

AD-A189 759

Report No. CG-D-01-88

ACCESSION AND RETENTION
OF
MINORITY COAST GUARD OFFICERS

Dr. Maurice St. Pierre
Dr. Moges Ayele
Dr. Irvin H. Bromall

Center for Transportation Studies
Morgan State University
Cold Spring Lane & Hillen Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21239



AUGUST 1987

FINAL REPORT

This document is available to the U.S. public through the National
Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

DTIC
ELECTE
DEC 3 1 1987
S H D

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Transportation
United States Coast Guard

Office of Research and Development
Washington, D.C. 20593

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

87 12 21 048

NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official view or policy of the Coast Guard; and they do not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

This report, or portions thereof may not be used for advertising or sales promotion purposes. Citation of trade names and manufacturers does not constitute endorsement or approval of such products.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. CG-D-01-88	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Accession and Retention of Minority Coast Guard Officers		5. Report Date August 1987	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Dr. Maurice St. Pierre Dr. Moges Ayele Dr. Irvin Bromall		8. Performing Organization Report No. DTMA 91-83-30033	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Center for Transportation Studies Morgan State University Cold Spring Lane & Hillen Road Baltimore, Maryland 21239		10. Work Unit No. (TRIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. DTCG 23-84-F-20080	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U. S. Department of Transportation United States Coast Guard Office of Engineering and Development Washington, D.C. 20593		13. Type of Report and Period Covered FINAL REPORT	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract: This study was designed to identify the problems of recruitment and retention of minority officers in the U.S. Coast Guard and to develop strategies to increase the minority Coast Guard officer population. The research approach included gathering quantitative and qualitative information using several techniques. A major research activity was the administration of a survey instrument to minority and white officers. The survey data was supplemented by a series of interviews with selected U.S. Coast Guard officers, civil rights officials, and others selected because of their familiarity with the Coast Guard. Based on a analysis of the information, the researchers drew conclusions and provided a series of recommendations to assist the U.S. Coast Guard in recruiting more minorities for officer programs and retaining them after they have been recruited. This report summarizes the major tasks, findings and recommendations of the study. Chapter 1 is designed to provide a review of the literature on recruitment and retention problems of the military in general and the U.S. Coast Guard in particular. Chapter 2 describes the approach used by the researchers to gather and analyze the information. Chapter 3 presents analysis of the data related to the problem of recruitment. In Chapter 4, the problem of retention is analyzed based on the survey data, qualitative information gained through the interviews, and observations. Chapter 5 focuses on what officers consider to be the main advantages and disadvantages of being a Coast Guard officer. Finally, conclusions and recommendations that grew out of the study are presented in Chapter 6.			
17. Key Words Recruitment Retention Accession Minority Coast Guard Officers		18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the U. S. Public through the National Technical Information Center, Springfield, Virginia 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 195	22. Price

ACCESSION AND RETENTION
OF
MINORITY COAST GUARD OFFICERS

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by

Dr. Maurice St. Pierre

Dr. Moges Ayele

Dr. Irvin H. Bromall

Student Assistants

Ms. Charlene Batts
Ms. Racquel Benlizar
Ms. Allyson S. Brown
Mr. Stephen Chu Chi Zeh
Ms. Alma Richardson
Mr. Baitee Tubah
Mr. Terry C. Williams



Secretary

Ms. Alice R. Williams

August 1987

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

ABSTRACT

This study, conducted by the Center for Transportation Studies of Morgan State University, was designed to identify the problems of recruitment and retention of minority officers in the U.S. Coast Guard and to develop strategies to increase the minority Coast Guard officer population. The research approach included gathering quantitative and qualitative information using several techniques. A major research activity was the administration of a survey instrument to minority and white officers. Of the total of 375 questionnaires distributed, 268 or 71.5 percent were returned which included 133 or 49.6 percent from minority officers and 135 or 50.4 percent from white officers. This provided an opportunity to make meaningful comparisons between the perceptions of minorities and whites. The survey data was supplemented by a series of interviews with selected U.S. Coast Guard officers, civil rights officials, and others selected because of their familiarity with the Coast Guard.

Based on a careful analysis of the quantitative and the qualitative information, the researchers drew conclusions and provided a series of recommendations to assist the U.S. Coast Guard in recruiting more minorities for officer candidacy and retaining them as

officers after they have been recruited.

This report summarizes the major tasks, findings and recommendations of the study. It is presented in six chapters. Chapter 1 is designed to provide a review of the literature on recruitment and retention problems in the military in general and the U.S. Coast Guard in particular. Chapter 2 describes the approach used by the researchers to gather and analyze the information. Chapter 3 presents analysis of the data related to the problem of recruitment. In chapter 4, the problem of retention is analyzed based on the survey data, qualitative information gained through the interviews and observations. Chapter 5 focuses on what officers consider to be the main advantages and disadvantages of being a Coast Guard officer. Finally, conclusions and recommendations that grew out of the study are presented in chapter 6.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Center for Transportation Studies of Morgan State University expresses its appreciation to all the individuals and groups who made contributions to this study or facilitated its completion. The Center is particularly grateful to the project monitor, Mr. Todd Jones, for his support and guidance throughout the project; Dr. Robert L. Scheina, for giving the researchers historical overview of the U.S. Coast Guard; Mr. Frederick Siebold of the Maritime Administration for facilitating the progress of the project; Mr. Curt Odum for generously giving his time and insights; Lieutenant Kirk Davis and Commander Ed Williams and his staff for helping in collecting relevant materials; and Miss Cecilia Chesno for helping in generating and checking tables used in the report. We thank Dr. Joon Byun for providing technical assistance in the programming and data processing phase of the study and the research assistants: Ms. Charlene Batts, Ms. Racquel Benlizar, Ms. Allyson S. Brown, Mr. Stephen Chu Chi Zeh, Ms. Alma Richardson, Mr. Baitee Tubah, and Mr. Terry C. Williams for their contributions at various stages of the development of the project. We are grateful to Ms. Alice R. Williams, the Center's secretary, for helping in the preparation of the report in her usual competent

fashion.

A special note of appreciation also goes to the Director of Civil Rights, Mr. Walter R. Somerville and his staff members, for sharing so much of their time and information. This study would not have been complete without the support of the Civil Rights Office. The Personnel Office of the U.S. Coast Guard also provided valuable information for which the Center is grateful. The Baltimore Regional Planning Council deserves special thanks for making its computer facilities available to the researchers.

The Center is also grateful to all those who cooperated with the researchers in various ways including providing needed information, availing themselves for interviews and participating in the pilot study. Finally, the Center owes special gratitude to the Coast Guard officers who participated in the survey by completing and returning the questionnaires on time.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	PAGE
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgement.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	x
Introduction.....	xiv
CHAPTER	
I REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	1
Unit of Analysis.....	1
Coast Guard Documents.....	3
History.....	6
Published Materials.....	7
Summary and Conclusions.....	16
II RESEARCH APPROACH.....	18
Qualitative Information.....	18
Literature Review.....	19
Visits to Coast Guard Installations	20
Unstructured Interviews.....	21
Key Informants.....	23
Quantitative Information.....	24
Construction of the Questionnaire..	25
The Pre-test/Pilot Study.....	26
Selection of Sample and Distribu-	27
tion of Questionnaires.....	28
Coding and Data Processing.....	28
Background of the Sample.....	31
Race/Ethnicity.....	31
Age.....	33
Sex.....	34
Rank.....	35
Marital Status.....	36
Education.....	38
Manner of Entry.....	39
III RECRUITMENT.....	42
High School Preparation of Officers.....	42
First Learning About the Coast Guard....	46
Comfortableness in Water.....	50

Self-Image of Officers.....	52
Entrance Requirements.....	57
Racial/Ethnic Perceptions and Recruitment.....	63
Perceptions on Recruitment.....	65
IV RETENTION.....	75
Role Strain.....	76
The Race/Ethnic Factor.....	81
Mobility Prospects.....	89
Levels of Commitment to the Coast Guard.....	105
V ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF BEING A COAST GUARD OFFICER.....	111
Advantages of the Coast Guard.....	111
Job Security.....	113
Pay.....	114
Travel.....	116
Free Education.....	117
New Career After 20 Years.....	120
Comparison with Other Military Branches.....	122
Benefits.....	124
Interesting Nature of Work.....	127
Opportunity to Serve One's Country.....	127
Humanitarian Obligations.....	129
Summary.....	130
Disadvantages of the Coast Guard.....	132
Moving Around.....	132
Ship Tours.....	137
Unequal Opportunities for Operational Experience.....	139
Greater Visibility of Errors.....	141
Slowness of Promotion Opportunities.....	141
Being Away From One's Family.....	144
Absence of Senior Officers of Same Racial/Ethnic Group.....	146
Summary.....	148

VI CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	152
Recommendations.....	157
A Critical First Step.....	157
Recruitment.....	159
Retention.....	169
Conclusion.....	175
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	177
APPENDIX.....	180
Questionnaire	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Coast Guard Officers by Race/Ethnicity...	32
2 Coast Guard Officers by Age.....	33
3 Coast Guard Officers by Sex.....	34
4 Coast Guard Officers by Rank.....	35
5 Coast Guard Officers by Marital Status...	37
6 Coast Guard Officers by Education.....	38
7 Coast Guard Officers by Race and Manner of Entry.....	41
8 Race and Math/Science Done in High School.....	44
9 Race/Ethnicity and How First Learned About the Coast Guard.....	47
10 Race/Ethnicity and Comfortableness in Water.....	51
11 Race/Ethnicity and How Minorities Preferred to be Viewed.....	54
12 Race/Ethnicity and Minorities and Perceptions of Success.....	55
13 Race/Ethnicity and Lowering of Entrance Requirements.....	60
14 Race/Ethnicity and Whether the Coast Guard Wants More Minorities.....	66
15 Race/Ethnicity and Whether the Coast Guard is Doing Enough to Recruit Minorities.....	67
16 Whether the Coast Guard is Spending Enough to Recruit Minorities.....	69
17 Race/Ethnicity and What Could Be Done to Recruit Minority Officers.....	72

18	Race/Ethnicity and Whether What Was Required by A Superior Officer Was Not Made Clear.....	77
19	Race/Ethnicity and Whether Junior/ Enlisted Personnel Ever Failed to Recognize Officers Status.....	79
20	Race/Ethnicity and Experience Regarding Punishment for Action Which Non-Minority Not Punished/Rewarded.....	80
21	Race/Ethnicity and Whether Ever Experie- nced Racial/Ethnic Prejudice.....	82
22	Race/Ethnicity and Being Made to Feel Welcome.....	83
23	Race/Ethnicity and Whether Minorities Have the Same Chances as Non-Minorities..	84
24	Race/Ethnicity and Importance of Opera- tional Experience for Advancement.....	90
25	Race/Ethnicity and Whether They Get Enough Opportunities for Operational Experience.....	91
26	Race/Ethnicity and Whether Enough Opportunities for Operational Experience by Manner of Entry.....	94
27	Race/Ethnicity and Importance of Operational Experience for Promotion to Lieutenant Commander.....	95
28	Race/Ethnicity and Policy Regarding Promotion from Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander.....	98
29	Race/Ethnicity and Preferential Treatment for Academy Graduates Over OCS Graduates.	99
30	Race/Ethnicity and Preferential Treatment for Academy Graduates by Manner of Entry.	102
31	Race/Ethnicity and Perceptions of Making Flag.....	104

32	Race/Ethnicity and Plan to Stay for 20 Years.....	107
33	Race/Ethnicity and Had To Do It Over Again.....	108
34	Race/Ethnicity and Whether Study Will Affect Position of Minority Officer.....	109
35	Race/Ethnicity and Job Security.....	114
36	Race/Ethnicity and Pay.....	115
37	Race/Ethnicity and Opportunity to Travel.	117
38	Race/Ethnicity and Getting a Good Education Free.....	119
39	Race/Ethnicity and New Career After 20 Years.....	121
40	Race/Ethnicity and Good Opportunities Compared With Other Branches of Military.	123
41	Race/Ethnicity and Interesting Work.....	126
42	Race/Ethnicity and Opportunity to Serve One's Country.....	128
43	Race/Ethnicity and Fulfilling Humanitarian Obligations.....	130
44	Ratings of the Advantages of Being in the Coast Guard* by Race.....	133
45	Race/Ethnicity and Moving Around.....	135
46	Race/Ethnicity and Ship Tours.....	138
47	Race/Ethnicity and Unequal Opportunities for Operational Experience.....	140
48	Race/Ethnicity and Greater Visibility of Errors.....	142
49	Race/Ethnicity and Slowness of Promotion Opportunities.....	143

50	Race/Ethnicity and Being Away From One's Family.....	145
51	Race/Ethnicity and Relative Absence of Senior Officers of Racial/Ethnic Group...	147
52	Ratings of the Disadvantages of Being in the Coast Guard* by Race.....	149

INTRODUCTION

Even though the U.S. Coast Guard has made some efforts to attract and retain minorities, the level of minority participation in the U.S. Coast Guard remains low. Currently, out of a total of 5,079 commissioned officers only 197 (3.8 percent) are minorities. With only 86 commissioned officers, Blacks make up 1.7 percent of the total commissioned officers in the U.S. Coast Guard. Other minorities are also underrepresented. There are 56 Asian American, 50 Hispanic and 5 Indian commissioned officers representing 1.1 percent, 1 percent and .1 percent of the total commissioned officers in the U.S. Coast Guard respectively. In May 1985, recognizing the problem, the U.S. Coast Guard awarded a contract to the Center for Transportation Studies of Morgan State University (Contract No. DTMA91-83-C-30033) to conduct this study on the problems of recruitment and retention of minority officers. This study is designed to identify the problems facing minorities in the Coast Guard and to develop strategies to increase the minority Coast Guard officer population. More specifically, the study has the following objectives:

(1) Measure empirically the demographic make up of the current minority commissioned officer and senior enlisted corps of the Coast Guard;

(2) Examine policies, socio-economic climate and culture of the U.S. Coast Guard and how they affect the recruitment and retention of minorities;

(3) Analyze the attitudes and perceptions of minority officers about the Coast Guard's policies, culture, opportunities, work environment and other related factors that may affect accession and retention;

(4) Identify the barriers that prevent minorities from choosing the Coast Guard as a career option and the causes for minorities to leave the Coast Guard early after joining it; and

(5) Develop recommendations to overcome the problems identified by the study.

In order to achieve these objectives, the research team carried out a number of tasks. These tasks included reviewing the literature on the topic, conducting a survey of minority and non-minority officers, interviewing key officers and individuals knowledgeable about the issues, analysing the data generated through the survey and the interviews and drawing conclusions and providing recommendations that will enhance greater participation of minorities in the

U.S. Coast Guard. This report summarizes the major tasks, findings and recommendations of the study. It is presented in six chapters. Chapter 1 is designed to provide a review of the literature on recruitment and retention problems in the military in general and the U.S. Coast Guard in particular. Chapter 2 describes the approach used by the researchers to gather and analyze the information. Chapter 3 presents analysis of the data related to the problem of recruitment. In Chapter 4, the problem of retention is analyzed based on the survey data, qualitative information gained through the interviews and observations. Chapter 5 focuses on what officers consider to be the main advantages and disadvantages of being a Coast Guard officer. Finally, conclusions and recommendations that grew out of the study are presented in chapter 6.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature has been undertaken with three main considerations in mind. These are:

- i. The basic objectives of this study which are defined earlier in the Introduction;
- ii. Strengths/weaknesses of the published data; and
- iii. A review of conceptual schemes and methodologies that may be used to undertake this study.

As a consequence, the following categories of literature were examined: (a) documents dealing with the history of minority participation in the United States Coast Guard (USCG); (b) documents relating to the USCG and its policies and regulations; and (c) published materials regarding the armed forces in general and the Coast Guard in particular. What follows therefore constitutes a summary review presented in several relevant categories.

Unit of Analysis

The term minority, following standard Federal usage, is defined to include (a) Blacks; (b) Hispanics, (c) American Indians and Alaskan Natives; and (d) Asians and Pacific Islanders.

Furthermore, the USCG has expressed its desire that the minorities in the USCG should be proportionate to their representation in the nation as determined by the 1980 Census. In addition, the minority officer commissioning rate should be "equivalent of the enlisted recruiting rate." (Department of Transportation (DOT), USCG, COMDTINST, 1131.7, December 2, 1982.) Thus, the desired goal of the representation of minorities is at least 20.2 percent of the Coast Guard personnel, which would then comprise 11.7 percent Black, 6.4 percent Hispanic, .6 percent American Indian and Alaskan Native, and 1.5 percent Asian and Pacific Islanders.

It should, however, be noted that because of the period of time that elapses between enlistment and graduation from the Academy (four years) and enlistment and commissioning from Officer Candidate School (OSC) (this could be five years), the recruitment and/or enlistment rate may not be an accurate barometer of the graduation/commissioning rate since some enlistees may fail to graduate from the Academy for a variety of reasons. Secondly, since the O1 rank (Ensign) is the lowest officer rank in the USCG, experience at this level is crucial to the continuation of a minority officer's career in the USCG for any appreciable length of time. Thus, in addition to the problems of recruiting minorities and of their success in the

Academy, the presence of minorities is very much a function of their initial experience as Coast Guard Officers in the O1 rank.

Coast Guard Documents

Materials reviewed under this heading have been primarily concerned with problems and efforts related to attracting minorities to the USCG.* For example, district commanders must ensure that each district has an annual recruiting plan, which involves among other things, visits to colleges and attendance at conventions and conferences. The inclusion of minority personnel in the recruiting efforts and the employment of special efforts to reach and recruit qualified minorities on waiting lists until monthly minority goals have been reached is also an element of this plan. In addition, the Coast Guard has an agreement with the Navy to utilize a maximum of 15 quotas per year from its Navy Academy Preparatory School (NAPS) and 10 quotas per year from the Broadened Opportunity for Officer Selection and Training (BOOST) program, which is designed to "improve the academic preparation of educationally deprived

*For a fairly detailed statement regarding problems/obstacles, goals and recommendations with respect to minority recruiting, see Military Recruiting Plan 1976-1980, Coast Guard, CG-477 Department of Transportation, 1976.

minority enlisted applicants" before entry into the Academy. Other recruitment tools involve some volunteer activities, advertising in those media which are likely to serve minorities (e.g., the Black Collegian and Ebony), pre-selection of minorities without regard to application deadlines and enlistment of minorities who are still in their junior year in college. The latter program targets three (3) minority colleges (COMDTINST, 1131.F, 1982).

While these efforts reflect a heightened awareness of the problem of minority enlistment and retention in the USCG, they appear to be aimed primarily, if not exclusively at Blacks. As we stated previously, the 1980 Census indicated that the Black population stood at 11.7 percent. This is just a little more than one-half of the desired recruitment and retention rate for minorities in general. It follows therefore that more information is needed with respect to recruitment efforts designed to attract minorities other than Blacks, as well as with regard to the programs to which specific reference has been made.

In this context, figures provided by the Admissions Office of the Coast Guard Academy in New London (March 1986) indicate that between 1962 and 1985 a total of 40 Asians graduated while 30 resigned, 32 Hispanics graduated while 30 resigned, 4 Native Americans

graduated while 7 resigned and 39 Blacks graduated while 52 resigned. Interestingly, among the Blacks who resigned was one individual who was used by the Academy as a way of advertising to attract Blacks. In passing it should also be noted that more Blacks resigned than graduated. For example, in 1978 and 1979, a total of 8 Blacks graduated while 28 resigned; and in 1984 a single Black American graduated while 8 resigned. Nor is the picture getting any brighter for representatives of other minority groups. Indeed for those minorities who initially expected to graduate in 1986, 1987 and 1988, among Asians a total of 21 are still enrolled while 19 have resigned, among Hispanics 11 are still enrolled while 14 have resigned among Native Americans 3 are still enrolled and 3 have resigned and among Blacks 6 are still enrolled while 15 have resigned. (Accumulated Minority Statistics, Office of Admissions United States Coast Guard, March 1986.) While no figures are provided for White entrants in the Academy, it would seem that more than one-half of the minority entrants into the Coast Guard Academy failed to graduate between 1962 and 1985. Obviously academic preparation and attitudinal make-up prior to entry into the Academy became very relevant to any understanding of problems associated with accession and ultimately with respect to retention.

History

Much of the historical information on the participation of minorities in the USCG has been prepared by the U.S. Coast Guard and U.S. DOT (see for example, USDOT, USCG, COMDTINST M5750.3, CG-378-8, and DOT, History of Blacks in Coast Guard from 1790). These sources clearly indicate that the level of participation has been minimal. Indeed, in one instance reference was made to the hostility of Indians in the early 19th century to some of the activities of the Coast Guard and to the valiant efforts of the assistant keeper of the Cape Florida Lighthouse in July 1830 in aborting efforts of the 'savages' (the Indians) to destroy the lighthouse (COMDTINST M5750.3). Again, reference was made to the prevailing views of Coast Guard officials in the late 19th century that Blacks "will lower the high morale of the Navy and the Coast Guard," because Blacks "have lower intelligence and health and Whites will not accept Blacks in positions of authority over them" (DOT, History of Blacks in Coast Guard from 1790).

While the orientation of the Coast Guard towards minorities, from a historical viewpoint, bespeaks of institutionalized racism and this may have lingered up to today, at least one document reviewed is significant for another reason. It also points to incidences of

successful Blacks in the USCG, and of the important impact of family influences on intergenerational occupational activity and career choices (DOT, History of Blacks in Coast Guard from 1790). The variable of family background and its impact on career constitutes a recurring theme in the literature on enlistment and retention, and will therefore be addressed later in this report.

Published Materials

While an assessment of the literature reveals a dearth of research on the Coast Guard (compared with other branches of the Armed Forces) and especially in the area of minority participation, much research does exist on the Armed Forces in general and on other services in particular. Much of this work is transferable to our study. Before making specific reference to the work which has been done on the Coast Guard, let us briefly review the relevant research work conducted on the Armed Forces in general.

In a very detailed study of minority representation in the Armed Forces, Eitelberg (1979) addresses the issues associated with under-representation of Blacks in the Armed Forces. After focusing on the complexity of the term "representation," the author argues that any serious evaluation of this variable has to consider the

quality of the Armed Forces.

This raises a whole series of culturally related problems in addition to socioeconomic variables. Of further relevance is Eitelberg's reference to current political issues and policies which, for our purposes, include prevailing views and governmental action regarding such issues as quotas, affirmative action, etc. Obviously any study of the USCG which concerns itself with minority perceptions of the Coast Guard must be viewed against the backdrop of its policies and the larger political environment.

In another detailed study of the military, which dealt with recruitment and retention of Black American and female cadets (Market Facts, Inc. and Uniworld Inc., Part I, 1981), the authors used indepth interviews to gather data. Views of individuals from military families with those from civilian families were compared. While family and peer group influences were important determinants regarding career choices of both groups, a military career was viewed positively by White high school females from military families but negatively by their counterparts from civilian families. More significantly, Black males from civilian families tended to view their parents and their teachers as the individuals who most strongly influenced their career choices with the former also

influencing their sons to attend their alma mater. These subjects tended to view a military career positively in terms of benefits, but negatively with respect to inflexibility and restrictiveness. For those Black males who came from military families, a career in the military was viewed primarily as a stepping stone to the achievement of a higher status in the civilian sector. Both of the categories of males coming from the military and civilian families perceived the military as posing specific limitations beyond which they felt could not go.

The question of perceptions of the military is of some importance from another perspective. For example, Guinn, et. al. (1973) found that the motivation to enter the military is a function of the extent to which the prospective enlistee perceives the military as being able to satisfy expressive desires (e.g., to serve one's country) as opposed to instrumental desires (e.g., to obtain training, advanced education and financial stability). Like the other studies previously mentioned, this study also indicates the importance of family background as a factor in making the military one's career choice. This point is further stressed by Lenti (1972) who found that family members who have been or are in the military tend to stress the prestige of the military as opposed to other career alternatives.

It follows therefore that the lower the perception of prestige, the less the likelihood of joining, and the more the family involvement in the military, the greater the likelihood of positively viewing the military as a career option. Thus, the implications for accession and retention are quite real.

Finally, with respect to affecting accession to the military, Gatling in an undated article on Black flyers, argues that personal background also affects one's decision to enter flight training. Thus, he suggests that the relative absence of Blacks in this area is related to socioeconomic constraints and cultural influences. If, as Gatling argues, one has little contact with flying as a profession (as more Blacks than Whites do) then one is not likely to view it as a readily accessible vocation. This leads to a lack of role models for Blacks to emulate in this field, thus further fuelling the likelihood of their relative absence as flyers. As far as the Coast Guard is concerned, a similar argument may emerge. Because of the lower socioeconomic status of minorities and the absence of role models, minorities may be less likely to have access to the USCG. In addition, minorities are less likely than Whites to have the same familiarity with aquatic activities (such as swimming and boating) which are part of the demands of Coast Guard life. They

are thus at a considerable disadvantage when it comes to participating in such activities as search and rescue "in peril at sea," which according to the USCG missions statement is regarded as "one of the oldest of Coast Guard traditional missions [and] has priority over all other Coast Guard operational peacetime missions." Indeed, each year some 5,000 persons are saved from death, over 140,00 other persons are aided in some way and over \$400 million worth of property is saved as a result of the search and rescue activities of the Coast Guard. (U.S. Department of Transportation Missions of the United States Coast Guard, CG-378-8,). Since these activities invariably take place in water, being comfortable in water becomes an important asset to good job performance and consequently good fitness reports.

