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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not significant differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction maintained by selected company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps who intended to remain on active duty and their counterparts who did not intend to remain on active duty.

The study was limited to selected company grade officers with from six to forty-eight months of active duty. There were 2,082 officers in the population on January 1, 1973. One thousand were selected to participate.

Measurements of overall job satisfaction and twelve areas of satisfaction were obtained with the use of an opinionaire. The opinionaire contained seventy-two statements, six in each of the following areas: pay and fringe benefits, job security, administration and policies, status, interpersonal relations with colleagues, relationship with immediate superior, Army way of life, work itself, professional growth and development, recognition, achievement, and responsibility.

The instrument was determined to have construct validity by a panel of experts in the field of Army personnel management. The opinionaire was administered to eighteen officers, and using a split half analysis and Pearson's first and second coefficients of correlations, the coefficient of correlation was found to be .991 in the test of reliability.
A total of 778 complete and usable opinionnaires were returned. Of that total, 325 respondents stated their intention to remain on active duty, 361 indicated their intention to leave the service, and ninety-two were uncertain about remaining on active duty. Since such a relatively large number of the officers were uncertain about remaining on active duty, the data involving that category of officer was discussed in the study, but the study was primarily concerned with comparisons of the satisfactions of officers who were intending to remain in the Army and of officers who were intending to leave active duty.

There were four possible responses to each of the seventy-two statements on the opinionnaire. Officers were asked to complete each item by circling one of the following: agree, probably agree, probably disagree, or disagree. The numerical values of one, two, three, or four were used in scoring the responses. The value of one always related to the lowest level of satisfaction and the value of four always related to the highest level. The highest possible score for overall job satisfaction was 288 and the lowest was seventy-two.

The opinionnaires were hand scored. The scores were then put on International Business Machine (IBM) cards. The tests for significant differences were accomplished by a computer, using a completely random design; i.e., one way analysis of variance.

Significant differences at the .01 level of confidence were found to exist in comparing the overall job satisfaction of officers
who intended to remain on active duty and the overall job satisfaction of officers who did not intend to stay in the Army.

The test for significant differences also showed that there were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence in comparing the satisfaction that these two categories held in the twelve areas of satisfaction, except in the area of job security. There was no significant difference in the levels of satisfaction maintained by the two categories of officers in the area of job security.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States Army Medical Service Corps is one of six branches of the United States Army Medical Department. Together with the Army Medical Corps, the Army Dental Corps, the Army Veterinary Corps, the Army Nurse Corps, and the Army Medical Specialty Corps, the Army Medical Service Corps shares the responsibility for delivering total health services to all active duty personnel; and also for providing limited, but substantial, medical services to military retirees, their dependents, and the dependents of active duty members.

Since the pioneer days of the Army Medical Corps, when the jobs performed by nonphysicians of the Department were limited to such storekeeping tasks as receiving and storing medicines and hospital supplies, the number and variety of jobs undertaken by nonphysicians have multiplied. As of February, 1973, the Medical Service Corps had some 5,400 commissioned officers on active duty, Officers of the Corps work in fifty-four military occupational specialities. Depending upon their specialities, the officers are assigned to one of the four sections which make up the Corps. The organization of the Corps and the sections within it were established by Public Law 337 on August 4, 1947. The four sections are: Pharmacy, Administration, and Supply Section; Medical Allied Science Section; Sanitary Engineering Section; and Optometry Section.
The Chief of the Medical Service Corps holds the rank of brigadier general. In addition to the general, there were 188 colonels, 443 lieutenant colonels, 863 majors, 2,101 captains, 913 first lieutenants, and 891 second lieutenants on active duty with the Corps on January 31, 1973.

Nearly one-half of the commissioned officers serving on active duty with the Corps had less than forty-eight months of active commissioned service. Officers with that relatively small period of service are not generally considered to be committed to a military career. Their retention on their loss to the Corps is dependent to some extent upon the satisfaction that they receive from their jobs and their way of life in the Army.

In a message addressed to major commanders of the Army, dated May 5, 1970, and entitled, Leadership, Management, and Morale: Putting First Things First, General William C. Westmoreland, who was then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, wrote:

"We are all aware of the many problems facing our junior officers these days, particularly in troop unit assignments exclusive of Southeast Asia. These are the very officers whom we wish to retain if they display the desire and talent required. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to create attitudes and conditions which make their service satisfying, rewarding, and challenging" (United States Department of the Army, 1972).

Do our junior officers find their service satisfying, rewarding, and challenging? What needs do they have? Are their job related needs being satisfied by their service?

Frederick Herzberg (1966) maintained that man has two sets of needs which are directly related to his work: environmental
needs and motivational needs. Herzberg used the term "hygiene" to identify such environmental items as physical working conditions, company administration and policy, supervisory practices, interpersonal relations, money, status, and job security. He observed that the classical approach to improving motivation concerns itself almost exclusively with improving the environment. While Herzberg recognized the importance of a good job environment, he said that a good environment is not sufficient in itself for effective motivation. An environment which is deficient will result in dissatisfaction, but a good environment will not result in lasting satisfaction.

The set of needs which had been almost totally overlooked by management, according to Herzberg, was involved with feelings of accomplishment, of professional growth and professional recognition, that were experienced in a job of sufficient scope and challenge. Herzberg used the term "motivation" to describe such feelings, and he used the term in a restrictive sense. He applied the term only to those kinds of experiences that produced sustained satisfaction, and did not use it in the more general sense which includes influences which have less lasting effects.

Has the Army in its attempts to make military service more satisfying to its members' needs fallen into the trap identified by Herzberg? Has it overemphasised the improvement of such environmental factors as physical working conditions, company administration and company policies, supervisory practices, interpersonal relations, money, status, and job security? Has the Army placed sufficient emphasis upon creating conditions whereby its members obtain feelings of accomplishment, of professional growth and professional recognition,
that are experienced in a job of scope and challenge? Indeed, has the Army placed enough emphasis upon satisfying either of the two sets of job related needs which Herzberg identified?

Herzberg's assertion that work itself can be a motivator represents an important breakthrough to behavioral science. Traditionally, work had been regarded as an unpleasant necessity, rather than as a potential motivator. For this reason, management had generally considered it necessary to either entice people to work by means of various rewards, or to coerce them to work by means of threats, or both.

Management commonly held that work was an unpleasant necessity. C. Argyris (1957) observed that the traditional principles of formal organization caused employees to work in an environment where:

1. they were provided minimum control over their workaday world,
2. they were expected to be passive, dependent, and subordinate,
3. they were expected to have short time perspective,
4. they were induced to perfect and value the frequent use of a few skin surface, shallow abilities and,
5. they were expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure.

Argyris added that these characteristics were incompatible with the ones that human beings are brought up to desire. They were more consistent with the needs of infants. He said that organizations
were willing to pay high wages if mature adults would, during their work day, behave in a less than mature way.

Does the Army view work as a motivator or as an unpleasant necessity? Are the younger officers of the Army given enough responsibility? Do they have control over their workaday world? Are they permitted to be active, independent, and contributing members of an organizational team?

McGregor (1960) stated that so long as man was struggling for subsistence, the means of satisfying his physiological and his safety needs could be provided for or withheld by management. He believed that employment itself was such a means, as were wages, working conditions, and benefits. Management cannot, however, provide man with such things as self-respect, respect of his fellow workers, or with satisfaction of needs for self-actualization. It can, though, create conditions which will enable and encourage employees to seek such satisfactions for themselves, or conversely, management can thwart personnel by failing to provide these conditions.

