



Information and Technology for Better Decision Making

2007 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Reserve Component 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 491 980

2007 WORKPLACE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SURVEY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

**Sadie E. Larsen
Alayne J. Ormerod
Christopher D. Nye
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

**Kenneth Matos
DMDC**

**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 Timothy Elig, Kenneth Matos, and Rachel Lipari. We would also like to thank Fritz Drasgow and Louise F. Fitzgerald for their insightful comments.

The *2007 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Reserve Component Members (2007 WEOR)* 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).

This research was supported in part by Defense Manpower Data Center, Contract Number M67004-08-C-0008.

The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official DMDC position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation.

2007 WORKPLACE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SURVEY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Executive Summary

In 2007, the Department of Defense (DoD) and Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) conducted the first DoD-wide survey on racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination experiences of Reserve component military personnel, the *2007 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Reserve Component Members (2007 WEOR)*. This report describes advances from similar, previously conducted surveys 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 the major scales, including individual items, background information, and psychometric analyses.

The 16-page survey booklet (see Appendix 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 48 items concerning race/ethnic-related harassment or discrimination behaviors experienced by Service members, and two items concerning whether Service members considered any of the race/ethnic-related behaviors to have been racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination. Together, these 50 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 Commitment Section	13
Organizational Commitment.....	13
Scales in the Workplace Information Section.....	14
Supervisor, Coworker, and Work Satisfaction	14
Unit Cohesion	17
Scales in the Stress and Health Section	18
General Health.	18
Physical Health.	19
Perceived Stress.	20
Scales in the Race/Ethnic-Related Experiences in Military Section	21
Discussion.....	29
References.....	31

Appendixes

Appendix A. Explanation and Table of Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models	35
Appendix B. Acronyms Used in the Report on Scales and Measures	43
Appendix C. Survey Instrument	47

List of Tables

Table 1.	Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2007 WEOR	7
Table 2.	Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors	9
Table 3.	Incidence Rates for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and/or Discrimination	11
Table 4.	Scale Items Measuring Organizational Commitment.....	14
Table 5.	Scale Items Measuring Coworker and Work Satisfaction	17
Table 6.	Scale Items Measuring Unit Cohesion.....	18
Table 7.	Scale Items Measuring General Health.....	19
Table 8.	Scale Items Measuring Physical Health.....	19
Table 9.	Scale Items Measuring Perceived Stress.....	21
Table 10.	Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Harassment.....	25
Table 11.	Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination.....	28
Table 12.	Commonly Cited Indices in CFA/SEM.....	37

Table of Contents (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Table 13. Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models.....	41

2007 WORKPLACE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SURVEY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Introduction

This report describes the scales and measures contained in the *2007 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Reserve Component Members*, referred to as the *2007 WEOR*. The *2007 WEOR* is the first Department of Defense (DoD)–wide survey of Reserve component members focusing on racial/ethnic discrimination and harassment issues.

The first survey on this topic, 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 *2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active Duty Members*, *2005 WEOA*, 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 *2007 WEOR* was designed to take advantage of developments in harassment and discrimination measurement technology that have occurred since its predecessors and to utilize a standardized method for measuring and counting racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination incidents.

The *2007 WEOR* 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 *2007 WEOR* used the same measures of racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination as did the *1996 EOS*, but, similar to the *2005 WEOA*, 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* and *2007 WEOR* include a more detailed assessment of affective, continuance, and normative commitment, supervisor, coworker, and job satisfaction, unit cohesion, stress, health, and labeling of racial/ethnic experiences. A detailed assessment of

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

a critical racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination experience, called the One Situation, was expanded from the *1996 EOS*, as were items that assessed reasons for not reporting, retaliation, climate related to racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, and training and education. Details on the properties and validation of these scales for the 2005 WEOA can be found in Ormerod et al. (2007).

This report describes results of psychometric analyses and validation of the major scales and measures used in the *2007 WEOR*. The items included in each scale are listed, along with the scale's mean, standard deviation, standard error, and reliability, where appropriate. 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 August 15, 2007, with the mailout of notification letters to sample members. Data were collected between August 27 and December 5, 2007, with paper surveys mailed on September 14, 2007 to those who had not yet responded via the Web. The population of interest for this survey consisted of members from the Selected Reserve in Reserve Unit, Active Guard/Reserve (AGR/FTS/AR; Title 10 and Title 32), or Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) programs from the Army National Guard (ARNG), U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), U.S. Navy Reserve (USNR), U.S. Marine Corps Reserve (USMCR), Air National Guard (ANG), U.S. Air Force Reserve (USAFR) and U.S. Coast Guard Reserve (USCGR) members, (1) who had at least six months of service at the time the questionnaire was first fielded and (2) were below flag rank. Single-stage, nonproportional stratified random sampling³ procedures were used. The sample consisted of 83,097 individuals drawn from the sample frame constructed from DMDC's Reserve Components Common Personnel Data System. 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 in a National Guard/Reserve component as of the first day of the Web survey, August 27, 2007 (2% of the sample).

Completed surveys (defined as 50% or more of the survey questions asked of all participants were answered and at least one item answered in Questions 53-54) were received from 23,170 eligible respondents. The overall weighted response rate for eligibles, corrected for nonproportional sampling and nonlocation, was 32% from DoD and 44% from the USCGR. The weighted number of respondents and response rates by race/ethnicity were Non-Hispanic Native American, $n = 6,257$, 27%, Non-Hispanic Asian, $n = 19,286$, 33%, Non-Hispanic Black, $n = 118,263$, 25%, Non-Hispanic White, $n = 565,417$, 34%, Hispanic, $n = 71,945$, 28%, Non-Hispanic Two or More Races, $n = 3,765$, 38%, Non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, $n = 2,942$, 33%, Total Minority, $n = 222,457$, 28%.

³ In 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 USAR personnel in one group, all female USNR 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.

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.

Survey Instrument

The 2007 WEOR 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 14 general sections. The 16-page survey booklet appears in Appendix C. The survey was subdivided into the following 14 topic areas:

- *Background Information* – Reserve component, gender, paygrade, race/ethnicity, ethnic ancestry, and education.
- *Family and Household Information* – Marital status, duration of relationship, and race/ethnicity of spouse/significant other.
- *Satisfaction and Retention Intention* – Degree expectations fulfilled regarding work and personal life, overall satisfaction with the military way of life, likelihood to stay on in a Reserve component, spouse/family support to stay on active duty, years spent in military service, willingness to recommend military service, and commitment to serve.
- *Tempo* – Time spent on military duties, time spent away from home on military duties, expectations of time commitments, and impact of time commitments on military career intentions.
- *Employment/Student Status* – Military technician, student and civilian employment status.
- *Activation/Deployment Status* – Incidence, duration, and (in)voluntary status of activations in the preceding 12 months, incidence, and location of deployments in the preceding 12 months, current activation and deployment status, and deployments since September 11, 2001.
- *Military Workplace* – Duration of service in present military unit, characteristics of and satisfaction with immediate supervisor, scarcity of coworkers of the same racial/ethnic background, military 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 in the Military Community* – Types and frequencies of personal experiences related to race/ethnicity involving military personnel or DoD/DHS civilians and contractors, 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.
- *Personal Experiences in the Civilian Community* – Types and frequencies of personal experiences related to race/ethnicity involving civilians in the local community where members live, and DoD's/Service's responsibility to prevent racial/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination.
- *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, and interactions with extremist groups, hate crimes, gangs and associated media.
- *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*, the *2005 WEOA* 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*; the *2005 WEOA*; 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 *2007 WEOR*.

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 53, 54, and 75). 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 15.0.1 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 averaging 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).

Missing data were handled differently for Items 53, 54, and 75. 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 *2005 WEOA* (Lipari and Cook 2007) and the *1996 EOS* (Scarville, Button, Edwards, Lancaster, and Elig, 1999). The means and standard errors were calculated on the weighted data using PROC SURVEYMEANS in SAS V9.1.3; this was used because it accounts for the stratified sample design. Standard deviations were computed using SAS PROC MEANS.

Table 3 presents the frequency counts, expressed as percentages, for scales measuring racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination. Percentages were calculated in SAS V9.1.3 using weighted data. Percentages for the discrimination subscales (Item 54) were calculated for those respondents who had completed at least one item.

Percentages for racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination and related subscales (Items 53, 54, and 75) reflect those respondents who experienced one or more incidents on the particular subscale being reported and labeled their experiences as racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination (Items 55 and 76). 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 LISREL 8.71 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2004).

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 2007 *WEOR* 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 43A-43P 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 77) and are not reported in this document.

