

Study Report 96-06

The Army Alumni Survey

Peter F. Ramsberger, Jeffrey D. Barnes,
and Ani S. DiFazio
Human Resources Research Organization

November 1995

19960408 021




United States Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

19960408 021

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

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

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

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Director

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

Human Resources Research Organization

Technical review by

Joan Harman
Laurel Oliver
Wendell W. Wilson

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-STP, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600.

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

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

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE 1995, November		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED October 1992-September 1995	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Army Alumni Survey				5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER MDA903-92-C-0216	
				5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 0605803A	
6. AUTHOR(S) Peter F. Ramsberger, Jeffrey D. Barnes, and Ani S. DiFazio				5c. PROJECT NUMBER D730	
				5d. TASK NUMBER 1332	
				5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER C01	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Human Resources Research Organization 66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 400 Alexandria, VA 22314				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences ATTN: PERI-RP 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600				10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI	
				11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Study Report 96-06	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES COR: Joan Harman					
14. ABSTRACT (<i>Maximum 200 words</i>): Samples of Army veterans were selected to be representative of all Non-Prior Service Regular Army Accessions and a subgroup that entered during this period who completed the New Recruit Survey. Response rate to the survey was 25%. Results indicated that most respondents were satisfied with their Army experience. Nearly 80% rate themselves as successful in their civilian careers. About 34% have used their military-gained skills in their civilian careers, and 57% indicated that they used education benefits following separation. About 75% felt that their Army service made them more disciplined, mature, and self-confident. Large majorities stated that they would join the Army again, and 60% indicated that they still agree with their decision to leave when they did.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Army veterans Ex-servicemembers Military experience					
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF			19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. NUMBER OF PAGES 95	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON (Name and Telephone Number)
16. REPORT Unclassified	17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified			

Study Report 96-06

The Army Alumni Survey

Peter F. Ramsberger, Jeffrey D. Barnes,
and Ani S. DiFazio

Human Resources Research Organization

Organization and Personnel Resources Research Unit
Paul A. Gade, Chief

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

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

November 1995

FOREWORD

One primary mission of the Organization and Personnel Resources Research Unit of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences is to carry out state-of-the-art personnel resources research that will provide the Army with timely information on which to base future planning and policy making.

This report describes work sponsored by the United States Army Recruiting Command. Questionnaires were sent to a sample of single-term Army veterans who left the service between 1982 and 1989. Results indicated that most respondents were satisfied with their Army experience, rated their civilian careers successful, and felt that the Army made them more disciplined, mature, and self confident.

The Recruiting Command can use these findings to enhance future recruiting efforts.

ZITA M. SIMUTIS
Deputy Director
(Science and Technology)

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Director

THE ARMY ALUMNI SURVEY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

Each year, thousands of soldiers leave the U.S. Army after completing their first term of service. Some do so voluntarily, while others are asked to leave because of inadequate performance or changing manpower requirements. Involuntary separations have become more common in recent years due to the military drawdown which, when completed, will result in the Army reducing its force by some 30 percent. In the face of this reality, efforts have been increased to assist departing soldiers as they make the transition back to civilian life. This is particularly important because of the sheer numbers involved, and the fact that some of those being asked to leave planned on a career in the military and are therefore particularly affected by the change they must make in these plans.

The Army Research Institute (ARI) and the U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) recognized that the experience of soldiers who have left the service and returned to civilian life could provide valuable insights into how this transition is best made and what additional assistance may be needed to help those faced with this prospect in the future. This, along with other research concerns, led ARI and USAREC to sponsor the Army Alumni Survey (AAS).

Procedure:

Two samples of Army veterans were selected, the first representing all 1982-1989 Non-Prior Service (NPS) accessions. The second sample was selected to reflect a subset of this population, that being accessions from this period who completed the New Recruit Survey (NRS) when they entered service. The AAS instrument included items addressing reasons for enlisting, experiences while in, reasons for departing, and experiences since separation. This information can be used to form a picture of Army service and its impact on those who have served after they return to the civilian world.

The existence of the NRS makes it possible to gain a longitudinal perspective on Army service and its impact. Collecting post-service data from a representative sample of those who completed the NRS at entry, combined with information extracted from their service records, allows for the construction of a long-term picture of their experiences. However, there was also an interest in generalizing to all recruits from the 1982-1989 period. For this reason, two samples were drawn, representing all 1982-1989 NRS participants and all NPS accessions. It was determined that a sample of 5,000 was required to ensure an adequate number of longitudinal respondents, while 4,000 were required for the cross-sectional sample.

The primary interest of the present research was on individuals who successfully completed one term of service and then left the military. Therefore, before the samples were drawn, those who failed to complete their first term and those who reenlisted following their initial commitment were excluded from the sampling frame. Stratification was then performed on the remaining population on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity (white, black, other), MOS category (Combat Arms, Combat Support, Combat Service Support), and term of service (2- 3- and 4-years). The samples were then drawn to be representative of the two populations on these dimensions.

Findings:

- Approximately 56% of each sample indicated that they were successful in their post-service careers, with 22% saying they were very successful.
- Some 60% of the "very successful" respondents gave their Army experience substantial credit for this success, while about 45% of those who judged themselves successful made this attribution.
- Some 82% of the cross-sectional and 85% of the longitudinal samples were employed full-time when they completed the AAS.
- Sixty percent of each sample indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their ability to make ends meet since leaving service, while the preponderance of respondents felt that having been in the Army had little impact in this regard.
- One-third of each sample stated that they have used the skills they obtained while in the Army frequently in their post-service careers, while another third said they were used seldomly or not at all.
- Approximately 56% of each sample took advantage of educational benefits after leaving the Army, with about three-quarters of this group saying that higher education would have been a less viable option without such benefits.
- Large majorities of both samples indicated that being in the Army made them more disciplined and mature, increased their self-confidence and attention to detail, resulted in their being better organized, more willing to take responsibility at work, more dependable, and more willing to take the lead.
- Over 90% of both samples rated their Army experience as being of value, while 85% agreed that they would enlist again if they had it to do over.
- Approximately two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they would still leave the Army after their first term if they had the choice to make again.

- Most respondents felt that they are better off in their civilian careers, stating that they were more satisfactory in terms of salary, skills required, responsibilities, independence and location.

Utilization of Findings:

Although the ability to draw conclusions from the results of this survey is tempered by the low response rate, the findings are still of interest from a variety of perspectives. From a recruiting/advertising point of view, they provide substantiation for many of the claims that are made in terms of the value of military service to an individual. Of primary benefit to the respondents to this survey was the impact that serving had on personal characteristics that later were positive influences in their civilian careers. Educational benefits and job training were also of value to large segments of each of the samples. Further analyses of the full range of data (e.g., NRS, cohort, AAS) should provide greater insight into the way in which serving in the Army was of value (or not of value) to various subgroups of veterans.

From a purely research perspective, the longitudinal portion of the dataset provides an opportunity to examine a range of questions regarding military service and life course issues. Examining goals upon entry, for instance, with service experience data and post-service outcomes, can provide insight into the impact of various factors on choices made and paths taken. Questions can be investigated such as whether there is a relationship between the achievement of early goals and current personal/career satisfaction, and/or satisfaction with military service in general.

The AAS files provide a wealth of data beyond that which is reported in this volume. And these data, when fully exploited, should provide insight into a range of questions and issues of both a practical and theoretical nature.

THE ARMY ALUMNI SURVEY

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 METHODOLOGY.....	4
Constructing the Sampling Frames.....	4
Determining Sample Sizes.....	7
Drawing the Samples.....	11
Survey Development.....	11
Obtaining Clearances.....	14
Sample Location.....	15
Survey Distribution.....	17
CHAPTER 3 RESULTS.....	22
Overall Assessment of Career Success and Army Impact.....	22
Objective Evidence Regarding Career Success.....	26
Impact of Army Training on Civilian Career.....	31
Impact of Educational Benefits.....	36
Impact on Personal Development.....	40
Impact of Army Experience on Personal Life.....	46
Reflections on Serving in the Army.....	53
CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSIONS.....	59
REFERENCES.....	63
APPENDIX A. STRATIFICATION CELL POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES.....	A-1
B. SURVEY MATERIALS.....	B-1
C. RESPONSE CODES, OPEN-ENDED ITEMS 56,60.....	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Sampling Frame Size	6
2 Cohort/New Recruit Survey Match Results	7
3 Sample Sizes Used in Designing Sampling Plan	8
4 Index of Surveys Reviewed	12
5 AAS Sample Location Disposition	17
6 AAS Disposition	19
7 Comparison of Longitudinal Sample and Returns	21
8 Comparison of Cross-Sectional Sample and Returns	21
9 Assessment of Career Success by Sample	23
10 Attributions of Army Impact on Career Outcomes - Cross-sectional Sample	23
11 Attributions of Army Impact on Career Outcomes - Longitudinal Sample	24
12 Impact of Army Service on Career--Open-Ended Responses	25
13 Employment Status of Army Veterans	27
14 Individual and Family Income, 1993 - Cross-sectional Sample	28
15 Individual and Family Income, 1993 - Longitudinal Sample	29
16 Satisfaction with Ability to Make Ends Meet Since Leaving Service Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Samples	30
17 Perceived Impact of Army Service on Civilian Earnings Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Samples	30
18 Job Skills as Motivation to Enlist and as Used in Civilian Life - Cross-sectional Sample	32
19 Job Skills as Motivation to Enlist and as Used in Civilian Life - Longitudinal Sample	32
20 Frequency of Mentioning Veteran Status to Employers by Employers Reactions - Cross-sectional Sample	34
21 Frequency of Mentioning Veteran Status to Employers by Employers Reactions - Longitudinal Sample	35
22 Use and Importance of Educational Benefits - Cross-sectional Sample	37
23 Use and Importance of Educational Benefits - Longitudinal Sample	38
24 Importance of Educational Benefits in Deciding to Return to School	39
25 Impact of Army on Work Attributes - Cross-sectional Sample	41
26 Impact of Army on Work Attributes - Longitudinal Sample	43
27 Attributions of Army Impact on Personal Outcomes- Cross-sectional Sample	47
28 Attributions of Army Impact on Personal Outcomes--Longitudinal Sample	48
29 Impact of Army Service on Personal Life--Open-Ended Responses	49
30 Impact of Army on Personal Attributes--Cross-sectional Sample	50
31 Impact of Army on Personal Attributes--Longitudinal Sample	51
32 Satisfaction with Army Training and Service	53
33 Value of Army Service	54
34 Reconsidering Military Service and Separation	54
35 Recommendations of Army Service to Friends	55
36 Comparison of Current Civilian to Last Military Job - Cross-sectional Sample	56
37 Comparison of Current Civilian to Last Military Job - Longitudinal Sample	56

THE ARMY ALUMNI SURVEY

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In any given year, thousands of soldiers leave the Army after completing their first term of service. In some cases such separations are voluntary, as the individual decides to pursue opportunities available in the civilian sector. In other instances the decision to leave service may not have been that of the soldier, but rather of the Army itself. This may be due to changing manpower requirements, a less than satisfactory performance record, or a variety of other causes.

Given the changing world situation and the corresponding downsizing of the military, involuntary separations have become an even harsher reality in the recent past. It is expected that when the reductions in force have been completed, the Army will have trimmed its active duty enlisted force by some 30 percent (Department of Defense, 1991). At first glance, it appears that this would ease concerns over maintaining a well-qualified and prepared force: Fewer people means fewer recruiting and retention problems. In fact, the opposite is likely to be true for a number of reasons. For one, it may be the case that those with the best qualifications (and therefore better opportunities in the civilian sector) will be more inclined to leave service as the impact of the drawdown is felt. Similarly, individuals in highly technical Military Occupational Specialties (MOS) may voluntarily separate in greater numbers, threatening the overall integrity of the force. In other words, although sheer numbers of soldiers may not be a problem, the quality and synergy of the career force may be in jeopardy.

Another concern is that recruiting resources will also be cut, making it even more imperative that those responsible for this function have as much information as possible to facilitate their efforts. Finally, there are issues surrounding those who are being asked to leave. What kinds of programs or advice can be given to ease their transition back into the civilian sector? Evidence from the Army Research Institute (ARI) 1990 Survey of Employers (Schroyer, Hansen, Lerro, & Benedict, 1990) showed that, while many employers perceive Army veterans as having desirable qualities (e.g., dependability, punctuality, self-discipline), they are also somewhat ignorant about other characteristics that typify more

recent recruits (e.g., the vast majority have high school diplomas). In addition, few companies have policies or programs to encourage the hiring of veterans. These facts suggest that there is a need to provide assistance to those being separated as a result of the drawdown to ease their transition back to the civilian world.

At the heart of all of the issues raised above are the men and women who complete their terms of obligation and return to the civilian realm. For it is they who can provide answers to many of the questions that the Army will have to answer to function effectively and humanely in the face of the drawdown. Such questions include:

- How do Army alumni feel military service affected their prospects and progress in the civilian world? Does this assessment reflect the claims that recruiting advertisements make?
- What are the characteristics of those who choose to leave the Army voluntarily? What are their reasons for leaving? What changes could be instituted that might affect this decision?
- What experiences do separatees have upon returning to the civilian world? What difficulties, if any, do those leaving the military have in locating satisfactory employment? To what extent were transition programs available? In what ways could they have been improved?

Clearly, Army veterans are the source of much information that is of great value in structuring advertising, recruiting, retention, and transition policies and programs. In recognition of this fact, ARI in conjunction with the United States Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) sponsored the Army Alumni Survey (AAS).

In assessing factors related to the military-civilian transition, it is essential that military experience variables be taken into account. For instance, one major factor that may affect the ease of transition is type of MOS, many of which have direct civilian counterparts (e.g., 62J General Construction Equipment Operator, 93H Air Traffic Controller), whereas others do not (e.g., 11B Infantryman) (Department of Defense, 1992). This degree of correspondence may have an impact on the perceptions of both veterans and potential employers in terms of the value of military training as applied to civilian occupations. Therefore, it will affect the ease or difficulty of finding employment after separation.

Another factor that is likely to affect the relationship between military experience and civilian outcomes is the goal(s) of the individual upon entering the Army. For instance, past

research has found varying percentages of veterans who report that they apply their military training in their civilian jobs (Laurence & Ramsberger, 1991; Magnum & Ball, 1989; Westat, 1986). These data can be misleading, however, in the face of evidence that people volunteer for a variety of reasons. Data from the 1995 ARI New Recruit Survey (NRS) indicate that about three-quarters of the respondents cited something other than skill training as their most important reason for joining the Army (W. Wilson, personal communication, September 26, 1995). In fact, almost identical proportions of those surveyed indicated that obtaining money for education (26.8%) and job training (26.7%), were their primary goals. In light of this, it is not surprising that in many cases skills learned while in the military are not applied upon return to the civilian world, given that the majority of recruits had little or no intention of doing so to begin with. For data on the application of military-learned skills in the private sector to be truly meaningful, therefore, it is necessary to examine the issue in terms of the goals the individuals had upon entering service.

Knowing what individuals hoped to get out of joining the Army when they entered also allows us to more accurately assess the value of serving as indicated by post-service experiences. While recognizing that values and goals change as one matures, insight can be gained into the "success" of Army service in helping to achieve individual aims by comparing stated goals upon entry with post-service status. For instance, one can look at the percentage of those who entered the military to obtain funds for education who subsequently used the benefits after serving.

