude concerned community involvement. Opportunity for community involvement is enhanced by homebasing, a central aspect of the regimental system. Other analyses showed that the three component attitudes were positively and significantly correlated with a composite measure of overall NMS attitudes. However, the correlations were moderately high at best. Altogether the findings indicate the appropriateness of considering attitudes toward the NMS and its two components as separate but interrelated phenomena.

Responses to the four attitudes scales lead to two conclusions. First, COHORT soldiers' attitudes toward the NMS are somewhat positive. Results for the measure of overall NMS attitudes support this conclusion. These results were also compatible with evaluations of COHORT elicited by two other items. One was the attitude item used in the COHORT/NMS evaluation: "Overall, what is your opinion of the COHORT idea?" The second was the interview question eliciting LDRs' overall assessment of COHORT. While the percent of COHORT LDRs giving unqualified positive evaluations was only about 20%, this percent grew to 75% when COHORT LDRs providing qualified positive evaluations were included. The tendency for slightly positive NMS attitudes was also uniform for all types of soldiers sampled with one exception. Non-COHORT FTs' evaluations of the COHORT idea were less positive than the other groups' evaluations and tended to be negative. How to account for this deviation is unclear in light of other results reported here and the more positive responses to this item by Non-COHORT FTs in past research (Tremble et al., 1983).

While attitudes toward the NMS concept were somewhat positive, attitudes were not highly positive, and the participating soldiers did not view the NMS to be free of problems. As just described, for example, most of the COHORT LDRs interviewed and providing evaluations of COHORT also described one or more problem with the system (see Table 9). Thus, NMS attitudes appear to be open to improvement perhaps by programs addressing the types of problems identified in this effort.

In determining the appropriateness of an intervention, however, distinction should be made between attitudes toward the NMS as a program and expressions of satisfaction by soldiers participating in trial NMS units. More specifically, the patterns of results for NMS attitudes and for the measures of satisfaction and morale differed. For example, comparison of COHORT LDRs and FTs found no difference in attitude toward the NMS. However, they did differ with respect to satisfaction and morale. Moreover, correlations be-

tween NMS attitudes and the measures of satisfaction and morale were low to moderate. These differences caution that expressions about satisfaction with conditions in a particular unit are not necessarily reliable indicators of attitudes toward the larger NMS program. Furthermore, programs based on (dis)satisfactions with local organizational conditions would effectively influence NMS attitudes only to the extent that the sources of satisfactions were also linked to the NMS.

During the period of this investigation, the NMS was designed to increase personnel stability in two respects. Through the COHORT component, the composition of a unit was to be stable for the life cycle of the unit. Regimental affiliation was to increase career stability in that soldiers would have continuous affiliation and repeated assignments to a relatively small number of units at a designated installation or homebase (as career and unit requirements permitted). This latter form of stability is the object of the second conclusion. Career-long stabilization and the career restrictions associated with it appear to be the least favorably regarded aspect of the NMS by COHORT soldiers.

Attitudes toward career-long stabilization were measured by the career stability attitude scale. Attitudes toward career stability tended to be neutral and, consequently, comparatively less favorable than the slightly positive attitudes obtained for the other attitudes measured. Neutral attitudes toward career stability were reflected in other results. Small percents of COHORT soldiers indicated that they wanted to remain in their current regiments of affiliation. Small percents of COHORT soldiers also believed that continued affiliation with their regiments would improve their chances for any of the following: changing career fields, choosing the next unit or post of assignment, promotion, or attending military schools.

The neutral attitudes toward career stability perhaps reflect trade-offs between the various effects of the NMS. More specifically, the interviews elicited beliefs that the NMS indeed accomplishes many of its intended effects. COHORT LDRs recognized and positively regarded the opportunities for predictability and homebasing. Three-year tours in COHORT units were also cited as conducive to good interpersonal functioning, development of effective units, and training. This positive impact on training opportunities was also expressed in COHORT LDRs' reasons for "doing it again based on hindsight", that is, now accepting assignment to their unit if given the chance. However, beliefs about these benefits seem to contrast with perceptions about the insensitivity of the NMS to the interests and needs of individuals which change over time.

Expressions of insensitivity were not confined to beliefs about the effects of regimental affiliation on career options. They were also intimated in the small percents of COHORT soldiers agreeing that their chances for choosing their next assignment or for changing career field, post, and unit were as good as those of other soldiers in the Army. Some form of career restriction or inflexibility was also identified as the most frequent reason for each of the following: not liking career-long stabilization, not liking

three-year stabilized tours in COHORT units, not choosing another tour in the unit if given a chance, and labeling their COHORT tour as a negative career experience.

If the NMS becomes the predominant personnel management system, it is possible that these trade-offs will eventually favor the NMS. Under such conditions, the differing opportunities afforded by the individual replacement system will be less available for comparison. Moreover, soldiers will have had greater experience with the benefits accruing from the NMS so that outcomes achieved through the individual careerism ascendent in the traditional personnel system may hold lower positions in their value hierarchies. Such a shift is perhaps suggested by results on the attractions of assignment variation and of meeting new people. These outcomes are restricted by the NMS, and COHORT soldiers expressed less agreement that they are sources of attraction to Army life.

COHORT Conditions and NMS System Characteristics

This research was based on the notion that consistent implementation of the NMS personnel management policies would create an operational system the characteristics of which would markedly differ from the conventional system. For the second research objective, COHORT soldiers indicated their agreement as to whether conditions representing a candidate set of NMS characteristics described their units. Differences between COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers' beliefs were examined as the third objective. Data for these two objectives support three conclusions.

First, COHORT is most clearly distinguished by conditions and associated system characteristics that directly pertain to personnel management. This was indicated by beliefs about the effects of COHORT assignments and career-long stabilization on the careers of soldiers. These include effects already reviewed about career opportunities. The data also confirmed that assignments of soldiers to units are more stable. Both COHORT LDRs and FTs had been stationed at their current installations and in their current units for longer periods of time than their Non-COHORT counterparts. These differences were such that based on time averages, COHORT FTs had spent about two-thirds of their careers in their present units. In contrast, less than half (about 45%) of the Non-COHORT FTs' time in service had passed in their present units. Evidence of greater stability was also found at the unit level where estimates of turnover were smaller for COHORT FTs than for Non-COHORT FTs. These estimates were reinforced by opinions about the difficulty of transferring from a unit.

A second conclusion is that COHORT is not clearly distinguished from Non-COHORT with respect to other operating conditions in a unit. Three system characteristics in the analytic framework pertained to such conditions: unit developmental cycle, opportunity/responsibility structure, and informal group influence. Most of the variables receiving high levels of affirmation represented these conditions, but the number of these conditions was small.

In addition, few differences between COHORT and Non-COHORT soldiers were obtained. Such results do not fully support the framework for this research which envisions NMS characteristics that distinguish COHORT units as units and the operational conditions internal to them.

COHORT's lack of distinction on unit operating conditions could be due to a conceptual or methodological weakness in this effort. It is important to note, however, that personnel stabilization is not alone sufficient to create such conditions as progressive unit development, military cohesion, etc. Other factors are involved and are possibly as critical as stabilization. It may be that these factors need to be identified and systematically promoted by provisions of the NMS.

Despite the lack of distinction, trends pertinent to several characteristics of operating NMS conditions are noteworthy and perhaps merit further investigation. One trend concerns unit developmental cycle. Compared to their Non-COHORT counterparts, more COHORT LDRs reported that their units had changed. This difference is possibly an outcome of unit stability in that COHORT LDRs had been in their units longer than had the Non-COHORT LDRs. As such, COHORT LDRs' opportunities to observe change were simply greater. Other data suggest that observation of change may indicate the realization of other opportunities provided by COHORT. That is, several interview responses indicated that opportunities to develop a unit were attractive aspects of COHORT. Such an opportunity was identified as a positive expectation which COHORT LDRs had held prior to their assignments and which had been met. Positive unit development was also identified as the second most frequent reason that COHORT LDRs would again accept assignment to their units if given the opportunity. Similar opportunities were also described as a favorable aspect of the three-year stabilized tour in a COHORT unit.

Another trend pertained to both unit developmental cycle and opportunity/responsibility structure. It involved the following three variables concerning requirements for effort: (1) workload in the unit compared to other units, (2) pressure to excel, and (3) feeling this pressure. The COHORT sample scored higher on all three variables. Higher scores could be interpreted as indicators of greater stress in COHORT units. While such an interpretation is possibly accurate, an equally plausible interpretation is that these scores are positive indicators of the opportunities for unit development and achievement in COHORT units. The latter interpretation is compatible with the effect of pressure to excel that was most frequently described by COHORT LDRs--professional motivation.

Other evidence indicates that interpersonal relationships may have special significance in COHORT units. Results highlight relationships among FTs and, accordingly, the system characteristic of informal group influence. In discussions of peer pressure and cohesion among FTs, COHORT LDRs often described their FTs as if they were a separate and distinguishable group. This group's influence on its members was also described. Positive influences were almost exclusively identified, with many indicating an eagerness for excellence by FTs and a tendency for self control by the body of FTs to achieve excellence. Vertical bonding between LDRs and FTs was not thoroughly addressed in this effort. Nevertheless, COHORT soldiers' greater agreement

about the care shown by their officers and NCOs possibly indicates that the significance of interpersonal relationships in COHORT units extends beyond FTs and includes relationships between LDRs and their subordinates.

The third conclusion is that compared to first-term soldiers, COHORT leaders are more positive about NMS conditions except career opportunities. More specifically, COHORT FTs and LDRs' attitudes toward the NMS and its components were similar. However, their opinions did differ about most (28 of 37) of the NMS conditions for which comparisons were possible. In all but three differences, COHORT LDRs expressed more positive opinions than did the COHORT FTs.

Exceptions to this pattern suggest a belief by COHORT LDRs that the NMS does not increase career opportunities. This belief was manifested in two ways. One involved measures on which COHORT LDRs and FTs differed. These were assessments of the overall comparative career opportunities in COHORT and of the specific opportunities for promotion in the regiment. Rather than being more favorable than FTs about these opportunities, COHORT LDRs tended to be neutral and more frequently indicated that their opportunities were unaffected by (or no different in) either COHORT or regimental affiliation. While beliefs of "no effect" are not necessarily negative, they nevertheless fail to convey a positive perception. The other manifestation provided a more direct indictment. It covered beliefs about the effects of COHORT and regimental affiliation on the following three opportunities: changing career fields, changing or choosing post of assignment, and changing or choosing unit of assignment. For these opportunities, COHORT LDRs and FTs did not differ, and both agreed that their opportunities were not as good as other soldiers in the Army and not enhanced by continued regimental affiliation.

While both components of the NMS have implications for changing career fields and choosing the units and locations of future assignment, future choices are most affected by regimental affiliation. This NMS component was most clearly represented in the system characteristic of restricted but predictable assignments. As the earlier discussion implies, responses generally indicated little agreement that opportunities representing this characteristic create an advantage. Relative to other system characteristics, this characteristic also showed the fewest differences between COHORT LDRs and FTs. Moreover, the differences between COHORT LDRs and FTs for this characteristic pertained to forms of mobility (promotions and military schooling) which COHORT LDRs believed to be unaffected by the NMS. Thus, COHORT LDRs' less positive opinions about opportunities for changing career fields and controlling future assignments tend to reinforce a previous conclusion: career-long stabilization and the career restrictions associated with it appear to be the least favorable regarded aspects of the NMS by COHORT soldiers. They may also possibly imply two conditions under which such stability would be appealing, that is, when soldiers are stabilized in career fields and geographical locations that are personally desirable.

NMS Attitudes and System Characteristics

The appropriateness of considering the dimensionality of NMS attitudes was discussed earlier. This appropriateness was further underscored by findings about the relationships between attitude measures and NMS conditions. For many variables, opinions differed by level of attitude. Moreover, the differences obtained for one attitude were often obtained for one or more additional attitudes. Despite this overlap, the pattern of relationships with the NMS variables was not the same for all attitude measures. Overall NMS attitude and attitude toward staying together produced the greatest number of differences. Differences for these two attitudes also pertained to practically all of the NMS characteristics. In contrast, few differences were obtained for career stability and community involvement. The few differences were also concentrated in one system characteristic--reordered career values. These data support the following conclusion: beliefs about conditions representing NMS characteristics are associated with attitudes toward the NMS, but the pattern of associations varies with the attitude measured.

These differences in patterns of relationships have a potentially important implication for the design of programs for influencing NMS attitudes. Specifically, the programs should vary depending on the attitude(s) to be influenced.

With respect to attitudes toward the regimental system, two alternative focuses are immediately evident from this effort. One is related to beliefs about career opportunities and restrictions. Most COHORT soldiers did not believe that their opportunities were improved by affiliation with the NMS, and many believed that their opportunities had lessened. Such beliefs and attitudes toward career stability might be favorably influenced by a program with two objectives: (1) accurate knowledge of which career opportunities are affected by the NMS and the nature of these effects compared to the Army's traditional personnel system and (2) accurate knowledge of the means available for soldiers to assert their individual choices and to achieve their own career goals. Such a program could be regarded as based on a "training" approach.

An alternative to the training approach is a "management" approach and centers on findings about the life-style attractions of differing foreign assignments, meeting new people, and liking of and involvement in the local civilian community. Opinions about the latter varied by level of attitude toward career stability and/or community involvement. These differences suggest the possibility of a regimental program that considers a soldier's community preferences. Such a management program could involve some combination of, first, matching soldiers' regional (or community) preferences and the regimental homebases having personnel requirements and, second, selecting soldiers for participation in the NMS according to their desires for career stability (as opposed to desires for seeing the world).

Attitudes toward COHORT or staying together would likely be affected by programs concerning career opportunity. However, these attitudes were also related to conditions internal to the unit. As discussed earlier, the data are unclear about differences between COHORT and Non-COHORT with respect to internal units conditions. Despite this uncertainty, several trends were identified and discussed. While trends provide weak guidance for program design, they nevertheless seem to emphasize the importance of leadership skills that capitalize on the COHORT opportunities for unit development and the close interpersonal relationships among soldiers (especially FTs).

REFERENCES

- Department of the Army (October 1982). The New Manning System: Unit Replacement/Regimental System. DA Circular 600-82-2. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army.
- Tremble, T.R., Jr., Kerner-Hoeg, S., & Bell, D.B. (1983). Results of the New Manning System evaluation survey: First semi-annual report. L&M Working Paper 83-03. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Tremble, T.R., Jr., Yoest, E.R., & Bell, D.B. (1984). Results of the New Manning System evaluation survey: Second semi-annual report. L&M Working Paper 84-02. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

APPENDIX A

OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEM CREATED BY
THE PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OF THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM

Appendix A

OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEM CREATED BY THE PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OF THE NEW MANNING SYSTEM

In one respect, the New Manning System (NMS) is a body of management practices regulating both unit personnel composition and individual soldier career assignments. Table A1 summarizes these practices from DA Circular 600-82-2. When enacted, however, these practices create an operational system of individuals and organizations. Since the NMS practices differ from those of the conventional individual replacement system (IRS), a critical question concerns the system characteristics that would be derived from the NMS practices. This is critical since the characteristics are first-level outcomes of the NMS intervention. Their specification also provides a framework for systematic examination of the NMS as it exists in the field.

This appendix is an initial attempt to identify characteristics of the NMS as an operational system. These characteristics were identified by considering the NMS management practices and projecting how units and organizations in the NMS would differ from units managed by the conventional IRS. Thus, the characteristics described here are notional and have not been subject to validation. In addition, their utility would be increased if they were integrated into a systems perspective that is both more theoretical and independent of the NMS itself. Finally, the characteristics depend on extant NMS practices. Thus, to the extent that NMS practices have changed since this writing, the characteristics expected of the system would differ.

The characteristics which we identified are described next. They are ordered according to the element of the NMS system which they were believed to characterize: COHORT units, first-term soldiers and leaders in COHORT units, regimental communities of units and personnel, and the NMS as a whole.

CHARACTERISTICS OF COHORT UNITS

Unit Developmental Cycle

A COHORT unit has a developmental cycle--from a "beginning" to an "end"--which provides opportunities for and imposes requirements on unit leaders and the larger organizational network. A COHORT unit forms from "scratch". The majority of first-term soldiers enter service and begin training at the same time. Leaders are identified and assembled as a group for the unit. In concept, unit members as individuals and as a group have a mutually predictable future that lasts until the target date for unit disestablishment. Once the first termers and leaders are combined in a field setting, the organizational shape of a unit emerges, and the unit begins to take on its own properties. These idiosyncratic properties are perpetuated, altered, or otherwise shaped as the unit prepares to and actually meets requirements at forecasted periods in its history

Table A-1
Personnel Management Practices of the NMS

<u>Life-Cycle Phase/Event</u>	<u>Management Practice</u>
I. <u>Pre-Unit Formation</u>	1. <u>First-Term soldiers</u> a. <u>Date of entry in service.</u> Date of entry is common for the first termers earning the predominant ("high density") military occupational specialty (MOS) in a COHORT unit. b. <u>Entry strength level.</u> The number of first-termers recruited and undergoing initial entry training (IET) for a COHORT unit is large enough to produce 105% and 50% of the unit's E1-E4 and E5 MOS requirements, respectively, by the end of IET. c. <u>IET.</u> The first termers targeted for a COHORT unit and in the high density MOS of the unit undergo IET together as a group. d. <u>Identified first-duty assignment.</u> The first-termers undergoing IET know the unit and location of their first-duty assignment. They are issued the patch of their division/assignment unit at the beginning of IET. e. <u>Strength maintenance.</u> If attrition before or during IET reduces the required strength level for a unit (see 1b, above), first termers are added so that the strength requirements are met.

Table A-1

(Continued)

- f. Orientation to first-duty assignment. Prior to graduation from IET, first termers are briefed by leaders of their FORSCOM COHORT unit.
- g. Bar to participation in volunteer programs. First termers in training for a COHORT unit may not be recruited (or volunteer) for or otherwise receive special assignments (e.g., Special Forces, OCS, Airborne training) that divert them from their targeted FORSCOM unit of assignment.
- h. Escorted relocation. Upon completion of IET, the first-termers travel as a group to the FORSCOM installation of their COHORT unit and are accompanied by leaders of their FORSCOM unit.

2. Unit leaders²

- a. More stringent enlisted selection criteria. Suggested criteria for selection of enlisted leaders are more stringent with respect to special qualifying criteria for position incumbents, profiles, nationality, criminal record, time in service, and other factors at the discretion of the commander of the installation at which the COHORT unit is located.
- b. Mandatory assignment of enlisted personnel. Career enlisted soldiers (not in a special reenlistment bonus category) have terms of service that cover the life cycle of their COHORT unit. If remaining time in service does not cover the life cycle, a careerist selected for a COHORT unit has to reenlist

Table A-1

(Continued)

or extend to obtain sufficient service time or, if unwilling to do so, sign a declination of continued service. In reenlistings, the careerist may not select an option that will cause him to leave the unit before its life cycle has been completed.

c. Strength level. For deploying COHORT units, 100% of the authorized enlisted leader positions (E5-E8) are filled prior to unit formation. For non-deploying COHORT units, these positions are filled at a level no lower than the installation averages for such positions.

d. By-grade substitution. At least 50% of the NCO positions are to be filled by soldiers holding the appropriate rank with the remainder filled by soldiers one grade lower than authorized.

e. Leader headstart. Leaders arrive at the the installation/unit between 30 and 90 prior to formation of the unit⁴ as a whole.

f. Hand-off of first-term soldiers. Before their first termers have graduated from IET, leaders of the unit meet with the IET instructors to discuss training progress recommendations for manning of the unit (to include candidates for NCO substitution⁵).

1. NCO substitution. First term soldiers fill up to 50% of the E5 positions in the unit.

II. Unit Formation

Table A-1

(Continued)

2. Fenced period for initial readiness training. COHORT units undergo a period of readiness training after they have formed.
 - a. COHORT units may receive a fair share of special duty requirements after completion of initial readiness training.
 - b. A C-5 readiness rating may be carried for two reporting periods when authorized by the responsible major command.

III. CONUS Sustainment⁶

1. Personnel stabilization

- a. COHORT soldiers personnel files are to be coded so that they do not receive instructions for assignment out of the unit.
- b. Approved personnel actions that would cause assignment out of a COHORT unit are to be delayed until the end of the unit's life cycle.

2. Strength maintenance

- a. Prior to 90 days before deployment, strength levels in deploying COHORT units will be maintained at these levels:
 - 95% of the original authorization for first termers.
 - 95% of the authorization of NCOs in high density MOSSs.
 - 100% of the authorization of officers and NCOs in low density MOSSs.

Table A-1

(Continued)

- b. Strength levels in non-deploying COHORT units may be allowed to sink no lower than installation average.
- 3. Accelerated promotions for enlisted personnel. The method for computing eligibility for promotion to grades E2, E3, and E4 is altered to take into account the common time in service of first-termers and, thereby, to allow more promotions for soldiers with lesser time in service.
- 1. Preparation for permanent change of duty station (PCS). All members of a COHORT unit destined to rotate overseas make their PCSs at the same time.
- 2. Predeployment training. Prior to rotation OCONUS, COHORT units and their members train or otherwise prepare for performance in the OCONUS area of operation, to include:
 - a. Training in individual skills required in the OCONUS setting.
 - b. Collective training to meet OCONUS training standards prior to rotation OCONUS.
 - c. Preparation (through exchange of liaison teams, review of standard operational procedures, etc.) to ensure that a rotating COHORT unit as an organization is prepared to operate in the larger OCONUS organization with which it will join.
 - d. Advanced completion of administrative processing normally accomplished after PCS/rotation OCONUS.

IV. Predeployment

Table A-1

(Continued)

3. Extended eligibility for family housing. Eligibility for family housing is extended so that:
 - a. All COHORT families rotating to Germany may be provided government quarters if normally eligible families currently in Germany are also provided government quarters.
 - b. Families of a COHORT sponsor and in a non-concurrent travel status may retain on-post quarters beyond the normal 140-day limit if approved by the local commander.

V. Deployment

1. Unit rotation. Units as wholes rotate OCONUS.

2. Shorter unaccompanied tours. The tour for married soldiers electing unaccompanied OCONUS tours is 18 months.

VI. Disestablishment.

1. Common PCS date. Especially for the unaccompanied soldiers in a unit, the dates for PCS/DROS tend to be common.
2. Unit disestablishment. At the end of their three-year life cycles, COHORT units are disestablished or disbanded. A unit's members receive assignments that may or may not keep career soldiers together.
3. Regimental assignments⁸. If assigned at battalion level or lower, a regimentally affiliated soldier may be assigned to a unit of his regiment.

VII. Regimental Affiliation.

1. Affiliation of soldiers to regiment. Soldiers in the predominant combat combat arms specialty of a unit become associated with a

Table A-1

(Continued)

regiment when their unit is designated as part of a regiment or when a previously unaffiliated soldier is assigned to a unit that is a part of a regiment.

2. Career-long regimental assignments. To the extent possible, assignments to units and locations will be affected by a soldier's regimental affiliation as long as the soldier remains in the regiment.

- a. Assignments at battalion level or lower will be made to elements of the soldier's regiment either stateside or OCONUS.
- b. Location of the regimental unit will be taken into account when an affiliated soldier receives a TDA assignment or a tactical assignment at a level higher than battalion.

¹This applies to IET groups that are not granted leave enroute after graduation from IET.

²Defined as "career" soldiers, that is, those who are beyond their first term of service.

³Masculine pronouns are used here since, at this writing, all COHORT soldiers were males.

⁴As used here, unit "formation" occurs when the first-term soldiers arrive at their targeted FORSCOM unit of assignment.