In sum, the literature tends to see enlistment as being related to a variety of factors including family background, teacher and school influences, peer group influences, socioeconomic and other personal factors and general cultural and political considerations. While all of these findings do not relate specifically to the Coast Guard, they are nevertheless of relevance because they point to possible factors affecting the decision to enlist in the military as a career. It can be expected that this analysis will also apply to the USCG.

When we turn to the question of retention, we observe an obvious connection between the problems and issues associated with attracting minorities in the Armed Forces and the ability to retain them after they join the services. Dorn (undated) in his article on attrition among Black officers identifies two major explanations. Attrition, he argues, is a function of unsatisfactory ratings in the early years of being an officer, particularly in the O1 (2nd lieutenant) rank. This, he suggests, is largely a consequence of efforts on the part of officials to recruit more Blacks by lowering the educational entrance requirements. In a similar vein, Corpin (1974) suggests that the Naval Academy has not been able to attract qualified Blacks for service in the Navy. Most, therefore, drop out and those who do not are the least qualified to remain and succeed in the service. Though Dorn does not expand on this point, he suggests that attempts to correct discrimination against Blacks by recourse to preferential treatment may really constitute preparation for failure by authorities who allow ill-prepared Black officers to enter the Coast Guard.

Dorn also suggests that attrition is related to failure on the part of Black Coast Guard officers to master the subtleties of career advancement. Norwood (1980), in a similar vein argues that for Black

officers, leaving the military is a function of a lack of fit between expectations and perceptions and the organizational climate. Thus, whether one describes it as Dorn did or as Norwood did, the message is that success and retention are very much related to one's ability to comprehend and to negotiate the peculiarities of the organization. Not surprisingly, Dorn further underscores the importance of family background by pointing out that one is less likely to be able to adjust to the demands of the organization easily if one is the first member of one's family to enter this sphere of professional activity.

By way of conclusion, Dorn warns that his explanations have not been empirically demonstrated, and that it is not clear whether those leaving the Armed Forces are the high achievers who desire more lucrative employment elsewhere or simply those who are ill-prepared. Clearly, a number of research questions spring to mind. These include whether those Black officers leaving the armed forces are: (a) the least qualified; (b) those unable to cope with the subtleties of career advancement; or (c) the brightest who are frustrated and therefore attracted to better paying civilian jobs. Certainly Lenti's (1972) contention that Black cadets who remain at West Point tend, among other things, to be (a) more enthusiastic than taciturn; (b)

more persevering than dispairing; and (c) more self-reliant than tender-minded and sensitive. This suggests the need for further research on this question.

In what is perhaps the most indepth study of the Coast Guard reviewed so far, Norwood (1980) looks at the extent to which expectations and perceptions of the Coast Guard by Black college graduates fit actual experiences in the Coast Guard. From data gathered from questionnaires, and interviews administered to past and present personnel in the Coast Guard, Norwood argues that separation is a function of the disparity between expectations and the actual organizational climate. The finding is relevant to the current study, because it points to the importance of an assessment of the perceptions of Blacks about the Coast Guard prior to their entry in that organization, as an important factor in determining their decision to stay. Further as Norwood points out a number of factors such as being away from home/one's family, equality of opportunity, existence of role models and the rigidity and inflexibility of military life (also mentioned by Dorn and others) can predispose to a decision to separate. The question of the organizational climate and its relevance for retention has also been the focus of Thorne's (1979) effort which was concerned with developing "a clear and effective strategy...to increase

Black participation in its (the Coast Guard's) officer corps." Using systems analysis with its emphasis on the interdependence of parts as a theoretical point of departure, Thorne points out, among other things, the subtle organizational barriers to the attainment of equal opportunity, the attitude of White towards minorities and, most significantly, minority perceptions of the organizational climate, as factors that can militate against minorities feeling comfortable enough to want to remain in the Coast Guard. The behavior and attitudes of Whites who feel that minorities in the Coast Guard are getting equal opportunity, as Romanczuk and Glickman indicate (1977), present a serious problem against equality in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Somewhat related, though different in focus from the last three studies mentioned, is a study on Human Relations in the Coast Guard conducted by the National Urban League in 1972-73. The findings of this study replicate those to which reference was previously made concerning the importance of such factors as racial attitudes of Whites and the relative underpreparedness of Blacks because of unequal societal opportunities on the internal operations of the Coast Guard. The relative unpreparedness of Blacks in particular reduces their capacity to do well, places them at a disadvantage when it comes to promotion and ultimately reduces their

level of satisfaction. The result is a relatively higher attrition rate. It is therefore evident from our brief assessment of the studies by Thorne, Ramanczuk and Glickman and the National Urban League, which all focus specifically on the Coast Guard, that there is a connection between such factors as racial attitudes of Whites, and minority perceptions of these attitudes, on the one hand, and recruitment and retention of minority officers on the other hand.

Of further significance in this context is the finding (Market Facts, Part II) that the decision to separate involves a number of stages. This is relevant because it suggests that research efforts might address the various stages of this process and the extent to which they affect the retention of minorities in the U.S. Coast Guard. Finally, some studies suggest that some persons enter a military career as a last resort and that this also conditions their decision to leave the military. Such is the case, and a disproportionate number of those entering in this manner are minorities where a "programming to fail" may be taking place.

Summary and Conclusions

The foregoing review of the literature suggests that for a number of reasons, the Coast Guard has problems with attracting and retaining capable

minorities. However, the following points underscore the need for more rigorous study of this phenomenon. First, some of the literature is dated and there may have since been changes. Second, most of the literature focuses on Blacks rather than on all minorities. Third, a number of important factors which affect the decision to separate need to be studied not only separately, but together. These include the overall political climate, the recruitment policies and programs of the USCG, prior perceptions of the Coast Guard, the separation process and the link between accession to and separation from the Coast Guard.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the literature points to the need to pursue a number of research issues. These include differential views regarding the recruitment, presence and retention of minorities, educational and general experiential preparation of minorities prior to entry into the Coast Guard, opportunities for acquisition of experiences crucial to the continuity of a career within the Coast Guard, subtle organizational barriers against acquiring these experiences and related issues. It is with these concerns in mind that the various data gathering techniques, which will be described in the next chapter, were chosen and used.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH APPROACH

At the outset of the project, it was decided by the research team* that, in order to get a comprehensive picture of the problems of recruitment and retention in the Coast Guard, it was necessary to gather qualitative as well as quantitative data. The approaches that were used to gather both the qualitative and the quantitative information will thus be described briefly in this chapter. The demographic characteristics of the sample of respondents to a questionnaire will also be provided.

Qualitative Information

Using the approaches described below, the researchers collected qualitative information which is not necessarily translatable to figures (i.e. numbers and/or percentages) but is nonetheless vital to an understanding of the research problems and issues. Such

*The research team consisted of three members, each possessing an earned doctorate and representing the fields of planning/policy analysis, sociology, and political science. The two members hold full-time academic appointments at Morgan State University; the third is a career member of the Federal civil service working in a Washington civil rights office. Each is experienced in behavioral and statistical analysis and is trained in intercultural research endeavors. The team represented a combination of skills and talents that equip it well to use the tools of social science to make public policy recommendations.

information is necessary to supplement the quantitative data gained through the questionnaire which will be described later in this chapter. The qualitative information was gathered by a) a review of the literature; b) visits to selected Coast Guard sites; c) unstructured in-depth interviews with a small sample of minority officers; and d) the utilization of key informants.

Literature Review - This aspect of the research involved the perusal of both published and unpublished materials related to the problems of recruitment and retention in the military in general and the Coast Guard in particular. As a consequence, documents, studies, theses and articles germane to the research problem were read with the specific aim of sharpening the focus of the research problem. In this context, particular attention was paid to the methodologies employed, the issues of concern to the authors and, most importantly, to the hypotheses which could be used to shed some light on the twin problems of recruitment and retention. In addition, special emphasis was placed on issues concerning minorities within the armed forces as well as in various other organizational contexts. Finally, the review of the literature enabled the researchers to pinpoint a number of concerns which may not ordinarily have been analyzed when studying minority participation

in an organization such as the Coast Guard. In this vein, the general lack of familiarity with the sea and the limited opportunities for being comfortable in water afforded to minorities such as Blacks when growing up, could be seen as constituting a physical and attitudinal barrier preventing them from access to operational experience involving such water related activities as search and rescue. The literature review was presented in greater detail in the preceding chapter.

Visits to Coast Guard Installations - In this context, several visits were paid to Coast Guard headquarters in Washington as well as to sites at Yorktown, Governor's Island and to the Academy in New London, Connecticut. Numerous visits to the main headquarters in Washington enabled the researchers to interview and to talk to a number of individuals with specific knowledge of the Coast Guard and to get a feel for the work and organizational milieu in which the officers function. Additionally, information was also gathered by systematic observations and by way of unobtrusive measures.* For example, during a number of

*These are defined as methods that do not require the active consent of the respondents. Thus, requesting an interview would not be unobtrusive, but simply observing where no permission from the subject is required would be unobtrusive.

visits to the headquarters, the researchers were able to observe informal activities and relationships among Coast Guard personnel. Observations made in the canteens, officers clubs and elsewhere in the Coast Guard headquarters were a useful barometer of some of the concerns close to the hearts of Coast Guard officers. The researchers also had the opportunity to interact informally with several officers during the visits to the headquarters and the Washington office.

Unstructured Interviews - These interviews were administered to a number of Black, Asian and Hispanic officers (no Native Americans were available) who were stationed primarily, though not exclusively, at Coast Guard headquarters. The interviews also included both males and females as well as officers who entered the Coast Guard by the three traditional routes - Academy, Officer Candidate School and Direct Commission. In addition, a few former Coast Guard officers were interviewed, as were two enlisted personnel of relatively high rank.

The purpose of these open-ended interviews was threefold. First, the interviewees who were assured anonymity, provided the researchers with a plethora of information on various problems and strains confronting the Coast Guard officers in general and the minority officers in particular. Second, the interviews

generated a number of glimpses into the life of these individuals. These insights were particularly relevant to the study. Vicarious knowledge of what it means to be a "swab" at the Academy, the importance of promotion from the rank of Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander and of being able to obtain operational experience, to name a few, were transmitted during this phase of the study. Finally, the interviews elicited information on the organizational culture of the Coast Guard. Terms such as "geographical bachelor," and "S.A.R. station" which were not fully understood by the researchers previously, began to assume new meaning and significance as components of the organizational argot, routinely in use by Coast Guard personnel became better understood by the researchers. In general, therefore, this aspect of the data gathering process not only facilitated an understanding of Coast Guard life, but also provided theoretical insights which ultimately were used to determine some of the variables which comprised the questionnaire.

During visits to Coast Guard sites and during the interviews, the researchers were able to obtain (again unobtrusively) information regarding working conditions, the ways officers related to fellow officers and to enlisted personnel and also on the "comfort level" of the officer. The "comfort level" refers to the extent

to which the behavior of the individual is compatible with the organization's demands and the level of adjustment to his/her status as an officer. For example, being an officer means, among other things, being able to provide leadership and command the respect (at least behaviorally) of those junior in rank. To do this requires being able to carry oneself in a certain manner. While some may have acquired this quality before entering the Coast Guard and others only after they became officers, whether or not it is possessed by an officer is only discernible by observation and interaction with the officer.

Key Informants - This technique involves the use of certain individuals who, by virtue of their positions and experiences, possess information and insight, which are vitally relevant to the research problem. Such individuals may know much about the topic being researched or they may know others who do. Therefore, they are in a position to point the researchers into the "right" direction, thus saving the latter much time, money and energy.

In this context, key informants provided information on other studies conducted on the Coast Guard, on the existence of documents that were germane to the study, about individuals, particularly former officers, who are knowledgeable about the life of the

minority officer and other key minority officers who are familiar with the problems and issues facing minorities. Such guidance by the key informants was particularly valuable in the early stage of the study when the researchers were orientating themselves to the real issues related to the research problem. One might also note that there were many instances when a request for an interview was speedily and willingly granted because a key informant had, so to speak "okayed" the researchers' efforts, by alerting prospective interviewees that the researchers would be calling for an interview. While it is possible that the interviews could have been granted, even if the key informants had not smoothed the way, the researchers' job was made far less difficult by the efforts of these individuals. This was especially true when the researchers had to make contacts with various individuals in order to obtain a number of Coast Guard related documents.

Quantitative Information

In order to gather quantitative data on various aspects of the problems of recruitment and retention of minority officers in the Coast Guard, the research team developed and administered a questionnaire to a sample of 375 officers which included Whites as well as minorities in order that meaningful comparisons could be

made. The approach used in acquiring the quantitative information is described briefly below under the following headings: (a) Construction of the Questionnaire; (b) A Pre-test or Pilot Study; (c) Selection of the Sample and Distribution of Questionnaire; and (d) Coding and Data Processing.

(a) Construction of the Questionnaire - The preliminary questionnaire was developed based on the literature review and the myriad of insights, ideas and suggestions that emanated from individuals who were previously interviewed. Once this version of the questionnaire was completed it was reviewed and refined through a series of interactions among members of the research team. It was then sent out to members of the pilot sample group and, on the basis of the team's analysis of their responses, it was further refined. The questionnaire was also shared with the Research and Develeopment (R&D) Office of the U.S. Coast Guard for additional input. Thus, the final version of the questionnaire was the result of the literature reviews, interviews, observations, interactions among the research team, inputs from the members of the pilot study and R&D Office of the U.S. Coast Guard.

The questionnaire was composed of three sets of questions which were designed to secure information on (a) demographic data; (b) issues connected with

recruitment; and (c) issues connected with retention. Moreover, the questionnaire sought to get information on issues which did not specifically fall under the rubric of recruitment and retention, but which were nevertheless related to the overall aims of the study. It, therefore, included questions on such factors as role strain, the effects of possible budget cuts and whether officers felt that the Coast Guard was serious about internal social change.

After weighing the relative merits and limitations of open-ended versus closed-ended questions, it was decided that the questionnaire should primarily be made up of closed-ended questions while also including a few open-ended questions. In the closed-ended questions, the respondents are given a limited number of answers from which to choose. The open-ended questions were designed to give the respondents the freedom to give their opinions on an issue and to decide on the form, aspect or detail of their answers.

(b) The Pre-test/Pilot Study - This phase was directed towards testing and refining a preliminary version of the questionnaire by distributing it to a small sub-sample of respondents in order to get their views on the content, phrasing of questions and any other facet of the questionnaire which they felt needed deletion, modification, or amplification. This is

considered to be an important phase of a study which involves the use of the questionnaire as the major data gathering technique, because it provides the opportunity for prospective sample members to assist the researchers in developing a balanced and valid instrument and avoids the possibility that the questionnaire will reflect only the ideas and biases of the researchers. This study proved to be no exception. The quality of the questionnaire was improved by refining the wording and sequencing of the questions and the manner in which the questionnaire was administered was also improved. For instance, the pilot study reaffirmed the researchers' inclination to use a control sample of non-minority officers. The pilot study also suggested the need for the respondents to return the questionnaires directly to the researchers at Morgan State University instead of returning them to the Office of the Coast Guard. These suggestions were accepted and were incorporated in the research plan.

(c) Selection of Sample and Distribution of Questionnaires - This phase involved the selection of the sample and the distribution of the questionnaire to members of the sample. Based on discussions with R&D Office of the U.S. Coast Guard, a sample of 375 officers, made up of a roughly equal number of minority and non-minority officers, was selected. In keeping

with Coast Guard policy, the term minority was used to describe officers who are Black, Hispanic, Native American and Alaskan Native, Asian and Pacific Islander. Additionally, efforts were made to include in the sample similiar numbers of Ensigns, Junior Grade Lieutenants, Lieutenants, etc. and to assure that within each rank Whites and minorities would be represented.

To facilitate the distribution of the questionnaires to the sample members, a list of the 375 officers with their addresses was provided by the U.S. Coast Guard. Questionnaires were sent to sample members at their places of work and self-addressed envelopes were included for the return of the questionnaires. The questionnaires were accompanied by a cover letter from the Office of the Commandant explaining the nature of the study and requesting the cooperation of the respondents. The respondents were requested to return the questionnaires within three weeks. After sending one reminder to those who did not return questionnaires after the three-week deadline, an eventual total of 268 or approximately 71.5 percent responded, which is considered to be a good rate of return.

(d) Coding and Data Processing - Once the questionnaires began arriving it then became necessary to begin translating the responses of the officers into a form that would lend itself to statistical analysis by

a computer program specifically designed for a research project of this nature. This phase of the research involved the construction of a master coding sheet which assigned a certain number to each response for each question and the transference of the information from each questionnaire to a coding sheet. The coded data was analyzed by means of the S.A.S. program which enabled the team to look at the relationships among answers to various questions in the form of tables, to break down tables into several "dimensions" according to preselected categories, and to apply basic tests of statistical relationships such as the "chi square" and basic correlation coefficient. In passing, it should be mentioned that while the information provided from the open-ended questions subsequently proved to be invaluable, it presented the rather difficult task of translating the information to quantitative form. This was done by a laborious reading and analyzing of each response and assigning it to a previously established coding category. In this way it was possible to translate the data in the open-ended responses to quantitative information that lends itself to analysis. As in many studies like this, more data were collected than were actually presented in this report, since it is always better to have too much than too little information. As noted, while much of the data collected

lent itself not only to the presentation of relationships between two variables, it was also possible to portray information that looked at bivariate relationships while controlling for a third variable. This type of data presentation was, however, omitted in the following chapters in the interest of providing information in as succinct fashion as possible.

In this study, the researchers have presented the empirical data embellished with much of the verbatim responses to the open-ended question as well as comments written at the end of the questionnaire. As is evident in the report, these responses and comments, along with information from the interviews, were used to support and amplify the analysis of the data, which was guided by one major issue, namely differential perceptions along racial/ethnic lines of the twin questions of the recruitment and the retention of minorities.

BACKGROUND OF THE SAMPLE

This section briefly describes the demographic characteristics of the sample of respondents to the questionnaire administered to 268 Coast Guard officers. It includes race/ethnicity, age, sex, rank, marital status, education, and manner of entry into the Coast Guard. Beside providing the reader with a general background picture of the sample, the data is also designed to facilitate analyses of the twin problems of recruitment and retention.

Race/Ethnicity

This critical variable was included for two reasons. First, since the study dealt essentially with minority recruitment and retention, sample members had to be initially identified based on their racial/ethnic background. Secondly, using an indicator of race/ethnicity enabled the researchers to make comparisons between Whites and minorities as well as among minority groups. Thus, we were able to compare recruitment and retention issues not only between minorities and non-minorities, but also within the minority category.

Table 1
Coast Guard Officers by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
Native American	11*	4.1
Black	49	18.3
Hispanic	39	14.5
Asian	34	12.7
White	135	50.4
Total	268	100.0

*This figure included eight officers who listed themselves as "Native American," two who listed themselves as "Native American" and "White," and one who was listed as "Alaskan Native."

As the above table indicates, of the 268 officers who comprise the sample, Whites (135 or 50.4 percent) and non-Whites or minorities (133 or 49.6 percent) are almost equally divided. Further, among minorities, Blacks are the most numerous (49 or 18.3 percent) followed by Hispanics (39 or 14.5 percent), Asians (34 or 12.7 percent) and Native Americans (11 or 4.1 percent).

Age

Table 2
Coast Guard Officers by Age

Age	Number	Percent
21 - 26 years	43	16.0
26 - 31	79	29.5
31 - 36	75	28.0
36 - 40	49	18.3
40 - 45	17	6.3
46+	5	1.9
Total	268	100.0

Table 2 provides the age distribution of sample members. It is evident from the table that the officers are relatively young in age with the 26 - 31 age cohort (79 or 29.5 percent) being the most significant category followed by those in 31 - 36 age cohort (75 or 28.0 percent) who comprise the second largest category. Seventy-five and one-half percent are less than 36 years old. Those officers who are 40 years or older (22 or 8.2 percent) were the least numerous. This age structure is perhaps not surprising, in view of the fact

that most of the officers are Academy graduates (see Table 7) and therefore probably entered the Coast Guard as an officer between the ages of 22 - 24 years.

Sex

Table 3
Coast Guard Officers by Sex

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	250	93.3
Female	16	6.0
No Answer	2	0.7
Total	268	100.0

As expected, Table 3 shows that the overwhelming majority (250 or 93.3 percent) of the sample is male. This is not surprising since the Coast Guard and its activities are perceived as being primarily male-oriented. Indeed one female officer reported that while she was on ship tour, her presence on the ship was often questioned (seemingly in jest) with the suggestion that a woman's place should be at home. She indicated that she would usually reply to the male in question in a similar jest, "If you would marry me and take care of me

and the children, I would stay home with the kids!" She indicated that such a response usually brought a halt to those kinds of comments.¹

Rank

Table 4
Coast Guard Officers by Rank

Rank	Number	Percent
Ensign	28	10.4
Lt. Junior Grade	79	29.5
Lieutenant	108	40.3
Lt. Commander	34	12.7
Commander	15	5.6
Captain	1	0.4
No Answer	3	1.1
Total	268	100.0

¹Interview with a female Lieutenant Junior Grade on March 28, 1986.

Table 4 indicates that in keeping with the age structure of the sample, the majority of the officers (108 or 40.3 percent) were of the rank of Lieutenant, while the next most numerous category was that of Lieutenant Junior Grade (79 or 29.5 percent) followed by Lieutenant Commander (34 or 12.7 percent). Of further significance was the fact that there was only one (1) Captain, which might indicate both the paucity of officers of this rank among minorities, as well as the possibility that an officer of this relatively high rank might derive little benefit from participating in a study of this kind.

Marital Status

Marital status is viewed as an important variable because of the views expressed during interviews that officers who were married and had children were more likely to perceive the Coast Guard negatively from the perspective of accepting assignments both on a ship as well as ashore. This perception certainly can influence a person's decision to join and to remain in the Coast Guard since travel and assignments on a ship are requirements of the organization.

Table 5
Coast Guard by Marital Status

Marital Status	Number	Percent
Married	199	74.3
Never Married	51	19.0
Separated	2	0.7
Divorced	6	2.2
Other	7	2.6
No Answer	3	1.1
Total	268	99.9*

*Does not add up to 100 percent because figures were rounded to the nearest tenth.

As the above table indicates the vast majority of the officers (199 or 74.3 percent) are married while nearly one-fifth (51 or 19 percent) are single by virtue of never having been married. Only a very small number (8 or 4.8 percent) reported that they are separated or divorced.

Education

This variable was designed to determine the educational background of the respondents and to determine the extent to which they seemed to be preparing themselves for a career outside the Coast Guard after the 20-year period, should this become necessary. The data on Table 6 indicate that over one-half of all officers (147 or 54.9 percent) did have at least a bachelor's degree, while 17 or 6.3 percent have a graduate degree. At the other end of the spectrum, 58 or 21.6 percent have only a high school education and 42 or 15.7 percent have only a high school education and 42 or 15.7 percent do have some college education. It

Table 6
Coast Guard Officers by Education

Education	Number	Percent
High School	58	21.6
Some College	42	15.7
Bachelor's Degree	147	54.9
Graduate Degree	17	6.3
No Answer	4	1.5
Total	268	100.0

should also be stated that the question of educational attainment does have an added dimension when it comes to retention. Minorities of lower rank but, with more education, are likely to resent the fact that they have to take orders from educationally less qualified Whites holding higher ranks.

Manner of Entry

This variable deals with the manner in which the individual entered the Coast Guard as an officer. We were concerned with this for the following reasons. First, some officers entered as enlisted personnel before becoming officers, by way of graduation from Officer Candidate School (OCS). Our interest was however in the individual from the time he/she became an officer. Second, since some views expressed during interviews suggested that Academy graduates get preferential treatment over OCS graduates (more will be said about this later), and therefore have a better chance of being upwardly mobile,² and further that this was justified,³ it appeared to be important to ascertain what seemed to be the most favorable route into the Coast Guard.

²Interview with Black Lieutenant Junior Grade who is an OCS graduate, January 21, 1986.

³Interview with Black Lieutenant who is an Academy graduate on March 11, 1986.

