

099982

~~76-0238~~
099982
LB

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

JAN 14 1976



UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE LIBRARY SYSTEM



Problems Resulting From
Management Practices In
Recruiting, Training, And
Using Non-High-School
Graduates And
Category IV Personnel

About half a million personnel in the armed services are non-high-school graduates and/or Category IV (low-aptitude) personnel. This report identifies problems concerning the recruitment, training, and use of these personnel which appear to be attributable to management practices. It also discusses educational programs and opportunities for these personnel. Alternatives are suggested to resolve these problems and reduce economic and human costs.

FPCD-76-24

JAN. 12, 1976

~~702814~~

099982



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND
COMPENSATION DIVISION

B-146890

The Honorable
The Secretary of Defense

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This report discusses problems resulting from management practices in recruiting, training, and using non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel. The information in this report was informally discussed with members of your staff.

We invite your attention to the fact that this report contains recommendations to you which are set forth on page 25. As you know, section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires the head of a Federal agency to submit a written statement on action taken on our recommendations to the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations not later than 60 days after the date of the report and to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with the agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of the report.

We are sending copies of this report to the Chairmen, House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services and Government Operations, and to the Director, Office of Management and Budget. We are also sending copies to the Secretaries of the military services and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Sincerely yours,

H. L. Krieger

H. L. Krieger
Director

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	i
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Scope	1
2 CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENT POPULATION	5
3 RECRUITING EXPERIENCES	9
Perceived lack of information at enlistment	9
Contractual promises made and honored	10
Noncontractual promises perceived as made and extent perceived as not honored	10
Alleged recruiting irregularities	12
4 TRAINING, ASSIGNMENT, AND USE	14
Receipt of advanced training	14
Assignments	15
Use of skills	16
5 PARTICIPANTS IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	17
Participants who actually enrolled in an educational program	17
Encouragement to participate in an educational program	18
6 POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN PRACTICES OF RECRUITING, TRAINING, AND USE OF NON-HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATES AND CATEGORY IV PERSONNEL	20
Effect of recruiting practices on service performance	20
Effect of training and utilization practices on service performance	21
Effect of educational participation on service performance	22
7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
Conclusions	24
Recommendations	25

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX	
I Relationships between identified problem areas and indicators of performance	27
II Questionnaire administered to enlisted personnel in GAO sample	29
III Principal officials responsible for administering activities discussed in this report	38

ABBREVIATIONS

DOD	Department of Defense
GAO	General Accounting Office
OJT	on-the-job training

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT TO THE
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM
MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN
RECRUITING, TRAINING, AND
USING NON-HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATES
AND CATEGORY IV PERSONNEL
Department of Defense

D I G E S T

As of June 30, 1974, almost half a million military servicemen were non-high-school graduates and Category IV (low-aptitude) personnel. This group has been experiencing noticeably higher rates of disciplinary actions and administrative discharges than other personnel.

GAO found that the military services do not have a directed policy for training and using non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel. From the data collected, we also identified a series of management practices that may be contributing to the problems we noted. They included

- alleged recruiting irregularities (see p. 12),
- training and assignment promises perceived as made but not honored (see p. 10),
- underuse of skills and training (see p. 16), and
- lack of encouragement to participate in educational programs (see p. 18).

We compared the relationship of these questionable management practices to several performance indicators and found that

- many men were claiming that they spent little or no time doing the work for which they were trained,
- participation in education programs was low compared to the interest expressed in educational incentives, and

--there were undesirable effects associated with underuse and lack of training in the form of lower individual performance and retention of personnel in the service.

High rates of disciplinary action and administrative discharges adversely affect the operational capability of the military services. They are also costly from a monetary as well as human standpoint. To improve management of recruiting, training, use, and education of non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel, GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense require each service Secretary to implement specific policies and practices for these personnel. Particular consideration should be given to:

--Strengthening and monitoring controls aimed at insuring compliance with entrance screening procedures.

--Policies governing the assignment of first-term personnel to advanced or on-the-job training to insure that servicemen receive opportunities for skill training commensurate with their ability and that such training is optimally used.