A key source of the information discussed above is the ARI New Recruit Survey, which has been administered since 1982 to samples of individuals entering the Army. Although the exact content has varied over years/administrations (see Data Recognition Corporation, 1987), the survey provides a rich source of background, attitudinal, and perceptual data that, in conjunction with the results of the present survey, will provide real insight into many of the questions raised earlier. With this in mind, the sampling frame for this survey included individuals who took the NRS between the fiscal years 1982 and 1989, who completed one term of Regular Army service, and subsequently separated. The key areas addressed in the survey are experiences since leaving the Army, perceptions of the impact of having served, and evaluations of various in-service and transition factors.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Constructing the Sampling Frames

The veterans selected to take part in the AAS entered the Army in fiscal years 1982 through 1989. During this period, ARI and the U.S. Army Recruiting Command conducted the New Recruit Survey (NRS) to collect data on motivations for enlisting, type of enlistment program, and future plans, along with a range of related topics. Individuals who completed the NRS were included in the present sample with the aim of creating a longitudinal database containing information about respondents from two points in time. One difficulty with this approach was that the NRS samples were not drawn to be representative of all persons entering the Army in any given year. Because of restrictions on the availability of new recruits, a convenience sample was used. Therefore, if the AAS sampling frame was limited to NRS participants, the resulting data would not allow generalizations to all veterans who served during this period. For this reason, a dual sampling frame was utilized, with a portion of the sample selected to reflect the entire population of soldiers entering service from 1982-1989. Thus, there were two overlapping sampling frames: all 1982-1989 non-prior service (NPS) active Army accessions (the cross-sectional sample); and 1982-1989 NPS active Army accessions who completed the NRS upon entering (the longitudinal sample).

There were some restrictions that had to be satisfied before a sampling frame of individuals eligible to participate in the AAS could be derived. First, those who were still on active duty were eliminated. Because interest is in soldiers' *post-service* lives, those still in service were not included in the sampling frame. "Non-alumni" were identified by matching the SSNs of accessions during the 1982-1989 period with the latest cohort update.¹ When there was a match, that individual was dropped.

Those persons who failed to complete their first term were also not eligible for the AAS. In examining the effects of training, on-the-job learning, travel, post-service benefits

¹ The 1982-1994 Army cohort files provided the information needed to determine eligibility to participate in the AAS and thus to compile the sampling frames. The cohort file is a wide-ranging database, containing data on the following: background (gender, race); status at entry (term of enlistment); in-service variables (reenlistment eligibility), and; separation (date, number of terms).

and the like, the focus was limited to those who actually experienced the whole range of benefits and burdens of Army service. Since "attritees" do not fall into this category, they were not included in the sample. Non-completers were identified by examining Interservice Separation Codes (ISC). Those persons with an ISC indicating release from active service (ISC 1-8) were not considered attritees. These are nonpunative separations, primarily due to expiration of term of service. All other ISCs were classified as attrition, including dependency or hardship, failure to meet minimum behavioral and performance criteria, and medical disqualifications.

Because the interest was in the impact of serving one term in the Army, a final criterion for eligibility was that respondents served only a single tour of duty. This was determined from the cohort file by examining Date of Last Enlistment (DOLE). If the DOLE didn't match the accession date, then it was assumed that the individual reenlisted. There were cases, however, where a soldier reenlisted shortly after entering service so as to gain some advantage in terms of assignment or occupation. For instance, if a particular career field is unavailable at the time of initial enlistment but opens up shortly thereafter, the soldier may choose to reenlist so as to get that assignment. This was handled by discounting reenlistments when the DOLE was 12 months or less after the initial enlistment.

The algorithms described were applied to the relevant datafiles to determine eligibility to participate. These checks resulted in a cohort abstract file containing the names and social security numbers of 1982-1989 NPS, active duty accessions who completed one-term, separated from service, and were not on active duty status as of the 1994 cohort update. Additional relevant information from the cohort file was abstracted (Date of Birth, Date of Entry (DOE), Term of Enlistment (TOE), MOS, etc.) as required. This AAS-eligible file constituted the sampling frame for both the cross-sectional and longitudinal portion of the study. Table 1 presents the number of cases in the original and final sampling frames.

Table 1
Sampling Frame Size

Year	Original N	Army Non-prior Service	Final N
1982	127,984	118,202 (92.4%)	45,518 (35.6%)
1983	144,803	132,168 (91.3%)	53,149 (36.7%)
1984	142,609	131,937 (92.5%)	53,501 (37.5%)
1985	125,739	118,931 (94.6%)	46,493 (37.0%)
1986	135,639	126,998 (93.6%)	46,027 (33.9%)
1987	133,278	120,586 (90.5%)	44,009 (33.0%)
1988	115,054	102,846 (89.4%)	38,398 (33.4%)
1989	120,463	106,371 (88.3%)	36,378 (30.2%)
Total	1,045,569	958,039 (91.6%)	363,473 (34.8%)

As a final step in developing the sampling frames, the AAS-eligible file was matched with the NRS files. Cases found in both databases were flagged as belonging to the longitudinal sampling frame.² The final number of matches are shown in Table 2.³

² Note that the cohort and NRS file years do not strictly overlap. For instance, individuals who completed the NRS in the fall of 1985 would be considered FY86 accessions but FY85 NRS participants. Therefore, NRS matches were conducted with both the corresponding and following year's cohort files. This explains the relatively low match rate for 1989, where a sizeable number of NRS participants were actually 1990 accessions and thus not eligible for the AAS.

³ Note that when the stratification cell "membership" was determined for the eligible longitudinal and cross-sectional sample members, 7,157 and 156 cases respectively had to be dropped due to missing data on one or more of the stratification variables. Thus, the final sampling frames contained 355,692 (cross-sectional) and 23,951 (longitudinal) cases.

Table 2
Cohort/New Recruit Survey Match Results

Year	Total NRS Observations	Match with AAS-eligible file
1982	6,318	2,496 (39.5%)
1983	14,245	5,509 (38.7%)
1984	9,695	3,810 (39.9%)
1985	7,223	3,083 (42.7%)
1986	7,988	3,209 (40.2%)
1987	7,005	2,699 (38.5%)
1988	5,863	2,236 (38.1%)
1989	5,098	1,065 (20.8%)
Total	63,435	24,107 (38.0%)

Determining Sample Sizes

Service outcomes are likely to be affected by a variety of demographic, background, and experiential factors. Therefore, a sample stratified by gender, race/ethnicity (White, Black, Other), term of enlistment (two, three, four or more years), and Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) area (combat arms, combat support, and combat service support) was selected.

To design an efficient sampling plan, one must define unique strata and have population counts on each. If the 11 groups comprising the four subpopulation categories are crossed, 54 (2 x 3 x 3 x 3) unique strata are defined. The percentages in each stratum, shown in Appendix A, are based on total active Army accessions for FY 1982-1989.

To determine the minimum sample size for each of the 11 primary subpopulations, the following formula was applied⁴:

$$s = \chi^2 * N * P * (1-P) / (d^2 * (N-1)) + (\chi^2 * P * (1-P)) \quad (1)$$

⁴ Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.

where

s = required sample size

χ^2 = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (in this case .95 resulting in a value of 3.841).

N = the population size

P = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05).

This quantity represents the minimum number of *returned surveys* needed. To obtain the number in the mail-out sample, locating and response rates need to be taken into account. These were estimated to be 70 percent each.⁵ The resulting minimum mail-out and expected sample sizes for each primary subpopulation are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Sample Sizes Used in Designing Sampling Plan

Stratification Variable	Strata	Minimum Cell Sizes	Minimum Mailout Sizes*
TOE	2	349	712
	3	370	755
	4	368	751
Race/Ethnicity	White	376	767
	Black	351	716
	Other	292	596
MOS	Combat Arms	367	749
	Combat Support	369	753
	Combat Service Support	359	733
Gender	Male	377	769
	Female	317	647

* Assumes 70% location rate and 70% response rate.

⁵ It should be noted that the 70% location rate was based on the past experience of Equifax Government Systems who did the locating.

Our goal was to determine the minimum random sample that must be drawn from each of the 54 sampling strata that would achieve **at least** the minimum sample required for each primary cell. This was accomplished by calculating the expected number of respondents in each of the 54 cells if a simple random sample were drawn from each of the primary subpopulations that meet the minimum sample sizes shown in Table 3. This resulted in four non-zero numbers for each of the 54 cells. We then selected the maximum of the four as the minimum sample size for that cell.

As an example, the cell defined by Male, White, 2-year TOE, Combat Arms has a population of 1,439. This represents 16.7% of the population defined by Combat Arms. Proportional allocation of this cell to a minimum random sample from Combat Arms results in an expected sample size in this cell of 61. However, this same cell represents 37.9% of 2-year enlistees. In this case, proportional allocation results in an expected sample size of 132. Proportional allocation to males results in an expected sample of 25 and proportional allocation to Whites results in an expected sample of 29. Since the maximum of these calculations is 132, the sample size of this cell is set to 132. Overall, this strategy results in a total mailout sample requirement of 3,725. Due to concerns of representation in smaller cells, this number was increased to a final longitudinal sample size of 5,000.

The sample size for NRS respondents was used to determine the number of non-NRS alumni required to obtain results valid within 5 percent with 95 percent confidence for all veterans who served 1982-1989.

Let

N_{1k} = total size of NRS frame from domain k.

and

N_{2k} = total size of non-NRS frame for domain k.

then

$$\sigma_k = \frac{N_{1k}}{(N_{1k} + N_{2k})}$$

Let

n_{1k} = size of sample of domain K personnel from NRS frame.

and

n_{2k} = size of sample of domain K personnel from non-NRS frame.

Thus

$n_k = n_{1k} + n_{2k}$ = total sample for domain K estimate.

With the original 54 cells, we calculated that n_{1k} would need to be about 400 to achieve inferences valid to within 5 percent with 95 percent confidence. With an additional stratification variable (NRS, non-NRS), to achieve this same level of precision for all alumni domain K, samples sizes n_{1k} and n_{2k} , and σ_k must be related by the equation:

$$n_{2k} = \frac{400 (1 - \sigma_k)^2 n_{1k}}{n_{1k} - 400 \sigma_k^2}$$

Thus, if $n_{1k} = 400$, and $\sigma_k = .1$, (roughly the proportion of NRS alumni to non-NRS alumni) $n_{2k} = 327$.

Note that the sample from each frame is stratified by the 54 cells (gender (2) x race/ethnicity (3) x term of enlistment (3) x MOS (3)). If P_{1k} and P_{2k} are the estimated proportions for domain k in each frame, then:

$$P_k = \sigma_k P_{1k} + (1 - \sigma_k) P_{2k}$$

is the estimate for the domain k in the entire population.

Thus our estimate for the size of the non-NRS sample was about 80 percent of that from the NRS, or approximately 4,000. The total combined mail-out sample was then 9,000, which given our .70 find and .70 response rate assumptions would yield around 4,400 completed surveys.

Drawing the Samples

The steps in drawing the samples were as follows:

- Develop algorithms to identify attritees, reenlistees, and current active duty and active reserve personnel, as described above.
- Apply these algorithms and create an AAS eligible abstract file (from the cohort database).
- Match the AAS eligible file with the NRS files and either delete matches from the former or flag them (in the AAS eligible file) as NRS participants.
- Perform crosstabulations on both samples to determine proportions in the 54 cells (gender (2) x ethnicity (3) x TOE (3) x MOS (3)).
- Using the above data, determine cell sample sizes within each sampling frame.
- Randomly select, within each cell, the predetermined number of cases.
- Prepare a printout of identifying information (SSN, DOB, any address information) for each individual selected.

Using this procedure, a total of 4,998 observations were selected for the longitudinal sample and 3,998 for the cross-sectional. These numbers differ from the target of 5,000 and 4,000 due to a rounding function in the random selection program. Note that 62 cases appeared in both the longitudinal and cross-sectional samples. The decision was made to maintain these individuals in both files for analytic purposes, but include them only once in the sample file for which location efforts would be undertaken. Thus, the final "search" N was 8,934.

Survey Development

To develop the AAS instrument, previous surveys of veterans were first reviewed to obtain a broad sample of items that might be relevant to the present effort. The specific instruments included in this process are shown in Table 4. The nearly 200 questions identified through this process were first reviewed for redundancy. Through conversations with the COR and other interested parties, additional items were eliminated, including those that sought information that could be obtained from other sources (e.g., automated military personnel databases). Finally, new items were generated and revised to address areas not

Table 4
Index of Surveys Reviewed

The 1985 Army Experience Survey
New Recruit Surveys
The 1990 ARI Survey of Employers
Veterans Attitude Tracking Study -- 1983
U.S. Army Survey of Nurses and Nursing Students
1991/1992 Survey of Total Army Military Personnel (STAMP)
STAMP Form E for Active Duty Enlisted Personnel
STAMP Form F for Active Duty Officers
STAMP Form G for Enlisted Personnel in the Reserve Components
STAMP Form H for Officers in the Reserve Components
STAMP Form I for Members of the Inactive Reserve
STAMP The Army Nursing Corps supplement
Sample Survey of Military Personnel -- 1991
Veterans' Life Experiences Study
The National Longitudinal Surveys
Survey of Participants and Inactive/Former Participants in the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program
(ACAP) Soldier Exit and Follow-up Surveys.

covered in previous instruments. After several iterations, a final pretest version of the survey was compiled.

Two pretests of the draft AAS instrument were conducted involving a sample of nine Army veterans from the Ft. Knox, KY area and five social scientists (HumRRO employees not previously involved with the project). The major change suggested by the results of the pretests was to restructure items concerning employment history to account for those veterans who entered school immediately upon exiting the Army and therefore have not held a job since that time. Other wording changes and the addition of response options were also incorporated for the purpose of increasing the clarity and comprehensiveness of the questions. The final survey instrument is shown in Appendix B. It addresses the following topics:

- Army service, including plans upon entering, tenure, rank upon separation, Military Occupational Specialty (MOS), reason for leaving;
- The use of veterans' benefits, such as the Montgomery GI Bill, the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program, or VA benefits;
- The types of job search strategies used by veterans upon leaving the military and the length of time to get a job;
- Perceptions of the impact of veteran status, if any, on the attitudes of potential employers;
- Post-service employment histories (e.g., number and type of jobs held, periods out of work, promotion history);
- The extent to which skills gained while in the military transferred to civilian employment;
- Indicators of successful/unsuccessful adjustment, possibly including income, familial stability, type of occupation, and self-ratings of achievement and satisfaction;
- Reserve/Guard consideration and/or participation, and perceptions of employers' attitudes towards this activity;
- Attitudes about the future (e.g., perception of future promotion opportunities, degree of optimism);

- Open-ended items concerning overall impact of having served in the Army and problems encountered in making the military-civilian transition.