⁴ Items 43A through 43P 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 2007 WEOR

Scale	Cronbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Hispanics	Cronbach α for Whites	Cronbach α for Blacks	Cronbach α for American Indian or Alaskan Native	Cronbach α for Asian	Cronbach α for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Cronbach α for Two or More Races	Cronbach α for Total Minority
Organizational Commitment (21A-K)	.90	.91	.90	.90	.91	.91	.91	.90	.90
Affective Commitment (21A-B,D,G-H, K)	.89	.89	.89	.88	.89	.89	.89	.88	.89
Continuance Commitment (21E, J)	.72	.70	.71	.73	.72	.75	.73	.68	.72
Normative Commitment (21C, F, I)	.83	.83	.84	.82	.85	.81	.80	.84	.83
Supervisor Satisfaction (40A-F)	.96	.96	.96	.96	.96	.96	.96	.96	.96
Coworker Satisfaction (44A-E)	.91	.91	.91	.91	.91	.90	.92	.91	.91
Work Satisfaction (45A-E)	.93	.93	.93	.93	.93	.93	.92	.92	.93
Unit Cohesion (48A-D)	.92	.93	.92	.91	.93	.93	.93	.93	.92
General Health (49A-D)	.77	.77	.77	.75	.77	.78	.74	.76	.77
Physical Health (50A-D)	.91	.91	.90	.90	.92	.92	.92	.93	.91
Perceived Stress (52A-J)	.86	.85	.86	.85	.86	.86	.84	.88	.86
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (53A-N)	.92	.92	.91	.91	.91	.94	.94	.94	.92
Offensive Encounters- DoD (53A-J)	.91	.91	.89	.91	.91	.93	.93	.92	.91
Harm/Threat-DoD (53K-N)	.90	.87	.91	.87	.90	.93	.93	.94	.90

Table 1.
Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from the 2007 WEOR (Continued)

Scale	Cronbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Hispanics	Cronbach α for Whites	Cronbach α for Blacks	Cronbach α for American Indian or Alaskan Native	Cronbach α for Asian	Cronbach α for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Cronbach α for Two or More Races	Cronbach α for Total Minority
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (75A-N)	.94	.92	.95	.93	.93	.96	.96	.92	.94
Offensive Encounters- Community (75A-J)	.93	.92	.93	.93	.93	.95	.95	.91	.93
Harm/Threat-Community (75K-N)	.94	.91	.95	.93	.95	.95	.93	.92	.93
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (54A-Q)	.91	.91	.90	.90	.90	.93	.95	.90	.91
Evaluation (54A-D)	.77	.76	.72	.78	.75	.78	.81	.76	.77
Assignment/Career (54E, J-N, Q)	.85	.85	.83	.84	.82	.87	.89	.84	.85
Training/Test Scores (54F-I)	.78	.78	.75	.76	.76	.83	.85	.74	.79
Undue Punishment (54O-P)	.67	.66	.68	.63	.62	.75	.77	.64	.67

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
Organizational Commitment (21A-K)	1 - 5	3.66 (.01)	.78	3.74 (.06)	.71	3.56 (.04)	.77	3.56 (.02)	.76	3.68 (.01)	.79	3.66 (.03)	.81	3.50 (.05)	.72	3.73 (.05)	.69	3.60 (.01)	.78
Affective Commitment (21A-B, D, G-H, K)	1 - 5	4.03 (.01)	.75	4.01 (.07)	.72	3.87 (.04)	.77	3.97 (.02)	.74	4.05 (.01)	.75	4.01 (.03)	.79	3.95 (.05)	.68	4.01 (.04)	.67	3.98 (.01)	.76
Continuance Commitment (21E, J)	1 - 5	3.18 (.01)	1.09	3.35 (.09)	.99	3.10 (.05)	1.07	3.09 (.02)	1.07	3.12 (.02)	1.10	3.17 (.03)	1.08	3.01 (.07)	1.01	3.42 (.05)	.95	3.13 (.02)	1.07
Normative Commitment (21C, F, I)	1 - 5	3.24 (.01)	1.07	3.46 (.09)	1.04	3.26 (.05)	1.00	3.05 (.02)	1.02	3.27 (.02)	1.08	3.30 (.03)	1.06	2.95 (.07)	1.04	3.37 (.08)	.89	3.18 (.02)	1.04
Supervisor Satisfaction (40A-F)	1 - 5	3.87 (.01)	.97	3.83 (.14)	1.12	3.78 (.04)	.95	3.75 (.02)	.99	3.91 (.02)	.96	3.78 (.03)	1.02	3.82 (.08)	1.01	3.91 (.06)	.92	3.78 (.02)	1.00
Coworker Satisfaction (44A-E)	1 - 5	3.86 (.01)	.74	3.91 (.10)	.82	3.76 (.04)	.74	3.82 (.02)	.77	3.87 (.01)	.73	3.82 (.02)	.78	3.87 (.06)	.77	3.96 (.03)	.72	3.82 (.01)	.77
Work Satisfaction (45A-E)	1 - 5	3.85 (.01)	.92	3.82 (.10)	.93	3.71 (.04)	.91	3.87 (.02)	.91	3.85 (.02)	.92	3.87 (.03)	.90	3.81 (.05)	.85	4.03 (.03)	.75	3.85 (.01)	.90
Unit Cohesion (48A-D)	1 - 5	3.86 (.01)	.78	3.90 (.08)	.77	3.71 (.04)	.81	3.70 (.02)	.83	3.91 (.01)	.75	3.81 (.03)	.83	3.82 (.06)	.78	3.89 (.06)	.75	3.76 (.01)	.82
General Health (49A-D)	1 - 4	3.31 (.01)	.54	3.34 (.05)	.51	3.28 (.02)	.56	3.33 (.01)	.56	3.31 (.01)	.53	3.30 (.02)	.59	3.17 (.05)	.61	3.29 (.02)	.45	3.30 (.01)	.57
Physical Health (50A-D)	1 - 4	3.63 (.01)	.60	3.59 (.07)	.64	3.52 (.03)	.66	3.56 (.01)	.65	3.67 (.01)	.56	1.47 (.02)	.70	3.61 (.06)	.69	3.59 (.02)	.60	3.55 (.01)	.67
Perceived Stress (52A-J)	0 - 4	1.45 (.01)	.66	1.54 (.05)	.63	1.56 (.03)	.63	1.48 (.01)	.67	1.44 (.01)	.66	3.52 (.02)	.67	1.51 (.05)	.65	1.52 (.05)	.62	1.50 (.01)	.66

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
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (53A-N)	1 - 4	1.09 (.00)	.28	1.08 (.01)	.22	1.22 (.03)	.46	1.18 (.01)	.38	1.06 (.00)	.22	1.67 (.01)	.36	1.12 (.01)	.28	1.13 (.01)	.32	1.17 (.01)	.37
Offensive Encounters-DoD (53A-J)	1 - 4	1.13 (.00)	.33	1.10 (.01)	.27	1.27 (.03)	.53	1.23 (.01)	.45	1.08 (.00)	.26	1.21 (.01)	.44	1.15 (.02)	.33	1.16 (.02)	.37	1.21 (.01)	.44
Threat/Harm-DoD (53K-N)	1 - 4	1.03 (.00)	.21	1.03 (.01)	.15	1.09 (.03)	.38	1.06 (.01)	.29	1.02 (.00)	.17	1.05 (.01)	.25	1.04 (.01)	.20	1.06 (.01)	.27	1.05 (.00)	.27
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (75A-N)	1 - 4	1.09 (.00)	.29	1.09 (.01)	.27	1.13 (.01)	.36	1.14 (.01)	.36	1.07 (.00)	.26	1.13 (.01)	.32	1.13 (.02)	.28	1.09 (.02)	.31	1.13 (.01)	.34
Offensive Encounters-Community (75A-J)	1 - 4	1.11 (.00)	.34	1.11 (.01)	.32	1.16 (.01)	.40	1.18 (.01)	.43	1.09 (.01)	.30	1.17 (.01)	.38	1.17 (.03)	.36	1.10 (.02)	.33	1.17 (.01)	.40
Threat/Harm-Community (75K-N)	1 - 4	1.03 (.00)	.23	1.02 (.00)	.19	1.06 (.01)	.32	1.04 (.01)	.26	1.03 (.00)	.21	1.04 (.01)	.25	1.02 (.00)	.15	1.05 (.02)	.27	1.04 (.00)	.25

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

^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

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 or Discrimination-Any (53A-N, 54A-Q, 75A-N)	12% (39%)	11% (41%)	18% (51%)	23% (52%)	8% (34%)	20% (50%)	23% (44%)	18% (42%)	21% (50%)
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment or Discrimination-DoD (53A-N, 54A-Q)	5% (32%)	7% (34%)	10% (47%)	14% (46%)	3% (27%)	10% (43%)	9% (36%)	11% (39%)	11% (44%)
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (53A-N)	1% (29%)	1% (28%)	1% (43%)	2% (41%)	0.4% (24%)	1% (40%)	1% (34%)	5% (38%)	1% (40%)
Offensive Encounters-DoD (53A-J)	1% (29%)	1% (26%)	1% (43%)	2% (41%)	0.4% (23%)	1% (40%)	1% (34%)	5% (37%)	1% (40%)
Threat/Harm-DoD (53K-N)	0.3% (4%)	0.4% (5%)	0.3% (8%)	0.4% (6%)	0.3% (2%)	0.2% (6%)	0.2% (6%)	0.1% (7%)	0.3% (6%)
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (75A-N)	2% (21%)	1% (23%)	3% (26%)	2% (26%)	2% (19%)	3% (26%)	6% (27%)	10% (23%)	3% (26%)
Offensive Encounters-Community (75A-J)	2% (21%)	1% (23%)	3% (26%)	2% (26%)	2% (19%)	3% (26%)	6% (27%)	10% (23%)	3% (26%)
Threat/Harm-Community (75K-N)	1% (3%)	0.1% (2%)	1% (6%)	1% (4%)	1% (3%)	1% (4%)	0.4% (3%)	0.1% (4%)	1% (4%)
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (54A-Q)	2% (6%)	1% (4%)	3% (11%)	5% (17%)	1% (3%)	3% (9%)	3% (7%)	2% (9%)	4% (12%)