Certainly, the young officers of today's Army are not struggling for subsistence. Appeal to their physiological and safety needs could not be expected to be very effective as a motivator. But does the Army create conditions that encourage and enable its members to seek such satisfactions as self-respect, respect of fellow workers, and self-actualization?

Great efforts have been made to improve the lot of military personnel, particularly since 1955, in the hope of improving the level of need satisfaction and increasing the motivation of those
personnel. Since 1955, base pay has been increased by as much as 350 percent for some grades, and by not less than 200 percent for all grades, according to Information on Current Issues--4th Edition, 1972. Allowances for quarters have been raised by at least forty percent for all grades since 1971. Many unnecessary and overly restrictive regulations have been revoked or revised. Emphasis upon improving the working conditions and the living conditions of military personnel are receiving a high priority by the Department of Defense. Are these efforts having the desired effect?

Retention rates of young officers have decreased since 1971. The retention rates vary from one branch of the Army to another and under various conditions. It is reasonable to expect that levels of satisfaction among various categories of personnel also vary.

Attracting and retaining junior officers has always been important to the Army, since authorized strength levels must be maintained if the Army is to accomplish its mission. However, this concern became even more vital when certain provisions of the Selective Service Act expired on June 30, 1973. Prior to that time, a number of younger officers of the Army had entered active duty with their commissions as an alternative to being drafted into enlisted service.

The end of the draft will have an effect upon the number of applications for commissions in the Medical Service Corps. The Corps will need to maintain its strength level to the extent that it can accomplish its mission. The Medical Service Corps will have to obtain volunteers for commission without having the draft as a motivator.
Through a better understanding of junior officer attitudes, actions can be taken to increase the level of satisfaction and to decrease the level of dissatisfaction. A better understanding and appropriate action could make an Army career more attractive to the junior officers of the Corps. For this reason, the United States Army Medical Service Corps Branch, Officer of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, gave concurrence and authority necessary for the conduct of this study.

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to measure, analyze, and interpret the job satisfaction of selected company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps.

HYPOTHESES

Based on the stated problem, the following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

1. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the overall job satisfaction felt by company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps, who have between six months and forty-eight months active commissioned service and who intend to remain on active duty, and the overall job satisfaction felt by their counterparts who do not intend to remain on active duty.

2. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the satisfaction felt by officers in these same
two categories toward the following twelve areas of their jobs: pay and fringe benefits, job security, administration and policies, status, interpersonal relations with colleagues, relationship with immediate superior, Army way of life, work itself, professional growth and development, recognition, achievement, and responsibility.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps who had at least six months and not more than forty-eight months active commissioned service as of January 1, 1973. The sample was randomly selected from the population of 2,082, and was limited to 1,000 officers.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Terms in this study which had special or unusual meanings and those subject to various meanings were defined as follows:

Army Way of Life

This term was used to identify the unique style of life that members of the Army and their dependents experience as the result of the following factors: Army regulations, policies, and rules, Army rank and hierarchy systems, Army protocol, and Army traditions and customs.

Company Grade Officers

This term was used to identify a category of officers with the Army ranks of second and first lieutenant and captain. These were the most junior ranks of the commissioned officer corps.
Military Occupational Specialty

The key to the Army's method of matching jobs and men was the military occupational specialty code. The term was used to identify a grouping of duty positions for officers and enlisted personnel which possessed such close occupational or functional relationships that, at any given level or skill, there was an optimal degree of interchangeability among personnel so classified.

PROCEDURE

An opinionaire was developed and used to obtain a measurement of overall satisfaction that selected company grade officers of the Army Medical Service Corps felt toward their jobs. Additionally, the instrument produced measurements of relative satisfaction that these officers felt toward the following twelve area of their jobs: pay and fringe benefits, job security, administration and policies, status, interpersonal relations with colleagues, relationship with immediate superior, Army way of life, work itself, professional growth and development, achievement, and responsibility.

The possible responses to the statements on this forced answer opinionaire were: agree, probably agree, probably disagree, and disagree. The numerical values of one through four were applied to the responses. A value of four was applied to "agree" in the case of a positive statement, and to "disagree" if the statement was negative. A value of three was given to "probably agree" if the statement was positive, and to "probably disagree" if the statement was negative. The value of two was applied to "probably
disagree" when the statement was positive, and to "probably agree" if the statement was negative. A value of one was given to the responses "disagree" if the statement was positive, and to "agree" if the statement was negative.

There were seventy-two statements on the opinionnaire, with six statements pertaining to each of the twelve areas of job satisfaction. The form also asked each respondent to answer the following questions:

1. Your present rank?
2. Number of months on active duty?
3. Your present primary duty?
4. Do you intend at this time to remain on active duty?

Prior to being used in the survey, the opinionnaire was submitted to a panel of experts consisting of nine instructors of personnel management, all commissioned officers, who were assigned to the Personnel Administration and Allied Arts Branch, Health Care Administration Division, Academy of Health Sciences, Fort Sam Houston, Texas. Each member of this panel examined each of the seventy-two statements and judged them in relation to the area of satisfaction to which they pertained. After making minor changes in the wording of two statements, the panel judged the instrument to have construct validity for its intended use.

The opinionnaire was then administered to a group of eighteen company grade, Medical Service Corps Officers by one of the members
of the validating panel, to test the internal consistency of the items. The test for reliability was accomplished by a split-half analysis of the items, and by using Pearson's first and second coefficients of correlation; the coefficient of correlation was found to be .991.

A roster containing the names, ranks, and duty addresses of Medical Service Corps officers, who had from between six months and forty-eight months active commissioned service as of January 1, 1973, was obtained from the Medical Service Corps Branch of the United States Army Surgeon General's Office. From this roster, officers were selected for participation in the research on the basis of a random selection.

The opinionnaire, along with instructions contained in a cover letter, were mailed on March 10, 1973.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

The remainder of the study consisted of a review of related literature (Chapter 2), development of the instrument (Chapter 3), presentation of the data (Chapter 4), and recommendations and summary (Chapter 5), and the bibliography and appendices.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The job related needs of man are complex, and the means by which management has attempted to appeal to those needs are numerous. A landslide of research has been done within the area of job satisfaction, particularly since Roethlisberger and Dixon's Management and the Worker was published in 1939. Locke (1968) observed that more than 4,000 articles had been published since the 1930's; undoubtedly, a great number more have been promulgated since Locke made that observation.

Management experts generally agree that worker satisfaction emerged as a primary management concern in the 1930's, when the "human behavior school" began to dominate organization theory. To say that Mayo's The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization gave birth to the human relations movement would be consistent with the commonly held myth. However, Mayo's work did give the movement the impetus it required to become a major influence of management thought.

This chapter was devoted to a review of some of the more prominent and more pertinent literature which had been written about job related needs and the satisfaction of those needs. To discuss all of the literature which had been published on the subject, of course, would not have been feasible.
The modern beginning of the human behavior school of management can be traced to Munsterberg. Munsterberg (1913) believed that industrial psychology should be integrated with scientific management, which was the predominant school of thought at that time. He recognized the importance of management's understanding of the psychological differences which exist among individuals. He observed, through scientific studies, that employees reacted in varied ways to on-the-job situations.

Munsterberg recommended the integration of a better understanding of human behavior with the scientific management ideas of such men as Taylor, Gantt, Gilbreth, and others of the early twentieth century. However, his advice was not heeded, and not until later in the century did theorists recognize the good that existed in both the human behavior school and the scientific school of management theory.