Obtaining Clearances

All surveys being administered to the public-at-large by a government agency must first be approved by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12291 and/or the 5 CFR, 1320.13 (The Paperwork Reduction Act). A request for such approval was completed for the AAS in early May of 1993. After subsequent review within DoD, it was revised and submitted to OMB in August of the same year. This request included the following elements:

Standard Form 83

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explanation of the circumstances which make data collection necessary
2. Use to be made of the data
3. Consideration of the use of improved information technology to reduce response burden
4. Efforts to identify duplication
5. Explanation of why similar information already available cannot be used
6. Minimization of impact on small business
7. Consequences of less frequent collection
8. Compliance with 5 CFR 1320
9. List of outside consultations
10. Measures taken to ensure confidentiality
11. Nature of sensitive questions
12. Cost to the Federal Government and to respondents
13. Estimate of burden on respondents
14. Changes in burden for longitudinal instruments
15. Plans for tabulating and publication

B. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Respondent universe and sampling
2. Description of procedures for the collection of information
3. Methods employed to maximize response rates
4. Tests to be undertaken
5. Statistical consultants employed

In addition to the OMB requirement, ARI has an internal Human Use Committee (HUC) that must approve all data collection efforts conducted or funded by ARI that involve human subjects. An authorization statement was developed for the committee and submitted in late May 1993. It contained the following elements (as outlined in ARI Supplement 1 to Army Regulation 70-25).

1. Technical Area/Field Unit/Office Responsible
2. Project title
3. Principal Investigator, Other Investigators
4. Location(s) of research
5. Month/year of expected start and stop dates
6. Synopsis of research
 - a. Objective
 - b. Military relevance/benefits
 - c. Design methodology/measures
 - d. How subjects will be involved
7. Human subjects involved
 - a. Subject population
 - b. Expected number of subjects/minimum needed
 - c. Approximate age range
 - d. Criteria for inclusion/exclusion in the research
 - e. Sex of subjects
 - f. How subjects will be obtained
 - g. Whether/how subjects will be identified
 - h. How informed consent will be obtained
 - i. How privacy/confidentiality will be maintained
 - j. Analysis of the risks/benefits to subjects
 - k. Precautions to minimize/eliminate risks
 - l. Follow-up procedures, if any

Draft versions of the AAS instrument were included in both the OMB and ARI review packages. Due to a glitch in the review process, OMB approval was not obtained until March of 1994.

Sample Location

The sample location process was conducted in a series of stages. The first of these involved submitting a tape containing 8,934 sample member SSNs to Equifax Government Systems. They first checked this information with Social Security Administration files and determined that all of the SSNs were valid. A match was then conducted between the validated SSNs and Equifax's nationwide death file. The Death File is the largest of its kind

and contains over 40 million records for deceased individuals. In all, 48 persons selected to participate in the AAS were identified as deceased. The date of death and the state where it was recorded were extracted and combined with the information from the NRS and DMDC Loss files so that a complete record of all searches could be maintained. Equifax then eliminated these cases from the list of names to be searched.

An updated sample tape containing 8,886 was then delivered to the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) for the purpose of obtaining last address information for each of the AAS participants. They were asked to perform a match of the sample with the Prior-Service Military Address File (PSMAF), which contains information on all individuals who separated from service since the beginning of FY1983. Further, they were asked to perform an additional match for cases not located in the first step using the VA DD 214 file, which contains information on military personnel separating since January 1971. This information includes SSN, branch of Service, and address.

Of the 8,886 cases sent to DMDC, 99 were returned with no address information at all, while an additional 51 could not even be matched by SSN. Given questions raised about the viability of these latter 51 cases, they were deleted from the sample, yielding a new "search" N of 8,835 cases.

The next step in the location process involved Equifax matching the DMDC-provided addresses against the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) National Change of Address (NCOA) file. The USPS has selected Equifax to act as a licensee in connection with the National Change of Address System. Accordingly, USPS refers all address changes to Equifax. Via an inter-company exchange, Equifax loads these changes into its appropriate files. The NCOA file contains approximately 45 million names and addresses. The match with the AAS sample file yielded 1,180 matches, 1,083 of which provided new address information.⁶

Equifax proceeded with "hand searches" on all cases for which updated location data had not been achieved. This process involves a variety of sources, relying heavily on telephone directories, leads from related sources, and the like. In all, an additional 7,633

⁶ Some individuals apparently notify the USPS that they are moving without providing a new forwarding address.

addresses were developed through these means, resulting in a total of 8,716 cases with updated addresses. This amounts to a location rate of 98%. Table 5 summarizes the sample location rate outcomes.

Table 5
AAS Sample Location Disposition

Initial N	8,996
Duplicates (longitudinal/cross sectional)	62
Search N	8,934
Deceased	48
Sent to DMDC	8886
No address	99
No SSN match	51
Sent for NCOA	8835
New Address--NCOA	1,083
New Address--Hand Search	7,633
New Address--Total	8,716 (98%)

Survey Distribution

Address information was received from Equifax in batches, beginning in February, 1995. As each batch was received, advance letters were sent to sample members. The letter, contained in Appendix B, indicated that the recipient had been selected at random to participate in the AAS, and explained the purpose of the effort. The importance of the project was stressed, as well as the unique position of each sample member to provide feedback on their Army experience and its outcomes. They were asked to complete a postcard that was included with the letter. Doing so required that they indicate their willingness to participate, update their address information, and check a box if they wished to receive a summary of the results. As the postcards were returned, the survey distribution database was updated. There were seven possible dispositions at this point:

- Letter returned by post office with new address information
- Letter returned by post office without new address information

- Postcard returned by respondent, address verified, respondent willing to participate
- Postcard returned by respondent, address corrected, respondent willing to participate
- Postcard returned by respondent, address verified, respondent unwilling to participate
- Postcard returned by respondent, address corrected, respondent unwilling to participate
- Postcard not returned

The survey distribution database was updated to reflect these outcomes. New address information was entered for respondents as needed.

Approximately one month after the distribution of the last advance letters, the questionnaires were sent out (late May 1995). Each package contained a cover letter reiterating the purpose and importance of the survey, the instrument itself, and a postage paid return envelope. Surveys were sent to all sample members *except* those who said they did not wish to participate and those whose advance letters were returned by the post office as undeliverable.

Approximately one month after the surveys were distributed, a reminder letter was sent to all who had been sent a copy of the AAS (late June 1995). The letter thanked those who had already completed and returned the survey, and reminded those who had not of the importance of doing so. A toll-free number was included to allow individuals to ask questions about the project or request an additional copy of the survey if the first one was lost.⁷

Table 6 presents final survey distribution outcomes. Assuming that mail was returned for all respondents for whom the address found was *not* valid, the results indicate that 77% of the sample had good addresses (n = 6,845). Only 27.7% (n = 1,898) of the sample

⁷ In all, 47 calls were made to the toll-free number. Of these, 36 requested new copies of the survey instrument, seven indicated that the respondent could not or would not participate, and four individuals called with other inquiries.

Table 6
AAS Disposition

Frequency Column % Row % Overall %	Postcard Returned						Postcard not Returned		Total
	Agree to Participate	Declines	Agrees to Participate	Declines	Survey Not Returned		Survey Returned	Survey not returned	
					Survey Not Returned				
					Survey Not Returned				
Address Good	734	3	456	95	758	4799	6845		
	69.5	50.0	63.9	77.9	97.3	77.3	77.0		
	10.7	0.0	6.7	1.4	11.1	70.1	100.0		
	8.3	0.0	5.1	1.1	8.5	54.0			
Address Updated	315	3	251	27	0	1	597		
	29.8	50.0	35.1	22.1	0.0	0.0	6.7		
	52.8	0.0	42.0	4.5	0.0	0.2	100.0		
	3.5	0.0	2.8	0.3	0.0	0.0			
Address Bad	7	0	7	0	21*	1411	1446		
	0.7	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.7	22.7	16.3		
	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	97.6	100.0		
	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	15.9			
Total	1056	6	714	122	779	6211	8888		
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	11.9	.1	8.0	1.4	8.8	69.88			

* In some cases, addresses were coded as bad based on return of the advance letter. This occurred before the information could be updated on the survey distribution database, and surveys were mailed. Somehow the survey was delivered even though the advance letter could not be.

members whose advance letter was not returned as undeliverable sent back the postcard that was included with the advance letter. Of these, 93% agreed to participate, although 38% of these individuals did not actually return the survey. When the bad addresses ($n = 2,043$) and those who declined to participate ($n = 128$) are eliminated from the overall count, a response rate of 27.4% ($1,841/6,717$) results. Why the response rate was so low is obviously a matter of speculation. One possible factor is the amount of time that passed since sample members separated--as long as 11 years. As ties to an organization age, the sense of responsibility to that organization is likely to fade, reducing the willingness to comply with requests they may make. Whatever the exact cause, it is apparent that future efforts of this type need not only invest the required funds to locate sample members, but they must also involve extensive follow-ups to ensure an adequate response rate. Evidence from this experience would suggest that simply doing more mailings may not have much effect; telephone or other more personal contact may be required.

Tables 7 and 8 provide a comparison of the longitudinal and cross-sectional respondents and samples (drawn to reflect the populations) in terms of the stratification variables (Gender, MOS, TOE, and Race/Ethnicity). Generally, the respondents to the AAS mirror the samples from which they were drawn in terms of the stratification variables. The major deviation appears in the race/ethnicity category, where blacks are underrepresented, and whites are overrepresented. The deviations from the sample/population required that weights be derived so that, when applied, such variations would be minimized. Therefore, using Iterative Proportional Fitting (IPF), the sample was redistributed so that the marginals of the distribution corresponded exactly to the population. Two different sets of weights were derived, one for the longitudinal and the other for the cross-sectional samples. Note that one major advantage to IPF is that it minimizes changes to the sample (using a Chi-Square criterion) which means that the weights themselves are also minimized. When analyses are conducted with the goal of generalizing these populations, the weights should be employed.

Table 7
Comparison of Longitudinal Sample and Returns

	Sample %	Return %		Sample %	Return %
Males	92.2	90.7	White	77.1	85.8
Females	7.8	9.3	Black	17.7	9.0
			Other	5.2	5.1
2-year	15.8	17.5	Combat	35.9	34.9
3-year	46.3	44.8	Combat Support	39.9	39.4
4-year	37.9	37.7	Combat Service Support	24.3	25.7

Table 8
Comparison of Cross-Sectional Sample and Returns

	Sample %	Return %		Sample %	Return %
Males	90.5	87.7	White	76.3	87.7
Females	9.4	12.3	Black	18.3	7.9
			Other	5.4	4.4
2-year	14.0	15.3	Combat	34.2	32.3
3-year	47.8	47.6	Combat Support	41.4	42.2
4-year	38.2	37.1	Combat Service Support	24.4	25.5

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

A primary focus of the Army Alumni Survey was attempting to assess the impact of having served in the Army on subsequent career and personal achievement and satisfaction. The results presented below provide both "objective" evidence in this regard in the form of employment and income data, as well as subjective opinions regarding the contribution of Army service to the realization of career and personal goals as stated by the veterans themselves. The data are summarized separately for the longitudinal and cross-sectional samples, and are weighted in all cases. Where fitting, quotations are included from open-ended items included in the survey to give a more in-depth perspective on the aggregated results.

Overall Assessment of Career Success and Army Impact

AAS respondents were asked to provide a general assessment of how successful they have been in their current civilian career. These results are summarized in Table 9. Over half of both samples judge themselves to have been successful in their jobs, with one fifth of each rating themselves very successful. After making this assessment, AAS participants were asked to judge how much of an impact being in the Army had on these outcomes. Tables 10 and 11 present these results by sample and success categories.

Of the few respondents who judged themselves as unsuccessful in their careers, even fewer attributed this outcome to the Army to any degree. On the other hand, a vast majority of the "successful" respondents in both the cross-sectional (83%) and longitudinal (87%) samples attributed at least some of their success to having served, with about 10% of each giving the Army a great deal of credit. Similar attributions were made by those who judged their careers to be very successful, however higher percentages felt that their Army experience had a great deal to do with this outcome.

Table 9
Assessment of Career Success by Sample

Sample	Count Percent	Very Successful	Successful	Neither Successful or Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful ¹
Cross-sectional (n = 773)		172 22.3	434 56.1	152 19.7	15 1.9
Longitudinal (n = 944)		206 21.8	534 56.6	180 19.1	24 2.5

¹ The "unsuccessful" and "very unsuccessful" categories were combined due to small cell sizes.

Table 10
Attributions of Army Impact on Career Outcomes
Cross-sectional Sample

Level of Career Success	Army Impact					
Count Row % Column %	None	Very Little	Some	A Substantial Amount	A Great Deal	Total
Unsuccessful	3 22.6 5.7	7 46.0 6.7	3 22.1 1.2	2 11.1 0.8	0 0.0 0.0	15 2.0
Neither	23 15.7 39.4	28 19.1 27.4	70 47.3 24.7	21 13.9 9.3	6 3.8 5.3	148 19.1
Successful	23 5.4 39.5	52 12.0 50.5	167 38.4 59.0	149 34.3 67.6	44 10.1 41.7	435 56.5
Very Successful	9 5.2 15.0	16 9.3 15.5	43 24.9 15.2	49 28.4 22.1	56 32.5 53.2	172 22.4
Total	59 0.1	103 13.4	283 36.7	221 28.7	105 13.6	771

Table 11
 Attributions of Army Impact on Career Outcomes
 Longitudinal Sample

Level of Career Success	Army Impact					
Count Row % Column %	None	Very Little	Some	A Substantial Amount	A Great Deal	Total
Unsuccessful	9 38.7 11.8	4 16.2 3.4	4 17.1 1.2	4 15.7 1.4	3 11.0 2.0	24 2.5
Neither	39 21.9 48.8	40 22.5 35.0	70 39.6 20.4	22 12.6 8.2	6 3.5 4.6	176 18.8
Successful	23 4.3 29.1	48 9.1 42.8	214 40.2 62.6	180 33.8 66.6	67 12.6 49.7	532 56.7
Very Successful	8 4.1 10.6	21 10.1 18.4	54 26.1 15.7	65 31.3 23.9	59 28.6 43.7	2.6 22.0
Total	79 8.4	113 12.0	342 36.5	270 28.8	135 14.4	938

AAS respondents were asked to provide written input regarding how they felt serving in the Army hurt or helped them in terms of their civilian careers. Approximately 75% of the each of the samples complied with this request. Content analysis of these responses was conducted. The resulting categories are presented in Appendix C. Table 12 shows those categories in which two percent or more of the responses were classified in either of the samples.

Table 12
Impact of Army Service on Career
Open-Ended Responses

Response	Cross-Sectional		Longitudinal	
	n	% of responses	n	% of responses
Discipline	126	10.0	153	9.4
Leadership	87	6.9	125	7.7
Teamwork	80	6.3	118	7.2
Self-Confidence	75	5.9	106	6.5
Work Ethic	60	4.8	56	3.4
Maturity	55	4.3	82	5.0
Skills Training	54	4.3	62	3.8
Led to Jobs	48	3.8	61	3.7
Jobs Easier to Get	43	3.4	67	4.1
Responsibility	40	3.2	67	4.1
Respect	37	2.9	42	2.6
More Motivated	28	2.2	36	2.2
Punctuality	25	2.0	27	1.7
Attention to Detail	24	1.9	33	2.0
No Effect	47	3.7	61	3.7

The two samples closely mirrored one another in regard to traits or characteristics mentioned as being inculcated while in the Army and of value after leaving service. Together, discipline, leadership, ability to work as part of a team, and self-confidence accounted for approximately 30% of the responses given by members of each sample. Overall, the answers shown in Table 12 account for about two-thirds of all responses given, indicating that there was a fair degree of agreement among those who chose to write in their thoughts in this regard.