--Educational programs and related policies to insure that servicemen with low educational attainments are encouraged and provided appropriate opportunities to increase their education.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As of June 30, 1974, the combined number of non-high-school graduates and Category IV (low-aptitude) enlisted personnel totaled almost half a million men, comprising over 25 percent of the Department of Defense's (DOD's) total enlisted force. 5

NON-HIGH-
SCHOOL GRADUATES AND CATEGORY IV
PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES
JUNE 30, 1974

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Army	240,968	36
Navy	102,935	22
Marine Corps	64,806	38
Air Force	<u>85,246</u>	17
Total	<u>493,955</u>	27

There is evidence that the services have been experiencing management problems with the above categories of enlisted personnel. For example

- several studies showed that non-high-school graduates are more likely than high school graduates to receive some kind of disciplinary action and
- discharges for unsuitable behavior among non-high school graduates have increased from 28 percent in fiscal year 1971 to 46 percent in fiscal year 1974. (In contrast, discharges for unsuitable behavior for high school graduates was approximately 6 percent in fiscal year 1971 and 15 percent in fiscal year 1974.)

SCOPE

The objective of our survey was to identify and assess management policies, practices, and programs which may be contributing to the above problems. We limited our approach to personnel who were in their first enlistment, had

completed recruit training, and were assigned to operational units at the following locations.

Army

Fort Eustis, Va.

539

Navy

Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.

608

USS AMERICA

USS KENNEDY

Naval Amphibious Base, Norfolk, Va.

Marine Corps

Camp Lejeune, N. C.

226 540

Air Force

Langley Air Force Base, Va.

242

We considered it important to obtain information directly from the enlisted personnel. A questionnaire was developed to obtain information concerning their experiences with and opinions about recruitment, training, assignments, use, and educational programs. The questionnaire consisted of items dealing with the individual's general background, military training, current job, past assignments, reenlistment plans, educational program experiences, knowledge and receipt of choices or promises at enlistment, and recruiting experiences.

Each military service provided a computer listing of first-term enlisted men who were non-high school graduates, and/or Category IV, and assigned to installations included in our survey. From these listings, a statistical random sample was taken of 1,184 enlisted men. The sample size was computed to provide credible results from which valid conclusions could be drawn. The table on the next page lists the populations, sample sizes, and completed questionnaires for each military service.

The questionnaires were pretested in December 1974 and administered in group sittings by GAO personnel from January through March 1975. Respondents were interviewed after completing the questionnaire to clarify and elaborate on some of their responses.

	<u>Army</u>	<u>Navy</u>	<u>Marine Corps</u>	<u>Air Force</u>	<u>Total</u>
Population	1,357	1,921	11,448	305	15,031
Sample size	310	326	373	175	1,184
Questionnaires completed (note a)	205	212	214	122	753

a/Excludes servicemen on leave, absent without official leave, transferred, discharged, or otherwise unreachable.

We also obtained:

- Information from the personnel records of 424 respondents to corroborate questionnaire responses, as well as relevant data on the individual's mental category, disciplinary actions, enlistment contract terms, etc.
- Information from the commanders of 738 respondents, consisting of the commander's assessment of (1) whether the respondent was in the job for which he was trained, (2) the respondent's performance, (3) the need for additional training, and (4) whether the respondent would be recommended for reenlistment.

All of the above steps were taken to insure a balanced presentation of data and views concerning the management problems discussed in this report.

Perceptions of Encouragement to
Participate in Educational Programs

	<u>Army</u>	<u>Navy</u>	<u>Marine Corps</u>	<u>Air Force</u>
Amount of encouragement to increase education received from:				
Officers in unit				
A lot	15	6	12	4
Some	34	26	37	24
None	51	68	51	71
NCO's in unit				
A lot	18	5	10	11
Some	33	26	38	36
None	49	69	52	54
Education Office				
A lot	24	4	8	23
Some	35	18	32	54
None	41	78	60	23

The above table shows that these men, who should be the prime candidates for the military educational programs, perceived very little encouragement to participate.

CHAPTER 6

POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN PRACTICES OF RECRUITING, TRAINING, AND USING NON-HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATES AND CATEGORY IV PERSONNEL

This report identifies several problem areas in the management of non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel. We noted problems in recruiting, training, using, and educational program participation. This chapter explores the possible consequences of these problems by examining their relationship to several performance indicators, such as

- commander's rating the individual's performance,
- commander's recommendation concerning the individual's reenlistment eligibility,
- incidence of disciplinary actions, and
- individual's stated reenlistment intent.

These interrelationships have been analyzed in the aggregate, across the four services, in the interest of greater validity.