Table 7 not only provides information on the manner of entry of the officers but also a breakdown by race/ethnicity. If one looks at the column totals for Table 7, one notices that 125 or 46.6 percent of the sample entered as Academy graduates, while a little less than a quarter (63 or 23.5 percent) entered as OCS graduates, 43 or 16.0 percent went to college before graduating through OCS and 26 or 9.7 percent became officers as a result of a direct commission. In passing it should also be mentioned that most of the ten officers who comprise the "other" category came in after graduating from OCS, but by way of a more circuitous route such as "aviation then OCS," "enlisted then college then OCS" and "graduate school then OCS."

When we look at how officers of the different racial/ethnic groups entered the Coast Guard, we notice that of the 125 Academy graduates 62 were White while Asians made up the second largest category (21), followed by Blacks (19), Hispanics (16), and Native Americans (7).

In sum, Table 7 indicates that (a) most officers are Academy graduates; (b) most Academy graduates are White; and (c) Native Americans, Asians and Whites are more likely to be Academy graduates than OCS graduates. Blacks and Hispanics are more likely to be OCS graduates than Academy graduates.

[41]

Table 7

Coast Guard Officers by Race and Manner of Entry
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Manner of Entry					Total %
	Academy	OCS	College then OCS	Direct Commission	No Answer	
Native American	63.6 (7)	9.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	38.8 (19)	30.6 (15)	16.3 (8)	12.2 (6)	- -	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	41.0 (16)	25.6 (10)	25.6 (10)	7.7 (3)	- -	99.9 (39)
Asian	61.8 (21)	14.7 (5)	11.8 (4)	5.9 (2)	2.9 (1)	100.0 (34)
White	45.9 (62)	23.7 (32)	14.8 (20)	9.6 (13)	- -	99.9 (135)
Total	46.6 (125)	23.5 (63)	16.0 (43)	9.7 (26)	0.4 (1)	99.9 (268)

CHAPTER III

RECRUITMENT

This chapter of the report deals with a number of issues which the respondents felt were related to recruitment. As a consequence, information presented in this section will be portrayed under five major headings. The first subsection focuses on high school background of the officers, how the officers first learned about the Coast Guard and comfortableness in water. The second subsection focuses on questions related to self-image while the third subsection will deal with perceptions concerning the efforts on the part of the Coast Guard to recruit minorities. The fourth and fifth subsections are related. While the former looks at attitudes of officers concerning one possible way of getting more minorities, i.e. through lowering of standards with its implications for quotas, the latter deals with specific suggestions of officers for improving recruitment efforts.

High School Preparation of Officers

The first item addressed here is the amount of mathematics and science done by the officers while they were in high school. This variable is important because

of the need for a certain kind of intellectual and scholarly preparation in high school that Coast Guard officers will need before their formal training and while they are on the job. Indeed, it has been stated that the Academy, in its recruitment efforts, is looking for three major attributes of high school graduates as prerequisites for entry to the Academy. These are intellectual capability, athletic prowess and leadership potential.¹ Second (and this will be dealt with more fully later on) the more competent one is in mathematics and science in high school, the better one is likely to do at the Academy, the better one is likely to do on the job. Thus high school background assumes much importance in the context of recruitment and ultimately retention.

Table 8 indicates that overall the majority of the officers (71.9 percent) had taken "a lot" of math and science in high school while 26.2 percent reported that they had studied "some" math and science in high school. However, when we look at this variable from the perspective of race/ethnicity, we notice that Black officers were least likely (57.1 percent or a little more than half) to have taken "a lot" of math/science in

¹Interview with top Academy official, Coast Guard Academy, New London, Connecticut, March 12, 1986.

Table 8
Race and Math/Science Done in High School
N=267

Race/ Ethnicity	A Lot	Some	Hardly Any	None	Total %/(No)
Native American	81.8 (9)	18.2 (2)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)**
Black	57.1 (28)	40.8 (20)	2.0 (1)	- -	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	66.7 (26)	28.2 (11)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	100.1 (39)
Asian	79.4 (27)	11.8 (4)	2.9 (1)	2.9 (1)	97.0* (33)
White	75.6 (102)	24.4 (33)	- -	- -	100.0
Total	71.9 (192)	26.2 (70)	1.1 (3)	0.7 (2)	99.9 (267)

Note:

*The figures do not add up to 100 percent because there was one (1) nonresponse.

**Because of the limited number of Native American respondents, the researchers have refrained from drawing conclusions on the basis of the responses. This will be evident in subsequent analyses.

high school followed by Hispanics (26 or 66.7 percent). Not surprisingly, Black officers recorded the highest percentage (40.8 percent or approximately 4 out of every 10) among those who reported that they had taken "some" math in high school. On the other hand nearly 27

or 80 percent of the Asian officers and just over three-fourths (102 or 75.6 percent) of the White officers reported that they had taken "a lot" of math and science in high school, clearly demonstrating the advantage these groups had over Blacks and Hispanics.

When we consider these figures against the backdrop of the critical importance of having a math and science background if one is to graduate from the Academy in particular, it is evident that Blacks and to a certain extent Hispanics, are least prepared in terms of their high school experience, for entry to the officer corps. We can also argue that this lack of preparation can pose other problems of lack of self-esteem and self-confidence for Blacks during their training. This in turn can fuel and buttress previously held views among Whites that Blacks have no right to be in the Academy especially if their background does not appear to justify their presence as Coast Guard Officers.²

It is also possible to argue here that one of the reasons why a higher number of Blacks fail to graduate is lack of adequate preparation in high school. Furthermore, when we consider the historical legacy of an education system that up to 1954 existed under the

²Interview with Black Lieutenant Commander on January 15, 1986.

banner of the "separate but equal" doctrine, and thus offering inferior education to Blacks, taking "a lot of math and science" in high school can mean markedly different things depending on the color of one's skin and, whether one attended a Black (as most Blacks did) or a White high school.

First Learning About the Coast Guard

This subsection deals with the manner in which officers first learned about the Coast Guard. This is considered to be of some importance, because the way in which and the person from whom an individual first learns about a career option is likely to affect his subsequent orientation towards that particular career. Thus a sympathetic and a well-reasoned portrayal of the Coast Guard, especially if it comes from a significant other, can determine whether an individual will join and do well enough to stay in the Coast Guard.

Table 9 indicates that the majority of White (42 or 31.1 percent) Asian (12 or 35.3 percent) and Black officers (24 or 49.0 percent) first learned about the Coast Guard from "other" sources. These sources included "from a high school teacher," from "family and friends," "media" "magazines and TV," "heard about it all my life," "grew up near the water," and so on.

Table 9
Race/Ethnicity and How First Learned About
the Coast Guard
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Friends	Family Members	High School Counselor	Recruiter	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	9.1 (1)	36.4 (4)	-	9.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	27.3 (3)	100.1 (11)
Black	8.2 (4)	10.2 (5)	10.2 (5)	22.4 (11)	-	49.0 (24)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	30.8 (12)	15.4 (6)	12.8 (5)	15.4 (6)	2.6 (1)	23.1 (9)	100.1 (39)
Asian	17.6 (6)	17.6 (6)	17.6 (6)	8.8 (3)	2.9 (1)	35.3 (12)	99.8 (34)
White	15.6 (21)	26.7 (36)	12.6 (17)	13.3 (18)	.7 (1)	31.1 (42)	100.0 (135)
Total	16.4 (44)	21.3 (57)	12.3 (33)	14.5 (39)	1.9 (5)	33.6 (90)	100.0 (268)

When we dispense with the "other" category which as we saw was an umbrella category, we observe that White officers were then most likely to have first learned about the Coast Guard from "family members" (36 or 26.7 percent) and from "friends" (21 or 15.6 percent). In other words when we combine these two categories we see

that 57 or 42.3 percent of White officers, first learned about the Coast Guard from close associates (i.e., family and friends), which probably suggests a greater presence and history of family traditions in the Coast Guard. While it is true that most Hispanics (12 or 30.8 percent) first learned about the Coast Guard from "friends," an almost similar number first became aware of the Coast Guard from "family members" (6 or 15.4 percent), a "recruiter" (6 or 15.4 percent) or from a "high school counselor" (5 or 12.8 percent).

In a somewhat related sense, Asians were equally likely to have first heard about the Coast Guard from "friends," "family members" and from a "recruiter" (6 or 17.6 percent) for each category. Finally Table 9 indicates that apart from the "other" category, Blacks were most likely to have first learned about the Coast Guard from a "recruiter" (11 or 22.4 percent). Only 5 or 10.2 percent of Black officers indicated that they first heard about the Coast Guard from "family members." Black officers are also least likely (4 or 8.2 percent) to have first learned about the Coast Guard from "friends."

In sum, it is possible to argue that Whites are more advantageously placed in gaining access to the Coast Guard, by virtue of their greater propinquity to family and friends, who presumably have some knowledge

of this organization. This probably reflects a longer tradition among family and friends of being in the Coast Guard. The other minorities particularly Blacks have no such real advantage. Blacks must depend on mostly "recruiters," Hispanics mainly on "friends" and Asians on a combination of "friends," "family members," and "high school counselors" to acquire their first knowledge of the Coast Guard. Interviews with Black officers reinforces the same finding. Many Black officers got interested in the Coast Guard fortuitously, when for a number of reasons their prior interest in joining the Air Force became attenuated after contact with a recruiter.³ Thus, their interest in for the Coast Guard only began after contact with a recruiter. As one Black officer put it:

I had gone to join the Air Force, but I saw a poster of a Coast Guard aviation crewman carrying a baby away from a helicopter.....I said I wanted to do this.....The recruiter seemed personable. The Army recruiter was a redneck and talked to me like a redneck.....the Coast Guard offered me something I wanted. (Interview with Black Lieutenant, January 21, 1986.)

³Interview with Black Lieutenant on March 11, 1986. He switched his interest to the Coast Guard because his eyesight would not have permitted him to be a pilot in the Air Force.

Clearly, the Coast Guard can compete with the other branches of the military, but it needs to find a way to have its image more firmly planted in the minds of those minorities who are contemplating a military career. The above comment of the Black officer also seems to support the view that a lot may depend on the image presented by the first person, in this case the recruiter, who tells the potential candidate about the organization and opportunities.

Comfortableness in Water

Attraction to water may be a variable related to a person's choice of a career in the Coast Guard and may influence an individual's initial decision to seek out a career in the United States Coast Guard. For example, in many of our interviews, we found that "growing up around water" seemed to be an important correlate of choosing a Coast Guard career. Logic would also suggest that a positive orientation towards water might impel an individual to a water-centered career.

In addition to the above, many of the activities critical to effective functioning as a Coast Guard officer involve water-oriented activities. Not only is this required in the physical education curriculum at the Academy, but "swim call" or "sea call" is also part of a cadet's training. "Swim" or "sea call" requires a

student to jump for for a certain height off a slowly moving vessel into the cold sea and to simulate the rescue of a drowning individual. This involves, among other things, swimming with the "rescued" person, catching up with the slowly moving vessel, and hoisting the inert figure of the "rescued" person onto the deck of the moving vessel. The point is simply that water activities are very much an integral part of a Coast Guard officer's career duties.

The survey asked a series of questions regarding comfortableness in water. The results of those questions are shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Race/Ethnicity and Comfortableness in Water
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Comfortable	Moderately Comfortable	Not Comfortable	Total %/(No)
Native American	81.8 (9)	18.2 (2)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	30.6 (15)	63.3 (31)	6.1 (3)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	43.6 (17)	43.6 (17)	12.8 (5)	100.0 (39)
Asian	44.1 (15)	50.0 (17)	5.9 (2)	100.0 (34)
White	69.6 (94)	28.9 (39)	1.5 (2)	100.0 (135)
Total	56.0 (150)	39.5 (106)	4.5 (12)	100.0 (268)

Table 10 indicates that White (94 or 69.6 percent) and Native American (9 or 81.8 percent) officers, are far more likely than other minority officers to feel "very comfortable" in water. The table suggests that Black officers (15 or 30.6 percent) were least likely to feel "very comfortable" in water. This point was also made by a number of Blacks who were interviewed. Many of them indicated that they had been placed in remedial classes at the Academy in swimming. One Black female officer describes her initial experience with swimming at the Academy as follows:

That first summer.....I sank like a rock. I am better off having done it [swimming and physical education] but I did have problems jumping off a tower.....I look back and I say I must have been crazy to have done this.....I run everyday as a consequence of that experience (Interview January 21, 1986).

This may be understandable in view of the fact that many Blacks are more likely to have grown up in urban centers where their accessibility to swimming and water-related activities is limited. Having access to swimming pools is much more likely to occur for white youth than for Blacks. This may place Blacks at a disadvantage during training at the Academy.

Self-image of Officers

This variable was included because of the perception developed during interviews with selected

officers that the Coast Guard officer has to be a special type of individual if he/she is to be successful. In addition to his intellectual and sometimes physical prowess, he/she is expected to carry himself/herself in such a way that enlisted personnel and officers junior in rank, regardless of race, will be predisposed to respect him/her. It is being argued here that an essential component of this bearing is the way in which the officer sees himself/herself. Indeed many interviews revealed that self-image of the successful officer was often positive, was nurtured during experiences prior to entry to the Academy, usually those occurring in the family. For example, one officer who was one of 15 children disclosed that despite his humble origins, his mother never worked and his father was a laborer, his mother always "made me feel that I was something special...she always told me to do the best I can." Later on after his mother died when he was 11 years of age, he was encouraged by a teacher to consider moving in with the school principal who was recently widowed. As the officer put it

Since my father was peripheral and it seemed like a good idea to me I moved in with him [the principal]...my goals were reinforced by being in his presence...he encouraged me to continue academically, to polish up my social graces...he has been the predominant father figure...When I go home I still stay with him (Interview on January 28, 1986).

It was reported experiences like the above, which were obviously instrumental in promoting a positive self-image, that prompted the inclusion of a number of indices of self-image. One measure of self-image of minority officers in the Coast Guard is the way they view themselves in relation to the Coast Guard. They were asked to indicate how they preferred to be viewed. Table 11 summarizes their responses.

Table 11
Race/Ethnicity and How Minorities Preferred
to be Viewed
N=133

Race/ Ethnicity	As Minority Officer	As Officer Who is Minority	No Answer	Total %/No.
Native American	- -	9.1 (1)	90.9 (10)	100.0 (11)
Black	10.2 (5)	89.8 (44)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	12.8 (5)	82.0 (32)	5.2 (2)	100.0 (39)
Asian	5.9 (2)	88.2 (30)	5.9 (2)	100.0 (34)
Total	9.0 (12)	80.4 (107)	10.5 (14)	99.9 (133)

The table provides information on whether minorities see themselves primarily as "minority officers" or as "officers who happens to be minority." It is obvious from Table 11 that the vast majority of Blacks (44 or 89.8 percent) Asians (30 or 88.2 percent) and Hispanics (32 or 82.5 percent) see themselves primarily as "officers who happen to be minority." In other words they prefer to de-emphasize their minority status and to be viewed, at least on the job, in terms of their status and abilities as an officer rather than their race/ethnicity.

Table 12

Race/Ethnicity and Minorities and Perceptions of Success
N=133

Race/ Ethnicity	Hard Work	Discrimin- ation	Neither/ No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	9.1 (1)	- -	90.9 (10)	100.0 (11)
Black	79.6 (39)	14.3 (7)	6.1 (3)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	76.9 (30)	17.9 (7)	5.1 (2)	99.9 (39)
Asian	82.3 (28)	8.8 (3)	8.8 (3)	99.9 (34)
Total	73.7 (98)	12.8 (17)	13.5 (18)	100.0 (133)

Table 12 focuses on whether the basis of the locus of control for the individual is internal (hard work) or external (institutionalized discrimination). Here it is clear that the majority (98 or 73.7 percent) of minority officers - Asians (28 or 82.3 percent) followed by Blacks (39 or 79.6 percent) and Hispanics (30 or 76.9 percent) - feel that if they work hard they will be successful. This would seem to suggest that their perception of self is such that they feel that in spite of racial/ethnic discrimination, they can by their efforts, overcome this discrimination and ultimately be successful. This is consistent with the findings of the interviews conducted with a number of minority officers. Minority officers feel that they are capable of overcoming adversity, and the data, here and in Table 11, indicate that they are also professionally oriented, preferring to be judged by achievement-oriented criteria which they can control rather than by ascriptive criteria such as race over which they have no control. These views, as we shall soon see, are also reflected in their perceptions regarding requirements for entry to the Coast Guard.

Entrance Requirements

The issue of entrance requirements is a troubling question in the society at large, and as is to be expected, reproduces itself in microcosmic form in various organizations including the Coast Guard. The basic question is: should minorities be given special treatments designed to bring them into the mainstream of American life (possibly based on their numbers in the population, as the Coast Guard would like to do) and thereby correct the effects of the historical legacy of institutional racism? Most Americans of consequence (for example those in the courts and politicians) seem to agree on the loftiness of the aims. The controversy that arises is often regarding the means that should be used to attain these goals.

Briefly, the means seem to fall into three (3) main categories. There are those who feel that quotas are the answer, that is a specific number of slots should be set aside for minorities. This approach has been criticized by those who argue that it brings "reverse discrimination" by restricting opportunities for qualified non-minorities. The implication is, therefore, that this approach is inherently un-American.

Others have suggested that rather than implementing a quota system, entrance requirements should be lowered for minorities so as to enable them to get their foot in

the door. It is hoped that once they get in, they will then be able to compete on equal terms and ultimately their presence will be commensurate with their percentages in the national population. While there is something to be said in favor of this approach, its success is essentially predicated on the assumption that (a) those who came in under lower standards will eventually be able to catch up with those who did not and (b) the attitudes of the latter, will be sympathetic to the policies which permitted differential entry requirements and to the individuals, who are the beneficiaries of these policies.

Still others believe that the way to solve this problem is to employ neither of previously mentioned approaches, but to bring minorities up to the required entrance standards prior to entry so that from the start, they can compete on equal terms with non-minorities (Loury 1985). In this way, the impression is not created in the minds of minorities and non-minorities alike, that the former were so incapable that standards had to be lowered to get them in. Thus, minorities do not experience feelings of inferiority, and non-minorities do not experience feelings of resentment towards minorities whom they consider have no business participating in programs for which they are not qualified. It was with these issues in mind that

certain questions were asked of all officers. Table 13 summarizes the responses of the officers regarding entrance requirements. The table deals with the attitude of officers towards lowering of requirements for entry to the Coast Guard. It is readily apparent that 241 or 90 percent of the officers do not wish to see a lowering of entrance requirements, and although this impression is strongest among White officers (128 or 94.8 percent) and least strong among Black officers (40 or 81.6 percent), the near unanimity of this response shows that even minorities do not wish entrance requirements to be lowered, although they may benefit from such action. Indeed the following comments are illustrative of the strong feelings of some officers against lowering entrance requirements.

No reverse discrimination for minorities.
(Male Hispanic)

Lowering standards is a disgrace and disservice to minorities. All this does is reinforce the majority view that Blacks are lazy and stupid. (Male Hispanic)

It is not fair to the individual - in my class of OCS two Blacks were admitted into OCS through a special program. One dropped out and the other one barely made it. (Male Hispanic)

Table 13

Race/Ethnicity and Lowering of Entrance Requirements
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	- -	100.0 (11)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	10.2 (5)	81.6 (40)	8.2 (4)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	7.7 (3)	84.6 (33)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	-	100.0 (39)
Asian	5.9 (2)	85.3 (29)	5.9 (2)	- -	2.9 (1)	100.0 (34)
White	2.2 (3)	94.8 (128)	0.7 (1)	- -	2.2 (3)	99.9 (135)
Total	4.8 (13)	90.0 (241)	3.0 (8)	0.7 (2)	1.5 (4)	100.0 (268)

No-this will be a big mistake-will have unqualified people working with us. Keep the same standards for all. (CG Academy made this mistake '73-76) CGA took in close to 30 people but only 4-5 graduated-an atrocity. Sad thing is we have some in today CG that think all minorities are allowed in this way. (Black Male)

Entrance requirements should never be lowered, it would increase a high number of unqualified minorities causing low retention rates. To get minorities in the mainstream the basics have to be stressed at an early age and emphasized throughout one's high school career. (Black Male)

As a minority officer who has worked hard to be successful, I don't want to be identified with dirtballs who can get in because standards have been lowered. (Male Asian)

Lowering standards is counterproductive. The minority problem is a national problem (not merely a CG problem). Efforts need to be made at the local levels to lift and build minorities to meet standards. I know minorities who meet our standards and are outstanding members. (White Male)

It would demean the applicant, stigmatize the recruitment. Down those that most need the lower entrance standard to failure and probably drag the talented co-worker down with them. (White Male)

You can't let someone ride piggy-back forever. If someone is still in the ghetto it's his own fault. I don't believe racial prejudice is that prevalent any more. (White Male)

I am strongly against lowering any standard to allow minorities to enter anything. This only causes problems once the person gets the position. Obviously, there must have been a reason to have a standard at a certain level. (Black Male)

It should be stressed that the above verbatim comments only represent some of the views expressed by officers against the lowering of standards. While these comments are inherently interesting, they also exemplify a number of facets of this problem which are worthy of further discussion.

First, the comments indicate that lowering standards is "counterproductive" because it "demeans" and "stigmatizes" the beneficiary. The emphasis should be on "quality" not "quantity," especially since "there

must have been a reason" for the standards in the first place. Second, lowering standards creates problems for the very people for whom they were intended, because they generate resentment among non-minorities, reinforce the view that minorities are inferior and ultimately "cause low retention rates." Finally, the comments indicate that rather than lowering standards, one should bring minorities up to the standard of non-minorities, by stressing and emphasizing the basics "at an early age and...throughout one's high school career." The verdict across racial/ethnic lines is therefore reasonably clear. However, before leaving this topic, we should also be reminded that the verdict was not unanimous as the following comment supporting lowering standards illustrates.

In order to mainstream one must get the opportunity to "break into" various institutions. If an individual has been denied the tools to begin with, he will never break in. Even if so called objective criteria are used...the majority of minorities will not score as highly because they have a poorer education background...The cycle must be broken. Lowering the standard now allows a minority to get into the system. (Black Male)

Some officers hold the view that minorities need a measure of preferential treatment presumably on a temporary basis, so as to allow them to get their foot in the door. As another officer put it

Allow a probationary period for lower academic performers who show high achievement in leadership. After one year if they do not meet standards, dismiss them. (White Male)

In sum, the issue of lowering requirements brought forth a large number of strongly worded comments opposing this approach of dealing with the problem of recruiting more minorities. Furthermore, even those who favored some form of lowered entrance requirements, seem to advocate this view on a temporary basis. However, before turning to more specific views concerning what should be done to recruit more minorities, attention will be focussed on perceptions regarding the Coast Guard and its efforts of recruiting minorities.

Racial/Ethnic Perceptions and Recruitment

A number of indicators of this variable was included so as to ascertain how officers felt about the Coast Guard's recruitment efforts. As previously reported the percentage of minority officers in the Coast Guard is not commensurate with the representation of minorities in the national population. The Coast Guard Academy has been involved in a number of activities designed to attract minorities. In addition to those activities which have previously been mentioned, the Academy has placed advertisements in minority magazines such as Essence, Ebony, and Nuestro.

It has participated in college fairs sponsored by the National Scholarship Service for Negro Students (NSSFNS), especially those where Black colleges/universities are represented, has instituted the Minority Introduction to Engineering (MITE) program, which in July 1984 gave 67 minority students the opportunity to spend a week at the Academy to gain firsthand knowledge of the life of a cadet and has been making personal contacts with male and female prospects on the Minority Student Search List. (For further details, see Memorandum from Superintendent, Coast Guard Academy to Commandant re Academy Recruiting Report, 3 September 1985.)

With respect to Blacks, it should also be pointed out that, attracting the best qualified young Blacks is not an easy task for the Coast Guard. As we noted, the Coast Guard is seeking the best qualified individuals (intellectually or otherwise). However, the nation's best universities are also competing for Blacks of this caliber. Therefore, faced with the option of going to a prestigious university or going into the Coast Guard, the most talented Blacks tend to choose the former. This means that the Coast Guard sometimes has to settle for Blacks who are not of the highest caliber. In this context, two further issues spring to mind. The first is whether what applies to Blacks may not also apply to

Whites and other minorities as far as the Coast Guard having to take "less than the best." The second asks whether there is still not a sufficient pool of Blacks left, who are capable of being successful Coast Guard officers. Possible answers to these questions must await our analysis of what could further be done to enhance minority recruitment. This will constitute the last subsection of our statement on recruitment. However, before turning to this subsection let us examine some officer perceptions regarding the Coast Guard's minority recruitment efforts.

Perceptions on Recruitment

As was previously mentioned, efforts were made to determine how officers feel about recruitment, so as to get more of an idea as to how they feel about the Coast Guard's attitude towards getting minorities into the organization. To this end, a number of questions was asked with which three will now be addressed.