⁵NCO substitution is presented later as a management practice.

⁶This describes (a) for deploying units, the period after initial unit training and prior to preparation for deployment overseas and (b) for non-deploying units, the period after initial unit training and prior to disestablishment.

⁷Overseas will subsequently be referred to as "OCONUS", or outside of the contiguous territory of the states on the North American Continent.

⁸This may apply only to those soldiers who are OCONUS at disestablishment.

(e.g., certification of the unit's operational readiness, predeployment training, rotation to an overseas station, and the eventual disbanding of the unit).

Variance Properties

Phenomena linked to unit development tend to (a) be homogeneously descriptive of or common to all members of a particular COHORT unit and (b) pulse with the unit's developmental cycle. In COHORT units, the career (and personal) development of individual soldiers is correlated with unit development due to the experience levels of leaders (see later) and the status of the E4s and below in the unit (i.e., first term of service, first tour of service, common data of entry into service). Moreover, transactions traditionally occurring for individuals on the basis of their unique career situations tend to occur at the level of the unit and, thus, occur at about the same time for all eligible members in the unit. These transactions include the following: entry into service, initial exposure to collective training, preparation for PCS (or "rotation"), and organizational exit. As a result, variance in phenomena linked to organizational development or change tends to be different in COHORT units in at least two interrelated ways. First, there should be less variance in the individuals in a COHORT unit at any particular cross section in the unit's life cycle. That is, there is potentially more homogeneity with the tendency that either most or none of the members of a COHORT unit will be experiencing a particular phenomena at the same time period. For example, more members of a COHORT unit are new to the unit, installation, and the Army at the time of unit formation. Problems associated with "newness" should also be experienced by more members of the unit at that time. Second, phenomena at the level of the unit will pulse through time in the life cycle and will occur at a smaller number of periods in the life cycle (as opposed to steadily throughout the life cycle). For example, relocation problems should be non-existent in COHORT units in a few months after unit formation if unit members and their families have successfully resolved relocation problems when they are initially transferred to their duty station.

Organizational Synchrony

The life cycle of a COHORT unit unfolds within a larger and ongoing organizational system that does not share the life-cycle characteristics of COHORT. The operation of the larger Non-COHORT system assumes replacement by individuals and, accordingly, a relatively steady rate of personnel turnover in units. Changes within COHORT units are not as constant due to their developmental sequence and variance properties. As a result, the fit between COHORT units and the larger system is potentially antagonistic. For example, the needs of a COHORT unit may not be supported by externally generated training opportunities/requirements that have not been scheduled to fit a COHORT unit's developmental status.

Alternately, a COHORT unit could increase the special requirements shouldered by other units because of either the system's need to support the unique status of a COHORT unit or the unavailability of the COHORT unit for sharing its load of special duties (e.g., during the periods of initial unit training or predeployment training).

Contained Unit History

Each COHORT unit develops a unique organizational history which is contained within its life cycle. COHORT units have unit histories that differ from the histories of conventional units. First, the history of a COHORT unit develops as the unit progresses through its life cycle. Second, this history is unique to the body of soldiers composing the unit. Third, all members of the unit share the same history to the extent that unit stabilization is achieved. Such a history differs from that of a conventional unit which spans successive generations of soldiers and which is imperfectly transmitted by the soldiers whose memories reflect, among other things, their varying tenures in the unit.

Informal Group Influence

The potential for informal group influence among lower ranking soldiers is greater in COHORT units. In any military unit as large as a company, sub-groups will develop that are not acknowledged on charts of formal organizational structure. Moreover, these informal groups can influence their members in ways that may or may not conform to the formal direction of the unit's chain of command. This potential for informal group development and control is greater in COHORT units. In particular, COHORT first-term soldiers represent a group (sometimes called a "package") that at the outset is distinguished from other elements of the unit by such factors as: (a) their demographic characteristics (e.g., age); (b) common individual-level training experiences which have not been shared by other elements of the unit; (c) transition as a group from a training installation to their first field duty installation. Conditions that initially set first termers apart are possibly reinforced by other conditions that emerge later in the unit life cycle. Most notable are the conditions that stem from the stabilization practices designed for COHORT units. These practices tend to retain lower-ranking soldiers in their units for the duration of the life cycle. In contrast, high-ranking soldiers, such as the company commander, are more open to transfer out of the unit. Thus, interpersonal relationship among lower ranking soldiers (whether formal or informal) may be more stable across time.

Sanctioned Period of Low Unit Readiness

COHORT units are not expected to be combat ready when they are initially formed. Performance degradation is expected during the early period of the COHORT unit's history, that is, when personnel are first assembled into an operating unit and have not had an opportunity to train

assembled into an operating unit and have not had an opportunity to train together. As a result, status ratings indicating low readiness are, with MACOM approval, acceptable for the first 90 days of a COHORT unit's history.

Organizational Interchange

Units as wholes (as opposed to individuals from a unit) pass from one organizational/operational context into another. Within the conventional personnel system, individuals pass into new units as they either move from the training base to a field unit or transfer from one unit to another. Adjustment involves mutual accommodation between the incoming individual and the receiving unit. This differs in the NMS in that whole units as well as the individuals comprising them change from one organizational context to another. Consequently, adjustment to new organizations involves more than accommodation of incoming individuals with the receiving organization. It also includes inter-organizational adjustment so that incoming and receiving units function as one organization.

Training for Organizational Interchange

COHORT units have dedicated periods of training for performance in the organizational contexts into which they pass. COHORT units have at least two periods allocated for training to insure effectiveness in the specific organizational contexts that they enter. The first, initial entry collective training, applies to all COHORT units. This training occurs when a COHORT unit initially forms and is designed to mold the unit into an effective organization. The training is also oriented on preparing both the unit and its personnel to achieve their assigned combat mission. The second applies to COHORT units that deploy or rotate to an "overseas" (or OCONUS) setting such as Alaska, Korea, or Europe (USAREUR). This predeployment training focuses explicitly on organizational interchange. It encompasses individual skills, collective capabilities, and organizational operation required in the OCONUS organization which a COHORT is about to enter. Training for organizational passage is not necessarily prescribed for or available to individual soldiers who are transferred in the conventional management system.

Personnel Stability

The membership of a COHORT unit is more stable and less open to turnover. Several management practices have been devised to reduce turnover and, thus, increase personnel stability. Most of these mechanisms apply to the lower-level enlisted soldier. The mechanisms include:

(1) First termers completing IET are barred from participation in voluntary or special programs (such as hometown recruitment duty, OCS, airborne training) that would divert them from the COHORT unit of assignment.

(2) Career enlisted soldiers who join a COHORT unit must either reenlist or extend their terms of service for a period that covers the life cycle of the unit.

(3) Personnel records centralized at the Army level are annotated with assignment to a COHORT unit. Personnel with annotated files are not to receive instructions for reassignment out of their COHORT units.

(4) Approved personnel actions that would cause assignment out of the COHORT unit are delayed until the end of the unit's life cycle.

(5) Installation commanders apply the intent of the NMS and determine the length of time that officers are stabilized in their COHORT units of assignment.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRST-TERM SOLDIERS IN COHORT UNITS

Organizational Entry of First Termers

The first-term soldiers with the predominant combat arms MOS have a history of organizational entry which provides them common characteristics. These characteristics differentiate first termers from other members of the unit. The first termers in a COHORT unit are more common or homogeneous with respect to several characteristics. First termers enter service at about the same time. Prior to active duty, they were also subject to the same recruitment conditions. As a result, the first termers in a COHORT unit are likely more similar with respect to demographic characteristics (age, marital status, etc.) than first termers in conventional units who enter service at differing times. After entry into service, COHORT first termers undergo initial entry individual training together as a group. This provides a set of shared experiences, accomplishments, and common skill levels. The early training is especially important as it represents soldiers' orientation to military service. Given commonality of orientation, COHORT first termers' expectations about the military are more likely to be similar.

These characteristics at the time of unit formation tend to differentiate the first termers from other members of a COHORT unit. For example, most of the other unit members are career soldiers drawn from an older and more experienced population. Also, the other unit members did not directly participate in the first termers' entry training and have only second-hand access to these experiences. This differentiation at the start of a unit is likely compounded by other features of COHORT which further separate the first termers from the higher-ranking soldiers in the unit. These include:

(1) At the time of unit formation, the first termers are newcomers who enter the field or turf of the career soldiers.

(2) The junior ranks in a unit (E4 and below) are held by first termers.

(3) A unit's life cycle is timed more with first termers' terms of service than with the terms of career soldiers. As a result, first termers are likely to experience more of the life cycle; in this respect, the life cycle tends to belong to them.

Common Career Development

Career development levels and career progression needs linked to time-in-service tend to be similar for the first-term soldiers in COHORT units. Except for individual and experiential differences due to duty assignments, level of military experience tends to be similar for the first-term soldiers in COHORT units. The similarity stems from the common time of entry into and training for service. Early in the life cycle, levels of skills and general military experiences are immature. Later in the life cycle, development should be greater than in conventional units. Career progression needs would also be similar for COHORT first termers. As used here, needs refer to potential aspirations (e.g., promotion, opportunity to perform at higher skill levels) as well as deficits that pose performance problems.

Restricted Extra-Organizational Career Experiences

Opportunities for career experiences outside the COHORT unit are restricted in comparison to those for first-term soldiers in conventional units. The intent of the NMS is to stabilize soldiers in a COHORT unit for the unit's life cycle. Accordingly, management guidelines tend to rule against any assignment for a COHORT first termers that would permanently and prematurely remove the soldier from the unit. Such guidelines do not prevent application for opportunities outside the COHORT unit of assignment. However, the guidelines result in delays of personnel actions that would cause assignment out of the unit. Moreover, to the extent that opportunities are available momentarily, they would be rendered inaccessible to COHORT soldiers if the requirement to delay were enforced.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CAREER SOLDIERS IN COHORT UNITS

Opportunity and Responsibility Structures

Circumstances in COHORT units are such that opportunities for affecting unit development and performance are greater and that their responsibility for (influence over) achievement in these areas is more clearly identifiable. When assigned to COHORT units, leaders are given "new" units, that is, units that are to be transformed from an assembly of

individuals devoid of unit history into operationally effective organizations. This contrasts to the assumption of leadership in a conventional unit which is ongoing and established. Unlike a conventional assignment, a COHORT unit also has a forecasted life span. Such a life span has implications for goal setting. Finally, soldiers have stabilized tenures in COHORT units which stabilize the resources implied by personnel and tour lengths. Under these conditions, leaders have a better opportunity to develop units that reflect themselves as leaders. Moreover, these conditions reduce variation in factors that impact on effectiveness. As a result, the factors having actually influenced a unit's achievements are possibly more obvious, to include leadership factors and their enactment in the unit.

Leader Rehearsal

Leaders who are career soldiers have the opportunity to train or otherwise to function together before the unit as a whole assembles and must perform operationally. In the conventional system, a leader assumes a position in an ongoing organization when entering a unit. There is no designated or uniformly prescribed period of training or other preparation specifically tailored to the new assignment before its duties must be performed. Systematic programs are also unavailable for the leaders who must receive another incoming leader (so they can learn to work with the new leader before they must perform as an integrated leadership team). In concept, this situation differs in COHORT units. Unit leaders arrive at the FORSCOM installation 30 or more days before the first termers arrive and the unit forms. This period provides COHORT leaders an opportunity to adapt to aspects of their new assignments and to develop a working leadership structure before they must lead a fully operational unit.

Growth in Military Experience

The military experience of the leaders of COHORT units grows from relatively less experienced to relatively more experienced throughout the life cycle. In concept, the military experience of the leaders of a COHORT unit is comparatively lower than conventional units at the beginning of the unit's life cycle. This stems from the management practices designed to permit career progression within the unit of assignment. That is, 50% of the E5 positions are filled by first termers who would have just completed IET when a unit is first formed. Moreover, management practices foster less experience of careerist NCOs by recommending, first, NCO grade substitution and, second, the selection of other NCOs who have a short enough time in grade that they will not be promoted during the life cycle of a unit. As the life cycle progresses, the experiences of a unit's leaders will increase in tandem and will become greater than that found in conventional units. At least two forms of experience are significant. These are (a) the knowledges, skills, and

attitudes applicable to like leadership positions in any unit and (b) the personal knowledges and abilities derived from a particular organizational setting.

Knowledge of Subordinates

Subordinates of first-term leaders have more (and probably unique) knowledge of these leaders than do the leaders' superiors. After a COHORT unit is formed, a number of first-term soldiers are selected to fill positions of E5 NCOs and, thereby, given an early career reward and advantage. This has significance in that first termers have longer and more direct knowledge of each other's performance record than do the cadre who have determined which first termers will fill leadership roles. The implications of the selection of first termers for leadership positions are unclear. A likely critical factor, however, is the fit between the first termers selected as leaders and the remaining first termers' evaluations of these soldiers. This fit is not only of importance for relationships between first-term leaders and their subordinates (other first termers), but also for relationships within the unit's cadre. These relationships provide early clues about the cadre's criteria for bestowing career rewards and/or their acumen about their subordinates' performance capabilities.

Restricted Career Opportunities

Especially for those in the lower enlisted ranks, career/professional opportunities are restricted in comparison to careerists not selected for or assigned to COHORT units. Selection for and assignment to COHORT units tends to restrict the career opportunities open to COHORT soldiers, relative to those of soldiers in conventional units. This begins with selection for assignment to a COHORT unit. That is, enlisted careerists must reenlist or extend their terms of service to cover the life cycle of their targeted unit. If they refuse to do so, they must sign a declaration of continued service beyond their present terms of service. This approximates the mandate of "join COHORT or leave service" since the NCOs selected for a COHORT unit are to have terms of service that cover the unit's life cycle. As described elsewhere, guidelines for personnel stabilization further restrict opportunities that require transfer out of a COHORT unit. It is noteworthy that COHORT enlisted soldiers may be relatively more restricted than are officers. That is, the NMS guidelines are less clear for officers, recommend that officers' tours cover the life cycle, and indicate that officers' stabilization dates are determined by the assigning installation as opposed to the life cycle of the COHORT unit of assignment.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIMENTAL SYSTEM

Restricted but Predictable Assignments

With continued regimental affiliation, a soldier's possible assignments after leaving a COHORT unit (or other regimentally associated unit) are (a) relatively restricted but (b) more predictable with respect to location and unit. Soldiers in the predominant combat arms specialty of a COHORT unit became affiliated with the regiment of their unit. To the extent possible, subsequent career assignments will be affected by this regimental affiliation as long as the soldier remains in the regiment. Assignments at the battalion level or lower will be made to elements of the soldier's regiment. Since a regiment normally consists of a group of four battalions in CONUS and OCONUS, the soldiers would expect assignments in the units and locations of the regiment. The location of a soldier's regiment is also to be considered when extra-regimental assignments are made in that the other assignments would possibly involve units also at the locations of the soldier's regimental units. Thus, regimental affiliation tends to imply that a soldier's career would involve less variation with respect to unit and location of assignment. This could be viewed as "restriction". The limitation also produces "predictability" in that a soldier can forecast the likely locations of stateside and foreign assignments. It should be noted that regimental assignment patterns interact with COHORT unit stabilization to produce restricted but predictable tours.

Unit Member Commonalities

With time, a pool of regimentally affiliated soldiers will develop such that careerists with past experiences in regimental units will be available for new COHORT units forming in the regiment. If the NMS is sustained, a pool of career soldiers having served in regimentally affiliated units will evolve. Soldiers will be drawn from this pool when new COHORT units are formed. Such a pool of potential unit members differ from careerists earlier available for assignment to a COHORT unit. All members of this pool will at least have had a common regimental identification and a previous tour in a unit of the regiment. With time, the number of soldiers having had even closer experiences--having served together in the same unit(s)--will increase. If past common experiences have been positive, the formation of COHORT units would likely be facilitated by building from past working relationships.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TOTAL NMS

Reordered Career Values

The conditions for retention and career progression are reordered in accordance with the values represented in and perpetuated by the NMS. The management practices of the NMS represent a change in career values.

New values are not necessarily implanted. Rather, the priorities of already present values are reordered. The reordering of values cannot be precisely identified. However, they include the following:

(1) Greater emphasis on the unit as opposed to the individual as the primary constituent of the Army. Accordingly, personnel actions conventionally linked to the individuals and their career statuses are now more closely linked to the status of the unit(s). Thus, soldiers rotate overseas as parts of units as opposed to as individuals; other PCSs occur when units disband; soldiers undergo training as groups that remain together.

(2) Longer temporal perspective. This perspective is apparent in several respects. First, the intent is to stabilize and, as a result, to increase the lengths of assignment to particular units. Second, the future is more predictable in that career-long assignments are determined by regimental affiliation. Third, individual soldiers are expected to delay actions that would fulfill their own interests until the interests of the present unit of assignment have been satisfied.

(3) Community as opposed to a cosmopolitan orientation. Soldiers and their families become affiliated with a smaller number of units. Throughout their careers, they can expect to serve in the locations of the units and to have repeated experiences with others who are affiliated with the regiment. These notions of community contrast with the more cosmopolitan values of travel and assignment to a variety of locations (stateside as well as overseas) and of relatively short-lived interpersonal relationships with a wide variety of people.

Community Development

As soldiers enter the NMS, are retained in regiments, and are repetitively assigned to regimentally affiliated units, communities of soldiers and organization will evolve, the members of which have interdependent interests and destinies. Unlike other characteristics described, this one will materialize as the two components of the NMS--COHORT units and the regimental system--interact and feed each other over time. Community development will occur as soldiers and their families, who have had common past experiences, continue to associate with each other and recognize the prospects of continued association. The importance of such communities probably depends on (a) the functions served by regiments and (b) the extent to which, first, individuals affiliated with a regiment perceive themselves as different from other military members in important ways other than duty assignments and, second, the differences incite further interaction among and involvement of the regiment's membership.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

This appendix summarizes the questionnaires and interview guides used in this research.

Questionnaire items are organized by type of item: background, belief about NMS characteristics, NMS attitude, and satisfaction and morale. The organization reflects as closely as possible the order of an item's presentation. The items measuring beliefs about system characteristics are further organized into sections according to the response alternatives provided. For each section, the procedure used to define affirmation is specified. Each item is headed with the label by which it is referred to in the text and tables in this report. Items were administered to the entire sample unless parenthetically noted beside a label. When they appear, the notations indicate the sub-samples to which the item was administered. The notation for each sub-sample is as follows: (1) COHORT first term--CFT, (2) COHORT leader--CL, (3) Non-COHORT first term--NCFT, and (4) Non-COHORT leader--NCL.

The items in the interview guides for COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders are presented verbatim and in their order of presentation. The system for analyzing the content of interview protocols (presented in Appendix C) resulted in variables (1) that summarized the general nature or direction of response to an item and (2) that elaborated upon the general or directional responses. This appendix identifies the general-level variables analyzed for affirmation of the NMS characteristics. For such variables, rules for defining a response as affirming a characteristic are presented.

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

BACKGROUND DATA

The items and response alternatives used to collect personal background data from all respondents are presented in this section.

Months in Service

Please write in the total number of years and months that you have been in the Army. _____

Months at Installation

Please write in the total number of months you have been assigned to this installation on this tour. _____

Months in Unit

Please write in the total number of months you have been assigned to your current company/battery. _____

Age

Please write in your age. _____

Rank

Please indicate your current military pay grade.

____ E1	____ E7
____ E2	____ E8
____ E3	____ E9
____ E4	____ O1
____ E5	____ O2
____ E6	____ O3

Duty Position

Please indicate your current duty position.

1. ____ Team, squad, or section member
2. ____ Team leader
3. ____ Section chief, tank commander, or squad leader
4. ____ Platoon sergeant/chief of firing battery
5. ____ First sergeant
6. ____ Platoon leader
7. ____ Company/battery executive officer
8. ____ Other (please write in) _____

Marital Status

Please indicate your marital status.

1. ☐ single
2. ☐ married
3. ☐ was married, but now single
4. ☐ widowed

Quarters

Where do you live now?

1. ☐ on post--barracks/BEQ/BAQ
2. ☐ on post--family housing
3. ☐ off post--government furnished housing
4. ☐ off post--civilian housing

Dependents

Please indicate which statement best describes you.

1. ☐ Family members (dependents) living with me now
2. ☐ Family members (dependents) not living with me now
3. ☐ No family members (dependents)

Secondary Education

Please indicate your high school education status.

1. ☐ Diploma
2. ☐ GED
3. ☐ Neither of these

Post Secondary Education

Please indicate your college education status.

1. ☐ None
2. ☐ 1 year or less
3. ☐ 2-3 years
4. ☐ Associate
5. ☐ BA or BS
6. ☐ Professional/MS/MA/PhD
7. ☐ Other (Technical, Trade, Specialty School at least 1 year beyond High School)

Career Intention

Which of the following best describes your career intentions at the present time?

1. ☐ I will stay in the Army until retirement.
2. ☐ I will reenlist or extend but am undecided about staying until retirement.
3. ☐ I am undecided whether I will reenlist or extend.
4. ☐ I will probably leave the Army upon completion of my present obligation.
5. ☐ I will definitely leave the Army upon completion of my present obligation.

Perceived Turnover of First Termers

Since you have been with your current company/battery, how many of the first-term soldiers have left it?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. ☐ 0-5 | 4. ☐ 16-20 |
| 2. ☐ 6-10 | 5. ☐ 21-25 |
| 3. ☐ 11-15 | 6. ☐ more than 25 |

Perceived Turnover of Leaders

Since you have been with your current company/battery, how many of the leaders have left it?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. ☐ 0-5 | 4. ☐ 16-20 |
| 2. ☐ 6-10 | 5. ☐ 21-25 |
| 3. ☐ 11-15 | 6. ☐ more than 25 |

BELIEFS ABOUT SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Section I

Responses to the items in this section were made by selecting one of the following five alternatives: "strongly agree"; "agree"; "neither agree nor disagree"; "disagree"; or "strongly disagree." These alternatives were treated as a five-point scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). For these items, affirmation was defined as a response of "agree" or "strongly agree".

Choice of Assignment Considered

I believe that my choice of assignment was adequately considered when I was assigned to this company/battery.

Adjustment Helped by Unit Members

When I (and my family) moved here, I was able to depend on the other members of my company/battery for help in settling in and adjusting to this installation.

Greater Workload

My workload is greater than the workloads of soldiers in a similar position in other units.

Satisfaction with Predictability of Duty Hours

Overall, I am satisfied with the predictability of my duty hours.

Opportunity for Professional Development Assignments

In my opinion, the first termers in this company/battery have good opportunities for assignments that will develop them professionally.

Reasonable Performance Standards

In my opinion, the performance standards in this company/battery are reasonable.

NCOs' Caring

The NCOs in this company/battery really care about the personal welfare of their soldiers.

Officers' Caring

The officers in this company/battery really care about the personal welfare of their soldiers.

Acceptance of Unit

When this company/battery was first formed, I felt our unit was accepted by the members of the battalion as a whole.

(For Non-COHORT soldiers, this item read: When I first came to this company/battery, I felt our unit was accepted by the members of the battalion as a whole.)

Helping to Identify Training Needs (CL, NCL)

In my unit, I help to identify the training needs of the soldiers I lead.

Predictability of Assignments (CL, NCL)

As a leader, I know well in advance the training and support missions that my soldiers will be assigned.

Helping to Set Standards (CL, NCL)

I help to set the performance standards that my soldiers are expected to meet.

Ability to Reward Soldiers

In this unit, I can make sure that my soldiers are rewarded when they do well.

(For first termers, this item read: In this company/battery, I have been rewarded when I have done well.)

Felt Responsibility for Soldiers' Performance (CL, NCL)

I feel very responsible for the quality of my soldiers' performance.