Table 3.
Incidence Rates for Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and/or Discrimination (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
Assignment/Career Discrimination (54E, J-N, Q)	1% (4%)	0.4% (3%)	2% (7%)	4% (12%)	1% (2%)	2% (6%)	3% (5%)	1% (8%)	3% (8%)
Evaluation Discrimination (54A-D)	1% (4%)	0.4% (3%)	3% (8%)	4% (10%)	1% (2%)	2% (6%)	1% (4%)	1% (8%)	3% (8%)
Training/Test Scores Discrimination (54F-I)	1% (2%)	0.1% (1%)	2% (4%)	1% (5%)	0.2% (1%)	1% (3%)	0.4% (1%)	1% (2%)	1% (4%)
Undue Punishment (54O-P)	1% (2%)	0.2% (1%)	1% (2%)	1% (5%)	0.4% (1%)	1% (3%)	0.3% (2%)	0.4% (1%)	1% (3%)

^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 55 or 76).

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

Scales in the Commitment Section

Organizational Commitment. In Items 21A-K, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements about their Reserve component (see Table 4). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A higher score denotes a higher degree of commitment to one's Reserve component.

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 and was developed by members of the Military Family Research Institute (H. M. Weiss, personal communication, May 8, 2006). Item 21G is similar to an item found in Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Items 21C and 21F are from Meyer and Allen's (1997) normative commitment scale and were piloted on a military population (Ormerod, Lee, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 2001) and Items 21E and 21J are similar to items found in Meyer and Allen's continuance commitment scale.

For Organizational Commitment (21A-K), alpha coefficients were .90 for the total sample, .91 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .91 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .90 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .90 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .91 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).

Alpha coefficients for the Affective Commitment scale (Items 21A, 21B, 21D, 21G, 21H, 21K) were .89 for the total sample, .89 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .89 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .88 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .89 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .89 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .89 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .89 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Continuance Commitment scale (Items 21E, 21J) were .72 for the total sample, .72 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .75 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .73 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .71 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .70 for Hispanics, .68 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .73 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .72 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

For Normative Commitment (Items 21C, 21F, 21I), alpha coefficients were .83 for the total sample, .85 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .81 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .82 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .84 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .83 for Hispanics, .84 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .80 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .83 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 = .19, NNFI = .76, SRMR = .09, GFI = .77, AGFI = .66, and CFI = .81 for the total sample. The three-factor CFA reflected affective, continuance, and normative commitment (see Table 4) and fit moderately well. For example, RMSEA = .10, NNFI = .91, SRMR = .06, GFI = .93, AGFI = .88, and CFI = .93 for the total sample (see Appendix A).

Recommendations for this scale include adding a theoretically-derived third item to the Continuance Commitment scale.

Table 4.
Scale Items Measuring Organizational Commitment

<i>Affective Commitment</i>	
21A	I enjoy serving in the National Guard/Reserve
21B	Serving in the National Guard/Reserve is consistent with my personal goals
21D	Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am happy with my life in the National Guard/Reserve
21G	I really feel as if the military's values are my own
21H	Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am proud to be in the National Guard/Reserve
21K	I feel like being a member of the National Guard/Reserve can help me achieve what I want in life
<i>Continuance Commitment</i>	
21E	It would be difficult for me to leave the National Guard/Reserve and give up the benefits that are available
21J	I continue to serve in the National Guard/Reserve because leaving would require considerable sacrifice
<i>Normative Commitment</i>	
21C	I would feel guilty if I left the National Guard/Reserve.
21F	I would not leave the National Guard/Reserve right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it
21I	If I left the National Guard/Reserve, I would feel like I had let my country down

Scales in the Workplace Information Section

Supervisor, Coworker, and Work Satisfaction. In Items 40A-F, 44A-F and 45A-E, survey participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements about their supervisors, coworkers, and the work they do, respectively (see Table 5). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Item 44F was reverse coded. A higher score indicates more satisfying experiences with supervisors, coworkers, and work, respectively.

The Supervisor Satisfaction scale consists of six items similar to items first used in the *1995 Form B*.⁵ All items on this scale have been modified from items employed in previous DMDC surveys. Items 40A-E are modified versions of those used in the *1995 Form B*, while Item 40F is a modified version of an item used in the *1996 EOS*. Items 40A-F were used in the *2005 WEOA* and the *2006 WGRA*. A similar scale has been useful in research with military members (e.g., Hay & Elig, 1999; Sims, Dragow, & Fitzgerald, 2005).

The Coworker Satisfaction scale consists of five items, 44A-E. Although Item 44F asks about coworkers it was not included in this scale.⁶ Three items (Items 44A, 44B, and 44E) 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* and *2005 WEOA*. Item 44C was adapted from Spector's (1985) *Job Satisfaction Survey* (JSS)⁸ and was used in the *2002 WGR*, the *2004 WGR*, the *2005 WEOA*, and the *WGRA 2006* surveys. Item 44D was first used in the *2002 WGR*. First used on the *2005 WEOA*, Item 44F was created by subject matter experts at DMDC and was included for purposes of testing. Of these five items, only 44E was used in the *1996 EOS*.

The Work Satisfaction scale consists of five items (Items 45A-E) that were modified from the *1995 Form B*.⁹ Items 45B-E were all included in the *1996 EOS* and Items 45A-E were all subsequently reported in the *2002 WGR* (Ormerod et al., 2003) and used in the *2005 WEOA* and the *2006 WGRA*.

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).

Alpha coefficients for the Supervisor Satisfaction scale (Items 40A-F) were .96 for the total sample, .96 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .96 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .96 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .96 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .96 for Hispanics, .96 for Non-Hispanic

⁵ In Items 40A-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 40A was originally listed as “Do you trust your supervisor?” in the *1995 Form B*.

⁶ The scale has previously been examined with Item 44F included (using data from the *WEOA2005*) but the item performed poorly. For example, the alpha coefficient for the total sample for the improved from .87 to .91 when 44F was removed from the scale.

⁷ In Item 44A 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 44B 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 44C 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 45C and 45D 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 45C was originally listed as “The kind of work you do.” Items 45A and 45B 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 45A was originally listed as “Does your work provide you with a sense of pride?”

individuals of two or more races, .96 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .96 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Coworker Satisfaction scale (Items 44A-E) were .91 for the total sample, .91 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .90 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .91 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .91 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .91 for Hispanics, .91 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).

Alpha coefficients for the Work Satisfaction scale (Items 45A-E) were .93 for the total sample, .93 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .93 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .93 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .93 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .93 for Hispanics, .92 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .92 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .93 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

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).

A one-factor and three-factor CFA were fit to the data. The one-factor CFA fit poorly, for example, RMSEA = .30, NNFI = .55, SRMR = .18, GFI = .46, AGFI = .30, and CFI = .61 for the total sample. The three-factor CFA reflected the three indices of job satisfaction, Supervisor Satisfaction (40A-F), Coworker Satisfaction (44A-E) and Work Satisfaction (45A-E) and fit the data well. For example, RMSEA = .06, NNFI = .97, SRMR = .03, GFI = .95, AGFI = .93, and CFI = .97 in the total sample (see Appendix A). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 5.
Scale Items Measuring Coworker and Work Satisfaction

<i>Supervisor Satisfaction</i>	
40A	You trust your supervisor
40B	Your supervisor ensures that all assigned personnel are treated fairly
40C	There is very little conflict between your supervisor and the people who report to him/her
40D	Your supervisor evaluates your work performance fairly
40E	Your supervisor assigns work fairly in your work group
40F	You are satisfied with the direction/supervision you receive
<i>Coworker Satisfaction</i>	
44A	There is very little conflict among your co-workers
44B	Your co-workers put in the effort required for their jobs
44C	The people in your workgroup tend to get along
44D	The people in your workgroup are willing to help each other
44E	You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers
44F* [†]	You put more effort into your job than your coworkers do
<i>Work Satisfaction</i>	
45A	Your work provides you with a sense of pride
45B	Your work makes good use of your skills
45C	You like the kind of work you do
45D	Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills
45E	You are satisfied with your job as a whole

*Reverse Coded

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

Unit Cohesion. In Items 48A-D, survey participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding their unit cohesion (see Table 6). 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 48A-D) were .92 for the total sample, .93 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .93 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .91 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .92 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .93 for Hispanics, .93 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 6.
Scale Items Measuring Unit Cohesion

<i>Unit Cohesion</i>	
48A	Members in your unit really care about each other
48B	Members in your unit work well as a team
48C	Members in your unit pull together to get the job done
48D	Members in your unit trust each other

Scales in the Stress and Health Section

General Health. In Items 49A-D, survey participants were asked to rate their health in general (see Table 7). Response options ranged from 1 (*definitely false*) to 4 (*definitely true*). Items 49B and 49C 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.¹⁰ 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 49A-D) were .77 for the total sample, .77 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .78 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .75 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .77 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .77 for Hispanics, .76 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .74 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .77 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

¹⁰ 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 7.
Scale Items Measuring General Health

<i>General Health</i>	
49A	I am as healthy as anybody I know
49B*	I seem to get sick a little easier than other people
49C*	I expect my health to get worse
49D	My health is excellent

*Reverse coded.