EFFECT OF RECRUITING PRACTICES ON SERVICE PERFORMANCE

A number of alleged irregular recruiting incidents were noted that could cause problems. As noted in chapter 3, the alleged incidents took the form of assistance on the mental qualification examination or encouragement to withhold prejudicial information. In assessing the degree to which these alleged instances of recruiting irregularities exist in the total population, it is important to note that our sample consists only of "survivors" (i.e., those still on active duty). Since these criteria are included in the screening process, we assume that those enlistees who do not meet minimal mental standards or who have physical defects or a police record are less likely to successfully complete their military service. Consequently, recruiting irregularities could possibly be more prevalent than the sample data indicates.

Appendix I, part A, shows the relationship between receipt of assistance on the aptitude test and a number of performance indicators.

Compared to those men who did not receive assistance, those who did were

- more likely to be seen by their commanders as performing unsatisfactorily,
- less likely to be recommended for reenlistment, and
- more likely to have incurred some type of disciplinary action.

A similar relationship was found between receipt of advice to omit derogatory information and performance assessment and reenlistment recommendations. Again, those who acknowledged recruitment irregularities were more likely to receive an unfavorable performance rating and less likely to be recommended for reenlistment (see app. I, pt. B).

The perception of unkept promises was also found to be negatively related to performance criteria (see app. I, pt. C). Those men who believed that the military had not honored its promises were

- more likely to be rated as unsatisfactory performers,
- less likely to be recommended for reenlistment, and
- less likely to express favorable reenlistment intent.

Although there is no way of confirming or refuting the claims of these men, we were convinced through our interviews that many genuinely believed they had been misled.

EFFECT OF TRAINING AND UTILIZATION PRACTICES ON SERVICE PERFORMANCE

Analysis of responses on training and use disclosed a large proportion of men reporting they were in a job other than the one they were trained for. A high degree of partial use was evident, with many indicating they spent little or no time doing the tasks for which they were trained. In addition, they expressed considerable dissatisfaction with the way they were used.

There was a consistent negative relationship between perceptions of use and underuse and the performance indicators. Appendix I, part D, shows that those men who perceived themselves to be misassigned were more likely to be judged as performing unsatisfactorily by their commanders. Also, they were less likely to express favorable reenlistment intent.

Partial use was found also to have a negative relationship to performance (see app. I, pt. E). Those men who indicated they spent little or no time doing tasks for which they were trained were

- more likely to be seen as performing unsatisfactorily,
- more likely to have been subject to some kind of disciplinary action,
- less likely to be recommended for reenlistment, and
- less likely to indicate favorable reenlistment intentions.

Appendix I, part F, shows the relationship of satisfaction with skill use to performance. Dissatisfaction with the way in which the individual's job uses his military skills and training was associated with

- unsatisfactory performance,
- receipt of disciplinary action(s),
- unfavorable reenlistment recommendation, and
- unfavorable reenlistment intent.

Obviously putting a man in a job for which he was not trained would put him at a disadvantage in comparison with those who were trained for the job and could lead to unfavorable reenlistment recommendation. Also, failure to assign a man to the job for which he was trained may lead to dissatisfaction and, consequently, to unfavorable reenlistment intent.

EFFECT OF EDUCATIONAL PARTICIPATION ON SERVICE PERFORMANCE

Studies conducted by DOD and the Military Departments have shown that an individual's educational level is directly related to his performance. It has been shown that the higher the individual's educational level

- the higher the pay grade he is likely to achieve,
- the less likely he is to fail training,
- the higher his class standing in training courses is likely to be, and
- the less likely he is to have disciplinary problems.

In our sample, the lack of a high school diploma was also found to be associated with performance deficiencies. More non-high-school graduates were rated unsatisfactory than high school graduates, fewer non-high-school graduates were recommended for reenlistment than high school graduates, and more non-high-school graduates incurred some type of disciplinary action than high school graduates. (See app. I, pt. G.)

Non-high-school graduates who participated in the General Educational Development or some other type of education program were more likely to receive a satisfactory rating and be recommended for reenlistment. (See app. I, pts. H and J.)

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

There are about half a million non-high-school graduates and Category IV enlisted men in the armed services, comprising approximately 25 percent of the enlisted strength.

This group has experienced significantly higher rates of disciplinary actions and administrative discharges than other personnel. This results in higher cost and adversely affects operational capability. In addition, it imposes human costs upon the individuals involved.