Felt Responsibility for Unit Performance (CFT, NCFT)

I feel personally responsible for the successes and failures of this company/battery.

Dependency of Reputation of Soldiers' Performance

My reputation in this unit depends on the quality of my soldiers' performance.

(For first termers, this item read: My reputation in this company/battery depends on the quality of my performance.)

Difficulty of Transferring

It is hard for soldiers to transfer out of this company/battery, even if they have a good reason.

Job Helped by Cooperation of Work Group

My job is easier because the soldiers in my work group try to help each other to perform well.

Respect Given to Leaders

The leaders in this company/battery are respected as leaders by their followers.

Uncertainty about Meeting Soldiers' Expectations

Sometimes I am not sure that I can live up to the expectations of the soldiers that I lead.

(For first termers this item read: Sometimes I am not sure that I can perform as well as the other soldiers in this unit think I should.)

First Termers' Satisfaction with Career Development

Most of the first termers in this unit are satisfied with their chances for career development.

Satisfaction with Predictability of Daily Assignments

Overall, I am satisfied with the predictability of my duty/training assignments from one day to the next.

Prevalence of Personnel Problems

In this unit when one soldier (and/or a soldier's family) has a personal problem, everyone else seems to have a similar problem at the same time.

Careerists' Desire for Unit Assignment

Most of the career soldiers in this unit really want to be in this unit.

Responsibility for Helping Soldier Adjust (CL, NCL)

One of my major leadership responsibilities is helping the "inexperienced" soldiers adjust to the Army.

Liking of Local Civilian Community

I like the civilian community surrounding this installation.

Attraction of Differing Foreign Locations

One attraction of military life is assignment to different foreign locations.

Attraction of Meeting New People

One attraction of reassignment is the opportunity to work with new people.

Attraction of Differing US Locations

One attraction of military life is assignment to different stateside locations.

Involvement in Location Civilian Community

I feel I am a part of the civilian community which surrounds this installation.

Unit Respected

My unit is respected on this post.

Desire to Remain in Regiment

I want to remain in the regiment my company/battery is in.

Section II

For the items in this section, response alternatives and the computation of affirmation were the same as the items in Section I. These items were prefaced with the following:

"In my current assignment, my opportunities for each of the following are as good as the opportunities of any other soldier in the Army".

Chances for Changing Career Fields

Changing career fields.

Chances for Military Schooling

Attending military schools at the right time in my career.

Freedom to Choose Next Assignment

Having freedom to choose my next assignment.

Chances for Changing Unit (CFT, NFT)

Transferring to another unit.

Chances for Changing Posts

Transferring to another installation.

Promotion Opportunities

Promotion.

Section III

In response to the items in this section, one of the following five alternatives was selected:

- A. Much better than other soldiers in the Army
- B. Better than other soldiers in the Army
- C. About the same as other soldiers in the Army
- D. Not as good as other soldiers in the Army
- E. Much worse than other soldiers in the Army.

These alternatives were scaled from 0 (much worse) to 4 (much better). An item was defined as "affirmed" if a response of 4 (much better) or 3 (better) was selected. The first five items in this section were prefaced by the following statement:

"If you remain in the regiment to which your company/battery is assigned, what are your opportunities for each of the following:"

Chances in Regiment for Changing Career Fields (CL, CFT)

Changing career fields.

Chances in Regiment for Attending Military Schools (CL, CFT)

Attending military schools at the right time in your career.

Choice in Regiment of Next Unit of Assignment (CL, CFT)

Having freedom to choose your next unit of assignment.

Choice in Regiment of Next Post of Assignment (CL, CFT)

Having freedom to choose your next installation/location of assignment.

Promotion Opportunities in Regiment (CL, CFT)

Promotions.

Comparative COHORT Career Opportunities

The career opportunities of soldiers in COHORT units are:

(Note that the response alternatives for this section followed this stem.)

Section IV

The one item in this section was Overall Opinion of COHORT as follows: At this time what is your feeling about the COHORT idea?

- A. I don't like it at all
- B. Not so bad
- C. I'm not for it or against it
- D. Good
- E. Excellent idea
- F. I don't know anything about COHORT.

These responses were coded from 0 (don't like) to 5 (don't know). The first five responses were treated as a five-point scale.

MEASURES OF SATISFACTION

For the satisfaction items, response alternatives and their coding were same as for the items in Section I, Beliefs about Systems Characteristics.

Satisfaction with Post

All in all I am satisfied with this post.

Satisfaction with Supervisor

All in all I am satisfied with my supervisor.

Satisfaction with Work Group

All in all I am satisfied with the soldiers in my work group.

Satisfaction with the Army

All in all I am satisfied with the Army.

Satisfaction with My Unit

All in all I am satisfied with my company/battery.

Unit Morale

The morale in my unit is very high.

Personal Morale

My morale right now is very high.

NMS ATTITUDE ITEMS

For the attitude items, response alternatives and their coding were the same as for the items in Section I, Beliefs about Systems Characteristics.

Importance of Mutual Caring and Respect

It is important that the soldiers in a company/battery care for and respect each other.

Staying Together--More Mutual Caring and Respect

If the same soldiers in a company/battery staytogether for several years, the chances are better that they would care for and respect each other.

Staying Together--Better Unit Performance

An Army company/battery performs better when the same soldiers stay together for several years.

Wanting a Company That Does a Good Job

I want to be in a company/battery which always does a good job.

Liking to Spend Off-Duty Time Together

I like to spend my off-duty time with the members of my company/battery.

Preference for Remaining at Same Installation

If I were to make the Army a career, I would prefer spending most of my time at the same stateside installation.

Importance of Involvement in Civilian Community

It is important to me that I become a part of the civilian community where I am stationed.

Unit Leaders' Staying Together--Better Unit Performance

A company/battery would perform better if the leaders had served together in previous assignments.

Ability to Achieve Career Goals if Assigned to One or Two Units over Career

My career goals could be achieved if I stayed in one or two units for my career.

Homebase--Good for Family Life

My family (or, if not married, "I") would have a better life if I received repeated assignments to a "homebase".

INTERVIEW ITEMS AND CONTENT ANALYSIS VARIABLES

INTERVIEW ITEMS

The items forming the interview guides for leaders are presented next. The items were administered orally in the order of their presentation.

1. a. Since you have been in this company/battery, how would you describe the way in which the unit has changed or developed? That is, has the unit remained more or less the same, or has there been a steady improvement or decline?

(Probe in these areas: individual skills and individual skills training; collective training; unit performance, or mission and organizational effectiveness; relationships among unit members.)

b. In what ways have you personally influenced these changes?

c. In what way would you have liked to influence changes in this unit?

2. a. Compared to other units, does your company/battery have more or less pressure to excel?

b. If so, where does this pressure come from? That is, what is the source of the pressure? Why do you think so?

c. If so, how has it affected you and the other career soldiers in this unit?

(Probe in these areas: attitude toward the pressure; belief about the unit; personal life.)

3. a. Did you want to be assigned to this company/battery?

(Probe about: Choice over and desire for the assignment)

b. Why or why not?

c. Have your expectations about the assignment (whether positive or negative) been met?

(Probe as to which expectations have or have not been met.)

d. Based on your experiences in this unit, would you now choose to be assigned to this company/battery?

e. Why or why not?

4. In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is,

a. Has this assignment been a good career experience? In what ways has the assignment been good or bad?

b. Has or will assignment to this unit affect your opportunities to attend military schools at the right time in your career? How?

c. Has or will assignment to this unit affect your chances of getting your choice in your next assignment? How?

d. Has or will assignment to this unit affect your promotion opportunities? How?

5. a. Has this company/battery allowed unit members to transfer to another unit?

(Probe for: EMs, NCOs, and officers.)

b. How have people in this unit tried/what have they done to get transferred?

c. In your opinion, has this unit fairly considered the personal and professional needs of the people who have wanted to transfer? Why do you think this?

d. In your opinion, has this unit's treatment of the people who have wanted to transfer been in the best interests of the Army? Why?

6. a. What are your present intentions about remaining in the Army?

b. How has your assignment to this company/battery affected your intent to remain in the Army?

(Probe for when and why if intent has been affected.)

c. If respondent's career intent is uncertain, ask: What will have to happen to make you decide that you want to remain in service longer?

What will have to happen to make you decide that you want to leave the service?

7.¹ What is your opinion of the training, orientation, or other preparation that you and other career soldiers have received when they have come to this company/battery? That is,

a. How accurate and adequate was the orientation/information given about this unit?

(If none given, probe for: what was needed.)

b. How accurate and adequate was the orientation/information given about the affect on your career of assignment to this unit?

(If none given, probe for: what was needed.)

c. How adequate was the training or other preparation that was given for your leadership duties?

(If none given, probe for: what was needed.)

d. What do you consider to be the most important things for a career soldier to know in order to function in a COHORT unit?

7/8. a. What is your opinion of the leadership of first-term soldiers who have held leadership positions in this company/battery?

(Probe about: areas in which first term leaders are perceived to perform well and/or poorly as leaders and what has enabled them to perform this way.)

b. What have been the biggest problems that first term soldiers have had as leaders?

¹ This item was administered to COHORT leaders only. Subsequent items are double numbered (e.g., 7/8) to indicate their orders in the Non-COHORT and COHORT leaders' guides, respectively.

8/9. How would you describe the cohesiveness of this company/battery?
Specifically,

a. How would you describe the cohesiveness of the first-term soldiers in this unit?

Has turnover among first-term soldiers affected their cohesiveness?

How has their cohesiveness affected your ability to function as a leader?

b. How would you describe the cohesiveness of the first-term soldiers and their immediate leaders in this company/battery?

(Note: Immediate leader is the leader of the soldier's work group.)

Has turnover of first-term soldiers and leaders affected the cohesiveness of first term soldiers and their immediate leaders?

How has the cohesiveness of first-term soldiers and their immediate leaders affected your ability to function as a leader?

c. How would you describe the cohesiveness of junior and senior leaders in this company/battery?

(Note: Junior leaders and team- are squad-level leaders.)

Has turnover of leaders affected the cohesiveness of junior and senior leaders?

How has the cohesiveness of junior and senior leaders affected your ability to function as a leader?

9/10. a. Is there much peer pressure among the soldiers you lead?

b. How do you know this? That is, how is it demonstrated?

c. How does the peer pressure (or lack of it) make it easier to lead your soldiers?

d. How does the peer pressure (or lack of it) make it more difficult to lead your soldiers?

10.² What do you think are the most common reasons for:

² This items was administered to Non-COHORT leaders only. All subsequent items were identical for the two types of leaders.

- a. Wanting assignment to a COHORT unit?
 - b. Not wanting assignment to a COHORT unit?
11. What is your opinion of the COHORT policies that say people cannot be transferred from a unit for three years?
- (If respondent is unaware of such policies, probe about opinions if such policies existed.)
12. What is your opinion of the COHORT policies that say soldiers are always assigned to the same locations stateside and/or overseas most of their careers?
13. Overall, what is your opinion of COHORT?

INTERVIEW VARIABLES

Appendix C describes the content analysis system applied. Two types of variables were identified and coded. One type, summarized here, captured the general nature or direction of response. Most of these were reported as variables which represented NMS characteristics. These variables are identified in Table B1 along with the following:

- (1) The interview item number, the responses to which were coded to measure the variable.
- (2) Rules for defining a response as affirming the variable.
- (3) Notes directing the reader to the annex in Appendix C that contains definitions of response alternatives.

Table B-1
Variables Derived from Interview Protocols and Rules for Measuring Affirmation

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Rules for Affirmation</u>	<u>Annex</u>
Unit Change	1a	Response coded as (1) "improvement," (2) "decline", (3) "mixture", or (4) "fluctuation"	#1
Respondent Influenced Change	1b	(1) Response coded "yes" and (2) "Unit change" affirmed	#4
Pressure to Excel	2a	Response coded "yes, more pressure"	#6
Feeling Pressure to Excel	2b	(1) Response coded "yes" and (2) "Pressure to excel" affirmed	#8
Wanted Assignment to Unit	3a	Response coded "yes"	#10
Want Repeated Assignment to Unit	3c	Response coded "yes"	#14
Tour Good Career Experience	4a	Response coded "positive"	#17
Assignment Affects Opportunities for Military Schools	4b	Response coded "good opportunities"	#20

Table B-1

(Continued)

Assignment Affects Future Assignments Available	4c	Response coded "good chances"	#21
Assignment Affects Promotions	4d	Response coded "positive effect"	#22
Unit Permits Transfers	5a	Response coded "yes"	#23
Transfer Policies Fair	5b	(1) Response coded "fair" and (2) "Unit permits transfers" coded "yes" or "no"	#24
Transfer Policies in Army's Best Interests	5c	(1) Response coded "yes" and (2) "Unit permits transfers" coded "yes" or "no"	#27
Assignment Impacts on Career Intent	6a	Response coded "increased inclination to remain in service"	#29
Opinion of First-Term Leaders	7/8a	Response coded "positive"	#30
Cohesion of First Termers	8/9a	Response coded "positive"	#32

Table B-1

(Continued)

Leadership and Cohesion	8/9a	(1) Response coded "positive" and (2) "Cohesion of first termers" coded "positive" or "qualified"	#34
Much Peer Pressure	9/10a	Response coded "yes"	#36
Opinion about Three-Year Tour	11	Response coded "favorable"	#39
Opinion about Regimental Assignments	12	Response coded "favorable endorsement"	#42

Note. Entries are the labels of the variables derived from interviewed protocols and used to describe affirmation of NMS characteristics. For each variable, the following are noted: (1) interview item (by number), the protocol for which was analyzed to code the variable; (2) the rules used to classify a response as affirming the variable; and (3) the annex in Appendix C that presents coding rules for the variable.

APPENDIX C

SYSTEM FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX C

	Page
SYSTEM FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS	C-1
<u>ITEM 1a.</u> <u>Since you have been in this company/battery, how would you describe the way in which the unit has changed or developed? That is, has the unit remained more or less the same, or has there been a steady improvement or decline?</u>	C-1
<u>ITEM 1b.</u> <u>In what ways have you personally influenced these changes?</u> . .	C-2
<u>ITEM 2a.</u> <u>Compared to other (Non-COHORT) units, does your company/battery have more or less pressure to excel?</u>	C-2
<u>ITEM 2b.</u> <u>If so, where does this pressure come from? That is, what is the source of the pressure? Why do you think so?</u>	C-3
<u>ITEM 2c.</u> <u>If so, how has it (the pressure to excel) affected you and the other career soldiers in this unit?</u>	C-3
<u>ITEM 3a.</u> <u>Did you want to be assigned to this company/battery?</u>	C-4
<u>ITEMS 3b and 3c.</u> <u>Why or why not (did the respondent want assignment to the unit)? Have your expectations about the assignment (whether positive or negative) been met?</u> . .	C-4
<u>ITEMS 3d and 3e.</u> <u>Based on your experiences in this unit, would you now choose to be assigned to this company/battery? Why or why not?</u>	C-5
<u>ITEM 4a.</u> <u>In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has this assignment been a good career experience? In what ways has the assignment been good or bad?</u>	C-6
<u>ITEM 4b.</u> <u>In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has or will assignment to this unit affect your opportunities to attend military schools at the right time in your career? How?</u> . . .	C-7
<u>ITEM 4c.</u> <u>In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has or will assignment to this unit affect your chances of getting your choice in your next assignment? How?</u>	C-7
<u>ITEM 4d.</u> <u>In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has or will assignment to this unit affect your promotion opportunities?</u> . .	C-8

<u>ITEM 5a.</u>	<u>Has this company/battery allowed unit members to transfer to another unit?</u>	C-8
<u>ITEM 5b.</u>	<u>How have people in this unit tried/what have they done to get transferred?</u>	C-8
<u>ITEM 5c.</u>	<u>In your opinion has this unit fairly considered the personal and professional needs of the people who have wanted to transfer? Why do you think this?</u>	C-8
<u>ITEM 5d.</u>	<u>In your opinion, has this unit's treatment of the people who have wanted to transfer been in the best interest of the Army? Why?</u>	C-10
<u>ITEM 6a.</u>	<u>What are your present intentions about remaining in the Army?</u>	C-10
<u>ITEM 6b.</u>	<u>How has your assignment to this company/battery affected your intent to remain in the Army?</u>	C-10
<u>ITEM 6c.</u>	<u>If respondent's career intent is uncertain: What will have to happen to make you decide that you want to remain in the service longer? What will have to happen to make you decide that you want to leave the service?</u>	C-11
<u>ITEM 7.</u>	<u>What is your opinion of the training, orientation, or other preparation that you and other career soldiers have received when they have come to this company/battery?</u>	C-11
<u>ITEM 7/8a.</u>	<u>What is your opinion of the leadership of first-term soldiers who have held leadership positions in this company/battery?</u>	C-11
<u>ITEM 7/8b.</u>	<u>What have been the biggest problems that first-term soldiers have had as leaders?</u>	C-11
<u>ITEM 8/9a.</u>	<u>How would you describe the cohesiveness of this company/battery? Specifically, how would you describe the cohesiveness of the first-term soldiers in this unit?</u>	C-12
<u>ITEM 8/9b.</u>	<u>How would you describe the cohesiveness of the first-term soldiers and their immediate leaders in this company/battery?</u>	C-13
<u>ITEMS 8/9c.</u>	<u>How would you describe the cohesiveness of junior and senior leaders in this company/battery?</u>	C-13
<u>ITEM 9/10a.</u>	<u>Is there much peer pressure among the soldiers you lead?</u>	C-14
<u>ITEM 9/10b.</u>	<u>How do you know this (much peer pressure)? That is, how is it demonstrated?</u>	C-14

ITEM 9/10c.	<u>How does the peer pressure (or lack of it) make it easier to lead your soldiers?</u>	.C-15
ITEM 10.	<u>What do you think are the most common reasons for (a) wanting assignment to a COHORT unit and (b) not wanting assignment to a COHORT unit?</u>	.C-15
ITEM 11.	<u>What is your opinion of the COHORT policies that say people cannot be transferred from a unit for three years?</u>	.C-15
ITEM 12.	<u>What is your opinion of the COHORT policies that say soldiers are always assigned to the same locations stateside and/or overseas most of their careers?</u>	.C-17
ITEM 13.	<u>Overall, what is your opinion of COHORT?</u>	.C-18
ANNEX 1.	<u>Unit Change.</u>	.C-19
ANNEX 2.	<u>Areas in Which Change is Mentioned</u>	.C-19
ANNEX 3.	<u>Applicability of Category.</u>	.C-21
ANNEX 4.	<u>Respondent Influenced Unit Change.</u>	.C-21
ANNEX 5.	<u>How Respondent Influenced Change</u>	.C-22
ANNEX 6.	<u>Pressure to Excel.</u>	.C-24
ANNEX 7.	<u>Pressure Sources</u>	.C-25
ANNEX 8.	<u>Respondent and/or Other Careerists Feel the Pressure</u>	.C-27
ANNEX 9.	<u>How Pressure is Felt</u>	.C-27
ANNEX 10.	<u>Wanted Assignment to Unit.</u>	.C-29
ANNEX 11.	<u>Direction of Expectations About the Assignment</u>	.C-30
ANNEX 12.	<u>Positive Expectations About the Assignment</u>	.C-31
ANNEX 13.	<u>Whether Respondent Held Expectation.</u>	.C-34
ANNEX 14.	<u>Want Repeated Assignment to Unit</u>	.C-34
ANNEX 15.	<u>Reasons for Wanting Repeated Assignment to the Unit.</u>	.C-35
ANNEX 16.	<u>Reasons for Not Wanting Repeated Assignment to the Unit.</u>	.C-37
ANNEX 17.	<u>Tour Good Career Experience.</u>	.C-38
ANNEX 18.	<u>How Assignment Has Been Positive Career Experience</u>	.C-39
ANNEX 19.	<u>How Assignment Has Been a Negative Career Experience</u>	.C-41
ANNEX 20.	<u>Assignment Affects Opportunities for Military Schools.</u>	.C-43
ANNEX 21.	<u>Assignment Affects Future Assignments Available.</u>	.C-44
ANNEX 22.	<u>Assignment Affects Promotions.</u>	.C-45

	Page
ANNEX 23. <u>Unit Permits Transfers</u>	.C-46
ANNEX 24. <u>Whether Unit's Transfer Policies Fair.</u>	.C-47
ANNEX 25. <u>How Policy Considered Fair</u>	.C-48
ANNEX 26. <u>How Policy Consider Unfair</u>	.C-50
ANNEX 27. <u>Unit Transfer Policies in Army's Best Interest</u>	.C-52
ANNEX 28. <u>How Unit Policies are in Army's Best Interests</u>	.C-53
ANNEX 29. <u>Impact of Assignment on Career Intent.</u>	.C-55
ANNEX 30. <u>Opinion of First-Term Leadership</u>	.C-56
ANNEX 31. <u>First-Term Leadership Problems</u>	.C-57
ANNEX 32. <u>Cohesion of First-Term Soldiers.</u>	.C-58
ANNEX 33. <u>How Cohesion of First Termers is Demonstrated</u>	.C-59
ANNEX 34. <u>Effect of First Termers' Cohesion on Leadership.</u>	.C-60
ANNEX 35. <u>Positive Effects of First Termers' Cohesion on Leadership.</u>	.C-61
ANNEX 36. <u>Much Peer Pressure</u>	.C-63
ANNEX 37. <u>Nature of Influence of Peer Pressure</u>	.C-64
ANNEX 38. <u>How Peer Pressure Makes Leadership Easier.</u>	.C-66
ANNEX 39. <u>Opinion About Three-Year Stabilized Tours.</u>	.C-68
ANNEX 40. <u>Positive Aspects of 3-Year Stabilization</u>	.C-69
ANNEX 41. <u>Unfavorable Aspects of Three-Year Stabilized Tours</u>	.C-71
ANNEX 42. <u>Opinion About Regimental Assignments</u>	.C-75
ANNEX 43. <u>Positive Aspects of Regimental Rotation.</u>	.C-76
ANNEX 44. <u>Negative Aspects of Regimental Rotation.</u>	.C-78
ANNEX 45. <u>Overall COHORT Opinion</u>	.C-80
ANNEX 46. <u>Improvements Needed/Problems in COHORT</u>	.C-81

APPENDIX C

SYSTEM FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS

ITEM 1a. Since you have been in this company/battery, how would you describe the way in which the unit has changed or developed? That is, has the unit remained more or less the same, or has there been a steady improvement or decline?

1. Read the response to Item 1a to identify:
 - a. Whether any change was mentioned by the respondent.
 - b. The separate areas or ways in which the unit was described as having changed.
 - c. For each area, the direction (improvement, decline, fluctuation between improvement and decline, or stability) in which the unit is described as having changed.
2. Place the response to Item 1a into the one category in ANNEX #1 that best fits the direction of change described.
3. If unit change was coded as "improvement", "decline", "mixture" or "fluctuation", examine ANNEX #2.
 - a. Determine which one or more of the areas of change in ANNEX #2 were described in the response as having changed.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #2 according to ANNEX #3.
4. Code each area in ANNEX #2 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Unit change (from ANNEX #1) had been coded as "stability" or "change neither mentioned nor discernible".
 - b. The respondent gave a general response suggesting a directional change but did not specify areas in which the unit had changed (e.g., "Yes, the unit has improved, but I can't say how.").

ITEM 1b. In what ways have you personally influenced these changes?