Physical Health. In Items 50A-D, survey participants were asked how much their physical health had limited their functioning over the past four weeks (see Table 8). Response options were coded from 1 (*all or most of the time*) to 4 (*little or none of the time*).¹¹ A higher score indicates little negative impact of physical health on daily activities. The Physical Health scale is composed of four items and is based on the RAND-36. It can be found in the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992)¹² which is derived from work by the Rand Corporation. The *1995 Form B* utilized the dichotomous response scale and contained three items to measure this construct. The scale is intended to assess the impact of a member's physical health on their daily activities.

Alpha coefficients for the Physical Health scale (Items 50A-D) were .91 for the total sample, .92 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .92 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .90 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .90 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .91 for Hispanics, .93 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 Physical Health

<i>Physical Health</i>	
50A	Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities
50B	Accomplished less than you would like
50C	Were limited in the kind of work or other activities you do
50D	Had difficulty performing the work or other activities you do (for example, it took extra effort)

¹¹ The original instrument included a mid-point response option of "*don't know*."

¹² The original instrument utilized a dichotomous response scale.

Perceived Stress. In Items 52A-J, survey participants were asked how many times over the past month they had perceived stress in their lives (see Table 9). Response options were coded from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*very often*). Items 52D, 52E, 52G, and 52H were reverse coded so that a higher score indicates greater perceived distress.

Items 52A-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 were later incorporated into the *2005 WEOA* as well as the *2006 WGRA*. The Perceived Stress scale is composed of the 10-item version of the *Perceived Stress scale* (PSS10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988).¹³ 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 52A-J) were .86 for the total sample, .86 for Non-Hispanic Native Americans, .86 for Non-Hispanic Asians, .85 for Non-Hispanic Blacks, .86 for Non-Hispanic Whites, .85 for Hispanics, .88 for Non-Hispanic individuals of two or more races, .84 for Non-Hispanic Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, and .86 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 = .19, NNFI = .69, SRMR = .11, GFI = .79, AGFI = .67, and CFI = .76 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 an improved fit. For example, RMSEA = .09, NNFI = .92, SRMR = .05, GFI = .95, AGFI = .92, and CFI = .94 in the total sample (see Appendix A). Recommendations for this scale 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).

¹³ 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?"

Table 9.
Scale Items Measuring Perceived Stress

<i>Perceived Stress</i>	
52A	Been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
52B	Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
52C	Felt nervous and stressed?
52D*	Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
52E*	Felt that things were going your way?
52F	Found that you could not cope with all of the things you had to do?
52G*	Been able to control irritations in your life?
52H*	Felt that you were on top of things?
52I	Been angered because of things that were outside of your control?
52J	Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

*Reverse coded.

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

Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment and Discrimination. In Items 53A-O and 75A-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 10). Items 53A-O and 75A-O differed only in the source of such harassment. Items 53A-O asked about experiences involving military personnel and/or Service/DoD civilian employees and/or contractors (on or off installation) and Items 75A-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 54A-R 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*).

Similar to the 2005 WEOA and the 2006 WGRA, Items 55 and 76 asked survey participants whether they considered any of the behaviors that they experienced in Items 53-54 and 75 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 because of race/ethnicity*). Items 55 and 76 were used in conjunction with other items to calculate incident rates (described below).

Items 53A-O, 75A-O, 54A-R, were the central part of the *1996 EOS* and the *2005 WEOA*.¹⁴ 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 53A-D, 53G-J, 53L, 75A-D, 75G-J, and 75L 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.¹⁵ The SEQ was included in the *1995 Form B* and subsequent gender and workplace relations surveys. 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 53A-O) and Member Incident-Community (Items 75A-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 53A-J) and Offensive Encounters-Community (Items 75A-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 53K-N) and Threat/Harm-Community (Items 75K-N) includes 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 53A-O and 75A-O, grouped according to subscale, can be seen in Table 11. Items 53O and 75O asked about other race/ethnic experiences and were not used in subsequent analyses.

¹⁴ Question 54 originally included several other items which addressed the experiences of a member's family in the *1996 EOS* and the *2005 WEOA*. Items were either altered or deleted to remove any references to a member's family. For example Item 47X on the *2005 WEOA* "You were afraid for you or your family to go off the installation for because of gang activity" was not include in the *2007 WEOR*.

¹⁵ For example, Item 53A 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)?"

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 (53A-N or 75A-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 55 or 76).

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.¹⁶ To be counted as a complete survey the respondent must have provided (a) at least one response in Item 53, 54, and/or 75, and (b) answered at least 50% of non-skippable items on the survey.

For Race/ Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (Items 53A-N), alpha coefficients were .92 for the total sample, .92 for Hispanics, .91 for Whites, .91 for Blacks, .91 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .94 for Asian, .94 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .94 for individuals of two or more races, and .92 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Offensive Encounters-DoD scale (Items 53A-J) were .91 for the total sample, .91 for Hispanics, .89 for Whites, .91 for Blacks, .91 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .93 for Asian, .93 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .92 for individuals of two or more races, and .91 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Threat/Harm-DoD scale (Items 53K-N) were .90 for the total sample, .87 for Hispanics, .91 for Whites, .87 for Blacks, .90 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .93 for Asian, .93 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .94 for individuals of two or more races, and .90 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

For Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (Items 75A-N), alpha coefficients were .94 for the total sample, .92 for Hispanics, .95 for Whites, .93 for Blacks, .93 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .96 for Asian, .96 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .92 for individuals of two or more races, and .94 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Offensive Encounters-Community scale (Items 75A-J) were .93 for the total sample, .92 for Hispanics, .93 for Whites, .93 for Blacks, .93 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .95 for Asian, .95 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .91 for individuals of two or more races, and .93 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

¹⁶ 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).

Alpha coefficients for the Threat/Harm-Community scale (Items 75K-N) were .94 for the total sample, .91 for Hispanics, .95 for Whites, .93 for Blacks, .95 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .95 for Asian, .93 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .92 for individuals of two or more races, and .93 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for Items 53A-N and 75A-N using tetrachoric correlations (dichotomized responses) and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation. 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. Both one factor (e.g., Item 53A-N) and two factor (e.g., Offensive Encounters, Item 53A-J and Threat/Harm, Item 53K-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 = .10 and .09 and SRMR = .06 and .05, respectively, for the military and civilian contexts (see Appendix A). The two factor model is consistent with findings reported in Ormerod, Bergman et al. (2001) and Bergman, Palmieri, Drasgow, and Ormerod (2007). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Table 10.
Scale Items Measuring Racial/Ethnic-Related Harassment

<i>Offensive Encounters</i>	
53A & 75A	Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into an offensive discussion of racial/ethnic matters?
53B & 75B	Told stories or jokes which were racist or depicted your race/ethnicity negatively?
53C & 75C	Were condescending to you because of your race/ethnicity?
53D & 75D	Put up or distributed materials (for example, pictures, leaflets, symbols, graffiti, music, stories) which were racist or showed your race/ethnicity negatively?
53E & 75E	Displayed tattoos or wore distinctive clothes which were racist?
53F & 75F	Did not include you in social activities because of your race/ethnicity?
53G & 75G	Made you feel uncomfortable by hostile looks or stares because of your race/ethnicity?
53H & 75H	Made offensive remarks about your appearance (for example, about skin color) because of your race/ethnicity?
53I & 75I	Made remarks suggesting that people of your race/ethnicity are not suited for the kind of work you do?
53J & 75J	Made other offensive remarks about your race/ethnicity (for example, referred to your race/ethnicity with an offensive name)?
<i>Threat/Harm</i>	
53K & 75K	Vandalized your property because of your race/ethnicity?
53L & 75L	Made you feel threatened with retaliation if you did not go along with things that were racially/ethnically offensive to you?
53M & 75M	Physically threatened or intimidated you because of your race/ethnicity?
53N & 75N	Assaulted you physically because of your race/ethnicity?
<i>Other</i>	
53O & 75O	Other race/ethnic related experiences?

The Racial/Ethnic-Related Discrimination measure consists of 19 items (Items 54A-R and 55) that measure four facets of discrimination: Assignment/Career, Evaluation, Training/Test Scores, and Punishment. Assignment/Career discrimination (Items 54E, 54J-N, 54Q) 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 54A-D) reflects members' perceptions that race/ethnicity influenced some aspect of their performance evaluation. Training/Test Scores Incident (Items 54F-I) 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 54O-P) reflects members' perceptions that race/ethnicity influenced whether and how they were punished. Items 54A-R, grouped according to subscale, can be seen in Table 11. Item 54R asked about other bothersome experiences and was not used in subsequent analyses.

