



Information and Technology for Better Decision Making

2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members

Report on Scales and Measures

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from:

Defense Technical Information Center

ATTN: DTIC-BRR

8725 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite #0944

Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

Or from:

<http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/order.html>

Ask for report by ADA 469 773

2005 WORKPLACE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SURVEY OF ACTIVE-DUTY MEMBERS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

**Alayne J. Ormerod, Angela K. Lawson, Maria C. Lytell, Caroline Vaile Wright, Christopher Nye,
Leigh Ann Perry, Fritz Drasgow, Louise F. Fitzgerald, Catherine Kusznir, and Danielle Rynczak
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

**Defense Manpower Data Center
Survey & Program Evaluation Division
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400, Arlington, VA 22209-2593**

Acknowledgments

The authors of this report are indebted to the members of Defense Manpower Data Center's (DMDC) survey program for their assistance with this report, in particular Anita Lancaster, Timothy Elig, and Rachel Lipari.

The *2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members (2005 WEOA)* was conducted on behalf of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD[P&R]). DMDC's survey program is conducted under the leadership of Timothy Elig, Division Chief of the Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program (HRSAP).

2005 WORKPLACE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SURVEY OF ACTIVE-DUTY MEMBERS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Executive Summary

In 2005, the Department of Defense (DoD) and Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) conducted the second DoD-wide survey on racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination experiences of active-duty military personnel, the 2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members (2005 WEOA). This report describes advances from the previous survey and presents results on scale development.

The first section of this report presents a general overview of the survey instrument and describes the sample and methods of data collection. The body of the report is comprised of a description of each scale, including individual items, background information, and psychometric analyses.

The 16-page survey booklet (see C) included an in-depth series of questions concerning background and family/household demographics, retention and commitment, workplace information, stress, health, and well-being, race/ethnic-related experiences in the military, personnel policy, practices, and training, as well as military and civilian comparisons. Scales were composed of multiple items and results were reported in terms of reliability coefficients (i.e., Cronbach's coefficient alpha), means, standard deviations, standard errors, and frequency counts. Scales, rather than single items, were used because measures that rely on multiple items to tap a construct of interest are more reliable than those relying on single items. Scales are also preferable because the standard error for a measurement is lower for a scale than for a single item. Statistics are reported for racial/ethnic groups.

Particular attention was paid to assessing race/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination. The method of calculating race/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination rates parallels the method that is used to calculate rates of sexual harassment in DoD-wide and Service-wide surveys of sexual harassment.¹ The measure used to assess race/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination consists of 57 items concerning race/ethnic-related harassment or discrimination behaviors experienced by Service members or their families, and one item concerning whether Service members considered any of the race/ethnic-related behaviors to have been racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination. Together, these 58 items were used to calculate the incident rates for racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination.

¹ See Survey Method for Counting Incidents of Sexual Harassment, 2002.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Sample Design and Survey Administration.....	2
Survey Instrument.....	3
Results.....	4
Scales in the Retention and Commitment Section.....	17
Retention Tendencies.....	17
Organizational Commitment.....	17
Scales in the Workplace Information Section.....	19
Supervisor Satisfaction	19
Coworker and Work Satisfaction.....	20
Unit Cohesion	22
Scales in the Stress and Health Section	23
Perceived Stress	23
General Health	24
Scales in the Race/Ethnic-Related Experiences in Military Section	25
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination.....	25
Behaviors in the One Situation	34
Subjective Distress.....	36
Coping.....	37
Reporting.....	39
Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome	40
Reasons for Not Reporting.....	41
Retaliation	42
Scales in the Personnel Policy, Practices, and Training Section	44
Leadership Efforts to Stop Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination.....	44
Organizational Climate	45
Attitudes toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity.	48
Training and Education.....	48
Discussion.....	49
References.....	51

Appendixes

A. Explanation and Table of Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models	57
B. Acronyms Used in the Report on Scales and Measures.....	65
C. Survey Instrument	69

Table of Contents (Continued)

Page

List of Tables

1.	Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2005 WEOA	7
2.	Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors	11
3.	Incidence Rates for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and/or Discrimination and Retaliation	15
3.	Incidence Rates for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and/or Discrimination and Retaliation (Continued).....	16
4.	Scale Items Measuring Retention Intentions	17
5.	Scale Items Measuring Organizational Commitment	19
6.	Scale Items Measuring Supervisor Satisfaction.....	20
7.	Scale Items Measuring Coworker and Work Satisfaction	22
8.	Scale Items Measuring Unit Cohesion.....	23
9.	Scale Items Measuring Perceived Stress.....	24
10.	Scale Items Measuring General Health.....	25
11.	Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Harassment.....	28
12.	Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination.....	32
13.	Scale Items Measuring Behaviors in the One Situation.....	36
14.	Scale Items Measuring Subjective Distress	37
15.	Scale Items Measuring Coping	39
16.	Scale Items Measuring Reporting	40
17.	Scale Items Measuring Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome	41
18.	Scale Items Measuring Reasons for Not Reporting.....	42
19.	Scale Items Measuring Retaliation	44
20.	Scale Items Measuring Leaderships Efforts to Stop Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination.....	45
21.	Scale Items Measuring Organizational Climate	47
22.	Scale Items Measuring Attitudes toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity	48
23.	Scale Items Measuring Training and Education	49
24.	Commonly Cited Indices in CFA/SEM	59
25.	Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models.....	63

2005 WORKPLACE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SURVEY OF ACTIVE-DUTY MEMBERS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Introduction

This report describes the scales and measures contained in the *2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members*, referred to as the *2005 WEOA*. The *2005 WEOA* is the second Department of Defense (DoD)–wide survey of active-duty members focusing on racial/ethnic discrimination and harassment issues.

The first survey, the *Status of the Armed Forces Surveys Form D—Equal Opportunity 1996 (1996 EOS)* was fielded in 1996-97² and was designed to assess active-duty service members' perceptions of fair treatment and equal opportunity (EO) in the Department of Defense (DoD) and Coast Guard (Elig, Edwards, & Riemer, 1997). Specifically, it was designed to provide survey data on types, frequency, and effects of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination experienced by active-duty military; context, location, and circumstances under which such experiences occur; racial climate within the larger organizational climate; characteristics of the complaint process; and effectiveness of current policies and training designed to prevent, reduce, and eliminate racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination (Wheeless, Mason, Kavee, Riemer, & Elig, 1997). These measures were intended to increase understanding of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination and of policies and programs that prevent it from occurring, as well as gather information on a variety of workplace issues.

Similar to other surveys employed in Defense Manpower Data Center's (DMDC) survey program (e.g., the *2004 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members*, *2004 WGRR*, and the *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey—Workplace and Gender Relations*, *2002 WGR*), the *2005 WEOA* was designed to take advantage of developments in harassment and discrimination measurement technology that have occurred since its predecessor and to utilize a standardized method for measuring and counting racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination incidents.

The *2005 WEOA* used multiple item measures to assess racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, as well as antecedent and outcome constructs related to such experiences. Outcome measures were assessed prior to asking about race/ethnic-related behaviors. The *2005 WEOA* used the same measures of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination as did the *1996 EOS*, but included a new item about the labeling of such experiences as racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination. It also incorporated an improved measurement of workplace relations and their associated constructs by revising certain scales and adding new ones. Scales new to the *2005 WEOA* include a more detailed assessment of retention intentions, affective, continuance, and normative commitment, supervisor, coworker, and job satisfaction, unit cohesion, stress, health, and labeling of racial/ethnic experiences. A detailed assessment of a critical racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination experience, called the One Situation, was expanded from the *1996*

² See Scarville, Button, Edwards, Lancaster, and Elig (1999) for background information on DoD-wide research about racial/ethnic-related behavior.

EOS, as were scales that assessed reasons for not reporting, retaliation, climate related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, and training and education.

This report describes results of psychometric analyses and validation of the scales and measures used in the 2005 *WEOA*. The items included in each scale are listed, along with the scale's mean, standard deviation, standard error, and reliability. Results are presented for the total sample and separately by race/ethnicity, including a category for total minority.

Methodology

Sample Design and Survey Administration

The survey administration process began on January 10, 2005, with the mailout of notification letters to sample members. Data were collected between January 24, 2005 and April 4, 2005, with paper surveys mailed on February 24 to those who did not respond via the Web. The population of interest for the survey consisted of active-duty members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, excluding National Guard and Reserve members who(1) have at least 6 months of service at the time the questionnaire is first fielded and (2) are below flag rank. Single-stage, nonproportional stratified random sampling³ procedures were used. The sample consisted of 91,024 individuals drawn from the sample frame constructed from DMDC's *Active-Duty Master File*. Members of the sample became ineligible if they indicated in the survey or by other contact (e.g., telephone calls to the data collection contractor) that they were not on active duty as of the first day of the Web survey, January 24, 2005 (.21% of sample).

Completed surveys (defined as 50% or more of the survey questions asked of all participants and at least one item answered in Questions 45-48) were received from 32,299 eligible respondents. The overall weighted response rate for eligibles, corrected for nonproportional sampling, was 39%. The weighted number of respondents and response rates by race/ethnicity were Non-Hispanic Native American, $n = 11,863$, 1%, Non-Hispanic Asian, $n = 47,136$, 4%, Non-Hispanic Black, $n = 228,364$, 17%, Non-Hispanic White, $n = 817,706$, 62%, Hispanic, $n = 157,097$, 12%, Non-Hispanic Two or More Races, $n = 39,411$, 3%, Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, $n = 8,555$, 1%, Total Minority, $n = 492,426$, 38%.

Data were weighted to reflect the population of interest. These weights reflect (1) the probability of selection, (2) a nonresponse adjustment factor to minimize bias arising from differential response rates among demographic subgroups, and (3) a poststratification factor to force the response-adjusted weights to sum to the counts of the target population as of the month the sample was drawn and to provide additional nonresponse adjustments.

³In stratified random sampling, all members of a population are categorized into homogeneous groups. For example, members might be grouped by gender and active-duty component (all male Army active-duty personnel in one group, all female Navy active-duty personnel in another, etc.). Members are chosen at random within each group. Small groups are oversampled in comparison to their proportion of the population so there will be enough responses to analyze. Weights are used so that groups are correctly represented in the analyses.

Survey Instrument

The 2005 WEOA was developed to provide users with timely, policy-relevant information. The survey booklet was designed and formatted to facilitate ease and reliability of responding, and to minimize possible response bias and demand effects. It was constructed around a core of questions grouped into eight general sections. The 16-page survey booklet appears in C. The survey was subdivided into the following ten topic areas:

- *Background Information* – Service, gender, paygrade, race/ethnicity, ethnic ancestry, and education.
- *Family and Household Information* – Marital status, duration of relationship, race/ethnicity of spouse/significant other, and presence of dependents.
- *Satisfaction and Retention Intention* – Degree expectations fulfilled regarding work and personal life, overall satisfaction with the military way of life, likelihood to stay on active duty, spouse/family support to stay on active duty, years spent in military service, willingness to recommend military service, characteristics of work environment, and commitment to serve.
- *Military Workplace* – Location, time away from permanent duty station, deployments since September 11, 2001, and current deployment status, characteristics of and satisfaction with immediate supervisor, coworkers and work, mentoring, preparedness, morale, and unit cohesion.
- *Stress, Health, and Well-Being* – Level of stress in work and personal life and physical well-being.
- *Personal Experiences* – Types and frequency of both personal and family experiences related to race/ethnicity, and DoD's/Service's responsibility to prevent racial/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination.
- *One Situation of Race/Ethnic-Related Experiences* – Details pertaining to the most bothersome race/ethnic-related situation experienced during the 12 months prior to taking the survey, including type(s) of incident(s) experienced, where and when it occurred, characteristics of offenders, to whom behaviors were reported, and, if applicable, members' satisfaction with the complaint process and outcome.
- *Personnel Policy and Practices* – Views on current racial/ethnic policies and leadership practices, and perceptions of race relations within the military and in the local community.
- *Training* – Frequency and perceived effectiveness of training on racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination.

- *Military/Civilian Comparisons* – Perceptions of opportunities/conditions in the military compared to civilian employment, and historical and military/civilian comparisons of the prevalence of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination.

Survey content was developed in consultation with academicians, other experts, and officials in the area of Equal Opportunity—including those in the federal, private, public, and military sectors; from an analysis of relevant literature—including reports and policy statements; and from individual interviews with officials from organizations representing minority-group members in the military. In addition, a series of focus groups were conducted, and the items, particularly those pertaining to racial ethnic harassment and discrimination, were refined through an iterative process of pretesting and modification (Elig et al., 1997).

Results

This report contains descriptions of the major scales, in the order in which they appear in the questionnaire, including the items within each scale, internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach's coefficient α), means, standard deviations, standard errors, and frequency counts for selected scales. Results of multivariate analyses are reported for longer or multidimensional scales. Scales used in previous DoD-wide surveys, and scales derived from published measures are identified in the scale descriptions.

Each scale is composed of multiple items to measure the theoretical construct of interest. Wherever possible, existing scales were designed to be comparable to previous surveys tapping harassment, discrimination, and workplace relations, including the *1996 EOS*, the *2002 WGR*, the *2004 WGR-R*, and the *1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey (1995 Form B)*. When feasible, scales were drawn from the psychological literature and adapted for use in a military setting, or were employed from previous military surveys (e.g., the *1995 Form B*; the *1996 EOS*; the *2002 WGR*; and the *2004 WGR*). If existing measures were not available, items were developed by subject matter experts to tap the construct of interest in the *2005 WEOA*.

Analyses were conducted on surveys whose respondents (1) completed at least 50% of all items they were eligible to answer and (2) answered at least one item on the Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination scales (Items 45-48). Table 1 provides information about scale homogeneity and internal consistency. The reliability estimates (i.e., Cronbach's coefficient α) are listed for each scale for the total sample as well as by race/ethnicity, and were calculated using SPSS 12.0.1 software.

Table 2 provides the means, standard deviations, and standard errors for each scale by race/ethnicity, all computed using weighted data. The means reported in Table 2 were obtained by summing the item scores for each scale. Unless otherwise indicated, the means are based on those individuals who had completed at least 50% of the questionnaire (as described above).

In addition, a second method was used to calculate the means for Items 45-48. In this method, means were calculated following data imputation in which the following process was employed: for each subscale, the respondent was required to have responded to at least one item on the subscale; if there were one or more responses, means were calculated based on the number of items completed. This process was used to maintain consistency with the frequency

counts reported in Table 3 and with the incident rates reported for the *1996 EOS* (Scarville, Button, Edwards, Lancaster, and Elig, 1999). Thus the means, standard deviations, and standard errors for Items 45-47 were calculated using two different methods and are reported as such in Table 2. The means were calculated on the weighted data using PROC SURVEYMEANS in SAS V8.02. Standard errors of the means were computed by SAS PROC SURVEYMEANS, which was used because the function accounts for the stratified sample design.

Table 3 presents the frequency counts, expressed as percentages, for scales measuring racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination and retaliation. Percentages were calculated in SAS V9.1 using weighted data. Percentages for the discrimination subscales (Item 47) were calculated for those respondents who had completed at least one item.

Percentages for racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination and related subscales (Items 45, 46, 47, and 48) reflect those respondents who experienced one or more incident on the particular subscale being reported and labeled their experiences as racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination (Item 49). The counting algorithms for calculating these percentages are described in later sections of this report.

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for longer scales to examine the number of factors or dimensions per scale. All confirmatory factor analyses were performed using PRELIS 2.30 and LISREL 8.30 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993).

When conducting confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), or structural equation modeling (SEM), fit statistics are used to evaluate whether a specified model adequately fits the data. There are numerous fit statistics to choose from and little agreement exists about which indices are best (Klem, 2000). Compounding the issue of which index to report, the literature routinely offers guidance about cut scores for interpreting fit statistics (e.g., Byrne, 1998 provides suggestions culled from the SEM literature), but provides little discussion about the strengths and weaknesses associated with particular fit statistics. This has led to the interpretation of fit statistics being somewhat subjective. Issues to consider when evaluating whether a fit statistic is appropriate include sample size and non-normality of the observed data. Real-world data are often non-normal and the data from the *2005 WEOA* are no exception. Various authors (e.g., Byrne, 1998 and Klem, 2000) recommend taking a holistic approach when evaluating SEM and CFA models, that is, examining fit statistics, but not neglecting other important features that indicate the acceptability of the model, such as the plausibility of parameter estimates, the size of standard errors, and theoretical criteria. Thus conclusions about the adequacy of a model are based on an accumulation of evidence rather than a particular cut score (Klem, 2000). Given the current lack of knowledge about SEM and CFA with discrete item response data, it is necessary to consider all aspects of model fit rather than to rely solely on fit statistics and particular cutoff scores alone. Often, a researcher must accumulate and rely on experience in SEM and CFA applications to determine a “good fit” statistic for a particular type of data. An expanded discussion about fit statistics can be found in Appendix A.

Items 38A-38P are copyrighted and will not be addressed in this report. For information on the psychometric properties of these items please contact the appropriate copyright holder.⁴ Other items were intended as single-item indicators (e.g., Item 36) and are not reported in this document. Items intended to function as checklists (e.g., Item 67) may be discussed, but will not include psychometric documentation.

⁴ Items 38A through 38P are used by permission of the copyright holder, The Gallup Organization, 901 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004.

Table 1.
Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2005 WEOA

Scale	Cronbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Native American	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Asian	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Black	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Whites	Cronbach α for Hispanics	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Two or More Races	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Cronbach α for Total Minority
Retention Tendencies (16,17,18)	.84	.83	.84	.82	.85	.84	.81	.85	.83
Organizational Commitment (25A-Q)	.89	.90	.91	.87	.89	.90	.88	.91	.89
Affective Commitment (25A,B,E,H,J,M)	.88	.89	.88	.86	.89	.88	.87	.88	.87
Continuance Commitment (25C,F,I,L,N)	.80	.79	.82	.79	.79	.81	.81	.82	.81
Normative Commitment (25G,D,K)	.80	.80	.80	.77	.80	.80	.79	.83	.79
Supervisor Satisfaction (35A-F)	.95	.96	.95	.95	.95	.95	.95	.96	.95
Coworker Satisfaction (37A-E)	.91	.91	.90	.90	.91	.90	.90	.91	.90
Work Satisfaction (39A-E)	.92	.92	.92	.92	.92	.92	.92	.91	.92
Unit Cohesion (42A-D)	.92	.92	.92	.91	.92	.91	.90	.92	.91
Perceived Stress (43A-J)	.86	.86	.83	.85	.87	.85	.88	.86	.85
General Health (44A-D)	.75	.72	.76	.74	.75	.75	.75	.75	.74
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (45A-O)	.88	.89	.91	.88	.86	.89	.88	.92	.89
Offensive Encounters- DoD (45A-J)	.88	.89	.90	.88	.84	.89	.88	.92	.89

Table 1.
Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2005 WEOA (Continued)

Scale	Cronbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Native American	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Asian	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Black	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Whites	Cronbach α for Hispanics	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Two or More Races	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Cronbach α for Total Minority
Threat/Harm-DoD (45K-N)	.81	.80	.82	.76	.83	.83	.81	.87	.81
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (46A-O)	.88	.90	.90	.89	.86	.90	.89	.93	.89
Offensive Encounters- Community (46A-J)	.88	.90	.90	.89	.85	.89	.89	.92	.89
Threat/Harm-Community (46K-N)	.80	.78	.82	.79	.77	.84	.79	.90	.82
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (47A-Z)	.87	.90	.90	.87	.85	.89	.85	.93	.88
Evaluation (47A-D)	.66	.73	.71	.69	.59	.68	.58	.75	.69
Assignment/Career (47E, J-N, S)	.79	.81	.83	.79	.76	.80	.77	.86	.80
Training/Test Scores (47F-I)	.66	.77	.72	.67	.59	.69	.58	.84	.70
Punishment (47V-W)	.60	.60	.59	.66	.55	.62	.45	.67	.62
Member/Family Services (47O-R,T,U)	.64	.67	.72	.61	.59	.70	.57	.82	.67
Member/Family Fears (47X-Z)	.76	.80	.80	.81	.73	.80	.66	.80	.80
Member Incident – DoD (45A-N, 47A-N,S,V-W)	.65	.63	.63	.69	.64	.65	.68	.72	.66

Table 1.
Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2005 WEOA (Continued)

Scale	Cronbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Native American	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Asian	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Black	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Whites	Cronbach α for Hispanics	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Two or More Races	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Cronbach α for Total Minority
Member/Family Incident (45O, 46O, 47O-R, T, U, X-Z)	.60	.67	.66	.60	.55	.64	.52	.76	.63
Behaviors in the One Situation (51A-K)	.73	.78	.75	.74	.69	.76	.67	.87	.75
Subjective Distress (53A-E)	.91	.92	.93	.92	.91	.92	.90	.93	.92
Internal Coping (63A,C,I)	.59	.60	.60	.54	.61	.57	.51	.60	.56
External Coping (63B,D-I)	.56	.53	.59	.50	.56	.58	.51	.51	.55
Satisfaction with Reporting (69A-G)	.94	.94	.96	.94	.93	.94	.97	.97	.95
Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome (69A-G, 73)	.95	.97	.96	.94	.94	.95	.97	.97	.95
Retaliation (76A-G)	.92	.93	.91	.90	.93	.91	.90	.93	.91
Leadership Efforts to Stop Race/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination (78A-C)	.88	.90	.91	.87	.87	.88	.84	.86	.88
Organizational Climate (80A-E and 82A-M)	.90	.91	.90	.89	.89	.89	.90	.90	.89
Tolerance for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination (80A,B,C, and 82A,B,C)	.83	.85	.81	.83	.81	.83	.85	.81	.83

Table 1.
Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2005 WEOA (Continued)

Scale	Cronbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Native American	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Asian	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Black	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Whites	Cronbach α for Hispanics	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Two or More Races	Cronbach α for Non- Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Cronbach α for Total Minority
Provision of Resources (80D, E, and 82D, E, F)	.92	.92	.92	.91	.92	.91	.93	.94	.91
Perceptions of Racist/Extremist Groups and Gangs (82I-M)	.90	.89	.92	.91	.89	.90	.90	.93	.91
Attitudes Toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity (83A-C)	.27	.24	.33	.24	.26	.28	.28	.24	.28
Training and Education (89A-J)	.97	.97	.97	.96	.97	.97	.96	.97	.96

Note. Item numbers are shown in parentheses following the scale name.