Follett also predated the era of the human behaviorist. Along with the publication of her Creative Experience in 1924, came an addition of new words to the behavioral school of management. The words, "togetherness" and "group thinking" are descriptive of Follett's beliefs. She observed that man was motivated by the same needs in his work as he was off the job. She believed that it was the manager's job to coordinate individual efforts into group energy. She held that there was great potential in group work; that it was the manager's function to inspire, to guide, and to harmonize individual efforts into teamwork. It was not the manager's job to drive workers or to force work from them. Although Follett used a
different vocabulary to describe her thoughts, she expressed the same faith in the individual as McGregor did in his "Theory Y".

Barnard was another early writer of the human behavior school. His *The Functions of the Executive* stressed the importance of the individual. Barnard (1938) saw the organization as a system by which people could, through the coordinating efforts of a manager, reach beyond individual limitations. He recognized that the life of an organization depended upon a balance of the individual's contributions and the satisfactions that those individuals derive from their efforts.

Munsterberg, Follett, Mayo, and Barnard are typical of the early writers of the human behavior school, in that they all recognized that the work world of the individual was an extension, rather than a separate part of a human being's whole life. The needs that the individual has on the job are not distinct from his entire set of needs. To them, the individual was important. They pointed out that it was necessary for the good of the organization, as well as to the employees of the organization, that human needs be met through productive work.

More recent theorists did not deviate to a great extent from the beliefs of these early writers. Maslow (1947) recognized that human needs had to be acknowledged and understood by management, if the organization hoped to meet those needs. He placed man's needs into a hierarchy. His "Hierarchy of Needs" theory was the foundation from which many later writers of the behavioral sciences built their theories. Maslow placed man's needs, as he saw them, into five
categories. From lower-level to higher-level, he classified these
needs as follows: (1) physiological, (2) safety or security, (3)
love or social, (4) ego, and (5) self-actualization.

Maslow observed that man was a wanting animal. When a person
feels that a need has been satisfied, he brings another need into
focus. Most members of our society never attain complete satisfaction
of all the needs within a given level. While certain needs may be
temporarily satisfied, normally not all of the needs of the same
level are met. Thus, according to Maslow's theory, people do not
move completely from one set of needs to another set. A person may
be eighty-five percent satisfied in his physiological needs; seventy
percent satisfied in his safety needs; fifty percent, in his social
needs; thrity percent, in his ego needs; and ten percent satisfied
in his self-actualization needs. Maslow's theory also gave preced­
ence to lower-level needs over higher-level needs.

If management were employing personnel who were deprived to
the extent that they were primarily intent upon satisfying physiologi­
cal needs, then motivating them would be a relatively simple task.
Employment itself, since it would provide the means for satisfying
the need for food, would be a real motivator. However, the number
of workers in our society who are limited to the striving to meet
such basic needs is small. Therefore, managers must be more sophis­
ticated in their understanding of human needs and motivation.

Man is certainly more than an animal whose main objective
in life is to fulfill basic needs. Biggers (1949) believed that
while man was an individual, he was also a social being who wished
to develop his own personality and self-respect. He desired an opportunity to achieve and to create, and delighted in the self-assurance that he derived from possessing real ability and a chance to use it. Biggers observed that self-esteem was based only in part on an inner conviction of worth. To a large extent, self-esteem was a product of recognition from other people. Therefore, feelings that an individual received from his job performance were a mixture of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. While self-esteem is intrinsic in nature, extrinsic rewards influence how one's ego needs are met.

Biggers believed that there were five broad drives or needs that influence behavior: (1) dignity, (2) esteem of others, (3) instinct for survival, (4) security, and (5) social needs. He said that dignity involved the conviction that a person had basic human rights that must be respected. The seeking of self-expression, the opportunity for advancement, the success of one's endeavors, and the satisfaction of attaining a useful place in the world are all important ingredients of the individual's dignity.

Man craves recognition, the feeling that his human dignity is respected, and the confidence that he will be treated with respect in all relationships. If these feelings are satisfied, esteem of others was felt to have been achieved, according to Biggers.

Instinct for survival requires assurance that a man and his family can obtain food, clothing, and other essentials for a decent standard of living. For man to have his lower-level needs met on a day-to-day basis, however, is not enough. He needs to feel secure about the future.
Biggers added that man needed to associate with other men who shared their interests and to develop teamwork in pursuing common goals.

A similarity exists between the ideas of Maslow and those of Biggers. To separate and classify theories based upon who influenced whom, is difficult, and to do so would serve no purpose. There is a common thread running through the works of the theorists of the behavioral school. The similarity of their theories is even more obvious in the writings which have appeared since 1950, or thereabout.

McGregor (1957) classified man's needs in nearly the same manner as did Maslow. McGregor believed that a satisfied need ceased to be a motivator of behavior. He also observed that when one set of needs was satisfied, the next higher level emerges. He maintained that management, by enabling employees to satisfy lower-level needs, had lost the means which it traditionally used to motivate them. However, if Maslow's assertion that man's needs at any given level are never completely satisfied is accurate, then management still possesses the ability to exploit lower-level needs. An employee who is eighty percent secure in his job may be motivated to perform by an appeal to his twenty percent level of insecurity. However, recognizing man's needs for self-esteem and self-actualization, a more acceptable means for motivating people would seem to be an appeal to those needs.

While man's basic needs are satisfied to a great extent, there is an amount of unfulfillment remaining at the lower levels. As McGregor recognized, rewards, promises, incentives, or threats or
other coercive devices did not motivate men who had adequate incomes, who did not fear physical harm, and who had job security. However, how many employees are completely satisfied with the adequacy of their incomes or feel absolutely secure in their jobs? Rewards, promises, and threats do not seem to be devoid of motivational power.

Do employees require extrinsic rewards and extrinsic pressures to make them work toward the accomplishment of organizational goals? Can jobs be designed in such a way that they permit and encourage commitment and involvement? To attempt an answer to these and other questions, certain assumptions about the nature of man appeared helpful.

McGregor (1960) was quite optimistic about man's nature in his "Theory Y". He believed that work was as natural to man as were play and rest. He said that man's commitment to the objectives of his job was determined by the rewards that he associated with his achievement. Furthermore, man not only accepted responsibility, but he sought it. Creativity, imagination, and ingenuity were widely distributed among men. McGregor also observed that the intellectual potential of man was not utilized by management to the degree that it should have been.

What are the rewards that men seek? How can management use those rewards as means of motivating men to work effectively and efficiently? Will an appeal to the higher-level needs produce the desired motivation? It must be recognized that what motivates one person may not motivate another. Man experiences different degrees of pleasure or displeasure from different jobs and within the various
aspects of the same job. Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction are emotional reactions to the job. Brandon (1966) said that man's consciousness had three basic biological functions: (1) cognition, which involves identification of existents; (2) evaluation, or the estimate of the beneficial or harmful relationship of perceived existents to oneself; and (3) the regulation of action.

Cognition enables man to discover what exists, but it does not tell him what action to take. To undertake successful action, a person must evaluate the implications of alternative courses of action. What motivates one person to act in a certain way may not motivate another person to act in a similar way. The individual's needs, his values, and his judgment will determine his actions.

According to Lawler (1967), motivation toward effective work was determined by two variables. The first variable entailed the expected reward that the individual perceives will result from his efforts. The other variable was the value that the individual places upon the perceived rewards.