1. If unit change (Item 1a) had been coded as "improvement", "decline", "mixture", or "fluctuation" (using ANNEX #1), examine the response to Item 1b.
 - a. Identify if the respondent described something which he¹ had done to influence, contribute to, or impact on the way that the unit had changed. Code whether the respondent influenced unit change according to ANNEX #4.
 - b. If the respondent indicates having influenced change, examine ANNEX #5.
 - (1) Determine which one or more of the categories of having influenced change in ANNEX #5 were described by the respondent.
 - (2) Code each category in ANNEX #5 according to the rules in ANNEX #3.
 - c. Code each way of having influenced change as "3" for "not appropriate" if the respondent did not influence unit change (from ANNEX #4) or if the respondent indicated having influenced change but did not describe how.
2. Code respondent influenced change and each way of having influenced change as "not appropriate" or "3" if "unit change" (Item 1a) had been coded "stability" or change "neither mentioned nor discernible".

ITEM 2a. Compared to other (Non-COHORT) units, does your company/battery have more or less pressure to excel?

Use ANNEX #6 to code the response to Item 2a as to whether the respondent believed his unit has had more or less pressure to excel.

¹All respondents were male.

ITEM 2b. If so, where does this pressure come from? That is, what is the source of the pressure? Why do you think so?

1. If pressure to excel was coded "more" (ANNEX #6), consider the response to Item 2b.
 - a. Examine the categories in ANNEX #7 to determine which one or more summarize the source or cause of pressure described in response to Item 2b.
 - b. Code each category of pressure source in ANNEX #7 according to ANNEX #3.
2. Code each source or pressure (in ANNEX #7) as "3" for "not appropriate" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Pressure to excel was coded as "less", "no different", or "unknown" (from ANNEX #6).
 - b. Pressure to excel was coded "more" (ANNEX #6), but the response to Item 2b does not describe a source or cause of the pressure.

ITEM 2c. If so, how has it (the pressure to excel) affected you and the other career soldiers in this unit?

1. Consider the response to Item 2c.
 - a. If pressure to excel was coded "more" (ANNEX #6), use ANNEX #8 to code this response for feeling pressure to excel.
 - b. If pressure to excel was coded "less", "no different", or "unknown" relative to other units (ANNEX #6), code feeling pressure to excel as "3" for "not appropriate".
2. If feeling pressure to excel was coded as "yes", examine ANNEX #9, which summarizes ways of feeling the pressure to excel.
 - a. Identify which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #9 was described in the response.
 - b. Code each way of feeling pressure according to ANNEX #3.

3. Code each way of feeling pressure (ANNEX #9) as "3" for "not appropriate" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Feeling pressure to excel was not coded "yes".
 - b. Feeling pressure to excel was coded "yes", but there is no description of the way in which pressure was felt.

ITEM 3a. Did you want to be assigned to this company/battery?

Code the response to Item 3a for whether the respondent wanted assignment to the unit. Use the codes in ANNEX #10.

ITEMS 3b and 3c. Why or why not (did the respondent want assignment to the unit)? Have your expectations about the assignment (whether positive or negative) been met?

1. Read the responses to Items 3b and 3c to identify expectations held about the assignment.
2. Code the response into the one category in ANNEX #11 that best describes the direction of expectations held for the assignment by the respondent.
3. If the direction of expectations was coded as "positive" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #11).
 - a. Examine ANNEX #12 to determine which one or more of the categories of "positive expectations" summarize the positive expectations described in the response.
 - b. Code each category of positive expectations as to whether it was "held and/or met" according to ANNEX #13.
4. Code each category of positive expectation in ANNEX #12 as "5" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Direction of expectations (ANNEX #11) was coded as "negative", "no expectations", or expectations "not discernible".
 - b. Direction of expectations (ANNEX #11) was coded as "positive" or "mixed", but the nature of the positive expectations held by the respondent was not described.

ITEMS 3d and 3e. Based on your experiences in this unit, would you now choose to be assigned to this company/battery? Why or why not?

1. Examine the response to Items 3d and 3e. Code the response for want repeated assignment to the unit according to ANNEX #14.
2. Examine ANNEX #15 that defines categories of reasons for now wanting assignment to the unit.
 - a. If want repeated assignment to unit (ANNEX #14) was coded "yes" or "unsure" and the response described reasons for this positive inclination,
 - (1) Determine which one or more categories in ANNEX #15 describe the positive reasons mentioned,
 - (2) Code each positive reason in ANNEX #15 according to ANNEX #3.
 - b. Code each positive reason in ANNEX #15 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - (1) Want repeated reassignment to the unit (from ANNEX #14) was coded as "no" or "not applicable".
 - (2) Want repeated assignment to the unit was coded "yes" or "unsure" (from ANNEX #14), but the response did not include the positive reasons for such a preference.
3. Examine ANNEX #16 that defines the categories of reasons for now not wanting assignment to the unit.
 - a. If want repeated assignment to the unit was coded "no" or "unsure" (from ANNEX #14) and if the response described reasons for this negative preference,
 - (1) Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #16 summarize the negative reasons described in the response,
 - (2) Code each category in ANNEX #16 according to ANNEX #3.

b. Code each category of negative reasons as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:

- (1) Want repeated assignment to the unit (from ANNEX #14) was coded as "yes" or "not applicable".
- (2) Want repeated assignment to the unit (from ANNEX #14) was coded as "no" or "unsure", but the response did not include reasons for a negative preference.

ITEM 4a. In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has this assignment been a good career experience? In what ways has the assignment been good or bad?

1. Examine and code the response to Item 4a as to whether the tour was described as having been a good career experience. Use the coding rules in ANNEX #17.
2. Consider ANNEX #18 which defines ways in which the tour might have been described as a good career experience.
 - a. If the tour is coded as "positive" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #17) and if the response described how (or what about) the assignment had been good.
 - (1) Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #18 best summarize(s) the respondent's description.
 - (2) Code each category in ANNEX #18 according to ANNEX #3.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #18 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - (1) The career experience obtained during the tour was coded as "negative" or "uncertain" or "no effect" (from ANNEX #17).
 - (2) The tour was coded as "positive" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #17), but the response did not describe how (or what about) the tour had been a good career experience.

3. Consider ANNEX #19 which defines ways in which the tour might have been described as a negative career experience.
 - a. If the tour is coded as "negative" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #17) and if the response described how (or what about) the assignment had been negative,
 - (1) Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #19 best summarize the respondent's description.
 - (2) Code each category in ANNEX #19 according to ANNEX #3.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #19 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - (1) The career experience obtained during the tour was coded as "positive" or "uncertain" or "no effect" (from ANNEX #17).
 - (2) The tour was coded as "negative" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #17), but the response did not describe how (or what about) the tour had made it a negative career experience.

ITEM 4b. In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has or will assignment to this unit affect your opportunities to attend military schools at the right time in your career? How?

Use ANNEX #20 to code the response to Item 4b for beliefs as to whether the assignment affects opportunities for military schools.

ITEM 4c. In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has or will assignment to this unit affect your chances of getting your choice in your next assignment? How?

Use ANNEX #21 to code the response to Item 4c for beliefs as to whether the assignment affects the future assignments available to the respondent.

ITEM 4d. In what ways does your assignment to this company/battery affect your career opportunities? That is, has or will assignment to this unit affect your promotion opportunities?

Use ANNEX #22 to code the response to Item 4d for beliefs as to whether the assignment affects promotions.

ITEM 5a. Has this company/battery allowed unit members to transfer to another unit?

1. From the response to Item 5a, determine whether any soldier has (a) tried to transfer from the unit and/or (b) actually (by the time of the interview) left the unit. Consider having left the unit for any reason (to include DA directed, levy, etc.) as a transfer.
2. Check the responses to Items 5b-5d to determine if they elicited descriptions of transfers or transfer attempts.
3. Code the response to Item 5a (augmented by 5b-5d if they elicited descriptions) according to the categories in ANNEX #23.

ITEM 5b. How have people in this unit tried/what have they done to get transferred?

NOT CODED. THIS ITEM TENDED TO PRODUCE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE FORM COMPLETED WHEN SEEKING A TRANSFER.

ITEM 5c. In your opinion has this unit fairly considered the personal and professional needs of the people who have wanted to transfer? Why do you think this?

1. From the response to Item 5c, determine the respondent's perceptions of the fairness of the unit's transfer policies.
2. If, based on Item 5a, unit members have tried or actually transferred, code the perceived fairness of the unit's transfer policies according to ANNEX #24.

3. If the unit's transfer policies were considered "fair" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #24), identify if the respondent described one or more ways in which (or reasons for believing that) the transfer policies were fair. If one or more ways were described,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #25 best summarize them.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #25 according to ANNEX #3.
4. Code each category in ANNEX #25 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Transfer policies were coded as "fair" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #24), but no way or reason was mentioned for believing that the policies were fair.
 - b. Transfer policies were coded as "unfair" or "not applicable" (from ANNEX #24).
5. If the unit's transfer policies were coded "unfair" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #24), identify if the respondent described one or more ways in which (or reasons for believing that) the transfer policies were unfair. If one or more ways were described,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #26 best summarize them.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #26 according to ANNEX #3.
6. Code each category in ANNEX #26 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Transfer policies were coded as "unfair" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #24), but no way or reason for believing that the policies were unfair was mentioned.
 - b. Transfer policies were coded as "fair" or "not applicable" (from ANNEX #24).

ITEM 5d. In your opinion, has this unit's treatment of the people who have wanted to transfer been in the best interest of the Army? Why?

1. From the response to Item 5d, determine the respondent's belief as to whether the unit's transfer policies have been in the Army's best interest. Code these beliefs according to ANNEX #27.
2. If these beliefs were coded as "yes" or "uncertain/mixed" (from ANNEX #27), identify whether the respondent described how the unit's transfer policies were in the Army's best interest. If the respondent described how,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #28 would (alone or together) best summarize the respondent's beliefs.
 - b. Code each reason in ANNEX #28 according to ANNEX #3.
3. Code each category in ANNEX #28 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. Transfer policies were considered to be in the Army's best interests (from ANNEX #27), but the respondent did not describe how.
 - b. Transfer policies were coded as "not in the Army's best interests", "not applicable", or "no response" (from ANNEX #27).

ITEM 6a. What are your present intentions about remaining in the Army?

NOT CODED SINCE NEARLY ALL RESPONDENTS INTENDED TO REMAIN IN THE ARMY FOR 20 OR MORE YEARS.

ITEM 6b. How has your assignment to this company/battery affected your intent to remain in the Army?

From the response to Item 6b, determine which category in ANNEX #29 best describes the respondent's beliefs about the impact of the assignment on his career intent.

ITEM 6c. If respondent's career intent is uncertain: What will have to happen to make you decide that you want to remain in the service longer? What will have to happen to make you decide that you want to leave the service?

NOT CODED SINCE NEARLY ALL RESPONDENTS INTENDED TO REMAIN IN THE ARMY FOR 20 OR MORE YEARS.

ITEM 7. What is your opinion of the training, orientation, or other preparation that you and other career soldiers have received when they have come to this company/battery?

NOT CODED. ADMINISTERED TO COHORT LEADERS ONLY.

ITEMS 7/8a¹. What is your opinion of the leadership of first-term soldiers who have held leadership positions in this company/battery?

From the response to Item 7/8a, determine which category in ANNEX #30 best describes the respondent's opinion of the leadership of first termers who have held leadership positions in the unit.

ITEM 7/8b. What have been the biggest problems that first-term soldiers have had as leaders?

1. From the response to Item 7/8b (and possibly 7/8a), identify whether the respondent described one or more problems that first-term soldiers have had as leaders.
2. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #31 best summarize the problem(s) mentioned.
3. Code each category in ANNEX #31 as follows:
 - a. According to ANNEX #3 if the respondent described one or more problems,
 - b. As "3" for "not applicable" if the respondent described no problem.

¹The numbers for double-numbered items indicate the items' orders respectively in the Non-COHORT/COHORT interview guides.

ITEM 8/9a. How would you describe the cohesiveness of this company/battery? Specifically, how would you describe the cohesiveness of the first-term soldiers in this unit?

1. From the response to Item 8/9a, determine the direction of the respondent's evaluation of the cohesion of the first termers in the unit.
2. Code the direction of this evaluation according to the one category in ANNEX #32 that is most descriptive.
3. If first termers' cohesion is evaluated as "positive" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #32),
 - a. Identify whether the respondent described one or more ways in which the positive cohesion had been demonstrated (or the conditions which led to the respondent's positive evaluation).
 - b. If the respondent described one or more manifestations of positive cohesion.
 - (1) Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #33 best describe the way(s) in which positive cohesion had been manifested.
 - (2) Code each category in ANNEX #33 according to ANNEX #3.
 - c. Code each category in ANNEX #33 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - (1) The cohesion of first-term soldiers was evaluated as "positive" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #32), but no positive manifestation was described.
 - (2) The cohesion of first termers was not evaluated as positive, rather as "low" or "not applicable" (from ANNEX #32).

ITEMS 8/9a (cont.). How has their (first termers') cohesiveness affected your ability to function as a leader?

1. Determine the perceived direction of the effects of first termers' cohesion on the leadership of the respondent functioning as a leader.
2. Code the perceived direction of effect according to the one category in ANNEX #34 that best summarizes this perception.
3. If the perceived effect of first termers' cohesion on leadership is "positive" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #34), determine if the nature of the positive effect was described. If one or more positive effects on leadership were described,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #35 best summarize the effect.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #35 according to ANNEX #3.
4. Code each category in ANNEX #35 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. The respondent did not hold a "positive" or "mixed" opinion (from ANNEX #34) of the effects of first termers' cohesiveness on his leadership.
 - b. The respondent held a "positive" or "mixed" opinion but did not describe the nature of the "positive" effect.

ITEMS 8/9b. How would you describe the cohesiveness of the first-term soldiers and their immediate leaders in this company/battery?

NOT CODED. ITEM TENDED TO ELICIT RESPONSES ABOUT FORMAL WORK RELATIONSHIPS.

ITEMS 8/9c. How would you describe the cohesiveness of junior and senior leaders in this company/battery?

NOT CODED. ITEM TENDED TO ELICIT RESPONSES ABOUT FORMAL WORK RELATIONSHIPS.

ITEMS 9/10a. Is there much peer pressure among the soldiers you lead?

1. From the response to Items 9/10a, determine the respondent's beliefs about the amount of peer pressure among the unit's first-term soldiers.
2. If the response indicated low levels of peer pressure, review the responses to Items 9/10b and 9/10c.
3. Based on these responses together (Items 9/10a-9/10c), determine the code in ANNEX #36 which best describes beliefs about much peer pressure among first termers.

ITEMS 9/10b. How do you know this (much peer pressure)? That is, how is it demonstrated?

1. If the response to Item 9/10a was coded as "yes" or "the same" as other units (from ANNEX #36), use the response to Items 9/10b to identify if one or more ways were described in which first termers have influenced each other through peer pressure. If the nature of the peer pressure influence was described,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #37 best summarize the influence.
 - b. Code each category of influence in ANNEX #37 according to ANNEX #3.
2. Code each category in ANNEX #37 as "3" for "not applicable" if any of the following applies:
 - a. The respondent believed that there was "more" or "as much" peer pressure as in other units (from ANNEX #36), but did not describe the nature of the influence.
 - b. The respondent indicated that there was a lack of (or "no") peer pressure (from ANNEX #36).
 - c. The respondent had "no opinion" about the peer pressure among first termers in the unit (from ANNEX #36).

ITEM 9/10c. How does the peer pressure (or lack of it) make it easier to lead your soldiers?

1. If the respondent believed that there was "more" or "as much" peer pressure in this unit as in other units (from ANNEX #36), use the response to Item 9/10c to identify if the respondent described a way in which the peer pressure had made leadership easier. If such an effect was described,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories of effects in ANNEX #38 best summarize the effects.
 - b. Code each category of effect in ANNEX #38 according to ANNEX #3.
2. Code each category of effect in ANNEX #38 as "3" for "not applicable" if any of the following applies:
 - a. The respondent described "more" or "as much" peer pressure in the unit (from ANNEX #36), but an effect of the peer pressure on leadership was not described.
 - b. The respondent indicated that there was "no" peer pressure (from ANNEX #36).
 - c. The respondent expressed "no opinion" about peer pressure (from ANNEX #36).

ITEM 10. What do you think are the most common reasons for (a) wanting assignment to a COHORT unit and (b) not wanting assignment to a COHORT unit?

NOT CODED. ADMINISTERED TO NON-COHORT LEADERS ONLY.

ITEM 11. What is your opinion of the COHORT policies that say people cannot be transferred from a unit for three years?

1. From the response to Item 11, determine the direction of opinion about three-year stabilized tours.
2. Code the direction of opinion according to the one category in ANNEX #39 that is most descriptive.

3. If the direction of opinion is coded as "favorable" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #39), identify whether the respondent mentioned one or more aspects (conditions or outcomes) of the three-year tour that were positive for the respondent. If one or more positive aspects were mentioned,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #40 describe them.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #40 according to INSET #3.
4. Code each category in ANNEX #40 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. The respondent held a "favorable" or "mixed" opinion (from ANNEX #39) but did not describe an aspect of the tour that was associated with the favorable side of his opinion.
 - b. The respondent had an "unfavorable" or "neutral" opinion (from ANNEX #39) of the three-year tour.
5. If the direction of opinion is coded as "unfavorable" or "mixed" (from ANNEX #39), identify whether the respondent mentioned one or more aspects (conditions or outcomes) of the three-year tour that was negative for the respondent. If one or more negative aspects were mentioned,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #41 describe them.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #41 according to ANNEX #3.
6. Code each category in ANNEX #41 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. A respondent with an "unfavorable" or "mixed" opinion (from ANNEX #39) did not describe an aspect of the tour that was associated with the unfavorable side of his opinion.
 - b. The respondent had a "favorable" or "neutral" opinion (from ANNEX #39) of the three-year tour.

ITEM 12. What is your opinion of the COHORT policies that say soldiers are always assigned to the same locations stateside and/or overseas most of their careers?

1. From the response to Item 12, determine the direction of opinion about regimental assignments.
2. Code the direction of opinion according to the one category in ANNEX #42 that is most descriptive.
3. If the direction of opinion is coded "favorable", "resigned", or "good for some (but not others)", identify whether the respondent mentioned one or more aspects (conditions or outcomes) associated with the favorable side of his opinion. If one or more positive aspects were mentioned,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #43 describe them.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #43 according to ANNEX #3.
4. Code each category in ANNEX #43 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. A respondent expressed an opinion of "favorable", "resigned", or "good for some (but not for others)" (from ANNEX #42); but the respondent did not describe an aspect of the tour that was associated with the favorable side of the opinion.
 - b. The respondent had an "unfavorable" or "indifferent" opinion (from ANNEX #42) about regimental assignments.
5. If the direction of opinion is coded "unfavorable", "resigned", or "good for some (but not for others)" (from ANNEX #42), identify whether the respondent mentioned one or more aspects (conditions or outcomes) associated with the unfavorable side of his opinion. If one or more negative aspects were mentioned,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #44 describe them.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #44 according to ANNEX #3.

6. Code each category in ANNEX #44 as "3" for "not applicable" if either of the following applies:
 - a. A respondent expressed an opinion of "unfavorable", "resigned", or "good for some (but not for others)" (from ANNEX #42); but the respondent did not describe an aspect of the tour that was associated with the unfavorable side of the opinion.
 - b. The respondent had a "favorable" or "indifferent" opinion (from ANNEX #42) about regimental assignments.

ITEM #13. Overall, what is your opinion of COHORT?

1. From the response to Item 13, determine the direction of "overall opinion of COHORT".
2. Code the direction of opinion according to the one category in ANNEX #45 that is most descriptive.
3. From the response to Item 13, determine if the respondent described one or more problems with COHORT. A problem is represented by statements about changes that would make the program more effective or acceptable or by statements about conditions that limit effectiveness or acceptability.
4. If one or more problems were described,
 - a. Determine which one or more of the categories in ANNEX #46 best summarize the problems mentioned in the protocol.
 - b. Code each category in ANNEX #46 according to ANNEX #3.
5. Code each category in ANNEX #46 as "3" for "not applicable" if the respondent described no problem with COHORT.

ANNEX #1

Unit Change

1. Improvement. Improvement in one or more areas is described. Decline in no area is described.
2. Decline. Decline in one or more areas is described. Improvement in no area is described.
3. Mixture. Improvement in one or more areas is described; decline in one or more other areas is also described.
4. Fluctuation. One (or more) area(s) is (are) described as improving and then declining (or the reverse).
5. Stability. Unit is described as remaining the same since the respondent has been in it.
6. Change not either mentioned or not discernible. Response does not yield a determination of change or stability.

ANNEX #2

Areas in Which Change is Mentioned

Performance capability. Reference is made to the knowledge, skills, performance, training, or proficiencies of either the whole unit or individuals in it. The reference describes or suggests that level of achievement has changed (increased or decreased) or that the outcomes achieved have more or less closely approached a standard, goal, or objective. The description does not pertain only to a change in the training procedures used to reach a goal.

Soldier motivation. The response describes motivational phenomena linked to the Army, unit, or performance of the soldier role. Words like and suggesting the following are used:

"motivation"; "morale"; "sharpness"; "discipline" (to include disciplinary problems); "participation in unit activities"; "adherence to standards" in the military code of conduct (e.g., "appearance"; "saluting").

Maintenance. Responses pertaining to the assembly, repair, or upkeep of equipment and/or facilities are given.

Organization-Integration. Reference is made to change in some aspect of the unit as an operating or integrated entity. This is represented in statements describing changes related to such things as:

"procedures" (training); "priorities" or "goals" (perhaps their clarity); overall functioning as an integrated organization ("...more as a unit"; "people working together better").

Generalized change. Although improvement, decline, or fluctuation is described, the change is generally described and cannot be placed in a particular content category.

Other. A change is described that is not non-specific but that does not fit into performance capability, soldier motivation, maintenance, or organization.

ANNEX #3

1. Yes. This category applies.
2. No. This category does not apply.

ANNEX #4

Respondent Influenced Unit Change

1. Yes. There has been change in the unit--improvement, decline, mixture, or fluctuation. The respondent describes something that he has done to influence, contribute to, or impact on the change.
2. No. There has been change in the unit--improvement, decline, mixture, or fluctuation. The respondent describes nothing that he himself has done to influence, contribute to, or impact on the change.

ANNEX #5

How Respondent Influenced Change

Soldier or unit training. The respondent has impacted on change by engaging in activities that contribute to improvement in the knowledge, skills, or performance capabilities of the unit or its members through training. Training activities may involve the definition, planning, or conduct of training for unit members or the unit as a whole. Training is indicated by activities such as:

"conducting training"; "planning training"; "making suggestions or input to the training schedule"; "holding classes"; "teaching" others what the respondent knows; "made others learn".

All activities pertaining to training are to be placed in this category unless one or both of two conditions are obtained: (1) those trained are only personnel in leadership positions or (2) the activity addresses organizational development (e.g., advocating the need to make training a priority) more than a particular training need (e.g., specific training objectives).

Training of leaders. The respondent has impacted through training activities as defined above under training. However, the target of the training is described as unit leaders, the cadre, or career soldiers.

Applying leadership. The respondent has applied leadership. Leadership is indicated by words such as "leadership" or by reference to a leadership technique, a style of leadership behavior (e.g., "I used a hard leadership style"), or general leadership role behaviors (e.g., "set the example"; "set the pace").

Performance of job/tasks of own position. The respondent has impacted by performing the non-leadership aspects of his duty position. This is indicated by statements about having performed the job, having been able to perform the job, or having had to perform a smaller number of jobs (or roles).

Dealing with personnel matters. The respondent has impacted by taking actions to deal with the problems of unit members as individuals. This involves both (1) helping soldiers (or their families) adjust or cope with problems and (2) taking formal actions on disciplinary or performance problems. This category is indicated by such descriptions as:

"show concern"; "listen to soldiers' problems"; "helped adjust"; "talk to people"; "counsel people"; "relieved people" (from a position); "eliminate from service".