Male, 2-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1987 at the age of 22

I had clear goals that I wanted to complete upon leaving the Army. Primarily, I wanted to obtain my college degree and pursue a career. I have been successful in college and financed my education from Army College Fund - GI Bill. Now I am happy and successful in my career and owe much of my success to my Army experience.

Female, 4-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered 1987 when 22 years old

If you utilize self discipline, leadership skills, and drive that you acquire during your service you can accomplish anything. I never thought I could rappel from a helicopter, but I did. I also never thought I would earn a Master's Degree, but I am. The same determination that makes you finish every road march without giving up can take you through each and every goal you set in your civilian life.

Objective Evidence Regarding Career Success

Although no control group of non-veterans was surveyed for this project, some broad indications regarding the nature of the post-service lives of these alumni can be obtained by examining data concerning employment status, income, and their evaluations of how their income compares to what they would be making if they remained in the Army. As indicated in Table 13, the vast majority of respondents in both samples were employed full-time at the time they completed the AAS. Approximately nine percent of the cross-sectional and seven percent of the longitudinal samples indicated that they were unemployed or underemployed (e.g., part-time) and looking for full-time work. The six and four percent, respectively, who were completely without jobs compares favorably with national unemployment rates which have hovered between six and seven percent over the past several years.

Table 13
Employment Status of Army Veterans

Current employment status	Count Column %	Cross-sectional Sample	Longitudinal Sample
Employed full-time		675 82.4	856 85.2
Not employed, looking		47 5.7	40 4.0
Employed part-time, not looking for full-time		38 4.6	38 3.8
Not employed, not looking		31 3.8	37 3.7
Employed part-time, looking for full-time		28 3.4	34 3.4
Total		819 100.0	1005 100.0

Personal and family income data are presented for the cross-sectional sample in Table 14 and for the longitudinal in Table 15. Some 47% of the cross-sectional sample and 40% of the longitudinal reported 1993 personal incomes of under \$20,000, which was about the national average for that year (U.S Bureau of the Census, 1994). In terms of household income, 51% of the cross-sectional and 47% of the longitudinal samples reported combined incomes of under \$30,000, which was the median family income in 1992 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1994). Thus, at least as indicated by these gross comparisons, these veterans appear to be fairly typical of Americans nationwide in regard to personal and household earnings.

Table 14
Individual and Family Income, 1993
Cross-sectional Sample

Current Income	Count Column %	Personal (n = 816)	Family (n = 801)
0-4,999		43 5.3	17 2.1
5,000-9,999		80 9.8	43 5.4
10,000-14,999		122 14.9	87 10.9
15,000-19,999		141 17.3	82 10.2
20,000-24,999		145 17.8	101 12.6
25,000-29,999		97 11.9	76 9.5
30,000-34,999		71 8.7	82 10.2
35,000-39,999		51 6.2	68 8.5
40,000-44,999		34 4.2	60 7.5
45,000-49,999		13 1.6	42 5.2
50,000-54,999		10 1.2	40 5.0
55,000-59,999		1 0.1	11 1.4
60,000-64,999		5 0.6	29 3.6
65,000-69,999		2 0.2	20 2.5
70,000 or >		1 0.1	43 5.4

Table 15
Individual and Family Income, 1993
Longitudinal Sample

Current Income	Count Column %	Personal (n = 991)	Family (n = 983)
0-4,999		52 5.2	26 2.6
5,000-9,999		86 8.7	51 5.2
10,000-14,999		122 12.3	66 6.7
15,000-19,999		138 13.9	96 9.8
20,000-24,999		189 19.1	129 13.1
25,000-29,999		139 14.0	91 9.3
30,000-34,999		89 9.0	101 10.3
35,000-39,999		89 9.0	85 8.6
40,000-44,999		32 3.2	79 8.0
45,000-49,999		16 1.6	55 5.6
50,000-54,999		22 2.2	79 8.0
55,000-59,999		4 0.4	26 2.6
60,000-64,999		5 0.5	39 4.0
65,000-69,999		4 0.4	17 1.7
70,000 or >		4 0.4	43 4.4

Perhaps more important than absolute dollars, however, is the degree of satisfaction with the amount of money that is available for the support of oneself and one's family. As indicated in Table 16, about one-fifth of each sample indicated that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied in this regard, and 15-16% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This means that over sixty percent of each group was at least somewhat satisfied with their ability to support themselves and their families since leaving service.

Given that most of the respondents are satisfied with their earnings, the question remains as to whether they feel their Army service had an impact in this regard. As can be seen in Table 17, about 47% of both samples felt that having served in the Army had little impact on their subsequent incomes. Of the remainder, a somewhat higher proportion felt it enhanced their earning potential (30%) than felt that it hurt (22%).

Table 16
Satisfaction with Ability to Make Ends Meet Since Leaving Service
Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Samples

Count Row %	N	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Cross- sectional	825	144 17.4	364 44.1	171 20.7	98 11.9	48 5.8
Longitudinal	1008	223 22.1	414 41.1	210 20.8	114 11.3	47 4.7

Table 17
Perceived Impact of Army Service on Civilian Earnings
Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Samples

Count Row %	N	Much Less if Never In	Somewhat Less if Never In	About the Same if Never In	Somewhat More if Never In	Much More if Never In
Cross- sectional	775	64 8.3	172 22.2	370 47.7	113 14.6	56 7.2
Longitudinal	962	104 10.8	186 19.3	457 47.5	150 15.6	65 6.8

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Service Support MOS, Entered in 1984 at 22 years of age
In my civilian job I earn decent money. But, there is no comparison to the military. In military life not having to pay insurance and medical bills far outweighs having to in civilian life.

Male, 2-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1984 at the age of 21
I was lucky, my former employer offered me a job, with retroactive raises to a salary similar to what I would have received if I had not left to enter the Army.

Impact of Army Training on Civilian Career

One avenue by which Army service can have an impact on one's subsequent civilian life is through skills training. To the extent that individuals learn and apply specific job skills while in service, this may enhance their ability to obtain and be successful in a job after leaving the Army. The AAS contained several questions related to this factor.

As mentioned previously, the application of Army-gained job skills in civilian life must be viewed in conjunction with the goals each individual had upon entering the service. Someone who is primarily interested in education funding, for instance, may have little or no desire to obtain skills while serving that can be applied back in the civilian world. Therefore, Tables 18 and 19 present the results of an item asking how frequently skills obtained while in Service have been applied in a civilian context since separation in conjunction with an assessment of the importance of obtaining job skills in making the decision to enlist.

Table 18
Job Skills as Motivation to Enlist and as Used in Civilian Life
Cross-sectional Sample

Frequency of Use	Count Row % Column %	Importance		Total
		Not Important	Important	
Never/Seldom		84	176	259
		32.3	67.9	34.2
		39.6	32.1	
Now and Then		69	172	241
		28.6	71.2	31.7
		32.7	31.3	
Frequently/Always		58	201	259
		22.4	77.5	34.1
		27.5	36.6	
Total		211	548	759
		27.7	72.2	

Table 19
Job Skills as Motivation to Enlist and as Used in Civilian Life
Longitudinal Sample

Frequency of Use	Count Row % Column %	Importance		Total
		Not Important	Important	
Never/Seldom		129	194	323
		40.0	60.1	34.9
		45.0	30.3	
Now and Then		88	211	299
		28.6	71.2	32.3
		30.7	33.0	
Frequently/Always		70	234	304
		22.4	77.5	32.8
		24.3	36.6	
Total		287	640	927
		31.0	69.0	

As can be seen from the row totals, roughly one-third of each sample fell into each of the frequency of use categories (never/seldom, now and then, frequently/always). Further, two-thirds to three-quarters of each usage group indicated that obtaining job skills was an important motivation to enlist. In both samples, a higher percentage of those who say they use their Army skills regularly rated the obtaining of such skills as an important reason to enlist to begin with than did those who seldom apply service-gained skills (77% vs. 68% in the cross-sectional sample, 77% vs. 60% in the longitudinal). Of course, it is possible that the retrospective ratings of the importance of various motivators to enlist was affected by intervening events. That is, those who currently find themselves applying their Army-gained skills in their work now see them as important reasons for enlisting, whether or not this was true at the time they joined. This hypothesis can be checked with the longitudinal sample, inasmuch as the NRS data include similar motivation-importance ratings made at the time of entry into service.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1981 at the age of 21

I was an out-of-shape college student who needed to grow and get fit in order to obtain my planned career. The Army put me in shape, gave me discipline, taught me respect, and helped me mature. The specific job I had while in the Army had nothing to do with my planned career, but the discipline, confidence, and maturity I received provided me the tools to obtain my career as a police officer.

Male, 2-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1982 at the age of 20

A secondary MOS should be mandated for those MOSs which do not have a civilian counterpart. An example is a tank driver or infantry person. I imagine it is quite a hopeless feeling to leave the military after 3, 4, or more years and only have expert skills in a field that is of little or no use as a civilian. This also would bring diversity to a leaner force.

Another possible influence that Army service can have is opening potential employers' doors. Previous research has indicated that employers perceive veterans as having desirable qualities such as dependability and punctuality (Schroyer, et al., 1990). It is possible, therefore, that being able to identify oneself as a veteran provides an advantage while seeking employment. AAS participants were asked how often they mention this fact when talking to a prospective employers. They were also asked to indicate what the typical reaction is to this news. These data are summarized in Tables 20 and 21.

Table 20
Frequency of Mentioning Veteran Status to Employers
by Employers Reactions
Cross-sectional Sample

		Employers' Reactions			
Frequency mention	Count Row % Column %	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Total
Rarely/Never		2	27	13	42
		3.6	65.4	32.1	5.4
		16.7	14.8	2.3	
Sometimes		0	24	34	58
		0.0	7.9	58.1	7.4
		0.0	12.9	5.7	
Usually/Always		7	134	542	684
		1.1	19.6	79.2	87.2
		82.2	72.2	92.0	
Total		9	186	589	784
		1.1	23.7	75.1	

Table 21
Frequency of Mentioning Veteran Status to Employers
by Employers Reactions
Longitudinal Sample

Frequency mention	Count Row % Column %	Employers' Reactions			
		Negative	Neutral	Positive	Total
Rarely/Never	3 9.1 19.4	19 59.9 7.7	10 30.8 1.4	32 3.3	
Sometimes	0 0.5 2.1	38 55.7 15.1	29 43.2 4.2	68 7.1	
Usually/Always	12 1.4 81.4	193 22.5 77.1	652 76.1 94.4	857 89.6	
Total	15 1.6	250 26.1	691 72.3	956	

The vast majority of respondents in both samples (79% of the cross-sectional and 76% of the longitudinal) indicated that they usually or always tell employers that they are veterans, and that the reaction to this news is generally positive. The bulk of the remaining respondents also said that they usually or always mention their military service, but they classify the reaction as being neutral (20% of the cross-sectional, 22% of the longitudinal).

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1982 at the age of 20
I have found that when interviewing for jobs, whatever they are, employers appreciate and *respect* the fact that I served in the military. They immediately assume that the individual who has an honorable discharge is mature, responsible and worthy of trust.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1983 at the age of 22
It has opened many doors in my career.

Female, 4-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1983 at the age of 19
I am proud to have served, and overall it was a good experience. It also helped me to get the money to go to college. But I do not feel that it made a significant difference in my ability to become employable in civilian life. I've found, that for the most part, employers are just not impressed, and the training I received was just not sufficient.

Female, 3-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1984 at the age of 19
All the training that you receive for a skill or career in the Army doesn't mean much to the employers in civilian life. The certificates you receive for completing your training don't mean a thing in civilian life. Most employers will hire you for your dependability.

Female, 3-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1983 at the age of 26
I found that after serving in the Army, many businesses would hire me based on the fact that I had a military background.

To summarize, about one-third of AAS respondents indicated that they have used their Army-obtained job skills frequently in their civilian careers, with a somewhat higher percentage of this group indicating that such skills were an important reason for enlisting. These veterans also cite their Army service when talking to potential employers, and the majority feel that the reaction they receive is a positive one.

Impact of Educational Benefits

Another highly tangible benefit that can be gained from Army service is the amassing of money to be used after separation to further one's education. During the period when AAS respondents served, two education incentive packages were in effect. The first, the Veterans Education Assistance Program (VEAP), was initiated in 1977. It required

participants to contribute to the program, and such contributions were matched two-for-one. The Army College Fund was instituted as an additional incentive, allowing individuals to obtain up to an additional \$12,000 for their subsequent education. VEAP was abandoned in 1984 in favor of the more generous Montgomery GI Bill.

As with skill training, the use of educational benefits post-service must be examined in conjunction with the intentions of individuals upon entering service. Many may have no interest in continuing their educations, in which case a failure to do so is not an indictment of the effectiveness of the program overall. Tables 22 and 23 present data showing whether or not educational benefits were used after leaving the Army in conjunction with ratings of the importance of such benefits in making the decision to enlist.

Table 22
Use and Importance of Educational Benefits
Cross-sectional Sample

Use of benefits	Count Row % Column %	Ed benefits important reason for joining	Ed benefits unimportant reason for joining	Total
Didn't use benefits	172	185	357	
	48.1	51.9	44.0	
	29.7	79.2		
Did use benefits	406	48	454	
	89.4	10.6	56.0	
	70.2	20.6		
	578	234	811	
	71.2	28.8	100	

Table 23
Use and Importance of Educational Benefits
Longitudinal Sample

Use of benefits	Count Row % Column %	Ed benefits important reason for joining	Ed benefits unimportant reason for joining	Total
Didn't use benefits	206	240	773	
	46.2	53.8	42.9	
	29.3	82.9		
Did use benefits	498	49	1030	
	91.0	9.0	57.1	
	70.8	17.0		
	703	289	1803	
	70.9	29.1	100	

Overall, 56% of the cross-sectional and 57% of the longitudinal samples used educational benefits after separation. As might be expected, among those who felt such benefits were an unimportant reason for enlisting, a relatively small proportion (around one-fifth) went on to use them. However, nearly 30% of those who said such benefits *were* important never took advantage of them. It appears that intention to use money for college is an almost necessary, but not sufficient determinant of their actually being exploited.

AAS respondents who used Army-provided educational benefits were asked to indicate how important a determinant they were in their actually attending school. These results are summarized in Table 24, and clearly demonstrate the importance of service-gained education benefits in allowing these respondents to achieve their goals of going to college or some other institution of advanced education. Approximately 46% of both samples said that without the funds earned through their Army service they would not have been able to attend school following separation, while about 30% said that such attendance would have been questionable unless these funds were available.

Table 24
Importance of Educational Benefits in Deciding to Return to School

Importance of education benefits	Count Column Percent	Cross-sectional Sample	Longitudinal Sample
Very Important, wouldn't have gone otherwise		243 46.1	301 45.5
Somewhat Important, may not have gone otherwise		168 31.9	191 28.9
Not Important, would have gone without them		116 22.0	170 25.7
Total		527	662

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1986 at the age of 18
The GI Bill and Army College Fund was a HUGE help in civilian life. I would not have attended college if it weren't for the benefits.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Support, Entered in 1986 at the age of 29
I went in initially for the money (for the most part) but came out with an attitude about myself which will help me in all ways for the rest of my life.

Male, 4-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1982 at the age of 20
My worst regret was not taking advantage of Army college fund programs. College is important to employers and I am now realizing that I'm going to have to scramble to catch up with others in my career in that area.