Lawler identified rewards that can be obtained from work performance as being either intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic rewards are those which a person gives himself. Such things as a sense of achievement, a feeling of using one's skills and abilities effectively to accomplish a challenging, rewarding, and meaningful task, and a feeling of accomplishment which enhances one's self-esteem, are examples of intrinsic rewards. Extrinsic rewards, on the other hand, are those rewards which come from the job environment and are given by other people. Promotions, financial and
material rewards, and improved working conditions are examples of extrinsic rewards. Lawler related intrinsic rewards with higher-level needs, and extrinsic rewards with lower-level needs.

Herzberg (1959) divided man's job related needs into two broad categories: motivational needs and environmental needs. He contended that true motivation could result only from efforts directed toward satisfaction of high-level needs. He called the elements of the job which offered the intrinsic rewards that were required to satisfy higher-level needs, "satisfiers". The following are the needs that Herzberg found to be the real motivators of the job: achievement, recognition, interesting work, and advancement in terms of responsibility and salary.

Management has traditionally spent a great amount of effort in its attempts to satisfy and to motivate employees by improving the job environment. Factors of the environment, which Herzberg called "hygiene" items, include administration and policies, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, job security, and personal life. "Dissatisfiers" was another term that Herzberg used to identify such factors. He held that the environmental parts of the job, which commonly receive a great amount of attention from both management and employee organizations, did not satisfy; however, inattention to the environmental factors lead to employee dissatisfaction.

Thus management, according to Herzberg (1966), must provide for a good job environment in order to prevent dissatisfaction. If management seeks to satisfy employees' needs, though, management must also emphasize the dimension which results in intrinsic rewards.
Herzberg's analysis of satisfiers and dissatisfiers showed them to be separate and discrete. That is to say, the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, but rather, no satisfaction. Conversely, the opposite of dissatisfaction is not satisfaction, but no dissatisfaction.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) pointed out an interesting thing about salary. Salary can contribute to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Appropriate financial reward was observed to be necessary in order to prevent dissatisfaction. Appropriate salary was also essential for a high level of satisfaction and job performance. In addition, as the researchers reported, the amount of salary was less important than was the equity of the salary.

McClelland (1969) believed that achievement, or the need to achieve was the principal motivator of a job. His research indicated that the "achievement motive" was a primary measure of emotional maturity and psychological success. People with high achievement motives need to pursue challenging goals. Their primary reward was intrinsic; a feeling of personal growth and accomplishment attained through a job well done. McClelland observed that in terms of higher-level, lower-level needs, achievement motivated people function within the higher-level areas of self-esteem and self-actualization. Employees with low achievement motives were primarily concerned with such things as peer acceptance and material rewards. These rewards were satisfying to lower-level needs.

There is a danger of over generalizing about needs' satisfaction. Rush (1971) observed the following:
The lack of interest of lack of motivation may be understood in terms of how a person perceives any activity in relation to himself and his needs. Motivation is generally defined as a movement toward a goal. The strength of motivation is determined directly by the rewards associated with reaching a goal. Selection of a goal and the perception of its rewards are highly individual, since motivation is an internally generated phenomenon.

Differences exist among individuals. What one person views as a satisfying job may be seen as drudgery by another person. There are also differences among various groups of people. Age, for example, has an influence upon levels of satisfaction. A large number of studies, according to Harrell (1960), indicated that younger workers expressed a considerable amount of satisfaction. Morale went down during the first few years of work, and then it rose steadily with age.

Occupational level is also related to job satisfaction. Gilmer (1966) reported that the higher the level, in terms of the organizational hierarchy, the greater the job satisfaction. Gilmer observed that professional people had the highest level of satisfaction with their jobs. Salaried workers were next, and wage earners had the lowest level of job satisfaction. This conclusion may be interpreted in terms of salary, the opportunity for self-actualization, self-esteem, and status, or a combination of these factors.

Can jobs be improved to enhance the motivation of all employees? Rush (1971) believed that they could. He contended, as Herzberg did, that job-content items were the true motivators that lead to job satisfaction. Rush claimed that motivation was a
function of job satisfaction and personal freedom, and that motivation and productivity were inextricably linked. He said that man needs meaningful work and that work can be designed to meet this need.

French (1964) stated that some attention to human needs was essential if management desired to minimize excessive personnel turnover, absenteeism, apathy, work stoppages, and other defense mechanisms. French believed that a good job environment was necessary to prevent poor job attitudes.

French observed that practice and research demonstrated that there were ways to increase human satisfaction within the context of productive work. He said that the congruency between individual realization and goal attainment can be maximized to enhance goal attainment. It is to management's own interest to make human satisfactions and organizational goals congruent.

MILITARY EFFORTS

Relatively little research has been accomplished in an attempt to determine the level of job satisfaction that commissioned officers of the military services receive from their work or from their unique life style. However, junior officer turnover rates have been high, and from that fact it may be surmised that a large number of officers have not received sufficient job satisfaction, or adequate satisfaction from the military style of life.

Many questions arise in the attempt to discover the reasons for the high turnover rates among the young officers of the Armed
Forces. Based upon the research discussed thus far in this chapter, the most pertinent question is this: "What job related needs of young military officers are not being met?"

Apgar (1966), at the time an Army lieutenant, conducted an informal and unofficial study in an attempt to determine why so many company grade officers of the Army chose to leave active duty immediately upon completion of their obligation. He questioned ninety-four lieutenants and captains who had from one year to three years of active commissioned service, and who had decided to leave the Army as soon as they were eligible to do so.

Apgar conducted open-end interviews with each of the respondents. Each interviewee was asked certain specific questions. The questions were based on assumptions of certain obvious shortcomings of Army life as evidenced by these weaknesses continually cited in Congressional testimony. The questions centered around such things as career attractiveness, working conditions, job satisfaction, pay, and fringe benefits.

Apgar reported that only three percent of the officers questioned said that pay was their primary reason for leaving the service. Only five percent of the group felt that fringe benefits were of much value. Seventy-seven percent of the officers stated that they took pride in being commissioned officers. The most startling attitude expressed by these officers was that only five percent of them said that they respected or admired their immediate superiors. Ninety-five percent of the officers interviewed stated that they neither respected nor admired their immediate superiors.
Apgar discovered that more than one-half of the officers who were interviewed felt that they were interested in and satisfied with their work and found it challenging. They were unhappy, however, about what they considered to be unnecessary paperwork generated by "lack of faith in an officer's word."

Apgar concluded from his study that it was mostly the absence of professionalism on the part of the lower field grades, who in most cases were the immediate superiors of the junior officers, that caused young officers to leave the service.

Miller (1966) observed that many junior officers of the Army leave the service because they find that superiors would not permit controversial thinking or original suggestions. Miller said that junior officers who offered original ideas were often labeled contradictors of the military system and that young officers who did offer original suggestions often incurred the wrath of their superiors.

Hauser (1970), an Army lieutenant colonel, stated that military professionalism was declining. He believed that decline was the greatest factor for young officers' dissatisfaction, and the primary reason for their leaving the service. He observed that junior officers did not accept the lack of professionalism on the part of their superior officers. Hauser added that young officers were willing to forego the higher pay and settled conveniences of civil life if the Army had offered them intrinsic rewards of professional achievement.
Work environment within the military services differs a great deal from one job to another, from one branch of service to another, from one organization to another within a branch, and from one geographical location to another. To generalize too much about junior officer satisfaction could lead to incorrect conclusions.