Table 14
Race/Ethnicity and Whether the Coast Guard
Wants More Minorities
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	72.7 (8)	- -	9.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	16.3 (8)	40.8 (20)	36.7 (18)	4.1 (2)	2.0 (1)	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	48.7 (19)	10.3 (4)	25.6 (10)	10.3 (4)	5.1 (2)	100.0 (39)
Asian	32.3 (11)	8.8 (3)	26.5 (9)	20.6 (7)	11.8 (4)	100.0 (34)
White	57.0 (77)	8.1 (11)	12.6 (17)	17.8 (24)	4.4 (6)	99.9 (135)
Total	46.0 (123)	14.2 (38)	20.5 (55)	14.5 (39)	4.8 (13)	100.0 (268)

As can be seen from Table 14, a total of 123 or 46.0 percent of officers feel that the Coast Guard wants more minorities, while a total 93 or 34.7 percent feel that the Coast Guard either did not want or "not sure" that the Coast Guard wants more minorities. Whites (77 or 57.0 percent) were most likely to feel that the organization wants more minorities, while Blacks (8 or 16.3 percent) were least likely to feel this way. As would be expected, the majority of Blacks (38 or 77.5 percent) felt that the Coast Guard did not want more

minorities or were "not sure" about this. Two other points are worthy of note. First, it seems that the other minorities are not as firm in their view about the Coast Guard not wanting more minorities, as are Blacks. This is significant because as we shall see, it will become necessary to deal with minorities not only as a combined group but also as separate entities. Second, 24 or 17.8 percent (the second largest category) of White officers reported that they "do not know" whether the organization wanted more minorities, which could mean a lack of interest in issues which they feel do not affect them directly.

Table 15

Race/Ethnicity and Whether the Coast Guard
is Doing Enough to Recruit Minorities
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	54.5 (6)	- -	9.1 (1)	27.3 (3)	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Black	8.1 (4)	63.3 (31)	20.4 (10)	6.1 (3)	7.0 (1)	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	33.3 (12)	28.2 (11)	20.5 (8)	15.4 (6)	2.6 (1)	100.0 (39)
Asian	29.4 (10)	23.5 (8)	20.6 (7)	17.6 (6)	8.8 (3)	99.9 (34)
White	44.4 (60)	9.6 (13)	18.5 (25)	24.4 (33)	3.0 (4)	99.9 (135)
Total	34.7 (93)	23.5 (63)	19.0 (51)	19.0 (51)	3.7 (10)	99.9 (268)

Table 15 focuses on whether or not the Coast Guard is doing enough to recruit more minorities. It indicates that out of the 93 or 34.7 percent of officers who felt that the Coast Guard is doing enough, 60 or 64.5 percent, that is nearly two-thirds, was White. This figure, however, constituted less than one-half or 44 percent of all the White officers. Among the minority officers, less than 10 percent, that is (4 or 8.1 percent) of Black officers, less than one-third (10 or 29.4 percent) of Asian officers and one-third (13 or 33.3 percent) of the Hispanic officers, felt that the Coast Guard is doing enough to recruit minorities.

On the other hand 31 or 63.3 percent of Black officers felt that the Coast Guard is not doing enough to recruit more minorities. This was by far the strongest statement by any of the racial/ethnic categories, a statement that becomes even stronger if one were to combine those Blacks who answered "no" with those who answered "not sure," in which case the figures become 41 or 83.7 percent. Again, it is noticeable that White officers, 33 out of 51 or 64.7 percent, were most frequent among those officers who answered "don't know."

Table 16

Whether the Coast Guard is Spending Enough
to Recruit Minorities
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	27.3 (3)	9.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	54.5 (6)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	6.1 (3)	63.3 (31)	14.3 (7)	12.2 (6)	4.1 (2)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	25.6 (10)	25.6 (10)	17.9 (7)	30.8 (12)	- -	99.9 (39)
Asian	23.5 (8)	26.5 (9)	14.7 (5)	26.5 (9)	8.8 (3)	100.0 (34)
White	26.7 (36)	9.6 (13)	20.0 (27)	40.7 (55)	3.0 (4)	100.0 (135)
Total	22.4 (60)	24.0 (64)	17.5 (47)	32.8 (88)	3.4 (9)	100.1 (268)

Now, let us consider how officers feel about whether the Coast Guard is spending enough on the recruitment of minorities. Table 16 reveals that (a) only 60 or 22.4 percent, that is less than one-fourth of all officers, feel that the organization is spending enough and (b) Whites comprise 36 or 60 percent of this category. In general in every category only a small percentage of officers felt that the Coast Guard was spending enough money on recruitment of minorities. Furthermore, only three (3) or 6.1 percent of Black

officers were of this view.

Turning to those officers who felt that the Coast Guard is not spending enough on recruitment of minorities, 31 or 63.3 percent of the Black officers were of this view compared with 10 or 25.6 percent of Hispanics and nine 9 or 26.5 percent of Asians. Thus, it is clear that among minority officers, Blacks are far more likely to fault the organization for not spending enough for the purpose of minority recruitment. Once again, it is significant that a relatively large number (55 or 40.7 percent) of White officers answered "don't know" to this question.

The final subsection on recruitment focuses on what officers feel should be done to recruit more minority officers. First of all, Table 17 reveals that a significant proportion of officers (186 or 69.4 percent) did not respond to this question. Among these officers, it was not surprising that in view of their "no answer" responses to the previous questions on minority recruitment, a large number of White officers (111 or 82.2 percent) would fall into this category. It is also noticeable that this was true for Asian officers, where 26 or 76.5 percent of these officers also did not respond to this question. Finally, the same was true for almost one-half of the Hispanics 20 or 51.3 percent and 19 or 38.8 percent of the Black officers.

With respect to those officers who registered their views on this question, the majority (25 or 9.3 percent) felt that "more advertising" was needed, with Hispanics (10 or 25.6 percent) constituting the largest category. Among those officers who felt that "more effort in minority communities" was needed, 10 or 20.4 percent of the Black officers held this view. They represented the most numerous group expressing the need for increased efforts in minority communities. A total of 9 or 18.4 percent of Black officers felt that "more effort in Black universities/colleges" was also needed to deal with recruitment of minorities.

In sum, while the responses to this question were disappointing, a small but significant number of officers felt that expenditure on minority recruiting should focus primarily on advertising and on refurbishing the image of the Coast Guard in minority communities. Again, the fact that only eight or 3.0 percent of all officers felt that the use of minority officers (no Blacks were of this view) was needed to deal with the recruitment problem is consistent with the view of many officers that no or little credit is given to them on their fitness reports for this activity.

[72]

Table 17

Race/Ethnicity and What Could Be Done to Recruit Minority Officers
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	More Advertising	More Money	More Effort in Minority Communities	More Visibility by Minority Officers	More Effort Black Colleges Universities	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	90.9 (10)	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Black	12.1 (6)	2.0 (1)	20.4 (10)	-	18.4 (9)	38.8 (19)	8.2 (4)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	25.6 (10)	-	7.7 (3)	2.6 (1)	-	51.3 (20)	12.8 (5)	100.0 (39)
Asian	11.8 (4)	-	-	8.8 (3)	-	76.5 (26)	2.9 (1)	100.0 (34)
White	3.7 (5)	-	4.4 (6)	3.0 (4)	-	82.2 (111)	6.7 (9)	100.0 (135)
Total	9.3 (25)	0.4 (1)	7.1 (19)	3.0 (8)	3.4 (9)	69.4 (186)	7.5 (20)	100.0 (268)

Finally, it should be mentioned that although the quantitative data was not as illuminating as it could have been, the qualitative data was very helpful in this context, as the following comments indicate.

If the service doesn't have enough minorities, I'd suspect it's because we haven't gotten the word about the CG to minorities in this country. (White Male)

Most CG stations are small outposts in White areas. It's difficult to get young minorities interested in a career that will take them to these isolated areas. (White Male)

The market is your target area group. Need to improve Coast Guard recognition among minorities. Many are confused on our role mission. (Hispanic Male)

More T.V. time, newspapers concerning GC missions and life. (Hispanic Male)

Identifying possible recruits earlier and encouraging these students to excel in math and science and encouraging them to take the SAT/ACT tests, more than once if necessary. (Hispanic Male)

More advertising and visibility in minority communities. Also, establish more programs in elementary and high schools gearing qualified minority students toward academics and high-tech colleges. (Black Male)

USCG has to go to minority schools and colleges and blow their gorn and let minorities hear about what we do. (Black Male)

Throw money at the recruiting program. Open up the recruiting offices we just closed. Add recruiting billets. Give them the money to travel to do their job. (Asian Male)

[74]

The above comments would therefore seem to indicate that, by and large, the following techniques may, with success, be used to enhance the Coast Guard's minority recruitment efforts. These are (a) paying more attention to talented minority high school students and (b) highlighting the Coast Guard's role and mission and improving its image in minority communities. These points will be discussed in greater detail in the recommendations section of this report.

CHAPTER IV

RETENTION

In this chapter we turn our attention to the problem of retention. As in the case of recruitment, efforts were made to solicit information that would measure a number of variables associated with retention. Accordingly this section of the report is subdivided into five main subsections. The first section deals with the question of role strain, where efforts were made to determine any pressures related to the individual's status as an officer and particularly as a minority officer. Thus, some questions on role strain were asked of all officers, while others were addressed only to minority officers.

The second section focuses on the question of race/ethnicity with respect to retention. Here efforts are made to determine whether minorities experienced any form of discrimination, which could conceivably result in voluntary separation or in role strain which in turn could contribute to involuntary separation.

The third section deals with the question of mobility within the Coast Guard. Here we turn our attention to such specific issues as the importance of and the adequacy of opportunities to operational

experience, the Coast Guard's policy regarding promotion to the rank of Lieutenant Commander, whether officers feel that Academy graduates are preferentially treated and finally, perceptions regarding the possibility of making it to the top.

A final section pulls together a few snippets of information on levels of attachment to the organization. As a consequence, information concerning whether officers plan to stay for at least 20 years, whether they would join the Coast Guard if they had to do it over again, and whether they think the study will affect the position of the minority officer, in particular, are presented.

Role Strain

In this section we examine the question of strains or pressures that emanate from the fact that the Coast Guard officer occupies a status (being an officer) which carries with it certain privileges and obligations (role). While there are many facets to the role of the Coast Guard officer and therefore many possibilities for strain, in this study we have sought to look only at three aspects. These are strain emerging from (a) role ambiguity, that is where role expectations are not made clear, by a superior officer, for example (b) role inconsistency, that is where responses by a superior

officer to particular actions on the part of a minority officer were perceived as being inconsistent when compared with responses to similar behavior by non-minority; and (c) role strain experienced by minority officers caused by non-recognition of their status as an officer.

Table 18

Race/Ethnicity and Whether What Was Required By
A Superior Officer Was Not Made Clear
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	63.6 (7)	27.3 (3)	9.1 (1)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	59.2 (29)	28.6 (14)	10.2 (5)	- -	2 (1)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	48.7 (19)	35.9 (14)	5.2 (2)	2.6 (1)	7.7 (3)	100.0 (39)
Asian	76.5 (26)	17.7 (6)	2.9 (1)	2.9 (1)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	60.0 (81)	29.6 (40)	6.7 (9)	.7 (1)	3 (4)	100.0 (135)
Total	60.45 (162)	28.73 (77)	6.72 (18)	1.12 (3)	2.99 (8)	100.0 (268)

The issue of role ambiguity was posed to all officers. Table 18 reflects their responses to a question designed to indicate whether or not what was required of them by a superior officer was made clear. Interestingly enough the table reveals that this aspect of role strain has been experienced by all officers but mostly by Asian officers, where 26 or 76.5 percent of this group of officers responded that they had experienced role ambiguity. Almost as many Black officers 29 or 59.2 percent as White officers 81 or 60.0 percent, and less than one-half of Hispanics (19 or 48.7 percent) reported that they had also had the experience. Clearly, role ambiguity is not a minority problem, but one that cuts across racial/ethnic lines. This was evidenced by the fact the majority of officers (162 or 60.4 percent) reported the occurrence of this form of role strain. This is partially illustrated by the following comments.

The superior officer is not clear on the direction and intent of the job thus giving me leeway to improvise. When I improvise, he disagrees. (Black Male Lieutenant)

As U/W OOD (underway officer of deck), entering port at night, CO was asleep. Asked XO, who was on bridge, if I should wake captain. He said no, don't worry about it. After moving without incident, CO chewed me out. (I did not fully realize the enormous responsibility of the U/W OOD. (Black Male Lieutenant Commander)

This happens frequently, this reflects poor management techniques. (White Male Lieutenant Commander)

Table 19

**Race/Ethnicity and Whether Junior/Enlisted Personnel
Ever Failed to Recognize Officers Status**

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	- -	- -	- -	- -	90.9 (10)	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Blacks	12.2 (6)	- -	2 (1)	2 (1)	63.3 (31)	20.4 (10)	99.9 (49)
Hispanics	12.8 (5)	15.4 (6)	- -	- -	59.0 (23)	12.4 (5)	100.0 (39)
Asian	11.8 (4)	8.8 (3)	- -	2.9 (1)	67.7 (23)	8.8 (3)	100.0 (34)
White	- -	- -	- -	.7 (1)	95.6 (129)	3.7 (5)	100.0 (135)
Total	5.60 (15)	2.99 (8)	.37 (1)	1.12 (3)	80.97 (217)	8.96 (24)	100.0 (268)

Tables 19 and 20 provide responses to questions that (a) were directed only at minorities and (b) attempted to get to more specific aspects of role strain. For example, efforts were made to determine whether junior officers or enlisted personnel had ever failed to respect and acknowledge the officer status of

a higher ranking minority officer. As table 19 indicates, the results are very inconclusive. This is because while only a small number of minority officers experienced this form of role strain and also only a small fraction reported that they had not experienced this form of role strain, the vast majority of minority officers did not respond to this issue.

Table 20

Race/Ethnicity and Experience Regarding Punishment
for Action Which Non-Minority Not Punished/Rewarded

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	9.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	- -	- -	81.8 (9)	100.0 (11)
Black	51.0 (25)	42.9 (21)	6.1 (3)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	10.2 (4)	84.6 (33)	- -	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	100.0 (39)
Asian	8.8 (3)	82.4 (28)	8.8 (3)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	1.5 (2)	2.2 (3)	.7 (1)	- -	95.6 (129)	100.0 (135)
Total	13.06 (35)	32.09 (86)	2.61 (7)	.37 (1)	51.87 (139)	100.0 (268)

However, when one looks at the question of role strain as it is related to differential treatment for the same action, a completely different picture emerges. Table 20 summarizes the responses to the question concerning whether minority officers felt that they had been punished for an action for which a non-minority officer was either not punished or was rewarded. Of the 35 officers (this included two Whites although the question was only asked of minorities) who answered in the affirmative fully 25 or 71.4 percent were Black. This meant that among Black officers, 51 percent (a little more than one-half) reported that they had experienced this form of role strain while only four or 10.2 percent of Hispanics and three or 8.8 percent of Asians reported having had this experience.

The Race/Ethnic Factor

Table 21 deals with responses to the question regarding whether the minority officers had ever experienced prejudice based on their race/ethnicity in the Coast Guard. The data here indicates that only a small number (14 or 10.5 percent) reported that they had experienced prejudices. Of those who said they had, six or 42.8 percent were Black and four or 28.6 percent were Hispanic. Again only seven or 5.3 percent of all minority officers reported that they had not experienced

racial/ethnic prejudice. Of much significance, however, is the fact that the vast majority of minority officers 91 or 68.4 percent did not answer the question.

Table 21

Race/Ethnicity and Whether Ever Experienced
Racial/Ethnic Prejudice

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	18.2 (2)	- -	- -	81.8 (9)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	12.2 (6)	2 (1)	10.2 (5)	65.3 (32)	10.2 (5)	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	10.2 (4)	10.2 (4)	10.2 (4)	59.0 (23)	10.2 (4)	99.8 (39)
Asian	5.9 (2)	5.9 (2)	2.9 (1)	79.4 (27)	5.9 (2)	100.0 (34)
Total	10.5 (14)	5.3 (7)	7.5 (10)	68.4 (91)	8.3 (11)	100.0 (133)

In Table 22, in response to the question of whether or not they were made to feel welcome in the Coast Guard, the vast majority of the minority officers (214 or 79.8 percent) reported in the affirmative. The table also reveals that at least eight out of ten officers (almost 80 percent) in each of the minority groups with the exception of Blacks, indicated that they were made to feel welcome. Among Black officers, 30 or 61.2

percent were of this view. Again when we look at those who responded "not sure," Black officers (12 or 24.5 percent) were more than twice as likely to have been of this view than the other officers. Clearly, while the majority of Blacks (61.2 percent) felt that they are welcome, compared to the other groups, a larger percentage of Blacks are uncertain that they are welcome in the Coast Guard.

Table 22
Race/Ethnicity and Being Made To Feel Welcome
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	90.9 (10)	- -	- -	- -	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Black	61.2 (30)	8.2 (4)	24.5 (12)	- -	6.1 (3)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	79.5 (31)	5.1 (2)	7.7 (3)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	100.0 (39)
Asian	79.4 (27)	11.8 (4)	8.8 (3)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	85.9 (116)	5.2 (7)	6.7 (9)	- -	2.2 (3)	100.0 (135)
Total	79.8 (214)	6.3 (17)	10.0 (27)	.4 (1)	3.3 (9)	100.0 (268)

Table 23

**Race/Ethnicity and Whether Minorities Have The Same
Chances as Non-Minorities
N=268**

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	100 (11)	- -	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	40.8 (20)	34.7 (17)	22.4 (11)	- -	2.0 (1)	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	79.5 (31)	10.2 (4)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	100.0 (39)
Asian	79.4 (27)	8.8 (3)	8.8 (3)	2.9 (1)	- -	99.9 (34)
White	90.4 (122)	6.7 (9)	1.5 (2)	0.7 (1)	0.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	78.7 (211)	12.3 (33)	6.3 (17)	1.1 (3)	1.5 (4)	99.9 (268)

Table 23 provides data on the responses to perceptions concerning whether minorities have the same chances as non-minorities in the Coast Guard. In general, the majority of the officers (211 or 78.7 percent) felt that minorities and Whites have the same chances. However, White officers (122 or 90.4 percent) were more likely to have felt that this was the case than Hispanics (31 or 79.5 percent) or Asians (27 or 79.4 percent) and more than twice as likely as Blacks

(20 or 40.8 percent). Obviously, the fact that Hispanics and Asians are almost twice as likely as Blacks to feel this way, once again, and very potently in this instance, exemplifies the differences in perceptions between Blacks and other minorities. Among Blacks a total of 28 or 57.1 percent (more than one-half) reported that they did not have the same chances as Whites (17 or 34.7 percent) or were "not sure" (11 or 22.4 percent) that they have same chances. Perhaps what is the most interesting finding for which we can't provide meaningful explanation is the fact that all the 11 Native Americans (100 percent) felt that minorities have the same chances as non-minorities.

Before completing our discussions on the question of perceptions of racial/ethnic experiences, it is necessary to state that our interest in the question came about as a consequence of information gathered from the interviews. While most officers during interviews implied that there was racial/ethnic discrimination, there were only two instances in which officers overtly and categorically stated their views on this matter. Let us deal with the implied assertions before commenting on the more overt ones.

More than one officer referred to what is described as "faint praise" which officers portray as comments by superior officers on their fitness reports, which in

reality neither praise nor fail to praise them for their job performance. More than one officer referred to the inclusion of the phrase "a credit to his race," on fitness reports while a female officer reported that she had been described as "bubbly" on her report. Minority officers objected to these comments because they felt that such comments dwell on the person's racial background instead of the officer's capabilities as an officer especially in the areas that are critical for advancement in the Coast Guard such as operational experience. In view of the fact that the vast majority of minority officers preferred to be viewed by their status as officers, rather than by their status as minorities, this is obviously not surprising. Another Black officer while referring to some superior officers whom he said "took pills to be a better bastard," indicated during an interview that a common way "to hold back minorities" is that "if they needed a 3.0 mark for promotion they (the supervisors) would give the officer a 2.9 mark" (Interview with Black Male, March 6, 1986). Still another officer had this to say, "I can't prove we (Blacks) are discriminated against because we are Black, but I have a gut feeling...Evaluation officers may use the 'wrong' words" (Interview with Black Female, January 23, 1986).

Another officer skirted around the issue of race, by couching his thoughts in such terms as "guppies" and "sharks" and the need "to cover your back" until you get your "ticket punched." He further indicated that "you have sharks and guppies swimming around in the same pool. The sharks (powerful White officers) would eat you up...as guppies (Blacks) you need to be careful" (Interview of Black Lieutenant, January 15, 1986). Another female Asian officer spoke of ethnic jokes being told in her presence, although the supervising officer in a "boys will be boys" tone asked her whether she found the jokes offensive, implying that if she did, he would put a stop to it. She said that she told him that it was "okay."

Some officers also made their views on race known by way of comments on the questionnaires. For example one Hispanic officer wrote:

There is possibly discrimination - not necessarily to race, but, job assignments. CG needs minorities in highly visual assignments, which are not operational. Therefore minorities appear less qualified than someone else who has more adequate experience in certain areas (Hispanic Male).

A Black female officer wrote that she felt that:

The CG is a close knit/politically orientated WASP organization steeped in years of traditions/inflexibility. It will take years to infiltrate (Black Female Lieutenant Junior Grade).

In addition, there were those officers who were very overt in their views on the question of race. For example one officer in commenting on the relative absence of Blacks in the top echelons of the Coast Guard, said that "there was one Black captain in the last century, there is one in this century and it looks as though we won't have another one until the next century"¹ (Interview January 15, 1986). Another Black officer, who said that he was passed over for promotion on two occasions because of race remarked that

there is both institutionalized and individual racism in assignments and charges [brought against Black officers]...the Coast Guard is like a small private country club run by Southern Whites...the Coast Guard will not allow the 'magic number of Blacks' they want, to go beyond a certain strength.....I am in the Coast Guard not of the Coast Guard (Interview with Black Male, March 11, 1986).

Finally, during a number of wide ranging comments on race, another officer had this to say.

If the magic number of Blacks is that small (about 1 percent or less of total number of officers) they [Blacks] don't present a problem...Black officers need to have bricks in their back pocket when they stand up because the limelight is always on you...You always have to be slick, street savvy...you need to document everything, Whites don't have to do this (Interview with Black Male, March 6, 1986).

¹At the time of the interviews, there was one Black Captain [whom I understand had since retired] and three Black Commanders.

It is therefore evident from the above statements, that some Black officers in particular have a number of concerns with respect to what they feel is racism in the Coast Guard. These include allegations of "faint praise" on fitness reports, ethnic jokes and assignments based on racial considerations. These concerns are all the more significant in view of the fact that in response to a direct question in the questionnaire, most officers reported that they had never experienced racial prejudice in the Coast Guard and some Blacks felt that they were "not sure." Perhaps many of the implied assertions made in the above comments reflect this feeling of uncertainty or the subtleness of racism.

Mobility Prospects

In addition to the issue of racial perceptions and their implications for retention, we were also concerned with ascertaining the views of officers with respect to their perceptions of their prospects for mobility in the Coast Guard. Since the ability to move from the rank of Lieutenant to that of Lieutenant Commander, is critical to continuity or discontinuity, a number of questions was included in the questionnaire to deal with the various factors associated with mobility.

Table 24

**Race/Ethnicity and Importance of Operational
Experience for Advancement
N=268**

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Impor- tant	Mod Impor- tant	Not Impor- tant	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	45.5 (5)	45.5 (5)	9.1 (1)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	65.3 (32)	32.7 (16)	- -	- -	- -	2.0 (1)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	56.4 (22)	38.5 (15)	2.6 (1)	- -	2.6 (1)	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	61.8 (21)	32.4 (11)	2.9 (1)	- -	2.9 (1)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	44.4 (60)	39.3 (53)	8.9 (12)	4.4 (6)	3.0 (4)	- -	100.0 (135)
Total	52.2 (140)	37.3 (100)	5.6 (15)	2.2 (6)	2.2 (6)	0.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

Table 24 focuses on responses to a question concerning the importance of operational experience for career advancement. This was included because officers had revealed in interviews that experience on cutters, helicopters, in search and rescue, etc. is viewed favorably when officers come up for promotion. Table 24 reveals that 140 or 52.2 percent of officers felt that operational experience is "very important" for career

[91]

advancement and 100 or 37.3 percent officers viewed operational experience as "moderately important" for advancement. This view is held by all officers regardless of race/ethnicity. However, Black officers (32 or 65.3 percent), followed by Asians (21 or 61.8 percent), most often felt that operational experience was "very important," while Whites (6 or 44.4 percent) least often held this view.