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 18 discrimination behaviors and perceives that race/ethnicity was a factor (a score of 1 on one or more items in Items 54A-R) at least once in past 12 months, and
2. Respondent indicates that the behaviors were racial/ethnic discrimination (a score of 2 on Item 55).

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 four facets of discrimination: Evaluation Discrimination (Items 54A-D and 55), Assignment/Career Discrimination (Items 54E, 54J-N, 54Q, and 55), Training/Test Scores (Items 54F-I and 55), Punishment (Items 54O-P and 55).

For Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (Items 54A-Q), alpha coefficients were .91 for the total sample, .91 for Hispanics, .90 for Whites, .90 for Blacks, .90 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .93 for Asian, .95 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .90 for individuals of two or more races, and .91 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Evaluation scale (Items 54A-D) were .77 for the total sample, .76 for Hispanics, .72 for Whites, .78 for Blacks, .75 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .78 for Asian, .81 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .76 for individuals of two or more races, and .77 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Assignment/Career scale (Items 54E, 54J-N, 54Q) were .85 for the total sample, .85 for Hispanics, .83 for Whites, .84 for Blacks, .82 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .87 for Asian, .89 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .84 for individuals of two or more races, and .85 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Training/Test Scores scale (Items 54F-I) were .78 for the total sample, .78 for Hispanics, .75 for Whites, .76 for Blacks, .76 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .83 for Asian, .85 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .74 for individuals of two or more races, and .79 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Alpha coefficients for the Punishment scale (Items 54O-P) were .67 for the total sample, .66 for Hispanics, .68 for Whites, .63 for Blacks, .62 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, .75 for Asian, .77 for Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, .64 for individuals of two or more races, and .67 for all minority groups combined (see Table 1).

Two CFAs of Items 54A-Q were carried out using tetrachoric correlations and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation and fitting a one and four-factor structure to the data (Evaluation, Items 54A-D; Assignment/Career, Items 54E, 54J-N, 54Q; Training/Test Scores, Items 54F-I; Punishment, Items 54O-P). The four-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 = .08 and SRMR = .05 in the total sample (see Appendix A). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Two global measures of race/ethnic-related harassment and/or discrimination were examined (Incident – Any, Incident – DoD). Incident – Any (Items 53A-N, 54A-Q, 75A-N, 55 and 76) reflects whether members indicated that they personally experienced race/ethnicity-related insensitivity, threats, harm, or discrimination from either another military member, DoD civilian, or someone in the local civilian community. Incident – DoD (Items 53A-N, 54A-Q, and 55) reflects whether members indicated that they personally experienced race/ethnicity-related insensitivity, threats, harm, or discrimination from another military member or DoD civilian.

The incident rate for Incident – Any 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 53A-N and/or Items 75A-N) or discrimination (a score of 1 on one or more items in Items 54A-Q), 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 Items 55 and/or 76).

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 54, 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.

The incident rate for Incident – DoD 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 53A-N) or discrimination (a score of 1 on one or more items in Items 54A-Q), 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 55).

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 54, 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.

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

<i>Evaluation</i>	
54A	You were rated lower than you deserved on your last military evaluation
54B	Your last military evaluation contained unjustified negative comments
54C	You were held to a higher performance standard than others in your military job
54D	You did not get a military award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances
<i>Assignment/Career</i>	
54E	Your current military assignment has not made use of your job skills
54J	Your current military assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military
54K	You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would help you prepare for advancement
54L	You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement
54M	You did not learn until it was too late of opportunities that would help your military career
54N	You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities
54Q	You were excluded by your military peers from social activities
<i>Training/Test Scores</i>	
54F	You were not able to attend a major school needed for your specialty
54G	You did not get to go to short (1-to-3-day) courses that would provide you with needed skills
54H	You received lower grades than you deserved in your training
54I	You did not get a military job assignment that you wanted because of scores that you got on tests
<i>Punishment</i>	
54O	You were taken to nonjudicial punishment or court martial when you should not have been
54P	You were punished for something that others did without being punished

<i>Evaluation</i>	
<i>Other</i>	
54R	You had other bothersome experiences at your military job

Discussion

The 2007 *WEOR* 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 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, including . organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit cohesion, stress, and health and a detailed assessment of a critical experience of racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination called the “One Situation.” Further, it included an assessment of climate variables related to racial/ethnic-related harassment and discrimination and expanded the surveyed population to include members of the National Guard/Reserve components.

This report provides details about the major scales constructed from the 2007 *WEOR*. 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 2007 *WEOR* produced 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 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

- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- 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. (2007). Racial and ethnic harassment and discrimination: In the eye of the beholder? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 144-160.
- Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 98-104.
- 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.
- Edwards, J. E., Elig, T. W., Edwards D. L., & Riemer, R. A. (1997). *The 1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Administration, datasets, and codebook for Form B* (Report No. 95-015). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- 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., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425-445.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hu, L. & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, 3, 424-453.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Hu, L., Bentler, P. M., Kano, Y. (1992). Can test statistics in covariance structure analysis be trusted? *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 351-362.
- Hoyle, R. H. (1995). The structural equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Issues, concepts, and applications* (pp. 1-15). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Idaszak, J. R., & Drasgow, F. (1987). A revision of the Job Diagnostic Survey: Elimination of a measurement artifact. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 69-74.
- Joreskog, K. & Sorbom, D. (1993). *Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Hillsdale, NJ: Scientific Software International.
- Joreskog, K. & Sorbom, D. (2004). *Lisrel 8.7 for Windows [Computer Software]*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- 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.
- Lipari, R.N., Cook, P.J., Rock, L.M., Matos, K. (2008). *2006 Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Members*. (Report No. 2007-022). Arlington, VA: DMDC.
- McDonald, R. P., & Marsh, H. W. (1990). Choosing a multivariate model: Noncentrality and goodness of fit. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 247-255.
- 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.
- 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., 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., Lytell, M.C., Vaile Wright, C., Nye, C., Perry, L. A., Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., Kuszniir, C., & Rynczak, D. (2007). *2005 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active Duty Members: Scales and Measures Report*. (Report No. 2007-004). 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.
- Roznowski, M. (1989). Examination of the measurement properties of the Job Descriptive Index with experimental items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 805-814.
- 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.
- Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment*, 8, 350-353.
- 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.
- Steiger, J. H., & Lind, J. C. (1980, May). Statistically-based tests for the number of common factors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Psychonomic Society, Iowa City, IA.

- Tucker, L. R. & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 38, 1-10.
- 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.
- West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Issues, concepts, and applications* (pp. 56-75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wheeless, S.C., Manson, R.E., Kavee, J.D., Riemer, R.A., Elig, T.W., (1997). *Armed Forces 1996 equal opportunity survey: Statistical methodology report*. Report No. 97-025. Defense Manpower Data Center, Arlington, VA.

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 12.
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 2007 WEOR.

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 2007 WEOR 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; Ormerod et al., 2003). 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 2007 WEOR.

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 53A-N and 54A-Q). 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 2007 *WEOR* be revised (e.g., see recommendations for Perceived Stress).

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 rational for our recommendations throughout this report. The table that follows documents the results of the CFA's for each scale.

Table 13.
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 (21A-K) 1 Factor	21902	842.04	44	19.14	0.19	0.76	0.09	0.77	0.66	0.81
Organizational Commitment (21A-K) 3 Factor	21902	255.60	41	6.23	0.10	0.91	0.06	0.93	0.88	0.93
Job Satisfaction (40A-F, 44A-E, 45A-E) 1 Factor	22005	4722.15	104	45.41	0.30	0.55	0.18	0.46	0.30	0.61
Job Satisfaction (40A-F, 44A-E, 45A-E) 3 Factor	22005	308.93	101	3.06	0.06	0.97	0.03	0.95	0.93	0.97
Perceived Stress (52A-J) 1 Factor	22182	697.32	35	19.92	0.19	0.69	0.11	0.79	0.67	0.76
Perceived Stress (52A-J) 2 Factor	22182	169.64	34	4.99	0.09	0.92	0.05	0.95	0.92	0.94
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (53A-N) 1 Factor	21685	1626.29 ^c	77	21.12 ^c	0.19	0.82 ^c	0.10	0.96 ^c	0.95 ^c	0.85 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-DoD (53A-N) 2 Factor	21685	463.51 ^c	76	6.10 ^c	0.10	0.95 ^c	0.06	0.99 ^c	0.98 ^c	0.96 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (75A-N) 1 Factor	19513	1843.00 ^c	77	23.94 ^c	0.20	0.83 ^c	0.10	0.96 ^c	0.95 ^c	0.85 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Harassment-Community (75A-N) 2 Factor	19513	397.63 ^c	76	5.23 ^c	0.09	0.96 ^c	0.05	0.99 ^c	0.99 ^c	0.97 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (54A-Q) 1 Factor	21103	768.09 ^c	119	6.45 ^c	0.10	0.91 ^c	0.06	0.97 ^c	0.96 ^c	0.92 ^c
Race/Ethnic-Related Discrimination (54A-Q) 4 Factor	21103	456.47 ^c	113	4.04 ^c	0.08	0.95 ^c	0.05	0.98 ^c	0.98 ^c	0.96 ^c

Note. The Effective Sample is the *n* following listwise deletion for missing data. The *N* for the overall sample was 23,170.