Organizational development or integration. The respondent impacted by actions that contributed to the structure or operation of the unit as an organizational entity. This includes development of relationships among unit members. This category is represented by statements such as:

"set priorities for training"; "helped set standards"; "assigned/reassigned people to make the unit work better"; "scheduled events"; "kept the cohesion going"; "develop working relationships"; "get them to depend on each other".

Other. The respondent has impacted by actions that do not fit any of training, leader training, leadership, performance of job/tasks of position, personnel problems, or organizational development categories as defined above.

ANNEX #6

Pressure to Excel

1. Yes. There is more pressure to excel in this unit.
2. No. There is less pressure to excel in this unit.
3. No different. This unit either no different from any other unit or about the same as other units.
4. Unknown. No comparative response is given.

ANNEX #7

Pressure Sources

Unit image. Pressure is related to generalized beliefs about the way the unit is, likely will be, or should be because of its performance reputation or the type of unit that it is. This is represented by comments like:

"we are different"; "they want to outdo the prima dona COHORT units"; "we are viewed as one of the good units"; "they are aware of what other COHORT units have done"; "we are expected to set the example"; "we are looked at because we are COHORT".

Performance expectations. The pressure is described in relationship to the performance levels of the unit (may be seen as "poor"), to high expectations of the unit, or to an attempt to achieve performance goals or levels at a rate that does not seem reasonable to the respondent. Examples are:

Performance levels--pressure is described in relationship to "poor performance in the field"; "troops not at the level needed for an ARTEP".

High expectations--pressure is described in relationship to "expectations to meet standards of seasoned troops"; "expect us to do as well as other units" (when the COHORT unit is recently formed); "never satisfied"; "try to beat the standards"; "trying too much training"; "we have high internal standards".

Unreasonable expectations--pressure in relationship to "wanting to train as part of the battalion, but the unit cannot be expected to do well at first"; "priority is given to training and maintenance when needs of the company should be given more attention".

Details or special assignments. The pressure is described in relationship to the number or quality of details or special assignments given to the unit. The description may be couched in statements about the reason the unit has certain assignments. Examples are:

"we get a lot of details because we are good and have a large fill"; "details are given to units who have people and can handle them"; "we get special assignments"; "...just coming off two weeks of support"; "commitments".

COHORT program characteristics. The pressure is related to a general characteristic of a program in which the unit is participating. This is indicated by statements such as:

"COHORT is a new program"; "the bugs have got to be worked out of COHORT".

Family issues. Pressure is related to family considerations. An example is:

"families got here before the troops had a chance to settle in".

Experience or qualifications of personnel. The pressure is related to the level of military experience, qualifications, or problems (performance) of either the respondent or others in the unit. This category is represented by statements about:

"have to prove myself because I am new in the job"; "adjustment/adaptation problems of first-term soldiers"; "caliber of soldiers" (or other particular individual, e.g., the company commander).

Chain of command. Someone in the chain of command is described as the source of pressure. What the chain of command has done to create pressure is not specified; that is, only the "link" in the chain is mentioned without further specification of the conditions having created pressure.

Other. The pressure is related to conditions not fitting any of the above categories.

ANNEX #8

Respondent and/or Other Careerists Feel the Pressure

1. Yes. Respondent mentions an effect for himself, for himself and others, or only for other careerists. The effect may be negative or positive.
2. No. Respondent states that neither he nor anyone else in the unit has been affected by the pressure.

ANNEX #9

How Pressure is Felt

Long duty hours. Length of work/duty day or long hours is mentioned. This may be mentioned in conjunction with family/personal life or more field duty.

Family or personal life. Respondent states that the pressure or an effect of it (such as long hours) has affected his family or personal life. Effect on family or personal life is indicated by such statements as:

"affected family life"; "not enough off-duty time"; "wife cannot understand"; "cannot do what I want off-duty".

Professional restriction. The pressure (or conditions related to it) either restricts professionalism or produces a feeling of being restricted as a professional. This includes feelings of fear, anxiety, or other misgivings about either performing well or other's reactions at poor performance. Also included is an inability to perform fully because role authority has been usurped, is not respected, or is not recognized by leaders higher in the chain of command. This category is indicated by statements about:

"fear of failure"; "fear of making a mistake"; "risk of getting busted if a mistake is made"; "not feeling free to perform as a NCO"; "micro-managed"; "being treated as a first termier rather than as an NCO"; "not being heard".

Professional motivation. The pressure is appealing or boosts effort in an aspect of the leader role. This is indicated by statements about:

"liking it"; "finding it stimulating"; "motivation of professionalism"; "forcing one to adhere more closely to the leader (officer or NCO) role"; "studying harder (may be after regular duty hours) to learn or keep up"; "keeps you on your toes".

Personnel turnover from unit. There is an effect on desire to remain in the unit or regiment either for the remainder of the present term or in subsequent enlistments. This is indicated by statements about:

"wanting to leave (or not stay in) the unit regiment"; "not wanting to return to the unit"; "need to leave the unit to get ahead, be promoted, or achieve another professional goal".

General dissatisfaction. The pressure or condition(s) originating it produces a negative affect for or among unit members. This category is scored only if the response indicates a negative affect that, first, cannot be coded otherwise and, second, is a generalized description such as:

"negative attitude"; "low morale"; "low motivation"; "bothered"

Other. The effect of the pressure cannot be placed in one of the other categories.

ANNEX #10

Wanted Assignment to Unit

1. Yes. The respondent indicates having wanted assignment to the unit. Code as yes if there is an indication that the respondent wanted assignment to the unit regardless of whether the respondent had a choice.
2. No. The respondent indicates not having wanted assignment to the unit. Code as no if there is an indication that the respondent did not want assignment to the unit regardless of whether the respondent had a choice.
3. No choice. The respondent indicates no choice in his assignment. Code as no choice only if there is no indication as to whether the respondent wanted assignment to the unit and if the respondent states that he had no choice.
4. No preference. There is no indication that the respondent had a clear desire either for or against assignment to the unit. no indication of a lack of choice is mentioned.

ANNEX #11

Direction of Expectations About the Assignment

(Use responses to item 3c (and maybe 3b) to determine whether the respondent's expectations about the unit had been positive or negative in direction.)

1. Positive direction. Expectations are described in terms of occurrences or outcomes which seem to be personally desirable to the respondent or generally socially desirable.
2. Mixed. Several expectations are described, one or more of which are positive in direction (as defined here) and one or more of which are negative (as defined here).
3. Negative direction. Expectations are described in terms of occurrences or outcomes which seem to be personally undesirable to the respondent and/or generally socially undesirable.
4. No expectations. The respondent indicates having had no expectations. N/A is recorded as the response to item 3c.
5. Not discernible. The nature of the respondent's expectations is unclear.

ANNEX #12

Positive Expectations About the Assignment

Opportunity to develop own unit. The assignment would offer an opportunity for the leader to develop, form, or train a group of (new) soldiers (from scratch) into a unit of his own. As a result, desirable ends were envisioned (meeting the leader's standards, freedom from personnel problems, soldiers who were known entities, or better unit performance). This is indicated by responses such as:

"expected the job/assignment to be more challenging than the last one (working with people who have never been in the Army before)"; "ability to mold soldiers from scratch...to be the trainer"; "liked the idea of COHORT"; "training your own people so that you know what you have reflects your own skills"; "I will know that I have trained these people, what they can be, and what their abilities are"; "I had been in a unit where people could not function as a team...thought it would be good to train people from IET and make people work together"; "I would get new troops to be trained the way they are supposed to be trained"; "I thought that this was the best opportunity an NCO could have--to take young men and prepare them for combat"; "opportunity to train soldiers our way and thereby avoid the bad attitudes and discipline problems in regular units"; "a chance to exercise my style of leadership, to train, and to develop the unit"; "I was hoping that we wouldn't be pressured into being the best company right away...that we could develop step by step"; "...wanted to start the unit, develop it, and stay together for three years"; "want to form the unit my way"; "this would be an NCO's dream: get new troops, mold them, and keep them for a long period"; "COHORT has its advantages. Forming a unit with new soldiers. You will have fewer discipline problems. If training is available, you can create a great unit"; "I had expected the ability to develop a company that you could depend on and that would be stable. People would work well together".

Improved training conditions. The response pertains to training and how it would have a greater emphasis, be more effective, or be freer from problems. This is indicated by statements such as:

"expected training to be number one"; "expected training to be different"; "...well trained units"; "fewer training problems because of stable NCOs".

Personnel stability. The unit was expected to be more stable or to experience less turnover. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I liked the idea of stability"; "I liked the thought of staying together for three years"; "....stability of unit members"; "thought COHORT would alleviate turnover"; "I wanted a unit that did not constantly turnover"; "...less (no) turnover".

Career opportunity. The assignment was expected to benefit, develop, or advance one's career; or to provide the opportunity to serve in a particular type of position. This is indicated by statements such as:

"career development"; "command and control a company"; "...wanted C of FB position"; "wanted platoon sergeant position"; "expected to be platoon sergeant"; "experience in position of XO of firing battery"; "quicker promotions".

Relationships among unit members. The members of a unit would have a better opportunity to know each other well, to become tightly knit, or develop into a team. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...knowing people well seemed to be a big advantage: more realistic expectations of them"; "if you get to know your fellow workers, there are fewer chances for friction, better chances of knowing how to work with others, and building up confidence about what others are like"; "thought it would tightly knit..."; "I expected a close knit unit with the people trying together to be the best".

Quality personnel. The members of the unit were expected to be of high quality, to be well disciplined, or to have better morale. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...leadership was good"; "...high quality people"; "the first termers are good and have lived up to my expectations"; "...good quality personnel"; "...high expectations...because the skill levels were higher"; "I expected the troops to be more disciplined"; "...did not expect high disciplinary rates"; "...better morale"; "...good chain of command".

Tour at preferred location. The soldier wanted to be at (or go to) the area that the unit was (would be) located. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...wanted to go to Germany"; "...wanted a way to get away from Fort _____"; "...going to Germany"; "...wanted this area".

Stabilized tour. The idea of a stabilized tour was attractive. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I liked the idea of a stabilized tour"; "I like the idea of stabilizing within CONUS".

Serve as instructor. Assignment to a COHORT unit would allow the respondent to serve in the role of instructor. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...wanted to be a DI"; "my job would be more like an instructor".

Terms of foreign tour. The terms of a foreign tour were attractive. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...concurrent travel with family to Germany"; "they promised us an 18-month accompanied tour with dependents. This has now been changed to 36 months".

Other. Other types of expectations to include general testimonial about COHORT and its attractiveness.

ANNEX #13

Whether Respondent Held Expectation

1. Held and met. The respondent held this positive expectation which seems to have been met.
2. Held and not met. The respondent held this positive expectation which seems to have not been met.
3. Held and unknown. The respondent held this positive expectation. Whether the expectation has been met is not indicated.
4. Not held. The respondent indicates having held positive expectations. But not this one.

ANNEX #14

Want Repeated Assignment to Unit

1. Yes. The respondent would now want assignment to the unit.
2. No. The respondent would now not want assignment to the unit.
3. Unsure. The respondent is now unsure or mentions both positive and negative aspects (without stating a preference) about assignment to the unit.
4. Not applicable. Respondent's preference is unknown or not indicated by the response.

ANNEX #15

Reasons for Wanting Repeated Assignment to the Unit

Personnel stability. The respondent describes attitudes towards keeping soldiers together for three years or the effects of three-year stabilization on training, group relations, family, unit effectiveness, etc. This is indicated by statements such as:

"less need to retrain new people"; "family is settled at present location"; "like the stability"; "stabilized soldiers are a great group to work with"; "stabilization of first termers is a good thing"; "no turnover produces a better unit in combat".

Relationships among unit members. The response defines attitudes toward togetherness and interpersonal relationships, unit morale, or sense of "belongingness" of the soldiers in the unit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"esprit de corps and togetherness"; "feeling of belonging"; "morale is very high"; "people are close and rely on one another".

Unit training and development. Respondent describes the rate and quality of the unit's acquisition and retention of military skills, the effect on training accomplishments of soldiers' being kept together for three years, or soldiers' willingness to learn. Respondent describes the opportunity provided to start, form, and mold soldiers into a unit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"Soldiers very willing to learn"; "people trained more quickly"; "unit progresses very quickly"; "really train people to standards"; "build people to standards"; "get new troops and mold them into a unit"; "I've seen it form and it would be stupid to throw it away"; "had the ability to develop a company..."; "we can make good soldiers of the first-termers"; "could try my form of leadership to train and develop the unit"; "different and interesting experience working with people who have never been in the Army before".

Identification with unit. There is a sense of unit identity beyond its individual members, pride in the unit and affiliation with it, reference to the "unit" as a separate entity. This is indicated by statements such as:

"my favorite unit"; "I helped to build it this way"; "best company in the brigade"; "served with this company in Korea and in Vietnam"; "am familiar with this unit".

Quality of leadership. Response concerns perceptions of leader behavior, effective communication skills, command climate, rapport, or a desirable approach to management. This indicated by statements about:

"very qualified leaders"; "really good management"; "leaders allow us to do our jobs"; "higher-ups do not hassle us"; "leaders allow us to learn our jobs"; "qualified NCOs".

Good career experience. A distinct reference is made to the acquisition of a role or role requirements by virtue of assignment to the current unit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"command opportunity"; "promoted because of this unit".

Other. Reasons for wanting another assignment to the unit are mentioned that do not fit into one of the other categories.

ANNEX #16

Reasons for Not Wanting Repeated Assignment to the Unit

NCO quality. Comments refer specifically to the quality of NCO leadership: performance, interpersonal skills, effectiveness, motivation, etc.

"incompetent"; "unwilling to learn"; "inadequately trained to teach others"; "unwilling to accept advice".

Leadership problems. Unit leaders (as opposed to NCOs alone) are perceived to have problems in terms of effectiveness or demonstrating concern. Command climate does not fully support leadership behavior. This is indicated by statements such as:

"SOPs restrict influence of junior leader"; "leaders are uncaring about the problems associated with being together for three years"; "leaders do not stand up for their troops".

Confined assignment opportunities. Assignment to the current unit has reduced opportunities for military schooling, career advancement, experience with other military installations, or ability to transfer. This assignment has been (or will be) either long enough or too long. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I have given my time, now let somebody else do it"; "been here too long"; "want to travel overseas"; "want to go to an installation other than _____"; "career-developmental opportunities have to be delayed"; "no chance for military schools"; "no chance for other assignments".

Pressures of assignment. Serving in the unit has created pressures or demands of such a time magnitude or nature that the respondent's work or personal (family) life have been adversely affected. This is indicated by statements such as:

"pace has been too tough"; "too much pressure, too many hours spent"; "too demanding, too much pressure"; "initial stages are too demanding"; "very hard on personal life"; "pressure"; "burned out as an instructor"; "family pressures are great because of the time spent".

Other. Response refers to a reason for not wanting repeated assignment to the unit that is not captured by one of above categories.

ANNEX #17

Tour Good Career Experience

1. Positive. Respondent explicitly evaluates the assignment as a good career experience or describes outcomes that are personally or socially desirable.
2. Negative. Respondent explicitly evaluates the assignment as a negative (poor, bad) career experience or describes outcomes that seem personally or socially undesirable.
3. Mixed. The career experience is described as both positive and negative.
4. Uncertain. Respondent either does not know or expresses uncertainty as to whether the experience has been positive or negative. Expression of uncertainty may be made along with ways in the experience tended to be positive and/or negative.
5. Neither positive nor negative. The assignment is regarded as having no special career significance, as neither especially good nor especially bad, or as no different from another assignment.

ANNEX #18

How Assignment Has Been Positive Career Experience

Positive idiosyncratic effect. The assignment has had a positive personal relevance and significance beyond being a good career experience. This is suggested by statements indicating that:

"stabilized tour good for me"; "set my own goals"; "have not been away from the family too much"; "personally rewarding".

Received promotion. The respondent has been promoted during the current assignment. This is indicated by statements such as:

"promoted to platoon position"; "made E8 on the secondary list".

Career record helped. The current assignment will have significant future benefits for the respondent's career. The assignment has kept the respondent on track of career development/personal goals. This is suggested by statements indicating:

"...an E7--exactly where I should be"; "I will stand out to the promotion board"; "good to have COHORT on your record"; "want to reenlist--COHORT locks me in"; "will get to the Light Infantry Division more easily"; "will get me to Germany"; "easier to get selected for First Sergeant's school"; "schools more open to me"; "am on the E8 list and need COHORT to make E9".

Good leadership experience. There have been opportunities to acquire, refine, and apply leadership training; to achieve a leadership position; or to function in a leadership position. This is suggested by statements indicating:

"pushed me to become a competent leader"; "senior officers have been very instructive and beneficial to my career"; "really apply schooling and past experiences"; "good experience training and retaining troops"; "been good managerial experience"; "learned to lead and to pass on this skill"; "learned to deal with leadership pressures"; "learned to help new soldiers adjust to their problems"; "opportunity to command"; "maximum use of duty position to command"; "tested and proved myself as a leader".

Opportunity to develop soldiers. Leaders have had the opportunity to take new soldiers and to shape them to their own standards and expectations. This is suggested by statements indicating:

"take new soldiers and shape them for combat"; "set standards for new group of soldiers"; "mold new soldiers into good soldiers"; "control bad habits".

Good unit training. The assignment has provided an opportunity for good unit training. This is indicated by statements such as:

"a lot of training experience"; "we have had a lot of good field training".

Benefit of personnel stability. Personnel stability is viewed as good or as creating a benefit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"good to work with the same people for a longer period of time"; "I will have the same troops for three years. I will not lose them and become short in my section"; "chance to see how a unit is supposed to function since people stay together".

Other. Comments not fitting into any of the above categories are made about how the assignment is a positive career experience.

ANNEX #19

How Assignment Has Been a Negative Career Experience

Reduced opportunities for military schools. Assignment to the unit has decreased or denied the respondent opportunities to attend military schools, and this has adversely impacted on the respondent's career. This is indicated by statements such as:

"barred from military schools".

Personality clashes. Assignment to the unit negatively impacts in that because the same people are together for three years, reprisals and personal enmity have greater impact. This is indicated by statements such as:

"locked in with people that you conflict with"; "personality clashes with peers and supervisors".

Confined assignment opportunities. Inability to leave the unit for the three-year life cycle prevents soldiers from pursuing other career opportunities or experiences. This is indicated by statements such as:

"If another opportunity comes along, you cannot take it"; "if they go regimental, I will have to stay here"; "if you are CO-HORT, you cannot go anywhere else until your time is up"; "all a company commander will know is Fort _____"; "NCOs will be doing the same thing for years--they cannot get out"; "confining--have to get promoted to get to the next job"; "locked in--cannot get position as chief of firing battery"; "committed myself to a program where I would be rotated overseas--now they have changed the rules".

Promotion problems. Assignment to the current unit creates difficulties in promotability since soldiers are staying together and since there are no vacancies (high fill rates) into which people may be moved. This is indicated by statements such as:

"three 2LTs were promoted at the same time--there was no place to put them"; "elsewhere, E6s have the opportunity to go in higher positions, but not here"; "I am simply in my own E6 job".

Poor leader preparation. There is a perceived deficit in the training of leaders for which refresher/basic training should be provided. This is indicated by statements such as:

"need a cadre training program so that all NCOs are prepared to deal with COHORT units"; "platoon leaders need introductory courses to teach them how to deal with their new positions".

Other. A negative factor associated with assignment to the unit is given that does not fit into any other of the above categories.

ANNEX #20

Assignment Affects Opportunities for Military Schools

1. Good opportunities. Opportunities for attending military schools are described as "good" for either the respondent or other unit members. There are expressions indicating satisfaction with school opportunities. There is a belief that opportunities in this unit have been better than they would have been in other units. Restricted opportunities are not described for either the respondent or other unit members.
2. Mixed/uncertain opportunities. Opportunities have been both good and restricted as described here, or there is uncertainty as to whether the opportunities have been good or restricted.
3. Restricted opportunities. Opportunities have not been as good as the respondent had expected they would or should have been. There are expressions of dissatisfaction with school opportunities or of a belief that opportunities would have been better in other units. Either the respondent or other unit members have been deprived of opportunities to go to military schools. Good opportunities are not described for either the respondent or other unit members.
4. No effect on opportunities. Opportunities have been neither good nor restricted as defined here. The respondent has no need for further military schooling at this phase in his career.
5. No response. No response is given (to include an entry of not applicable). The entry is a listing of the schools attended (or not attended) but does not indicate whether this attendance record is believed to represent good or restricted opportunities.

ANNEX #21

Assignment Affects Future Assignments Available

1. Good choices. Chances for choice in the next assignment are good.
2. Uncertain choices. There is uncertainty as to whether the respondent has a choice or will be able to get his choice of next assignment.
3. Restricted choices. Chances for choice of next assignment are restricted, to include the notion that the next assignment is predestined.
4. Choices not effected. The present assignment has no effect on chances of getting choice in the next assignment.
5. No response. No response is given. The respondent indicates lack of knowledge (as opposed to uncertainty).

ANNEX #22

Assignment Affects Promotions

1. Positive effect. The assignment has or will positively influence promotion opportunities.
2. Uncertain. The respondent is in some way uncertain whether the assignment will affect promotion opportunities.
3. Negative effect. The assignment has or will somehow reduce promotion opportunities for the respondent.
4. No effect. The assignment has not affected promotion opportunities. The belief is expressed that promotions are based on the performance quality of a soldier and not the unit of assignment.
5. No response. No response is given, or the respondent indicates lack of knowledge (as opposed to uncertainty).

ANNEX #23

Unit Permits Transfers

1. Yes. Unit members have (apparently) both tried to transfer and have actually transferred.
2. No. Unit members have (apparently) tried to transfer, but their attempts have been denied.
3. No attempts. There is no awareness of an attempt by a unit member to transfer. Code response as no attempts if unit members have informally voiced a desire to transfer but have not officially tried (by putting in the appropriate form, by formal discussions with company commander or other leader, etc.).
4. Not applicable. Response is unclear.

ANNEX #24

Whether Unit's Transfer Policies Fair

1. Fair. Unit members have tried to transfer. The respondent either explicitly states that the unit's policies are fair or describes a way in which the unit's policies serve the personal or professional interests of the unit's members.
2. Mixed. Unit members have tried to transfer. The unit's policies are regarded as both fair and unfair as defined here, or the respondent expresses uncertainty about the policies' fairness.
3. Unfair. Unit members have tried to transfer. The respondent either explicitly states that the unit's policies are unfair or describes a way in which the unit's policies do not serve the personal or professional interests of the unit's members. The respondent does not indicate any way in which the policies are regarded as fair.
4. Not applicable. No one has tried to transfer. No response is given that can be coded.

ANNEX #25

How Policy Considered Fair

Policy compliance. The unit's policies are fair because they are "the policies". References may be made to some aspect of the COHORT/NMS, such as "soldiers know they are locked in". This is indicated by statements such as:

"fair because they know they are locked in"; "(professional and personal interest are) not usually considered, but this is fair".

Career progression needs supported. The unit's policies have taken the career interests (progression needs) of soldiers into account. This is indicated by statements such as:

"if a soldier wants to go to another unit to improve his career, the CO and I will not stand in his way"; "soldier made E8 and was allowed to go to battalion"; "the unit has transferred two people so they can do better elsewhere"; "good reasons for transfers are: changing jobs, doing something else, etc"; "an E5 did not want to reenlist for COHORT. He was allowed out of the unit. Then he reenlisted for Germany"; "people have been transferred for professional reasons".