To summarize, 70% of those who considered educational benefits an important reason for entering the Army ended up taking advantage of them after completing their term, with over 70% of those who did use them indicating that their ability to return to school would have been compromised to at least some degree had such funds not been available.

Impact on Personal Development

Most recruits enter the Army shortly after completing high school, and well before any "real world" experience has been gained as an independent adult operating in the civilian world of work. For many, this experience represents their first time away from the stability and nurturance provided by families and thus the first time they have had to make independent decisions regarding financial and other matters. This fact, along with the rigors associated with Army training and job performance, leads to the expectation that a certain amount of personal growth would result in areas that could have an impact on one's performance in the world of work following completion of one's term. AAS respondents were asked about this in a series of questions that listed work-related characteristics, and asked if these were affected by having been in the Army (positively, negatively, not affected), and whether this hurt, helped or had no impact on their careers. These results are presented in Table 25 for the cross-sectional sample and Table 26 for the longitudinal sample. In each case, noteworthy percentages are indicated by highlighted cells.

An examination of the far right-hand column of these tables reveals that, in general, respondents felt that serving in the Army had a positive effect on the traits listed and that this had a positive impact on their careers. This was especially true on the following dimensions (percentages listed as cross-sectional/longitudinal): discipline (79%/76%), maturity (75%/76%), self-confidence (72%/74%), attention to detail (69%/72%), organized (70%/70%), willing to take responsibility (69%/70%), dependable (69%/69%), and willing to take the lead (72%/69%). Even in those areas that were not rated as highly as these, the split tended to be between this positive view and the opinion that having served in the Army did not affect the trait/ability at all (the middle column of the table). The only areas where there appeared to be some indication of a negative effect were patience with others and flexibility, where 3-4% of respondents indicated that their Army experience had made them less possessive of the characteristic and that this had hurt their careers.

Table 25
Impact of Army on Work Attributes
Cross-sectional Sample

I am and this has	Row %	less hurt my career	less neither helped nor hurt my career	less helped my career	neither hurt my career	neither neither helped nor hurt my career	neither helped my career	more hurt my career	more neither helped nor hurt my career	more helped my career
disciplined		1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	11.2	0.6	0.3	7.9	78.8
mature		0.3	0.5	0.1	0.20	12.6	1.1	0.2	10.1	75.0
self-confident		1.4	0.0	0.0	0.6	16.7	0.9	0.6	7.3	72.5
willing to take the lead		0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2	19.4	0.3	0.8	7.4	71.6
organized		0.5	0.0	0.0	0.4	20.7	1.5	0.1	6.9	69.9
dependable		1.0	0.1	0.6	0.6	22.7	1.8	0.1	4.1	69.0
attentive to detail		0.2	0.4	0.0	0.1	21.7	0.7	0.3	7.5	69.0
willing to take responsibility		1.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	20.6	0.6	0.5	8.2	68.8
able to work as a team		1.0	1.0	0.0	0.3	21.1	1.1	0.1	7.9	67.6
professional		0.5	1.3	0.0	0.4	27.2	1.4	0.3	4.8	64.2
able to carry out instructions		0.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	28.0	1.3	0.2	5.5	64.1
able to work independently		0.8	0.0	0.0	0.1	26.8	2.2	0.9	5.9	63.3
able to set priorities		0.4	0.2	0.0	1.0	28.2	0.5	0.1	8.0	61.6

Table 25 (continued)
Impact of Army on Work Attributes
Cross-sectional Sample

I am and this has	Row %	less hurt my career	less neither helped nor hurt my career	less helped my career	neither hurt my career	neither neither helped nor hurt my career	neither helped my career	more hurt my career	more neither helped nor hurt my career	more helped my career
willing to put in time	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.3	26.8	0.9	0.6	7.2	61.4	
able to stick with task	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.4	31.5	0.3	0.1	8.1	58.8	
able to get to work on time	1.1	0.4	0.0	1.5	32.1	1.7	0.1	5.2	58.0	
able to anticipate problems	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.6	35.3	1.1	0.4	5.3	57.4	
respectful of others	1.2	1.7	0.0	0.9	32.6	1.2	0.2	5.7	56.4	
efficient	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	35.6	0.7	0.2	6.2	55.9	
willing to ask questions	2.6	0.6	0.1	0.6	32.7	1.0	0.4	7.8	54.2	
attentive to safety	0.2	0.9	0.0	0.1	32.1	1.0	0.7	12.4	52.6	
able to pick up on things	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	41.7	2.9	0.0	2.8	50.8	
flexible	2.7	2.5	1.3	0.1	35.3	1.7	0.4	6.3	49.6	
anxious to take more responsibility	1.8	2.0	1.0	0.5	35.3	1.0	2.2	7.8	48.2	
able to explain myself	2.5	1.0	0.0	2.3	40.0	1.6	0.9	4.9	46.9	
patient w/ others	4.8	3.4	0.0	0.5	36.6	1.3	0.1	6.9	46.4	
able to work w/ equipment	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.4	51.1	1.5	0.1	7.6	38.9	
health conscious	1.6	2.9	0.0	0.9	46.9	0.5	0.6	12.2	34.4	

Table 26
Impact of Army on Work Attributes
Longitudinal Sample

I am	Row %	less hurt my career	less neither helped nor hurt my career	less helped my career	neither hurt my career	neither neither helped nor hurt my career	neither helped my career	more hurt my career	more neither helped nor hurt my career	more helped my career
disciplined		1.1	.2	0.0	0.1	13.9	0.5	0.5	7.5	76.2
mature		0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	13.7	0.7	0.2	9.6	75.6
self-confident		0.9	0.2	0.0	0.9	16.4	0.5	1.0	6.3	73.6
attentive to detail		0.4	0.1	0.0	0.9	20.1	0.7	0.4	5.8	72.0
willing to take responsibility		0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	20.4	1.2	0.5	7.5	69.8
organized		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	23.6	0.7	0.0	5.7	69.7
dependable		0.5	0.1	1.1	0.1	23.0	2.1	0.4	3.8	69.1
able to work as a team		0.5	0.6	0.0	0.7	22.0	1.7	0.1	5.7	68.8
willing to take the lead		0.4	0.2	0.0	0.7	22.1	1.1	0.9	5.8	68.8
able to set priorities		0.5	0.3	0.0	0.4	26.0	1.0	0.1	6.6	65.1
able to carry out instructions		0.2	0.1	0.0	0.3	30.0	2.5	0.0	4.0	62.8
professional		0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	29.5	1.3	0.2	5.9	61.9
able to work independently		0.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	31.4	1.8	0.3	5.3	60.2
willing to put in time		0.5	0.6	0.0	0.6	30.2	1.3	0.5	6.5	59.8

Table 26 (continued)
Impact of Army on Work Attributes
Longitudinal Sample

I am and this has	less hurt my career	less neither helped nor hurt my career	less helped my career	neither hurt my career	neither neither helped nor hurt my career	neither helped my career	more hurt my career	more neither helped nor hurt my career	more helped my career
efficient	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.3	32.7	1.0	0.2	6.4	59.1
able to stick with task	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4	34.0	1.7	0.0	6.3	57.2
able to anticipate problems	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.2	35.7	1.4	0.3	5.2	56.2
attentive to safety	0.4	1.2	0.1	0.6	32.4	1.3	0.4	8.6	54.9
willing to ask questions	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.4	33.2	1.4	0.5	8.2	54.5
able to get to work on time	0.5	0.9	0.0	0.3	38.9	1.4	0.0	4.2	53.8
respectful of others	1.6	1.5	0.1	0.6	36.2	2.2	0.4	6.6	50.8
able to pick up on things	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2	45.5	2.3	0.1	3.3	48.1
flexible	3.2	2.0	0.8	0.7	36.6	1.4	0.3	7.0	47.9
anxious to take responsibility	0.8	1.4	1.1	0.5	35.2	1.8	2.0	9.8	47.5
able to explain myself	1.9	0.2	0.0	2.6	43.3	0.9	1.2	4.3	45.5
patient with others	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.3	38.6	1.6	0.0	5.6	45.4
able to work w/ equipment	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.9	50.4	0.8	0.0	7.1	40.5
health conscious	1.1	2.6	0.2	1.0	47.8	0.9	0.1	10.7	35.6

Clearly AAS respondents overwhelming felt that the Army had a positive effect on them in terms of the development of characteristics that are typically beneficial in terms of the world of work. In fact, there was greater agreement on this than there was concerning the benefit of either Army-gained job skills or the use of educational benefits. This suggests that the intangible changes that are brought about through military service may be of equal or greater importance to the achievement of post-service success than are "concrete" gains represented by specific job skills or monetary payments for education.

Male, 4-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1985 at the age of 19

As far as the technical training is concerned, I don't know whether the individual jobs count for as much as the fact that a person will learn that he can pick up something that he/she knows absolutely nothing about and in a matter of weeks or months can totally master the subject, or at least feel confident in employing the tool, or system, for the job in which it was intended. In four years, I learned several different things, but I believe the best thing a person learns while serving is that they are capable of learning pretty much whatever they choose to learn.

Male, 4-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1985 at the age of 21

I learned the meaning of "long term consequences." I learned the meaning of "the power of the pen." Punctuality is extremely important to me. I am very picky about the kind of beer I drink--a result of living in Germany for 2 years. I met one of my best friends in the Army. I have a better appreciation for different cultures. I avoid incompetent authority.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1986 at the age of 22

The things the Army gave me were primarily non-monetary benefits--self discipline, confidence, focus, mission-orientation, and responsibility.

Impact of Army Experience on Personal Life

The Army is unlike almost all other employers in that, for those who serve, it becomes a way of life during their tenure; not just a nine-to-five job. As such, it might be expected that the impact of having served would extend beyond the world of work into ones personal life as well. This possibility was assessed through the AAS by first asking respondents how successful they felt they were in their personal lives, and to what degree they attribute this outcome to the fact that they served in the Army. These results are presented in Tables 27 and 28. In both samples, just over five percent of the respondents judged themselves to be unsuccessful. (Because of the small numbers, the unsuccessful and very unsuccessful categories were collapsed.) Further, these groups split fairly evenly in terms of attributing this outcome to their Army service, with a somewhat higher percentage saying that it had a substantial amount or great deal to do with it in the longitudinal sample.

Among those who said they were successful in their personal lives, 45% and 49% (cross-sectional and longitudinal samples, respectively) indicated that they Army had a substantial amount or great deal to do with that success. This figure was even higher among those who judged themselves to be very successful, with about two-thirds of each sample indicating that their Army experience was important in this regard.

Table 27
 Attributions of Army Impact on Personal Outcomes
 Cross-sectional Sample

Level of Personal Success	Army Impact					
Count Row % Column %	None	Very Little	Some	A Substantial Amount	A Great Deal	Total
Unsuccessful	12 27.8 23.6	8 18.5 8.8	12 27.0 3.7	11 24.9 4.3	1 1.7 0.7	44 5.4
Neither	14 8.0 27.6	29 16.3 31.5	91 50.3 28.6	43 23.8 16.7	3 1.6 2.8	180 21.9
Successful	18 4.3 34.9	42 10.2 45.6	170 40.9 53.7	156 37.3 60.7	30 7.31 29.4	417 50.8
Very Successful	8 4.3 14.9	13 7.2 14.1	44 24.5 14.0	47 25.8 18.3	69 37.9 66.7	181 22.0
Total	52 6.3	93 11.3	317 38.6	256 31.2	103 12.5	821

Table 28
 Attributions of Army Impact on Personal Outcomes
 Longitudinal Sample

Level of Personal Success	Army Impact					
Count Row % Column %	None	Very Little	Some	A Substantial Amount	A Great Deal	Total
Unsuccessful	8 13.9 12.6	15 27.0 12.8	8 13.2 2.1	16 28.5 5.4	10 16.8 6.2	57 5.7
Neither	32 14.9 51.3	50 23.2 42.0	93 43.0 25.8	32 14.6 10.4	9 4.3 6.1	217 21.7
Successful	16 3.0 25.1	40 7.5 33.1	217 41.0 60.0	203 38.3 67.0	54 10.3 35.6	530 52.9
Very Successful	7 3.6 11.3	15 7.51 12.3	44 22.3 12.2	52 26.3 17.2	80 40.4 52.3	198 19.8
Total	63 6.3	120 12.0	362 36.1	303 30.2	153 15.3	1002

As was done regarding careers, AAS respondents were asked to provide a written response indicating how they felt serving in the Army affected their personal lives (for better or for worse). Overall, two-thirds of each of the samples chose to do so. These data were also content analyzed (see Appendix C for the resulting categories). Table 29 presents those categories in which two percent or more of the responses (in either sample) were categorized.

The two samples closely mirror one another in terms of the specific ways in which Army service was cited as affecting personal lives. In fact, these results largely overlap those shown earlier regarding the impact on careers. This suggests that, at least in the eyes of these respondents, the same characteristics that are required to get ahead in the world of work are also beneficial in the personal arena. Together, the responses shown in Table 29 account for just over 62% of the answers given by members of each of the samples.

Table 29
Impact of Army Service on Personal Life
Open-Ended Responses

Response	Cross-Sectional		Longitudinal	
	n	% of responses	n	% of responses
Better able to Deal with Others	85	7.9	106	8.4
Discipline	83	7.7	87	6.9
More Mature	72	6.7	72	5.7
Self-Confidence	53	5.0	52	4.1
Responsibility	35	3.2	39	3.1
Communication Skills	34	3.2	40	3.2
Experienced	30	2.8	32	2.8
Pride in Self	30	2.8	33	2.6
Leadership	27	2.6	24	1.9
Appreciate Family	26	2.5	23	1.8
Perseverance	24	2.2	14	1.1
Confidence	23	2.1	45	3.6
Developed Friendships	23	2.1	19	1.5
Better Person Overall	22	2.1	33	2.6
Detrimental to Personal Life	18	1.6	36	2.9
Organizational Skills	19	1.8	32	2.5
Mental Strength	17	1.6	27	2.1
No Effect	51	4.8	68	5.4

AAS respondents were also asked to judge whether having served affected various aspects of their personal lives, and whether this impact was for better or for worse. These data are summarized in Tables 30 and 31.