Our survey has focused on a number of management-generated problems in the recruiting, training, use, and education of non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel. We believe they merit management attention and corrective action.

We found what we consider to be an unexpectedly high number of alleged instances of recruiting irregularities. These irregularities consisted of recruiters giving assistance on preenlistment examinations and encouraging enlistees to omit certain facts pertaining to education, health, and police records.

The desire to learn a skill or trade was the most frequently cited reason for enlistment in each of the services, except the Marine Corps where it was second to educational opportunity. Nevertheless, over two-fifths of the Navy group reported they had received no formal training or OJT. This represents a serious denial of the expectations of a great number of enlistees. The Navy group also had the highest proportion indicating dissatisfaction with their job and the lowest proportion reporting favorable reenlistment intent. It follows then that failure to satisfy servicemen's expectations of training opportunities may have adverse consequences.

We believe that every serviceman should be given the opportunity to receive specialized job training commensurate with his ability and the needs of the military services. This is especially necessary for those who would otherwise have no such opportunity.

The Army had the shortest average contract period, the shortest average number of months for each assignment, and the highest proportion of personnel receiving their choice

of unit, location, or training. Because the Army had its personnel on the average only 2.7 years and allowed over three-fourths some choice in determining their assignment at the time of enlistment, it could be forced to either misassign personnel or break promises subsequent to enlistment. These management practices bear upon the facts that the Army had

--the lowest proportion of men assigned to the job for which they were trained and

--the highest proportion of men spending little or no time working as trained.

The change to longer enlistment terms could mitigate some but not all of this problem.

Across the services, it was shown that there were undesirable effects associated with the lack of training and underuse in the form of lower performance and retention. We feel the services should pay particular attention to the interrelationships among recruitment, training, and use practices to resolve the problems described in this report.

Non-high-school graduates and low-aptitude personnel should be a prime target for educational upgrading. We found that the opportunity for increased education ranked either first or second as a stated enlistment incentive. However, participation in education programs was low in comparison to the interest expressed in educational incentives. The primary reasons indicated by nonparticipants for their failure to enroll were inability to get time off and lack of information on the programs. Additionally, the servicemen perceived very little encouragement to participate in these educational programs. Given the benefits of educational upgrading to both the service and the individual, steps should be taken to increase participation of non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel in these programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Secretary of Defense require each service secretary to review the management of non-high-school graduates and Category IV personnel in the interest of improving their performance and as a benefit to themselves. Improved management of recruiting, training, use, and education are areas demonstrated in this report which merit the service secretaries' attention.

We suggest that particular consideration be given to:

- Strengthening and monitoring controls aimed at insuring compliance with entrance screening procedures. (Additional specific recommendations concerning recruiting policies and practices will be made in forthcoming comprehensive reports on recruiting operations.)
- Policies governing the assignment of first-term personnel to advanced training or OJT to insure that they receive the opportunity for skill training commensurate with their ability and that such training is optimally used.
- Educational programs and related policies to insure that servicemen with low educational attainments are encouraged and provided appropriate opportunity to increase their education.

We believe that these recommendations and areas of consideration should provide management direction which can go a long way to resolving costly problems.

Part A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECEIPT OF HELP ON MENTAL TEST AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Received help on test	Did not receive help on test
Commander's assessment of performance:	71%	84%
Satisfactory	29	16
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	56	73
Recommended	44	27
Not recommended		
Receipt of disciplinary action(s) (note a):	38	51
No	62	49
Yes		

a/Includes only those respondents whose personnel records were examined.

Part D

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT UTILIZATION AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Working in job for which trained	Working in related job	Working in different job
Commander's assessment of performance:	86%	83%	71%
Satisfactory	14	17	29
Unsatisfactory			
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	71	69	60
Recommended	27	31	40
Not recommended			
Individual's stated reenlistment intent:	39	32	31
Favorable	61	68	69
Unfavorable			

a/Includes only those respondents whose personnel records were examined.

Part G

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION LEVEL AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Non-high school graduates	High school graduates
Commander's assessment of performance:	81%	81%
Satisfactory	19	19
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	58	79
Recommended	42	21
Not recommended		
Receipt of Disciplinary action(s) (note a):	43	65
No	57	35
Yes		

a/Includes only those respondents whose personnel records were examined.