Personal interests considered. Decisions about transferring soldiers in the unit have taken their personal (to include family) interests, needs, or concerns into account. This is indicated by statements such as:

"the 1st SGT and CO are concerned about the reputation of the company. This is protected by supporting concerns of soldiers"; "personal needs are considered, but not professional"; "one has transferred for personal reasons (personality conflict)"; "a transfer has been approved for family reasons (an extreme case)"; "people have been asked if they want to transfer or not".

Reasoned administration. The reasons for (or reasonableness of) requests for transfer have been considered. Decisions about transfers reflect the reasonableness of the request. This is indicated by statements such as:

"they look at the request and try to do the best thing"; "requests for transfers were for unsubstantive reasons"; "reasonable requests are recommended for approval"; "they consider

it"; "a good soldier gets considered"; "gave person every opportunity to state his case...but not allowed to transfer. Instead, he was 'chaptered out' of the Army"; "those who have wanted out, we have let out".

Other. A way in which the unit's policies is considered fair is described, but it does not fit with any of the above categories.

ANNEX #26

How Policy Considered Unfair

Confined assignments. Soldiers cannot leave the unit until their terms of service have elapsed, perhaps except with an extreme act (e.g., declination of reenlistment, receiving a chapter). This is indicated by statements such as:

"can't go anywhere until your time is up. You're locked in if you are in COHORT"; "because you are locked into COHORT"; "it takes something more than an act of God to get transferred out"; "needs not considered because we are COHORT and must serve the obligated tour"; "only option we have. You can't leave COHORT unless you take a bar to reenlistment"; "once in COHORT--stuck in COHORT. The only way out is death or a chapter".

Career progression needs hindered. Soldiers' needs to transfer for professional advancement, growth, or interests have not been considered. Soldier development has not been encouraged through transfers. This is indicated by statements such as:

"people who felt they weren't going to advance in the unit were not let out"; "people with potential (e.g., for OCS) have been turned down"; "transfers should be allowed if they effect a soldier's career development"; "especially those in low density MOSs should be allowed to transfer for career development"; "unfair to restrict assignments to other units"; "wants to go to drill instructor school, off-post schooling (but presumably cannot)"; "professional needs are not considered; many careerists want out now".

Personal needs not considered. The personal needs of individual soldiers (to include motivation) are not considered. Personality conflicts are not considered valid reasons for transfers. This is indicated by statements such as:

"they don't consider the personal needs"; "an E6 had a heat/cold profile and was not allowed out--the E6 had a good reason. This inflexibility creates a bad attitude about the Army"; "personality conflicts are not considered"; "reason for transfer was a personality conflict. He wasn't allowed to leave".

Deviant behaviors encouraged. Treatment of requests for transfers have resulted in AWOLs or other behaviors associated with less than honorable discharges. This is indicated by statements such as:

"can't get out by honorable means"; "soldier went AWOL just to get out of unit"; "a new E6 was forced either to sign a declaration or to join the COHORT unit--no one has seen him yet".

Other. A way in which the unit's policies is considered unfair is described, but it does not fit with any of the above categories.

ANNEX #27

Unit Transfer Policies in Army's Best Interest

1. Yes. Unit members have tried to transfer. The respondent explicitly agrees that the unit's policies are the Army's best interest. Respondent describes a condition, outcome, or value which is supported (created by) the unit's policies and which seems to be personally desirable to the respondent or generally socially desirable (e.g., unit effectiveness, testing the NMS, weeding out poor soldiers).
2. No. Unit members have tried to transfer. The respondent explicitly indicates that the unit's policies are not in the Army's best interest. Respondent describes an outcome or value which seems to be personally undesirable to the respondent or generally socially undesirable (e.g., promotes inclinations to leave service; creates unhappy soldiers; not enough flexibility).
3. Uncertain or mixed. Unit members have tried to transfer. The respondent describes either (1) himself as uncertain as to whether the unit's policies are in the Army's best interest or (2) ways in which the policies both are and are not in the Army's best interest as defined here.
4. No response. Unit members have tried to transfer. But no response is recorded for the respondent (to include entries of "no", and "not applicable" if responses to 5a indicate that unit members have tried to transfer).
5. Not applicable. No unit member has tried to transfer.

ANNEX #28

How Unit Policies are in Army's Best Interests

Policy compliance necessary. Unit's policies conform to the Army's (COHORT) policies. The Army's policies should support what the Army wants or needs. This is indicated by statements such as:

"DA should know what it wants"; "COHORT units have been kept intact. Otherwise purpose of COHORT would have been defeated"; "to conform to the requirements of COHORT".

Benefit of stabilization. Keeping people (or the unit) intact has a benefit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"merely keeping people around is a benefit to the Army"; "has kept people in the unit and freed them to work".

Good performers transferred. The interests of "good soldiers" have been supported when they have requested transfers. This is indicated by statements such as:

"requests have been examined individually. They have always been endorsed when an outstanding performer has requested a transfer to better himself"; "the people trying to transfer were good soldiers, and the unit tried to help them".

Career progression needs supported. Transfer policies have supported professional advancement and career interests of soldiers and, through them, development of the Army's personnel resources. This is indicated by statements such as:

"only people wanting/willing to go to Germany were moved into a unit going there"; "those who have transferred are going to OCS and they are doing what they want to do"; "those allowed to leave to go to OCS will benefit the Army".

Unit training/effectiveness supported. The unit's policies support high fill levels which is needed for good training or unit effectiveness. This is indicated by statements such as

"this is an ideal situation for the unit members. With full squads, we will generate our own training. The Army does not need people who don't want this situation"; "what is good for the soldiers is good for the unit, and therefore, the Army. We have to have high unit fills to train the first termers"; "to keep fill levels"; "no one else would volunteer in".

Basis of unit's policies. The Army's interests are the basis of decisions/policies about transfers. This is indicated by statements such as:

"policy is based on considerations of mission and unit effectiveness"; "my decisions are based on the best interest of the Army".

Other. A way in which the unit's policies are in the Army's best interests is described, but it does not fit in any of the above categories.

ANNEX #29

Impact of Assignment on Career Intent

Increased inclination to remain in service. The respondent has "long-range" plans for remaining in service (i.e., plans for one or more additional enlistments, plans to remain in service until retirement). Assignment to the present unit has contributed to or reinforced the respondent's retention plans. This is indicated by statements such as:

"helped to improve my intentions to remain in service"; "made me want to stay"; "maybe made me feel better about my intentions to be a careerist"; "now, I feel better about my job"; "the assignment has reinforced my beliefs that the infantry is the place for me and also has strengthened my beliefs in my own abilities".

Decreased inclination to remain in service. Due to present or future career conditions associated with the assignment, the respondent has become less motivated to stay in the Army (1) longer or (2) as long as had been planned at one time. This is indicated by statements such as:

"due to the leadership, it is hard for me to want to stay for 20 years, although I would like to. The commander destroys your EER for one small mistake"; "don't like the idea of returning to Fort _____"; "it has made me think that I have screwed up by staying. My family would want me to get out of the Army"; "the people (commander) have ruined my attitude. There have been too many changes"; "my wife is opposed to _____ and I would leave the service if I have to remain at Fort _____".

Mixed or uncertain effects. The respondent either is uncertain about the effects of the present assignment on intent to remain in service or indicates ways in which the assignment has both increased and decreased inclination to remain in the Army.

No effect on inclination to remain in service. Assignment to the present unit has not affected the respondent's plans for remaining in service. This is indicated by statements such as:

"none"; "not really"; "COHORT won't break me"; "no"; "not at all"; "no, plans already firm"; "already planned to leave service".

ANNEX #30

Opinion of First-Term Leadership

1. Positive. Leadership of first-term soldiers in leadership positions is described either by a global positive evaluation (e.g., good, excellent) or behaviors or outcomes that are positive. The opinion should not be scored as positive if the appraisal is qualified by statements indicating that leadership is good when rank, pay grade, training, experience, etc., are considered.
2. Negative. The leadership of first-term soldiers in leadership positions is described either by a global negative evaluation (e.g., poor) or by behaviors, outcomes, or conditions suggesting problems or weaknesses. Conditions suggesting weaknesses or problems include limitations associated with rank, pay grade, training, experience, etc.
3. Mixed. The leadership of first-term soldiers in leadership positions is described positively and negatively, as defined above. The opinion should be coded as mixed if an overall positive evaluation is qualified by statements that leadership is good when other conditions (e.g., rank, pay grade) are considered.
4. No opinion. The response provides no evaluation of the leadership of first-term leaders in the that the response is non-evaluative or indicates no observation of first-term leaders (to include that there are no first-term leaders in the unit). Use this category when no response was given/sought.

ANNEX #31

First-Term Leadership Problems

Differentiation from lower or equal ranking soldiers. First termers in a leadership position have problems in transitioning from "soldier" to "leader", that is, of pulling away from friendship relationships with peers and becoming or acting as their leader. This is indicated by statements referencing a relationship with peers or friends such as:

"dealing with peers"; "telling friends what to do"; "ties with E4s and below"; "he is only one of the privates"; "inhibited by personal friendships".

Receipt of respect. Other unit members do not readily respond to the first-term soldier as a leader. This is indicated by statements about:

"getting respect"; "not being treated or recognized as a full-fledged leader"; "perceived as trainees"; "inability to associate with older NCOs"; "being acknowledged as an NCO by other (senior) NCOs".

Skill deficiencies. First-term leaders lack or are weak in skills needed for their leadership positions. The skills may be related to leadership or technical aspects of the role. The skills may also be derived from experience (or the lack thereof), either military experience or personal experience (maturity). This problem is indicated by statements about:

"lack of technical experience" (specific skills could be stated);
"lack of military experience"; "have to learn to become NCO";
"need experience in giving orders"; "they use friendships and not rank to get things done"; "personal immaturity".

Other. Problems of first-term leaders not fitting into any of the above categories are given.

ANNEX #32

Cohesion of First-Term Soldiers

1. Positive. Respondent positively evaluates cohesion of first termers; mentions an effect of cohesion that seems to be either positive to the respondent or generally socially desirable; or directly states that the first termers are cohesive.
2. Mixed or qualified positive. Cohesion of first termers is described in a mixed or qualified way suggesting that it could be better. This is indicated by evaluative descriptors such as "fair" or "ok, but could be better". This also indicated by a positive evaluation (e.g., "good") followed by description of a limiting condition (e.g., "good when they are in the field but not in garrison").
3. Low. Cohesion of first-termers is described as poor, low, or non-existent.
4. No meaningful response. No response is given. The response does not permit classification as positive, mixed, or low (e.g., "like any other unit").

ANNEX #33

How Cohesion of First Termers is Demonstrated

Good work relationships. First termers work well together on assignments, push each other to do well, and help one another with work.

Mutual caring. First termers care about, look after, and take care of one another on- and off-duty. They are friends.

Sense of unity. First termers have a group identity, sense of belonging and loyalty between group members, or sense of the group's helping individual members with their problems. The "group" approaches leaders with first termers' problems.

Free time interaction. First termers associate with one another both on- and off-duty; first termers spend free time together.

Other. A way is described in which cohesion among first termers is demonstrated, but it does not fit any of the above categories.

ANNEX #34

Effect of First Termers' Cohesion on Leadership

1. Positive. Cohesion among first termers has been beneficial to the leader in some fashion.
2. Mixed. Respondent is either uncertain or perceives cohesion of first termers as having had both beneficial and detrimental effects.
3. Negative. First-termer cohesion is perceived to have had detrimental effects on the leadership of the respondent.
4. Non-directional effects. First-termer cohesion has impacted, but no specific direction is indicated, (e.g., "caring has a new impact in COHORT groups").
5. No effect. First-termer cohesion has had no effect on leadership abilities.
6. Not applicable. No meaningful response is recorded.

ANNEX #35

Positive Effects of First Termers' Cohesion on Leadership

General positive effect. Cohesion has made the job "easier". Cohesiveness has "helped" the leader. First termers are easier to train or control in the field. How leadership has been made easier or helped is not specified further.

Motivation of leader. The cohesiveness of first term soldiers favorably impacts on the leader's motivation, satisfaction, or morale. This is indicated by statements such as:

"positive--when I feel I have support"; "their wanting to be a team motivates me"; "more challenging"; "helps my morale"; "makes my job more rewarding--first termers want to be pushed"; "I feel respected".

First termers' functioning as a group. The first termers function well as a group or manifest properties of a well functioning group. This is indicated by statements such as:

"work as a team"; "team effort"; "people really work well together"; "they help each other out"; "I can depend on a cohesive group to help me out"; "all are moving toward a common goal"; "they usually stick together"; "they pull together"; "they cover each other so that they know exactly what to do".

Reduced need to supervise. The leader does not have to supervise as much. The leader has more time. The leader has less pressure. First termers perform in the leader's absence, police each other, and keep things going themselves. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I don't have to supervise"; "they carry out orders with very little supervision"; "gives me more time"; "it takes a lot of pressure off of me"; "they function even without key leaders"; "they police among themselves"; "if you tell one, they will pass the information on".

Performance energized by group functioning. Cohesiveness results in faster job performance, faster learning, drive, or positive attitudes toward goal or job accomplishment. This is indicated by statements such as:

"faster response time to orders"; "it helps to get things done faster"; "they pick up on things quickly and complete them"; "the attitude is, 'it has got to get done, so let's do it'"; "they have got drive and esprit de corps".

Clarity of expectations by first termers. The first termers know both what is expected of themselves and of others; they have more insight into the situation. This is indicated by statements such as:

"soldiers know what is expected of them"; "people know what to expect from one another"; "long affiliation makes first termers more perceptive"; "knowing everyone...helps them know me".

Attitudes of first termers disciplined. Cohesiveness is associated with positive motivation, attitudes, or conditions that positively motivate first termers. This is indicated by statements such as:

"very positive attitudes"; "give more challenge to the young soldiers"; "the first termers are in a 'controlled' environment and are unexposed to bad elements".

Clarity of expectations by leaders. The leader's expectations are affected--possibly higher or more realistic. The leader has more knowledge of subordinates. The leader can more easily set expectations. This is indicated by statements such as:

"expect more of people when you know them"; "expect subordinates to be more tactically competent"; "makes the job easier--set expectations and standards".

Other. A positive leadership effect of first termers' cohesion is mentioned, but it does not fit any of the categories above.

ANNEX #36

Much Peer Pressure

(Coded for responses about peer pressure among first termers only)

1. Yes. A response indicating the existence of peer pressure, or influence among first term soldiers, is given. Even if "no" is given in response to 10a, categorize as "yes" if responses to later sub-items (e.g., 10c) indicate the existence of peer pressure (e.g., the respondent has said there is no peer pressure in the unit and then describes a way in which the peer pressure in the unit makes the job easier).
2. Neither more nor less than other units. The present unit is compared with other units. The comparison does not indicate whether peer pressure in the present unit is more or less than in other units.
3. No. There is either a lack of peer pressure or less peer pressure than in other units that the respondent is (or has been) familiar with.
4. No opinion. The respondent does not know, is not sure, cannot say, or gives another response indicating no opinion.

ANNEX #37

Nature of Influence of Peer Pressure

Caring and closeness. Reference is made to on- and off-duty interpersonal relationships between unit members, care shown for (and by) unit members to each other, concern for prosocial behavior, or policing behavior by and for unit members. This is indicated by statements such as:

"soldiers take care of each other"; "help each other get squared away"; "look out for each other to avoid a black mark on the unit"; "concerned about each others' welfare"; "bring drunks back from town"; "hold down drunk soldiers".

Friendly competition. There exists a friendly and positive competitive state between unit members that pushes them to do their best. This is indicated by statements such as:

"friendly competition shows pride in the unit"; "out do themselves and others for rewards"; "everyone trying to do their best"; "makes soldiers want to be one of the best"; "privates out do the corporals"; "compete to look the best to the boss"; "nickname other units".

Group pressures performance of individuals. Contemporaries push each other to perform. This is differentiated from competition in that there is a sense of direction by the group. Unit members "get down on" someone with unacceptable low levels of motivation. This is indicated by statements suggesting:

"ride each other to meet the standards"; "pressure each other to meet the standards"; "insist that fellow soldiers meet the standards"; "push each other until they get it right"; "keep each other straight on knowledge"; "get on each other when something goes wrong"; "will not stand for substandard performers"; "try to change the guy who is messing up"; "got down on someone because he was relieved of duty for having been too slow"; "soldiers do not like and try to straighten up the bums"; "chastize those who do not do well"; "majority reject and complain about those who do not perform".

Sense of unit. The response expresses a sense of "unit" that is apart from the individual soldiers who comprise it. The "unit" is referred to as a collective entity. This is indicated by statements such as:

"people work together as a team"; "unit wants to prove itself"; "if one guy screws up, the unit lets him know"; "police guys who goof off--the unit wants to do well"; "working as a company"; "look out for each other to avoid a black mark on the unit".

Group aids performance of individuals. Group members provide care and help to one who needs it (poor performance by a group member). In this sense, provision of support is similar to correction of poor performance. However, provision of support involves actions by the group to improve circumstances or performance for a member. This contrasts with the communication of expectations that the member must himself improve the circumstances of performance. Provision of support is represented by statements such as:

"help someone to do better"; "weakness is helped"; "try to help each other out"; "they keep silent and try to fix things themselves"; "they take care of each other"; "teach each other".

Other. The response describes peer pressure in a way that does not fall into one of the categories above.

ANNEX #38

How Peer Pressure Makes Leadership Easier

Fewer problems for leaders to solve. There are fewer problems that a leader has to solve in part because they are solved by the peer group. This is indicated by statements such as:

"reduces the number of problems I have to deal with"; "I don't have to deal with the little problems myself. The junior guys take care of problems themselves"; "I don't have to deal with low level problems as the soldiers take care of it themselves"; "problems never get to senior leader level"; "problems solved at lowest level--saves midnight phone calls"; "reduces scope of problems I have to deal with".

Reduced need to supervise. The requirement to monitor performance and to insure that it meets the standards is smaller because peers insure that standards are met, others do not slack off, everything needed to accomplish an objective is done. This is indicated by statements such as:

"don't have to check--good initiative"; "I don't have to waste time on correcting actions--first termers take care of this"; "they do it, I don't have to be there"; "don't have to check everything all of the time"; "they insure that their contemporaries meet standards"; "he who is not contributing will be chastised by the other guys. They will be singled out readily"; "the soldiers take care of substandard performance"; "all I have to do is say, 'This is what we have to do', and if someone slacks off, they get on their case"; "makes it easier to enforce a standard, performance objective, goal--they will do everything to accomplish it"; "there are things I don't have to say or do; they take care of themselves"; "they keep each other straight".

Group support of leader. Unit members are described as assisting or supporting the leader in some way. This is indicated by statements such as:

"when a soldier is giving trouble, the squad supports me"; "they assist me when they want to do a job"; "peers will assist you by showing other soldiers that they can do the job".

Functioning of soldiers as a unit. Unit members pull together, help each other out in doing a task, or display teamwork. This is indicated by statements such as:

"they help each other out"; "I'm trying to reinforce the teamwork that began in IET"; "there is more teamwork"; "there is a lot to do and all have to pull together on a task"; "yes, because they pull together"; "pull together--they teach each other".

Increased competitiveness of individuals or unit. Unit members compete with each other to do well. They want the unit to do well, to have pride in their unit (or group), and to prove the unit's worth relative to other units. This is indicated by statements such as:

"peer pressure motivates soldiers to be responsible for the success of their unit"; "they work very hard to be proud of their unit and to please their leaders"; "if they know that they fail in a task and someone else wins, it makes them strive to be the best"; "individuals will try to get ahead of the next man"; "helps platoon want to prove itself"; "a generally positive attitude among soldiers"; "every soldier is trying to do his best"; "peer pressure makes it easier because the soldiers like to be one of the best"; "if one gets promoted then they will say 'what about me?'; "there is more competition to be better than one another"; "when soldiers compete among themselves to do well and to achieve, you have a well motivated, high performing section".

Opportunity/resource for leadership. Peer pressure creates a condition which the leader can use to accomplish organizational goals. This is indicated by statements such as:

"convince one and the group will follow"; "I have used it--when there is a problem, I talk to the soldier's friends and they communicate"; "it makes it easier to lead them because I can divide the people based on my knowledge of them. A PFC was not doing the TA-50 inspection well so I told him that a private would inspect him. The PFC squared it away"; "it makes it easier for me to find out what is going on".

Other. A positive effect of peer pressure on leadership is mentioned that does not fit into any of the above categories.

ANNEX #39

Opinion About Three-Year Stabilized Tours

1. Favorable. Only positive evaluations or good outcomes are mentioned.
2. Mixed. A mixture of favorable and unfavorable opinions are expressed.
3. Unfavorable. Only negative evaluations or negative outcomes are mentioned.
4. Neutral. Responses that are not necessarily positive or negative about three-year stabilization are given. These include responses such as:

"neutral"; "can live with it"; "must be done to test COHORT"; "no different from the policies in my present unit"; "it is OK".

ANNEX #40

Positive Aspects of 3-year Stabilization

Good interpersonal functioning. Staying together for three years allows or forces people to get to know each other and solve interpersonal problems. This allows unit members to function together better as a whole. This is indicated by statements such as:

"three years is long enough to learn to live together and solve problems. Each one knows what to expect"; "it keeps people together. People get to know each other. This is good"; "if people realize that they are here to stay, they will try harder to work out their problems"; "you know who is going to be there, who you've got to work with all of the time"; "it is good because you know people longer and how to function better as a whole".

Opportunity to develop effective combat units. Staying together for three years improves opportunities to develop combat readiness or effective units. This is indicated by statements such as:

"really makes it practical to develop effective combat units"; "it is very good in terms of being able to maintain a level of readiness"; "it is good for readiness and makes the job of staying ready easier"; "from a readiness point of view, it is the only way to go"; "good potential for combat readiness"; "keeping people together will produce better soldiers--they will survive"; "should make for an overall much more effective unit"; "makes good sense in terms of readiness".

Improved training opportunities. Staying together for three years provides opportunities for better, more advanced, or more effective training. This is indicated by statements such as:

"it is good to keep the NCOs and subordinates together for three years so you can work as a team and train as a team"; "good--train a unit to standards and keep them there"; "like it because of reduced turbulence and advanced training"; "I like it because everyone can be trained as a group. Everyone is at the same level of training"; "you don't have a start over--there is a forward momentum with stability".

Benefits of stabilized environment. When soldiers stay in one unit for three years, there is more stability for soldiers and/or their families. It makes it easier for soldiers or families when there is stability. This is indicated by statements such as:

"it provides stability for the soldier and his family"; "easier on families--people I know are around to interact with"; "I like it because of family stability, financial planning"; "you get to know the place you are at. It becomes a place you can call home".

Assignment to preferred location. The policy is good for those who want to be or to remain at the installation (or in the area of the installation). This is indicated by statements such as:

"it is good for senior NCOs close to retirement who want to retire in the same area"; "good for those who want to stay at an installation".

General positive evaluation. A general positive evaluation is given. The idea is expressed that "this" must happen if COHORT is to work, to be tested, etc. This is indicated by statements such as:

"this must happen if COHORT is to be effective"; "if the policy didn't exist, then COHORT wouldn't exist"; "good for incoming soldiers".

Other. A positive aspect of three-year stabilization that does not fit with any of the above categories is mentioned.