The majority of both samples felt that overall they were more satisfied having served in the Army. This, in combination with the neutral category, account for over 90% of the responses to this item. In all other realms, however, this result was reversed, with around one-third of the respondents indicating that the Army was a positive influence, while the

Table 30
Impact of Army on Personal Attributes
Cross-sectional Sample

I have/am Row %	a worse/less	a worse/less	a worse/less	no better/worse more/less	no better/worse more/less	no better/worse more/less	a better/more	a better/more	a better/more
and this has	hurt my personal life	neither helped nor hurt my personal life	helped my personal life	hurt my personal life	neither helped nor hurt my personal life	helped my personal life	hurt my personal life	neither helped nor hurt my personal life	helped my personal life
satisfied overall	3.8	0.6	0.0	0.5	35.7	0.1	0.0	4.2	55.1
respect in community	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.1	59.7	0.9	0.0	1.5	31.1
able to develop relationships	5.6	1.0	0.0	0.4	59.0	0.9	0.0	3.4	29.7
relationship with spouse	10.5	0.7	0.0	0.7	58.4	0.7	0.0	0.7	28.4
relationship with kids	2.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	66.7	0.9	0.0	1.5	26.3
effective in the community	2.5	3.6	0.0	0.8	67.2	0.4	0.1	1.9	23.5

Table 31
Impact of Army on Personal Attributes
Longitudinal Sample

I have/am Row %	a worse/less	a worse/less	a worse/less	no better/worse more/less	no better/worse more/less	no better/worse more/less	a better/more	a better/more	a better/more
and this has	hurt my personal life	neither helped nor hurt my personal life	helped my personal life	hurt my personal life	neither helped nor hurt my personal life	helped my personal life	hurt my personal life	neither helped nor hurt my personal life	helped my personal life
satisfied overall	4.4	0.9	0.1	0.2	36.0	0.2	0.1	4.1	54.0
able to develop relationships	6.6	1.3	0.0	0.6	54.8	0.6	0.1	2.4	33.6
respect in community	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.6	62.2	0.2	0.0	5.2	30.5
relationship with kids	4.5	0.0	0.0	1.7	60.6	1.8	0.0	1.5	29.9
relationship with spouse	9.6	1.6	0.0	1.2	59.0	2.6	0.0	0.4	25.6
effective in the community	2.2	2.6	0.0	0.3	72.4	0.3	0.0	2.3	19.9

majority indicated that it had little or no impact. The most negative outcome appears to be in regard to relationships with spouses, with around 10% of each sample indicating that such relationships were in some way compromised by having served in the Army.

When compared with the previous results regarding job characteristics, it is clear that despite the pervasive nature of Army service, these respondents felt that it had much more of an influence in ways related to the workplace than it did in their personal lives. Still, among those who did feel that there was an external influence, it was largely judged to be a positive one.

Female, 3-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1985 at the age of 22
The military has had no effect on my life at all. About the only experience that the Army has given me was the experience to travel and meet all different kinds of people.

Male, 2-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1989 at the age of 18
My major concern about military life doesn't concern myself, it's about how high the divorce rate is in the military. If I had been married when entering or while in the military I am quite confident it would not have been a very enjoyable experience.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1984 at the age of 28
Although the discipline and attention to detail I learned in the Army has been helpful in many areas it has hurt in my last marriage. My last wife felt I'd retained too much discipline from the service when dealing with our children. I would suggest anyone getting out take things a little easier when dealing with civilians on personal matters. In work, remember that the same attention to detail, the same discipline, and the same "soldier on" attitude will go a long way.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat MOS, Entered in 1984 at the age of 18

I think I would have been pretty much the same person without my Army experience. But I don't mean that in a negative way. I've always been well adjusted with a good head on my shoulders personally. But I think that attributes to loving and caring parents with a solid foundation of not moving from place to place.

Male, 4-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1982 at the age of 19

The changes I would like to see is less separation of families. I know this is hard but with my first marriage I had to choose between her or the Army which I choose the Army.

Reflections on Serving in the Army

A series of questions were included in the AAS to obtain an assessment of satisfaction with Army service. Table 32 contains the responses to two questions asking for evaluations of military training and the overall Army experience. The bulk of both samples falls in the "satisfied" category, with satisfied and very satisfied accounting for the majority across samples and questions. Relatively few respondents expressed dissatisfaction on either count, with about eight percent in both samples saying they were dissatisfied with their Army service.

Table 32
Satisfaction with Army Training and Service

Item	Count Row %	Sample	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Total
Satisfaction with military training		Cross- sectional	31 3.8	66 7.0	193 23.4	339 41.1	195 23.7	824 100.0
		Longitudinal	40 4.0	89 8.8	239 23.7	431 42.7	210 20.8	1009 100.0
Satisfaction with Army Service		Cross- sectional	21 2.5	49 6.0	99 12.0	406 49.4	247 30.0	822 100.0
		Longitudinal	17 1.7	60 5.9	118 11.7	523 51.8	291 28.8	1009 100.0

Aside from satisfaction, there is the question of how valuable these veterans felt the experience to be. It is possible for one to be dissatisfied with an experience and yet recognize that, in the end, it provided assets that made it worthwhile. As shown in Table 33, this was apparently the case with a number of AAS respondents. This is indicated by the fact that, although approximately 80% of each sample indicated they were satisfied with their Army service, over 90% of each said that it was valuable or very valuable. In fact, the majority of both the cross-sectional and longitudinal samples said the experience was very valuable.

Table 33
Value of Army Service

Sample	Count Row %	Not at all valuable	Not very valuable	Valuable	Very Valuable	Total
Cross-sectional		12 1.4	57 6.9	285 34.5	471 57.1	825 100.0
Longitudinal		7 4.7	68 4.7	389 38.4	548 54.1	1012 100.0

Another indicator of how people feel about a given experience is if they would repeat it given the chance to go back and do things again. As indicated in Table 34, the vast majority of AAS respondents would, in fact, most likely enlist in the Army if they had the chance to go back and do it again. Over half of each sample said they would take the same course, and nearly one-third were fairly sure that they would.

Table 34
Reconsidering Military Service and Separation

Item	Count Row %	Sample	Definitely Not	Probably Not	Probably	Definitely	Total
If you had it to do over again, would you join the Army?		Cross-sectional	32 3.9	92 11.2	237 28.8	463 56.2	824 100.0
		Longitudinal	31 3.1	116 11.4	302 29.8	565 55.7	1014 100.0
If you had it to do over again, would you stay in the Army?		Cross-sectional	188 22.9	328 39.9	187 22.7	119 14.5	822 100.0
		Longitudinal	210 20.8	453 45.0	231 22.9	113 11.2	1007 100.0

Also in Table 34 are the results of an item that asked respondents whether they would reconsider their decision to *leave* the Army when they did. In this case, the results are a little less definitive. About one-fifth of both samples indicated that they definitely would not have stayed in, while 40% of the cross-sectional and 45% of the longitudinal stated that they would probably not do so. Thus, although most of the AAS respondents felt that they made the right decision in enlisting, they also felt that leaving was the right thing to do at the end of their first term. In combining this information, it is plausible to conclude that many of them are saying that they got what they needed and wanted out of one term of enlistment in the Army.

Yet another indicator of general feelings regarding Army service is whether respondents would recommend that a friend enlist. As seen in Table 35, most AAS respondents would do so. About 45% of each sample would have no hesitation in recommending to a friend that he/she enlist in the Army, while an additional 37% of the cross-sectional and 39% of the longitudinal samples would most likely do so, but were not quite as sure.

Table 35
Recommendations of Army Service to Friends

Sample	Count Row %	Definitely Not	Probably Not	Probably	Definitely	Total
Cross-sectional		34 4.1	113 13.7	302 36.7	373 45.4	822 100.0
Longitudinal		47 4.6	123 12.2	394 39.0	447 44.2	1011 100.0

Finally, respondents were asked to compare their job situation with the last job they held before departing the Army on a variety of dimensions. These data are presented in Table 36 for the cross-sectional sample and Table 37 for the longitudinal. With one exception, AAS respondents are generally more satisfied with these dimensions in their civilian jobs than they were in the Army. Only in the case of benefits were there significant portions of the samples that indicated that they were less, or much less satisfied with their current situation (40% of the cross-sectional and 36% of the longitudinal).

Table 36
Comparison of Current Civilian to Last Military Job
Cross-sectional Sample

Job Dimension	Count Row %	n	Much Less Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Just as Satisfied	More Satisfied	Much More Satisfied
Annual Salary		767	42 5.5	87 11.3	153 19.9	207 27.0	278 36.2
Skills Required		765	37 4.8	76 9.9	260 34.0	218 28.5	174 22.7
Responsibilities		765	46 6.0	86 11.2	222 29.0	208 27.2	203 26.5
Independence		767	33 4.3	44 5.7	169 22.0	218 28.4	303 39.5
Benefits		764	150 19.6	150 19.6	212 27.7	128 16.7	124 16.2
Location		765	38 5.0	46 6.0	193 25.3	193 25.3	295 38.6

Table 37
Comparison of Current Civilian to Last Military Job
Longitudinal Sample

Job Dimension	Count Row %	n	Much Less Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Just as Satisfied	More Satisfied	Much More Satisfied
Annual Salary		940	43 4.6	83 8.8	187 19.9	257 27.3	370 39.4
Skills Required		939	50 5.3	88 9.4	300 31.9	268 28.5	233 24.8
Responsibilities		938	44 4.7	98 10.4	284 30.3	282 30.1	230 24.5
Independence		934	25 2.7	49 5.2	215 23.0	283 30.3	362 38.8
Benefits		938	174 18.5	169 18.0	279 29.7	134 14.3	182 19.4
Location		935	42 4.5	71 7.6	260 27.8	215 23.0	347 37.1

Taken together, these last results suggest that, although these veterans were largely satisfied with their Army experience, they generally do not regret the decision to leave and are generally more satisfied with their civilian positions than they were in the Army. It must be kept in mind that many of the respondents had been out of service for some time when they completed the AAS, and thus had the opportunity to gain more experience and seniority, factors that would likely affect the dimensions that were compared.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1982 at the age of 20

I would definitely recommend military service to any young adult that is unsure of what they want to do with their life. People say that, "the Army is what you make of it." I believe that is true. The biggest thing that I miss about the service is the closeness that my family and I felt from other service families when we were far from home. The Army was a great experience for me. I wouldn't have missed it for the world.

Male, 2-year TOE, Combat Service Support, Entered in 1986 at the age of 18

My Army experience was positive overall and a positive impact on both my personal and professional life. I'm glad I was able to serve for the time I did. I would do it again if I had to do it over. I would also choose not to reenlist again. I couldn't continue to do well in an establishment with so many restrictions, abuses of power, and double standards.

Male, 3-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1983 at the age of 21

The first year of my Army service was immensely good for me. It gave me the motivation and discipline to return to school and perform up to my abilities. After that the next two years were a total waste other than it was necessary for the college fund. Military life was completely lacking in intellectual stimulation. It was a valuable experience to look BACK on.

Female, 3-year TOE, Combat Support MOS, Entered in 1984 at the age of 18

I have missed and always will miss certain aspects of military life but I feel that what I have accomplished as a civilian will make me happier than if I would have chosen to remain in the Army. I will always appreciate the military for giving me a start on what I now consider the best way of life for me.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

Any discussion of the results presented in this report, and those that will be generated from future analyses of these data, must begin by acknowledging the low response rate and the possible impact this may have on the data. As stated earlier, it is impossible to know exactly why practically three-quarters of those chosen to participate in the AAS failed to do so. On a broad level, this may be symptomatic of a national trend in declining survey response rates. In the present case, it is also true that connections between those selected to participate in the AAS and the sponsoring organization were tenuous at best. These are individuals who served their term of service and departed the Army, most of them voluntarily. It may well be the case that they simply feel no obligation to respond to information requests now that this chapter in their lives is over.

Whatever the cause, clearly future endeavors of this type would be well served by devoting the necessary time and resources to ensure an adequate response rate. The question that immediately arises is, how can this be done? The evidence from this project suggests that continued follow-up mailing may not be the answer. Although exact numbers cannot be determined, it is clear based, on the rate of survey return, that the vast majority were completed and sent back shortly after receipt. That is, the reminder letter (including the toll-free number for those with questions) did relatively little to boost the response rate. It seems likely that additional mailings would have had a similar impact.

One answer may be to make the investment in conducting such surveys by telephone. Although more expensive and typically more limited in regard to the amount of data that can be collected, evidence suggests that phone surveys usually have higher response rates. It should be noted, however, that devoting funds a more expensive phone survey cannot be done at the expense of investing time and money in respondent location activities, as is required for surveys like the AAS.

Having acknowledged that the response rate to the AAS was low, it is at least somewhat encouraging that those who did return the survey were generally representative

of the population of interest. The major exception to this is the smaller proportion of blacks who responded. This problem is addressed by the generation and application of the weights that bring the sample into line with the population.

The results presented here suggest that most veterans appreciate the time spent in the Army, and feel that it brought about positive outcomes in terms of their post-service lives. About a third of respondents in both samples indicated that they have used their military-obtained job skills frequently since separation, with another third saying they have been tapped now and then. The vast majority of AAS participants stated that they typically mention their veteran status to potential employers, and that this is generally reacted to favorably. Just under one-third feel that they would be making less money than if they had never served in the Army, and over 60% are satisfied with their ability to meet their financial obligations since leaving service.

Another important outcome of Army service for many of these veterans was that they obtained money that enabled them to further their educations. Over 55% of each sample indicated that they did in fact use educational benefits, and over three-quarters of those who did stated that their ability to attend school may have been or would definitely have been challenged without these monies.

Perhaps the greatest possible impact of Army service as indicated by these data is on personal attributes. Large majorities of respondents agreed that having served in the Army made them more disciplined and mature, increased their self-confidence and attention to detail, resulted in their being better organized, more willing to take responsibility at work, more dependable, and more willing to take the lead. These results are mirrored by the responses to the open-ended questions asking how Army-service contributed to career success. Personal attributes such as those cited above were mentioned at least as often, if not more so, than tangible gains such as job skills or educational benefits.

Judgements in regard to the Army's impact on their personal lives were not as overwhelmingly positive. It is true that more than half of the respondents indicated that serving increased their overall satisfaction. However, generally less than one-third felt it had a positive effect in other ways, with the majority of these respondents indicating that their Army service had no impact on their personal success.

The AAS respondent evaluations of their Army experience were generally positive, with most indicating that they were satisfied with it and that it was valuable. Although the vast majority of respondents would join the Army again if they were to go back and redo things, 60% or more feel that their decision not to reenlist was a good one. Apparently, for a majority of respondents the experience was good, but it was also time to move on.

The final question in the AAS was an open-ended item asking respondents to comment on their Army service generally and their outprocessing in particular. Content analysis of these responses was not required under this project and, given their diverse nature, would be a difficult undertaking. More than half of those who participated in the survey wrote something in response to this item, and many of the comments were in-depth. Samples have been included throughout this report, but they only begin to scratch the surface of the myriad of experiences detailed and points raised. These comments highlight a wide range of issues and concerns, and may be instructive if only in making the point that there exists a great diversity among those who choose to enter the Army, and that this diversity is reflected in the experiences that each individual has both while serving and after separation.

Future analyses of AAS data are at least somewhat limited by the small sample size. However, the inclusion on the file of key variables from the cohort dataset and the New Recruit Survey allows for several approaches that could yield informative results, including: 1) an examination of key variables (e.g., satisfaction with Army service) in light of respondent characteristics, such as when they served and for how long; 2) analysis of post-service occupational outcomes in conjunction with in-service occupational information; 3) comparisons of reasons for entering service as stated retrospectively in the AAS and as given at the time of entry, and; 4) looking at other post-service outcomes along with personal characteristics such as age at entry and activities following separation (e.g., school, work). Such analyses can provide a rich source of information about the determinants of both in-service success and a productive transition back to civilian life.