Table 25

Race/Ethnicity and Whether They Get Enough Opportunities for Operational Experience
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Sure	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	54.5 (6)	36.4 (4)	9.1 (1)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	42.8 (21)	28.6 (14)	10.2 (5)	4.1 (2)	14.3 (7)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	43.6 (17)	35.9 (14)	5.1 (2)	10.2 (4)	5.1 (2)	99.9 (39)
Asian	55.9 (19)	32.3 (11)	5.9 (2)	2.9 (1)	2.9 (1)	99.9 (34)
White	45.2 (61)	35.5 (48)	4.4 (6)	1.5 (2)	13.3 (18)	99.9 (135)
Total	42.3 (124)	33.9 (91)	6.0 (16)	3.3 (9)	10.4 (28)	99.9 (268)

Let us explore a bit further the question of operational experience specifically whether or not officers feel that they get enough opportunities for operational experience. In this context, Table 25 reveals that less than one-half of all officers (124 or 46.3 percent) feel that they get enough operational experience. While more than one-half of the Asian officers (19 or 55.9 percent) answered in the affirmative, less than one-half of the White officers (61 or 45.2 percent), a total of 17 or 43.6 percent of the Hispanic officers and 21 or 42.8 percent of the Black officers felt that they get enough opportunities for operational experience.

In view of (a) the importance attached to operational experience and (b) the views described concerning the availability of opportunities for operational experience, we decided to probe a bit further and try to find out whether the way the officer joined the Coast Guard would make a difference in his/her views concerning the availability of opportunities for this experience. Table 26 presents our findings on officers' views, on this topic, while controlling for manner of their entry. Here we note that (comparison by rows) graduates in every racial/ethnic category felt that Academy graduates get more opportunities for operational experience. For

example (comparison by rows) 11 or 68.7 percent of the Hispanic Academy graduates compared with three or 30 percent of officers who enlisted before graduating from OCS, three (3) or 30 percent of those who were college graduates before graduating from OCS felt they did not have enough opportunities for operational experience. No Hispanic direct commissioned officers held this view. Two other points are worthy of note as far as Table 26 is concerned. These are (a) while it was noted in Table 25 that the percentage of officers who felt they were getting enough opportunities for operational experience was largest among Asians (19 or 55.9 percent), we note from Table 26 that Hispanic Academy graduates have the highest percentage (68.7 percent) holding that view. Secondly, it is clear that officers who entered the Coast Guard as a result of direct commissions, were consistently least likely to feel that they get enough opportunities for operational experience.

Table 27 provides data on the views of officers concerning the importance of operational experience for promotion to Lt. Commander. Here we note that 111 or 41.4 percent of the officers reported that operational experience was "very important" and 104 or 36.8 percent of them felt it was "important" for promotion from the rank of Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander. Thus, the overwhelming majority of officers 215 or 80.2 percent

[94]

Table 26

Race/Ethnicity and Whether Enough Opportunities for Operational Experience by Manner of Entry
N=268

Enough Opportunities	A C A D E M Y				E N L I S T M E N T O C S				C O L L E G E (OCS)				D I R E C T C O M M I S S I O N				O T H E R			
	1	2	3	4	8	1	2	3	4	8	1	2	3	4	8	1	2	3	4	8
Native American	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Black	57.9 (11)	26.3 (5)	10.5 (2)	5.2 (1)	0 (0)	40.0 (6)	33.3 (5)	6.7 (1)	0 (0)	20.0 (3)	37.5 (3)	25 (2)	12.5 (1)	0 (0)	33.3 (2)	0 (0)	66.7 (4)	100 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Hispanic	68.7 (11)	12.5 (2)	6.2 (1)	6.2 (1)	0 (0)	30 (3)	50 (5)	0 (0)	10 (1)	10 (1)	30 (3)	50 (5)	0 (0)	20 (2)	66.7 (2)	33.3 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Asian	66.7 (14)	28.6 (6)	4.8 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	60 (3)	20 (1)	0 (0)	20 (1)	0 (0)	25 (1)	75 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (1)	50 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (1)
White	54.8 (34)	29 (18)	4.8 (3)	1.6 (1)	0 (0)	44.8 (6)	27.6 (13)	3.5 (1)	0 (0)	24.1 (8)	40 (8)	50 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)	30.8 (4)	15.4 (2)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	20 (6)	0 (0)

1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Don't Know
4 = Not Sure
8 = No Answer

Table 27

Race/Ethnicity and Importance of Operational
Experience for Promotion to Lieutenant Commander
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Import- tant	Mod Import- tant	Not Import- tant	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	36.4 (4)	27.3 (3)	9.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	- -	100.1 (11)
Black	59.2 (29)	28.6 (14)	6.1 (3)	6.1 (3)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	48.7 (19)	38.5 (15)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	100.1 (39)
Asian	44.1 (15)	38.2 (13)	5.9 (2)	5.9 (2)	5.9 (2)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	32.6 (44)	43.7 (59)	7.4 (10)	5.2 (7)	11.1 (15)	- -	100.0 (135)
Total	41.4 (111)	38.8 (104)	6.3 (17)	5.2 (14)	7.8 (21)	.37 (1)	100.0 (268)

felt it was either "very important" or "important." Furthermore, Whites (44 or 32.6 percent) were least likely and Blacks (29 or 59.2 percent) were most likely to stress the "very important" contribution of operational experience for advancement to Lieutenant Commander. It should also be noted that 15 or 11.1 percent of White officers (the largest percentage of any group) answered "don't know" to this question. This

finding is consistent with the earlier finding regarding the importance that various racial/ethnic groups attach to operational experience for advancement in general as indicated in table 24. Clearly, White officers were less likely than the officers of other racial/ethnic groups to regard operational experience as critical for promotion to Lieutenant Commander. When one considers that the promotion from Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander determines continuity or involuntary separation from the service with all its attendant loss of benefits the views of White officers is quite interesting. It may suggest that they feel that they may have other things in their favor which other minority officers do not have.

In Table 28 we look at the respondents' views concerning the Coast Guard's policy of terminating the services of those officers, who on two occasions fail to be promoted from Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander.² An obvious connection lies between what has been discussed earlier in connection with operational experience and this policy, because of the important link between operational experience and promotion to

²There are exceptions to this policy in that officers in this situation are allowed to appeal to a Board which may request that the aggrieved officer's record be expunged, allowing him to re-apply for promotion as though it were the first time.

Lieutenant Commander on the one hand, and the Coast Guard's policy in this matter on the other. Table 28 reveals that, in general, only a minority of all the officers (57 or 21.3 percent) "strongly agree" with this policy. It is also revealed that Hispanics (12 or 30.8 percent of this group) were most likely to "strongly agree" and Blacks (8 or 16.3 percent) were least likely to "strongly agree" with this policy. In between these two (2) groups were Whites (28 or 20.7 percent) and Asians (6 or 17.6 percent) reporting their strong agreement with this policy.

Again, we notice that a total of 114 or 42.5 percent of all officers reported that they agreed with this policy, which when we combine this group with those who "strongly agreed," means that an overall total of 171 or 63.8 percent most frequently reported that they held this view, while once more, Black officers (16 or 32.7 percent) least frequently reported that they "agreed" with this policy.

Finally, of the 97 or 36.2 percent officers, who did not report agreement, 39 or 14.5 percent said they "disagreed" and 26 or 9.7 percent said that they "strongly disagreed" with this policy. However, no clear pattern of disagreement along racial/ethnic lines is apparent. This is indicated by the fact that roughly equal percentages of Blacks (7 or 14.3 percent) and

[98]

Table 28

Race/Ethnicity and Policy Regarding Promotion from Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander

N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	27.3 (3)	45.5 (5)	27.3 (3)	-	-	-	-	100.0 (11)
Black	16.3 (8)	32.7 (16)	14.3 (7)	16.3 (8)	14.3 (7)	4.1 (2)	-	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	30.8 (12)	33.3 (13)	17.9 (7)	7.7 (3)	7.7 (3)	2.6 (1)	-	100.0 (39)
Asian	17.6 (6)	35.3 (12)	14.7 (5)	11.8 (4)	20.6 (7)	-	-	100.0 (34)
White	20.7 (28)	50.4 (68)	12.6 (17)	8.2 (11)	6.7 (9)	.7 (1)	-	100.0 (135)
Total	21.3 (57)	42.5 (114)	14.5 (39)	9.7 (26)	9.7 (26)	1.5 (4)	.7 (2)	99.9 (268)

Asians (5 or 14.7 percent), Hispanics (7 or 17.9 percent) and Whites (17 or 12.6 percent) stated that they disagreed with this policy. Also with respect to those who "strongly disagreed," we find Blacks (8 or 16.3 percent) most frequently, and Hispanics (3 or 7.7 percent) and Whites (11 or 8.2 percent) least frequently.

Table 29

Race/Ethnicity and Preferential Treatment For Academy
Graduates Over OCS Graduates
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer /Other	Total %/No
Native American	45.4 (5)	54.5 (6)	- -	- -	- -	99.9 (11)
Black	73.5 (36)	12.2 (6)	14.3 (7)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	51.3 (20)	33.3 (13)	10.2 (4)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	100.0 (39)
Asian	32.3 (11)	55.9 (19)	11.8 (4)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	55.5 (75)	30.4 (41)	8.9 (12)	3.0 (4)	2.2 (3)	100.0 (135)
Total	54.8 (147)	31.7 (85)	10.1 (27)	1.9 (5)	1.5 (4)	100.0 (268)

Before we leave this topic one final point is worth noting. While 18 or 52.9 percent of Asian officers, 25 or 64.1 percent of Hispanic officers and 96 or 71.1

percent of White officers reported some form of agreement, less than one-half of Black officers - 24 or 49.0 percent held this view.

Now we turn to the perception of respondents regarding the question of preferential treatment on the basis of manner of entry into the Coast Guard. This question was included in the questionnaire because of feedback received from selected interviews that there is preferential treatment of Academy graduates over OCS graduates. Examining this factor is necessary because it could conceivably affect the opportunities for advancement of those officers who are OCS graduates, as opposed to Academy graduates. In this context, Table 29 indicates that 147 or 54.8 percent of all officers felt that Academy graduates do get preferential treatment. While roughly one-half of all Hispanic officers (20 or 51.3 percent) and 75 or 55.5 percent of White officers and nearly one-third of Asian officers (11 or 32.3 percent) held this view, nearly three-fourths of the Black officers (36 or 73.5 percent) responded in the affirmative to this question. It is also evident from the table that a little less than one-third (85 or 31.7 percent) of the officers felt that Academy graduates did not get preferential treatment. Here, Asian officers (19 or 55.9 percent) most frequently expressed this view while not surprisingly, only a minority of Black

officers (6 or 12.2 percent) shared that view.

In view of the fact that more than one-half of the officers (143 or 53.4 percent) had reported that they were not Academy graduates (see Table 7), we decided to probe further into the relationship between the manner of entry and perception of preferential treatment. We wanted to see whether manner of entry had any effect on the way in which the different racial/ethnic groups viewed the question of preferential treatment for Academy graduates. Table 30, which contains this information, indicates that for every racial/ethnic group non-Academy graduates far more often reported that they felt that their Academy counterparts are the beneficiaries of preferential treatment. For example among Blacks, 13 or 86.7 percent of the "enlistment then OCS graduates," six or 75.0 percent of the "college then OCS graduates" and five or 83.3 percent of the "direct commissioned" officers felt that Academy graduates get preferential treatment compared with 12 or 63.2 percent of the Black Academy graduates. Among Asians, the figures for those who agree are two or 40 percent of the "enlistment then OCS graduates," three (3) or 75 percent of the "college then OCS graduates" and two (2) or 100 percent of the "direct commissioned" officers compared with four (4) or 19 percent of the Academy graduates.

Race/Ethnicity and Preferential Treatment for Academy Graduates by Manner of Entry

N=268

Preferential Treatment																													
Race/ Ethnicity	Academy				Enlistment OCS				College				OCS				Direct Commission				Other								
	1	2	3	4	8/9	1	2	3	4	8/9	1	2	3	4	8/9	1	2	3	4	8/9	1	2	3	4	8/9				
Native American	28.6 (2)	71.4 (5)	0	0	0	100 (1)	0	0	0	0	100 (1)	0	0	0	0	50 (1)	50 (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Black	63.2 (12)	26.3 (5)	10.5 (2)	0	0	86.7 (13)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	0	0	75 (6)	0	25 (2)	0	0	83.3 (5)	0	16.7 (1)	0	0	0	0	100 (1)	0	0	0			
Hispanic	43.7 (7)	43.7 (7)	12.5 (2)	0	0	50 (5)	50 (5)	0	0	0	50 (5)	10 (1)	20 (2)	10 (1)	10 (1)	100 (3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Asian	19 (4)	76.2 (16)	4.8 (1)	0	0	40 (2)	20 (1)	40 (2)	0	0	75 (3)	25 (1)	0	0	0	100 (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	50 (1)	50 (1)	0	0			
White	37.1 (23)	50 (31)	8.1 (5)	3.2 (2)	1.6 (1)	65.6 (21)	21.9 (7)	6.2 (2)	3.1 (1)	3.1 (1)	75 (15)	10 (2)	10 (2)	0	5 (1)	76.9 (10)	0	23.1 (3)	0	0	0	75 (6)	12.5 (1)	0	12.5 (1)	0	0	0	0

1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Not Sure
4 = Don't Know
8/9 = No Answer/Other

In passing it should also be added that officers were also asked whether they felt that preferential treatment for Academy graduates was justified and the comments of some of those who answered in the affirmative are worthy of note. Some of these comments include the following:

OCS graduates are nothing but 90 day ensigns. The Coast Guard spends more on us, then we get better training therefore we should get more from the service. (Black Male Lieutenant who is an Academy graduate during an interview on March 11, 1986)

Time invested to become an officer and the sacrifices made during that time. (Hispanic Male Ensign who is an Academy graduate)

Because USCGA graduates have been much more carefully screened before and during their four years at the Academy. The training is superior and pressures greater than other program areas. Therefore a generally more qualified officer is produced. (White Male Lieutenant Commander who is an Academy graduate)

Academy graduates automatically get an operational assignment when they graduate. We don't. Therefore they have more opportunities for operational experience. (Black Male Lieutenant Junior Grade OCS graduate)

The above comments suggest that Academy graduates believe that their training is superior and the Coast Guard spends more on such training. They feel that any preferential treatment that favors them is justified, especially in terms of operational assignments. To the extent that this is true it would mean that those

officers who are not Academy graduates (that is 143 or 54.4 percent) of the sample experience restricted opportunities for upward mobility. Thus another minority is perhaps unintentionally created, with all of the attendant implications that this would entail.

Table 31

Race/Ethnicity and Perceptions of Making Flag

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	54.5 (6)	36.4 (4)	- -	9.1 (1)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	14.3 (7)	69.4 (34)	10.2 (5)	2.0 (1)	4.1 (2)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	17.9 (7)	51.3 (20)	20.5 (8)	7.7 (3)	2.6 (1)	100.0 (39)
Asian	26.5 (9)	52.9 (18)	14.7 (5)	5.9 (2)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	33.3 (45)	55.6 (75)	8.9 (12)	1.5 (2)	.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	27.6 (74)	56.3 (151)	11.2 (30)	3.4 (9)	1.5 (4)	100.0 (268)

Table 31 focuses on a final indicator of mobility which concerns the perceptions of officers with respect to whether they feel that they will ever be able to "make flag," that is achieve the rank of admiral. Here an effort is made to see if officers feel that they are capable of reaching the top. In the history of the

Coast Guard no minority has ever attained a rank higher than captain. Table 31 indicates that only 74 or 27.6 percent of all officers felt that it was possible to "make flag." One hundred fifty-one officers (56.3 percent) did not feel that they could attain this rank. When these figures are examined from the perspective of race/ethnicity, we find that White officers (45 or 33.3 percent of this group) followed by Asians (9 or 26.5 percent) most often felt that they could make flag. Noticeably less than one in five (7 or 17.9 percent) of the Hispanic officers and (7 or 14.3 percent) of the Black officers held this view.

The fact that Black officers least often felt that they could "make flag" and most often answered in the negative to this question (34 or 69.4 percent), is perhaps not surprising. This is consistent with the finding discussed earlier that Blacks felt that their chances for advancement in the Coast Guard were the worst of all the minorities.

Levels of Commitment to the Coast Guard

The final aspect of data presented in this section on retention deals with levels of commitment of the officers to the Coast Guard which we attempted to measure by asking the officers if they plan to stay in service for the initial 20 years and if they would be

willing to do it all over again. This issue was thought to be important because we suspected from interviews and conversations with officers that, despite their views about the Coast Guard, many officers expressed commitment to the organization. This is certainly borne out by a look at Table 32 which shows that 170 or 66.8 percent of all the officers said they planned to stay for the initial 20 year period. Furthermore this was true for a majority of the officers in every racial/ethnic group, with the Hispanic officers (21 or 53.8 percent) being the least committed and Asian officers (25 or 73.5 percent) being most committed. It was also noted that White officers (94 or 69.6 percent) and Black officers (31 or 63.3 percent) fell in between the Hispanics and the Asians. Also of significance is the fact that more than twice as many officers reported that they were "not sure" (50 or 18.7 percent) than those who answered "no" on this issue (24 or 9 percent). This was also true for officers in every racial/ethnic category, and obviously denotes some degree of uncertainty for some of the officers on an issue of some importance. Finally, it is also possible to argue that the fact that so many officers answered in the affirmative on this issue might be attributable to the great attraction to the benefits that accrue after 20 years of service than to the Coast Guard itself. It was

[107]

for this reason that responses to another indicator of commitment is provided.

Table 32

Race/Ethnicity and Plan to Stay for 20 Years
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	72.7 (8)	9.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	63.3 (31)	10.2 (5)	22.5 (11)	2.0 (1)	2.0 (1)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	53.8 (21)	12.8 (5)	23.1 (9)	2.6 (1)	7.7 (3)	100.0 (39)
Asian	73.5 (25)	2.9 (1)	17.7 (6)	5.9 (2)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	69.6 (94)	8.9 (12)	16.3 (22)	4.4 (6)	0.7 (1)	99.9 (135)
Total	66.9 (179)	9.0 (24)	18.7 (50)	3.7 (10)	1.9 (5)	100.0 (268)

Table 33 provides information on responses to a hypothetical question concerning whether officers would join the Coast Guard again if the opportunities were to present themselves. Here it is evident that nearly three-fourths (196 or 73.1 percent) of the officers reported that they would. Using this as a rough indicator of commitment, Asian officers (29 or 85.3 percent) were seen as being the most committed, followed by Hispanic (29 or 74.4 percent), White (97 or 71.9

percent), and Black officers (34 or 69.4 percent).

Table 33

Race/Ethnicity and Had To Do It Over Again
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Yes	No	Not Sure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	63.6 (7)	18.2 (2)	9.1 (1)	- -	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Black	69.4 (34)	14.3 (7)	12.2 (6)	2.0 (1)	2.0 (1)	99.9 (49)
Hispanic	74.4 (29)	7.7 (3)	15.4 (6)	- -	2.6 (1)	100.1 (39)
Asian	85.3 (29)	2.9 (7)	11.8 (4)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	71.9 (97)	11.1 (15)	12.6 (17)	1.5 (2)	3.0 (4)	100.0 (135)
Total	73.1 (196)	10.5 (28)	12.7 (34)	1.1 (3)	2.6 (7)	100.0 (268)

Finally, since a number of officers had appeared to be skeptical about the outcome of what they regarded as "just another study of the Coast Guard which would produce little or no change," we included a question designed to gather perceptions on the possible impact of this study.

Table 34 presents the views of officers regarding whether they feel that this study will affect the position of the minority officer. It is evident that only 46 or 17.2 percent of the officers feel that this

Table 34

Race/Ethnicity and Whether Study Will Affect Position of Minority Officer
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Improve A Lot	Improve A Little	Makes No Difference	No Opinion	Not Sure	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	-	36.4 (4)	18.2 (2)	27.3 (3)	18.2 (2)	-	-	100.0 (11)
Black	-	10.2 (5)	51 (25)	4.1 (2)	32.7 (16)	2 (1)	-	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	7.7 (3)	20.5 (8)	38.5 (15)	12.8 (5)	20.5 (8)	-	-	100.0 (39)
Asian	-	20.6 (7)	55.9 (19)	2.9 (1)	20.6 (7)	-	-	100.0 (34)
White	1.5 (2)	12.6 (17)	45.9 (62)	15.6 (21)	20 (27)	3.7 (5)	.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	1.9 (5)	15.3 (41)	45.9 (123)	11.9 (32)	22.4 (60)	2.2 (6)	.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

study will lead to any improvement for minority officers, with only five or 1.9 percent of the officers feeling that the position of minority officers would "improve a lot" and 41 or 15.3 percent feeling that it would "improve a little." Furthermore, of the 46 officers who feel that there would be some improvement, only five or 10.9 percent are Black, seven or 15.2 percent are Asian, 11 or 22.4 percent are Hispanic with the remaining 19 or 41.3 percent being White. White officers are slightly more optimistic than are non-White officers about the value of this study.

On the other hand, a total of 123 or 45.9 percent of all the officers felt that this study will "make no difference" to the position of the minority officer. Asians (19 or 55.9 percent) were the most skeptical followed by Blacks (25 or 51 percent), Whites (62 or 45.9 percent) and Hispanics (15 or 38.5 percent). In addition, 60 or 22.4 percent of the officers indicated that they were "not sure" indicating a relatively high level of uncertainty about the possible efficacy of this study.

CHAPTER V

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF BEING A COAST GUARD OFFICER

In this chapter, our attention is focused on what officers consider to be the main advantages and disadvantages of being a Coast Guard officer. Since individuals very often weigh such factors in considering whether to join or remain in the chosen career, information gathered here was viewed as being crucial to our understanding of the problems of retention and recruitment of new officers to the Coast Guard.

Advantages of the Coast Guard

In this section, we turn our attention to those aspects of Coast Guard life with which officers appear to be most happy. These aspects are considered to be of direct relevance because they point to those factors which are most conducive to retention. It should also be mentioned that the literature on work and occupations and on job satisfaction distinguishes between those individuals whose satisfaction comes primarily from instrumental involvement in their jobs, and those whose satisfaction derives primarily from expressive involvement (Friedman and Havighurst, 1954). Those who are instrumentally involved see the job primarily as a

means to an end. Thus, they tend to view the job basically in terms of its benefits (especially pay), which they perceive as a means that would enable them to attain an end, such as a car, a house and other material objects. Incumbents of working class occupations, such as coal miners, and automobile workers (Blauner, 1964) and fisherman (Tunstall, 1962), tend to be instrumentally involved in their jobs. On the other hand, incumbents of middle class and upper class occupations and professionals,* tend to be expressively involved in the sense that they see the job as an end in itself (Morse and Weiss, 1955). Thus, their interest lies more in the intrinsic dimensions of the job itself (teachers may emphasize the joys of shaping undeveloped minds and scientists may stress the rewards that accrue from unravelling the mysteries of the universe) rather than the pay, holidays, that may be gained from the

*Despite the tendency in the United States today to apply the term "professional" to almost any form of occupational endeavor, the term is used in this study to apply to those occupations which involve (a) a long period of specialized training that equips the incumbent with an esoteric body of knowledge and skills which are not easily duplicated, (b) the internalization and utilization of a specific jargon, (c) the development of certain attitudes to work and standards of occupational conduct that usually (along with the skills and knowledge) separates practitioners from non-practitioners, and (d) membership in an occupational association (as opposed to a union), which meets for the purpose of and in other ways seeks to disseminate the latest research findings in its discipline.

jobs. It was in this context that certain questions were put to the officers, which attempted to dichotomize job advantages in terms of the expressive/instrumental axis. Thus, questions concerning job security, pay, travel opportunities, educational opportunities, the opportunity to start a new career and other benefits, were designed to determine the extent of instrumental involvement. On the other hand, questions regarding the interesting nature of the work, opportunities to serve one's country and to fulfill humanitarian obligations were viewed as providing evidence of expressive involvement.

Job Security

As shown on table 33, job security was cited as a "very important" advantage of being in the Coast Guard by 127 or 47.4 percent of all officers and as "important" advantage by 128 or 47.8 percent of the officers. When we combine the two figures, we find that a total of 255 or 95.2 percent of the officers expressed the opinion that job security was either "very important" or "important" advantage, while a mere 11 or 4.1 percent saw it as being "not important." Table 35 also reveals that among Black officers, a higher percentage (25 or 51 percent) than that of any racial/ethnic group viewed job security as being "very

important." This is perhaps not surprising in view of the importance Blacks attach to job security since there has been a tendency in society that Blacks are often last hired and first fired.

Table 35
Race/Ethnicity and Job Security
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	54.5 (6)	45.5 (5)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	51.0 (25)	45.0 (22)	4.0 (2)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	41.0 (16)	51.3 (20)	7.7 (3)	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	47.1 (16)	50.0 (17)	2.9 (1)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	47.4 (64)	47.4 (64)	3.7 (5)	1.5 (2)	100.0 (135)
Total	47.4 (127)	47.8 (128)	4.1 (11)	0.7 (2)	100.0 (268)

Pay

Here we consider the question of remuneration as a job consideration. As suggested earlier, in the world of work, pay in particular tends to separate the instrumentally involved from the expressively involved.