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.

Note. Job Satisfaction is composed of Supervisor, Coworker, and Work Satisfaction.

^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>1995 Form B</i>	<i>1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey</i>
<i>1996 EOS</i>	<i>1996 Equal Opportunity Survey</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>
<i>2006 WGRA</i>	<i>2006 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active-Duty Members</i>
<i>2007 WEOR</i>	<i>2007 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Reserve Component Members</i>
AGR	Active Guard/Reserve
ANG	Air National Guard
AR	Active Reserve
ARNG	Army National Guard
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
DHS	
DMDC	Defense Manpower Data Center
DOD	Department of Defense
EO	Equal Opportunity
FTS	Full Time Support
GLS	Generalized Least Squares Estimation
IMA	Individual Mobilization Augmentee
JDI	Job Descriptive Index
JDS	Job Diagnostic Survey
JSS	Job Satisfaction Survey
LISREL	Linear Structural Relations software
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimation
OUSDP[P&R]	Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
PSS10	10-item Perceived Stress Scale
SAS	Statistical Analysis Software
SEM	Structural Equation Modeling
SEQ	Sexual Experiences Questionnaire
SF-36	Short-Form Health Survey
March 2003 SOFR	March 2003 Status of Forces Survey
USAR	U.S. Army Reserve
USAFR	U.S. Air Force Reserve
USCGR	U.S. Coast Guard Reserve
USMCR	U.S. Marine Corps Reserve
USNR	U.S. Navy Reserve

Appendix C.

Survey Instrument



RCS: DD-P&R(QD) 1946
Exp: 12/31/07
DMDC Survey No. 07-0028

2007 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Reserve Component Members

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



Please return your completed survey in the business reply envelope through a U.S. government mail room or post office.

DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CENTER
ATTN: SURVEY PROCESSING CENTER
DATA RECOGNITION CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 5720
HOPKINS, MN 55343

COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a blue or black pen.
- 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 ☐

PRIVACY ACT & INFORMED CONSENT

In accordance with the Privacy Act, this notice informs you of the purpose of the HRSAP Surveys and how the findings of these surveys will be used. It also provides information about the Privacy Act and about informed consent. Please read it carefully.

Returning this survey indicates your agreement to participate in this research.

AUTHORITY: 10 United States Code, Sections 136, 481, 1782, and 2358. 14 USC 1.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Information collected in this survey will be used to research attitudes and perceptions about racial and ethnic issues including harassment and discrimination and identify areas where improvements are needed. This information will assist in the formulation of policies which may be needed to improve the working environment. Reports will be provided to the Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), 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 the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) or in professional journals, or presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. Datasets without any identifying information may be analyzed by researchers outside of DMDC. Briefings and reports on results from these surveys will be posted on the following Web site: <http://www.dmdc.osd.mil/surveys/>. In no case will individual identifiable survey responses be reported.

ROUTINE USES: None.

DISCLOSURE: Providing information on this survey is voluntary. Most people take 16-30 minutes to complete the survey. There is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled if you choose not to respond. However, maximum participation is encouraged so that the data will be complete and representative. Your survey responses will be treated as confidential. Identifying information will be used only by government and contractor staff engaged in, and for purposes of, the survey research. For example, the research oversight office of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) and representatives of the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command are eligible to review research records as a part of their responsibility to protect human subjects in research. This survey is being conducted for research purposes. If you answer any items and indicate distress or being upset, etc., you will not be contacted for follow-up purposes. However, if a direct threat to harm yourself or others is found in survey comments or communications about the survey, DMDC is legally required to forward information about that threat to an office in your area for appropriate action.

SURVEY ELIGIBILITY AND POTENTIAL BENEFITS: DMDC uses well-established, scientific procedures to select a sample that represents the Defense community. This sampling procedure sets up clusters of people based on combinations of demographic characteristics (for example, location, gender). You were selected at random from one of these clusters of people. This is your chance to be heard on issues that directly affect you. While there is no benefit just for you for your individual participation, your answers on a survey **make a difference**. For example, results from previous surveys have played an important role in deliberations on pay rate adjustments, cost of living and housing allowances, and morale and retention programs.

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, the government and its contractors have a number of policies and procedures to ensure that survey data are safe and protected. For example, no identifying information (name, address, Social Security Number) is ever stored in the same file as answers to survey questions. Answers to survey questions may be shared with organizations doing research on DoD personnel but only after minimizing detailed demographic data (for example, paygrade and detailed location information) that could possibly be used to identify an individual. A confidentiality analysis is performed to reduce the risk of there being a combination of demographic variables that can single out an individual. To further minimize this risk, some variables are randomly set to missing. Government and contractor staff members have been trained to protect client identity and are subject to civil penalties for violating your confidentiality.

If you are a victim of racial/ethnic harassment or a person who wishes to prevent or respond to it, you may want to contact your Service's local equal opportunity office. To reach a hotline for your Service call:

Army: 1-800-267-9964 **Marine Corps:** 703-784-9371 **Navy:** 1-800-253-0931 **Air Force:** 1-800-616-3775 **Coast Guard:** 1-800-222-0364

To reach Military OneSource 24/7 you can call a hotline number: Stateside: 1-800-342-9647 Overseas: 00-800-3429-8477 or call collect 1-484-530-5908. Worldwide: www.militaryonesource.com. Coast Guard members may want to call Employee Assistance Program Counseling Services 1-800-222-0364.

If you have questions about the survey, please e-mail HRSurvey@osd.pentagon.mil or leave a message any time, toll-free, at 1-800-881-5307.

If you have concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact Ms. Caroline Miner, Human Subjects Protections Specialist, Deployment Health Support Division, 5113 Leesburg Pike, Skyline 4, Suite 403, Falls Church, VA 22041, humansubjects@deploymenthealth.osd.mil, 703-575-2677, Fax 703-824-4216.

YOUR BACKGROUND

1. Of which Reserve component were you a member on August 27, 2007?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Army National Guard | ☐ Air National Guard |
| ☐ Army Reserve | ☐ Air Force Reserve |
| ☐ Navy Reserve | ☐ Coast Guard Reserve |
| ☐ Marine Corps Reserve | |
| ☐ No Reserve component ⇒ stop here and return the survey | |

2. Are you . . . ?

- ☐ Male ☐ Female

3. 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 | |

4. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

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

5. What is your race? *Mark one or more races to indicate what race 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.

6. 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.

7. 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 (for example, 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)

8. Have you served on active duty, not as a member of the National Guard/Reserve, for a cumulative 24 months or more?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

9. About how many miles would you have to drive, one way, to get to the nearest military installation from your residence?

- ☐ 10 miles or less
- ☐ 11 to 20 miles
- ☐ 21 to 40 miles
- ☐ 41 to 60 miles
- ☐ 61 to 100 miles
- ☐ 101 miles or more

FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

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

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

11. 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 14
- ☐ Less than 1 year
- ☐ 1 year to less than 6 years
- ☐ 6 years to less than 10 years
- ☐ 10 years or more

12. 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

13. 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)

SATISFACTION AND RETENTION INTENTION

14. How many years have you spent in military service? *To indicate less than one year, enter "0".*

		Years
--	--	-------

15. Suppose that you have to decide whether to continue to participate in the National Guard/Reserve. Assuming you could stay, how likely is it you would choose to do so?

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

16. In your opinion, how does your spouse/significant other view your participation in the National Guard/Reserve?

- ☐ Does not apply; I am not married and I do not have a girlfriend/boyfriend
- ☐ Very favorably
- ☐ Somewhat favorably
- ☐ Neither favorably nor unfavorably
- ☐ Somewhat unfavorably
- ☐ Very unfavorably

17. In your opinion, how does your family view your participation in the National Guard/Reserve?

- ☐ Very favorably
- ☐ Somewhat favorably
- ☐ Neither favorably nor unfavorably
- ☐ Somewhat unfavorably
- ☐ Very unfavorably

18. In general, has your life been better or worse than you expected when you first entered the National Guard/Reserve?

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

◆ 19. In general, has your National Guard/Reserve duty been better or worse than you expected when you first entered the National Guard/Reserve?