References

- Data Recognition Corporation (1987). Recruit survey item bank as of August 1987. Eden Prairie, MN: Author.
- Department of Defense (1991). News Release. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistance Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs).
- Department of Defense (1992). Military careers: A guide to military occupations and selected military career paths. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.
- Laurence, J. H., & Ramsberger, P. F. (1991). Low-aptitude men in the military: Who profits, who pays? New York: Praeger.
- Magnum, S. L., & Ball, D. E. (1989). The transferability of military-provided occupational training in the post-draft era. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 42(2), 230-244.
- Schroyer, C. J., Gaskins, R. C., & Waters, B. K. (1988). Evaluation of 1987 New Recruit Survey (NRS) data (Final Report 89-01). Alexandria, VA: HumRRO International.
- Schroyer, C. J., Hansen, L. A., Lerro, P. A., & Benedict, M. E. (1990). Analysis of the 1990 ARI Survey of Employers (Final Report 90-19). Alexandria, VA: HumRRO International.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994). Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Westat, Inc. (1986). The 1985 Army Experience Survey: Methodology and recommendations for future administrations (ARI Technical Report 700). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (ADA 178 569)

APPENDIX A

STRATIFICATION CELL POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

Appendix A
Stratification Cell Population and Sample Sizes

Gender	Race	TOE	MOS Type	Longitudinal count	# Selected	Cross-sectional count	# Selected
Male	White	2	CBT	1,439	299	19,914	224
Male	White	2	CS	893	186	11,467	129
Male	White	2	CSS	776	162	9,564	108
Male	White	3	CBT	2,499	522	38,125	429
Male	White	3	CS	2,913	608	44,161	497
Male	White	3	CSS	1,975	412	28,377	319
Male	White	4 or more	CBT	2,770	578	37,319	420
Male	White	4 or more	CS	3,193	667	49,056	552
Male	White	4 or more	CSS	719	150	11,040	124
Male	Black	2	CBT	84	18	1,228	14
Male	Black	2	CS	92	19	1,205	14
Male	Black	2	CSS	112	23	1,377	15
Male	Black	3	CBT	811	169	11,467	129
Male	Black	3	CS	662	138	9,786	110
Male	Black	3	CSS	699	146	11,144	125
Male	Black	4 or more	CBT	502	105	6,473	73
Male	Black	4 or more	CS	551	115	9,137	103
Male	Black	4 or more	CSS	238	50	3,802	43
Male	Other	2	CBT	71	15	1,000	11
Male	Other	2	CS	54	11	661	7
Male	Other	2	CSS	40	8	462	5
Male	Other	3	CBT	234	49	3,551	40
Male	Other	3	CS	189	39	3,200	36
Male	Other	3	CSS	137	29	2,259	25
Male	Other	4 or more	CBT	170	35	2,395	27
Male	Other	4 or more	CS	203	42	3,052	34
Male	Other	4 or more	CSS	57	12	814	9
Female	White	2	CBT	10	2	96	1
Female	White	2	CS	60	13	1,066	12

Appendix A (continued)
Stratification Cell Population and Sample Sizes

Gender	Race	TOE	MOS Type	Longitudinal count	# Selected	Cross-sectional count	# Selected
Female	White	2	CSS	116	24	1,191	13
Female	White	3	CBT	7	1	133	1
Female	White	3	CS	237	49	4,423	50
Female	White	3	CSS	405	85	6,911	78
Female	White	4 or more	CBT	9	2	150	2
Female	White	4 or more	CS	303	63	5,549	61
Female	White	4 or more	CSS	132	28	2,602	29
Female	Black	2	CBT	0	0	8	0
Female	Black	2	CS	6	1	199	2
Female	Black	2	CSS	28	6	322	4
Female	Black	3	CBT	4	1	35	0
Female	Black	3	CS	66	14	1,452	16
Female	Black	3	CSS	196	41	3,953	44
Female	Black	4 or more	CBT	3	1	40	0
Female	Black	4 or more	CS	93	19	1,747	20
Female	Black	4 or more	CSS	95	20	1,959	22
Female	Other	2	CBT	0	0	8	0
Female	Other	2	CS	5	1	58	1
Female	Other	2	CSS	5	1	65	1
Female	Other	3	CBT	0	0	8	0
Female	Other	3	CS	17	4	356	4
Female	Other	3	CSS	43	9	621	7
Female	Other	4 or more	CBT	1	0	12	0
Female	Other	4 or more	CS	18	4	411	5
Female	Other	4 or more	CSS	9	2	281	3
			TOTAL	23,951	4,998	355,602	3,998

APPENDIX B
SURVEY MATERIALS



The Army Alumni Survey



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

13529



The U.S. Army Research Institute
c/o HumRRO
66 Canal Center Plaza
Alexandria, VA 22314-4457

Approved OMB Number: 0702-0097
Expires: December 31, 1994

The Army Alumni Survey

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0702-0097), Washington, DC 20503. Please **DO NOT RETURN your form/questionnaire to either of these addresses**. Send your completed form/questionnaire in the enclosed return envelope to:

HumRRO
66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 400
Alexandria, VA 22314

AUTHORITY: Public Law 93-573, called the Privacy Act of 1974, requires that you be informed of the purpose and uses of the information that is collected. The Federal Government may collect the information requested in the Army Alumni Survey under the authority of 10 United States Code 137, 503, 2358.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: This survey is being conducted to help the Department of the Army learn more about the experiences of veterans as they return to civilian life. The information that you give will help us provide better transition services to current and future soldiers when they leave the Army to become civilians once again. Also, the data collected here will provide insight into a number of work-related and professional issues confronting servicemen and women today.

DISCLOSURE: Providing information in this questionnaire is voluntary. You do not have to answer particular questions if you choose not to. The information you give us is protected under the Privacy Act of 1974. Your answers will be kept confidential and your identity will never be known to anyone. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as honest as you can about your feelings.

ROUTINE USES: Information on individual respondents will not be released to other agencies or institutions. Only group statistics will be reported in the findings from this project. Copies of the final report will be provided to the Army Research Institute and other Army personnel and research agencies. The contractor and the Army will produce in-house publications on overall results. In some cases manuscripts of findings will be presented at conferences, symposia, scientific meetings, and in professional journals.

Instructions for Marking

- Use a soft lead pencil only (a standard No. 2 is best).
- Make heavy marks that fill the circle.
- Completely erase any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks of any kind. When asked to write comments, use the space provided and a separate piece of paper if necessary.
- Fill in only one circle for each question unless it specifically says "mark all that apply."
- Where numbers are called for in an answer, first write your answer in the boxes provided and then fill in the circles underneath that correspond to the numbers you have put in the boxes.

EXAMPLE A:

How old were you on May 1, 1994?

2	1
0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3

Years

EXAMPLE B:

How many complete terms of enlistment did you serve (not including extensions)?

☒ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

Return this questionnaire as soon as possible in the postage-paid envelope provided.

Thank you.

First we'd like to ask you a few questions about your Army experience.

1. Below is a list of reasons that people may give for joining the Army. Please indicate how important each reason was for you in joining the Army. (Mark one response on the right for each reason.)

Not At All Important
Not Very Important
Important
Very Important

Joining the Army gave me a chance to:

- a. better myself ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- b. get trained in a skill ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- c. get money for a college education ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- d. serve my country ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- e. get a job (I was unemployed) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- f. prove that I could make it ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- g. be away from home on my own ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- h. earn more money ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- i. travel ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- j. get away from a personal problem ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- k. do something I can be proud of ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- l. carry on a family tradition ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- m. mature ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- n. obtain physical training/challenge ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- o. obtain fringe benefits (health/dental, PX) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- p. work with sophisticated, high-tech equipment ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- q. obtain leadership training ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- r. get a better job than the one I had ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- s. get the respect of others ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- t. Other (please specify) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

2. If you had it to do all over again, would you have joined the Army?

☐ Definitely
☐ Probably
☐ Probably not
☐ Definitely not

3. When you entered the Army, what did you think you would most likely do upon completion of your first term? (Mark all that apply.)

☐ Leave the Army to find civilian employment
☐ Leave the Army to attend college
☐ Leave the Army for civilian vocational/technical education
☐ Reenlist, but probably not make the Army a career
☐ Stay in the Army until I retired
☐ Join an Army Reserve Unit
☐ Join a National Guard Unit
☐ Participate in an Army Reserve Officer's Training Corps program in college

4. How much do you feel you used your military training while actually doing your Army job?

☐ All or most of the time
☐ About half the time
☐ Only some of the time
☐ Very little of the time
☐ Never

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with the job skills you obtained in the service? Are you:

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

6. During your term of service, were you ever assigned outside of the US?

☐ No
☐ Yes → Where? (Mark all that apply)
☐ Germany
☐ Korea
☐ Philippines
☐ Lebanon
☐ Grenada
☐ Panama
☐ Persian Gulf
☐ Other (please specify)

7. How satisfied were you with the pay grade or rank you held when you separated? Were you:

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

8. At the end of your term of service, were you eligible to reenlist?

☐ Yes
☐ No

9. Did you consider reenlisting in the Army at, or near the end of your first term?

Does not apply, wasn't eligible to reenlist
☐ Yes
☐ No

10. The following is a list of reasons that people may give for getting out of the Army. Please indicate how important each reason was for you in leaving the Army. (Mark one answer on the right for each reason.)

Not True/Does Not Apply
Not At All Important
Not Very Important
Important
Very Important

I left the Army because:

- a. The officers didn't care about enlisted people ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- b. I could get a good civilian job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- c. I didn't get promoted ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- d. Poor NCO leadership ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- e. Too many PCS moves ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- f. The pay was too low ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- g. I thought I would have to leave due to downsizing ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- h. The working hours were too long ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- i. I didn't get credit for doing a good job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- j. Of family separations ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- k. I wanted to go to school or college ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- l. I couldn't get the education or skill I wanted ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- m. I didn't get along with my NCO ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- n. I had family problems at home ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- o. There were too many military rules and regulations ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- p. Of the possibility of combat ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- q. Downsizing was affecting morale ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- r. My family wanted me to get out ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- s. There was too much unfair treatment ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- t. The work wasn't interesting or challenging ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- u. Family support services were inadequate ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- v. I wanted to use veterans' benefits ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- w. I was not treated with respect ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- x. I was sexually harassed ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- y. I could get separation pay/bonuses ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- z. I wasn't eligible to reenlist ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- aa. Other (please specify) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11. How satisfied were you with the overall outprocessing or separation experience when you left active service? Would you say you were ...

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

12. If you had it to do all over again, would you have decided to stay in the Army?

- ☐ Definitely
- ☐ Probably
- ☐ Probably not
- ☐ Definitely not

13. In general, how satisfied were you with your Army service? Would you say you were ...

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

14. Whether you were satisfied or not, how valuable was your Army experience to you? Would you say ...

- ☐ Very valuable
- ☐ Valuable
- ☐ Not very valuable
- ☐ Not at all valuable

15. Would you recommend joining the Army to a friend?

- ☐ Definitely
- ☐ Probably
- ☐ Probably not
- ☐ Definitely not

These questions are about your service in the National Guard or Reserves.

16. Have you joined a National Guard or Reserve unit since you left active service?

- ☐ No (skip to question 22)
- ☐ Yes, but I am no longer a member
- ☐ Yes, and I am still a member

17. In which Reserve component have you served?

(Mark all that apply.)

- ☐ US Air Force Reserves
- ☐ US Navy Reserves
- ☐ US Coast Guard Reserves
- ☐ Air National Guard
- ☐ US Army Reserves
- ☐ US Marine Corps Reserves
- ☐ Army National Guard

18. Below are some reasons people may give for joining the Reserve/Guard. Please indicate how important each reason was for you in joining the Reserve/Guard. (Mark one response on the right for each reason.)

Not True/Does Not Apply
Not At All Important
Not Very Important
Important
Very Important

- a. I wanted to join my friends in the unit. ○○○○○○
- b. I wanted to earn extra income. ○○○○○○
- c. I wanted to continue to serve my country. ○○○○○○
- d. I wanted to learn a new job skill. ○○○○○○
- e. I wanted to use educational benefits. ○○○○○○
- f. I wanted retirement or fringe benefits. ○○○○○○
- g. Service in the Reserves was part of my enlistment obligation for the Active Forces. ○○○○○○

19. How satisfied are (were) you with your National Guard or Reserve unit? Are (Were) you ...

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

20. How would you describe your civilian employer's personnel policies about participation in the Reserves/National Guard?

- ☐ Does not apply
- ☐ Very supportive
- ☐ Supportive
- ☐ Neither supportive or non-supportive
- ☐ Non-supportive
- ☐ Very non-supportive
- ☐ Not sure that they have/had policies

21. Which of the following best describes your current career intentions with the Reserve/Guard? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Probably leave before the end of my obligation
- ☐ Definitely leave before the end of my obligation
- ☐ Probably leave after my present obligation is met
- ☐ Definitely leave after my present obligation is met
- ☐ Probably stay in, but maybe not until retirement (eligibility) letter
- ☐ Definitely stay in at least until retirement (eligibility) letter

SKIP TO QUESTION 24

22. How likely is it that you will join a National Guard or Reserve unit? Would you say ...

- ☐ Definitely
- ☐ Probably
- ☐ Probably not
- ☐ Definitely not

23. Which statement best explains why you are not now in a Reserve or National Guard unit?

- ☐ My community does not have the kind of unit I should be in
- ☐ It would interfere with my civilian job
- ☐ It would interfere with my family responsibilities
- ☐ I applied but was not accepted
- ☐ I am not interested
- ☐ I completed my military service obligation
- ☐ I am not eligible

The next few questions concern your civilian work experience.

24. What were you doing most of the time the month after you completed your most recent period of active duty?

- ☐ Working full-time
- ☐ Working part-time
- ☐ With a job but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, or strike
- ☐ Unemployed, looking for work
- ☐ Going to school
- ☐ Taking time off
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

25. Which of the following best describes your employment status at the present time?

Are you ...

- ☐ Employed full-time (35 or more hours per week)
- ☐ Employed part-time (less than 35 hours per week) but looking for full-time employment
- ☐ Employed part-time (less than 35 hours per week) and not looking for full-time work
- ☐ Not employed but looking for work
- ☐ Not employed and not looking for work

26. Mark the one statement below that is *most* true for you. Since leaving the Army ...

- ☐ ... I have had one or more jobs.
- ☐ ... I have been unable to find a job.
- ☐ ... I have been unable to take a job. (on disability, caring for children).
- ☐ ... I have not looked for a job because I've been in school.
- ☐ ... I have not looked for a job for other reasons.

Go to
Question
40

27. When looking for your first job after leaving the Army, what sources of information or types of assistance did you use? (Mark all that apply.)

- ☐ Did not need assistance
- ☐ None
- ☐ Newspaper want ads
- ☐ Trade/Specialty publication want ads
- ☐ Contacts (e.g., friends/family)
- ☐ Door-to-door (e.g., personal visits)
- ☐ State/Local employment offices
- ☐ Word-of-mouth
- ☐ Employment hot lines
- ☐ Headhunter
- ☐ Army Career Assistance Center

28. When talking to prospective employers, how often did you (or do you) mention that you are an Army veteran?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Usually
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

29. In general, how would you describe employers' reactions to the fact that you are an Army veteran?

- ☐ Very positive
- ☐ Positive
- ☐ Neither positive nor negative
- ☐ Negative
- ☐ Very negative

If you have not held a job since leaving the Army, go to question 40.

30. Did you have a full-time job lined up before you left the Army?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

31. How difficult was it to get your first full-time job after leaving the Army? Would you say it was ...

- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Difficult
- ☐ Neither difficult or easy
- ☐ Easy
- ☐ Very easy

32. Approximately how many months did it take to find your first full-time job after separating from the Army?

Months	
0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

33. How many full-time jobs (35 or more hours per week) with different employers have you had since you left the Army?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ 6
- ☐ 7
- ☐ 8
- ☐ 9
- ☐ 10 or more

Civilian Work Experience

34. Which title below best describes your current (or if unemployed, your last) job? (Mark only one. If you have more than one job, please mark the answer corresponding to your primary occupation.)