Thus, in view of the fact that being a Coast Guard officer is a non-manual and middle class occupation, it would be expected that Coast Guard officers would attach limited importance to pay.

Table 36
Race/Ethnicity and Pay
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	42.9 (21)	51.0 (25)	6.1 (3)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	25.6 (10)	74.4 (29)	- -	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	26.5 (9)	64.7 (22)	8.8 (3)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	30.4 (41)	60.7 (82)	8.2 (11)	0.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	32.1 (86)	61.2 (164)	6.3 (17)	0.4 (1)	(268)

This is in a sense borne out by Table 34 which shows that overall 86 or 32.1 percent (less than one-third) of officers viewed pay as being "very important." Black officers (21 or 42.9 percent) reported that pay was

"very important" followed by White officers of whom 41 or 30.4 percent held this view with Asian officers (9 or 26.5 percent) and Hispanic officers (10 or 25.6 percent), registering the lowest frequency. It is also revealed that pay is viewed by the majority of officers (164 or 61.2 percent) as being "important." Obviously, living in a society where wealth is the measure of a person's status, the fact that so many officers viewed pay in this light is not surprising.

Travel

This variable was included because during interviews some officers had indicated that the Coast Guard, in addition to its various installations within the United States, also maintains installations abroad (e.g. in Europe and Japan). In addition, Coast Guard activities involve travel to various Caribbean countries.

Table 37 indicates that a minority of officers (59 or 22.0 percent), that is less than one (1) in four (4), viewed the opportunity to travel as being "very important." Of the officers who held this view Hispanics were most frequent (12 or 30.8 percent) followed by Whites (34 or 25.2 percent of these officers), followed by a small minority of Asians (5 or 14.7 percent) and Blacks (6 or 12.2 percent).

[117]

Furthermore, while we discovered that nearly one-half of all officers (126 or 47 percent) see travel opportunities as being "important," nearly one in three (82 or 30.6 percent) of the officers saw this as being "not important."

Table 37

Race/Ethnicity and Opportunity to Travel
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	18.2 (2)	45.5 (5)	36.4 (4)	- -	100.1 (11)
Black	12.2 (6)	55.1 (27)	32.7 (16)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	30.8 (12)	43.6 (17)	25.6 (10)	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	14.7 (5)	52.9 (18)	32.4 (11)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	25.2 (34)	43.7 (59)	30.4 (41)	0.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	22.0 (59)	47.0 (126)	30.6 (82)	0.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

Free Education

As was previously indicated, aspirants for Coast Guard officer status have the opportunity of being selected by the Academy to get a free education

culminating in an engineering degree. This is of much importance to minorities for at least two reasons. The first is that, in general minorities are relatively underrepresented in the engineering profession. Therefore, attendance at the Coast Guard Academy provides a real opportunity to minorities who would otherwise be unable to gain an engineering education. Secondly, education is very often viewed as a mechanism for upward mobility for minorities who have traditionally not been afforded equal opportunities because of their racial background. Our initial expectation was that minorities in general, and Blacks in particular, would view a good free education more positively than non-minorities. Even though it is not conclusive, the data on Table 38 provides some evidence that it is the case.

First, only 79 or 29.5 percent of all the officers viewed education as being "very important" and 104 or 38.8 percent saw it as being "important." However, among those who viewed education as being "very important" and "important," only slightly more minorities expressed that view. For instance, 13 or 38.2 percent of Asian officers (the highest percentage in the minority categories), followed by 12 or 30.8 percent of Hispanic officers and 15 or 26.7 percent of

Table 38

Race/Ethnicity and Getting a Good Education Free
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Import- tant	Import- tant	Not Import- tant	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	27.3 (3)	63.6 (7)	9.1 (1)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	30.6 (15)	44.9 (22)	22.5 (11)	2.0 (1)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	30.8 (12)	46.2 (18)	20.5 (8)	2.6 (1)	- -	100.1 (39)
Asian	38.2 (13)	35.3 (12)	23.5 (8)	2.9 (1)	- -	99.9 (34)
White	26.7 (36)	33.3 (45)	35.6 (48)	3.0 (4)	1.5 (2)	100.1 (135)
Total	29.5 (79)	38.8 (104)	28.4 (76)	2.6 (7)	0.7 (2)	100.0 (268)

White officers viewed education as being a "very important" feature of Coast Guard life. The same finding is true for those officers who viewed education as being "important." Here, Hispanics (18 or 46.2 percent) most often viewed education as being "important," closely followed by Blacks (22 or 44.9 percent) and Asians (12 or 35.3 percent). Once again, Whites (45 or 33.3 percent) least often saw the opportunity for a good free education as being "important." On the other hand, Whites (48 or 35.6

percent) most often viewed education as "not important," while roughly the same percentage of officers in each of the minority groups (8 or 20.5 percent of the Hispanics, 11 or 22.5 percent of Black and 8 or 23.5 percent of the Asians) held that view. A good free education is generally viewed as more important by minority officers than it is viewed by non-minority officers.

New Career After 20 Years

The Coast Guard officer who is successful in being promoted from the rank of Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander and remains in the Coast Guard for at least 20 years is entitled to separate from the organization with full benefits which are roughly equivalent to those that accrue to retirees of similar status from the other branches of the military. It is for this reason that this question was asked. This was considered to be especially relevant in view of the fact that officers who complete their 20 years in the U.S. Coast Guard seek and find employment in the private sector because of their academic training and work experience.

Table 39 indicates that a little more than one-third of all the officers (92 or 34.3 percent) viewed the opportunity to have a new career after 20 years as being "very important," while 112 or 41.8 percent saw it as being "important." It should be noted that Black

[121]

officers (28 or 57.1 percent of them) most often thought that a new career was "very important," followed by Asian officers (13 or 38.2 percent) and Hispanic officers (13 or 33.3 percent). White officers least often (37 or 27.4 percent) saw this as being "very important." Clearly, this opportunity is of much greater significance to minorities than it is to non-minorities and is of particular importance to Blacks.

Table 39
Race/Ethnicity and New Career After 20 Years
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	9.1 (1)	63.6 (6)	27.3 (3)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	57.1 (28)	24.5 (12)	18.4 (9)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	33.3 (13)	38.5 (15)	28.2 (11)	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	38.2 (13)	38.2 (13)	23.5 (8)	- -	99.9 (34)
White	27.4 (37)	48.2 (65)	23.0 (31)	1.5 (2)	100.1 (135)
Total	34.3 (92)	41.8 (112)	23.1 (62)	0.8 (2)	100.0 (268)

It is also revealed that nearly one-fourth (62 or 23.1 percent) of all officers did not see a new career as important and Hispanics were most frequently represented and Blacks least frequently represented in this respect. It would therefore appear that once again, Whites more often feel that they can make it whether they leave after 20 years or not. Perhaps, this is the case because they are most likely to attain the highest ranks in the Coast Guard if they remain beyond 20 years and secondly are more likely to get a good paying civilian job if they don't.

Comparison With Other Military Branches

In this section we focus on perceptions regarding opportunities in other branches of the military compared with the U.S. Coast Guard. This was considered to be of some significance for at least two reasons. First, as indicated earlier some officers enter the Coast Guard as a second choice when attempts to enter the other services fail, and, secondly, as we noted earlier, the Coast Guard has the lowest minority representation of all the military branches. We thus wanted to see how officers felt about the alternatives which some of them gave up and how the Coast Guard "stacks up" against the other branches. Surprisingly, table 40 clearly reveals that the officers feel that the Coast Guard provides

good opportunities compared with other branches of the military.

Table 40

Race/Ethnicity and Good Opportunities Compared
With Other Branches of Military
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Import- tant	Import- tant	Not Import- tant	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	45.5 (5)	18.2 (2)	36.4 (4)	- -	- -	100.1 (11)
Black	45.0 (22)	34.7 (17)	20.4 (10)	- -	- -	100.1 (49)
Hispanic	56.4 (22)	30.8 (12)	10.3 (4)	2.6 (1)	- -	100.1 (39)
Asian	44.1 (15)	23.5 (8)	32.4 (11)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	43.7 (59)	31.9 (43)	21.5 (29)	2.2 (3)	0.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	45.9 (123)	30.6 (82)	21.6 (58)	1.5 (4)	0.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

The table indicates that a total of 123 or 45.9 percent of all the officers thought that the good opportunities provided by the Coast Guard, when compared with those of other branches of the military was a "very important" advantage and another 82 or 30.6 percent saw it as being an "important" advantage. Further, apart

from the Hispanic officers, 22 or 56.4 percent of whom felt the Coast Guard's opportunities were "very important," there was no real appreciable difference among the other racial/ethnic groups in this context. The figures were 22 or 45 percent of the Black officers, 15 or 44.1 percent of the Asian officers and 59 or 43.7 percent of the White officers. Finally, it is also noticeable that a little more than one-fifth (58 or 21.6 percent) of the officers regarded opportunities in the Coast Guard as being "not important," with Asian officers most frequently holding this view and Black officers and White officers being almost evenly distributed. In short, the majority of officers attached some degree of importance to opportunities in the Coast Guard, vis-a-vis those in other branches of the military. However, minorities in general (except Asians) and Hispanics in particular, more often viewed these opportunities as being "very important" or "important" than did non-minorities.

Benefits

Here, we look at some of the more general advantages of Coast Guard life, which are likely to be attractive to officers. These include medical benefits, opportunities to meet interesting people, opportunities for various types of advance education such as

leadership training, postgraduate degrees both in engineering and in non-engineering fields. About a third (89 or 33.2 percent) of all officers viewed these benefits as being "very important" and a further 145 or 54.1 percent viewed these benefits as being "important." Only a small minority, that is 33 or 12.3 percent of the officers saw the organization's benefits as being "not important."

In sum, therefore, minority officers more often stressed instrumental features, particularly getting a good education free and starting a new career, than did non-minority officers. Also, Blacks more often than other minorities, emphasized these instrumental features as being "very important" to them. This probably reflects the relative lack of access to these opportunities that Blacks experience in society. Finally, using the relatively low numbers of officers who viewed the instrumental features as "not important" as a basis, it is possible to argue that in general officers felt that job security, pay and the organization's benefits were, in that order, the most advantageous instrumental features. The question of job security is particularly relevant, in view of the fact that minorities tended to feel that they have less opportunities to obtain them, because of relatively insufficient access to operational experience.

We now turn to a discussion of the expressive aspects of the job situation in the Coast Guard, by looking at the perceptions of the officers regarding three other advantages of the job (a) the interesting nature of the job; (b) the opportunities it provides to serve one's country; and (c) the chance to fulfill humanitarian obligations.

Table 41
Race/Ethnicity and Interesting Work
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	59.2 (29)	40.8 (20)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	74.4 (29)	23.1 (9)	2.6 (1)	- -	100.1 (39)
Asian	76.5 (26)	17.7 (6)	5.9 (2)	- -	100.1 (34)
White	71.1 (96)	25.2 (34)	2.2 (3)	1.5 (2)	100.0 (135)
Total	65.0 (185)	28.0 (75)	2.2 (16)	0.8 (2)	100.0 (268)

Interesting Nature of Work

Here we consider the perceptions of officers regarding a particular intrinsic dimension of the job, i.e., its interesting nature. As we suggested earlier one would expect this to be of some significance to a group of individuals who have a middle class occupation. As indicated on Table 41, almost seven out of ten of the officers (185 or 69 percent) saw interesting work as being a "very important" advantage of Coast Guard life and another 75 or 28 percent of the officers viewed this as being "important." In other words, only six or 2.2 percent of all officers saw interesting work as being "not important." Thus, as we shall see, the interesting nature of the work turned out to be the most important advantage of being a Coast Guard officer. With respect to those who fell into the "very important" category, Black officers (29 or 59.2 percent) were least likely to have this view while Asian officers (26 or 76.5 percent) Hispanics (29 or 74.4 percent) and Whites (96 or 71.1 percent) were relatively close in their views in this regard.

Opportunity to Serve One's Country

Another aspect of the expressive aspect of the job was addressed by examining the officers' perception of the importance of "opportunity to serve one's country"

as an advantage of working in the U.S. Coast Guard. In this context, we note from Table 42 that only 83 or 31.5 percent of the officers viewed the opportunity to serve one's country as being "very important" advantage and 140 or 52.2 percent saw it as being "important" advantage. Thus, a significant majority, that is 223 or 83.2 percent of the officers attached some degree of importance to this factor. Furthermore, and perhaps not surprisingly, White officers were more likely than

Table 42

Race/Ethnicity and Opportunity to Serve One's Country
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Import- tant	Import- tant	Not Import- tant	Don't Know	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	9.1 (1)	81.8 (9)	9.1 (1)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	16.3 (8)	59.2 (29)	24.5 (12)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	30.8 (12)	51.3 (20)	15.4 (6)	2.6 (1)	- -	100.1 (39)
Asian	26.5 (9)	55.9 (19)	17.7 (6)	- -	- -	100.1 (34)
White	39.3 (53)	46.7 (63)	13.3 (18)	- -	0.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	31.0 (83)	52.2 (140)	16.0 (43)	0.4 (1)	0.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

minority officers, to view service to one's country as "very important." Fifty-three or 63.8 percent of the 83 officers who held this view were White. Thirty-nine point three percent of the Whites held this view compared to 12 or 30.8 percent of the Hispanics, nine or 26.5 percent of the Asians and a faltry eight or 16.3 percent of the Blacks.

Humanitarian Obligations

In view of the fact that the Coast Guard spends much of its time rescuing people in distress on water, we felt that it was appropriate to assess how important officers view this facet of Coast Guard life.

Table 43 indicates that a total of 99 or 36.9 percent of all the officers saw this aspect as being "very important," advantage, 121 or 45.2 percent viewed it as being "important" and a minority (40 or 14.9 percent) reported that it was "not important." Here again Whites are overrepresented among those in the "very important" category with 56 or 56.6 percent of these officers. Blacks were relatively underrepresented with 15 or 15.1 percent. It should also be noted that 56 or 41.5 percent of the White officers compared with 14 or 35.9 percent of the Hispanic officers, 11 or 32.4 percent of the Asian officers and 15 or 30.6 percent of the Black officers viewed humanitarian obligations as being "very important" advantage.

Table 43

**Race/Ethnicity and Fulfilling Humanitarian Obligations
N=268**

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Import- tant	Import- tant	Not Import- tant	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	27.3 (3)	45.5 (5)	27.3 (3)	- -	- -	100.1 (11)
Black	30.6 (15)	40.8 (20)	24.5 (12)	4.1 (2)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	35.9 (14)	51.3 (20)	5.1 (2)	5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	100.0 (39)
Asian	32.4 (11)	50.0 (17)	17.6 (6)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	41.5 (56)	43.7 (59)	12.6 (17)	1.5 (2)	0.7 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	36.9 (99)	45.2 (121)	14.9 (40)	2.2 (6)	0.8 (2)	100.0 (268)

In sum therefore, White officers were more likely to see service to one's country and humanitarian obligations as being "very important" than minority officers.

Summary

So far we have discussed the perceptions of the officers regarding each of the advantages of being Coast Guard officers. As a way of summarizing that discussion, we feel that it is appropriate to show the

relative importance of the advantages discussed above. Table 44, which is developed for that purpose summarizes the "very important" and "important" ratings given to each of the advantages by the respondents. The interesting nature of the work is viewed as the most important advantage of working as a Coast Guard officer. Sixty-nine percent of the officers indicated that the "interesting work" at the U.S. Coast Guard is "very important" advantage of working in the Coast Guard. Another 28 percent indicated that it is "important" which means that 97 percent of the officers felt that it is either "very important" or "important" advantage. As indicated in the table, this view seems to be dominant among the officers regardless of racial/ethnic background. With 95.2 percent of the officers giving either "very important" or "important" ratings, job security ranks a close second as the most frequently cited advantage of working as a Coast Guard officer. This view is also held by all the racial/ethnic groups. On the other hand, opportunity to travel and getting free education were cited least frequently as "very important" or "important" advantages with 67 percent and 68.3 percent of the officers respectively expressing that view. The other four advantages - new career after 20 years, good opportunity compared with other branches, opportunity to serve one's country and fulfilling

humanitarian obligations - fall between the two extremes and may be viewed as moderately important advantages. These four advantages received "very important" or "important" ratings from 76.1 percent, 76.5 percent, 83.2 percent and 82.1 percent of the officers respectively. However, a close look at the table may show differences in perception between the various racial/ethnic groups regarding the importance of the advantages.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE COAST GUARD

Besides examining the perceptions of the officers about the advantages of being a Coast Guard officer, this study also looked at the perceptions of officers with respect to what they find to be disadvantageous about Coast Guard life. These include such factors as moving around, ship tours, unequal opportunities for operational experience, greater visibility of errors and slow promotion opportunities, being away from one's family, and from the point of view of minorities, relative absence of senior minority officers.

Moving Around

One of the requirements of being a Coast Guard officer is that one is subject to be transferred from one installation and job responsibility to another. This could be either a blessing or a curse. Moving

Table 44

Ratings of the Advantages of Being in The Coast Guard* By Race

Race/ Ethnicity	Job Security		Pay		Travel		Getting Free Education		New Career After 20 Years		Good Opport- unity Compared W/Other Branches		Interesting Work		Opportunity To Serve One's Country		Fulfilling Humanitarian Obligations	
	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I
Native American	54.5 (6)	45.5 (5)	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)	18.2 (2)	45.5 (5)	27.3 (3)	63.3 (7)	9.1 (1)	63.6 (6)	18.2 (2)	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)	9.1 (1)	81.8 (9)	27.3 (3)	45.5 (5)	
Black	51.0 (25)	45.9 (22)	42.9 (21)	51.0 (25)	12.2 (6)	55.1 (27)	30.6 (15)	44.9 (22)	57.1 (28)	24.5 (12)	34.7 (17)	45.0 (22)	59.2 (29)	16.3 (8)	59.2 (29)	30.6 (15)	40.8 (20)	
Hispanic	41.0 (16)	51.3 (20)	25.6 (10)	74.4 (29)	30.8 (12)	43.6 (17)	30.8 (12)	46.2 (18)	33.3 (13)	38.5 (15)	30.8 (12)	56.4 (22)	74.4 (29)	23.1 (9)	51.3 (20)	35.9 (14)	51.3 (20)	
Asian	47.1 (16)	50.0 (17)	26.5 (9)	64.7 (22)	14.7 (5)	52.9 (18)	38.2 (13)	35.3 (12)	38.2 (13)	38.2 (13)	23.5 (8)	44.1 (15)	76.5 (26)	17.7 (6)	55.9 (19)	32.4 (11)	59.0 (17)	
White	47.4 (64)	47.4 (64)	30.4 (41)	60.7 (82)	25.2 (34)	43.7 (59)	26.7 (36)	33.3 (45)	27.4 (37)	48.2 (65)	31.9 (43)	43.7 (59)	71.1 (96)	25.2 (34)	46.7 (63)	41.5 (56)	45.7 (59)	
Total	47.4 (127)	47.8 (128)	32.1 (86)	61.2 (164)	22.0 (59)	47.0 (126)	29.5 (79)	38.8 (104)	34.3 (92)	41.8 (112)	30.6 (82)	45.9 (123)	69.0 (185)	28.0 (75)	31.0 (83)	52.2 (140)	36.9 (99)	45.2 (121)

VI - Very Important; I - Important

*In this table only the "very important" and "important" ratings are included because they represent significant percentages of the responses. It is felt that meaningful comparisons can be made by looking at these figures.

around from one area to the other could mean increased job experiences and ultimately enhanced opportunities for promotion. Indeed, it is in the nature of the American world of work, that every year, hundreds of thousands of families re-locate in response to the demands of the job. On the other hand, re-location can mean having to make new friends and contacts, having to sell a house and to look for a new one (this could mean a loss of money on a sale of a house) and having to find new schools for the children. For the Coast Guard officer, it could also mean having to separate from the rest of one's family, especially if one's wife is also a professional or has a career occupation which therefore makes re-location difficult or impossible. Thus, some males who have to leave their families become "geographical bachelors," with all of the concomitant strains on the family that this entails.

For the minority officer there may also be other problems. One Hispanic officer reported that he has had to work out a modus operandi, whereby he seeks to re-adjust to a new neighborhood by checking the local yellow pages for Hispanic clubs, restaurants and social organizations, in order to make contact with fellow Hispanics. This, he said, is not always easy because of subcultural variations among Hispanics with different national origins. Thus, there may be cultural

differences between Hispanics from Puerto Rico, Mexico, Central America, Cuba and Spain, which may militate against re-adjustment (Interview with Hispanic Male on March 27, 1986). Black officers who have to re-locate to predominantly White communities with very few or no Blacks, face special problems in obtaining accommodation because of racial discrimination (Interview with Black Male on March 6, 1986). When we consider these factors, it is apparent that moving around is more disadvantageous to minorities than it is to non-minorities.

Table 45
Race/Ethnicity and Moving Around
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Impor- tant	Impor- tant	Not Impor- tant	No Answer	Other	Total %/No
Native American	45.5 (5)	54.5 (6)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	30.6 (15)	46.9 (23)	22.5 (11)	- -	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanics	20.5 (8)	48.7 (19)	28.2 (11)	2.6 (1)	-	100.0 (39)
Asian	41.2 (14)	35.3 (12)	23.5 (8)	- -	- -	100.0 (34)
White	34.8 (47)	38.5 (52)	25.9 (35)	- -	0.8 (1)	100.0 (135)
Total	33.2 (89)	41.8 (112)	24.3 (65)	0.4 (1)	0.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

Table 45 indicates that a total of 89 or 33.2 percent of all officers reported that moving around was a "very important" disadvantage of Coast Guard life and that 47 or 52.8 percent of these officers were White. However, fewer Hispanic officers (8 or 20.5 percent) and Black officers (15 or 30.6 percent of this group) than White officers (47 or 34.8 percent of this group) and Asian officers (14 or 41.2 percent of this group) viewed moving as a "very important" disadvantage. Asians therefore were the only minorities whose percentage was higher than that of Whites. Also, 112 or 41.8 percent of all officers view moving around as an "important" disadvantage. Here, Hispanics (19 or 48.7 percent) and Blacks (23 or 46.9 percent) more often held this view than did Whites (52 or 38.5 percent) and Asians (12 or 35.3 percent). However, when we combined those in the "very important" and the "important" categories we find Blacks (38 or 77.5 percent) most often attached some degree of importance to moving, followed by Asians (26 or 76.5 percent), Whites (99 or 73.3 percent) and finally Hispanics (27 or 69.2 percent). The data therefore shows that moving around is a problem for all officers regardless of race (201 or 75 percent either saw it as being a "very important" or an "important" disadvantage) and with the exception of Hispanics, it is somewhat a "more important

disadvantage" for minorities than it is for Whites.

Ship Tours

This factor is to some extent related to the previous topic, since it involves some degree of relocation. For the officer, ship tours could mean intermittent absences from his/her family for periods of up to two (2) years or more. Being on a ship tour, however, involves an opportunity to get operational experience which, as we noted earlier, may be advantageous for advancement in the Coast Guard.

Table 46 indicates that only 46 or 17.2 percent of the officers saw this as a "very important" disadvantage while 101 or 37.7 percent saw it as an "important" disadvantage. Among those who saw it as a "very important" disadvantage minorities in general were more often represented than were Whites. For example 10 or 29.4 percent of the Asian officers, 10 or 20.4 percent of the Black officers and six of 15.4 percent of the Hispanic officers, compared with a mere 17 or 12.6 percent of the White officers, viewed ship tours as a "very important" disadvantage. Turning to those who answered that it was "important" disadvantage, a somewhat similar picture emerges, with 17 or 43.6 percent of the Hispanic officers and 20 or 40.8 percent of the Black officers falling into this category,

compared with 49 or 36.3 percent of the White officers. Asian officers (9 or 26.5 percent) least frequently fell in this category.

Table 46
Race/Ethnicity and Ship Tours
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	27.3 (3)	54.5 (6)	9.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Black	20.4 (10)	40.8 (20)	38.8 (19)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	15.4 (6)	43.6 (17)	38.5 (15)	2.6 (1)	100.1 (39)
Asian	29.4 (10)	26.5 (9)	44.1 (15)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	12.6 (17)	36.3 (49)	46.7 (63)	4.4 (6)	100.0 (135)
Total	17.2 (46)	37.7 (101)	42.2 (113)	2.96 (8)	100.0 (268)

It is also revealed that 113 or 42.2 percent of the officers viewed ship tours as a "not important" disadvantage and here Whites (63 or 46.7 percent) more often felt this way than did minority officers, where 15 or 38.5 percent of the Hispanics and 19 or 38.8 percent of the Blacks fell into this category. Clearly, the data shows that white officers less often viewed ship tours as a disadvantage.