Table 2.
Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors

Scale	Range	Total Sample		Non-Hispanic Native American		Non-Hispanic Asian		Non-Hispanic Black		Non-Hispanic White		Hispanic		Non-Hispanic Two or More Races		Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		Total Minority	
		Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b
Retention Tendencies (16,17, 18)	-5.4 – 3.5	-1.1 (.01)	.89	-1.4 (.05)	.89	-.05 (.02)	.84	-.09 (.02)	.86	-.10 (.01)	.90	-.19 (.02)	.89	-.20 (.04)	.86	-.00 (.08)	.89	-.12 (.01)	.87
Organizational Commitment (25A-Q)	1 - 5	3.13 (.01)	.70	3.19 (.04)	.76	3.34 (.02)	.70	3.13 (.01)	.66	3.19 (.01)	.70	3.19 (.02)	.71	3.08 (.04)	.71	3.41 (.07)	.71	3.17 (.01)	.69
Affective Commitment (25A,B,E,H,I,M)	1 - 5	3.77 (.01)	.82	3.75 (.04)	.87	3.78 (.02)	.75	3.71 (.01)	.78	3.80 (.01)	.83	3.77 (.02)	.83	3.61 (.05)	.86	3.88 (.06)	.72	3.73 (.01)	.80
Continuance Commitment (25C,F,I,L,N)	1 - 5	2.73 (.01)	.90	2.72 (.05)	.88	2.97 (.03)	.88	2.73 (.02)	.88	2.71 (.01)	.89	2.76 (.02)	.93	2.70 (.04)	.92	3.12 (.08)	.90	2.77 (.01)	.90
Normative Commitment (25G,D,K)	1 - 5	2.52 (.01)	1.00	2.68 (.05)	1.06	2.87 (.03)	.95	2.32 (.02)	.91	2.55 (.01)	1.01	2.56 (.02)	1.00	2.47 (.05)	1.00	2.77 (.10)	1.12	2.48 (.01)	.98
Supervisor Satisfaction (35A-F)	1 - 5	3.86 (.01)	.96	3.79 (.06)	1.09	3.80 (.03)	.89	3.75 (.02)	.97	3.91 (.01)	.95	3.85 (.02)	.97	3.71 (.05)	1.02	3.91 (.10)	1.05	3.79 (.01)	.97
Coworker Satisfaction (37A-E)	1 - 5	3.67 (.01)	.85	3.66 (.05)	.92	3.62 (.02)	.79	3.63 (.02)	.89	3.71 (.01)	.83	3.61 (.02)	.88	3.49 (.05)	.94	3.62 (.08)	.92	3.61 (.01)	.88
Work Satisfaction (39A-E)	1 - 5	3.68 (.01)	.97	3.63 (.06)	1.00	3.68 (.03)	.95	3.73 (.02)	.93	3.67 (.01)	.98	3.67 (.02)	.99	3.46 (.05)	1.05	3.83 (.08)	.97	3.69 (.01)	.97
Unit Cohesion (42A-D)	1 - 5	3.54 (.01)	.84	3.51 (.06)	.91	3.54 (.02)	.78	3.42 (.02)	.87	3.59 (.01)	.82	3.47 (.02)	.87	3.36 (.04)	.83	3.49 (.08)	.92	3.45 (.01)	.86
Perceived Stress (43A-J)	0 - 4	1.57 (.01)	.70	1.64 (.04)	.74	1.67 (.02)	.59	1.57 (.01)	.69	1.55 (.01)	.71	1.57 (.02)	.70	1.73 (.03)	.75	1.67 (.06)	.70	1.60 (.01)	.69

Table 2.
Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors (Continued)

Scale	Range	Total Sample		Non-Hispanic Native American		Non-Hispanic Asian		Non-Hispanic Black		Non-Hispanic White		Hispanic		Non-Hispanic Two or More Races		Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		Total Minority	
		Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b
General Health (44A-D)	1 - 4	3.11 (.01)	.68	3.06 (.04)	.70	3.13 (.02)	.61	3.12 (.01)	.69	3.10 (.01)	.68	3.13 (.02)	.70	3.02 (.04)	.72	3.13 (.05)	.66	3.11 (.01)	.69
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (45A-O)	1 - 4	1.60 (.00)	.30	1.21 (.02)	.34	1.24 (.01)	.39	1.22 (.01)	.36	1.12 (.00)	.25	1.22 (.01)	.34	1.25 (.02)	.40	1.23 (.03)	.43	1.22 (.00)	.36
Offensive Encounters-DoD (45A-J)	1 - 4	1.22 (.00)	.39	1.29 (.02)	.45	1.33 (.02)	.49	1.30 (.01)	.47	1.16 (.00)	.32	1.31 (.01)	.45	1.34 (.03)	.52	1.30 (.04)	.51	1.31 (.01)	.47
Threat/Harm-DoD (45K-O)	1 - 4	1.03 (.00)	.19	1.05 (.01)	.21	1.07 (.01)	.27	1.05 (.00)	.23	1.02 (.00)	.16	1.04 (.00)	.21	1.06 (.01)	.24	1.09 (.03)	.35	1.05 (.00)	.23
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (46A-O)	1 - 4	1.16 (.00)	.31	1.20 (.02)	.35	1.22 (.01)	.36	1.20 (.01)	.35	1.14 (.00)	.28	1.18 (.01)	.33	1.27 (.03)	.43	1.19 (.03)	.40	1.20 (.00)	.36
Offensive Encounters-Community (46A-J)	1 - 4	1.22 (.00)	.40	1.26 (.02)	.44	1.30 (.02)	.46	1.28 (.01)	.46	1.19 (.00)	.36	1.24 (.01)	.42	1.36 (.03)	.54	1.24 (.03)	.46	1.27 (.01)	.45
Threat/Harm-Community (46K-O)	1 - 4	1.05 (.00)	.21	1.07 (.01)	.22	1.07 (.01)	.25	1.05 (.00)	.23	1.04 (.00)	.19	1.05 (.00)	.22	1.08 (.02)	.34	1.09 (.02)	.32	1.06 (.00)	.24
Subjective Distress (53A-E)	1 - 5	1.69 (.01)	.99	1.69 (.04)	.96	1.77 (.04)	.99	1.90 (.03)	1.11	1.59 (.01)	.92	1.74 (.03)	1.03	1.91 (.05)	1.03	1.85 (.09)	1.08	1.83 (.02)	1.07
Internal Coping (63A,C,J)	1 - 2	1.48 (.00)	.34	1.55 (.02)	.33	1.54 (.01)	.31	1.50 (.01)	.34	1.46 (.01)	.34	1.52 (.01)	.33	1.51 (.02)	.32	1.52 (.04)	.35	1.51 (.01)	.33
External Coping (63B,D-I)	1 - 2	1.29 (.00)	.22	1.32 (.01)	.22	1.33 (.01)	.22	1.31 (.01)	.22	1.27 (.00)	.22	1.31 (.01)	.23	1.30 (.02)	.21	1.30 (.02)	.21	1.31 (.00)	.22

Table 2.
Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors (Continued)

	Range	Total Sample		Non-Hispanic Native American		Non-Hispanic Asian		Non-Hispanic Black		Non-Hispanic White		Hispanic		Non-Hispanic Two or More Races		Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		Total Minority	
		Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b
Satisfaction with Reporting (69A-G)	1 – 5	3.11 (.04)	1.01	2.83 (.17)	.97	3.15 (.07)	.85	3.14 (.08)	1.05	3.10 (.05)	.98	3.16 (.11)	1.05	2.95 (.24)	1.23	2.94 (.14)	.71	3.12 (.06)	1.05
Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome (69A-G, 73)	1 – 5	3.08 (.04)	1.01	2.83 (.17)	.96	3.12 (.07)	.84	3.12 (.08)	1.05	3.07 (.05)	.98	3.13 (.11)	1.02	2.93 (.24)	1.22	2.95 (.18)	.74	3.10 (.06)	1.04
Retaliation (76A-G)	1 – 3	1.25 (.01)	.45	1.30 (.03)	.47	1.30 (.02)	.48	1.28 (.01)	.48	1.23 (.01)	.43	1.26 (.01)	.45	1.22 (.03)	.41	1.33 (.05)	.54	1.28 (.01)	.47
Leadership Efforts to Stop Race/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination (78A-C)	1 – 3	2.80 (.00)	.54	2.79 (.03)	.55	2.78 (.02)	.57	2.72 (.01)	.63	2.83 (.01)	.50	2.75 (.02)	.60	2.75 (.03)	.58	2.84 (.04)	.48	2.74 (.01)	.60
Organizational Climate (80A-E and 82A-M)	1 – 5	2.00 (.01)	.67	2.12 (.03)	.68	2.19 (.02)	.67	2.14 (.01)	.68	1.92 (.01)	.64	2.13 (.02)	.67	2.09 (.03)	.67	2.12 (.06)	.70	2.14 (.01)	.68
Tolerance for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination (80A,B,C, and 82A,B,C)	1 – 5	2.13 (.01)	.85	2.29 (.04)	.89	2.33 (.03)	.81	2.38 (.02)	.88	2.02 (.01)	.81	2.28 (.02)	.86	2.26 (.04)	.88	2.21 (.08)	.87	2.33 (.01)	.87
Provision of Resources (80D,E, and 82D,E,F)	1 – 5	2.46 (.01)	1.10	2.75 (.08)	1.14	2.71 (.03)	1.06	2.63 (.02)	1.13	2.35 (.01)	1.07	2.70 (.03)	1.13	2.58 (.06)	1.12	2.63 (.10)	1.16	2.66 (.02)	1.12

Table 2.
Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors (Continued)

Scale	Range	Total Sample		Non-Hispanic Native American		Non-Hispanic Asian		Non-Hispanic Black		Non-Hispanic White		Hispanic		Non-Hispanic Two or More Races		Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		Total Minority	
		Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b	Mean (SE ^a)	SD ^b
Perceptions of Racist/Extremist Groups and Gangs (82I-M)	1 – 5	1.47 (.01)	.75	1.48 (.04)	.70	1.62 (.03)	.88	1.51 (.02)	.77	1.45 (.01)	.72	1.48 (.02)	.78	1.53 (.04)	.76	1.64 (.07)	.87	1.52 (.01)	.78
Attitudes Toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity (83A-C)	1 – 5	1.57 (.01)	.67	1.58 (.04)	.67	1.71 (.02)	.71	1.68 (.01)	.71	1.52 (.01)	.64	1.60 (.02)	.70	1.58 (.04)	.70	1.68 (.07)	.72	1.64 (.01)	.71
Training and Education (89A-J)	1 – 5	4.25 (.01)	.68	4.23 (.05)	.73	4.19 (.02)	.64	4.19 (.02)	.69	4.27 (.01)	.68	4.26 (.02)	.65	4.20 (.04)	.71	4.41 (.06)	.66	4.22 (.01)	.67

^aStandard error of the mean was computed by SAS PROC SURVEYMEANS adjusting for nonrandom sampling.

^bStandard deviations were computed by SAS PROCMEANS. The standard deviations are weighted and irrespective of strata with the sum of the weights as the divisor.

Table 3.
Incidence Rates for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and/or Discrimination and Retaliation

Scale	Total Sample	Non-Hispanic Native American	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Black	Non-Hispanic White	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races	Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Total Minority
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (45A-N) ^a	2% (48%)	2% (55%)	4% (59%)	3% (55%)	2% (42%)	3% (60%)	4% (56%)	3% (49%)	3% (57%)
Offensive Encounters-DoD (45A-J) ^a	2% (47 %)	2% (55%)	4% (59%)	3% (55%)	2% (42%)	3% (60%)	4% (56%)	3% (49%)	3% (57%)
Threat/Harm-DoD (45K-N) ^a	1% (5%)	1% (7%)	1% (10%)	1% (7%)	0.4% (4%)	1% (7%)	1% (9%)	0.1% (9%)	1% (8%)
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (46A-N) ^a	2% (41%)	2% (44%)	4% (48%)	3% (45%)	2% (39%)	2% (44%)	4% (50%)	3% (37%)	3% (45%)
Offensive Encounters-Community (46A-J) ^a	2% (41%)	2% (44%)	4% (47%)	3% (44%)	2% (38%)	2% (44%)	4% (50%)	3% (37%)	3% (45%)
Threat/Harm-Community (46K-N) ^a	1% (6%)	1% (8%)	1% (9%)	1% (7%)	1% (6%)	1% (7%)	2% (10%)	2% (11%)	1% (7%)
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (47A-Z) ^a	4% (14%)	4% (14%)	4% (15%)	7% (26%)	2% (9%)	5% (18%)	6% (21%)	6% (20%)	6% (22%)
Evaluation (47A-D) ^a	1% (5%)	1% (4%)	2% (6%)	3% (11%)	1% (3%)	2% (7%)	1% (6%)	3% (9%)	2% (9%)
Assignment/Career (47E, J-N, S) ^a	1% (5%)	1% (5%)	2% (6%)	3% (9%)	1% (3%)	1% (6%)	2% (9%)	2% (11%)	2% (8%)
Training/Test Scores (47F-I) ^a	0.4% (2%)	0.1% (1%)	1% (2%)	1% (4%)	0.2% (1%)	1% (2%)	0.5% (2%)	1% (5%)	1% (3%)
Punishment (47V-W) ^a	1% (2%)	1% (3%)	1% (2%)	1% (4%)	0.3% (1%)	1% (3%)	2% (4%)	0.1% (4%)	1% (4%)
Member/Family Services (47O-R,T,U) ^a	3% (8%)	3% (10%)	3% (9%)	5% (16%)	2% (5%)	4% (12%)	5% (14%)	6% (13%)	4% (13%)

Table 3.
Incidence Rates for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and/or Discrimination and Retaliation (Continued)

Scale	Total Sample	Non-Hispanic Native American	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Black	Non-Hispanic White	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races	Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Total Minority
Member/Family Fears (47X-Z) ^a	0.3% (1%)	1% (2%)	0.3% (1%)	0.2% (1%)	0.3% (1%)	0.2% (2%)	0.2% (2%)	1% (6%)	0.3% (1%)
Any Member/Family Incident (45A-O, 46A-O, 47A-Z) ^a	12% (59%)	11% (64%)	16% (67%)	20% (68%)	8% (54%)	15% (67%)	18% (66%)	18% (58%)	18% (67%)
Member Incident-DoD (45A-N, 47A-N,S,V-W) ^a	10% (49%)	9% (56%)	15% (60%)	17% (58%)	6% (43%)	14% (61%)	16% (57%)	16% (51%)	16% (59%)
Member/Family Incident (45O, 46O, 47O-R,T,U,X-Z) ^a	7% (11%)	7% (13%)	8% (13%)	12% (19%)	4% (8%)	9% (15%)	12% (18%)	12% (20%)	10% (17%)
Member/Family Miscellaneous (45O, 46O, 48) ^a	6% (9%)	7% (12%)	7% (12%)	9% (14%)	4% (8%)	7% (11%)	9% (14%)	10% (13%)	8% (13%)
Behaviors in the One Situation (51A-K) ^b	(20%)	(21%)	(22%)	(27%)	(17%)	(23%)	(29%)	(25%)	(25%)
Retaliation (76A-G) ^c	2% (6%)	3% (11%)	2% (9%)	3% (10%)	1% (5%)	2% (9%)	3% (9%)	2% (11%)	2% (9%)

^aThe values not in parentheses reflect endorsement of one or more items measuring racial/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination, and endorsement of an item measuring the labeling of one's experiences as racial/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination (Item 49).

^bThe values in parentheses reflect endorsement of one or more items measuring race/ethnic-related behaviors during a significant experience.

^cThe values not in parentheses reflect endorsement of one or more items measuring retaliation, and endorsement of an item measuring the labeling of any of the behaviors as retaliation for reporting one's significant experience.

Scales in the Retention and Commitment Section

Retention Tendencies. In Items 16, 17, and 18, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they, their spouse, and their family members believe they should remain in the military (see Table 4). Response options ranged from 1 (*very unlikely*) to 5 (*very likely*) for Item 16 and from 1 (*strongly favors leaving*) to 5 (*strongly favors staying*) for Items 17 and 18. Item 17 had the additional response option of *Does not apply; I am not married and I do not have a girlfriend/boyfriend*. Because Item 16 has different response options than Items 17 and 18, scale scores were obtained by first standardizing the items. A higher score on the scale reflects fewer tendencies to leave the military.

The items comprising this proposed scale have been used, in some form, on other surveys in DMDC's survey program. An item similar to Item 16 was used in the *1995 Form B*, the *1996 EOS*, the *1999 Survey of Active-Duty-Personnel – Form A (1999 ADS)*, the *2002 WGR*, and the *2004 WGRR*. Item 17 can also be found in the *1999 ADS*. Item 18, while not in any of these surveys, follows the logic of Item 17. Because Items 17 and 18 do not directly reflect an individual's intention to stay in the military, the three items, when combined, reflect tendencies, more than direct intentions, to stay on active duty in the military.

For Retention Tendencies (16, 17, 18), alpha coefficients were .84 for the total sample, .83 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .84 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .82 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .85 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .84 for Hispanics, .81 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .85 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .83 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 4.
Scale Items Measuring Retention Intentions

<i>Retention Intentions</i>	
16	Suppose that you have to decide whether to stay on active duty. Assuming you could stay, how likely is it that you would choose to do so?
17	Does your <u>spouse or significant other</u> think you should stay on or leave active duty?
18	Does your <u>family</u> think you should stay on or leave active duty?

Organizational Commitment. In Items 25A-Q, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements about their Service (see Table 5). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A higher score denotes a higher degree of commitment to one's Service.

Organizational commitment is a construct that represents an employee's degree of allegiance to their organization, in this case, the military. Research has found that organizational

commitment is multidimensional in nature and has been conceived of as having three components: affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997), which indicate that employees continue to work at an organization because they want to (affective attachment to one's organization), because they need to (perceived cost associated with leaving one's organization or continuance commitment), or because they feel they ought to (an obligation to stay in one's organization or normative commitment).