Part B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADVICE TO WITHHOLD PREJUDICIAL INFORMATION AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Advised to withhold information	Not advised to withhold information
Commander's assessment of performance:	76%	84%
Satisfactory	24	16
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	64	73
Recommended	36	27
Not recommended		

a/Includes only those respondents whose personnel records were examined.

Part C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTIAL USE OF SKILLS AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Amount of time on job spent during the kind of work for which trained	Receipt of GED?	
	All, almost, all, None, almost none, or most of the time	Yes	No
Commander's assessment of performance:	89%	76%	
Satisfactory	11	24	
Unsatisfactory			
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	76	65	85%
Recommended	24	35	15
Not recommended			21
Receipt of disciplinary action(s) (note a):	54	43	74
No	46	57	26
Yes			65
Individual's stated reenlistment intent:	42	29	74
Favorable	58	71	26
Unfavorable			35

a/Includes only those respondents whose personnel records were examined.

Part C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF UNKEPT PROMISES AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE (NOTE a)

	Feel that military has not kept promises	Feel that military has kept promises
Commander's assessment of performance:	79%	85%
Satisfactory	21	15
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	62	77
Recommended	38	23
Not recommended		
Individual's stated reenlistment intent:	27	41
Favorable	73	59
Unfavorable		

a/Includes only those respondents who believe that promises were made to them at the time they were enlisting.

Part F

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SATISFACTION WITH SKILL USE AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Satisfied with the way job uses skills	Dissatisfied with the way job uses skills
Commander's assessment of performance:	86%	77%
Satisfactory	14	23
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	75	63
Recommended	25	37
Not recommended		
Receipt of disciplinary action(s) (note a):	53	45
No	47	55
Yes		
Individual's stated reenlistment intent:	41	78
Favorable	59	
Unfavorable		

a/Includes only those respondents whose personnel records were examined.

Part H

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECEIPT OF GED AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

	Receipt of GED?	
	Yes	No
Commander's assessment of performance:	85%	79%
Satisfactory	15	21
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	74	65
Recommended	26	35
Not recommended		

a/Includes only those respondents who were non-high school graduates at entry?

Part I

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTICIPATION IN SOME TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM AND INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE (NOTE a)

	Participated in some type of education program	Did not participate in some type of education program
Commander's assessment of performance:	85%	74%
Satisfactory	15	26
Unsatisfactory		
Commander's reenlistment recommendation:	71	62
Recommended	29	38
Not recommended		

a/Includes only those respondents who were non-high school graduates at entry.

QUESTIONNAIRE INTRODUCTION

We are from the Norfolk Regional Office of the U.S. General Accounting Office. Our job is to provide Congress with information concerning the operation of Federal and military programs. We are currently studying the ways in which the military services assign and use their personnel. In order to do this, we need your help. The purpose of this questionnaire is to get information on your assignments and your opinions about them.

The questionnaire has been kept fairly short so that we would not have to take up too much of your time. Since it is short, we may have to contact you again to get more information. For this reason, we are asking you to put your name and social security number on the questionnaire. However, you can be assured that your answers to these questions will be kept strictly confidential and will not be seen by anyone in the Army/Navy/Marine Corps/Air Force.

This questionnaire is also being given to servicemen in each of the other three branches of the military. Since there may be differences between the services on the meaning of some of the questions, we are going to explain what we mean by certain terms:

1. When the questionnaire asks about your "primary military specialty code," what is meant is your military occupational specialty or MOS/Naval Enlisted Classification, NEC or Rating/Air Force Specialty Code or AFSC.

2. The questions asking about your "job" refer to the work you are actually doing. This might be different from the military specialty designation of the position to which you are assigned. That is, if you are assigned as a truck driver but you spend most of your time doing something else, we want to know what you are actually doing.
3. When we ask about the number of "assignments" you have had, we are referring to assignments and reassignments which involved either a PCS move or a change of unit. Do not count assignments to school or TDY assignments.
4. In the question about "on-the-job training (OJT)," we mean an assignment where you are being taught to perform a job while you are actually working on that job.

Now, please turn to the cover of the questionnaire and read the instructions printed there.

(READ INSTRUCTIONS)

You should answer all questions. Some of the questions, which may not apply to you, have an answer marked "not applicable."

Again, let me assure you that nobody outside of our Office will see your answers. Thank you very much for assisting us. Please begin.