Unequal Opportunities for Operational Experience

In view of the previously stated importance of operational experience, as well as the feeling among minorities (particularly Blacks) that they have less opportunities for this experience than do Whites, we felt that it would be interesting to see how it is viewed as a disadvantage. In this regard, Table 47 reveals that overall, 84 or 31.3 percent of officers viewed unequal opportunities for operational experience as a "very important" disadvantage and another 95 or 35.5 percent saw it as an "important" disadvantage. Thus the majority of officers (179 or 66.8 percent) attached some degree of importance, to unequal operational experience as a disadvantage. As would be expected, more minorities viewed this as a "very important" disadvantage than did Whites. Perhaps, somewhat surprisingly, Hispanic officers (15 or 38.5 percent) and Asian officers (13 or 38.2 percent) more often felt this way than did Black officers (17 or 34.7 percent). By and large, minority officers with the exception of Hispanics more often saw the disparity in opportunities as an "important" disadvantage than did White officers. Again, and perhaps not surprisingly, White officers (50 or 37 percent) more often saw unequal operational experience opportunities as "not important" disadvantage than did minority officers (28.6 percent of

Blacks, 28.2 percent of Hispanics and 23.5 percent of Asians). In sum, unequal opportunity for operational experience is viewed as being less important as a disadvantage for White officers than it is for minority officers. Secondly, Asian officers saw it as being a more important disadvantage than did Blacks or Hispanics.

Table 47

**Race/Ethnicity and Unequal Opportunities
for Operational Experience
N=268**

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	36.4 (4)	27.3 (3)	36.4 (4)	- -	100.1 (11)
Black	34.7 (17)	37.7 (18)	28.6 (14)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	38.5 (15)	33.3 (13)	28.2 (11)	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	38.2 (13)	38.2 (13)	23.5 (8)	- -	99.9 (34)
White	25.9 (35)	35.6 (48)	37.0 (50)	1.5 (2)	100.0 (135)
Total	31.3 (84)	35.5 (95)	32.5 (87)	0.7 (2)	100.0 (268)

Greater Visibility of Errors

This factor was included because of the feeling that the smaller numbers of Coast Guard officers (compared with those in the other branches of the military), made any errors committed more visible and therefore more likely to generate a reprimand, which could be disadvantageous to one's career. Table 48 indicates that less than a third of officers (a combined total of 85 or 31.7 percent) attached any importance to this as a disadvantage. However, minorities in general, and Blacks in particular (10 or 20.4 percent of this group) more often viewed this as a "very important" disadvantage than did Whites, where only six or 44 percent of these officers held this view. In sum, White officers far less often than did minority officers viewed greater visibility of errors as an important disadvantage. However, as indicated in the table, most officers saw it as a "not important" disadvantage, although the disparity between Blacks (25 or 51 percent) and Whites (104 or 77 percent) is significant.

Slowness of Promotion Opportunities

This "disadvantage" was included because many officers intimated during interviews that the wheels of the promotional machinery tend to turn rather slowly. Thus, we wanted to see how important this is considered

Table 48

Race/Ethnicity and Greater Visibility of Errors
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	9.1 (1)	27.3 (3)	54.5 (6)	9.1 (1)	100.0 (11)
Black	20.4 (10)	26.5 (13)	51.0 (25)	2.0 (1)	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	12.8 (5)	30.8 (12)	53.8 (21)	2.6 (1)	100.0 (39)
Asian	8.8 (3)	20.6 (7)	70.6 (24)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	4.4 (6)	18.5 (25)	77.0 (104)	- -	99.9 (135)
Total	9.3 (25)	22.4 (60)	67.2 (180)	1.1 (3)	100.0 (268)

by the officers as a disadvantage. Not surprisingly, Table 49 shows that almost one-half of all the officers (133 or 49.6 percent) saw this as a "very important" disadvantage and 81 or 30.2 percent viewed it as being an "important" disadvantage. This means that a combined total of 214 or 79.8 percent of officers attached some degree of importance to what they perceive are slow promotion opportunities. This view is held by all the officers regardless of race.

Table 49

Race/Ethnicity and Slowness of Promotion Opportunities
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	63.6 (7)	18.2 (2)	18.2 (2)	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	51.0 (25)	32.7 (16)	16.3 (8)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	59.0 (23)	20.5 (8)	12.8 (5)	7.7 (3)	100.0 (39)
Asian	44.1 (15)	41.2 (14)	14.7 (5)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	46.7 (63)	30.4 (41)	21.5 (29)	1.5 (2)	100.0 (135)
Total	49.6 (133)	30.2 (81)	18.3 (49)	1.8 (5)	100.0 (268)

However, a greater percentage of the Hispanic officers (23 or 59 percent) and of Black officers (25 or 51 percent), compared with 63 or 46.7 percent of White officers, viewed this as a "very important" disadvantage. Finally, when we combine those in the "very important" category with those in the "important" category, we find that minority officers more often attached some degree of importance to slow promotion opportunities than did White officers. The figures were

were 85.3 percent of Asian officers, 83.7 percent of Black officers, 79.5 percent of Hispanic officers, and, lastly, 77.1 percent of the White officers. The slowness of promotional opportunities in the Coast Guard is understandable when we consider the fact that, compared with the other branches of the military, the U.S. Coast Guard is a small organization with limited numbers of vacancies created in the upper echelon of the organization.

Being Away From One's Family

The problem of being away from one's family is viewed as a serious disadvantage of being a Coast Guard officer. Table 50 shows that 123 or 45.9 percent of the officers viewed this as a "very important" disadvantage and 113 or 42.2 percent saw it as an "important" disadvantage. Clearly, then, the vast majority of the officers (236 or 88.1 percent) viewed absence from the family as a "very important" or "important" disadvantage. Asian officers (18 or 52.9 percent) most often saw this as a "very important" disadvantage followed by White officers (66 or 48.9 percent), Hispanic officers (17 or 34.7 percent) and lastly Black officers (17 or 34.7 percent). Among those who saw this as being "important" disadvantage, the

Table 50

Race/Ethnicity and Being Away From One's Family
N=268

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	63.6 (7)	36.4 (4)	- -	- -	100.0 (11)
Black	34.7 (17)	49.0 (24)	16.3 (8)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	38.5 (15)	46.2 (18)	12.3 (5)	2.6 (1)	100.1 (39)
Asian	52.9 (18)	35.3 (12)	11.8 (4)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	48.9 (66)	40.7 (55)	10.4 (14)	- -	100.0 (135)
Total	45.9 (123)	42.2 (113)	11.6 (31)	0.4 (1)	100.0 (268)

position is reversed with Blacks (24 or 49 percent) most often and Asians (12 or 35.3 percent) least often choosing this response. It is also interesting to note that White officers (89.6 percent) most often and Black officers (83.7 percent) least often attached some importance to being away from one's family as a disadvantage.

Absence of Senior Officers of Same Racial/Ethnic Group

This issue has been indirectly discussed when we focused on the question of race/ethnicity and mobility. In this instance, we are concerned with the extent to which officers saw the relative absence of minority officers in the top echelons of the Coast Guard as a disadvantage.

Table 51 indicates that this was basically a concern of minority officers and especially of Black officers. In fact only a total of 80 or 29.8 percent of the officers saw this as a "very important" or "important" disadvantage, while 181 or 67.5 percent viewed it as being "not important" as a disadvantage. What is strikingly significant about these findings is that, of the 47 officers who saw it as a "very important" disadvantage, almost 64 percent were Black. Furthermore, 30 or 61.2 percent of the Black officers held this view compared with nine (9) or 23.1 percent of the Hispanic officers, five (5) or 14.7 percent of the Asian officers and only three (3) or 2.2 percent of the White officers. Similarly, a small minority of Black officers (7 or 14.3 percent) saw this issue as being of no importance in contrast with a majority of Asian officers (26 or 76.5 percent) and of White officers (120 or 88.9 percent). Hispanic officers were almost evenly divided in their opinions concerning the importance (19

Table 51

**Race/Ethnicity and Relative Absence of Senior Officers
of Racial/Ethnic Group
N=268**

Race/ Ethnicity	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Answer	Total %/No
Native American	- -	9.1 (1)	72.7 (8)	18.2 (2)	100.0 (11)
Black	61.2 (30)	24.5 (12)	14.3 (7)	- -	100.0 (49)
Hispanic	23.1 (9)	25.6 (10)	51.3 (20)	- -	100.0 (39)
Asian	14.7 (5)	8.8 (3)	76.5 (26)	- -	100.0 (34)
White	2.2 (3)	5.2 (7)	88.9 (120)	3.7 (5)	100.0 (135)
Total	17.5 (47)	12.3 (33)	67.5 (181)	2.6 (7)	100.0 (268)

or 48.7), and the non-importance (20 or 51.3 percent), of this factor as a disadvantage. This table reveals what is by far the most dramatic differences, not only between Blacks and Whites, but also between Blacks and other minorities, concerning an issue that has been viewed by some (see, for example Moskos, 1986) as a critical factor as far as the attractiveness of the armed forces to Blacks is concerned. Obviously, the more Blacks perceive that they can make it to the top,

the more they are likely to join and remain in the armed forces.

Summary

Table 52 was developed in order to summarize the relative importance of the disadvantages of being a Coast Guard officer as discussed above. It provides the views of the officers who participated in the survey about the seriousness of the disadvantages. Slowness of promotional opportunities and being away from one's family are the two most significant disadvantages. Forty-nine point six percent of the officers cited "slowness of promotional opportunities" as a "very important" disadvantage and another 30.2 percent indicated that it is "important" disadvantage. In other words, close to 80 percent of the officers viewed "slowness of promotional opportunities" as a "very important" or an "important" disadvantage. A close look at the table reveals that this view is shared by all the officers regardless of their racial/ethnic background. This finding is understandable in view of the fact that unlike the other branches of the military, the Coast Guard is a small organization with limited vacancies in the higher levels of the organization.

"Being away from one's family" is also viewed as a major disadvantage with 45.9 percent of the officers

[149]

Table 52

Ratings of the Disadvantages of Being in the Coast Guard* By Race

Race/ Ethnicity	Moving Around		Ship Tours		Unequal Operational Experience		Greater Visibility Of Errors		Slowness of Promotion Opportunities		Being Away From One's Family		Relative Absence Senior Officer Of R/E Group	
	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I	VI	I
Native American	45.5 (5)	54.4 (6)	27.3 (3)	54.5 (6)	36.4 (4)	27.3 (3)	9.1 (1)	27.3 (3)	63.6 (7)	18.2 (2)	63.6 (7)	36.4 (4)	-	9.1 (1)
Black	30.6 (15)	46.9 (23)	20.4 (10)	40.8 (20)	34.7 (17)	37.7 (18)	20.4 (10)	26.5 (13)	51.0 (25)	32.7 (16)	34.7 (17)	49.0 (24)	61.2 (30)	24.5 (12)
Hispanic	20.5 (8)	48.7 (19)	15.4 (6)	43.6 (17)	38.5 (15)	33.3 (13)	12.8 (5)	30.8 (12)	59.0 (23)	20.5 (8)	38.5 (15)	46.2 (18)	23.1 (9)	25.6 (10)
Asian	41.2 (14)	35.3 (12)	29.4 (10)	26.5 (9)	38.2 (13)	38.2 (13)	8.8 (3)	20.6 (7)	44.1 (15)	41.2 (14)	52.9 (18)	35.3 (12)	14.7 (5)	8.8 (3)
White	34.8 (47)	38.5 (52)	12.6 (17)	36.3 (49)	25.9 (35)	35.6 (48)	4.4 (6)	18.5 (25)	46.7 (63)	30.4 (41)	48.9 (66)	40.7 (55)	2.2 (3)	5.2 (7)
Total	33.2 (89)	41.8 (112)	17.2 (46)	37.7 (101)	31.3 (84)	35.5 (95)	9.3 (25)	22.4 (60)	49.6 (133)	30.2 (81)	45.9 (123)	42.2 (113)	17.5 (47)	12.3 (33)

VI - Very Important; I - Important

*In this table only the "very important" and "important" ratings are included because they represent significant percentages of the responses. It is felt that meaningful comparisons can be made by looking at these figures.

indicating that it is a "very important" advantage and 42.2 percent indicating that it is an "important" disadvantage. When we combine the two figures, it becomes the number one disadvantage with 88.1 percent expressing the view that it is "very important" or "important" disadvantage. With slight variations, this view is also generally held by all the racial/ethnic groups.

On the other extreme, the least important disadvantages are the "relative absence of senior officers of one's racial/ethnic group" and "greater visibility of errors because of the smallness of the size of the Coast Guard." Only 29.8 percent of the officers felt that the "absence of senior officers of one's racial/ethnic group" is "very important" or "important" advantage. However, a close look at the table clearly reveals that there are significant differences in views based on racial/ethnic background. Eighty-five percent of the Black officers consider the absence of senior officers of one's racial/ethnic group as "very important" or "important" disadvantage. In fact, as far as the Black officers are concerned, this is the most serious disadvantage of being a Coast Guard officer. In contrast, only 7.4 percent of the White officers hold this view. Hispanics and Asians fall in between these two extremes.

[151]

"Greater visibility of error" is viewed as a relatively less significant disadvantage. Only 31.7 percent of the officers indicated that it is "very important" or "important" disadvantage. This view is shared by all the racial/ethnic groups.

"Moving around," "ship tours," and "lack of equality of opportunity for operational experience" can generally be considered as moderately important disadvantages since they fall between the two extremes. These three disadvantages are viewed as "very important" or "important" by 75 percent, 54.9 percent and 66.8 percent of the officers respectively.

CHAPTER VI

REVIEW, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In previous chapters, we have presented in detail our study of the recruitment and retention of minorities as officers in the U.S. Coast Guard. We have discussed at length our review of the literature pertaining to the recruitment and retention of minority officers in the various branches of the armed services. The literature dealing exclusively with the U.S. Coast Guard was limited, but we feel safe in assuming that much of what has been written on the other services applies, in a general sense, to U.S. Coast Guard. We then presented in detail our research approach which included analytical and qualitative components. A major research activity was the administration of a survey instrument, a mail questionnaire, to minority and White officers. Of the overall 375 questionnaires distributed, 268 or 71.5 percent were returned. These included 133 or 49.6 percent from minority officers and 135 or 50.4 percent from White officers. Of great help in providing us with a "feel" for the subject matter was a series of interviews with selected U.S. Coast Guard officers, civil rights officials, and others selected because of their familiarity with the Coast Guard. These

interviews were especially valuable in providing us with insights into the military worldview, in general, and into the culture of the U.S. Coast Guard, in particular. Throughout our study we have touched on the history of minority involvement in the U.S. Coast Guard and have demonstrated the manner in which institutionalized patterns of discrimination present in the larger society have permeated U.S. Coast Guard culture. This should not be surprising since the U.S. Coast Guard is, after all, a product of the larger society and thus reflects its strengths, weaknesses, and imperfections.

Following these introductory chapters, we summarized our analysis of the data generated through our survey instrument looking, first, at what it told us about officers' perceptions of minority officer recruitment and, second, retention of minority officers once they were recruited. This was the basis for the chapter immediately preceding this one summarizing officers' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of a U.S. Coast Guard career. Our aim in this chapter was to see how officers themselves, both White and minority, perceive the Coast Guard as an occupation and, on the basis of this analysis, to make an assessment of the quality of the product that the Coast Guard has to sell. Our conclusion is that as a career, the U.S. Coast Guard offers a relatively "good

job," as jobs in this society go, but that it is not so good as not to need considerable marketing if it is to attract minority officers.

In this chapter, we will present a series of recommendations based on our study, especially on our analysis of the mail questionnaire, that may assist the U.S. Coast Guard recruit more minorities for officer candidacy and to retain minorities as officers once they have been recruited.

We have tailored our recommendations with a clear recognition of the realities of the contemporary American political scene. Civil rights is not a national priority; monies to create broad, new social welfare programs are unavailable. Decreasing budgetary allotments are a U.S. Coast Guard reality at a time when expectations regarding the U.S. Coast Guard's role in enhancing greater participation of minorities are increasing. As a military component of the Department of Transportation (DOT), the U.S. Coast Guard lacks much of the civilian flexibility of its sister DOT agencies. Since it is not a part of the Department of Defense (except during wartime), it is not benefiting from the budget windfalls that have come the way of the other services. In a way, the U.S. Coast Guard has the worst of two possible worlds.

In addition, the U.S. Coast Guard's efforts to recruit minorities into its officer ranks are hampered by the fact that the competition from other private and public agencies for minorities, especially minority youth, trained in mathematics and sciences, is intense. Moreover, this stratum within the minority community, with the skills and aptitude needed for U.S. Coast Guard officer candidacy, is smaller than that in the majority community. And, as we have stated earlier, the product that the Coast Guard can offer, while good, is not so outstanding as to enable it to corner the market on minority candidates. As in any military organization, there are an increasingly limited number of positions open as one ascends its steeply hierarchical pyramid. Compounding this is the relative smallness of the Coast Guard. As indicated earlier, there are only 5,079 commissioned officers in the Coast Guard. There is simply not a great deal of "slack" within the U.S. Coast Guard which could be used to facilitate minority recruitment and upward mobility.

One conclusion that we have drawn during the course of our work is the overriding need for the U.S. Coast Guard to construct systematically access routes - routes of entry - from the minority community into Coast Guard service. Throughout this study, we were struck by the paucity of linkages between the minority community and

the U.S. Coast Guard. It is only by creating these linkages, and systematically exposing minority youth to the U.S. Coast Guard as an organizational entity and as a career option, that the long range situation of increasing the numbers of minority as officers in the U.S. Coast Guard will be addressed. A prime goal of ours is to assist the U.S. Coast Guard "create" a pool of minority youth with, at least, the potential to enter officer candidacy status. It is within the above context that we have structured our recommendations. The themes of cost effectiveness have been blended with the construction of long-term strategies to bring minorities into U.S. Coast Guard officer candidacy positions. We have tried to identify low cost tactics which will have long-term payoffs.

A caveat is now necessary. Putting in place an effective system of equal opportunity, and making it work, is not an easy job. It is a long-term undertaking; it is hard work. In so doing, there are no ready answers or simple solutions to constructing intelligently designed programs of organizational action to alleviate the impact of fundamental social inequities. Accordingly, our study presents no magic solutions; we present only recommendations. The payoff of adopting these recommendations may not be visible for some time to come. But if these recommendations are put

into operation, and done so with care, the end results may well be an organization which is more reflective of its larger parent society and more fair in its treatment of those who serve it. With a lot of hard work, the U.S. Coast Guard has the potential to become a model of equal opportunity for all the armed services.

This chapter will present a series of recommendations focusing on the recruitment of accession of minorities into the U.S. Coast Guard. This will be organized around several themes, but linkage development between the U.S. Coast Guard and the minority community will be highlighted. Following this will be a series of recommendations which addresses the question of retention. In that section, we will consider several aspects of internal U.S. Coast Guard procedures that may lend themselves to modification and improvement. First, however, we will begin with a rather simple recommendation that may serve as a catalyst to fundamental organizational change within the U.S. Coast Guard.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A Critical First Step

One recommendation which we present as a critical first step, as a catalyst, centers on the better use by the U.S. Coast Guard of the skills, talents, and insights of its own minority officers into the problems

the U.S. Coast Guard is encountering in recruiting qualified minorities and in retaining minorities as officers. Throughout our study, particularly in our analysis of the open-ended questionnaire items, through review of margin comments, and through our interviews, we were impressed with the depth of thought displayed by minority officers who, as a group, are as highly skilled and educated as any in this society. This is a group whose racial and ethnic identities are, for the most part, overshadowed by their status as officers. They generally see themselves as "officers who happen to be minority group members" and not as "minority group members who happen to be officers." While these are men and women for whom "lowering standards" is a personal anathema and professional insult, they are also a group who, by reason of their minority background, have special insights into the inequities which exist in the impact of seemingly neutral systems of rules and procedures. These men and women have lived that which we are analyzing and constitute an untapped resource whose expertise in this area has largely been ignored by the upper echelon U.S. Coast Guard command. Our first recommendation, and one which may serve as a catalyst for fundamental amelioration of the situation, is that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Establish a mechanism whereby the input of minority officers may be systematically and regularly secured in all matters pertaining to U.S. Coast Guard equal opportunity concerns.

Recruitment

As we have stated, a fundamental problem that the U.S. Coast Guard faces is its lack of linkages with the minority community. The construction of these access routes between the minority community and the U.S. Coast Guard must be a fundamental ingredient of any strategy of equal opportunity. If such access routes are built, then the infrastructure of an effective program of equal opportunity will have been put in place. We offer first a series of recommendations focusing on making the U.S. Coast Guard a more visible organization within the minority community - and within American society as a whole. We recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Capitalize on press coverage of events of national significance by depicting minorities as an integral part of U.S. Coast Guard operations in such situations when press coverage is likely or necessary. Examples of this during recent months have included several events of major national ceremonial significance and several disaster situations. These include:

- < the "Lady Liberty" celebration
- < the travels of the tall ship, "Eagle"
- < the search for the "Pride of Baltimore"
- < the recovery of the wreckage of the space shuttle, "Challenger"
- < the U.S. Coast Guard's role in making America "drug free"

By doing so, the Coast Guard will capitalize on "free" news coverage by the major media and send the very clear message to the country that the U.S. Coast Guard is an equal opportunity employer. While this approach is diffuse and untargeted, we do not have any doubt that it will have impact on the minority community.

In addition, we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Examine all of its recruiting materials, especially its advertisements targeted for the minority mass media (which are, for the most part, Black), to assure that they highlight the instrumental values which our study indicated motivate minorities in their evaluation of the Coast Guard. In addition, the status of being an officer should be stressed in order to highlight the U.S. Coast Guard as a legitimate channel of upward mobility.
- o Continue to run its recruitment advertisements in media targeted to the minority, especially the Black community, especially large circulation publications such as Ebony and Jet.

As a complement to the above, it should be obvious that that which will appeal to a predominately Black audience will not necessarily "work" with other minority racial/ethnic communities. This should lead the U.S. Coast Guard to:

- o Expand its media campaign to include more media targeted to minorities other than Blacks.

And within the above context:

[161]

- o Develop creative strategies of recruiting, based on ethnic and national differences within broadly defined minority groups (e.g., the many national groups constituting "Hispanic": the ethnic variations within the "Asian" community; etc.). It may be that subtle cultural variations will reveal themselves to have impact on an individual group members' predispositions to choose a career in the U.S. Coast Guard.

In addition (and we will address the negative side of this at a later point), we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Continue to use minority officers as recruiters. In many instances, the recruiter is the first contact many minority youth have with the U.S. Coast Guard and the importance of the greater likelihood of cultural affinity between the recruiter and the recruit is amply demonstrated by research and by experience. Minority officers who carry out recruitment activities should be given proper considerations in their fitness reports.

To supplement the rather diffuse strategies presented above, we now turn to the development of a series of linkages which are much more personal in nature, which involve the one-to-one relationship of U.S. Coast Guard officers to minority youth, and which may have greater long-range impact in recruiting minorities to U.S. Coast Guard officer candidacy status in a much more cost effective manner. Each of these recommendations focuses on junior or senior high school students who are learning about the world of work as

they make fundamental choices which will influence their lives and their career choices. In each of the following, resources should be carefully targeted and each activity continued over a multiple year period. We recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Participate actively in the current Administration's volunteerism campaign by "adopting" a minority school and by providing role models for minority youth through tutoring (especially in mathematics and sciences), counseling, and other activities which are part of the Coast Guard program.
- o Establish contact with guidance counselors and advisors in predominately minority high schools to spread the "message" of the Coast Guard.
- o Evaluate the experience of the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) magnet high school concept in Atlanta, Georgia, and, if the evaluation is favorable, consider the replication of that program through the development of a magnet U.S. Coast Guard high school which will expose minority youngsters to the world of the Coast Guard.
- o Work with the National Technical Association (NTA) in the development of interest among minority youth in science, mathematics, and engineering.

DOT headquarters in Washington, DC, has adopted Hine Junior High School as part of the current Administration's campaign emphasizing volunteerism. Employees of agencies within DOT are given administrative leave to work with students, particularly in tutoring programs, in this predominately Black,

Capitol Hill District of Columbia school. An approach modeled on this effort is a relatively inexpensive way to develop potential career routes from the minority community into the U.S. Coast Guard. The FAA-sponsored high school in Atlanta, Georgia, is a project specifically tailored to attracting minority youth to careers in the aviation industry. The magnet school builds even firmer linkages but at a higher price.

The NTA is an organization whose prime mission is the encouragement of minority youth to enter science, mathematics, and engineering fields. NTA has worked extensively with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and has a credible track record in attracting minority youth to technical fields. Similar interagency cooperation between the U.S. Coast Guard, FAA, and other agencies is a strategy that should be considered.