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

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

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

21. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about serving in the National Guard/Reserve? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. I enjoy serving in the National Guard/Reserve.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Serving in the National Guard/Reserve is consistent with my personal goals.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. I would feel guilty if I left the National Guard/Reserve.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am happy with my life in the National Guard/Reserve.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. It would be difficult for me to leave the National Guard/Reserve and give up the benefits that are available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. I would not leave the National Guard/Reserve right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. I really feel as if the military's values are my own	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Generally, on a day-to-day basis, I am proud to be in the National Guard/Reserve	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. If I left the National Guard/Reserve, I would feel like I had let my country down	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. I continue to serve in the National Guard/Reserve because leaving would require considerable sacrifice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

21. Continued.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
k. I feel like being a member of the National Guard/Reserve can help me achieve what I want in life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. I intend to leave the National Guard/Reserve at the next available opportunity.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. My National Guard/Reserve component's evaluation/selection system is effective in promoting its best members.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. I am proud to tell others that I am a member of my National Guard/Reserve component	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

22. If you had a close personal friend considering 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.....	☐	☐

TEMPO

23. In the past 12 months, how many days (full days, not drill periods) did you spend in a compensated (pay or points) National Guard/Reserve status? *To indicate none, enter "0".*

----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Days

24. In the past 12 months, how many nights did you spend away from your home because of your military duties? *Do not include nights spent away from home before out-of-town drills. To indicate none, enter "0".*

----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Nights

25. In the past 12 months, have you spent more or less time away from your home than you expected when you first entered the National Guard/Reserve?

- ☐ Much more than expected
- ☐ More than expected
- ☐ Neither more nor less than expected
- ☐ Less than expected
- ☐ Much less than expected

26. What impact has time away (or lack thereof) from your home in the past 12 months had on your military career intentions?

- ☐ Greatly increased your desire to stay
- ☐ Increased your desire to stay
- ☐ Neither increased nor decreased your desire to stay
- ☐ Decreased your desire to stay
- ☐ Greatly decreased your desire to stay

27. Are you currently a member of the National Guard/Reserve on full-time active duty (AGR/FTS/AR)?

- ☐ Yes ⇒ IF YES, GO TO QUESTION 37
- ☐ No

EMPLOYMENT/STUDENT STATUS

The following questions ask you to report your employment and student status. If you are currently activated, report your employment and student status in the week prior to your current activation.

28. Are you a military technician?

- ☐ Yes, I am currently a military technician
- ☐ Yes, in the week before my current activation I was a military technician
- ☐ No

29. Do you have a civilian job?

- ☐ Yes, I currently have a civilian job
- ☐ Yes, in the week before my current activation I had a civilian job
- ☐ No

30. Are you a student?

- ☐ Yes, I am currently a student
- ☐ Yes, in the week before my current activation I was a student
- ☐ No

ACTIVATION/DEPLOYMENT STATUS

Please read the following definitions carefully. In this survey, the term “**activation**” refers to the involuntary or voluntary call to active duty in support of a contingency of a National Guard/Reserve component member under the provision of 10USC 12301(a) (Full Mobilization), 10USC 12301(d) (Voluntary Active Duty), 10USC 12302 (Partial Mobilization), or 10USC 12304 (Presidential Reserve Callup). **It does NOT apply to members on full-time active duty (AGR/FTS/AR), members serving on full-time National Guard Duty, or members serving on State Active Duty.**

In this survey, the term “**deployment**” refers to the movement of a member (or unit), for duty purposes, to a location that would be considered outside normal commuting distance or time from the member’s permanent duty station (i.e., the location where the member normally performs Inactive Duty Training [IDT] drills). Deployments can be to a location within the contiguous 48 states (CONUS) or to a location outside the contiguous 48 states (OCONUS).

31. Have you been activated in the past 12 months? *This includes activations that started more than 12 months ago and continued into the past 12 months.*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 38

32. Was at least one of your activations in the past 12 months longer than 30 consecutive days?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 36

33. In the past 12 months, have your activation(s) for more than 30 consecutive days been voluntary, involuntary, or both?

- ☐ Voluntary
- ☐ Involuntary
- ☐ Both

34. Did any of your activations for more than 30 consecutive days in the past 12 months result in deployment?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 36

35. In the past 12 months, after processing in the mobilization station, were you deployed within the contiguous 48 states (CONUS), outside the contiguous 48 states (OCONUS), or both?

- ☐ CONUS
- ☐ OCONUS
- ☐ Both

36. Are you currently activated?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 38



37. Are you currently deployed?

☐ Yes

☐ No

38. Since September 11, 2001, have you been deployed for any of the following operations? *Mark one answer for each item.*

	No		
	Yes, but not in the past 12 months		
	Yes, in the past 12 months		
a. Operation Noble Eagle (airport security) ..	☐	☐	☐
b. Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan)	☐	☐	☐
c. Operation Iraqi Freedom	☐	☐	☐
d. Other	☐	☐	☐

YOUR MILITARY WORKPLACE

39. How long have you been in your present military unit? *To indicate less than one year, enter "0".*

		Years
--	--	-------

40. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your immediate supervisor at your military job? *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.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. 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
- ☐ Don't know

42. Are you currently in a military work environment where members of your racial/ethnic background are uncommon?

☐ Yes

☐ No

43. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your military 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 duty day	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. In the last 7 duty 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 National Guard/Reserve component 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 43.a through 43.p are used by permission of the copyright holder, The Gallup Organization, 901 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004.



44. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the people you work with at your military 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.....

45. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the work you do at your military 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.....

46. Overall, how well prepared . . . *Mark one answer for each item.*

Very poorly prepared	Poorly prepared	Neither well nor poorly prepared	Well prepared	Very well prepared
----------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------	---------------	--------------------

- a. Are you to perform your wartime job?.....
- b. Is your unit to perform its wartime mission?

47. How would you rate . . . *Mark one answer for each item.*

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
----------	-----	----------	------	-----------

- a. Your current level of morale?
- b. The current level of morale in your unit?

48. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your National Guard/Reserve unit? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	----------	----------------------------	-------	----------------

- a. Members in your unit really care about each other.....
- b. Members in your unit work well as a team.....
- c. Members in your unit pull together to get the job done.....
- d. Members in your unit trust each other.....

STRESS, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING

49. 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.....

50. How much of the time during the past 4 weeks have you had any of the following problems with your work or other regular daily activities as a result of your physical health? *Mark one answer for each item.*

	All or most of the time	A good bit of the time	Some of the time	Little or none of the time
a. Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Accomplished less than you would like	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Were limited in the kind of work or other activities you do	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Had difficulty performing the work or other activities you do (for example, it took extra effort).....	☐	☐	☐	☐

51. Overall, how would you rate . . . *Mark one answer for each item.*

	Much more than usual	More than usual	About the same as usual	Less than usual	Much less than usual
a. The current level of stress in your <u>military</u> life?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The current level of stress in your <u>personal</u> life?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

52. In the past month, how often have you . . . *Mark one answer for each item.*

	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?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

EXPERIENCES IN THE MILITARY COMMUNITY IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

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

- Military Personnel (Active Duty or National Guard/Reserve)
 - on- or off-duty
 - on- or off-installation; and/or
- DoD/DHS Civilian Employees and/or Contractors
 - In your military workplace or on your installation/ship . . .

Mark one answer for each item.

	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. Other race/ethnic-related experiences? ..	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please print.

54. 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 military evaluation.....	☐	☐	☐
b. Your last military evaluation contained unjustified negative comments.....	☐	☐	☐
c. You were held to a higher performance standard than others in your military job...	☐	☐	☐
d. You did not get a military award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances	☐	☐	☐
e. Your current military assignment has not made use of your job skills	☐	☐	☐
f. You were not able to attend a major school needed for your military specialty..	☐	☐	☐
g. You did not get to go to short (1- to 3-day) courses that would provide you with needed skills for your military job	☐	☐	☐
h. You received lower grades than you deserved in your military training	☐	☐	☐
i. You did not get a military job assignment that you wanted because of scores that you got on tests.....	☐	☐	☐
j. Your current military 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 military advancement	☐	☐	☐
l. You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on military career development or advancement.....	☐	☐	☐
m. You did not learn until it was too late of opportunities that would help your military career	☐	☐	☐
n. You were unable to get straight answers about your military promotion possibilities.....	☐	☐	☐
o. You were taken to nonjudicial punishment or court martial when you should not have been.....	☐	☐	☐
p. You were punished at your military job for something that others did without being punished.....	☐	☐	☐
q. You were excluded by your military peers from social activities.....	☐	☐	☐
r. You had other bothersome experiences at your military job.....	☐	☐	☐

Please print.

55. Based on your responses to Questions 53-54, would you say that the experiences you reported happening are racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination? **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 57
☐ Does not apply, I did not mark that anything had happened to me because of race/ethnicity ⇒ IF DOES NOT APPLY, GO TO QUESTION 75

56. Do you think that DoD/DHS and your National Guard/Reserve component have a responsibility to prevent the racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination which YOU MARKED AS HAPPENING TO YOU? **Mark one.**

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

ONE SITUATION OF RACE/ETHNIC-RELATED EXPERIENCES

57. Think about the situations you experienced during the past 12 months that involved the behaviors you marked in Questions 53-54 as having happened to you because of race/ethnicity. Now pick the event or set of related events that bothered you most.

What behavior(s) did you experience during the situation? **Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.**

	Yes	No
a. Offensive race/ethnic-related speech, pictures/printed material, non-verbal looks, or dress	☐	☐
b. Race/ethnic-related threats, intimidation, vandalism, or physical assault	☐	☐
c. Racial/ethnic discrimination in assignments, daily tasks, availability of mentorship, access to information about career opportunities or promotion potential.....	☐	☐
d. Race/ethnic-motivated negative evaluations, differences in performance standards, and distribution of awards/decorations.....	☐	☐
e. Nonjudicial punishment, or additional punishment(s) because of your race/ethnicity	☐	☐



57. Continued.

- f. Unfair training scores, and/or lack of access to schools/training because of your race/ethnicity ☐ Yes ☐ No
- g. Other ways in which you have been bothered/hurt by military personnel, DoD/DHS civilian employees and/or contractors because of your race/ethnicity ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please print.