SURVEY OF ASSIGNMENT AND
UTILIZATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The General Accounting Office is conducting a survey to get information on how the military services assign and use their personnel. The purpose of this questionnaire is to get your personal feelings, experiences, and opinions about your assignments. You can be assured that your answers will be treated confidentially and will not affect you in any way.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Be sure to answer all questions.
2. Read all of the possible choices for each question before you choose your answer.
3. You may use either pen or pencil.
4. Some of the questions have several answers from which you can choose. When you have chosen your answer, place an X mark on the appropriate line as shown.

 X my answer
 not my answer

5. On other questions, we have left room for you to write in your answer.
6. After you have finished, please take your questionnaire to a survey administrator.

1. Name _____
2. Social Security Number _____
3. What is your age to the nearest birthday? _____
4. What is your pay grade?
- E1 E3 E5
 E2 E4
5. What enlistment are you in?
- First
 First, but I have already reenlisted for a second
 Second or later enlistment
6. What is the highest grade of school you had completed when you entered the military?
- 8th grade or less
 9th grade
 10th grade
 11th grade
 12th grade - high school graduate
 GED high school equivalency
7. If you did not graduate from high school before you entered the service, what was your main reason for leaving school?
- Check here if you graduated before coming in.
- _____
- _____
- _____
8. Since entering the service, have you received GED high school equivalency?
- Yes
 No
9. What is your job called? (For example: Clerk-typist, supply clerk, aviation mechanic, etc.)
- _____

10. What kind of things do you do during an average work day?

11. Have you gone to any training schools (A.I.T.) since you finished basic training?

_____ No
_____ Yes

12. What training programs or service skill schools have you gone to since basic training? (For example: cooks school, parachute training, aviation mechanics school, etc.)

_____ Check here if you have not received any training

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>How Many Weeks</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

13. Are you currently working in the job for which you were trained?

_____ Not applicable, I haven't received any training
_____ Yes
_____ No, but I am working in a related job
_____ No, I am working a completely different job

14. Are you currently receiving formal on-the-job training (OJT)?

_____ Yes
_____ No

15. How long have you been working in your current job?

_____ Less than 3 months _____ 13-18 months
_____ 3-6 months _____ 19 months or more
_____ 7-12 months

16. How much of the time on your job do you spend doing the kind of work you were trained for?

- Not applicable, I did not receive any training
 All or almost all the time
 Most of the time
 Some of the time
 None or almost none of the time

17. How satisfied are you with the way your current job uses your military skills and training?

- Very satisfied
 A little satisfied
 A little dissatisfied
 Very dissatisfied

18. How many assignments have you had since completing basic or advanced training?

- This is my first assignment
 This is my second assignment
 This is my third assignment
 This is my fourth or later assignment

19. How many of your assignments have been in the kind of job you were trained for?

- Not applicable, I haven't received any training
 None
 1
 2
 3
 4 or more

20. Do you plan to reenlist?

- Definitely will reenlist
 Not sure, but probably will reenlist
 Not sure, but probably will not reenlist
 Definitely will not reenlist

21. Since you joined the service, have you been in any of the following education programs? (Mark one answer for each.)

- A. High school completion (GED, PREP, other)? Yes No
 B. Reading training? Yes No

- C. Courses to train you in a skill for a civilian job? Yes _____ No _____
- D. College courses Yes _____ No _____
- E. Other (please explain) Yes _____ No _____

22. If you have not been in any of the education programs listed above in question 21, what is your main reason? (Mark only one.)

- _____ Not applicable, I have been in an education program
- _____ I don't want any more education
- _____ I don't like classes
- _____ No courses were available at my station
- _____ I didn't know these programs existed
- _____ I couldn't get the time off
- _____ Other (please explain) _____

23. How much encouragement to increase your education have you received from each of the following? (Mark one answer for each.)

	<u>None</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>A lot</u>
A. Officers in my unit	_____	_____	_____
B. NCOs in my unit	_____	_____	_____
C. Base education office	_____	_____	_____

24. Mark whether or not each of the following was important in your decision to enter the service? (Mark one answer for each.)