Stagdill and Startle (1956) reported that real differences existed among officers performing different jobs within the Navy. They observed differences in status, behavior, and work performance among various positions. They found few significant differences between organizations of the same type, however.

Within the Army Medical Service Corps, the focus of this current study, there are fifty-four separate and distinct job specialties. Officers are assigned to hospitals, other garrison type organizations, and various field type organizations. Duty assignments are located in widely diverse geographical areas. These, and other variables, reasonably could be expected to effect the attitudes that officers have toward their work.

Some generalizations must be made, though, in the attempt to discover pertinent answers to questions about job satisfaction. Scott (1956) observed that studies by such men as Thurstone, Sherif, Bruner, Postman, Ansbacher, McLeod, Levine, Chapman, Murphy, Krech, and Crutchfield have resulted in several important generalizations. The items which Scott believed were relevant to perception were as follows:

1. That which an individual perceives when confronted with a stimulus situation may not correspond to "objective reality."
2. Several individuals confronted with the same stimulus situation may perceive the same situation quite differently.

3. The manner in which an individual perceived a stimulus situation was effected by biological, psychological, social, and cultural factors.

4. The individual responded to his environment in terms of his perceptions of that environment.

A position that one officer may view as a job of significant status, may be seen by another officer as a lowly post. What one officer may feel is a good salary, may be considered inadequate by another officer. Perceptions of the same realities vary according to values, needs, and personalities. One person may receive a great deal of satisfaction from the same job that another person would spurn as drudgery.

**SUMMARY**

Perhaps literature which has been written concerning job satisfaction could best be summarized by the work of O'Toole (1972), who headed a study called *Work in America* for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He stated that what workers wanted most was to be masters of their immediate environments, and to feel that their work was important. O'Toole said that more than one hundred studies, conducted over a period of the last twenty years, substantiated his observation. He also reported that the prestige of an occupation was often an accurate predictor of the level of satisfaction found in a job.
O'Toole observed that people knew what work was satisfying and what work was not, even though they may have been unable to state the characteristics of either.

O'Toole further reported that a 1960 survey of more than four hundred thousand high school students was repeated for a representative sampling in 1970, and the findings showed a marked change. In 1960 the students placed a very high value on job security and the opportunity for promotion. The survey conducted in 1970 indicated that students placed a high premium on jobs which would give them freedom to make their own decisions, and on work that would be important to them.

Attitudes do change. To expect that the younger officers of today's Army place different priorities on the various aspects of their jobs than do their leaders is consistent with past research. Misunderstanding between the younger and the older officers is understandable and natural. To know what priorities today's junior officers place upon the various aspects of their jobs, and to know how they feel about the various facets of their lives in the Army, is important.

If the United States Army is to remain strong, if it is to maintain its personnel strengths with high quality people, and if it is to continue to accomplish its assigned missions in the face of an all volunteer force, then retention of highly qualified young officers is essential.
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DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT

The collection of the data was accomplished by the use of an opinionaire which was designed to yield a measurement of overall job satisfaction and measurements of the following twelve areas: (1) pay and fringe benefits, (2) job security, (3) administration and policies, (4) status, (5) interpersonal relations with colleagues, (6) relationship with immediate superior, (7) Army way of life, (8) work itself, (9) professional growth and development, (10) recognition, (11) achievement, and (12) responsibility. A copy of the opinionaire is included in Appendix A of this study.

The opinionaire contained seventy-two statements; six in each of the twelve areas listed in the preceding paragraph. A statement pertaining to each of the twelve areas was incorporated into the first twelve statements in the same order as above, and was included in each grouping of statements thereafter. Statements pertaining to pay and fringe benefits, for example, were numbered one, thirteen, twenty-five, thirty-seven, forty-nine and sixty-one; those related to the next areas, job security, were numbered two, fourteen, twenty-six, thirty-eight, fifty, and sixty-two; and the remaining ten areas followed in their proper order, and in that pattern.

The opinionaire also asked the respondents to answer the following questions:
1. Your present rank?
2. Number of months on active duty?
3. Your present primary duty?
4. Do you intend at the present time to remain on active duty?

There were four possible responses to each of the statements on the opinionaire. The respondents were instructed to choose one of the four responses for each of the items. The forced-choices were from among the following: (1) agree, (2) probably agree, (3) probably disagree, and (4) disagree. The numerical values used to score each response were one through four. The value of one always indicated the lowest level of satisfaction; the value of two always indicated the next to the lowest level of satisfaction; the value of three was applied to the second from highest level of satisfaction; and the value of four was applied to the highest level of satisfaction. The scores of three and four were interpreted as an indication of relative satisfaction, and the scores of one and two were interpreted as an indication of relative dissatisfaction with the item.

The highest level of overall satisfaction possible for any given opinionaire, using the above described scoring procedure, would be indicated by a score of 288. The lowest score possible on any given opinionaire would be seventy-two. The highest possible score on any one of the twelve areas of satisfaction would be forty-eight; the lowest, twelve.
VALIDATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The opinionnaire was submitted to a panel of nine commissioned officers assigned to the Personnel Administration and Allied Arts Branch, Health Care Administration Division, Academy of Health Services, at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, for validation.

The panel of officers recommended two changes: (1) that "C and GSC" in statement number thirty-three be spelled out to read, "Command, and General Staff College". and (2) that item number thirty-eight be changed from, "I do not object to Regular Army officers having greater job security than Army Reserve officers have," to "I do not object to the fact that Regular Army officers have greater job security than Army Reserve officers have."

These two changes were made, and the panel of officers agreed that the opinionnaire had construct validity for its intended use.

RELIABILITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

One of the officers of the validation panel administered the opinionnaire to eighteen company grade officers of the Medical Service Corps, who were stationed at Fort Sam Houston, Texas. A test for reliability was made from the completed opinionnaires. By using a split-half analysis and applying Pearson's first and second coefficients of correlation, the coefficient of correlation was found to be .991.
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

This study was limited to selected company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps, who had from six months to forty-eight months of active commissioned service as of January 1, 1973.

A roster of commissioned officers who fell within the limitations described above was obtained from the Office of the Army Surgeon General. The roster contained the names, ranks, and duty addresses of 2,082 officers. A total of one thousand of these officers was randomly selected to participate in the conduct of this study.

The opinionnaires were mailed to the selected officers on March 10, 1973. Accompanying the opinionnaires were two cover letters which contained messages and instructions. One of the letters was from the researcher. A copy of that letter is included in Appendix B of this study. The other letter was from the Chief of MSC Career Activities, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army. A copy of that letter is included in Appendix C of this study.

A total of 803 responses were received by the researcher by March 30, 1973, the date which instructions had specified for their return. Of the 803 returned opinionnaires, 778 were complete and usable for the purpose of this study. The remaining twenty-five could not be used because the participants failed to respond to some of the items on the instrument. Twenty-eight opinionnaires were received by the researcher after March 30, 1973, and were not used.
in the tabulation of the data. The total number of returned
opinionaires was 831, or 83.1 percent of the one thousand mailed.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The opinionaires were hand scored, using the point system
described earlier. The opinionaires were separated into three
categories. Category I was used to designate officers who stated
their intention to remain on active duty; Category II was the term
used to describe the officers who did not intend to remain on active
duty; and Category III was the term used to identify officers who
indicated that they were uncertain in their desire to remain on
active duty.

Scores were obtained for each of the three categories of
officers for overall job satisfaction and for each of the twelve
areas of satisfaction measured by the instrument.