In addition, the literature suggests that the use of minority organizations by branches of the services to serve as recruitment agents has been quite successful. We also recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Use minority organizations such as the National Urban League, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, etc. to assist in the recruitment of minority persons, especially youth, as officer candidates.

A valuable recruitment resource that remains to be fully tapped is the Historically Black Colleges and Universities' (HBCU) network and other predominately minority institutions of higher learning. Since 1982, the U.S. Coast Guard has run the Enlisted College Student Program which attempted to recruit minority youth from Bennett College, North Carolina A&T State University, South Carolina State College, Prairie View State College, and Virginia State University. This program focuses on students who are in their junior year and above. This, some observers argue, is a source of weakness since it fails to capture the enthusiasm that freshmen and sophomores generally bring to such activities. In addition, by focusing on the junior year and above, the program loses the opportunity to intervene and mold students' career choices which are often made before that year. This project has not been noted for its high success rate. It does serve, however, as an example of the kind of project which might have payoffs if it is well-conceptualized, managed properly, and pursued aggressively. We recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Reevaluate the Enlisted College Student Program and restructure it in such a way as to utilize better the resources of the participating institutions considering especially the merit of involving students before their junior year. USCG should also consider including other HBCUs.

A further example of the benefits that might accrue to the U.S. Coast Guard by utilizing the HBCU structure is the example of the FAA's Airway Science Program. This program is specifically designed to restaff the national air traffic control system. From the FAA's point of view, it has operated with a high degree of success. "Model" schools in this program are Hampton and Texas Southern Universities, which not only guarantee minority graduates, but also garner for the FAA considerable amounts of favorable press coverage. The use of one or two HBCUs, or other minority institutions, as demonstration schools in a carefully planned recruitment project may well have substantial payoffs for the U.S. Coast Guard. Such projects must, of course, provide real and tangible benefits to their participants or they run the risk of producing decidedly negative outcome.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy is the prime source of officers for the Coast Guard. Academy officer graduates enjoy a prestige in the U.S. Coast Guard that is not shared by officers who enter by other routes. Its graduates constitute a close knit group sharing a esprit de corps which binds them together throughout their careers. Because of its preeminent position, it is in the interest of the U.S. Coast Guard to use the Academy for the recruitment and training of minority

officers. (From the above, it is obvious that the status of being an Academy graduate has impact on retention.)

For many talented minority youth, the key factor in determining post-secondary educational choices is the availability and amount of scholarship assistance. In addition, many minority youth, with aptitude in the sciences and mathematics, are products of inner-city systems of education which are notoriously weak in these areas. For these youth, the difference between success and failure in higher levels of technical fields is the provision of a "catch up" period of intensive preparatory activities. Past experience has demonstrated the great impact that a year of "prep" activities, conducted in a positive and affirmative manner, can have on carefully selected, high-potential minority students.

In easing the transition for all students from the world of home to the rigorous, disciplined, and military world of the U.S. Coast Guard, most majority group students can expect familiar cultural styles, a peer group with whom to interact, and an atmosphere which is conducive to hard work and success. For the minority student, especially whose origins are not in the middle class, such is not the case. The familiar world of the white middle class student is, in some

cases, unexplored turf for the minority. The atmosphere which is supportive of most Whites is also confusing, transmitting mixed signals for many minorities.

One example that is often given is the use of "study groups" by students to assist them in reviewing and digesting materials which are nearly impossible for a single student to master alone. The study group is usually based on something deeper than just friendship; cultural affinity plays a major role. Study group members usually reflect many aspects of middle class American business culture, early socialization experiences into this culture, and lessons in the art of "making it" in middle class American society. The study group, through the pooling of cultural resources it provides, and the mutual support structure that it represents, plays a major role in many students' lives. Yet the numbers of minority faculty at the Academy are, as we have noted elsewhere, quite small. It is obvious that the minority student is less likely to be part of such a group and, as such, is likely to find himself/herself at a competitive disadvantage. In this process, the role of sympathetic faculty members who serve as role models is crucial. These are only a few aspects of the environment in which the minority student is placed at a disadvantage; there are many other

examples. It is the cumulative impact of these experiences which increases the failure rates for many minority students.

The point of the above is simply that there is a positive responsibility on the part of the Academy to ease the transition into the Academy for those in whom it has invested so much to recruit if it wishes to see those recruited actually graduate.

Accordingly, we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Step up the efforts by the Academy to recruit minority students by enhancing such areas as:
 - < budgetary allotments
 - < outreach efforts
 - < scholarship assistance
- o Develop preparatory activities for minorities so recruited in order to ease the transition into the Academy and strengthen their academic skills, especially in science and mathematics.
- o Recruit more minority faculty to the Academy to serve as role models for minority students.
- o Develop support structures for the minority students like those that are "naturally" available for majority students.
- o Conduct a more spirited affirmative outreach efforts to support all of the above Academy-based activities.

Retention

Our analysis of the survey data clearly demonstrated that minorities in general perceive the existence of discrimination within the U.S. Coast Guard. Black officers are most likely to see the existence of discrimination and constituted the minority group that is least "integrated" into the Coast Guard. Our interviews suggested that, in many instances, a measure of reality lay behind these perceptions. Especially troublesome to many Blacks was the reference to race in fitness reports. One respondent reported that his commanding officer had judged him to be "a credit to his race." It is difficult to think of any other contemporary organization in American society in which such patronizing racial references are likely to be part of performance evaluations. While basic attitudes will not be changed overnight, and the patterns of generations of prejudice cannot be eliminated by the stroke of a pen, behavior can be modified. As a first, immediate, and visible step, we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Order the elimination of all references to race and ethnicity in all personnel documents, specially fitness reports except in extraordinary instances in which such a reference is clearly job-related or necessary for statistic gathering purposes.

The following recommendations which flow from the above are first listed and then briefly discussed. We recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Reiterate from the level of the Commandant a strongly worded reaffirmation of the policy of non-discrimination.
- o Deal swiftly and fairly with any allegation of discrimination and deal harshly, but fairly, with any proved complaint of discrimination.
- o Review the recommendation of providing an appellant of a second non-promotion to the rank of Lieutenant Commander with one peremptory challenge available to the appellant in the establishment of the review panel to hear the appeal.
- o Provide its mid- and upper-level officers with a contemporary course in intergroup relations. Several such courses are widely used in the Federal government: one is a one-day workshop in conflict management and related issues conducted by a consultant trained in intercultural relations. Such workshops may be specifically designed to facilitate interaction, communication, and understanding between minority and white officers.

The above clustering of recommendations centers on addressing the concerns most frequently raised by minority officers. There is the need for a strong reaffirmation of the non-discrimination policy of the U.S. Coast Guard from the very top; allegations of wrongdoing should be speedily dealt with and, if the allegations prove to be true, the guilty should be punished.

Of particular concern to minority officers is the perception of unfairness and arbitrariness in the appeal of a second instance of non-promotion to the rank of Lieutenant Commander. The denial of this appeal means automatic separation from the U.S. Coast Guard. This is a procedure which frustrates the aspirations of many minorities. It is argued by many that the provision of a peremptory challenge to the appellant in the second appeal of a non-promotion decision may help to assure impartiality on the part of the review panel. This adjustment on behalf of the appellant should be considered in light of empirical evidence developed through a careful analysis of such instances in the past, of ruling military law, and of comparable civilian practices. While we recommend such an adjustment, it is an area into which we tread with extreme caution and make our recommendation contingent upon careful review by the U.S. Coast Guard of the validity of the concern being addressed.

Contemporary training for officers in intergroup relations is always a useful recommendation although it is one that is often not received with enthusiasm. Cultural differences do exist and the cultural style of racial and ethnic groups does condition behavior and response to that behavior. Such training can help, at the very least, to improve communication. Said another

way, such training can help to emphasize similarities so that differences can be more effectively dealt with.

Of particular concern to us in our review of U.S. Coast Guard equal opportunity procedures was the goal setting methodology used by the U.S. Coast Guard. At any given time, the goal for minority officers is the same as their proportionate numbers in the ranks of enlisted persons. Since the goal is a target, and goal setting is both a management tool to measure accomplishment of objectives and to serve as an accountability mechanism, it may be wise to consider tying the goal to a factor other than minority presence in the ranks of enlistees. We, therefore, recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Review the use of goals and the methodology for setting goals, and on this basis, consider the development of a mechanism which will better tie the goal-setting process to a measure of minority availability in the population.

In addition to the above, we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Conduct a "program and management review" of all of its civil rights activities, and any other activities which impact on equality of opportunity, in order to identify program and managerial strengths and weaknesses.

A program and management review is a systematic and comprehensive review of any given set of activities. It is a useful tool of self-analysis and a rich source of ideas for better program implementation, achievement of program efficiency, and heightened program impact. The above review should be accompanied by an examination, freshly made from the perspective of the mid-1980's, of the equal opportunity experiences of other services and of the civilian world. Accordingly, we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Conduct a review of all contemporary equal employment programs of each of the other services for lessons to be applied to the U.S. Coast Guard operation.
- o Conduct a similar review of all equal employment programs of other DOT modal agencies and selected other Federal agencies for transferability of lessons to the U.S. Coast Guard.

In addition, we recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Review all of its past projects designed to increase minority participation; identify those which had a favorable ratio of costs to benefits; and consider the replication of efforts which have been successful.

The above three recommendations suggest that a review of all current U.S. Coast Guard policies and operations which have equal opportunity impact, as well as a similar review of other agencies' policies, is a

useful activity in which to engage and may well stimulate new thinking, the incorporation of new ideas, and the genesis of new cost effective strategies to accomplish the U.S. Coast Guard's aims.

Of particular importance has been the frequently raised complaint of minority officers that they are assigned, or tracked, to "dead end" jobs and that they are thus denied the operational experience which they see as crucial for professional advancement. Elsewhere in our report, we have recommended that minority officers be assigned a minority recruiting role and we have suggested the importance of minority visibility as a recruiting mechanism in and of itself. Here, however, we note the concerns that such action legitimately raises regarding career advancement. We recommend accordingly that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Review the impact of its personnel assignment policy on minority officers paying special attention to the role of operational experience in career advancement.

The upshot of the above may be the deliberate assignment of minorities to situations in which they will have operational experiences or the reevaluation of the significance of jobs such as recruiting for fitness ratings.

In addition, as a pledge of its sincerity to making equality of opportunity real for all, the U.S. Coast Guard should:

- o Consider designating equal opportunity performance as a critical job element, to be measured quantitatively, as part of each manager's own fitness review process.

CONCLUSION

While our review revealed few overt acts of discrimination, the perception of discrimination was quite widespread. The operation of the subtle cultural biases of the "old boy" network, and the nuances of an enlisted military culture, were clearly evident. The legacy of a larger American culture in which minority aspirations have not been accorded full legitimacy has left its imprint on the current, daily operations of the U.S. Coast Guard. To address these rather diffuse perceptions, and the reality they represent, must be an ongoing activity by the Coast Guard. We end by restating our first recommendation. We recommend that the U.S. Coast Guard:

- o Establish a mechanism whereby the input of minority officers may be systematically and regularly secured in all matters pertaining to U.S. Coast Guard equal opportunity concerns.

The development of a cohesive, involved, and tactfully vocal group of concerned minorities within the U.S. Coast Guard is a potent potential force to assure

[176]

the articulation of minority interests in the U.S. Coast Guard and to serve as advocates for minority progress in all aspects of the Coast Guard's operations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Coast Guard History, U.S. Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard, (COMDTINST) M5750.3, June 1982.
- Corpin, O. D. "Development of a Model for Minority Recruitment at the United States Naval Academy," U.S. Naval Academy, May 1974.
- Dorn, Edwin. Black Officers: A Special Report - Officer Attrition Joint Center, undated.
- Eitelberg, Mark Jan. Military Representation: The Theoretical and Practical Implications of Population Representation in the American Armed Forces. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Public Administration, New York University, October 1979.
- Friedman, E. A. and Havighurst, R. J. The Meaning of Work and Retirement, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Gatling, Wade. "Black Fliers." U.S. Department of Defense, undated.
- Goode, William J. "A Theory of Role Strain." American Sociological Review. Vol. 25, No. 4, August 1960.
- Guinn, N., Farmer C. B. and Wilbourn, J. M. Effect of an All-Volunteer Force on Input into the School of Military Sciences, Officer Training Program. Air Force Human Resources Lab, Brooks AFB, Texas, December 1973.
- History of Blacks in the Coast Guard from 1790, U.S. Department of Transportation, undated.
- Human Relations in the Coast Guard: 1972-73. A study conducted by the National Urban League, Department of Transportation.

Johnson, Harvey E. Quantitative and Qualitative Effectiveness Dimensions of the U.S. Coast Guard Recruiting Program, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, June 1983.

Lenti, J. M. The Black in Gray - Can West Point Attract the Black. Army Command and General Staff College, Kansas, June 1982.

Loury, Glenn C. "Beyond Civil Rights." The New Republic. October 7, 1985.

Market Facts, Inc. Qualitative Research Summaries for a Marketing Study on the Recruitment and Retention of Black American and Women Cadets, United States Military Academy, November 1982.

Market Facts Inc. and Uniworld Inc., Final Report, Part II - Advertising and Communications, A Marketing Study on the Recruitment and Retention of Black American and Women Cadets, United States Military Academy, November 1982.

Memo from Superintendent Coast Guard Academy to Commandant re Academy Recruiting Report, 3 September 1985.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968 (Enlarged Edition) Chapter XI.

Military Minority Recruiting Plan 1976-1980, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard, CG-477, April 1976.

Missions of the United States Coast Guard, Year of the Ocean 1984-1985, U.S. Department of Transportation, CG-378-8.

Morse, N. C. and Weiss, R. S. "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job." American Sociological Review. Vol. 20, No. 2, April 1955.

Moskos, Charles C. "Success Story: Blacks in the Army." The Atlantic Monthly. May 1966.

Norwood, Pevey, O. Jr. A Comparison of the Fit Between the Organizational Climate of the Coast Guard, the Job/Career Expectations of Black College Graduates and their Perceptions About the Coast Guard, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, December 1980.

Romanczuk, Alan P. and Albert S. Glickman. An Investigation of Civil Rights Problems in the Coast Guard, Final Report, U.S. Department of Transportation, December 1977.

The Annual Report of the Superintendent, United States Coast Guard Academy, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1986.

Thorne, Robert W. Applying Organization Development to Coast Guard Affirmative Action for Black Officers, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, December 1979.

Tunstall, Jeremy. The Fisherman. London: MacGibbon and Kec, 1962.

United States Coast Guard Commandant Instruction (COMDTINST) 1131.7 entitled Military Minority Recruiting Goals, 2 December 1982.

APPENDIX

SURVEY

Background Information

Please put a check ☐ or fill the information in the appropriate space.

1. Age _____ years 2. Sex Male ☐ Female ☐

3. What is your race/ethnicity?

Native American ☐ Black ☐ Hispanic ☐
Alaskan Native ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ White ☐

4. What is your rank? _____

5. Marital Status

Married ☐ Never Married ☐ Separated ☐
Divorced ☐ Other (Please Specify) _____

6. If you are married, how long has this been? _____ years.

7. Number of children (both natural and for whom you are responsible) _____

If you have children, what are their ages? _____

8. Before entering the USCG, as an officer, what was your highest level of educational attainment?

High School ☐ Some College ☐
Bachelor's degree ☐ Graduate degree ☐

9. Was the community in which you grew up?

Predominantly minority ☐ Predominantly White ☐
Racially/Ethnically Balanced ☐

10. Was your high school?

Predominantly minority ☐ Predominantly White ☐
Racially/Ethnically balanced ☐

11. Did your high school stress science and mathematics?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐ Don't know ☐

12. How much math/science did you take in high school?

A lot [] Some [] Hardly any [] None []

13. What was your primary reason for joining the USCG?

14. Since entering the USCG, as an officer, have you had any further education? Yes [] No []

If answer is YES,

(a) Who is paying/paid for it? The USCG [] I am []

(b) What kind of education is it?

Graduate study/USCG related (Specify) _____
Graduate study/not USCG related (Specify) _____
Other/USCG related (Specify) _____
Other/not USCG related (Specify) _____

15. How did you enter the USCG, as an officer?

Academy graduate [] Enlistment then OCS []
College then OCS [] Direct Commission []
Other (Please Specify) _____

16. How long have you been in the USCG as an officer?

[] years [] months

17. How did you first learn about the USCG?

From friends [] From family members []
From a high school counselor [] From a recruiter []
Other (Please Specify) _____

18. Do you have any family members in the armed forces?

Yes []

No []

19. Do you have any family members in the USCG?

Yes []

No []

If answer is YES, did they influence your decision to enter the USCG?

Yes []

No []

Not sure []

20. Were your parents employed when you were growing up?

Mother employed []

Mother unemployed []

Father employed []

Father unemployed []

21. If your parents were employed, what were their occupations?

Mother's occupation _____

Father's occupation _____

22. Can you swim? Yes [] No []

If answer is YES,

(a) Do you swim? Regularly [] Occasionally []

(b) Would you say that in water you are

Very comfortable []

Moderately comfortable []

Not comfortable at all []

(c) Would you say that you swim?

Very well []

Fairly well []

Not very well []

23. Of the following statements, please check the one with which you agree.

CHECK ONE

1. [] In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

2. [] Many times we might as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

CHECK ONE

1. ☐ Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
2. ☐ Getting a job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

CHECK ONE

1. ☐ In my experience doing the best I can has always paid off.
2. ☐ Sometimes it makes no sense to do the best you can because it does not pay off.

FOR MINORITIES ONLY

CHECK ONE

1. ☐ I prefer to be viewed primarily as a minority officer.
2. ☐ I see myself primarily as an officer who happens to be minority.

CHECK ONE

1. ☐ As a minority, I can succeed in America if I am willing to work hard.
2. ☐ No matter how hard I try, discrimination will always prevent me as a minority from reaching the top.

Recruitment

FOR ALL OFFICERS

1. Do you think the USCG is doing enough to recruit minority officers?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐ Don't know ☐

If answer is NO, in your opinion, what could be done to attract more minority officers?

2. Do you think the USCG wants to have more minority officers?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐ Don't know ☐

3. Do you think the USCG wants only a specific number of minority officers?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐ Don't know ☐

If answer is YES, please give an approximation of what you think that number is for:

Blacks ☐ Native Americans ☐ Hispanics ☐
Alaskan Natives ☐ Asian/Pacific Islanders ☐

4. Do you think the USCG is spending enough money in general, on recruitment for minority officers?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐ Don't know ☐

5. Do you think the USCG spends sufficient money on advertising for minority officer candidates?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐ Don't know ☐

If answer is YES, how do you think the money spent by the USCG for advertising and recruitment of minority officer candidates compares with money spent for the same purpose by other branches of the armed services?

Very favorably ☐ Favorably ☐
Not all favorably ☐ Difficult to judge ☐
Don't know ☐

6. Would you rank in order of importance with one (1) being the highest, and eight (8) being the lowest, the significance you attach to the following with respect to recruitment of minority officers?

- ☐ More media advertising
 - ☐ Spending more money
 - ☐ Recruitment at more minority colleges
 - ☐ Recruitment at non-minority colleges
 - ☐ More use of minority officers in recruitment
 - ☐ More use of high school counsellors to identify minorities with math/science interests
 - ☐ More community efforts to publicize the goals of the USCG to minority youths
 - ☐ Other (Please specify) _____
-

7. Do you think that minorities should be given any form of preferential treatment in the USCG?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

8. It has been argued by some that, in general, one way to increase the number of minorities in the mainstream of American life is to lower entrance requirements for schools, jobs etc. What are your views on this?

Strongly agree [] Agree [] Disagree []
Strongly disagree [] No opinion []

9. Do you think USCG authorities should lower entrance requirements for minorities in order to attract more for entry into the USCG?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

- (a) If answer is YES, why do you think so?

- (b) If answer is NO, why do you think not?

10. Would you advise a close relative or friend to join the USCG?

Yes [] No [] Not sure []
Don't know [] Yes, but not now []

- (a) If answer is YES, why?

(b) If answer is NO, why not?

11. In general, what do you think could be done to recruit more minority officers for the USCG?

Retention

FOR ALL OFFICERS

1. Since entering the USCG as an officer have you been eligible for any promotions?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

(a) If answer is YES,

(i) Have you received any promotions for which you were eligible?

Yes [] No [] Not sure []

(ii) What was the date of your last promotion? _____

(b) If answer is NO, why do you think this was so?

2. Do you think minority officers have the same chances for making it in the USCG as non-minority officers?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

If answer is NO, why do you think this is so?

3. Do you feel that you are made welcome in the USCG?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

If answer is NO/NOT SURE, why do you think this is so?

4. If you are an Academy /OCS graduate, do you think that the training you received at the Academy or OCS prepares you to deal with the demands of your job as an officer?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know [] N/A []

5. Do you think that your training before entry as an officer is being utilized by the USCG?

Fully utilized []	Partially utilized []
Not being utilized []	Not sure []
Don't know []	

6. How do you rate operational experience in terms of advancement in the USCG?

Very important []	Moderately important []
Not important []	Not sure []
Don't know []	

7. How do you rate operational experience in terms of promotion from the rank of Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander?

Very important [] Moderately important []
Not important [] Not sure []
Don't know []

8. If you think that operational experience is important, do you think the USCG provides enough opportunities for you to acquire this experience?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know [] N/A []

If answer is YES, do you think the opportunities provided are

Very adequate [] Adequate []
Barely adequate [] Not adequate []

9. Please list in order of importance what you consider to be the three (3) important categories of operational experience.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

10. Do you think that proposals like Gramm/Rudman to balance the national budget, will affect the USCG?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

11. If answer is YES, in what way do you think these proposals will affect you if they are implemented?

Positively [] Negatively []

If answer is Positively, do you think that these proposals will affect minority officers more than non-minority officers?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

- (i) If answer is YES, do you think the effect will be?

Positive [] Negative []

(ii) If answer is NEGATIVE, why do you think this is so?

12. The following have been described as major ADVANTAGES of being a USCG officer. Please indicate how important the following are by checking the appropriate space.

	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Job security			
Pay			
Benefits			
Possibility of starting a new career after 20 years service			
Doing interesting work			
Opportunities to travel			
Getting a good education free of charge			
Good opportunities to do things compared with other branches of the armed forces			
Opportunity to serve one's country			
Fulfilling humanitarian obligations			
Other (Please specify)			

12. The following have been described as major DISADVANTAGES of being a USCG officer. Please indicate how important the following are by checking the appropriate space.

	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Moving around	_____	_____	_____
Having to be away from one's family	_____	_____	_____
Ship tours	_____	_____	_____
Lack of equality of opportunity for opera- tional experience	_____	_____	_____
Greater visibility of errors because of relative small size compared with other branches of the armed forces	_____	_____	_____
Relative absence of senior officers of my social/ethnic group	_____	_____	_____
Slowness of promotion opportunities	_____	_____	_____
Other (Please specify)			
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

13. Do you think that academy graduates get preferential treatment over OCS graduates in USCG?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

(a) If answer is YES, do you think that this is?

Justified [] Not justified []
Sometimes justified/sometimes not justified []

(b) If you think it is justified, why do you think so?

14. Do you think it is possible for you to "make flag"?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

15. In your opinion have there been any instances where you feel that what was required of you by a superior officer was not made clear?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

If answer is YES, please briefly state the circumstances of this occurrence.

16. What are your views regarding the USCG policy of terminating officers who on two (2) occasions fail to be promoted from Lieutenant to Lieutenant Commander?

Strongly agree [] Agree [] Disagree []
Strongly disagree [] No opinion []

17. Do you think that your training in the USCG equips you to handle jobs outside the USCG? (e.g. in the private sector)

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

18. Do you plan to stay for the usual 20 year period or more in the USCG as an officer?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

(a) If answer is NO/NOT SURE, why is this so?

FOR MINORITIES ONLY

19. As a minority officer, have you ever experienced any instances of racial/ethnic prejudice?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

If answer is YES, briefly describe this experience. If more than one, please continue on the blank page at the end of the questionnaire.

20. As a minority, have you ever experienced any situation where non-minority enlisted personnel or officers junior in rank to you were unwilling to recognize your status as an officer?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

21. In your opinion, have you ever experienced any situation where you feel you were punished for an action for which a non-minority officer was not punished or was rewarded?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

If answer is NO/NOT SURE, briefly state the circumstances of this occurrence.

FOR ALL OFFICERS

22. If you had to do it again, would you join the USCG as an officer?

Yes [] No [] Not sure [] Don't know []

23. How do you think this study will affect the position of the minority officer in the USCG? Do you think it will?

Improve it a lot [] Improve it a little []
Make no difference [] No opinion []
Not sure []

24. What are the things you LIKE best about the USCG?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

25. What are the things you DISLIKE most about the USCG?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

-15-

NOTE: If you have any further comments, please write them in the space provided below.

Thank you for your time and patience.