- | | <u>Important</u> | <u>Not
Important</u> |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| A. Opportunity to learn a skill or trade | _____ | _____ |
| B. Opportunity to increase my education | _____ | _____ |
| C. Opportunity to serve my country | _____ | _____ |
| D. Opportunity to travel and see new places | _____ | _____ |
| E. The pay and benefits | _____ | _____ |
| F. Opportunity to get a cash bonus | _____ | _____ |
25. At the time you signed your enlistment papers, how much information did you have on what choices were open to you?
- _____ A lot
 _____ Some
 _____ Very little
26. When you were enlisting, were you promised or told that you would be assigned to the unit of your choice?
- _____ No
 _____ Yes, before I signed up
 _____ Yes, after I signed up
27. When you were enlisting, were you promised or told that you would be assigned to the duty station of your choice?
- _____ No
 _____ Yes, before I signed up
 _____ Yes, after I signed up
28. When you were enlisting, were you promised or told that you would be assigned to the training program of your choice?
- _____ No
 _____ Yes, before I signed up
 _____ Yes, after I signed up

29. When you enlisted, did you sign a contract for a specific specialty skill, unit, or duty station?

- No
- Yes, and I received my choice
- Yes, and I received something close to my choice
- Yes, but I did not receive my choice

30. Overall, do you feel the military has kept the promises made to you when you were enlisting?

- Not applicable, no promises were made to me
- Yes
- No

31. Where did you first take the mental test to see if you could get into the service?

- In a school
- In the recruiter's office
- At an AFEEES examining center or induction station
- At a military base
- From a Mobile Examining Team (MET)
- Other (please explain) _____

I don't remember

32. Did you receive any practice sessions or help in reading or taking the test?

- Yes
- No

33. Did your recruiter tell you that if you put certain information on your forms you might not get into the military?

- Yes
- No

34. What is your primary military specialty code? (MOS, NEC, Pating, AFSC) _____

35. Total months in service? _____

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS
RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING
ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
<u>DOD</u>		
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE:		
Donald H. Rumsfeld	Nov. 1975	Present
James R. Schlesinger	July 1973	Nov. 1975
William P. Clements (acting)	May 1973	July 1973
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE:		
William P. Clements	Jan. 1973	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS):		
William K. Brehm	Sept. 1973	Present Aug. 1973
Carl W. Clewlow (acting)	June 1973	

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY:		
Martin R. Hoffmann	Aug. 1975	Present
Norman R. Augustine (acting)	July 1975	Aug. 1975
Howard H. Callaway	May 1973	July 1975
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS):		
Donald G. Brotzman	Mar. 1975	Present
M. David Lowe	Feb. 1974	Jan. 1975
Carl S. Wallace	Mar. 1973	Jan. 1974
CHIEF OF STAFF		
Gen. Fred C. Weyand	Sept. 1974	Present
Gen. Creighton W. Abrams	Oct. 1972	Sept. 1974

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY:		
J. William Middendorf II	Apr. 1974	Present
John W. Warner	May 1972	Apr. 1974

<u>Tenure of office</u>	
<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (cont.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS):

Joseph T. McCullen, Jr.	Sept. 1973	Present
James E. Johnson	June 1971	Sept. 1973

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS:

Adm. James L. Holloway III	July 1974	Present
Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.	July 1970	July 1974

COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS:

Gen. Louis H. Wilson	July 1975	Present
Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr.	Jan. 1972	June 1975

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE:

Thomas C. Reed	Dec. 1975	Present
John L. McLucas	May 1973	Dec. 1975

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS):

David P. Taylor	June 1974	Present
James P. Goode (acting)	June 1973	June 1974

CHIEF OF STAFF:

Gen. David Jones	Aug. 1974	Present
Gen. George S. Brown	Aug. 1973	July 1974
Gen. John D. Ryan	Aug. 1969	Aug. 1973

Copies of GAO reports are available to the general public at a cost of \$1.00 a copy. There is no charge for reports furnished to Members of Congress and congressional committee staff members. Officials of Federal, State, and local governments may receive up to 10 copies free of charge. Members of the press; college libraries, faculty members, and students; non-profit organizations; and representatives of foreign governments may receive up to 2 copies free of charge. Requests for larger quantities should be accompanied by payment.

Requesters entitled to reports without charge should address their requests to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section, Room 4522
441 G Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Requesters who are required to pay for reports should send their requests with checks or money orders to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section
P.O. Box 1020
Washington, D.C. 20013

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the U.S. General Accounting Office. Stamps or Superintendent of Documents coupons will not be accepted. Please do not send cash.

To expedite filling your order, use the report number in the lower left corner and the date in the lower right corner of the front cover.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

**UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548**

**OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300**

**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**



THIRD CLASS