The current scale assesses affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The scale was developed by members of the Military Family Research Institute (H. M. Weiss, personal communication, May 8, 2006). Items 25P and 25Q were included in the *1996 EOS* and Item 25N⁵ was included in the *2004 WGRR*. Items 25H and 25Q are similar to items found in Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Items 25D and 25G are from Meyer and Allen's (1997) normative commitment scale and were piloted on a military population (Ormerod, Lee, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 2001) and Items 25F and 25L are similar to items found in Meyer and Allen's continuance commitment scale.

For Organizational Commitment (25A-Q), alpha coefficients were .89 for the total sample, .90 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .91 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .87 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .89 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .90 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .91 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Affective Commitment scale (Items 25A, 25B, 25E, 25H, 25J, 25M) were .88 for the total sample, .89 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .88 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .86 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .89 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .88 for Hispanics, .87 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .88 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .87 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Continuance Commitment scale (Items 25C, 25F, 25I, 25L, 25N) were .80 for the total sample, .79 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .82 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .79 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .79 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .81 for Hispanics, .81 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .82 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .82 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

For Normative Commitment (Items 25G, 25D, 25K), alpha coefficients were .80 for the total sample, .80 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .80 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .77 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .80 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .80 for Hispanics, .79 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .83 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .79 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

A one-factor and a three-factor CFA were fit to the data. The one-factor CFA fit poorly, for example, RMSEA = .22, NNFI = .77, SRMR = .15, GFI = .65, AGFI = .52, and CFI = .80 for the total sample. The three-factor CFA reflected affective, continuance, and normative

⁵ In Item 25N the response option originally ranged from "*strongly disagree*" to "*strongly agree*" and was listed as "One of the problems with leaving my Reserve component would be the lack of available alternatives in the *2004 WGRR*."

commitment (see Table 5) and fit moderately well. For example, RMSEA = .11, NNFI = .92, SRMR = .09, GFI = .89, AGFI = .84, and CFI = .94 for the total sample (see A).

Recommendations for this scale include dropping Items 25O, 25P, and 25Q because they are not conceptualized as part of affective, continuance, or normative commitment.

Table 5.
Scale Items Measuring Organizational Commitment

<i>Affective Commitment</i>	
25A	I enjoy serving in the military
25B	Serving in the military is consistent with my personal goals
25E	Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am happy with my life in the military
25H	I really feel as if the military's values are my own
25J	Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am proud to be in the military
25M	I feel like being a member of the military can help me achieve what I want in life
<i>Continuance Commitment</i>	
25C	If I left the military I would feel like I'm starting all over again
25F	It would be difficult for me to leave the military and give up the benefits that are available in the Service
25I	I would have difficulty finding a job if I left the military
25L	I continue to serve in the military because leaving would require considerable sacrifice
25N	One of the problems with leaving the military would be the lack of available alternatives
<i>Normative Commitment</i>	
25G	I would not leave the military right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it
25D	I would feel guilty if I left the military
25K	If I left the military, I would feel like I had let my country down
<i>Other</i>	
25O	I am committed to making the military my career
25P	My Service's evaluation/selection system is effective in promoting its best members
25Q	I am proud to tell others that I am a member of my Service

Scales in the Workplace Information Section

Supervisor Satisfaction. In Items 35A-F, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements about their supervisor (see Table 6). Response

options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A higher score denotes a higher degree of satisfaction with one's supervisor.

The Supervisor Satisfaction scale consists of six items similar to items first used in the *1995 Form B*.⁶ All items on this scale have been modified from items employed in previous DMDC surveys. Items 35A-E are modified versions of those used in the *1995 Form B*, while Item 35F is a modified version of an item used in the *1996 EOS*. A similar scale has been useful in research with military members (e.g., Hay & Elig, 1999; Sims, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 2005). Job satisfaction, a construct that includes supervisor, coworker and work satisfaction, has long been considered an important variable in organizational research (e.g., Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Job satisfaction has been found to predict job-related behaviors, such as work withdrawal (i.e., behaviors aimed at avoiding work tasks or the work environment, such as absenteeism, tardiness, and long breaks) and job withdrawal (i.e., intentions to leave the job or organization, such as thoughts about turnover and attempts at finding another job; see Hanisch & Hulin, 1991).

Alpha coefficients for the Supervisor Satisfaction scale (Items 35A-F) were .95 for the total sample, .96 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .95 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .95 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .95 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .95 for Hispanics, .95 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .96 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .95 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

A one-factor CFA was fit to the data and this model fit moderately well. For example, RMSEA = .10, NNFI = .98, SRMR = .01, GFI = .97, AGFI = .93, and CFI = .99 in the total sample (see A). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 6.
Scale Items Measuring Supervisor Satisfaction

<i>Supervisor Satisfaction</i>	
35A	You trust your supervisor
35B	Your supervisor ensures that all assigned personnel are treated fairly
35C	There is very little conflict between your supervisor and the people who report to him/her
35D	Your supervisor evaluates your work performance fairly
35E	Your supervisor assigns work fairly in your work group
35F	You are satisfied with the direction/supervision you receive

Coworker and Work Satisfaction. In Items 37A-F and 39A-E, survey participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements about their coworkers and the

⁶ In Items 35A-F the response options originally ranged from “*very large extent*” to “*not at all*” and were phrased as questions in the *1995 Form B*. For example, Item 35A was originally listed as “Do you trust your supervisor?” in the *1995 Form B*.

work they do (see Table 7). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Item 37F was reverse coded. A higher score indicates more satisfying experiences with coworkers and work.

The Coworker Satisfaction scale consists of five items, 37A-E. Although Item 37F asks about coworkers it was not included in this scale. Three items (Items 37A, 37B, and 37E) were modified from the *1995 Form B* (Edwards, Elig, Edwards, & Riemer, 1997)⁷ and were used subsequently on various DMDC surveys, such as the *2002 WGR*. Item 37C was adapted from Spector's (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)⁸ and was used in the *2002 WGR* and *2004 WGR* surveys. Item 37D was first used in the *2002 WGR*. New to the *2005 WEOA*, Item 37F was created by subject matter experts at DMDC and was included for purposes of testing. Of these five items, only 37E was used in the *1996 EOS*.

The Work Satisfaction scale consists of five items (Items 39A-E) that were modified from the *1995 Form B*.⁹ Items 39B-E were all included in the *1996 EOS* and Items 39A-E were all subsequently reported in the *2002 WGR* (Ormerod et al., 2003).

The Coworker and Work Satisfaction scales were piloted on a sample of military personnel and found to have strong reliability coefficients (Ormerod, Lee et al., 2001). Variations of these scales have been useful in research on military members (e.g., Hay & Elig, 1999; Sims et al., 2005). The Coworker Satisfaction scale measures satisfaction with coworkers and the Work Satisfaction scale measures satisfaction with work.

Alpha coefficients for the Coworker Satisfaction scale (Items 37A-E) were .91 for the total sample, .91 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .90 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .91 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .90 for Hispanics, .90 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .91 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .90 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). The scale was examined with Item 37F included but the item performed poorly. For example, the alpha coefficient for the total sample improved from .87 to .91 when 37F was removed from the scale.

Alpha coefficients for the Work Satisfaction scale (Items 39A-E) were .92 for the total sample, .92 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .92 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .92 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .92 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .92 for Hispanics, .92 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .91 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .92 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

⁷ In Item 37A the response option originally reflected an amount range (from “*very large extent*” to “*not at all*”) and was reworded from a question (“Is there conflict among your co-workers?”) to a statement. Item 37B was originally a statement (“The amount of effort of your co-workers compared to your effort) asking about satisfaction (from “*very satisfied*” to “*very dissatisfied*”).

⁸ Item 37C was originally listed as “There is too much bickering and fighting at work,” and response options ranged from “*disagree very much*” to “*agree very much*” in the *Job Satisfaction Survey*.

⁹ Modifications were made to the format of the item and item content. Items 39C and 39D were originally scored according to the member's degree of satisfaction along a 5-point scale ranging from “*very satisfied*” to “*very dissatisfied*,” and had slight content differences in the *1995 Form B*. For example, Item 39C was originally listed as “The kind of work you do.” Items 39A and 39B were originally scored according to the extent that the member agreed with the statements along a 5-point scale ranging from “*not at all*” to a “*very large extent*.” For example, Item 39A was originally listed as “Does your work provide you with a sense of pride?”

A two-factor CFA was fit to the data. Factor 1 reflected Coworker Satisfaction (37A-E) and Factor 2 reflected Work Satisfaction (39A-E). The two-factor CFA fit well. For example, RMSEA = .06, NNFI = .98, SRMR = .03, GFI = .97, AGFI = .96, and CFI = .99 in the total sample (see A). Recommendations include removing Item 37F from the Coworker Satisfaction scale.

Table 7.
Scale Items Measuring Coworker and Work Satisfaction

<i>Coworker Satisfaction</i>	
37A	There is very little conflict among your co-workers.
37B	Your co-workers put in the effort required for their jobs.
37C	The people in your workgroup tend to get along.
37D	The people in your workgroup are willing to help each other.
37E	You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers
37F* [†]	You put more effort into your job than your coworkers do.
<i>Work Satisfaction</i>	
39A	Your work provides you with a sense of pride.
39B	Your work makes good use of your skills.
39C	You like the kind of work you do.
39D	Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills.
39E	You are satisfied with your job as a whole

*Reverse Coded

[†]Omitted from final version of the Coworker Satisfaction scale.

Unit Cohesion. In Items 42A-D, survey participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding their unit cohesion (see Table 8). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A higher score indicates a higher perception of unit cohesion.

The Unit Cohesion scale is composed of four-items and assesses both affective (e.g., trust) and instrumental (e.g., teamwork) aspects of cohesion. Cohesiveness is a group property and can be viewed as a continuous rather than discrete variable, as degree of cohesiveness varies between groups. Previous research has shown unit cohesion to be a predictor of unit performance in the military (Siebold & Lindsay, 1999).

Alpha coefficients for the Unit Cohesion scale (Items 42A-D) were .92 for the total sample, .92 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .92 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .91 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .92 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .91 for Hispanics, .90 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .92 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .91 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 8.
Scale Items Measuring Unit Cohesion

<i>Unit Cohesion</i>	
42A	Service members in your unit really care about each other
42B	Service members in your unit work well as a team
42C	Service members in your unit pull together to get the job done
42D	Service members in your unit trust each other

Scales in the Stress and Health Section

Perceived Stress. In Items 43A-J, survey participants were asked how many times over the past month they had perceived stress in their lives (see Table 9). Response options ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Items 43D, 43E, 43G, and 43H were reverse coded so that a higher score indicates greater perceived distress.

Items 43A-J were tested in the *March 2003 SOFR* survey in response to a request from policy analysts concerned with military well-being. First used in the *2004 WGRR*, these items are new to the equal opportunity surveys. The Perceived Stress scale is composed of the 10-item version of the *Perceived Stress scale* (PSS10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988).¹⁰ This scale assesses the extent to which stressful life events are experienced. The PSS10 is a measure of perceived stress that focuses on one's appraisal of an event as stressful, rather than the event itself. Previous research indicates the PSS10 is a good predictor of health and other related outcomes and has adequate internal reliability with a coefficient alpha of .78 (Cohen & Williamson, 1988).

Alpha coefficients for the Perceived Stress scale (Items 43A-J) were .86 for the total sample, .86 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .83 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .85 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .87 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .85 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .86 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .85 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

This scale was intended to be unidimensional and thus a one-factor CFA was fit to the data. Examining the fit indices suggested the model did not fit the data well. For example, RMSEA = .17, NNFI = .87, SRMR = .09, GFI = .84, AGFI = .74, and CFI = .90 in the total sample. Findings from the *2004 WGRR Scales and Measures* report (Ormerod et al., 2005) suggested that the reverse-coded items formed a second method factor. Thus, a two-factor CFA was fit with the reverse-coded items being assigned to a second (method) factor. The two-factor model resulted in a much better fit. For example, RMSEA = .10, NNFI = .94, SRMR = .05, GFI = .93, AGFI = .89, and CFI = .96 in the total sample (see A). Recommendations for this scale

¹⁰ Originally a 14-item scale, the PSS10 is a shortened version, with response options that ranged from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*very often*). The 10-item version of the scale has been validated and appears to be an equal measure of perceived stress as the 14-item version (Cohen & Williamson, 1988). Modifications were made to the question stem in order to remain consistent with the format of other *2004 WGRR* survey questions. For example, the 10-item Perceived Stress scale (PSS10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988) originally asked, "In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?"

include replacing the reverse-scored items with items that are written in the positive direction, with the meanings of the items approximated as closely as possible. This was found to be a successful strategy for difficult scales in the past, such as the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS; Idaszak & Drasgow, 1987).

Table 9.
Scale Items Measuring Perceived Stress

<i>Perceived Stress</i>	
43A	Been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
43B	Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
43C	Felt nervous and stressed?
43D*	Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
43E*	Felt that things were going your way?
43F	Found that you could not cope with all of the things you had to do?
43G*	Been able to control irritations in your life?
43H*	Felt that you were on top of things?
43I	Been angered because of things that were outside of your control?
43J	Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

*Reverse coded.

General Health. In Items 44A-D, survey participants were asked to rate their health in general (see Table 10). Response options ranged from 1 (*definitely false*) to 4 (*definitely true*). Items 44B and 44C were reverse coded so that a higher score indicates more positive perceptions of the member's general health. The General Health scale is composed of four items from the general health perceptions subscale on the Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) of the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire.¹¹ The SF-36 is derived from work by the Rand Corporation and was designed to be used as a generic indicator of health status. It includes 36 items, drawn from the 245-item Medical Outcomes Study questionnaire, which assess eight health concepts (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992). First used in the *1995 Form B*, this scale is intended to assess members' perceptions of their general health and has been used in research with military members (e.g., Bergman, Langhout, Palmieri, Cortina, & Fitzgerald, 2002; Hay & Elig, 1999).

Alpha coefficients for the General Health scale (Items 44A-D) were .75 for the total sample, .72 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .76 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .74 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .75 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .75 for Hispanics, .75 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .75 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .74 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

¹¹ The general health perceptions subscale on the SF-36 included a mid-point response option of "*don't know*" and an additional question that asked the respondent to rate his or her health from excellent to poor.

Table 10.
Scale Items Measuring General Health

<i>General Health</i>	
44A	I am as healthy as anybody I know
44B*	I seem to get sick a little easier than other people
44C*	I expect my health to get worse
44D	My health is excellent

*Reverse coded.

Scales in the Race/Ethnic-Related Experiences in Military Section

Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination. In Items 45A-O and 46A-O survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they experienced any racial/ethnic-related harassment in the past 12 months (see Table 11). Items 45A-O and 46A-O differed only in the source of such harassment. Items 45A-O asked about experiences involving military personnel and/or Service/DoD civilian employees and/or contractors (on or off installation) and Items 46A-O pertain only to those experiences involving civilians in the local community around the installation. Response options ranged from 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*). A higher score denotes that the participant perceived experiencing more racial/ethnic-related harassment behavior.

In Items 47A-Z survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they experienced discriminatory behaviors that they considered to be the result of their race/ethnicity in the past 12 months (see Table 11). Response options included 1 (*yes, and my race/ethnicity was a factor*), 2 (*yes, but my race/ethnicity was NOT a factor*), and 3 (*no, or does not apply*).

Item 48 asked whether survey participants had any other negative race/ethnic-related experiences in the past 12 months. Response options included 1 (*no*) or 2 (*yes*).

New to the 2005 WEOA, Item 49 asked survey participants whether they considered any of the behaviors that they experienced in Items 45 to 48 to have been racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination. Response options included 1 (*yes, racial/ethnic harassment*), 2 (*yes, racial/ethnic discrimination*), and 3 (*yes both racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination*). Two additional response options included directions for skipping forward in the survey and were listed as: 4 (*no, neither racial/ethnic harassment nor discrimination*) and 5 (*does not apply, you did not mark that anything had happened to you or your family because of race/ethnicity*). Item 49 was used in conjunction with other items to calculate incident rates (described below).

Items 45A-O, 46A-O, 47A-Z, and 48 were the central part of the 1996 EOS. The 1996 EOS provided estimates of racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination experienced by active-duty military personnel and included items that tapped a limited set of antecedents and outcomes of such experiences. Survey questions were developed using a rational approach in consultation with academicians, other subject matter experts, and officials in the area of equal opportunity—including those in the federal, private, public, and military sectors; from an analysis of relevant literature—including reports and policy statements; from individual interviews with

officials from organizations representing minority-group members in the military; and were adapted from existing military surveys (Elig et al., 1997).

Items 45A-D, 45G-J, 45L, 46A-D, 46G-J, and 46L are modified from the *Sexual Experiences Questionnaire* (SEQ; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995), a behavioral measure of sexual harassment, to reflect racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination.¹² The SEQ was included in the *1995 Form B*. Following item generation, the items were refined through an iterative process of pretesting and modification. A series of focus groups were conducted for these purposes and the items, particularly those pertaining to racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination, were pretested to ensure that they were realistic, tapped a range of racial/ethnic experiences, and were understood by respondents. A total of 305 military personnel from all five Services participated in more than 30 focus groups at nine installations located throughout the United States (Elig et al., 1997). The focus groups typically contained from seven to twelve members who were of the same racial/ethnic group and organizational level (e.g., Black officers) and group leaders who were from the same racial/ethnic group as the members. Following each focus group, modifications were made to the survey and tested in subsequent focus groups (Ormerod, Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, Juraska, 2001). A complete description of item development and procedures can be found in Elig et al. (1997) and Scarville et al. (1999).

The items constituting Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination are configured in various ways, described below, to represent a spectrum of perceived racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination experiences. Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (Items 45A-O) and Member Incident-Community (Items 46A-O) reflect members' perceptions of racial/ethnic-related insensitivity, threats, or harm from another military member/DoD civilian or from civilians in the local community, respectively. Offensive Encounters-DoD (Items 45A-J) and Offensive Encounters-Community (Items 46A-J) reflect whether members indicated they experienced situations in which other DoD personnel or civilians in the community, respectively, engaged in racial/ethnic insensitive behavior that caused them discomfort or was insulting. Threat/Harm-DoD (Items 45K-N) and Threat/Harm-Community (Items 46K-N) include items that reflect the perception of threat, vandalism, or assault stemming from the members' race/ethnicity by DoD personnel or civilians in the community, respectively. Items 45A-O and 46A-O, grouped according to subscale, can be seen in Table 11.

To compute incident rates for Racial/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD, Member Incident-Community, Offensive Encounters-DoD, Offensive Encounters-Community, Threat/Harm-DoD, and Threat/Harm-Community, a two step counting process was used. This counting algorithm can be described as follows:

1. Respondent indicates experiencing any of the behaviors in that category (45A-N or 46A-N) at least once (response options "*once or twice*" to "*often*") in the previous 12 months, and
2. Indicates that the behaviors were racial/ethnic harassment (a score of 1 on Item 49).

¹² For example, Item 45A was originally stated as "Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?"

These rates are reported as percentages, computed by dividing the number of respondents who match the criteria for the measure (e.g., indicated that a behavior occurred at least once) by the total number of respondents who completed surveys and were in the racial/ethnic group under consideration in the analysis.¹³ To be counted as a complete survey the respondent must have provided (a) at least one response in Item 45, 46, 47, and/or 48 and (b) answered at least 50% of non-skippable items on the survey.

For Race/ Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD, alpha coefficients were .88 for the total sample, .89 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .91 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .88 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .86 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .92 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Offensive Encounters-DoD scale (Items 45A-J) were .88 for the total sample, .89 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .88 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .84 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .92 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Threat/Harm-DoD scale (Items 45K-N) were .81 for the total sample, .80 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .82 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .76 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .83 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .83 for Hispanics, .81 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .87 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .81 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

For Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community, alpha coefficients were .88 for the total sample, .90 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .89 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .86 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .90 for Hispanics, .89 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .93 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Offensive Encounters-Community scale (Items 46A-J) were .88 for the total sample, .90 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .89 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .85 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .89 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .92 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Threat/Harm-Community scale (Items 46K-N) were .80 for the total sample, .78 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .82 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .79 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .77 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .84 for Hispanics, .79 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .90 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .82 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

¹³ Rates for specific racial/ethnic groups were divided by eligible respondents in the particular racial/ethnic group under consideration (e.g., Racial/Ethnic-Related Harassment for Asians was divided by eligible respondents who were Asian).