- ☐ Salesworker (Examples: retail salesclerk, real estate agent, door-to-door salesperson, newspaper carrier)
- ☐ Office and Clerical Worker (Examples: shipping clerk, mail carrier, secretary, typist, keypunch operator, cashier, bookkeeper)
- ☐ Service or Restaurant Worker (Examples: cleaning person, dishwasher, cook, waitress)
- ☐ Trades or Crafts Worker (Examples: mechanic or repairman, baker, plumber, carpenter, painter, electrician)
- ☐ Transportation Operator (Examples: cab, bus, or truck driver)
- ☐ Manufacturing or Producing (Examples: assembly line worker, mill worker, packager, meat-cutter, fork-lift operator)
- ☐ Protection Service (Examples: police, security guard, firefighter, park ranger)
- ☐ Art, Entertainment, Recreation (Examples: dancer, actor, athlete, musician, artist)
- ☐ Laborer, except on farm (Examples: construction, laborer, gardener, truck loader, warehouse person)
- ☐ Farm Laborer
- ☐ Paraprofessional (Examples: dental assistant, nurse's or teacher's aide, paramedic, paralegal)
- ☐ Professional (Examples: doctor, lawyer, teacher, minister, accountant)
- ☐ Technical (Examples: draftsman, medical or lab technician, computer programmer, pilot)
- ☐ Manager or Administrator, except on farm (Examples: sales or office manager, school administrator, buyer)
- ☐ Owner or Proprietor (Examples: contractor, restaurant owner, small business owner)
- ☐ Farmer or Farm Manager
- ☐ Other (please describe)

35. Approximately how many years and months ago did you start working in your present job or primary job? (If less than 1 year, please enter 0 years and the number of months. If you have more than one job, please provide information for the one held the longest.)

Years		Months	
0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

36. How satisfied are you with your current job?

Are you:

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied
- ☐ Does not apply, not currently employed

37. How similar are the job skills you developed in the Army to those required in your last or current job? Would you say they are ...

- ☐ Very similar
- ☐ Similar
- ☐ Dissimilar
- ☐ Very dissimilar

38. Taking into account all jobs you have had since returning to civilian life, to what extent would you say you have been able to apply the training and job skills you obtained while in the Army?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Frequently
- ☐ Now & then
- ☐ Seldom
- ☐ Never

39. Compared to your last assignment in the Army, how satisfied are/were you with:

Much Less Satisfied
Less Satisfied
No More or Less Satisfied
More Satisfied
Much More Satisfied

MARK ONE ANSWER ON THE RIGHT FOR EACH.

- The annual salary of your present/last job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- The skills required for your present/last job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- The extent of responsibilities of your present/last job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- The amount of independence in your present/last job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- The benefits of your present/last job, such as medical insurance coverage ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- The geographic location of your present/last job ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Work Limitations

40. Are you limited in the kind or amount of work you can do because of your health?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

41. Do you have a disability that has been rated as service-connected by the Department of Veterans' Affairs?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes —> What type of disability is it?
☐ Physical
☐ Mental/Psychological
☐ Both

The next series of items has to do with your educational background.

42. Please indicate the highest grade you completed at each of the points of time shown. (Mark one response in each column.)

Currently
When you left the Army
When you entered the Army

- Less than high school (1-8 years) ☐ ☐ ☐
- Some high school, but did not graduate ☐ ☐ ☐
- GED ☐ ☐ ☐
- Certificate of completion/attendance ☐ ☐ ☐
- Graduated high school ☐ ☐ ☐
- Some college, but did not graduate ☐ ☐ ☐
- 2-year college degree ☐ ☐ ☐
- 4-year college degree ☐ ☐ ☐
- Graduate degree ☐ ☐ ☐
- Other (e.g., vocational/technical, business, secretarial school) (Please specify) ☐ ☐ ☐

43. Are you currently enrolled in any type of training or schooling?

- ☐ Yes, enrolled full-time
☐ Yes, enrolled part-time
☐ No, not enrolled

44. Since leaving the Army, have you used any educational benefits such as the Army College Fund, the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program, the GI Bill, or the Montgomery GI Bill?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

45. How important a consideration were your Army educational benefits in deciding to return to school after separation?

- ☐ Does not apply -- I did not return to school
☐ Does not apply -- I had no education benefits
☐ Very important -- I wouldn't have gone otherwise
☐ Somewhat important -- I may not have gone otherwise
☐ Not important -- I would have gone even without them

Now we turn to your income. Remember, all the information you provide is completely confidential.

46. Which of the following categories best describes your 1993 income before taxes, not including anyone else in your household:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ \$0 - \$4,999 | ☐ \$40,000 - \$44,999 |
| ☐ \$5,000 - \$9,999 | ☐ \$45,000 - \$49,999 |
| ☐ \$10,000 - \$14,999 | ☐ \$50,000 - \$54,999 |
| ☐ \$15,000 - \$19,999 | ☐ \$55,000 - \$59,999 |
| ☐ \$20,000 - \$24,999 | ☐ \$60,000 - \$64,999 |
| ☐ \$25,000 - \$29,999 | ☐ \$65,000 - \$69,999 |
| ☐ \$30,000 - \$34,999 | ☐ \$70,000 or more |
| ☐ \$35,000 - \$39,999 | |

47. For all of 1993, what was the total income of all family members in your household. (That is, you and all persons living with you.) Was it:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ \$0 - \$4,999 | ☐ \$40,000 - \$44,999 |
| ☐ \$5,000 - \$9,999 | ☐ \$45,000 - \$49,999 |
| ☐ \$10,000 - \$14,999 | ☐ \$50,000 - \$54,999 |
| ☐ \$15,000 - \$19,999 | ☐ \$55,000 - \$59,999 |
| ☐ \$20,000 - \$24,999 | ☐ \$60,000 - \$64,999 |
| ☐ \$25,000 - \$29,999 | ☐ \$65,000 - \$69,999 |
| ☐ \$30,000 - \$34,999 | ☐ \$70,000 or more |
| ☐ \$35,000 - \$39,999 | |

48. How would you compare the total of your military pay, allowances, and benefits compared to what you earn in civilian life? (Mark one.)

- ☐ Does not apply. I do not have a job
- ☐ Much more in the military
- ☐ A little more in the military
- ☐ About the same as in the military
- ☐ A little more in civilian life
- ☐ Much more in civilian life

49. How satisfied have you been with your ability to meet your financial needs since you left the service? Would you say you are:

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

50. If you had never been in the Army, do you think you would be making more, less, or about the same amount as you are in your current civilian job (including allowances, and benefits)?

My current civilian pay would be ...

- ☐ Does not apply. I do not have a job.
- ☐ ... *much higher* if I had never joined the Army.
- ☐ ... *somewhat higher* if I had never joined the Army.
- ☐ ... *about the same* as it is now if I had never joined the Army.
- ☐ ... *somewhat less* if I had never joined the Army.
- ☐ ... *much less* if I had never joined the Army.

51. Did you or anyone in your family living with you receive any welfare or public assistance in the last 12 months?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

52. In the last 12 months, did you or your spouse receive financial assistance from any of your relatives?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

53. During the past year, did you receive any other veterans' benefits (other than educational), workers' compensation, or disability payments?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Now we'd like to find out what impact you feel serving in the Army had on your civilian career. If you have not had a job since leaving the Army, skip to question 58.

54. How successful are you in your current civilian career, business or job?

- ☐ Very successful
- ☐ Successful
- ☐ Neither successful nor unsuccessful
- ☐ Unsuccessful
- ☐ Very unsuccessful

55. How much of your success (or lack of success) in your current civilian career, business, or job do you attribute to your experience being in the Army?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A substantial amount
- ☐ Some
- ☐ Very little
- ☐ None

56. Please describe below how your Army experience has contributed to your success (or lack of success) in your civilian career, business, or job.

57. Below is a list of individual traits that may be affected by the experience of having served in the Army. These same traits can also have an affect on ones' career. For each trait, please mark the response on the left that best describes the affect of your Army experience. Then on the right, indicate what impact you feel this has had on your career.

Having served in the Army, I think that ...

a. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	organized on the job.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
b. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	willing to ask questions when I need to.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
c. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to pick up on things that I am taught.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
d. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	dependable.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
e. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to work as part of a team.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
f. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to work independently.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
g. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to take the lead to get things done on the job.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
h. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to listen to instructions and carry them out.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
i. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	mature.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
j. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	self-confident.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.

Having served in the Army, I think that ...

k. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	Flexible in how I get the job done.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
l. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	willing to take on responsibility in my work.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
m. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	professional on the job.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
n. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	likely to pay attention to detail in doing my job.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
o. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	likely to get to work on time each day.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
p. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to stay with a task until it is completed.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
q. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	efficient in the way I get things done on the job.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
r. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to anticipate and avoid problems that might come up.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
s. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	attentive to safety concerns while on the job.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
t. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to set priorities for what needs to get done.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
u. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	respectful of those that I work with and for.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
v. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	health conscious.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
w. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to work with tools and equipment.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
x. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	patient in helping others.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.

Having served in the Army, I think that ...

y. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	anxious to take on more responsibility.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
z. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	disciplined.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
aa. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	willing to put in whatever time it takes to get the job done.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.
bb. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	able to explain myself clearly when I have something to say.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my career.

Now we'd like to find out what impact you feel serving in the Army had on your personal life.

58. How successful do you feel in your personal life (e.g., family, friends, community involvement)?

- ☐ Very successful
- ☐ Successful
- ☐ Neither successful or unsuccessful
- ☐ Unsuccessful
- ☐ Very unsuccessful

59. How much of the success (or lack of success) in your personal life do you attribute to your experience of being in the Army?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A substantial amount
- ☐ Some
- ☐ Very little
- ☐ None

60. Please describe below how your Army experience has contributed to your success (or lack of success) in your personal life.

61. Below is a list of aspects of ones' personal life that may be affected by having served in the Army. For each one, please mark the response on the left that best describes the impact of your Army experience. Then on the right indicate what effect this has had on your overall personal life.

Having served in the Army, I think that . . .

a. I have	☐ a better ☐ no better or worse ☐ a worse ☐ does not apply	relationship with my spouse.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my personal life.
b. I have	☐ a better ☐ no better or worse ☐ a worse ☐ does not apply	relationship with my kids.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my personal life.
c. I have	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	ability to develop and maintain friendships.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my personal life.
d. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	effective in participating in community projects.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my personal life.
e. I have	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	respect in the community	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my personal life.
f. I am	☐ more ☐ no more or less ☐ less	satisfied overall.	And this has	☐ helped ☐ neither helped nor hurt ☐ hurt	my personal life.

Finally, we have a few background questions we need to ask.

62. Are you?

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

63. What race do you consider yourself to be? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ White
☐ Black (African American)
☐ Indian (Native American)
☐ Eskimo or Aleut
☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Other

64. Are you of Hispanic Origin?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes, Mexican/Mexican American/Chicano
☐ Yes, Puerto Rican
☐ Yes, Cuban
☐ Yes, Other Spanish/Hispanic

65. What is your current marital status? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Married
☐ Separated, but no legal action taken
☐ Legally separated or filing for divorce
☐ Divorced
☐ Widowed
☐ Single, never been married

66. How many times have you been married?

- ☐ None
☐ One
☐ Two
☐ Three
☐ Four
☐ Five or more

67. How many children do you have?

- ☐ None
☐ One
☐ Two
☐ Three
☐ Four
☐ Five or more

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE CODES, OPEN-ENDED ITEMS 56, 60

Item 56—Please describe below how your Army experience has contributed to your success (or lack of success) in your civilian, career, business, or job.

Success

- 01 Adapt to situations easily
- 02 Attitude
- 02a Attitude - can do
- 02b Attitude - do it yourself
- 03 Decision-making
- 04 Dedication
- 05 Attention to detail
- 06 Dependability
- 07 Discipline
- 07a Follow rules and orders
- 08 Do the best you can
- 09 Education
- 09a Military paid for college
- 10 Focus
- 10a Focus on career goals
- 10b Focus interest in career
- 11 Good health
- 11a Physical stamina
- 12 Jobs
- 12a Jobs easier to get
- 13 Leadership
- 13a Leadership - do not give in
- 13b Leadership - ability to motivate
- 13c Leadership - take charge attitude
- 14 Maturity
- 15 Military skills training
- 15a Military training - mechanical
- 16 Motivated
- 16a Motivated to get what you want
- 17 Obedience
- 17a Obedience - follow instructions
- 17b Obedience - do not question superiors
- 18 Outlook on life better
- 19 Patience for other workers
- 20 Patriotism

- 21 Perseverance
- 22a Keep moving forward
- 22b No slacking off
- 22c Don't give in
- 23 Punctuality
- 24 Reliability
- 25 Respect
- 26 Responsibility
- 27 Safety
- 28 Self-confidence
- 29 Teamwork
- 30 Think on your own
- 31 Work ethic

Lack of Success

- 32 Academic goals
- 32a Academic goals - behind in
- 32b Academic goals - slow to realize
- 33 Contribution (none)
- 34 Employment not fruitful
- 35 Military training
- 35a Military training - inability to get desired
- 35b Military training - not relevant civilian life
- 35c Military training - acquired outside military better
- 35d Military training - useless
- 36 No effect
- 36a Army had no effect on civilian life

Item 60—Please describe below how your Army experience has contributed to your success (or lack of success) in your personal life.

Success

- 01 Ambitious
- 02 Army
- 02a Army - best thing in life
- 02b Army - great fun
- 02c Army - would do it again
- 03 Attitude
- 03a Attitude - can do
- 03b Attitude - move forward
- 04 Challenges - accept
- 05 Communicating
- 06 Confidence
- 07 Control
- 08 Courage
- 09 Dealing with others
- 10 Decision-making skills
- 11 Developed
- 11a Developed - greater character
- 11b Developed - traits present before Army
- 12 Discipline
- 13 Domestic skills
- 14 Experience
- 15 Family
- 15a Family - appreciation for
- 15b Family - put first
- 16 Flexibility
- 17 Friendships - developed while in
- 18 Helpful
- 19 Independence
- 20 Knowledge of life
- 21 Leadership
- 22 Listening skills
- 23 Maturity
- 24 Motivated
- 25 Objectivity
- 26 Organization skills
- 27 Overall better person
- 28 Perseverance
- 29 Poise

- 30 Pride
- 31 Professionalism
- 32 Respect
- 32a Respect - for authority
- 32b Respect - for others
- 32c Respect - for self
- 32d Respect - from others
- 33 Responsibility
- 34 Responsive to others' needs
- 35 Self-confidence
- 36 Skills - developed
- 37 Strength
- 37a Strength - mental
- 37b Strength - physical
- 38 Tact
- 39 Travel experience
- 50 VA loan for house

Lack of Success

- 51 Academic goals - delayed
- 52 Adjustment to civilian life difficult
- 53 Career (good)
- 54 Discipline
- 55 Drinking problems
- 56 Family and friends
- 56a Family and Friends - absences from
- 56b Family and Friends - separations difficult
- 57 Marriage
- 57a Marriage - ended in divorce
- 57b Marriage - nearly ended
- 58 Military training
- 59 Motivation
- 40 No effect
- 40a No effect - Army had
- 41 Personal life - Army detrimental