The scores for the three categories were transferred onto
IBM worksheets by the researcher and submitted to the Department of
Experimental Statistics, Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge.
IBM cards were prepared by the staff of the Department of Experimental
Statistics, and tests for significant differences among the three
categories of officers were accomplished by a computer, using a
completely random design; i.e., one way analysis of variance.

Chapter 4 presented the results of the tests for significant
differences and other material pertinent to the study.
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PRESENTATION OF DATA

This study was primarily concerned with measuring, analyzing, and interpreting the differences in the levels of job satisfaction held by officers who stated their intention to remain on active duty, and officers who stated their intention to leave active duty. The main focus of this study was upon the differences which were found to exist between those two categories of officers. The third category of officers, those officers who indicated their uncertainty about remaining on active duty, was large in number, and data involving that category of officers was discussed in this study.

The writer used the terms Category I, Category II, and Category III to identify the three groups of officers. "Category I" was used to identify officers who stated an intent to remain on active duty. "Category II" referred to officers who stated no intent to remain on active duty, and "Category III" identified officers who indicated an uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

PERSONNEL DATA

The population from which the sample for this study was obtained was limited to company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps. The officers had from six to forty-eight months of active commissioned service as of January 1, 1973.
Seven hundred and seventy-eight completed and usable opinionnaires were received by March 30, 1973. That date had been established as the cut-off date for the purpose of tabulating the data.

Of the 778 opinionnaires, 350 were completed by captains. First lieutenants completed 216 of the opinionnaires, and 212 of them were completed by second lieutenants. The captains had a mean of 37.58 months of active duty. The first lieutenants had a mean of 26.58 months of active duty, and the second lieutenants had a mean of 17.42 months of active duty. The overall mean in number of months on active duty for all of the 778 officers was 29.03.

To the question, "Do you intend at the present time to remain on active duty?", 325 of the officers answered, "Yes;" 361 of the respondents replied, "No." Ninety-two of the officers stated that they were uncertain; that is, they indicated that they were not certain about whether they would remain on active duty or leave active duty.

OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION

In order to obtain a measurement of overall job satisfaction, the numerical values of one through four were applied to each of the seventy-two responses on the opinionnaire. The higher numerical values indicated the higher levels of satisfaction, and the lower values indicated lower levels of satisfaction. Based upon the highest
possible numerical value of four for each response to the seventy-two statements, the highest possible score of overall satisfaction for any single opinionaire was 288. Conversely, the lowest possible score for any single opinionaire was seventy-two.

The scores for overall job satisfaction among all of the 778 officers ranged from a high of 285 to a low of 105. The mean score for the entire group of 778 officers was 202.61. The mean score of overall job satisfaction for Category I officers was 218.58. Category II officers had a mean score of 189.13 in overall job satisfaction, and Category III officers had a mean score of 199.09 in overall job satisfaction.

Use of the test of one-way analysis of variance revealed that there were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence among all three categories of officers. The overall job satisfaction expressed by officers who stated their intention to remain on active duty, then, was significantly higher than the job satisfaction demonstrated by either of the other two categories of officers. Also, the job satisfaction held by officers who stated an uncertainty about remaining on active duty was significantly higher than the job satisfaction felt by officers who did not intend to remain on active duty.

SATSFACTION WITH PAY AND FRINGE BENEFITS

The highest possible score obtainable in the area of pay and fringe benefits, and in any of the other eleven areas measured
in this study, was twenty-four. The lowest possible score in any of the twelve areas was six.

Category I officers had a mean score of 17.91 in this area of job satisfaction. Category II officers and Category III officers had respective mean scores of 16.93 and 16.77 in this area. These mean scores showed that there was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the satisfaction held by Category I officers and the satisfaction maintained by Category III officers. There was not a significant difference between the mean scores obtained by Category II and Category III officers in this area of satisfaction. Table 1 contains the mean scores by area.

Although there was not a significant difference between the mean scores received by Category II and Category III officers in the area of pay and fringe benefits, the fact that this was one of only two of the twelve areas in which the mean scores of Category III officers did not fall between the mean scores obtained by Category I and Category II officers, was noted.

The following six statements, numbered as they were on the opinionnaire, were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with pay and fringe benefits. The mean scores for the three categories of officers are shown in parentheses which follow the statements. A mean score of four relates to the highest level of satisfaction and a mean score of one indicates the lowest level of satisfaction.

Statement 1. I am reasonably satisfied with my income at the present time in that it provides me with a satisfactory standard
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay and Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Security</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administration and Policies</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interpersonal Relations with Colleagues</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship with Immediate Superiors</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Army Way of Life</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Itself</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professional Growth and Development</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recognition</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Achievement</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsibility</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of living. (Category I, 3.422; Category II, 3.216; Category III, 3.054).

**Statement 13.** My military income is not as high as I would expect to be making in a civilian job. (Category I, 2.560; Category II, 2.072; Category III, 2.228).

**Statement 25.** The military pay schedule provides for adequate pay increases for longevity and promotions. (Category I, 3.126; Category II, 2.981; Category III, 2.913).

**Statement 37.** Post housing or housing available to me at a cost equal to my quarters allowance is satisfactory. (Category I, 2.258; Category II, 2.263; Category III, 2.315).

**Statement 49.** The military retirement system as it presently exists is satisfactory. (Category I, 3.397; Category II, 3.238; Category III, 3.185).

**Statement 61.** Provisions for health care services for military personnel and their dependents are satisfactory. (Category I, 3.151; Category II, 3.158; Category III, 3.076).

While all three of the categories of officers demonstrated relative satisfaction with their present incomes, the prospects for future pay increases, the military retirement system, and health care provisions, they showed relative dissatisfaction with their incomes in comparison with what they felt they could be making in a civilian job, and with post housing and/or their quarters allowances. In Table 2 is indicated the ranking of the areas of satisfaction.
Table 2

Ranking, From Highest to Lowest, of the Areas of Job Satisfaction for the Three Categories of Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement</td>
<td>2. Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>2. Relationship with Immediate Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues</td>
<td>3. Relationship with Immediate Superior</td>
<td>3. Achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SATISFACTION WITH JOB SECURITY

The mean score for the three categories of officers on this area of job satisfaction were as follows: Category I, 18.30; Category II, 18.34; and Category III, 16.90. There was not a significant difference between the mean scores of Category I and Category II officers in this area of job satisfaction. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the mean scores of Category I officers and Category III officers. There was also a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the mean scores of Category II and Category III officers.

Job security was the only one of the twelve areas of job satisfaction measured by this study in which Category II officers had a higher mean score than did Category I officers. The area of job security was only one of two areas in which Category III officers had mean scores which did not fall between the mean scores of Category I and Category II officers. The other area in which Category III officers had a mean score which did not fall between the mean scores of Category I and Category II officers was pay and fringe benefits.

The following statements, numbered as they were on the opinionnaire, were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with job security. The mean scores for each of the three categories of officers follow the statements.

**Statement 2.** The Army does not provide me with a sufficient amount of job security. (Category I, 3.065; Category II, 2.886; Category III, 2.772).
Statement 14. If I were to remain in the Army, I would not worry much about being released through a reduction in force (RIF). (Category I, 2.843; Category II, 2.911; Category III, 2.576).

Statement 26. The Army does not provide as much job security as most civilian organizations do. (Category I, 3.049; Category II, 3.014; Category III, 3.022).

Statement 38. I do not object to the fact that Regular Army officers have greater job security than Army Reserve officers have. (Category I, 2.662; Category II, 2.759; Category III, 2.620).