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for Items 45A-N and 46A-N using maximum likelihood estimation. Both one factor (e.g., Item 45A-N) and two factor (e.g., Offensive Encounters, Item 45A-J and Threat/Harm, Item 45K-N) models were compared to assess fit, with the two factor models achieving a superior fit for both the military and civilian contexts. For example, in the total sample RMSEA = .09 and .08 and SRMR = .06 and .05, respectively, for the military and civilian contexts (see A). The two factor model is consistent with findings reported in Ormerod, Bergman et al. (2001) and Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, and Ormerod (in press). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 11.
Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Harassment

<i>Offensive Encounters</i>	
45A & 46A	Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into an offensive discussion of racial/ethnic matters?
45B & 46B	Told stories or jokes which were racist or depicted your race/ethnicity negatively?
45C & 46C	Were condescending to you because of your race/ethnicity?
45D & 46D	Put up or distributed materials (for example, pictures, leaflets, symbols, graffiti, music, stories) which were racist or showed your race/ethnicity negatively?
45E & 46E	Displayed tattoos or wore distinctive clothes which were racist?
45F & 46F	Did not include you in social activities because of your race/ethnicity?
45G & 46G	Made you feel uncomfortable by hostile looks or stares because of your race/ethnicity?
45H & 46H	Made offensive remarks about your appearance (for example, about skin color) because of your race/ethnicity?
45I & 46I	Made remarks suggesting that people of your race/ethnicity are not suited for the kind of work you do?
45J & 46J	Made other offensive remarks about your race/ethnicity (for example, referred to your race/ethnicity with an offensive name)?
<i>Threat/Harm</i>	
45K & 46K	Vandalized your property because of your race/ethnicity?
45L & 46L	Made you feel threatened with retaliation if you did not go along with things that were racially/ethnically offensive to you?
45M & 46M	Physically threatened or intimidated you because of your race/ethnicity?
45N & 46N	Assaulted you physically because of your race/ethnicity?
<i>Other</i>	
45O & 46O	Bothered or hurt any of your family in the ways listed above because of your family's race/ethnicity?

The Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination measure consists of 27 items (Items 47A-Z and 49) that measure six facets of discrimination: Assignment/Career, Evaluation, Training/Test Scores, Punishment, Member/Family Services, and Member/Family Fears. Assignment/Career discrimination (Items 47E, 47J-N, 47S, and 49) reflects the extent to which members perceive that an aspect of their current assignment or career progression was hampered because of their race/ethnicity. Evaluation Incident (Items 47A-D and 49) reflects members' perceptions that race/ethnicity influenced some aspect of their performance evaluation. Training/Test Scores Incident (Items 47F-I and 49) reflects the extent to which members perceived that their race/ethnicity influenced the availability of training and the assignment of training scores/grades. Punishment Incident (Items 47V-W and 49) reflects members' perceptions that race/ethnicity influenced whether and how they were punished. Member/Family Services (Items 47O-R, 47T, 47U, and 49) reflects whether members believed that they or their family members were treated differently because of race/ethnicity by either DoD or civilian businesses, police, or medical/support services. Member/Family Fears (Items 47X-Z and 49) reflects whether members indicated that either they or their family members were afraid to be on or off the installation because of gang activity or for other reasons. Items 47A-Z, grouped according to subscale, can be seen in Table 12.

The incident rate was calculated based on the algorithm described below. To report an incident rate for Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination, the counting algorithm used the following process:

1. Respondent indicates experiencing any of 26 discrimination behaviors and perceives that race/ethnicity was a factor (a score of 1 on one or more items in Items 47A-Z) at least once in past 12 months, and
2. Respondent indicates that the behaviors were racial/ethnic discrimination (a score of 2 on Item 49).

Those meeting these criteria were assigned a score of 2 (experienced racial/ethnic discrimination), whereas those who did not were assigned a score of 1 (did not experience racial/ethnic discrimination).

These rates are reported as percentages, computed by dividing the number of respondents who match the criteria for the measure (e.g., indicated that a behavior occurred and that the behavior was racial/ethnic discrimination) by the total number of respondents who completed surveys and were in the racial/ethnic group under consideration in the analysis. A similar method of counting discrimination incidents was employed using the six facets of discrimination: Evaluation Discrimination (Items 47A-D and 49), Assignment/Career Discrimination (Items 47E, 47J-N, 47S, and 49), Training/Test Scores (Items 47F-I and 49), Punishment (Items 47V-W and 49), Member/Family Services (47O-R, 47T, 47U, and 49), and Member/Family Fears (Items 47X-Z and 49).

For Race/ Ethnic-Related Discrimination (Items 47A-Z), alpha coefficients were .87 for the total sample, .90 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .87 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .85 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .85 for Non-Hispanic

individuals of two or more races, .93 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .88 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Evaluation scale (Items 47A-D) were .88 for the total sample, .89 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .88 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .84 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .92 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Assignment/Career scale (Items 47E, 47J-N, 47S) were .79 for the total sample, .81 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .83 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .79 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .76 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .80 for Hispanics, .77 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .86 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .80 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Training/Test Scores scale (Items 47F-I) were .66 for the total sample, .77 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .72 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .67 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .59 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .69 for Hispanics, .58 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .84 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .70 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Punishment scale (Items 47V-W) were .60 for the total sample, .60 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .59 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .66 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .55 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .62 for Hispanics, .45 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .67 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .62 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Member/Family Services scale (Items 47O, 47Q, 47R, 47T, 47U) were .64 for the total sample, .67 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .72 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .61 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .59 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .70 for Hispanics, .57 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .82 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .67 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Member/Family Fears scale (Items 47X-Z) were .76 for the total sample, .80 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .80 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .81 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .73 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .80 for Hispanics, .66 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .80 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .80 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Two CFAs of Items 47A-Z using tetrachoric correlations (dichotomized responses) and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation were carried out fitting a one and six-factor structure to the data (Evaluation, Items 47A-D; Assignment/Career, Items 47E, 47J-N, 47S; Training/Test Scores, Items 47F-I; Punishment, Items 47V-W; Member/Family Services, Items 47O, 47Q, 47R, 47T, 47U; and Member/Family Fears, Items 47X-Z). A tetrachoric correlation is computed as a measure of association between two dichotomous items. It is an estimation of the correlation that would be obtained if the items could be measured on a continuous scale. The reason for using a tetrachoric correlation is that the maximum Pearson product moment

correlation is less than 1.0 for dichotomous variables with different base rates. The six-factor structure fit the data significantly better than the one-factor structure. The fit indices suggested that the model had a good fit to the data. For example, RMSEA = .05 and SRMR = .04 in the total sample (see A). The six factor model is consistent with Ormerod, Bergman et al. (2001). For a discussion of a five factor configuration of these items, see Bergman, Palmieri et al. (in press). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Several global measures of race/ethnic-related harassment and/or discrimination were examined (Any Member/Family Incident, Member Incident – DoD, Member/Family Incident, and Member/Family Miscellaneous). Any Member/Family Incident (Items 45A-O, 46A-O, 47A-Z, and 49) is a global measure assessing whether either the Service member or a member of his/her family perceived experiencing any racial/ethnic-related behaviors or situations. Member Incident – DoD (Items 45A-N, 47A-N, 47S, 47V-W, and 49) reflects whether members indicated that they personally experienced race/ethnicity-related insensitivity, threats, harm, or discrimination from another military member or a DoD civilian. Member/Family Incident (Items 45O, 46O, 47O-R, 47T, 47U, 47X-Z, and 49) reflects whether members indicated that either they or their family experienced any of three types of racial/ethnic insensitivity, harassment, or discrimination from DoD personnel or civilians in the local community. Member/Family Miscellaneous (Items 45O, 46O, 48, and 49) reflects whether members indicated that either they or their family had any other race/ethnic-related experiences involving DoD personnel or civilians in the local community.

The incident rate was calculated based on the algorithm described below. To report an incident rate for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination, the counting algorithm used the following process:

1. Respondent indicates experiencing any negative racial/ethnic-related harassment (a score of 2 or more on one or more items in Items 45A-O and/or Items 46A-O), discrimination (a score of 3 on one or more items in Items 47A-Z), and/or other race/ethnic-related experiences (a score of 2 on Item 48) in past 12 months, and
2. Respondent indicates that the behaviors experienced were race/ethnic-related harassment and/or discrimination (a score of 1, 2, or 3 on Item 49).

Those meeting these criteria were assigned a score of 2 (experienced race/ethnic-related harassment/discrimination), whereas those who did not were assigned a score of 1 (did not experience race/ethnic-related harassment/discrimination).

These rates are reported as percentages, computed by dividing the number of respondents who match the criteria for the measure (e.g., indicated that a behavior occurred and, if specific to a behavior in Item 47, race/ethnicity was a factor and some or all of it was race/ethnic-related harassment and/or discrimination) by the total number of respondents who completed surveys and were in the racial/ethnic group under consideration in the analysis.

Alpha coefficients for Member Incident – DoD (Items 45A-N, 47A-N, 47S, 47V-W) were .65 for the total sample, .63 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .63 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .69 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .64 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .65 for Hispanics, .68 for

Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .72 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .66 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for Member/Family Incident (Items 45O, 46O, 47O-R, 47T, 47U, 47X-Z) were .60 for the total sample, .67 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .66 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .60 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .55 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .64 for Hispanics, .52 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .76 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .63 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). By excluding items 45O and 46O from this measure, the scale reliability for the total sample would increase to .74.

Table 12.
Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination

<i>Evaluation</i>	
47A	You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation
47B	Your last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments
47C	You were held to a higher performance standard than others
47D	You did not get an award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances
<i>Assignment/Career</i>	
47E	Your current assignment has not made use of your job skills
47J	Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military
47K	You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would help you prepare for advancement
47L	You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement
47M	You did not learn until it was too late of opportunities that would help your career
47N	You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities
47S	You were excluded by your peers from social activities
<i>Training/Test Scores</i>	
47F	You were not able to attend a major school needed for your specialty
47G	You did not get to go to short (1-to-3-day) courses that would provide you with needed skills
47H	You received lower grades than you deserved in your training
47I	You did not get a job assignment that you wanted because of scores that you got on tests
<i>Punishment</i>	
47V	You were taken to nonjudicial punishment or court martial when you should not have been
47W	You were punished for something that others did without being punished

<i>Evaluation</i>	
<i>Member/Family Services</i>	
47O	You or your family were discriminated against when seeking non-government housing
47Q	You or your family did not get appropriate medical care
47R	You or your family got poorer military support service (for example, at commissaries, exchanges, clubs, and rec centers) than others did
47T	Local civilian police harassed you or your family without cause

Table 12.
Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (Continued)

<i>Member/Family Services</i>	
47U	You or your family were watched more closely than others were by armed forces police
<i>Member/Family Fears</i>	
47X	You were afraid for you or your family to go off the installation because of gang activity
47Y	You were afraid for you or your family to go off the installation for other reasons
47Z	You were afraid for you or your family because of gang activity on the installation

Behaviors in the One Situation. In Items 51A-K, survey participants were presented with eleven of the subscales described in Items 45-48 and examples of behaviors from each subscale. For example, Offensive Encounters-DoD included the example “Your exposure to offensive race/ethnic-related speech, pictures/printed material, non-verbal looks, or dress.” Respondents were asked to “Think about the situations you experienced during the past 12 months that involved the behaviors you marked as having happened to you or your family because of race/ethnicity. Pick one situation to tell us about in this section. That situation should be the event or set of related events during the past 12 months that bothered you the most” (see Table 13). Response options were 1 (*no*) and 2 (*yes*). A higher score on Items 51A-K denotes perceptions of race/ethnic-related behaviors in the situation that was the most troublesome.

Items 51A-K are presented in a manner similar to that of the items in the One Situation on the *1996 EOS*. However, whereas the items in the *1996 EOS* were clustered rationally according to similar behaviors,¹⁴ the items in the *2005 WEOA* are grouped according to subscales based on factor analytic analyses of the *1996 EOS* data.

Alpha coefficients were .73 for the total sample, .78 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .75 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .74 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .69 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .76 for Hispanics, .67 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .87 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .75 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

An exploratory analysis using principal axis factoring with squared multiple correlations as communality estimates and an oblique rotation (Oblimin) was performed. An oblique rotation is used when factors are assumed to be correlated, whereas an orthogonal rotation (e.g., Varimax) is used when factors are considered to be independent of each other. Orthogonality is the more restrictive assumption and unless there is a theoretical justification for assuming factors are independent, an oblique rotation is most appropriate. The solution accounted for 29.4% of the variance and the scree plot clearly indicated the presence of two important components.

¹⁴ In the *1996 EOS* items were typically grouped by behavior. For example, “Offensive speech (for example, names, jokes, stories, remarks),” “Offensive music, pictures, or printed material (for example, graffiti, pamphlets, posters),” “Being left out socially, social isolation.”

However, examination of the factor plot suggested that, rather than being a simple two dimensional structure, the structure is a continuum ranging from Items 51D, 51J, and 51B at one end to Items 51F and 51E at the other. For example, Items 51D, 51J, 51B, 51K, and I form the first component and fall along the continuum in order followed by Items 51C, 51A, 51G, 51H, 51F, and 51E, which make up the second component. This suggests that perceptions of ethnic/race-related behaviors in the One Situation range from concerns about harm from harassment in non-work contexts to discrimination related to one's career, with additional subscales reflecting gradations between these two endpoints. Recommendations for modifications to this scale include repeating the questions from Items 45-48 rather than presenting the subscale descriptions.

Table 13.
Scale Items Measuring Behaviors in the One Situation

<i>One Situation</i>	
51A	Offensive encounters <u>with military personnel, DoD/Service employees and/or contractors</u> (for example, your exposure to offensive race/ethnic-related speech, pictures/printed material, non-verbal looks, or dress)
51B	Offensive encounters <u>with civilians around your installation</u> (for example, your exposure to offensive race/ethnic-related speech, pictures/printed material, non-verbal looks, or dress)
51C	Harm or threat of harm from <u>military personnel, DoD/Service employees and/or contractors</u> (for example, your experience(s) of race/ethnic-related threats, intimidation, vandalism, or physical assault)
51D	Harm or threat of harm from <u>civilians around your installation</u> (for example, your experience(s) of race/ethnic-related threats, intimidation, vandalism, or physical assault)
51E	Assignment/career discrimination (for example, your experience(s) of racial/ethnic discrimination in assignments, daily tasks, availability or mentorship, access to information about career opportunities or promotion potential)
51F	Evaluation discrimination (for example, your experience(s) of race/ethnic-motivated negative evaluations, differences in performance standards, and distribution of awards/decorations)
51G	Undue punishment (for example, your experience(s) of nonjudicial punishment, or additional punishment(s) because of your race/ethnicity)
51H	Training/testing discrimination (for example, your experience(s) of unfair training scores, and/or lack of access to schools/training because of your race/ethnicity)
51I	Discrimination by service providers (for example, your or your family's experience(s) of race/ethnic-motivated poorer customer service in civilian/military stores, lack of access to non-governmental housing, and scrutiny from civilian/military police)
51J	Safety concerns (for example, your or your family's safety fears on- or off-installation of gang activity or safety fears motivated by other reasons)
51K	Other race/ethnic-related experiences (for example, any other ways in which you or your family have been bothered/hurt by military personnel, DoD/Service employees and/or contractors, and/or civilians around your installation.
52	Would you say that <u>you and/or your family</u> experienced racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination in what you said happened in the situation that bothered you most?

Subjective Distress. In Items 53A-E, survey participants were asked to indicate the degree to which the One Situation (i.e., behaviors endorsed in Item 51) was distressing (see

Table 14). Response options ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very large extent*). A higher score denotes greater distress.

The Subjective Distress scale, first used in the *1995 Form B* (Dragow et al., 1999), was originally composed of the first four items in Table 14 plus and additional item.¹⁵ Additionally, Items 53A-D were used to measure perceptions of distress in DMDC's two subsequent gender and workplace relations surveys. Items 53A, 53B, and 53D can also be found in the Feelings Scale (FS; Swan, 1997).¹⁶ Originally a 15-item scale, the FS was adapted from an emotions scale by Folkman and Lazarus (1985) and measures the extent to which individuals' appraised behaviors indicative of sexual harassment as stressful. Items 53A-D were included in the *1996 EOS*. Item 53E was drawn from a scale adapted from the Perceived Racism scale (McNeilly et al., 1996) that taps Latina/os emotional responses to racism (Perceived Racism scale for Latina/os; Collado-Proctor, 1998).

Alpha coefficients were .91 for the total sample, .92 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .93 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .92 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .91 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .92 for Hispanics, .90 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .93 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .92 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 14.
Scale Items Measuring Subjective Distress

<i>Subjective Distress</i>	
53A	Annoying?
53B	Offensive?
53C	Disturbing?
53D	Threatening?
53E	Disillusioning?

Coping. In Items 63A-K, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they used specific non-reporting coping strategies (e.g., behaviors other than filing formal reports) in response to the One Situation (see Table 15). Response options ranged from 1 (*no*) to 2 (*yes*). A higher score indicates that the respondent used the strategies to a greater extent.

Items 63A-K are rationally grouped into two scales, Internal Coping (Items 63A, 63C, 63J) and External Coping (Items 63B and 63D-I), and are considered to be a collection of two individual scales rather than parts of one general scale. Item 63K asks about whether the person

¹⁵ The additional item was "Embarrassed."

¹⁶ Items 53A and 53D were originally expressed in the past tense (e.g., Item 53A is listed as "Annoyed" in the Feelings scale). In addition, Item 53B was originally listed as "Insulted."

accomplished less than what they wanted at work in response to the One Situation, and is not considered to be a coping response and is thus not reflected in analyses.

The two coping scales, excluding Items 63E-F and 63I-K, are modified versions of subscales from the Coping with Harassment Questionnaire¹⁷ (CHQ; Fitzgerald, 1990; Fitzgerald, Gold, Brock, & Gelfand, 1993; Ormerod & Gold, 1988).¹⁸ Items 63A, 63C, 63D, 63F, and 63G are similar to items used in the *1995 Form B*¹⁹ and Items 63A and 63C-G are modified versions of those used in the *1996 EOS*. Three items (63A-C) were reported in the *2002 WGR* (Ormerod et al., 2003) and the *2004 WGRR* (Ormerod et al., 2005). Item 63J is similar to an item piloted for use with the military in the *Status of the Armed Forces Survey Pilot Forms A and B-Gender Issues*²⁰ (Ormerod, Lee et al., 2001). Item 63K is based on an item in the RAND-36 and can be found in the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992)²¹, which is derived from work by the Rand Corporation.

Coping responses are thought to be used by targets of harassment to manage the harassment and/or their feelings in response to it. Researchers (e.g., Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997) have proposed that there are two general coping styles (internal and external) that can be employed by targets of harassment. These two types are not considered to be mutually exclusive and are based on Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) problem-focused and emotion-focused coping styles. Internal coping is represented by more cognitively-oriented responses, such as ignoring or denying the behavior, whereas external coping is represented by more active responses such as avoidance or assertion. The Coping scales in the *2005 WEOA* are intended to assess non-reporting coping strategies.

Alpha coefficients for the Internal Coping scale (Items 63A, 63C, and 63J) were .59 for the total sample, .60 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .60 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .54 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .61 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .57 for Hispanics, .51 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .60 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .56 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the External Coping scale (Items 63B and 63D-I) were .56 for the total sample, .53 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .59 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .50 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .56 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .58 for Hispanics, .51 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .51 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .55 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). Item 63J appears to be tapping a different aspect of internal coping than Items 63A and 63C. Dropping this item would increase the alpha coefficient from .59 to .80 in the total sample. Similarly, large increases would be seen across each race/ethnicity if this item was removed. However, removing this item would leave a scale

¹⁷ External coping was originally divided into four subscales.