ANNEX #41

Unfavorable Aspects of Three-Year Stabilized Tours

Developmental assignments restricted. Before three years have elapsed, soldiers will need or want to transfer to an assignment that offers them new professional opportunities, allows them to execute their career plans, or provides advancement. This includes the general notions that the transfer policy holds soldiers back or is not good for certain types of soldiers. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...does not allow for changes in duty positions"; "new challenges are needed before then"; "for the enlisted everyone is promoted in tandem. People could be stuck in the same section and same job for the full tour. Things could become boring"; "eighteen months would be long enough for a group to be together--limits professional growth otherwise"; "affects career development. No chance to move up, to get experience without supervisor present"; "holding good people back who could go on"; "more freedom...to let people find better spots/slots for professional growth"; "the first termers would have to transfer to another environment to really show their potential"; "after a year, NCOs and officers want to execute their career plans which would involve a transfer to another unit, place, or organization".

Insensitive to rehabilitation needs. The policy prevents soldiers from getting another chance if they have made a mistake or performed poorly. Some soldiers cannot handle the pressure in their present assignments, but they possibly could handle the pressure in another situation. Some soldiers are not suited for their present MOSs. This is indicated by statements such as:

"there is no chance to redeem yourself"; "it has its positive and negative advantages. Negative if you screw up and you have to face those same people"; "it may hurt a slow starter. Others will view him as a slow starter and he will have a difficult time turning around"; "should be some system whereby they can transfer if unsuited"; "restricts people from changing MOSs earlier in their careers when their potential is not really good for combat arms"; "some people can't handle it. it affects the section as well as their careers"; "I think that there should be a time period in the beginning (6 mon) when if a person did not fit, you could get rid of him. The performance counts"; "it is not a good idea because people won't have a chance to remove those people that are problems".

Lack of flexibility. The policy is too inflexible and does not allow for exceptions. Soldiers who are unhappy should be allowed to transfer when they have reasons. Individuals or their circumstances should be given more consideration. This is indicated by statements such as:

"there should be exceptions to every rule--family problems should be a reason for transferring"; "there should be exceptions"; "more exceptions should be granted on a case by case basis"; "need more flexibility"; "policy should be rewritten to take individuals into consideration"; "if a man is not satisfied in a unit and wants to go somewhere else and gives a good reason, he should be given a choice"; "if a person is not happy with the unit, he should be allowed to leave for a legitimate reason (like advancement)"; "policy should be adjusted/relaxed to allow for transfers when people are promoted or when extenuating circumstances are present".

Opportunities for personality conflicts. Personality conflicts can arise. They can be more difficult to deal with or cannot be escaped with three-year tours. This indicated by statements such as:

"if there is a personality conflict, people should have the opportunity to make a new start"; "you might end up working with someone whom you may have a personal conflict with. Three years in a unit is a long time"; "I do not think I would like that--personality conflicts"; "if there is a personality conflict, it can't be handled"; "personality conflicts can be a problem"; "they should be allowed to leave the unit if they choose--personality conflicts between NCOs and first termers pose special problems"; "the only thing bad is that bad relationships--if they start --will stay around longer"; "if someone has a gripe, it can build up to personal hate--but stuck with each other".

Performance degradations due to confined assignments. Soldiers who want (or need) to leave but are not allowed to leave may create problems or not (be motivated to) perform well. This can degrade the unit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"but I think that if a persons doesn't like it, he should be able to transfer. If you don't like the people you aren't going to be worth a damn"; "if a person doesn't want to be in the unit he is in, he will drag others down"; "it hurts morale when a guy has a family problem and can't leave"; "if we could just let the man go, we could get someone else in and get the job going again"; "some people can't handle it. It affects the section as well as their careers"; "I think that there should be a time period in the beginning (6 mos) when if a person did not fit, you could get

rid of him. The performance counts"; "it is not a good idea because people won't have a chance to remove those people that are problems"; "creates a strain on the unit. You cannot route them to other units, only chapter them out or put them in jail".

Choice of location restricted. The policy restricts own choice over location. Travel opportunities are also restricted. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I'm a careerist. I should be able to go where I want to retire"; "when you are in COHORT, you can't see the world like the Army slogan goes"; "three years may not be fair because it may block opportunities to travel to other areas".

Restricted opportunities for school. The policy reduces opportunities to attend military schools. This is indicated by statements such as:

"for progressive training, there should be some exceptions made for some outstanding soldiers to go to Ranger training, etc. This would have to be on an individual basis"; "you can't go to a professional school--or to Ranger and Airborne training if you want to".

Limited promotion opportunities. The opportunities for promotions limit careers. The idea is expressed that more soldiers should be promoted or that when soldiers cannot be promoted performance problems may arise. This is indicated by statements such as:

"A good idea if you can find a way to get more first termers promoted to E4 before they get two years in"; "hard on NCOs--quotas affect careers"; "people quit making progress on the job when you tell them that there are no more promotions for a year".

System unfairness. The policy is described as unfair in that the rules are not the same for all members of a unit or in that the rules are not the same for members of COHORT and Non-COHORT units. This is indicated by statements such as:

"it is OK if you didn't have back-to-back tours when other guys have not been in COHORT"; "it is not fair, NCOs who are PCSing are turned away from the programs while others may not want to be in it but cannot leave it"; "my major concern is the way in which you tell an NCO that if he doesn't reenlist or extend, he will be barred, but the officers do not follow the same rules"; "it is not right that NCOs can leave and the first termers can't"; "it draws a fine line on performance: we boot NCOs and officers should be booted as well".

Too long. A three-year stabilized tour is too long. People should be allowed to leave after some period shorter than three years. This is indicated by statements such as:

"three years is too long to remain in one unit. Maximum tour should be two years"; "a COHORT unit is a good thing. But it should be one and half or two years. In three years, they will get tired of seeing the same people over and over"; "too long"; "people should be allowed to PCS after one year of being together".

Resistance to forced assignments. The policy is bad when it forces soldiers to be in a unit or location that they do not like or have not chosen. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...wanted to join the unit in the first place"; "could create problems for people who don't like the unit or the home base"; "I've been turned off by having been forced here"; "bad...I do not like the area".

Other. A condition or outcome associated with a negative opinion about 3-year stabilization and not fitting any of the categories above is described.

ANNEX #42

Opinion About Regimental Assignments

1. Unqualified favorable endorsement. Opinion is positive, or only positive or favorable effects are mentioned. No qualification is recorded indicating that the policy creates a loss for the respondent or would be unfavorable under certain conditions (or for other soldiers).
2. Resigned endorsement. An overall positive or favorable opinion is expressed. Despite this, there is an added expression that something would be lost if the respondent were rotated between two locations. This is indicated by something like:

"overall good, but I like to travel"; "COHORT is good, but I do not like Fort _____".
3. Good for some, but not for others. A condition is mentioned under which the rotation policy would be either good or bad. Comments are made that the policy is okay for a specified group or person. Both good and bad outcomes are identified. This opinion is indicated by statements such as:
"has no effect on me"; "ok for me"; "good if you like the place"; "great for NCOs, but inhibits professional growth of officers"; "good for those who want buy a home".
4. Unfavorable endorsement. The opinion is either negative or only negative (or unfavorable) effects are mentioned. No qualification is given that indicates that the policy would be favorable under certain conditions.
5. No response. The respondent is neutral or uncertain or has no opinion.

ANNEX #43

Positive Aspects of Regimental Rotation

Predictable stable homebase. The regimental tour pattern is good in that it eliminates problems associated with lack of predictability, stability, and/or homebasing. As a result, individuals can predict and plan the future. Soldiers and families can establish themselves and perhaps buy a home. Spouses have better career possibilities. You can develop a sense of community. This is indicated by statements such as:

"it is a good policy---this is our homebase. We know we will be coming back to Fort _____"; "for me, that is fine, they can establish themselves"; "with homebasing, the spouse has a better chance of making a career"; "it is good. It gets them familiar with the community, etc. It lets them develop roots, etc."; "good idea for those who want to buy a house and whose wife wants a career"; "this is good for stability of the family"; "it is good because if you are married, you can go overseas and then come back to the same area"; "homebasing is good for families wanting to buy a home"; "good-stabilization-home purchase"; "overall good for families"; "you can work with people you know, you have home and friends"; "I think it is good. They know exactly where they are going. They can plan for their future. They can buy a house"; "it is good in terms of being able to find out where I'll be and when"; "you can get to know an area"; "you always know when and where you are going".

Liking of (or chosen) location of assignment. The rotational pattern is good if soldiers either like or have chosen the location to which they are assigned. This is indicated by statements such as:

"it is good...but some folks may want to go somewhere else. So it is not good for everyone"; "for me that is fine... especially if you like where they are at"; "if you could be guaranteed first choice of assignment, this would be okay"; "okay, if I were in a unit that I wanted to be in. Some rotations are okay"; "the system will work itself out. You need to screen soldiers by home locations and put them at the right locations"; "it is also good if you like where you are going"; "in the long run, good--if you are in an area you like"; "if the person is in a unit that is in a place that he likes, it is okay"; "great if the regimentally affected soldiers were locals--from the area of their homebase"; "depends on the choice of assignment. It is good if a new soldier had a choice of assignment".

Training improvement. Training opportunities are somehow improved. This is indicated by statements such as:

"it provides for stability for training that is needed to function"; "easier for the Army to teach larger groups of people".

Other. A condition or outcome associated with a favorable view of regional rotation is mentioned that does not fit any of the categories above.

ANNEX #44

Negative Aspects of Regimental Rotation

Variation in locations/travel restricted. The policy reduces variation in location to which one may be assigned. The respondent likes to travel more than the regimental system will permit. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I prefer the idea of travel or a variety of locations"; "it stinks. You join the Army to travel, and you are limited to two places"; "I do not like it"; "the main reason I came in was to go to different places"; "will limit a person's travel. It reduces options and choices for locations of assignments"; "I really do not care for it. It appears to limit the possibilities to see different areas of the world"; "majority of soldiers want to travel. But in COHORT, you can only travel where the unit travels"; "I agree with it, although I personally like to travel"; "if you assigned me to Fort _____ for life, I'd leave the military".

Reluctance to lack of choice. The policy is bad when it forces soldiers to be in a unit or location that they do not like or have not chosen. This is indicated by statements such as:

"...if wanted to join the unit in the first place"; "could create problems for people who don't like the unit or the *homebase*"; "I've been turned off by having been forced here"; "bad...I do not like the area".

More variation better for career. Variety of assignments promotes professional growth, stimulates performance, or helps prevent stagnation. Chances for these benefits are reduced. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I like the idea of moving around...This will restrict my knowledge and reduce my growth"; "not good for my career --burn out. Like 'stuck here in the 82nd'"; "comes back to the same place and his work has no challenge because he knows how it is here. He like to go to different assignments"; "it doesn't give the subordinates the chance to see the other side of things. They need to see different areas and jobs"; "going back and forth to the same places. You need broader training for having to fight in different parts of the world"; "it is bad because there are certain attitudes that are ingrained. NCOs have the old idea that new territory offers new opportunities. If not, you become stagnant. Takes away the initiative"; "soldiers should have the opportunity

for assignment to various units. It allows for teaching new personnel what you've learned and allows you to learn new or different techniques for doing things"; "different locations allow people different opportunities to perform".

Confinement to same peers or units. Staying with the same people, unit, or regiment is not a good idea. Soldiers should be able to change regiments. This is indicated by statements such as:

"they can forget it because after you have been in a unit once, it is no reason to send someone back"; "I don't agree that staying with the same people is a good idea"; "not a good idea--you should have a chance to transfer between regiments".

Dislike for location. The respondent or his family does not like the locations of assignments associated with the unit's regiment. This indicated by statements such as:

"I don't like Fort _____"; "my wife hates this area and will not return here with me"; "I would resign before I would return to this place again".

Other. A condition or outcome associated with an unfavorable view of regimental rotation is mentioned that does not fit any of the categories above.

ANNEX #45

Overall COHORT Opinion

1. Favorable. A positive evaluation of COHORT is given, or only positive characteristics are mentioned. No qualification is given.
2. Qualified positive. COHORT or the concept is favorably viewed by the respondent (as defined above). This favorable opinion is qualified by expressions (1) indicating a need to change the program or otherwise make it work, (2) describing a specific problem in the program, or (3) describing a condition under which the program is acceptable. This opinion is indicated by a favorable evaluation followed by statements such as:

"rules need to be enforced"; "has to be supported by battalion"; "needs interest of people"; "I want troops who want to be in it"; "if assigned with duds, you are stuck"; "company commanders need more freedom".
3. Perception of problems. No direct statement is made that the program is viewed unfavorably or has negative effects. However, only problems or conditions under which the program would work (or be favorable) are mentioned.
4. Negative. The respondent directly states that the program is viewed unfavorably or creates negative outcomes. Nothing favorable is described.
5. No opinion. The respondent has no opinion, or no opinion is given.

ANNEX #46

Improvements Needed/Problems in COHORT

Unit formation problem. Something about the way a COHORT company/battery is formed, built, or developed into a fully operational unit needs to be changed or reinforced. This is indicated by statements about:

"the drill sergeants in basic training should move to the unit with the first termers they trained"; "the way the unit is run needs to be changed so that there is more time to develop the unit as a unit"; "commanders need more freedom to build their units"; "first termers should not be treated differently"; "leaders need to be sent on time".

Repeated COHORT assignments. There is no desire for another assignment to a COHORT unit. Conditions in a COHORT unit are such that others want or will want to avoid assignment to a COHORT unit. Others should serve their time in COHORT before the respondent has to do so again.

Choice of locations limited. The regimental system is not liked. There should be more than two duty stations associated with a regiment. The respondent does not like the areas (locations) in the regiment, restrictions on choice of assignments, or having been blocked from going to a particular location.

Career progression limited. The COHORT system limits career development, limits promotion, or has a problem that limits career development, promotion, or progression. This is indicated by statements such as:

"career progression is adversely affected"; "promotability of EMs and NCOs is limited because they have the same date of rank".

Need to screen unit members. Unit members should be selected in a manner so that they have (or develop) proper qualifications or want to be in their unit of assignment. This is indicated by statements such as:

"sub-standard NCOs and highly motivated troops do not fit"; "the people who come in should be screened"; "volunteers should be screened"; "I want a COHORT unit in which the troops want to be there"; "need to send us quality NCOs"; "should select those who can be in the unit for three years".

Assign volunteers only. Unit members should either have a choice about participating in COHORT or want assignment to their units. This is indicated by statements such as:

"I want a COHORT unit in which the troops want to be there".

Broken promises. "Promises" have been made and then broken. Unit members have been "lied" to. Something that was supposed to be done has not been done. This is indicated by statements such as:

"if they would not lie and would manage it better"; "too many broken promises"; "it is built up to be something that it isn't"; "it is being abused. We were made promises that have not been kept".

Better family support needed. Families have problems or need more (better) support than they have been given. This is indicated by statements such as:

"more care for families--family housing"; "more concern for families, transportation of family effects"; "we forget those who work for us. Hell for family--either give them family quarters or not--let them know. We can't keep our families in quarters if we take an 18-month tour. Then when we come back, we have to apply for housing again".

Contempt bred by familiarity. Familiarity breeds contempt. Interaction of the same people over a three-year period is either not positively viewed or perceived to create problems for interpersonal relationships. This is indicated by statements such as:

"three-year stabilization may be too long. Not everyone likes everyone else. Can lead troops to blow steam at each other"; "if a personality clash occurs, you can't avoid this person in the future"; "staying with the same people is bad"; "being together may be bad for peacetime. Soldiers may have the time to get to know the weak points of an NCO".

Rank structure problem. The rank structure of the unit is such that at some period in the life cycle, there is an absence of people needed at an identified rank or that assignments do not fit the ranks of soldiers (or position incumbents). This is indicated by statements such as:

"In having a COHORT unit, you miss the knowledge and guidance that the E3s and E4s have and give to the new soldiers to help them through their transition"; "after three years, too many chiefs and not enough indians. E5s end up doing privates' work"; "DA should recognize that those in COHORT do a lot more than

their ranks state they should or can do"; "promotions to E4 and E5 deplete your pool of privates, and you have to assign NCOs to privates' duties".

Interorganizational compatibility. Relationships between the COHORT company/battery and other units (perhaps units at a higher echelon) are such that problems are created for one or the other unit. Higher units retain control so that needs of the COHORT unit are not focused upon or met. COHORT would be more effective if implemented at the battalion level. This is indicated by statements such as:

"a trouble is that units in Europe are not the same"; "the emphasis is on what DIV/BN needed to have done, not what the company needed"; "the rest of the Army harbors resentments. We have 100%. We are blocked off. But they resent it. There needs to be a reevaluation of the fit of a COHORT unit in the rest of the battalion"; "our biggest problem is not letting our troops get influenced by other batteries. Our first termers will then go down to their standards"; "good to stay together, but not to train at battalion level. Need training at the level of this unit, which we are blocked from"; "need to develop something so that other units will not be depleted at unit formation"; "the stabilizing of COHORT units is at the expense of other units"; "the whole battalion would then have to pull together and one unit would not have to adjust to the battalion"; "would be one of the better things if it were at the battalion level".

Better orientation needed. Personnel assigned to a unit need better information about some aspects of the New Manning System or some of its policies. There is a need for guidance on the implementation of NMS policies.

Other. A problem in COHORT is described that does not fit any of the categories above.

APPENDIX D
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Table D-1
Military Pay Grades of Sample

Pay Grades	COHORT		Non-COHORT	
	LDRs (n=146)	FTs (n=152)	LDRs (n=58)	FTs (n=58)
E1	--	12.5	--	1.7
E2	--	29.6	--	20.7
E3	.7	34.2	1.7	34.5
E4	15.1	22.4	19.0	39.7
E5	29.5	1.3	22.4	3.4
E6	16.5	--	20.7	--
E7	12.3	--	6.9	--
E8	2.0	--	--	--
E9	7.5	--	10.4	--
O1	7.5	--	10.3	--
O2	8.9	--	8.6	--
O3	--	--	--	--

Note. Entries are percents of respondents in the designated columns.

Table D-2

Duty Positions of Sample

Duty Positions	Type of Unit			
	COHORT		Non-COHORT	
	LDRs (n=147)	FTs (n=150)	LDRs (n=58)	FTs (n=58)
Team, Squads or Section Member	6.1	97.3	6.9	91.4
Team Leader	34.0	2.7	27.6	5.2
Section Chief, Tank Commander, or Squad Leader	19.7	--	20.7	3.4
Platoon Sergeant or Chief of Firing Battery	10.2	--	8.6	--
First Sergeant	11.6	--	12.0	--
Platoon Leader	3.4	--	6.9	--
Company/Battery Executive Officer	8.9	--	8.6	--
Company Battery Commander	6.1	--	6.0	--
Other	0	--	1.8	--

Note. Entries are percents of respondents in the designated columns.

Table D-3
Education of Sample

Education Level	Type of Unit			
	COHORT		Non-COHORT	
	LDRs (n=145)	FTs (n=152)	LDRs (n=57)	FTs (n=58)
<u>High School</u>				
Diploma	79.6	84.2	89.5	86.2
GED	19.7	14.8	10.5	6.9
Neither	.7	4.0	--	6.9
<u>College</u>				
None	34.7	71.0	24.6	67.3
1 yr or less	23.1	17.1	29.8	19.0
2-3 yrs	7.5	6.6	5.3	8.6
Associate	4.7	--	7.0	1.7
BA or BS	22.5	--	29.8	1.7
MS/MA/PhD	1.4	--	--	--
Other	6.1	5.3	3.5	1.7

Note. Entries are percents of respondents in the designated columns.

Table D-4
Career Intentions of Sample

Career Intention	Type of Unit			
	COHORT		Non-COHORT	
	LDRs (n=147)	FTs (n=152)	LDRs (n=57)	FTs (n=57)
Stay until retirement	59.2	3.3	64.9	3.5
Reenlist or extend	19.0	17.1	15.8	22.8
Undecided about reenlistment or extension	11.6	25.7	8.8	28.0
Probably leave at end of obligation	7.5	17.8	3.5	15.8
Definitely leave at end of obligation	2.7	36.1	7.0	29.9

Note. Entries are percents of respondents in the designated columns.

APPENDIX E

BELIEFS BY SYSTEM CHARACTERISTIC

Table E-1
Unit Developmental Cycle

Variable	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT	
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs vs FTs</u>	
Greater workload	58%	49%	53%	x	x	x		x
NCOs' caring	74%	40%	57%			x		x
Officers' caring	80%	45%	62%			x		x
Satisfaction with predictability of duty hours	47%	34%	37%					
Satisfaction with predictability of daily assignments	38%	24%	31%					
Predictability of assignments ^a	46%	---	46%					
Unit change ^b	90%	---	90%	x				
Prevalence of personnel problems	19%	19%	19%					x
Reasonable performance standards	75%	55%	65%		x			x
Acceptance of unit	47%	34%	40%		x			x
Unit respected	62%	47%	48%					x

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or (b) show (by Xs) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

^a Questionnaire item administered to leaders only.

^b Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

Table E-2
Informal Group Influence

Variable	Percent COHORT Agreeing		COHORT vs. Non-COHORT		Within COHORT
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u> <u>Total</u>	
Job helped by cooperation of work group	67%	41% 54%			x
Respect given to leaders	62%	47% 55%			x
Much peer pressure *	64%	--- 64%			
Cohesion of first termers *	83%	--- 83%			
Leadership and cohesion *	55%	55%			

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or 9b (show by Xs) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

* Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

Table E-3

Responsibility and Opportunity Structures

Variable	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT
	LDRs	FTs	Total	LDRs	FTs	Total	
Helping to identify training needs ^a	72%	---	72%				
Helping to set standards ^a	87%	---	87%				
Ability to reward soldiers	66%	29%	47%				x
Felt responsibility for soldiers' performance ^a	92%	---	92%				
Felt responsibility for unit performance ^b	---	44%	44%				
Dependency of reputation on soldiers' performance	75%	65%	71%				x
Uncertainty about meeting soldiers' expectations	21%	24%	23%			x	
Responsibility for helping soldiers adjust ^a	85%	---	85%				
Respondent influenced change ^c	78%	---	78%				

Table E-3

(Continued)

Variable	Percent COHORT Agreeing		COHORT vs Non-COHORT		Within COHORT	
	LDRs	FTs	Total	LDRs	FTs	Total
Pressure to excel ^c	67%	---	67%	x		
Feeling pressure to excel ^c	57%	---	57%	x		
Adjustment helped by unit members	44%	54%	49%			x

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or (b) show (by $\bar{X}$ s) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

a Questionnaire item administered to leaders only.

b Questionnaire item administered to first termers only.

c Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

Table E-4

Common Career Development of First-Termers

Opinion Item	Percent COHORT Agreeing		COHORT vs Non-COHORT		Within COHORT
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>LDRs vs FTs</u>
Opportunity for professional development assignments	58%	27%	42%		x
First termers' satisfaction with career development	30%	12%	21%		x
Opinion of first-term leaders*	40%	---	40%		

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or (b) show (by $\bar{X}$ s) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

* Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

Table E-5

Restricted Career Opportunities

Opinion Item	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT	
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs vs FTs</u>	
Choice of assignment considered	61%	43%	52%					x
Difficulty of transferring	80%	78%	79%	x	x	x		x
Chances for changing career fields	20%	21%	21%	x		x		
Chances for military schooling	51%	28%	39%					x
Chances for changing units*	---	11%	11%					
Chances for changing posts	18%	11%	15%			x		x
Promotion opportunities	65%	41%	53%					x
Careerists' desire for unit assignment	29%	12%	20%					x
Comparative COHORT career opportunities	21%	38%	30%	x	x	x		x
Wanted assignment to unit*	48%	---	48%	x				

Table E-5
(Continued)

Opinion Item	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT	
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs vs FTs</u>	
Assignment affects promotions*	20%	---	20%					
Unit permits transfers*	58%	---	58%					
Assignment affects opportunities for military schools	7%	---	7%					

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or (b) show (by Xs) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

* Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

Table E-6
Restricted but Predictable Assignments

Opinion Item	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Freedom to choose next assignment	27%	21%	24%				x
Chances in regiment for changing career fields	9%	11%	10%				
Choice in regiment of next unit of assignment	9%	14%	12%				
Choice in regiment of next post of assignment	9%	12%	11%				
Promotion opportunities in regiment	15%	26%	22%				x
Assignment affects future assignments available	7%	---	7%				
Chances in regiment for attending military schools	24%	12%	18%				x

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or (b) show (by Xs) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

* Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

Table E-7
Reordered Career Values

Opinion Item	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Liking for local civilian community	46%	43%	45%	x		x	x
Attraction of differing foreign assignments	75%	58%	66%			x	x
Attraction of meeting new people	84%	58%	71%			x	x
Attraction of differing US assignments	67%	12%	40%				x
Involvement in local civilian community	32%	29%	31%				x
Wanted repeated assignment to unit*	59%	---	59%				
Tour good career experience*	56%	---	56%				
Transfer policies fair*	51%	---	51%				
Transfer policies in Army's best interests	43%	---	43%				

Table E-7
(continued)

Opinion Item	Percent COHORT Agreeing			COHORT vs Non-COHORT			Within COHORT
	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>LDRs</u>	<u>FTs</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Assignment impact on career intent *	14%	---	14%				
Opinion about three-year tour *	19%	---	19%				
Opinion about regimental assignments *	21%	---	21%				
Desire to remain in regiment *	25%	21%	23%				

Note. Entries (a) are the percents of COHORT respondents affirming each variable or (b) show (by Xs) the sub-samples for which differences were obtained.