Statement 50. The fact that a good number of officers have been involuntarily released from active duty after several years of active duty has very little or no effect upon my decision to remain in the service or to leave the service. (Category I, 3.037; Category II, 3.233; Category III, 2.511).

Statement 62. Since whether or not an officer is retained on active duty is dependent upon how well he performs, I agree with the Army's policy of forcing out those officers who, "do not meet the standards for retention." (Category I, 3.622; Category II, 3.537; Category III, 3.402).

All three categories of officers were relatively satisfied with the amount of job security that the Army offered them in comparison to the job security that they believed to be available in a civilian organization. Mean scores of the three categories of officers indicated that Category I and Category II officers were less concerned about the possibility of being released from
active duty through a reduction in force than were Category III officers. Category I and Category II officers were also less concerned about the fact that a good number of officers had, in the past, been involuntarily released from active duty than were Category III officers. All three categories of officers were satisfied with the Army's policy of forcing out of the service those officers who did not meet the standards for retention on active duty.

All three categories of officers indicated a relative amount of dissatisfaction with the fact that Regular Army officers have greater job security than do Army Reserve officers; that is, the mean scores of all three categories were low in comparison to the mean scores that they had on the other items within the area.

Satisfaction with Administration and Policies

The three categories of officers all had their lowest mean scores in this area of job satisfaction. (See Table 2, page 40)

Category I officers had a mean score of 16.12 in this area. Category II and Category III officers had mean scores of 12.50 and 13.63, respectively, in this area of job satisfaction. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence among the mean scores of all three categories of officers.

The following statements, numbered as they were on the opinionnaire, were used to measure satisfaction with administration and policies. The mean scores for the three categories of officers follow the statements.
Statement 3. I do not feel that regulations pertaining to grooming and personal appearance are too restrictive. (Category I, 3.157; Category II, 2.568; Category III, 2.880).

Statement 15. I find the Army rank and hierarchy system unsatisfactory. (Category I, 2.674; Category II, 1.792; Category III, 2.130).

Statement 27. I do not object to such courtesies as saluting and addressing superiors with, "Sir." (Category I, 3.705; Category II, 3.094; Category III, 3.250).

Statement 39. Compared with other large organizations, the Army has too much administrative "red tape." (Category I, 2.000; Category II, 1.532; Category III, 1.707).

Statement 51. Such systems as efficiency reporting systems, supply requisitioning systems, patient admissions and dispositions systems, and others are satisfactory as far as I am concerned. (Category I, 2.175; Category II, 1.884; Category III, 1.793).

Statement 63. I do not object to such policies as mandatory attendance at certain social functions, monthly parades, weekly staff meetings, etc. (Category I, 2.412; Category II, 2.269; Category III, 2.250).

While all three categories showed relative satisfaction with the military requirements for saluting and addressing superiors with, "Sir," and Category I and Category III officers indicated relative satisfaction with grooming and personal appearance restrictions, this area in general was one in which officers indicated a relatively high degree of dissatisfaction.
The mean scores that all three categories of officers had on statement number thirty-nine were their lowest mean scores on any of the seventy-two items.

SATISFACTION WITH STATUS

Category I officers had a mean score of 18.33 in this area of job satisfaction. Category II officers had a mean score of 16.24, and Category III officers had a mean score of 16.62 in this area. These mean scores showed that there were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence between Category I and Category II officers, and between Category I and Category III officers. However, there was not a significant difference in the mean scores of Category II and Category III officers in this area.

The following statements were used on the opinionnaire to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with status. The mean scores of the three categories of officers follow the statements.

Statement 4. As an Army officer, I have a respected position in society. (Category I, 3.025; Category II, 2.573; Category III, 2.739).

Statement 16. An MSC officer is respected by branches of the Army outside the Army Medical Department. (Category I, 2.803; Category II, 2.587; Category III, 2.587).

Statement 28. An MSC officer is respected by the other branches of the Army Medical Department. (Category I, 2.763; Category II, 2.634; Category III, 2.533).
Statement 40. I do not receive the respect that I deserve from the members of my organization. (Category I, 3.406; Category II, 3.211; Category III, 3.250).

Statement 52. I take pride in wearing my uniform. (Category I, 3.662; Category II, 2.942; Category III, 3.261).

Statement 64. My rank does not afford me much status within the military community. (Category I, 2.640; Category II, 2.269; Category III, 2.250).

All three categories of officers showed relative satisfaction with the amount of respect that they received from the members of their organizations. The three categories of officers also indicated a relatively high amount of pride in wearing their uniforms. Category I officers felt relatively satisfied with the respect that their position as Army officers received from society. Categories II and III demonstrated less satisfaction with the level of respect which they believed that society offered their positions.

None of the three categories of officers held high levels of satisfaction with the status of Medical Service Corps in terms of the respect that the Corps received from other branches of the Army, including the other branches of the Army Medical Department. They also indicated that they were relatively dissatisfied with their statuses as junior officers within the military community.
Category I officers had a mean score of 19.34 in this area of job satisfaction. Category II and Category III officers had respective mean scores of 17.36 and 17.62 in this area. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the mean scores of Category I and Category II officers. There was also a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the mean scores of Category I and Category III officers in this area. However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of Category II and Category III officers in this area of satisfaction. All three categories ranked this area of satisfaction relatively high in comparison to the other eleven areas. (See Table 2, page 40)

The following statements were used on the opinionnaire to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with interpersonal relations with colleagues. The mean scores that the three categories of officers had in each item follow the statements.

Statement 5. My fellow officers are supportive and helpful. (Category I, 3.455; Category II, 3.205; Category III, 3.207).

Statement 17. Fellow officers of my organization take advantage of each other. (Category I, 3.049; Category II, 2.859; Category III, 2.761).

Statement 29. I enjoy socializing with my fellow officers. (Category I, 3.572; Category II, 3.061; Category III, 3.250).

Statement 41. I am favorably impressed with the quality of my fellow officers. (Category I, 3.138; Category II, 2.814; Category III, 3.000).
Statement 53. My fellow officers have high personal standards. (Category I, 3.114; Category II, 2.906; Category III, 2.891).

Statement 65. Relationships among my fellow officers are superficial. (Category I, 3.015; Category II, 2.512; Category III, 2.533).

The three categories of officers agreed that their fellow officers were supportive and helpful. They also indicated relative satisfaction with their social contacts with their fellow officers. All three categories were relatively satisfied that their fellow officers had high personal standards, and that their fellow officers were of high quality.

Though Category I and Category II officers were relatively satisfied that their fellow officers did not take advantage of each other, Category III officers were not as convinced that this was true. Category I officers were relatively satisfied that their relationships with colleagues were not superficial. The mean scores of Category II and Category III officers on that item, demonstrated that those two categories of officers believed that relationships among their fellow officers were superficial.

SATISFACTION WITH IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR

All three categories of officers showed a relatively high level of satisfaction with their relationships with their immediate superiors. (See Table 2)
The mean score attained by Category I officers in this area of job satisfaction was 19.34. Category II officers had a mean score of 17.12, and Category III officers had a mean score of 18.11 in this area. These mean scores demonstrated that there were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence among all three categories of officers.

The following statements were used on the opinionnaire in order to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with relationship with immediate superior. The mean scores of the three categories follow the statements.

Statement 6. I am satisfied with the amount and the quality of the performance counseling that I receive from my boss. (Category I, 2.708; Category II, 2.521; Category III, 2.630).