¹⁸ The original CHQ consists of fifty items, includes additional subscales, and the response options range from 1 (*not at all descriptive*) to 5 (*very descriptive*). CHQ items are worded as statements in the first person (e.g., "I tried to forget the whole thing"), as opposed to questions following a general stem.

¹⁹ Changes to items include changes in wording (e.g., Item 63B was listed as "I avoided the person[s]") from the *1995 Form B*.

²⁰ Item 63J was originally listed as "I thought about leaving military service" in the *1995 Form B*.

²¹ The original instrument included a mid-point response option of "don't know." Item 63K was originally listed as "Accomplished less than you would like" in the *1995 Form B*.

of only 2 items. Recommendations for this scale include replacing Item 63J with internal coping items from the CHQ and removing Item 63K.

CFA of Items 63A-J using tetrachoric correlations (dichotomized responses) and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation was carried out fitting the two-factor structure to the data (Internal Coping and External Coping). The model fit poorly. For example, RMSEA = .14 and SRMR = .21 in the total sample (see A).

Table 15.
Scale Items Measuring Coping

<i>Internal Coping</i>	
63A	Try to ignore the behavior?
63C	Try to forget it?
63J	Think about getting out of your Service?
<i>External Coping</i>	
63B	Try to avoid the person(s) who bothered you?
63D	Tell the person(s) to stop?
63E	Ask someone else to speak to the person(s) for you?
63F	Settle it yourself physically?
63G	Act as though it did not bother you?
63H	Call a hotline for advice/information (not to file a complaint)?
63I	Request a transfer?
<i>Other</i>	
63K	Accomplish less than you would like at work?

Reporting. In Items 67A-F, survey participants were asked to indicate whether and to whom the respondent reported the One Situation and the impact of reporting (see Table 16). For each of the six items, response options ranged from 1 (*no, I did not report it to this person/office*) to 5 (*yes, and it made things better*). Thus, respondents were able to endorse reporting to multiple individuals or offices. A higher item score indicates that the respondent endorsed reporting the One Situation to the queried individual or group.

Items 67A-F were part of a longer reporting scale in the 1996 EOS and Items 67A-E were originally part of a 10-item scale introduced in the 1995 Form B.²² Items 67A-E were created by subject matter experts to capture all of the different avenues through which experiences would be reported. Item 67F was added to the scale in response to results from pre-tests, and the total reporting scale was shortened to the current six items to reduce the burden on survey respondents

²² Item 67F is also modified from an item used in the 1995 Form B; it originally read “I informally requested advice/assistance from other base/post sources, such as the chaplain or counselors” and was grouped with coping items.

and to minimize small cell sizes.²³ Items similar to 67A-F²⁴ were pretested in a sample of military personnel (Ormerod, Lee et al., 2001) and reported in the 2002 WGR (Ormerod et al., 2003) and 2004 WGR (Ormerod et al., 2005). Items 67A-F measure behaviors that may be implemented by an individual, and, as such, are not necessarily intended as a scale measuring a theoretical construct.

Table 16.
Scale Items Measuring Reporting

<i>Reporting</i>	
67A	Your immediate supervisor
67B	Someone else in your chain-of-command
67C	Someone in the chain-of-command of the person(s) who did it
67D	Special military office responsible for handling these kinds of complaints (for example, Military Equal Opportunity or Civil Rights Office)
67E	Other person or office with responsibility for follow-up
67F	Chaplain, counselor, ombudsman, or health care provider

Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome. In Items 69A-G, participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the reporting process (see Table 17). Response options ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*). A higher score indicates a greater degree of satisfaction with the reporting process.

Originally a 7-item scale, Items 69A, 69C, 69D, 69E, and 69G were first used in the 1995 Form B.²⁵ Item 69F was a new item first used in the 2002 WGR (Ormerod et al., 2003) and was recommended for inclusion by subject matter experts and the University of Illinois, as it would provide more complete information about the complaint process. Item 69B was added to reflect the wide range of reporting options available to service members. Items 69A, 69C-E, and 69G were included in the 1996 EOS. This 7-item Satisfaction with Reporting scale is intended to assess a respondent's satisfaction with the reporting process.

In Item 73, participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the outcome of their complaint (see Table 17). Response options ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very*

²³ Items 67A-E are slightly modified versions of items used in the 1996 EOS and the 1995 Form B. Items contain modification to content. For example, Item 67A was originally listed as "My immediate supervisor." Scoring options in both the 1996 EOS and the 1995 Form B used four response options assessing whether the behavior was reported and whether it made things better or worse.

²⁴ Item 67F was included in the coping scales of these instruments.

²⁵ Items 69A, 69C, 69D, 69E, and 69G are slightly modified versions of items found on the 1995 Form B. Modifications were made to item content. For example, Item 69A was originally listed as "The availability of information about how to report or file a complaint" in the 1995 Form B. The stem was modified from "How satisfied are you with the following as they relate to your experience with reporting unwanted sex/gender-related attention" to better fit the focus of the current survey.

satisfied). Item 73 can be found on the 1996 EOS, the 1995 Form B²⁶, the 2002 WGR, and the 2004 WGR. When combined with Items 69A-G, this 8-item scale is referred to as Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome and is intended to measure satisfaction with the reporting process and with the outcome of the complaint.

Alpha coefficients were .95 for the total sample, .97 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .96 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .94 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .94 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .95 for Hispanics, .97 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .95 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .95 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 17.
Scale Items Measuring Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome

<i>Satisfaction with Reporting and Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome</i>	
69A	Availability of information about how to file a complaint
69B	Availability of information about how to follow-up on a complaint
69C	Treatment by personnel handling your complaint
69D	Amount of time it took/is taking to resolve your complaint
69E	How well you were/are kept informed about the progress of your complaint
69F	Degree to which your privacy was/is being protected
69G	The complaint process overall
73	How satisfied were you with the outcome of your complaint?

Reasons for Not Reporting. In Items 75A-N, survey participants were asked to indicate their reasons for not reporting the behaviors that were endorsed in the One Situation (see Table 18). For each of the fourteen items, response options ranged from 1 (*no*) to 2 (*yes*). Thus, respondents were able to endorse multiple reasons for not reporting. A higher item score indicates that the respondent endorsed the item as a reason for not reporting.

Items similar to Items 75A-B and 75D-N can be found on the 1996 EOS, items similar to 75A-B, 75D-J, and 75M were used in the 1995 Form B, and all but 75I, 75M, and 75N were included in the 2002 WGR and 2004 WGR surveys. Modifications were made to the content and the presentation was changed from that of a checklist to the current dichotomous scale.²⁷ Items 75A, 75B, 75D-H, and 75J-N were developed by DMDC researchers and subject matter experts through an iterative process that included feedback from focus groups. Item 75C was developed for the 2002 WGR, following group and individual structured interviews with service members (Ormerod et al., 2003). Items 75A-N are intended to function as a scale and tap several broad classes of reasons for not-reporting the racial/ethnic behaviors endorsed in Items 45-48.

²⁶ The item was asked in the present tense on the 1995 Form B.

²⁷ For example in the 1996 EOS and the 1995 Form B, Item 75A was originally listed as “I did not think it was that important.” Item 75K combined two items from the 1996 EOS.

However, examination of the factor structure on the 2002 WGR was inconclusive and these items appear to function more like a behavioral list than a scale. Thus reliability coefficients are not provided in Table 1.

Table 18.
Scale Items Measuring Reasons for Not Reporting

<i>Reasons for Not Reporting</i>	
75A	Was not important enough to report
75B	You did not know how to report
75C	You felt uncomfortable making a report
75D	You took care of the problem yourself
75E	You did not think anything would be done
75F	You thought you would not be believed
75G	You thought reporting would take too much time and effort
75H	You thought you would be labeled a troublemaker
75I	You thought it would make your work situation unpleasant
75J	You thought your performance evaluation or chance for promotion would suffer
75K	You were afraid of retaliation/reprisals from the person(s) who did it or from their friends
75L	You were afraid of retaliation/reprisals from your chain-of-command
75M	You did not know the identity of the person(s) who did it
75N	Situation only involved civilian(s) off an installation

Retaliation. In Items 76A-G survey participants were asked to indicate whether they experienced retaliatory behaviors in response to how they handled the One Situation (see Table 19). To calculate alpha coefficients, to compute means, standard deviations, and standard errors, and to run confirmatory factor analyses, response options for Items 76A-G, 1 (*no*), 2 (*yes*), and 99 (*don't know*), were recoded to 1 (*no*), 2 (*don't know*), and 3 (*yes*), based on research indicating that a “don’t know” option tends to act as a midpoint (Drasgow et al., 1999).

In Item 77, survey respondents were asked to indicate whether they considered any of the behaviors listed in 76A-G to be retaliation for reporting their experience. Response options for Item 77 were 1 (*no*), 2 (*yes*), 3 (*don't know*), and 4 (*does not apply, I did not report my experience or none of the things listed above happened to me*). Item 77 was used in conjunction with Items 76A-G to calculate incident rates for retaliation with a higher score denoting greater amounts of retaliation.

Originally an 11-item scale, the Retaliation scale was reported previously in the 2002 *WGR* (Ormerod et al., 2003) and the 2004 *WGRR*.²⁸ This scale reflects a composite of items adapted from the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board surveys of sexual harassment in the federal workplace (USMSPB, 1981, 1987; Near & Miceli, 1986) and research by Parmerlee, Near, and Jensen (1982). Retaliation related to workplace harassment is thought to include two types: personal (e.g., isolating and targeting victims of harassment with hostile interpersonal behaviors) and professional (e.g., behaviors that interfere with career advancement and retention) reprisals that may contribute differentially to outcomes (Cortina & Magley, 2003; Fitzgerald, Smolen, Harned, Collinsworth, & Colbert, in preparation). The current scale includes items related to both personal (Items 76A-B) and professional (Items 76C-G) retaliation.

The incident rate for retaliation was calculated based on whether the respondent indicated experiencing any of the seven retaliatory behaviors (a score of 3 on one or more items in Items 76A-G), and the respondent indicated that any of the behaviors experienced in Item 76 were retaliation for reporting experiences in the One Situation (a score of 2 on Item 77).

These rates are reported as percentages, computed by dividing the number of respondents who match the criteria for the measure (e.g., indicated experiencing a retaliatory behavior and labeled it as retaliation in response to reporting the One Situation) by the total number of respondents who completed surveys and were in the racial/ethnic group under consideration in the analysis.

Alpha coefficients for Items 76A-G were .92 for the total sample, .93 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .91 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .90 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .93 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .91 for Hispanics, .90 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .93 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .91 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

A CFA using tetrachoric correlations (using dichotomized responses) and diagonally weighted least squares estimation was carried out by fitting a two-factor structure to the data (personal and professional retaliatory behavior described above). The fit indices were acceptable; for example RMSEA = .02 and SRMR = .01 in the total sample (see Appendix A). However, the two factors were highly correlated (.95), indicating that the scale may be unidimensional. A one-factor CFA was performed and, although the fit degraded slightly (e.g., RMSEA = .03 and SRMR = .02 in the total sample), it was deemed the more parsimonious solution.

Recommendations for this scale include increasing the number of personal retaliation items in the scale so that both personal and professional retaliation can be examined.

²⁸ Item 76A was listed as “You were ignored by others at work” in the 2002 *WGR*.

Table 19.
Scale Items Measuring Retaliation

<i>Retaliation</i>	
76A	You were ignored or shunned by others at work
76B	You were blamed for the situation
76C	You were given less favorable job duties
76D	You were denied an opportunity for training
76E	You were given an unfair job performance appraisal
76F	You were denied a promotion
76G	You were transferred to a less desirable job
77	Do you consider any of the things which YOU MARKED AS HAPPENING TO YOU in response to how you handled the situation to have been retaliation for reporting your experience?

Scales in the Personnel Policy, Practices, and Training Section

Leadership Efforts to Stop Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination. In Items 78A-C, survey participants were asked to indicate whether senior leadership “make honest and reasonable efforts to stop racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination” (see Table 20). To calculate alpha coefficients and to compute means, standard deviations, and standard errors, response options, 1 (*no*), 2 (*yes*), and 99 (*don’t know*), were recoded to 1 (*no*), 2 (*don’t know*), and 3 (*yes*), based on research indicating that a “don’t know” option tends to act as a midpoint (Drasgow et al., 1999). A higher score indicates a higher perception of senior leadership as making “honest and reasonable efforts to stop racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination.”

Items 78A-C have been used consistently across the family of surveys that assess various forms of harassment and discrimination in the military (e.g., the 1988 *SHS*, the 1995 *Form B*, the 1996 *EOS*, the 2002 *WGR*, and the 2004 *WGRR*). The Leadership Efforts to Stop Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination scale is intended to assess perceptions of whether senior leadership and immediate supervisors make efforts to stop racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination.

Alpha coefficients were .88 for the total sample, .90 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .91 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .87 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .87 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .88 for Hispanics, .84 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .88 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .88 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 20.
Scale Items Measuring Leaderships Efforts to Stop Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination

<i>Leadership Efforts to Stop Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination</i>	
<i>Please give your opinion about whether the persons below make honest and reasonable efforts to stop racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, regardless of what is said officially.</i>	
78A	Senior leadership of my Service
78B	Senior leadership of my installation/ship
78C	My immediate supervisor

Organizational Climate. In Items 80A-E and 82A-M, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements about the climate for racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination in their work group and at their installation/ship (see Table 21). Response options ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very large extent*). Items 80A-B, 80D-E, 82A-B, and 82D-H are reverse coded such that a higher scale score indicates greater perceived organizational tolerance, decreased provision of resources, and increased perception of racist/extremist groups respectively.

Items 80A-E and 82A-M were rationally categorized into three scales, Organizational Tolerance for Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination (Items 80A-C and Items 82A-C), Provision of Resources (Items 80D-E and Items 82D-E), and Perceptions of Racist/Extremist Groups and Gangs (Items 82I-M). Items 82G-H were excluded from these scales because of their conceptual dissimilarity. Higher scale scores indicate greater individual perceptions that the organizational climate is tolerant of racial/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination, decreased provision of resources to combat or address racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, or that there is a greater amount of racist or extremist activity.

In the Organizational Tolerance scale, Items 80A, 80C, 82A, and 82C contain similar content to those found on the *1996 EOS*.²⁹ Items 80A-B and 82A-B are similar to an item used in the *1995 Form B*, and Items 80B and 82B are similar to items found in the *2002 WGR* and the *2004 WGRR*. In addition, the six items that make up the Organizational Tolerance scale are similar to response options found on the Organizational Tolerance of Sexual Harassment scale (OTSH; Hulin, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1996).³⁰ The OTSH assesses the climate for sexual harassment within work groups or larger organizational units. Items 80B and 82B ask if complaints about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination would be taken seriously. Items 80A and 82A assess perceptions about the risk involved in complaining, and Items 80C and 82C measure perceptions that corrective action would be taken following the complaint.

²⁹ The items on the *1996 EOS* refer to installation/ship, and the wording is somewhat different (e.g., the item equivalent to Item 80C is worded “Do people get away with racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination?”).

³⁰ The OTSH assesses individual perceptions of organizational tolerance for sexual harassment along scenarios about gender harassment (called Crude and Offensive Behavior in a military context), unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Response options ask if a complaint was made by the respondent, whether the respondent would incur risk, be taken seriously, or if corrective action would be taken.

Variants of the items comprising the Provision of Resources scale have been used in previous DMDC surveys, including the *1995 Form B*,³¹ the *1996 EOS*, the *2002 WGR*, and the *2004 WGR*. Items found in the Racist/Extremists scale, with the exception of 82K, can be found in the *1996 EOS*.³² Finally, although not included in the scales described above, Items 82G, and 80H were included in the *1996 EOS*.

Alpha coefficients for Organizational Climate (Items 80A-E and 82A-M) were .90 for the total sample, .91 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .89 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .89 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .90 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .90 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Organizational Tolerance for Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination scale (Items 80A-C, and 82A-C) were .83 for the total sample, .85 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .81 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .83 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .81 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .83 for Hispanics, .85 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .81 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .83 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Provision of Resources scale (Items 80D-E and 82D-F) were .92 for the total sample, .92 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .92 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .91 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .92 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .91 for Hispanics, .93 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .94 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .91 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Perceptions of Racist/Extremist Groups and Gangs scale (Items 82I-M) were .90 for the total sample, .89 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .92 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .91 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .89 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .90 for Hispanics, .90 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .93 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .91 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

One-factor and three-factor CFA's (described above) were fit to the data. Although the three-factor model had a better fit, both models fit poorly due to the presence of pairs of items reflecting similar content (i.e. Items 80C and 82C; Items 82I and 82J). For example, the fit statistics for the three-factor CFA were RMSEA = .15, NNFI = .77, SRMR = .10, GFI = .77, AGFI = .69, and CFI = .80 in the total sample (see A). Items 82C and 82J were dropped from subsequent factor analyses, as they were the least frequently endorsed of the paired items. A one- and three-factor CFA were fit without Items 82C and 82J. The three-factor CFA fit moderately well and fit better than the one-factor model. For example, the fit statistics for the three-factor model were RMSEA = .11, NNFI = .93, SRMR = .06, GFI = .88, AGFI = .83, and

³¹ In the *1995 Form B* participants were asked about the establishment, rather than the publicizing, of policies and procedures related to unprofessional gender-related behaviors. Items contain modifications of content and are modified to reflect racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination. For example, Item 80D was originally listed as "Establishing policies prohibiting sexual harassment" in the *1995 Form B*.

³² Modifications were made to item content. Participants were instructed to indicate the extent to which problematic behaviors or groups were a problem at their installation/ship. For example, Item 82J was originally listed as "Racist/extremist organizations or activities?" in the *1996 EOS*.

CFI = .94 in the total sample (see A). Recommendations for this scale include removing items that repeat or have highly similar content.

Table 21.
Scale Items Measuring Organizational Climate

<i>Organizational Tolerance for Racial/Ethnic Harassment and Discrimination</i>	
80A*	Would members of your work group feel free to report racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination without fear of reprisals?
80B*	Would complaints about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination be taken seriously?
80C	Would people be able to get away with racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination?
82A*	Would Service members feel free to report racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination without fear of reprisals?
82B*	Would complaints about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination be taken seriously?
82C	Would people be able to get away with racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination?
<i>Provision of Resources</i>	
80D*	Are policies forbidding racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?
80E*	Are complaint procedures related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?
82D*	Are policies forbidding racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?
82E*	Are complaint procedures related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?
82F*	Is the availability of complaint hotlines publicized?
<i>Perceptions of Racist/Extremist Groups and Gangs</i>	
82I	Are racist/extremist organizations or activities a problem?
82J	Are hate crimes/activities a problem?
82K	Are gang activities a problem?
82L	Are racist/extremist organizations or activities a problem in the local community around your installation?
82M	Are hate groups/extremist activities a problem in the local community around your installation?
<i>Other</i>	
82G* [†]	Do people feel free to sit wherever they choose in dining halls regardless of race/ethnicity?
82H* [†]	Do people feel free to use any recreation facilities regardless of race/ethnicity?

*Reverse Coded

[†]Omitted from the Organizational Climate scales.

Attitudes toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity. In Items 83A-C, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding attitudes toward racial/ethnic diversity (see Table 22). Response options ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very large extent*). Item 83C was reverse coded. A higher scale score denotes the presence of negative attitudes toward racial/ethnic diversity.

Items 83A-C were first used in the 1996 *EOS*. These items are similar in content to those from the Quick Discrimination Index (Ponterotto et al., 1995), which measures affective attitudes toward racial diversity in personal life. Alpha coefficients were .27 for the total sample, .24 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .33 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .24 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .26 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .28 for Hispanics, .28 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .24 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .28 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). Dropping Item 83C would increase the coefficient alpha from .27 to .69 in the total sample, with similar increases for each racial/ethnic group if this item was removed. However, removing this item would leave a scale of just two items.

Recommendations for this scale include replacing Item 83C with one or more items that assess attitudes toward racial/ethnic diversity or replacing Items 83A-C with an existing measure of attitudes toward racial/ethnic diversity.