58. To what extent was this situation . . . Mark one answer for each item.

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

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

- ☐ Once
- ☐ Occasionally
- ☐ Frequently

60. 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

61. Where did this situation occur? Mark one.

- ☐ At a military installation (for example, on base)
- ☐ Some behaviors occurred at a military installation and some did not
- ☐ Not at a military installation (for example, off base) ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 63

62. Did any of the behaviors in the situation on base occur . . . Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.

- | | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. At your military work (the place where you perform your military duties)? | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. During duty hours? | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. In a military work environment where members of your racial/ethnic background are uncommon? | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. At a military non-work location (for example, gym, quarters/housing, exchange/commissary, bowling alley)? | ☐ | ☐ |

63. Did any of the behaviors in the situation occur while you were . . . Mark "Yes," "No," or "Does not apply" for each item.

- | | Does not apply | No | Yes |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Deployed? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. At your civilian job? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. At your civilian school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Near your place of residence? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

64. Was the offender(s) . . . ? Mark one.

- ☐ One person (male)
- ☐ One person (female)
- ☐ More than one person (all males)
- ☐ More than one person (all females)
- ☐ More than one person (both males and females)
- ☐ Not sure

65. Was the offender(s) . . . Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each item.

- | | Yes | No | Don't know |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |



66. Was the offender(s) . . . Mark “Yes,” “No,” or “Don’t know” for each item.

	Don't know	No	Yes
a. Someone in your chain-of-command?	☐	☐	☐
b. Other military person(s) of higher rank/grade than you?	☐	☐	☐
c. Your military coworker(s)?	☐	☐	☐
d. Your military subordinate(s)?	☐	☐	☐
e. Other military person(s)?	☐	☐	☐
f. DoD/DHS civilian employee(s)?	☐	☐	☐
g. DoD/DHS civilian contractor(s)?	☐	☐	☐
h. Unknown person(s)?	☐	☐	☐

67. As a result of the situation, did you . . . Mark “Yes” or “No” for each item.

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

68. Did you report this situation to any of the following National Guard/Reserve/DoD/DHS individuals or organizations? Mark “Yes” or “No” for each item.

	No	Yes
a. Someone in your chain-of-command	☐	☐
b. Someone in the chain-of-command of the person who did it	☐	☐
c. Special military office responsible for handling these kinds of complaints (for example, Military Equal Opportunity or Civil Rights Office)	☐	☐
d. Other person or office with responsibility for follow-up	☐	☐
e. Chaplain, counselor, ombudsman, or health care provider	☐	☐

If you answered “No” to every item in Question 68, GO TO QUESTION 74.

69. What actions were taken in response to your report? Mark “Yes,” “No,” or “Don’t know” for each statement.

	Don't know	No	Yes
a. Person(s) who bothered you was 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	☐	☐	☐

70. 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

71. Was your complaint found to be true? Mark one.

- ☐ 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, GO TO QUESTION 73

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

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

73. As a result of reporting the situation, did you experience any . . . Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each item.

- | | Don't know | No | Yes |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Professional retaliation (for example, loss of privileges, denied promotion/training, transferred to less favorable job)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Social retaliation (for example, ignored by coworkers, being blamed for the situation)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If you reported the situation to a National Guard/ Reserve/DoD/DHS individual or organization, GO TO QUESTION 75.

74. What were your reasons for not reporting the situation to any of the National Guard/Reserve/DoD/DHS individuals or organizations? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each statement.

- | | No | Yes |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. You thought it 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..... | ☐ | ☐ |

EXPERIENCES IN THE CIVILIAN COMMUNITY IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

75. How frequently during the past 12 months have you been in circumstances where you thought civilians in the local community around where you live . . . Mark one answer for each item.

- | | Never | Once or twice | Sometimes | Often |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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. Other race/ethnic-related experiences involving civilians in the local community? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Please print.

76. Based on your responses to Question 75, would you say that the experiences you reported happening are racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination? **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 78
☐ Does not apply, you did not mark that anything had happened to you because of race/ethnicity ⇒ IF DOES NOT APPLY, GO TO QUESTION 78

77. Do you think that DoD/DHS and your National Guard/Reserve component have a responsibility to prevent the racial/ethnic harassment or discrimination by civilians which YOU MARKED AS HAPPENING TO YOU? **Mark one.**

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

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 item.**

- a. Senior leadership of my National Guard/ Reserve component.....
b. Senior leadership of my installation/ship...
c. My immediate supervisor.....

Don't know	No	Yes
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐

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. How would you rate race relations . . . **Mark one answer for each item.**

- a. In your military work group?.....
b. At your military duty station?.....
c. In your National Guard/Reserve component?

Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

80. Continued.

- d. In the local community around where you live?
e. In the local community around your military duty station?

Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

81. In your military work group, to what extent . . . **Mark one answer for each statement.**

- 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?.....

Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Large extent	Very large extent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

82. At your military duty station . . . **Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.**

- a. Would you know how to report experiences of race/ethnic harassment and/or discrimination?
b. Is the availability of complaint hotlines publicized?

Yes	No
☐	☐
☐	☐

83. At your military duty station, to what extent . . . **Mark one answer for each item.**

- a. Are racist/extremist organizations or individuals a problem?
b. Are hate crimes a problem?.....
c. Are gangs a problem?.....

Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Large extent	Very large extent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

◆ 84. In the local community around where you live, to what extent . . . **Mark one answer for each item.**

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
a. Are racist/extremist organizations or individuals a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Are hate crimes a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Are gangs a problem?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

85. To what extent . . . **Mark one answer for each statement.**

	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 National Guard/Reserve component 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

86. During the past 12 months, have you been involved in a racial confrontation . . . **Mark one answer for each item.**

	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 military duty station?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. In the local community around where you live?	☐	☐	☐	☐

87. During the past 12 months, has someone asked you . . . **Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.**

	Yes	No
a. To <u>join</u> an extremist organization?	☐	☐
b. To <u>participate</u> in extremist activities?	☐	☐

88. Do you regularly read websites/literature that . . . **Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.**

	Yes	No
a. Advocate the separation of people based on race/ethnicity?	☐	☐
b. Warn of the dangers of interactions between people of different races/ethnicities?	☐	☐
c. Point out the dangers of racial/ethnic diversity?	☐	☐
d. Point out the dangers of racial/ethnic tolerance?	☐	☐

89. Do you agree with the ideals of organizations that . . . **Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.**

	Yes	No
a. Advocate the separation of people based on race/ethnicity?	☐	☐
b. Warn of the dangers of interactions between people of different races/ethnicities?	☐	☐
c. Point out the dangers of racial/ethnic diversity?	☐	☐
d. Point out the dangers of racial/ethnic tolerance?	☐	☐

TRAINING

90. 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, GO TO QUESTION 94

91. 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

92. My National Guard/Reserve component's training . . . **Mark one answer for each item.**

	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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

92. Continued.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
b. Teaches that racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination reduces the cohesion and effectiveness of the military 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 me 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 my National Guard/Reserve component's policies on participation in racist/extremist organizations, hate crimes, or gangs.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Promotes religious tolerance.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

93. 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

94. In your opinion, how often does racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination occur at military workplaces compared to civilian workplaces?

- ☐ Don't know, I have not worked in a civilian job
☐ Much less often in the military
☐ Less often in the military
☐ About the same
☐ More often in the military
☐ Much more often in the military

95. 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? *Mark one answer for each item.*

	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 racist/extremist organizations, hate crimes, or gangs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Race/ethnic relations overall.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

96. 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

97. In your opinion, have opportunities in our nation gotten better or worse over the last 5 years for . . . *Mark one answer for each item.*

	Much worse	Worse	Neither better nor worse	Better	Much better
a. Blacks or African Americans?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. American Indians or Alaska Natives?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Asians, Native Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Spanish/Hispanic/Latinos?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Arab Americans?.....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Whites?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Muslims?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- ☐ Much less often
- ☐ Less often
- ☐ About the same
- ☐ More often
- ☐ Much more often
- ☐ Don't know, I have been in the military less than 5 years ⇒ IF DON'T KNOW, GO TO QUESTION 101

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

Much worse
Worse
Neither better nor worse
Better
Much better

- a. Blacks or African Americans?
- b. American Indians or Alaska Natives?
- c. Asians, Native Hawaiians or
Pacific Islanders?
- d. Spanish/Hispanic/Latinos?
- e. Arab Americans?
- f. Whites?
- g. Muslims?

101. If you have comments or concerns that you were not able to express in answering this survey, please print them in the space provided. Please do not use identifying names or information. Your feedback is useful and appreciated.

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)		2. REPORT TYPE			3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
				5e. TASK NUMBER		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)					8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
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						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT						
15. SUBJECT TERMS						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)	

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.