* Variable derived from interviews with leaders.

APPENDIX F
INTERVIEW RESULTS

Table F-1

Perception of Having Influenced Change in Unit

<u>Belief of Having Influenced Change^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=134)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=50)</u>
Yes	84%	86%
No	14%	8%
No unit change	1%	6%

<u>How Influenced Change^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=115)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=41)</u>
Individual or unit Training	42%	29%
Developing unit organization/integration	24%	20%
Dealing with personnel matters	19%	17%
Applying leadership	14%	34%
Training of leaders	11%	7%
Performing jobs/tasks of position	10%	7%
Other	23%	32%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders believing that they had influenced change.

^b Percents indicating they had influenced change in each way designated. Percents based on respondents who believed they had influenced change. Percents do not total 100% since more than one way of having influenced change could have been described by a respondent.

Table F-2

Pressure on Unit to Excel

Relative Amount of Pressure ^a	COHORT (n=149)	Non-COHORT (n=56)
Yes, more pressure	66%	43%
No, less pressure	11%	14%
Same as other units	13%	11%
No meaningful response	10%	32%

Source of Pressure ^b	COHORT (n=98)	Non-COHORT (n=24)
Unit image or reputation	44%	25%
Performance expectation	39%	33%
Chain of command ^c	26%	21%
Personnel qualifications or experience	10%	8%
Details or special assignments	7%	12%
Family issues	2%	0%
COHORT program characteristic	2%	0%
Other	22%	29%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders providing each response.

^b Percents of leaders who perceived more pressure to excel and who attributed the pressure to the designated sources. Percents do not total 100% since more than one pressure source could have been described.

^c Coded only if the pressure was attributed to an office in the chain of command without further specification of the conditions creating pressure.

Table F-3

Effects of Pressure to Excel

<u>Feeling Pressure to Excel^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=98)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=24)</u>
Yes, feel pressure	85%	58%
No, not feel pressure	12%	29%
No, no more pressure	3%	12%

<u>How Effect^bed by More Pressure^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=84)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=16)</u>
Motivation of professionalism	27%	44%
Family or personal life	25%	19%
Long duty hours	25%	12%
Restriction of professionalism	15%	6%
Personnel turnover	14%	0%
General dissatisfaction ^c	10%	19%
Other	29%	38%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders indicating that they and/or other unit members were affected by more pressure on the unit to excel.

^b Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders who believed that they or other unit members had been affected in the ways listed. Percentages do not total 100% as more than one effect could have been indicated.

^c Coded only if the response describes a general negative affect (e.g., low motivation) that was not associated with any other effect of the pressure.

Table F-4

Opinions about the Cohesiveness of First-term Soldiers

<u>Evaluation of Cohesiveness^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=147)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=55)</u>
Positive	80%	69%
Qualified Positive	11%	20%
Low	5%	4%
No meaningful response	3%	7%

<u>How Cohesiveness Demonstrated^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=88)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=30)</u>
Sense of unity	47%	40%
Good work relationships	36%	57%
Mutual caring	19%	7%
Free-time interaction	16%	3%
Other	18%	17%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders providing each evaluation of the cohesiveness of first-termers.

^b Percents describing the cohesiveness of first termers as demonstrated in each way listed. Percents based on leaders describing how cohesion of first termers is demonstrated. Percents do not total 100% as more than one manner of demonstration could have been mentioned.

Table F-5

Effects of First-Termer Cohesiveness on Leadership

<u>Overall Effect on Leadership^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=134)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=49)</u>
Positive	55%	61%
Negative	10%	4%
Mixed positive and negative	9%	4%
Non-directional effect	2%	0%
No effect	19%	20%
No meaningful response	4%	10%

<u>Positive Effect on Leadership^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=81)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=30)</u>
Functioning of soldiers as a group	36%	40%
Reduced need to supervise	27%	23%
Attitudes of first termers disciplined	11%	0%
General positive effect (e.g., easier)	10%	20%
Motivation of leader	7%	17%
Clarity of expectations by first-termers	6%	3%
Performance energized by group functioning	5%	13%
Clarity of expectations by leaders	5%	0%
Other	16%	17%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders evaluating the effect of first-termers cohesiveness in the manner indicated.

^b Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders describing positive effect of cohesiveness on their leadership in the ways listed. Percents do not total 100% as more than one type of effect could have been described.

Table F-6

Opinions about Peer Pressure among First-Term Soldiers

<u>Overall Assessment of Peer Pressure^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=56)</u>
There is much peer pressure	64%	66%
Peer pressure is like that in other units	11%	5%
Peer pressure is low	21%	7%
No opinion	3%	7%

<u>How Peer Pressure Demonstrated^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=76)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=21)</u>
Group pressures performance of individuals	45%	33%
Sense of unit	21%	29%
Friendly competition	28%	43%
Caring and closeness	13%	14%
Group aids performance of individuals	16%	14%
Other	5%	24%

<u>How Leadership Made Easier^c</u>	<u>COHORT (n=76)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=21)</u>
Reduced need to supervise	41%	29%
Increased competitiveness of unit or individuals	21%	29%
Functioning of soldiers as a unit	13%	19%
Fewer problems for leader to solve	12%	10%
Opportunity/resource for leadership	11%	14%
Group support of leader	9%	10%
Other	14%	10%

Table F-6

(continued)

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders who made each assessment of peer pressure in their units.

^b Percents of leaders who describe peer pressure in the ways indicated. Percents do not total 100% as more than one demonstration of peer pressure could have been described.

^c Percents of leaders describing positive effects of peer pressure on leadership in the ways indicated. Percentages do not total 100% as more than one effect could have been mentioned.

Table F-7
Perception of Unit Change

<u>Direction of Perceived Change</u>	<u>COHORT (n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=55)</u>
Improvement only	47%	75%
Decline only	14%	4%
Improvement in some areas; decline in others	18%	7%
Fluctuation of improvement and decline	11%	5%
Stability--no change	4%	4%
No meaningful response	6%	5%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders providing each response.

Table F-8

Area in Which Change Perceived

<u>Area of Perceived Change</u>	<u>COHORT (n=132)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=46)</u>
Performance capability of unit or its members	60%	46%
Motivation of soldiers	51%	48%
Unit organization or integration	23%	39%
Maintenance of equipment or facilities	5%	11%
Generalized change	13%	15%
Other	9%	20%

Note. Percents of leaders describing each area as having changed. Percents based on leaders who described their units as changing (improvement, decline, or fluctuation) in at least one area. Percents do not total 100% since more than one area of change could have been described by a respondent.

Table F-9

Transfer of Personnel from Unit Permitted

<u>Response</u>	<u>COHORT</u> <u>(n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT</u> <u>(n=56)</u>
Unit members have tried to transfer and have successfully transferred	45%	43%
Unit members' attempts to transfer have been denied	37%	29%
No unit member has actively attempted to transfer	18%	29%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders providing each response.

Table F-10

Wanted Assignment to Unit

<u>Preference</u>	<u>COHORT</u> <u>(N=147)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT</u> <u>(N=55)</u>
Yes, wanted assignment	48%	45%
No, did not want assignment	24%	15%
Had no choice ^a	23%	18%
No preference	5%	22%

Note. Percents providing each response.

^a Coded as "no choice" only when lack of choice was described and when the direction of preference was not mentioned.

Table F-11

Positive Expectations about Assignment to the Unit

<u>Expectation</u>	<u>COHORT</u>		<u>Non-COHORT</u>	
	<u>Held</u>	<u>Met</u>	<u>Held</u>	<u>Met</u>
Opportunity to develop own unit	31%	69%	10%	100%
Improved training conditions	15%	62%	10%	0%
Quality personnel	13%	73%	19%	67%
Career opportunity	11%	78%	23%	100%
Positive relationships among unit members	11%	56%	6%	100%
Stabilized tour	8%	71%	6%	100%
Tour at preferred location	7%	83%	6%	100 ^a
Personnel stability/less turnover	5%	75%	3%	0 ^a
Terms of foreign tour desirable	4%	100%	3%	0%
Other	16%	79%	6%	50%

Note. Based on COHORT (n=85) and Non-COHORT (n=31) leaders who described positive expectations about assignment to the unit. First column--percents of such leaders holding the designated expectations. Second column--percents of those leaders holding an expectation and describing the expectation as having been met.

Table F-12

Fairness of Unit's Transfer Policies

<u>Perception of Fairness^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=122)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=40)</u>
Yes, fair	43%	52%
No, unfair	11%	5%
Mixed perception	34%	30%
Not applicable	13%	12%

<u>How Perceived Fair^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=41)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=14)</u>
Personal needs considered	39%	7%
Reasoned administration	24%	57%
Career progression needs supported	20%	29%
Policy compliance	20%	21%
Other	7%	7%

<u>How Perceived Unfair^c</u>	<u>COHORT (n=45)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=11)</u>
Personal needs not considered	38%	45%
Career progression needs hindered	24%	27%
Confined assignments	20%	0%
Deviant behaviors forced	4%	9%
Other	16%	18%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders giving each response. "Not applicable" coded if no one had attempted to transfer from the unit.

^b Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders describing their unit's transfer policies as fair in the ways indicated. Percents do not total 100% as more than one aspect of fairness could have been described.

^c Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders describing their unit's policies as unfair in the way indicated. Percents do not total 100% as more than one aspect of unfairness could have been described.

Table F-13

Unit's Transfer Policies in Army's Best Interests

<u>Perception of Being in Army's Best Interests^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=122)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=40)</u>
Yes, in Army's best interests	42%	58%
No, not in Army's best interests	26%	18%
Uncertain	16%	8%
No response	13%	18%
Not applicable	2%	0%

<u>How Policies Support Army's Best Interests^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=43)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=17)</u>
Career progression needs supported	30%	18%
Unit training/effectiveness supported	16%	6%
Benefit of stabilization	12%	24%
Policy compliance	12%	12%
Good performers transferred	7%	18%
Other	21%	29%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders giving each response. "Not applicable" coded if no one had attempted to transfer from the unit.

^b Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT describing their unit's policies as supporting the Army's best interests in the way indicated. Percentages do not total 100% as more than one way of supporting the Army's best interests could have been described.

Table F-14

Overall Opinion of Three-Year Stabilized Tours

<u>Opinion</u>	<u>COHORT (n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=55)</u>
Favorable	19%	29%
Mixed	34%	22%
Unfavorable	42%	36%
Neutral	5%	13%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders expressing each opinion.

Table F-15

Favorable Aspects of Three-Year Stabilized Tours

<u>Favorable Aspects</u>	<u>COHORT (n=59)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=20)</u>
Good interpersonal functioning	37%	20%
Opportunity to develop effective combat units	24%	45%
Improved training opportunities	19%	30%
Benefits of stabilized environment	14%	10%
Assignment to preferred location	7%	5%
General positive evaluation	7%	10%
Other	17%	30%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders who described positive aspects of three-year stabilized tours and who described each aspect listed.

Table F-16

Unfavorable Aspects of Three-Year Stabilized Tours

<u>Unfavorable Aspects</u>	<u>COHORT (n=102)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=25)</u>
Lack of flexibility	22%	12%
Insensitive to rehabilitation needs	20%	16%
Developmental assignments restricted	15%	24%
Performance degradations due to assignment confinement	13%	8%
Opportunity for personality conflicts	12%	12%
System unfairness	10%	8%
Resistance to forced assignments	9%	20%
Restricted opportunities for schools	8%	0%
Choice of location restricted	5%	16%
Limited promotion opportunities	5%	8%
Too long	5%	12%
Other	16%	20%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders who described unfavorable aspects of three-year stabilized tours and who described each aspect listed.

Table F-17

Effect of Unit Assignment on Career Opportunities and Intention

	COHORT (n=149)	Non-COHORT (n=56)
<u>Attending Military Schools</u>		
Good opportunities	7%	9%
Mixed/uncertained opportunities	8%	4%
Restricted opportunities	19%	11%
Opportunities not affected	56%	64%
No response	10%	12%
<u>Future Assignments Available</u>		
Good choices	7%	12%
Uncertain choices	15%	9%
Restricted choices	34%	18%
Choices not affected	31%	54%
No response	13%	7%
<u>Promotion Opportunities</u>		
Positive effect	17%	27%
Uncertain effect	7%	4%
Negative effect	9%	2%
Opportunities not effected	58%	61%
No response	10%	7%
<u>Inclination to Remain in Service</u>		
Increased	14%	12%
Decreased	12%	11%
Mixed or uncertain effect	3%	5%
No effect	71%	71%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders assessing the effect of their present unit assignment on the career opportunities as designated.

Table F-18

Want Repeated Assignment to Unit

<u>Preference</u>	<u>COHORT</u> <u>(n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT</u> <u>(n=56)</u>
Yes	56%	75%
No	36%	21%
Unsure	6%	2%
Unknown	2%	2%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders expressing each preference about whether they would now want assignment to their present units if they were given a choice.

Table F-19

Reasons for Wanting Repeated Assignment to the Unit

<u>Reasons for Wanting</u>	<u>COHORT (n=83)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=34)</u>
Quality of relationships among unit members	33%	24%
Level of unit training or development achieved	25%	15%
Identification with unit	20%	24%
Effects of personnel stability	19%	3%
Quality of leadership	13%	35%
Good career experience	6%	6%
Other	16%	29%

<u>Reasons for Now Not Wanting</u>	<u>COHORT (n=60)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=12)</u>
Confined assignment opportunities	38%	17%
Leadership problems	22%	8%
Assignment pressures	20%	25%
Low NCO quality	13%	0%
Other	31%	50%

Note. Percents giving the designated reasons by the COHORT and Non-CO-HORT leaders who would now want (upper portion of table) and now not want (lower portion of table) assignment to their units if they were given a choice.

Table F-20

Assessment of Tour as Good Career Experience

<u>Assessment</u>	<u>COHORT</u> <u>(n=148)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT</u> <u>(n=56)</u>
Positive career experience	55%	70%
Negative career experience	16%	5%
Mixed positive and negative	16%	11%
Uncertain	3%	4%
Neither positive nor negative	9%	11%

Note. Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders indicating whether their present assignment has been a good or bad career experience.

Table F-21

How Present Unit Assignment
Assessed as Positive or Negative Career Experience

<u>How Assessed Positively^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=77)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=41)</u>
Career record helped	34%	49%
Good leadership experience	31%	34%
Other positive idiosyncratic effect	9%	12%
Good unit training	9%	2%
Promotion received	9%	5%
Opportunity to develop soldiers	6%	0%
Benefit of personnel stability	4%	0%
Other	14%	17%

<u>How Assessed Negatively^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=41)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=10)</u>
Assignment confinement	44%	20%
Promotion problems	29%	20%
Reduced opportunities for military schools	7%	0%
Poor leader preparation	5%	0%
Personality clashes	2%	10%
Other	27%	50%

^a Percents making each assesment. Based on the COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders who described a way in which their present unit assignments had been a positive career experience. Percents do not total 100% as more than one positive aspect could have been mentioned.

^b Percents making each assesment. Based on the COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders who described a way in which their present unit assignments had been a negative career experience. Percents do not total 100% as more than one negative aspect could have been mentioned.

Table F-22

Opinions about Regimental Assignment to Same Locations

<u>Overall Opinion^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=51)</u>
Unqualified favorable	20%	22%
Resigned endorsement	4%	4%
Good for some, but not for others	22%	29%
Unqualified unfavorable	49%	35%
No response	5%	10%

<u>Positive Aspects of Assignment Pattern^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=50)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=19)</u>
Predictable, stable homebase	70%	53%
Liking of (or chosen) location	40%	26%
Training improvement	6%	11%
Other	22%	26%

<u>Negative Aspects of Assignment Pattern^c</u>	<u>COHORT (n=83)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=22)</u>
Variation in locations/travel restricted	48%	41%
Reluctance to lack of choice	19%	18%
Dislike for location	17%	9%
More variation better for career	13%	27%
Confinement to same peers or units	5%	5%
Other	13%	18%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT LDRs providing each opinion about regimental assignments to the same locations stateside or overseas.

^b Percents of LDRs who described positive aspects of such a career pattern and who described each aspect listed.

^c Percents of LDRs who described negative aspects of such a career pattern and who described each aspect listed.

Table F-23

Opinion of First-Term Leaders

<u>Opinions of Leadership Quality^a</u>	<u>COHORT (n=149)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=56)</u>
Positive	40%	29%
Negative	16%	20%
Mixed	25%	25%
Not applicable	19%	27%

<u>Perceived Leadership Problems^b</u>	<u>COHORT (n=116)</u>	<u>Non-COHORT (n=37)</u>
Differentiation from peers	51%	41%
Skill deficiencies	49%	70%
Receipt of respect	30%	19%
Other	9%	5%

^a Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders giving each response. "Not applicable" coded if respondent either provided a non-evaluative opinion or had not had the opportunity to observe first-termers serving in leadership positions.

^b Percents of COHORT and Non-COHORT leaders describing first-term leaders in terms of the categories of problems listed. Percents based on leaders who described at least one problem. Percents do not total 100% as more than one problem could have been mentioned.

APPENDIX G

BELIEFS BY LEVEL OF NMS ATTITUDE

Table G-1

Variables Differentiated by Attitude toward Career Stability

<u>Variables Grouped by NMS System Characteristic</u>	<u>Attitude Level</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>
<u>Unit Developmental Cycle</u>			
Greater Workload*	47	48	45
<u>Informal Group Influence</u>			
Respect Given to Leaders*	63	51	40
Cohesion of First Termers	69	85	78
<u>Reordered Career Values</u>			
Opinion about Three-Year Tour	14	25	22
Opinion about Regimental Assignments	34	14	10
Liking of Local Civilian Community*	51	43	34
Attraction of Differing Foreign Assignments	56	74	82
Attraction of Meeting New People	63	75	78
Attraction of Differing US Assignments	33	42	58
Desire to Remain in Regiment*	36	17	10

Note. Table lists the variables differentiated by level attitude toward career stability. Entries are percents of soldiers by attitude level that affirmed each variable. See Table 5 for sample size. Variables denoted by an asterisk were also significantly differentiated by attitudes toward staying together.

Table G-2

Variables Differentiated by Attitude toward Staying Together
and Overall NMS Attitude

Variables Grouped by NMS System Characteristic	Attitude Level					
	Staying Together			Overall NMS		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
<u>Unit Developmental Cycle</u>						
Greater Workload ^a	49	43	48	53	42	46
NCOs' Caring ^d	68	57	34	82	51	37
Officers' Caring ^d	74	57	43	72	59	44
Satisfaction with Predictability of Duty Hours ^d	52	49	23	44	46	26
Satisfaction with Predictability of Daily Assignments ^d	42	34	18	42	33	20
Predictability of Assignments ^c	51	36	43	51	42	39
Reasonable Performance Standards ^c	79	69	47	80	67	49
Unit Respected ^d	70	54	41	71	54	34
<u>Responsibility/Opportunity Structures</u>						
Helping to Set Standards ^c	91	86	83	86	92	84
Ability to Reward Soldiers ^d	61	45	35	62	48	32
Felt Responsibility for Soldiers' Performance ^c	97	92	84	99	92	84

Table G-2

(continued)

<u>Variables Grouped by NMS System Characteristic</u>	<u>Attitude Level</u>					
	<u>Staying Together</u>			<u>Overall NMS</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>
Dependency of Reputation on Soldiers' Performance ^d	78	76	57	81	71	59
Adjustment Helped by Unit Members ^d	63	53	31	58	55	34
Uncertainty about Meeting Soldiers' Expectations ^b	28	27	19	29	23	21
<u>Informal Group Influence</u>						
Job Helped by Cooperation of Work Group ^d	68	61	37	70	52	44
Respect Given to Leaders ^d	71	51	37	77	49	38
<u>Common Career Development of First-Termers</u>						
Opportunity for Professional Development Assignments ^d	56	43	27	54	44	30
First-Termers' Satisfaction with Career Development ^d	34	21	14	32	25	15
<u>Restricted Career Opportunities</u>						
Difficulty of Transferring ^d	64	81	75	69	70	78
Choice of Assignment Considered ^d	66	51	32	62	54	35

Table G-2
(continued)

<u>Variables Grouped by NMS System Characteristic</u>	<u>Attitude Level</u>					
	<u>Staying Together</u>			<u>Overall NMS</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>
Chances for Changing Career Fields ^c	30	22	19	29	23	19
Chances for Military Schooling ^d	46	43	26	41	43	30
Chances for Changing Posts ^c	19	17	10	20	15	10
Promotion Opportunities ^d	63	59	37	65	54	42
Careerists' Desire for Unit Assignment ^d	35	15	8	31	18	11
Comparative COHQRT Career Opportunities ^d	46	33	18	45	36	15
Wanted Assignment to Unit ^b	57	44	38	51	52	38
<u>Restricted but Predictable Assignments</u>						
Chances in Regiment for Changing Career Fields ^c	13	10	7	14	8	8
Promotion Opportunities in Regiment ^b	31	23	12	33	17	16
Chances in Regiment for Attending Military Schools ^b	21	23	11	26	17	11

Table G-2
(continued)

<u>Variables Grouped by NMS System Characteristic</u>	<u>Attitude Level</u>					
	<u>Staying Together</u>			<u>Overall NMS</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>Low</u>
<u>Reordered Career Values</u>						
Wanted Repeated Assignment to Unit ^d	70	63	48	71	64	47
Transfer Policies Fair ^c	53	50	31	48	61	29
Opinion about Regimental Assignments ^c	25	24	11	37	11	13
Liking of Local Civilian Community ^d	57	42	33	62	40	32
Involvement in Local Civilian Community ^d	34	34	23	39	32	20
Transfer Policies in Army's Best Interests ^d	56	48	33	52	61	29
Desire to Remain in Regiment ^d	46	18	2	50	15	5

Note. Table lists the variables differentiated by level of attitude toward staying together and overall NMS attitude, either alone or in combination as indicated by the superscripts. Entries are percents of soldiers by attitude level that affirmed each variable. See Table 5 for sample sizes.

^a Staying together and career stability

^b Staying together

^c Overall NMS attitude

^d Staying together and overall NMS attitude