Table 22.
Scale Items Measuring Attitudes toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity

<i>Attitudes toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity</i>	
83A	Do you feel uneasy being around people who are of race/ethnic backgrounds different from yours?
83B	Have you felt pressure from Service members who are of your race/ethnicity not to socialize with members of other race/ethnic groups?
83C*	Do you feel comfortable interacting with people from different race/ethnic groups?

*Reverse Coded

Training and Education. In Items 89A-J, survey participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding training and education about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination (see Table 23). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A higher score indicates that respondents received training and education about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination.

Items 89A-D, 89F, and 89H are similar to items found in the 2002 *WGR* and the 2004 *WGRR*. Item 89A is also similar to an item first used in the 1995 *Form B*.³³ Items 89A-B, 89D,

³³ Item 89A was originally listed as “I know what kinds of words or actions are considered sexual harassment” in the 1995 *Form B*.

89F, and 89H are similar to items pretested for use in the 2002 WGR survey (Ormerod, Lee et al., 2001).³⁴ Items similar to 89E and 89G-H were used in the 1996 EOS.³⁵

Alpha coefficients were .97 for the total sample, .97 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .97 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .96 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .97 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .97 for Hispanics, .96 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .97 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .96 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

A one-factor CFA was fit to the data. The one-factor CFA fit moderately well. For example, RMSEA = .17, NNFI = .96, SRMR = .03, GFI = .83, AGFI = .74, and CFI = .97 in the total sample (see A). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 23.
Scale Items Measuring Training and Education

<i>Training and Education</i>	
89A	Provides a good understanding of what words and actions are considered racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination
89B	Teaches that racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination reduces the cohesion and effectiveness of your Service as a whole
89C	Identifies behaviors that are offensive to others and should not be tolerated
89D	Gives useful tools for dealing with racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination
89E	Explains the process for reporting racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination
89F	Makes you feel it is safe to complain about offensive, race/ethnic-related situations
89G	Promotes cross-cultural awareness
89H	Provides information about policies, procedures, and consequences of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination
89I	Provides information on your Service's policies on participation in hate groups/gangs/extremist activities
89J	Promotes religious tolerance

Discussion

The 2005 WEOA advances the assessment of racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination and workplace relations in several important ways. It utilizes a standardized method for measuring and counting racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination incidents that

³⁴ Items contain modifications to content, and are modified to reflect racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination. For example, Item 89B was originally listed as “Has convinced me that sexual harassment reduces the cohesion and effectiveness of my Service as a whole” in the *Status of the Armed Forces Survey Pilot Forms A and B-Gender Issues*.

³⁵ Modifications were made to item content. For example, Item 89E was originally listed as “Procedures for reporting racial/ethnic discrimination and harassment” in the 1996 EOS.

includes multi-item, behavioral assessment of such experiences and an item that asks whether the respondent labels his/her experiences as racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination. It assesses a wide array of correlate measures that increase understanding about workplace relations and the antecedents and consequences of racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination. The 2005 *WEOA* improved on its predecessor by including a more thorough assessment of retention intentions, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction, and expanded the detailed assessment of a critical experience of racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination called the “One Situation.” Further, it introduced the assessment of unit cohesion, stress, and health, and expanded the assessment of climate variables related to racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination.

This report provides details about scales constructed from the 2005 *WEOA*. The scales in this report have psychometric support and a history of being useful with a military population (e.g., Bergman et al., 2002; Hay & Elig, 1999; Sims et al., 2005). Of those scales formed via an iterative method of analyzing items for both content and statistical homogeneity, such composites have a strong justification. However, other researchers may find that variables defined in terms of different sets of items are preferable and there is no inherent problem in considering alternative multi-item composites if the alternate composite is theoretically justified with adequate reliability.

In sum, the 2005 *WEOA* produced an extraordinarily rich set of data for the study of workplace and racial/ethnic-related experiences. Reliable and valid measures of workplace variables, including racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination, were collected from an ethnically diverse sample of members of all the Services comprising DoD. This data set substantially furthers the scientific understanding of workplace relations and racial/ethnic-related behavior, and will enable policy makers to make more informed decisions about how to address such issues in the Armed Forces.

References

- Bastian, L. D., Lancaster, A. R., & Reyst, H. E. (1996). *Department of Defense 1995 sexual harassment survey*. Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Bergman, M. E., Langhout, R. D., Palmieri, P. A., Cortina, L. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). The (un)reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 230-242.
- Bergman, M. E., Palmieri, P. A., Drasgow, F., & Ormerod, A. J. (in press). Racial and ethnic harassment and discrimination: In the eye of the beholder? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*.
- Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Collado-Proctor, S. M. (1998). The Perceived Racism Scale for Latina/os: A multidimensional assessment of the experience of racism among Latina/os. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (1-B), 0361. (UMI No. 9917362).
- Cohen, S., & Williamson, G. M. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *The social psychology of health: Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2003). Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 247-265.
- Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R., & Zickar, M. J. (1999). *The 1995 Armed forces sexual harassment survey: Report on scales and measures* (Report No. 98-004). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Drasgow, F., Levine, M. V., Tsien, S., Williams, B., & Mead, A. D. (1995). Fitting polytomous item response theory models to multiple-choice tests. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 19, 143-165.
- Elig, T. W., Edwards, J. E., & Reimer, R. A. (1997). *Armed Forces 1996 Equal Opportunity Survey: Administration, datasets, and codebook* (Report No. 97-026). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. (DTIC/NTIS No. AD A365 205).
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990, March). *Assessing strategies for coping with sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the midwinter conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Tempe, AZ.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Magley, V. J. (1999). Sexual harassment in the Armed Forces: A test of an integrated model. *Military Psychology*, 11, 329-343.

- Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 578-589.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gold, Y., Brock, K., & Gelfand M. J. (1993). *Women's responses to victimization: Validation of an objective inventory for assessing strategies for responding to sexual harassment*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology*, 3, 243-264.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Smolen, A. C., Harned, M. S., Collinsworth, L. L., & Colbert, C. L. (In preparation). *Sexual harassment: Impact of reporting and retaliation*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S. & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donohue (Eds.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 5-28). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 150-170.
- Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1991). General attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An evaluation of a causal model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 110-128.
- Hay, M. S., & Elig, T. W. (1999). The 1995 Department of Defense Sexual Harassment Survey: Overview and methodology. *Military Psychology*, 3, 233-242.
- Joreskog, K. & Sorbom, D. (1993). *Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Hillsdale, NJ: Scientific Software International.
- Klem, L. (2000). Structure equation modeling. In L. G. Grimm and P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 227-260). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- McNeilly, M., Anderson, N. B., Robinson, E. F., McManus, C. F., Armstead, C. A., Clark, R., et al. (1996). Convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity of the Perceived Racism Scale: A multidimensional assessment of the experience of racism among African Americans. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of tests and measurements for Black populations* (pp. 359-374). Hampton, VA: Cobb & Henry Publishers.
- Meyer, J. P & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1986). Retaliation against whistle blowers: Predictors and effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 137-145.
- Ormerod, A. J., Bergman, M. E., Palmieri, P. A., Drasgow, F., Juraska, S. E. (2001, April). Structure of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination in the military. In F. Drasgow (Chair), *Racial/ethnic discrimination and harassment: Methodology, measurement, and results*. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial Organizational Psychologists, San Diego, CA.
- Ormerod, A. J., & Gold, Y. (1988, March). *Coping with sexual harassment: External and internal strategies for dealing with stress*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Women in Psychology, Bethesda, MD.
- Ormerod, A. J., Lawson, A. K., Lytell, M. C., Wright, C. V., Sims, C. S., Brummel, B. J., Drasgow, F., Lee, W. C., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2005). *2004 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members: Scales and measures report* (Report No. 2004-022). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Ormerod, A. J., Lawson, A. K., Sims, C. S., Lytell, M. C., Wadlington, P. L., Yaeger, D. W., Wright, C. V., Reed, M. E., Lee, W. C., Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Cohorn C. A. (2003). *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Surveys-Workplace and Gender Relations: Report of scales and measures* (Report No. 2002-031). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Ormerod, A. J., Lee, W. C., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (2001). *The 2000 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Report of scales and measures of the Y2K Pilot Survey* (Report No. 2001-004). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Palmieri, P. A., Drasgow, F., & Ormerod, A. J. (In preparation). *The 1996 Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey: Report on scales and measures* (Contract No. DASW01-97-C-0076). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Parmerlee, M. A., Near, J. P., & Jensen, T. C. (1982). Correlates of whistle-blowers' perceptions of organizational retaliation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 17-34.

- Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., D'Onofrio, A., Dubuisson, A., Heenehan, M., Millstein, B., Parisi, M., Rath, J. F., & Sax, G. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 55, 1016-1031.
- Reimer, R. A. (Ed.). (2005). *2004 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members: Statistical methodology report* (Report No. 2004-019). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- Scarville, J., Button, S. B., Edwards, J. E., Lancaster, A. R., & Elig, T. W. (1999). *Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey* (Report No. 97-027). Arlington, VA: DMDC. (DTIC/NTIS No. AD A366 037).
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Muller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit structural equation models: Test of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8, 23-74.
- Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 401-415.
- Siebold, G. L., & Lindsay, T. J. (1999). The relation between demographic descriptors and soldier-perceived cohesion and motivation. *Military Psychology*, 11, 109-128.
- Sims, C. S., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2005). The effects of sexual harassment on turnover in the military: Time-dependent modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1141-1152.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Survey Incidents of Sexual Harassment (April 28, 2002). Washington, DC: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
- Swan, S. (1997). Explaining the job-related and psychological consequences of sexual harassment in the workplace: A contextual model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 3371.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem?* Washington, DC: US. Government Printing Office.

- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1987). *Sexual harassment in the federal government: An update*. Washington, DC: US. Government Printing Office.
- Ware, J. E. & Sherbourne, C. D. (1992). The MOS 36-item short form health survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care*, 30, 473-483.
- Willis, E. J., Mohamed, S. G., Lipari, R. N. (2002). *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Surveys—Workplace and Gender Relations: Administration, datasets, and codebook* (Report No. 2002-010). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Appendix A.
Explanation and Table of Fit Indices for
Factor Analysis Models

Explanation and Table of Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models

A number of issues were considered while compiling the results of these analyses and providing the recommendations contained in this document. Of great concern was the factor structure of certain scales. Using factor analysis, we were able to identify items that represent a single construct of interest (e.g., coworker satisfaction). Likewise, using this approach, an item may be a candidate for removal from the scale if it is not found to load highly on the construct. Our strategy was to use *confirmatory factor analysis* (CFA, see Byrne, 1998) to validate *à priori* assumptions regarding the items comprising each scale and subscale (i.e., to see if such items really measure a single construct). Ultimately, these recommendations were made on the basis of our interpretation of these results combined with item-level analyses and practical issues.

Fit Indices and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

À priori assumptions regarding the composition of a scale are tested with CFA through the delineation of a *measurement model*, which stems from the literature on *structural equation modeling* (SEM, Byrne, 1998). Such models are evaluated against the data based on *goodness of fit measures or fit indices*. Due to a number of complex issues, a considerable amount of caution should be used when interpreting these fit indices.

Table 24.
Commonly Cited Indices in CFA/SEM

<i>Commonly Cited Indices in CFA/SEM</i>		
	<i>Index</i>	<i>Relevant Reference</i>
χ^2	Chi-squared statistic	Byrne, 1998
CFI	Common Fit Index	Bentler, 1990
NNFI	Non-Normed Fit Index	Tucker & Lewis, 1973
GFI	Goodness-of-Fit Index	Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993
AGFI	Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index	Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993
RMSEA	Root-Mean-Squared Error of Approximation	Steiger & Lind, 1980
SRMR	Standardized Root-Mean-Squared Residual	Bentler, 1995

Some researchers advocate the use of “rules-of-thumb,” or cutoffs for fit indices in the SEM framework. For example, Hoyle (1995) suggested a minimum value of .90 for a scale to be considered a good “fit” for the CFI and the NNFI; more recently, Hu and Bentler (1998; 1999) recommended a minimum value of .95 for the NNFI and CFI and a maximum value of .05 for the RMSEA and the SRMR. Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, and Muller (2003) recommended .90 for the GFI and .95 for the AGFI. Drasgow, Levine, Tsien, Williams, and Mead (1995) consider less than three a good fit for the Adjusted Chi-Square/Degree of Freedom statistic. While it may seem practical to use cutoffs such as these for fit statistics, problems with their use are apparent.

One well-known problem is the influence of sample size on the χ^2 statistic, a common “goodness of fit” measurement. Hu and Bentler (1998), as well as others, have shown that the χ^2 statistic is subject to a systematic bias (error), such that its expected value is a function of sample size. Hence, models appear to fit better in smaller samples and a large χ^2 statistic will inevitably result when a large data set is analyzed. A variety of adjustments to the χ^2 statistic have been made in an attempt to obtain fit indices less dependent on sample size. However, a more intractable problem concerns violations of multivariate normality often associated with observed data. Severe violations of this assumption affect the interpretability of a number of indices (e.g., RMSEA, CFI, NNFI, GFI, and AGFI). These problems can lead to the over-rejection of plausible models (West, Finch, & Curran, 1995).

Additionally, commonly used estimation methods, such as Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) and Generalized Least Squares Estimation (GLS), operate under assumptions that may not be reflected in the data. For example, both methods assume that variables in the dataset are normally distributed and continuous. Indeed, violations of these assumptions are common and many researchers often point to asymptotic robustness theory, the idea that the statistics used are not greatly affected by those violations, as a justification for ignoring these violations. Unfortunately, as Hu, Bentler, and Kano (1992) state, “nothing is known about the robustness of the asymptotic robustness theory” (p. 352).

Knowledge regarding violations of multivariate normality is somewhat limited. In one study, Hu and Bentler (1998) tested various fit statistics using different sample sizes of data that violated multivariate normality by having extreme kurtosis (i.e., highly “peaked” or nearly “flat” distributions), and, for some of their samples, factors and errors that were dependent on each other. Based on their overall results, they concluded that the SRMR performed better than the other indices studied. Unfortunately, Hu and Bentler did not consider other common distributions, such as discrete item responses that are highly skewed. In sum, the violations of assumptions examined in the available literature bear little resemblance to some of the violations encountered in real-world data such as those collected for the 2005 WEOA.

The Bottom Line on Cutoffs

Recommended cutoffs for fit indices are based on the ideal situation in which all assumptions are met. Unfortunately, such situations are not often found in practice. For example, item-level data from the 2005 WEOA may include few response options or some items may be heavily skewed. Thus, any such advocated “rules-of-thumb” in the available literature on these topics should be viewed with caution. Even considering the violations of certain assumptions, Hu and Bentler (1998) noted that “it is difficult to designate a specific cutoff value for each fit index because it does not work equally well with various types of fit indices, sample sizes, estimators, or distributions” (p. 449).

To provide a concrete example of the problems encountered when applying typical “rules-of-thumb” to real-world data we turn to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), a heavily used and well-validated measure of job satisfaction (Roznowski, 1989). Although its subscales are widely recognized as essentially unidimensional, when a single-factor CFA is fit to the raw data, the fit statistics range in the .80’s, which is clearly below the cutoffs discussed above. This may not be completely surprising given the three option response format

of the JDI (*Yes, ?, No*). That said, when item parcels (i.e., sums of three or more items) are used in the analysis, the fit statistics improve dramatically. One of the solutions proposed by West and his colleagues (1995) for non-normal variables is to use item parcels, specifically because these parcels tend to have distributions that more closely approximate the normal distribution assumed for SEM. Unfortunately, while this tactic is useful in a full SEM, it is not useful when using SEM or CFA in this context, due to the need to evaluate individual items.

To sum up, Byrne (1998) suggests taking a holistic approach when evaluating SEM models, examining fit statistics, but not neglecting other important features that indicate the acceptability of the model, such as the plausibility of parameter estimates and the size of standard errors. Given the current state of knowledge regarding SEM with discrete item response data, it is necessary to consider all aspects of model fit rather than to rely solely on “rule-of-thumb” guidelines for fit statistics. Often, a researcher must accumulate and rely on experience in SEM applications to determine an appropriate “good” fit statistic for a particular type of data. McDonald and Marsh (1990) noted that “although experience can suggest a recommendable cutoff point for use by those who fear the ‘subjectivity’ of judgment, such a cutoff point must itself remain inevitably subjective as only the saturated model is true (p.254).”

Factors Considered When Making Recommendations

Many factors were considered when we made our recommendations, such as the results from the item-level analyses. Corrected item-total correlations and coefficient alpha-if-item-deleted were examined and individual items eliminated if there was a clear “outlier” item (e.g., Item 17D, discussed in the 2002 *WGR Scales and Measures* report). Unfortunately, as with the cutoffs associated with fit indices in CFA, similar “rules-of-thumb” should be avoided with item-total correlations and coefficient alpha. Schmitt (1996) describes proper use of coefficient alpha and states that “[t]here is no sacred level of acceptable or unacceptable level of alpha... measures with (by conventional standards) low levels of alpha may still be quite useful” (p. 353). The reasons behind this position are, in part, due to the fact that coefficient alpha is influenced by a number of factors, including the homogeneity of the items as well as the number of items in the scale (Cortina, 1993). These characteristics and others make it difficult to justify the use of cutoffs. Additionally, the measures of interest in this report are often short and heterogeneous (leading to lower observed values for coefficient alpha). However, the value of .70 for coefficient alpha is a standard performance criteria, adopted by the DMDC survey program, thus it represented our lowest allowable limit in working with the 2005 *WEOA*.

As mentioned before, our recommendations were also driven by the results of the CFA’s for each scale. Based on documentation from DMDC and our own research and hypotheses, we tested measurement models for each scale and, when plausible, tested alternatives (e.g., we tested a one factor and a two factor model for Items 45A-N and 46A-N). Again, the use of cutoffs was avoided and the suggested treatment of scales and subscales are delineated in the text of the report.

A primary practical consideration throughout this process was the need to retain scales of interest as much as possible. The use of “hard and fast rules” (e.g., .95 cutoff for the CFI and NNFI, etc.) would not only have been inappropriate in our view, but also would have deleted a substantial number of important scales. We also realize that some of these scales were pieced

together from a wide range of sources, including single-items, scales under development, and scales adapted for use in this context. In some cases, we suggested that the text of certain items or the treatment of scales/subscales from the 2005 *WEOA* be revised (e.g., see recommendations for Perceived Stress and Organizational Climate).

In short, the results and interpretations of the factor and item-level analyses were balanced with practical considerations. Although there is always subjectivity in the interpretation of these analyses, we feel as though we have carefully documented the rationale for our recommendations throughout this report. The table that follows documents the results of the CFA's for each scale.

Table 25.
Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models

Model	Effective Sample	Adjusted Chi-Square ^a	DF	Adjusted Chi-Square/DF ^b	RMSEA	NNFI	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	CFI
Organizational Commitment (1 Factor)	30832	1426.49	77	18.53	0.22	0.77	0.15	0.65	0.52	0.80
Organizational Commitment (3 Factor)	30832	461.57	74	6.24	0.11	0.92	0.09	0.89	0.84	0.94
Supervisor Satisfaction (1 Factor)	31920	44.18	9	4.91	0.10	0.98	0.01	0.97	0.93	0.99
Coworker and Work Satisfaction (2 Factor)	31512	103.51	34	3.04	0.06	0.98	0.03	0.97	0.96	0.99
Perceived Stress (1 Factor)	31280	407.34	35	11.64	0.17	0.87	0.09	0.84	0.74	0.90
Perceived Stress (2 Factor)	31280	168.68	34	4.96	0.10	0.94	0.05	0.93	0.89	0.96
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD-1 Factor	30011	48987.63 ^c	77	11.58 ^c	0.15	0.90 ^c	0.08	0.81 ^c	0.74 ^c	0.92 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD-2 Factor	30011	18940.73 ^c	76	5.14 ^c	0.09	0.96 ^c	0.06	0.92 ^c	0.89 ^c	0.96 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community-1 Factor	28040	36139.05 ^c	77	9.35 ^c	0.13	0.92 ^c	0.08	0.84 ^c	0.79 ^c	0.93 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community-2 Factor	28040	15025.32 ^c	76	4.51 ^c	0.08	0.96 ^c	0.05	0.93 ^c	0.90 ^c	0.97 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (1 Factor)	28583	80474.28 ^c	299	5.69 ^c	0.10	0.84 ^c	0.07	0.94 ^c	0.93 ^c	0.85 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (6 Factor, without Item p)	28634	21858.98 ^c	260	2.45 ^c	0.05	0.95 ^c	0.04	0.98 ^c	0.98 ^c	0.96 ^c
Subjective Distress (1 Factor)	19818	254.36	5	50.87	0.13	0.96	0.03	0.97	0.90	0.98
Coping (2 Factor)	14549	18509.73 ^c	34	544.40 ^c	0.14	0.89 ^c	0.21	0.95 ^c	0.92 ^c	0.92 ^c
Retaliation (1 Factor)	14326	583.06 ^c	14	41.65 ^c	0.03	1.00 ^c	0.02	1.00 ^c	1.00 ^c	1.00 ^c
Retaliation (2 Factor)	14326	297.14 ^c	13	22.86 ^c	0.02	1.00 ^c	0.01	1.00 ^c	1.00 ^c	1.00 ^c
Organizational Climate (1 factor)	26275	30238.62	104	290.76	0.28	0.38	0.20	0.50	0.34	0.46

Table 25.
Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models (Continued)

Model	Effective Sample	Adjusted Chi-Square ^a	DF	Adjusted Chi-Square/DF ^b	RMSEA	NNFI	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	CFI
Organizational Climate (3 Factor)	26275	8951.02	101	88.62	0.15	0.77	0.10	0.77	0.69	0.80
Organizational Climate without Items 82C and 82J (1 factor)	26623	19953.02	77	259.13	0.26	0.66	0.17	0.57	0.41	0.71
Organizational Climate without Items 82C and 82J (3 Factor)	26623	3679.25	74	49.72	0.11	0.93	0.06	0.88	0.83	0.94
Training and Education	32299	270.09	35	7.72	0.17	0.96	0.03	0.83	0.74	0.97

Note. The Effective Sample is the *n* following listwise deletion for missing data. The *N* for the overall sample was

Note. DF = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; NNFI = non-normed fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; CFI = comparative fit index.

^aThis is adjusted chi-square. To improve interpretability, the observed chi-square was adjusted to that expected in a sample of *N*=500.

^bThis is the adjusted chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio.

^cDiagonally-weighted least squares estimation was used to estimate model parameters and RMSEA and SRMR are the most appropriate indices to determine goodness of fit.

Appendix B.
Acronyms Used in the Report on Scales and
Measures

Acronyms Used in the Report on Scales and Measures

Acronym	Explanation
<i>1988 SHS</i>	<i>1988 DoD Survey of Sex Roles in the Active-Duty Military</i>
<i>1995 Form B</i>	<i>1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey</i>
<i>1996 EOS</i>	<i>1996 Equal Opportunity Survey</i>
<i>1999 ADS</i>	<i>1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel – Form A</i>
<i>2002 WGR</i>	<i>2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey – Workplace and Gender Relations</i>
<i>2004 WGRR</i>	<i>2004 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members</i>
<i>2005 WEOA</i>	<i>2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members</i>
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CHQ	Coping with Harassment Questionnaire
DMDC	Defense Manpower Data Center
DOD	Department of Defense
EO	Equal Opportunity
FS	Feelings Scale
GLS	Generalized Least Squares Estimation
JDI	Job Descriptive Index
JSS	Job Satisfaction Survey
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimation
OTSH	Organizational Tolerance for Sexual Harassment
OUSDP[P&R]	Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
PSS10	10-item Perceived Stress Scale
SEM	Structural Equation Modeling
SEQ	Sexual Experiences Questionnaire
SF-36	Short-Form Health Survey
<i>March 2003 SOFR</i>	<i>March 2003 Status of Forces Survey</i>
USMSPB	U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

Appendix C.

Survey Instrument

DMDC

RCS: DD-P&R(QD) 1946
Exp. 12/31/07
DMDC Survey No. 05-0001

2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members

***Department of Defense
Human Resources
Strategic Assessment
Program (HRSAP)***



COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

- This is not a test, so take your time.
- Select answers you believe are most appropriate.
- Use a blue or black pen.
- Please PRINT where applicable.
- Place an "X" in the appropriate box or boxes.

RIGHT



WRONG



- To change an answer, completely black out the wrong answer and put an "X" in the correct box as shown below.

CORRECT ANSWER



INCORRECT ANSWER



- Do not make any marks outside of the response and write-in boxes.

MAILING INSTRUCTIONS

- Please return your completed survey in the business reply envelope. (If you misplaced the envelope, mail the survey to DMDC, c/o Data Recognition Corp., P.O. Box 5720, Hopkins, MN 55343).
- If you are returning the survey from another country, be sure to return the business reply envelope only through a U.S. government mail room or post office.
- Foreign postal systems will not deliver business reply mail.

PRIVACY ACT & INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

In accordance with the Privacy Act, this notice informs you of the purpose of this survey and how the findings of this survey will be used. Please read it carefully.

AUTHORITY: 10 United States Code, Sections 136, 481, 1782, and 2358.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Information collected in these surveys will be used to report attitudes and perceptions about personnel programs and policies. This information will assist in the formulation of policies which may be needed to improve the working environment. Reports will be provided to the Offices of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, each Military Department, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Findings will be used in reports and testimony provided to Congress. Some findings may be published by Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) or in professional journals, or presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. In no case will the data be reported or used for identifiable individual(s).

ROUTINE USES: None.

DISCLOSURE: Providing information on this survey is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, maximum participation is encouraged so that data will be complete and representative. Your survey responses will be treated as confidential. Identifying information will be used only by persons engaged in, and for purposes of, the survey research.

STATEMENT OF RISK: The data collection procedures are not expected to involve any risk or discomfort to you. The only risk to you is accidental or unintentional disclosure of the data you provide. However, DMDC has a number of policies and procedures to ensure that survey data are safe and protected. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact HRSurvey@osd.pentagon.mil. For questions regarding Human Subjects issues contact NPRST Protection of Human Subjects Committee at (901) 874-4994, (DSN) 882-4994, or nprstpao@persnet.navy.mil

YOUR BACKGROUND

1. I voluntarily consent to participate in this survey.

- ☒ Yes
☒ No - stop here and return the survey

2. In what Service were you on active duty on January 24, 2005?

- ☒ Army ☒ Air Force
☒ Navy ☒ Coast Guard
☒ Marine Corps
☒ None, you were separated or retired - stop here and return the survey

3. Are you . . . ?

- ☒ Male ☒ Female

4. What is your current paygrade? *Mark one.*

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| ☒ E-1 | ☒ E-6 | ☒ W-1 | ☒ O-1/O-1E |
| ☒ E-2 | ☒ E-7 | ☒ W-2 | ☒ O-2/O-2E |
| ☒ E-3 | ☒ E-8 | ☒ W-3 | ☒ O-3/O-3E |
| ☒ E-4 | ☒ E-9 | ☒ W-4 | ☒ O-4 |
| ☒ E-5 | | ☒ W-5 | ☒ O-5 |
| | | | ☒ O-6 or above |

5. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

- ☒ No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
☒ Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

6. What is your race? *Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.*

- ☒ White
☒ Black or African American
☒ American Indian or Alaska Native
☒ Asian (for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese)
☒ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (for example, Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)

Ancestry refers to your ethnic origin or descent, "roots," or heritage. It may refer to your parents or ancestors country of birth before their arrival in the United States. If you were not born in the United States, ancestry may also refer to your country of birth. If you have more than one origin and cannot identify with a single ancestry group, you may report two ancestry groups (for example, German-Irish). Do not report a religious group as your ancestry.

7. What is your ancestry or ethnic origin? (For example, Italian, Jamaican, African American, Cambodian, Cape Verdean, Norwegian, Dominican, French Canadian, Haitian, Korean, Lebanese, Polish, Nigerian, Mexican, Taiwanese, Ukrainian, and so on.)

Please print.

8. What is the highest degree or level of school that you have completed? *Mark the one answer that describes the highest grade or degree that you have completed.*

- ☐ 12 years or less of school (no diploma)
- ☐ High school graduate--high school diploma or equivalent (e.g., GED)
- ☐ Some college credit, but less than 1 year
- ☐ 1 or more years of college, no degree
- ☐ Associate's degree (for example, AA, AS)
- ☐ Bachelor's degree (for example, BA, AB, BS)
- ☐ Master's, doctoral, or professional school degree (for example, MA, MS, MEng, MBA, MSW, PhD, MD, JD, DVM)

FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

9. What is your marital status? *Mark one.*

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Never married

10. How many years have you been married to your current spouse? If you are not married, how long have you been in a relationship with your current significant other (that is, girlfriend or boyfriend)?

- ☐ Does not apply; I am not married and I do not have a girlfriend/boyfriend ⇒ IF DOES NOT APPLY, THEN GO TO QUESTION 13
- ☐ Less than 1 year
- ☐ 1 year to less than 6 years
- ☐ 6 years to less than 10 years
- ☐ 10 years or more

11. Is your spouse/significant other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

- ☐ No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- ☐ Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

12. What race is your spouse/significant other? *Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider your spouse/significant other to be.*

- ☐ White
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Asian (for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese)
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (for example, Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)

The definition of "child, children, or other legal dependents" includes anyone in your family, except your spouse, who has, or is eligible to have, a Uniformed Services identification card (military ID card) or is eligible for military health care benefits and is enrolled in the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS).

13. Do you have a child, children, or other legal dependents based on the definition above?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

SATISFACTION AND RETENTION INTENTION

14. In general, has your life been better or worse than you expected when you first entered the military?

- ☐ Much better
- ☐ Better
- ☐ Neither better nor worse
- ☐ Worse
- ☐ Much worse

15. In general, has your work been better or worse than you expected when you first entered the military?

- ☐ Much better
- ☐ Better
- ☐ Neither better nor worse
- ☐ Worse
- ☐ Much worse

16. Suppose that you have to decide whether to stay on active duty. Assuming you could stay, how likely is it that you would choose to do so?

- ☐ Very likely
- ☐ Likely
- ☐ Neither likely nor unlikely
- ☐ Unlikely
- ☐ Very unlikely

17. Does your spouse or significant other think you should stay on or leave active duty?

- ☐ Strongly favors staying
- ☐ Somewhat favors staying
- ☐ Has no opinion one way or the other
- ☐ Somewhat favors leaving
- ☐ Strongly favors leaving
- ☐ Does not apply; I am not married and I do not have a girlfriend/boyfriend

18. Does your family think you should stay on or leave active duty?

- ☐ Strongly favors staying
- ☐ Somewhat favors staying
- ☐ Has no opinion one way or the other
- ☐ Somewhat favors leaving
- ☐ Strongly favors leaving

- ◆ 19. How many years of active-duty service have you completed (including enlisted, warrant officer, and commissioned officer time)? *To indicate less than 1 year, enter "0". To indicate 35 years or more, enter "35".*

YEARS

20. Do you have children aged 10 or older with whom you talk about careers, jobs, and education?

☐ Yes
☐ No ⇒ IF NO, THEN GO TO QUESTION 22

21. When you talk with your children about their future, do you encourage them to consider the military?

☐ Yes
☐ No

22. If you had a close personal friend considering active-duty military service, would you recommend that he/she join? *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.*

	Yes	No
a. A friend who is White	☐	☐
b. A friend who is Black or African American ...	☐	☐
c. A friend who is American Indian or Alaska Native	☐	☐
d. A friend who is Asian (for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese)	☐	☐
e. A friend who is Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (for example, Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)	☐	☐
f. A friend who is Spanish/Hispanic/Latino	☐	☐

23. Are you currently in a military work environment where members of your race/ethnicity are uncommon?

☐ Yes
☐ No

24. Overall, how satisfied are you with the military way of life?

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

25. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. I enjoy serving in the military	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Serving in the military is consistent with my personal goals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. If I left the military I would feel like I'm starting all over again	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. I would feel guilty if I left the military ..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am happy with my life in the military ..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. It would be difficult for me to leave the military and give up the benefits that are available in the Service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. I would not leave the military right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. I really feel as if the military's values are my own	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. I would have difficulty finding a job if I left the military	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am proud to be in the military	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. If I left the military, I would feel like I had let my country down	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. I continue to serve in the military because leaving would require considerable sacrifice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. I feel like being a member of the military can help me achieve what I want in life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. One of the problems with leaving the military would be the lack of available alternatives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. I am committed to making the military my career	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p. My Service's evaluation/selection system is effective in promoting its best members	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q. I am proud to tell others that I am a member of my Service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

YOUR MILITARY WORKPLACE

26. Where is your permanent duty station located?

Mark one.

- ☐ In one of the 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, or a U.S. Territory or possession

Please print the two-letter postal abbreviation--for example, "AK" for Alaska.

- ☐ Europe (e.g., Bosnia-Herzegovina, Germany, Italy, Serbia, United Kingdom)
☐ Former Soviet Union (e.g., Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan)
☐ East Asia and Pacific (e.g., Australia, Japan, Korea)
☐ North Africa, Near East or South Asia (e.g., Bahrain, Diego Garcia, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia)
☐ Sub-Saharan Africa (e.g., Kenya, South Africa)
☐ Western Hemisphere (e.g., Cuba, Honduras, Peru)
☐ Other or not sure

27. Where do you live at your permanent duty station?

Mark one.

- ☐ Aboard ship
☐ Barracks/dorm/BEQ/UEPH/BOQ/UOPH military facility
☐ Military family housing, on base
☐ Military family housing, off base
☐ Privatized military housing that you rent on base
☐ Privatized military housing that you rent off base
☐ Civilian housing that you own or pay a mortgage on
☐ Civilian housing that you rent
☐ Other

28. In the past 12 months, how many nights have you been away from your permanent duty station because of your military duties? *To indicate none, enter "0".*

NIGHTS

29. Since September 11, 2001, have you been deployed for any of the following operations? **Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.**

	Yes	No
a. Operation Noble Eagle	☐	☐
b. Operation Enduring Freedom	☐	☐
c. Operation Iraqi Freedom	☐	☐
d. Other	☐	☐

30. Have you been deployed to a combat zone or an area where you drew imminent danger or hostile fire pay since September 11, 2001?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No ⇒ IF NO, THEN GO TO QUESTION 32

31. How many days have you been deployed to a combat zone or an area where you drew imminent danger or hostile fire pay since September 11, 2001? *To indicate 1000 days or more enter "999".*

DAYS

32. Are you currently on a deployment of 30 days or more?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

33. What is the paygrade of your immediate supervisor in your current military work group?

- ☐ E4 or below
☐ E5-E6
☐ E7-E9
☐ W1-W5
☐ O1-O3
☐ O4 or above
☐ Civilian (GS/GM/WG/WL/WS/SES/Other)

34. What is the race/ethnic background of your immediate supervisor in your current military work group? **Mark one or more to describe his/her race/ethnicity.**

- ☐ White
☐ Black or African American
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian (for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese)
☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (for example, Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)
☐ Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

- ◆ 35. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your supervisor? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. You trust your supervisor	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Your supervisor ensures that all assigned personnel are treated fairly	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There is very little conflict between your supervisor and the people who report to him/her	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Your supervisor evaluates your work performance fairly	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Your supervisor assigns work fairly in your work group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. You are satisfied with the direction/supervision you receive . . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

36. In your opinion, have you had a mentor while in the military?

- ☐ Yes, you have one now
☐ Yes, you had one, but you don't have one now
☐ No, but you would have liked one
☐ No, and you never wanted one
☐ Not sure or you do not know what a mentor is

37. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the people you work with at your workplace? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. There is very little conflict among your coworkers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Your coworkers put in the effort required for their jobs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The people in your work group tend to get along	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The people in your work group are willing to help each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. You put more effort into your job than your coworkers do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

38. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your workplace? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. I know what is expected of me at work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. In the last 7 days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There is someone at work who encourages my development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. At work, my opinions seem to count	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. The mission/purpose of my Service makes me feel my job is important . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. My coworkers are committed to doing quality work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. I have a best friend at work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. In the last 6 months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and to grow	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. At my workplace, a person's job opportunities and promotions are based only on work-related characteristics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. My supervisor helps everyone in my work group feel included	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. I trust my supervisor to deal fairly with issues of equal treatment at my workplace	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p. At my workplace, all employees are kept well informed about issues and decisions that affect them	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Items 38.a through 38.p are used by permission of the copyright holder, The Gallup Organization, 901 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004.

39. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the work you do at your workplace? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. Your work provides you with a sense of pride	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Your work makes good use of your skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. You like the kind of work you do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. You are satisfied with your job as a whole	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

40. Overall, how well prepared ...

	Very poorly prepared	Poorly prepared	Neither well nor poorly prepared	Well prepared	Very well prepared
a. Are <u>you</u> to perform your wartime job?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Is <u>your unit</u> to perform its wartime mission?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. How would you rate ...

	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
a. <u>Your</u> current level of morale?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The current level of morale <u>in your unit</u> ?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

42. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your unit? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. Service members in your unit really care about each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Service members in your unit work well as a team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Service members in your unit pull together to get the job done	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Service members in your unit trust each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

STRESS, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING

43. In the past month, how often have you ...

	Very often	Fairly often	Sometimes	Almost never	Never
a. Been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Felt nervous and stressed?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Felt that things were going your way?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Found that you could not cope with all of the things you had to do?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Been able to control irritations in your life?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Felt that you were on top of things?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Been angered because of things that were outside of your control? ...	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

44. How true or false is each of the following statements for you? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Definitely true	Mostly true	Mostly false	Definitely false
a. I am as healthy as anybody I know	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. I seem to get sick a little easier than other people	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. I expect my health to get worse	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. My health is excellent	☐	☐	☐	☐

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES

In this part of the survey, you are asked how often you have experienced various incidents during the past 12 months. Please report only on the past 12 months so that annual rates can be estimated.

How frequently during the past 12 months have you been in circumstances where you thought . . .

For each item a-o, mark one response for question 45 and one response for question 46.

45. Military personnel (on or off duty, on or off installation) and/or Service/DoD civilian employees and/or contractors (on or off installation)

46. Civilians in the local community around an installation

	Often	Sometimes	Once or twice	Never
a. Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into an offensive discussion of racial/ethnic matters?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Told stories or jokes which were racist or depicted your race/ethnicity negatively?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Were condescending to you because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Put up or distributed materials (for example, pictures, leaflets, symbols, graffiti, music, stories) which were racist or showed your race/ethnicity negatively?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Displayed tattoos or wore distinctive clothes which were racist?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Did not include you in social activities because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Made you feel uncomfortable by hostile looks or stares because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Made offensive remarks about your appearance (for example, about skin color) because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Made remarks suggesting that people of your race/ethnicity are not suited for the kind of work you do?	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Made other offensive remarks about your race/ethnicity (for example, referred to your race/ethnicity with an offensive name)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Vandalized your property because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Made you feel threatened with retaliation if you did not go along with things that were racially/ethnically offensive to you?	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Physically threatened or intimidated you because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Assaulted you physically because of your race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Bothered or hurt <u>any of your family</u> in the ways listed above because of your or your family's race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐

47. During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your race/ethnicity was a factor? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	No, or does not apply	Yes, but my race/ethnicity was NOT a factor	Yes, and my race/ethnicity was a factor
a. You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation	☐	☐	☐
b. Your last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments	☐	☐	☐
c. You were held to a higher performance standard than others	☐	☐	☐
d. You did not get an award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances ..	☐	☐	☐
e. Your current assignment has not made use of your job skills	☐	☐	☐
f. You were not able to attend a major school needed for your specialty	☐	☐	☐
g. You did not get to go to short (1- to 3- day) courses that would provide you with needed skills	☐	☐	☐
h. You received lower grades than you deserved in your training	☐	☐	☐
i. You did not get a job assignment that you wanted because of scores that you got on tests	☐	☐	☐
j. Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military	☐	☐	☐
k. You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would help you prepare for advancement	☐	☐	☐
l. You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement	☐	☐	☐
m. You did not learn until it was too late of opportunities that would help your career ..	☐	☐	☐
n. You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities	☐	☐	☐
o. You or your family were discriminated against when seeking non-government housing	☐	☐	☐
p. You or your family were made to feel unwelcome by a local business (for example, a store or restaurant)	☐	☐	☐
q. You or your family did not get appropriate medical care	☐	☐	☐
r. You or your family got poorer military support service (for example, at commissaries, exchanges, clubs, and rec centers) than others did	☐	☐	☐
s. You were excluded by your peers from social activities	☐	☐	☐
t. Local civilian police harassed you or your family without cause	☐	☐	☐

47. Continued.

	No, or does not apply	Yes, but my race/ethnicity was NOT a factor	Yes, and my race/ethnicity was a factor
u. You or your family were watched more closely than others were by armed forces police	☐	☐	☐
v. You were taken to nonjudicial punishment or court martial when you should not have been	☐	☐	☐
w. You were punished for something that others did without being punished	☐	☐	☐
x. You were afraid for you or your family to go off the installation because of gang activity	☐	☐	☐
y. You were afraid for you or your family to go off the installation for other reasons ...	☐	☐	☐
z. You were afraid for you or your family because of gang activity on the installation	☐	☐	☐

48. Have you or your family had other bad, race/ethnic-related experiences during the past 12 months--experiences related to your job, an installation/ship, or a community around an installation?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes (Please specify what happened and to whom below.)

Please print.

49. Would you say that you or your family experienced racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination in what you said happened in the Personal Experiences questions? *Mark one.*

- ☐ Yes, racial/ethnic harassment
☐ Yes, racial/ethnic discrimination
☐ Yes, both racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination
☐ No, neither racial/ethnic harassment nor discrimination ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 51
☐ Does not apply, you did not mark that anything had happened to you or your family because of race/ethnicity ⇒ IF DOES NOT APPLY, GO TO QUESTION 78

50. Do you think that DoD and your Service have a responsibility to prevent the racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination which YOU MARKED AS HAPPENING TO YOU OR YOUR FAMILY? *Mark one.*

- ☐ No
☐ Yes, some of it
☐ Yes, all of it

ONE SITUATION OF RACE/ETHNIC-RELATED EXPERIENCES

Think about the situations you experienced during the past 12 months that involved the behaviors you marked as having happened to you or your family because of race/ethnicity. Pick one situation to tell us about in this section. That situation should be the event or set of related events during the past 12 months that bothered you most.

51. Which of the following best describe(s) the situation that during the past 12 months has bothered you most? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item below that describes the situation you are going to tell us about in this section.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Offensive encounters with military personnel, DoD/Service employees and/or contractors (for example, your exposure to offensive race/ethnic-related speech, pictures/printed material, non-verbal looks, or dress) | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Offensive encounters with civilians around your installation (for example, your exposure to offensive race/ethnic-related speech, pictures/printed material, non-verbal looks, or dress) | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Harm or threat of harm from military personnel, DoD/Service employees and/or contractors (for example, your experience(s) of race/ethnic-related threats, intimidation, vandalism, or physical assault) | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Harm or threat of harm from civilians around your installation (for example, your experience(s) of race/ethnic-related threats, intimidation, vandalism, or physical assault) | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Assignment/career discrimination (for example, your experience(s) of racial/ethnic discrimination in assignments, daily tasks, availability of mentorship, access to information about career opportunities or promotion potential) | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Evaluation discrimination (for example, your experience(s) of race/ethnic-motivated negative evaluations, differences in performance standards, and distribution of awards/decorations) | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. Undue punishment (for example, your experience(s) of nonjudicial punishment, or additional punishment(s) because of your race/ethnicity) | ☐ | ☐ |

51. Continued.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| h. Training/testing discrimination (for example, your experience(s) of unfair training scores, and/or lack of access to schools/training because of your race/ethnicity) | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. Discrimination by service providers (for example, your or your family's experience(s) of race/ethnic-motivated poorer customer service in civilian/military stores, lack of access to non-governmental housing, and scrutiny from civilian/military police) | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. Safety concerns (for example, your or your family's safety fears on- or off-installation of gang activity or safety fears motivated by other reasons) | ☐ | ☐ |
| k. Other race/ethnic-related experiences (for example, any other ways in which you or your family have been bothered/hurt by military personnel, DoD/Service employees and/or contractors, and/or civilians around your installation) | ☐ | ☐ |

The remaining questions in this section refer to the one situation that had the greatest effect on you.

52. Would you say that you and/or your family experienced racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination in what you said happened in the situation that bothered you most? Mark one.

- ☐ Yes, racial/ethnic harassment
☐ Yes, racial/ethnic discrimination
☐ Yes, both racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination
☐ No, neither racial/ethnic discrimination nor harassment

53. To what extent was this situation . . .

- | | Very large extent | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Annoying? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Offensive? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Disturbing? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Threatening? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Disillusioning? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

54. Who experienced this situation?

- ☐ Only I experienced it
☐ Only members of my family experienced it
☐ Both my family and I experienced it

55. Where and when did this situation occur? Mark one answer for each item.

	All of it	Most of it	Some of it	None of it
a. At a military installation	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. At your military work (the place where you perform your military duties)	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. During duty hours	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. In a work environment where members of your racial/ethnic background are uncommon	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. While you were deployed	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. In the local community around an installation	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. At your current permanent duty station.	☐	☐	☐	☐

56. Do you know who did it?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No ⇒ IF NO, THEN GO TO QUESTION 61

57. Did more than one person do it?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

58. What was the gender of the person(s)?

- ☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Some were male and some were female

59. What was the race/ethnic background of the person(s) who did it? Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

	Don't know	No	Yes
a. White	☐	☐	☐
b. Black or African American	☐	☐	☐
c. American Indian or Alaska Native	☐	☐	☐
d. Asian (for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese)	☐	☐	☐
e. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (for example, Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)	☐	☐	☐
f. Spanish/Hispanic/Latino	☐	☐	☐

60. Was the person(s) who did it . . . Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

	Don't know	No	Yes
a. Your immediate supervisor?	☐	☐	☐
b. Your unit commander?	☐	☐	☐
c. Other military person(s) of higher rank/grade than you?	☐	☐	☐
d. Your military coworker(s)?	☐	☐	☐
e. Your military subordinate(s)?	☐	☐	☐
f. Other military person(s)?	☐	☐	☐
g. DoD/Service civilian employee(s)?	☐	☐	☐
h. DoD/Service civilian contractor(s)?	☐	☐	☐
i. Person(s) in the local community	☐	☐	☐

61. During the course of the situation you have in mind, how often did the event(s) occur?

- ☐ Once
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently

62. How long did this situation last, or if continuing, how long has it been going on?

- ☐ Less than 1 week
☐ 1 week to less than 1 month
☐ 1 month to less than 3 months
☐ 3 months to less than 6 months
☐ 6 months or more

63. As a result of the situation, did you . . .

	No	Yes
a. Try to ignore the behavior?	☐	☐
b. Try to avoid the person(s) who bothered you?	☐	☐
c. Try to forget it?	☐	☐
d. Tell the person(s) to stop?	☐	☐
e. Ask someone else to speak to the person(s) for you?	☐	☐
f. Settle it yourself physically?	☐	☐
g. Act as though it did not bother you?	☐	☐
h. Call a hotline for advice/information (not to file a complaint)?	☐	☐
i. Request a transfer?	☐	☐
j. Think about getting out of your Service?	☐	☐
k. Accomplish less than you would like at work?	☐	☐

64. Did the situation involve only civilians in the local community around an installation?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

◆ 65. Did you report the situation to any civilian community officials, offices, or courts?

- ☐ Yes, and it made things better
☐ Yes, but it made no difference
☐ Yes, and it made things worse
☐ Yes, but it is too soon to tell if it will make things better or worse
☐ No, I did not report it to a civilian official

66. Did you discuss/report this situation to any installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations?

- ☐ Yes, made a formal report
☐ Yes, made an informal report
☐ No ⇒ IF NO, THEN GO TO QUESTION 75

67. Did you report this situation to any of the following installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations? Please mark one answer for each.

No, I did not report it to this person/office
Yes, but it is too soon to tell if it will make things better or worse
Yes, and it made things worse
Yes, but it made no difference
Yes, and it made things better

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Your immediate supervisor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Someone else in your chain-of-command | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Someone in the chain-of-command of the person(s) who did it | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Special military office responsible for handling these kinds of complaints (for example, Military Equal Opportunity or Civil Rights Office) ... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Other person or office with responsibility for follow-up | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Chaplain, counselor, ombudsman, or health care provider | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

68. What actions were taken in response to your report? Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Don't know | No | Yes |
| a. Person(s) who bothered you was/were talked to about the behavior | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Your complaint was/is being investigated . | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. The situation was resolved informally | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. The rules on harassment and discrimination were explained to everyone in the unit/office/place where the problem had occurred | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. You were encouraged to drop the complaint. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Your complaint was discounted or not taken seriously | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. Members of your chain-of-command were hostile toward you | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. Your coworkers were hostile toward you . | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. No action was taken | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. You do not know what action was taken .. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

69. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the reporting process? Mark one answer for each item.

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Very dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Satisfied | Very satisfied |
| a. Availability of information about how to file a complaint | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Availability of information about how to follow-up on a complaint | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Treatment by personnel handling your complaint | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Amount of time it took/is taking to resolve your complaint | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. How well you were/are kept informed about the progress of your complaint | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Degree to which your privacy was/is being protected | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. The complaint process overall | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

70. Do you feel that your chances of having a successful military career will be affected by making this report?

- ☐ Yes, your chances will be improved
☐ Yes, your chances will be worse
☐ No, your career will not be affected

71. Was your complaint found to be true?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ They were unable to determine whether your complaint was true or not
☐ Does not apply, the action is still being processed ⇒ IF DOES NOT APPLY, THEN GO TO QUESTION 74

72. What was the outcome of your complaint? Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Don't know | No | Yes |
| a. The outcome of your complaint was explained to you | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. The situation was corrected | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Some action was taken against the person(s) who bothered you | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Nothing was done about the complaint ... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Action was taken against you | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

73. How satisfied were you with the outcome of your complaint?

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

74. Did you report **all** of the behaviors you experienced to one of the installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations?

- ☐ Yes ⇒ IF YES, THEN GO TO QUESTION 76
☐ No

75. What were your reasons for not reporting behaviors to any of the installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each.

	Yes	No
a. Was not important enough to report	☐	☐
b. You did not know how to report	☐	☐
c. You felt uncomfortable making a report	☐	☐
d. You took care of the problem yourself	☐	☐
e. You did not think anything would be done ...	☐	☐
f. You thought you would not be believed	☐	☐
g. You thought reporting would take too much time and effort	☐	☐
h. You thought you would be labeled a troublemaker	☐	☐
i. You thought it would make your work situation unpleasant	☐	☐
j. You thought your performance evaluation or chance for promotion would suffer	☐	☐
k. You were afraid of retaliation/reprisals from the person(s) who did it or from their friends ..	☐	☐
l. You were afraid of retaliation/reprisals from your chain-of-command	☐	☐
m. You did not know the identity of the person(s) who did it	☐	☐
n. Situation only involved civilian(s) off an installation	☐	☐

76. Did any of the following things happen **in response to how you handled the situation?** Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. You were ignored or shunned by others at work	☐	☐	☐
b. You were blamed for the situation	☐	☐	☐
c. You were given less favorable job duties ..	☐	☐	☐
d. You were denied an opportunity for training	☐	☐	☐
e. You were given an unfair job performance appraisal	☐	☐	☐
f. You were denied a promotion	☐	☐	☐
g. You were transferred to a less desirable job	☐	☐	☐

77. Do you consider **ANY** of the things which **YOU MARKED AS HAPPENING TO YOU** in response to how you handled the situation to have been retaliation for reporting your experience?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
☐ Does not apply, I did not report my experience or none of the things listed above happened to me

PERSONNEL POLICY AND PRACTICES

78. Please give your opinion about whether the persons below make honest and reasonable efforts to stop racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, regardless of what is said officially. Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. Senior leadership of my Service	☐	☐	☐
b. Senior leadership of my installation/ship ..	☐	☐	☐
c. My immediate supervisor	☐	☐	☐

79. Has the military paid too much or too little attention to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination during the past several years?

- ☐ Too much attention
☐ The right amount of attention
☐ Too little attention

80. In your work group, to what extent . . .

	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Large extent	Very large extent
a. Would members of your work group feel free to report racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination without fear of reprisals?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Would complaints about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination be taken seriously? ..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Would people be able to get away with racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Are policies forbidding racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Are complaint procedures related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

81. At your current duty station, would you know how to report experiences of race/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

◆ 82. At your installation/ship, to what extent . . .

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
a. Would Service members feel free to report racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination without fear of reprisals?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Would complaints about racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination be taken seriously? . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Would people be able to get away with racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Are policies forbidding racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Are complaint procedures related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination publicized?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Is the availability of complaint hotlines publicized?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Do people feel free to sit wherever they choose in dining halls regardless of race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Do people feel free to use any recreation facilities regardless of race/ethnicity?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Are racist/extremist organizations or activities a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Are hate crimes/activities a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Are gang activities a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Are racist/extremist organizations or activities a problem in the local community around your installation?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Are hate groups/extremist activities a problem in the local community around your installation?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

83. To what extent . . .

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
a. Do you feel uneasy being around people who are of race/ethnic backgrounds different from yours? . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Have you felt pressure from Service members who are of your race/ethnicity not to socialize with members of other race/ethnic groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Do you feel comfortable interacting with people from different race/ethnic groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

84. Have you tried to avoid an assignment in the military because you thought you might be subjected to racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination . . . Mark "Yes" or "No" for each.

	Yes	No
a. At a Command or on an installation/ship? . . .	☐	☐
b. In the local community around an installation?	☐	☐

85. During the past 12 months, have you been involved in a racial confrontation . . .

	Yes, and I have seen it happen to others	Yes, but I have NOT seen it happen to others	No, but I have seen it happen to others	No, and I have NOT seen it happen to others
a. On your installation/ship?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. In the local community around your installation?	☐	☐	☐	☐

86. How would you rate race relations . . . Mark one answer for each statement.

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
a. In your work group?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. At your installation/ship?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. In your Service?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. In the local community around your installation?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

TRAINING

87. Have you had any training from military sources during the past 12 months on topics related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No ⇒ IF NO, THEN GO TO QUESTION 91

88. In the past 12 months, how many times have you had training from military sources on topics related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination? To indicate nine or more, enter "9".

TIMES

89. My Service's training . . .

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. Provides a good understanding of what words and actions are considered racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Teaches that racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination reduces the cohesion and effectiveness of your Service as a whole	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Identifies behaviors that are offensive to others and should not be tolerated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Gives useful tools for dealing with racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Explains the process for reporting racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Makes you feel it is safe to complain about offensive, race/ethnic-related situations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Promotes cross-cultural awareness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Provides information about policies, procedures, and consequences of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Provides information on your Service's policies on participation in hate groups/gangs/extremist activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Promotes religious tolerance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

90. In your opinion, how effective was the training you received in actually reducing/preventing behaviors which might be seen as racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination?

- ☐ Very effective
☐ Moderately effective
☐ Slightly effective
☐ Not at all effective

MILITARY/CIVILIAN COMPARISONS

91. How do the opportunities/conditions for people of your race/ethnic background in the military compare to opportunities/conditions you would have in the civilian world?

	Much better as a civilian	Better as a civilian	No difference	Better in the military	Much better in the military
a. Promotion opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Pay and benefits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Fair performance evaluations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Education and training opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Quality of life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Fair administration of criminal justice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Chance to show pride in yourself	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Chance to show pride in your race/ethnic group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Freedom from harassment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Freedom from discrimination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Freedom from extremism/hate crimes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Race/ethnic relations overall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

92. Do you have friends of a different race/ethnicity with whom you socialize in your home/quarters?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

93. Do you have close personal friends who are of a different race/ethnicity than yours?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

94. Compared to right before you entered the military, do you have more or fewer close personal friends who are of a race/ethnicity different from yours?

- ☐ More now
☐ About the same
☐ Fewer now

95. In your opinion, have race/ethnic relations in our nation gotten better or worse over the last 5 years?

- ☐ Better today
☐ About the same as 5 years ago
☐ Worse today

- Much worse
Worse
Neither better nor worse
Better
Much better

- ☐ Don't know, you have been in the military less than 5 years ⇒ IF DON'T KNOW, GO TO QUESTION 100
- ☐ Much less often
- ☐ Less often
- ☐ About the same
- ☐ More often
- ☐ Much more often

- Much worse
Worse
Neither better nor worse
Better
Much better

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour 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 the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 30-06-2007		2. REPORT TYPE Scales and Measures Report		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) January 2005-April 2005	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members - Scales and Measures Report				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Ormerod, A. J., Lawson, A. K., Lytell, M. C., Wright, C. V., Nye, C., Perry, L. A., Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., Kusznir, c. & Rynczak, D.				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) University of Urbana - Champaign 603 East Daniel Street Chicago-Illinois 61820				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER DMDC Report 2007-004	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This report documents the scale development process and properties for the 2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active-Duty Members (WEOA2005). This report describes advances from previous surveys and presents results on scale development as obtained from respondents to this survey. The body of the report is comprised of a description of each scale, including individual items, background information, and psychometric analyses. Statistics are reported for Service members overall and by race/ethnicity.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Demographics, workplace, deployment, health and well-being, racial/ethnic-related experiences, personnel policies, racial/ethnic harassment, racial/ethnic discrimination					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 84	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Rachel N. Lipari
a. REPORT U	b. ABSTRACT U	c. THIS PAGE U			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (703) 696-1125

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

1. REPORT DATE. Full publication date, including day, month, if available. Must cite at least the year and be Year 2000 compliant, e.g. 30-06-1998; xx-06-1998; xx-xx-1998.

2. REPORT TYPE. State the type of report, such as final, technical, interim, memorandum, master's thesis, progress, quarterly, research, special, group study, etc.

3. DATES COVERED. Indicate the time during which the work was performed and the report was written, e.g., Jun 1997 - Jun 1998; 1-10 Jun 1996; May - Nov 1998; Nov 1998.

4. TITLE. Enter title and subtitle with volume number and part number, if applicable. On classified documents, enter the title classification in parentheses.

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER. Enter all contract numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. F33615-86-C-5169.

5b. GRANT NUMBER. Enter all grant numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. AFOSR-82-1234.

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER. Enter all program element numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 61101A.

5d. PROJECT NUMBER. Enter all project numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 1F665702D1257; ILIR.

5e. TASK NUMBER. Enter all task numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 05; RF0330201; T4112.

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER. Enter all work unit numbers as they appear in the report, e.g. 001; AFAPL30480105.

6. AUTHOR(S). Enter name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. The form of entry is the last name, first name, middle initial, and additional qualifiers separated by commas, e.g. Smith, Richard, J, Jr.

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES). Self-explanatory.

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER. Enter all unique alphanumeric report numbers assigned by the performing organization, e.g. BRL-1234; AFWL-TR-85-4017-Vol-21-PT-2.

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES). Enter the name and address of the organization(s) financially responsible for and monitoring the work.

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S). Enter, if available, e.g. BRL, ARDEC, NADC.

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S). Enter report number as assigned by the sponsoring/monitoring agency, if available, e.g. BRL-TR-829; -215.

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT. Use agency-mandated availability statements to indicate the public availability or distribution limitations of the report. If additional limitations/ restrictions or special markings are indicated, follow agency authorization procedures, e.g. RD/FRD, PROPIN, ITAR, etc. Include copyright information.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: prepared in cooperation with; translation of; report supersedes; old edition number, etc.

14. ABSTRACT. A brief (approximately 200 words) factual summary of the most significant information.

15. SUBJECT TERMS. Key words or phrases identifying major concepts in the report.

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION. Enter security classification in accordance with security classification regulations, e.g. U, C, S, etc. If this form contains classified information, stamp classification level on the top and bottom of this page.

17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT. This block must be completed to assign a distribution limitation to the abstract. Enter UU (Unclassified Unlimited) or SAR (Same as Report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited.