Statement 18. My boss is fair and impartial in dealing with me and other subordinates. (Category I, 3.363; Category II, 3.086; Category III, 3.098).

Statement 30. I am able to communicate freely with my boss. (Category I, 3.498; Category II, 3.133; Category III, 3.250).

Statement 42. My boss takes a sincere interest in me and in my work. (Category I, 3.240; Category II, 2.839; Category III, 3.043).

Statement 54. My boss helps me to feel that I am an important part of the organizational team. (Category I, 3.215; Category II, 2.704; Category III, 2.913).

Statement 66. I have a great deal of respect for my boss. (Category I, 3.311; Category II, 2.837; Category III, 3.174).
All three categories of officers felt relatively satisfied with the fairness and impartiality of their immediate superior's dealings with subordinates. They were also satisfied with their ability to communicate with their immediate superiors, and felt that their immediate superiors took an interest in them and in their work. All three categories of officers indicated a relatively high degree of respect for their immediate superiors.

While Category I and Category III officers were relatively satisfied with the help received from their immediate superiors in making them feel a part of the organizational team, Category II officers were not as satisfied in that regard.

None of the three categories demonstrated a high level of satisfaction with the amount and the quality of performance counseling received from their immediate superiors.

**SATISFACTION WITH ARMY WAY OF LIFE**

All three categories of officers had relatively low mean scores in this area of job satisfaction. (See Table 2, page 40)

Category I officers had a mean score of 17.42 in this area. Category II and Category III officers had respective mean scores of 13.43 and 14.95. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence among the mean scores of all three categories of officers.

The following statements were used on the opinionnaire to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with the Army way of life.
The mean scores obtained by each of the three categories of officers follow the statements.

**Statement 7.** "Army-life" provides too little by way of cultural opportunities. (Category I, 2.966; Category II, 2.330; Category III, 2.598).

**Statement 19.** The Army provides a good environment in which to raise a family. (Category I, 2.954; Category II, 2.006; Category III, 2.315).

**Statement 31.** I am favorably impressed with the opportunities for travel in foreign countries that overseas assignments provide. (Category I, 3.363; Category II, 2.850; Category III, 3.065).

**Statement 43.** The Army provides a way of life that an Army wife can enjoy. (Category I, 2.957; Category II, 2.019; Category III, 2.554).

**Statement 55.** I am dissatisfied with the amount of moving that is required by reassignments. (Category I, 2.714; Category II, 2.310; Category III, 2.489).

**Statement 67.** I find the inevitability of unaccompanied tours unacceptable. (Category I, 2.468; Category II, 1.920; Category III, 1.924).

Category I officers showed relative satisfaction with all items within this area of satisfaction except for those items in statements fifty-five and sixty-seven. They were not satisfied with the amount of moving required by the Army, nor were they satisfied with the inevitability of unaccompanied tours of duty.
Category II officers demonstrated relative dissatisfaction with all items on the opinionnaire in this area of job satisfaction except for the opportunities for travel in foreign countries. Category III officers were also dissatisfied with all of the factors measured in this area of job satisfaction, except for the opportunities for travel in foreign countries.

SATISFACTION WITH WORK ITSELF

Category I and Category III officers had their highest mean scores in this area of job satisfaction. (See Table 2, page 40)

Category I officers had a mean score of 19.81 in this area. Category II officers had a mean score of 16.66, and Category III officers had a mean score of 18.54. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence of the mean scores among all three categories.

The following statements were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with work itself. The mean scores of the three categories of officers follow the statements.

Statement 8. My work load is not so great that it places an undue hardship upon me. (Category I, 3.065; Category II, 3.166; Category III, 3.065).

Statement 20. My work load is sufficiently interesting to keep me actively involved without its becoming a drag. (Category I, 3.434; Category II, 2.573; Category II, 2.573; Category III, 3.098).

Statement 32. I have not been adequately prepared for my job. (Category I, 3.277; Category II, 3.122; Category III, 3.174).
Statement 44. I get a great deal of satisfaction from my work. (Category I, 3.314; Category II, 2.435; Category III, 2.946).

Statement 56. My work is important and worthwhile. (Category I, 3.634; Category II, 3.028; Category III, 3.380).

Statement 68. I usually feel good at the end of a day's work because I have a sense of accomplishment. (Category I, 3.083; Category II, 2.307; Category III, 2.880).

All three categories of officers were relatively satisfied with their work loads, the preparation that they had to accomplish their duties, and they were satisfied that their work was important and worthwhile.

Category I and Category III felt that their work was interesting, but Category II officers did not feel that way about their work. Category I and Category III officers obtained a relatively high level of satisfaction from their work, but Category II officers did not. Category I and Category III officers were relatively satisfied with the sense of accomplishment that their work offered them. Category II officers did not receive a sense of accomplishment from their work.

Satisfaction with Professional Growth and Development

Category I officers had a mean score of 17.31, Category II had a mean score of 15.10, and Category III officers had a mean score of 15.97 in this area of job satisfaction. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence in the mean scores among all three categories of officers.
This area of satisfaction ranked relatively low in comparison to the twelve areas measured in this study. The area ranked number ten for Category I officers, number eight for Category II officers, and number nine for category III officers. (See Table 2, page 40)

The following statements were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with professional growth and development. The mean scores for the three categories of officers follow the statements.

Statement 9. The Army does not provide satisfactorily for higher level assignments as an officer gains experience. (Category I, 2.880; Category II, 2.341; Category III, 2.587).

Statement 21. I am satisfied with the opportunities available to me for advanced degree and/or post graduate work if I were to remain in the Army. (Category I, 3.225; Category II, 2.828; Category III, 3.043).

Statement 33. I am satisfied with the opportunities available to me within the Army for military education; that is, advanced officer course, MOS schools, Command and General Staff College, etc. (Category I, 3.190; Category II, 2.648; Category III, 2.848).

Statement 45. My job is not providing me with good training for higher level assignments. (Category I, 3.037; Category II, 2.568; Category III, 2.967).

Statement 57. The position that I could reasonably expect to attain in the Army would not be as high as what I would expect to attain with a civilian organization. (Category I, 2.686; Category II, 1.992; Category III, 2.315).
Statement 69. The fact that the Medical Service Corps has but one authorized general officer has an adverse effect on me. (Category I, 2.280; Category II, 2.720; Category III, 2.207).

All three of the categories were relatively satisfied with opportunities available to them for advanced education at civilian institutions.

Category I officers were relatively satisfied with the Army's provisions for higher level assignments as an officer gains experience. Category II officers and Category III officers were not satisfied with such provisions.

Category I and Category III officers were relatively satisfied with the opportunities available to them for military education; i.e., advanced course, MOS schools, Command and General Staff College, etc. Category II officers were not satisfied with their opportunities in that regard.

Category I and Category III officers were relatively satisfied with the training that their jobs were providing them for higher level assignments.

All categories of officers were relatively dissatisfied with the levels that they could attain in the Army compared with the positions they could hope to eventually gain in a civilian organization. The three categories were also dissatisfied with the fact that the Medical Service Corps had but one authorized general officer. Category II officers were not as dissatisfied with that fact as were Category I and Category III officers.
SATISFACTION WITH RECOGNITION

Category I officers had a mean score of 16.81 in this area of job satisfaction. Category II and Category III officers had respective mean scores of 14.72 and 15.25 in this area. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence among the mean scores of all three categories of officers.

The following statements were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with recognition. The mean scores for the three categories of officers follow the statements.

Statement 10. I do not get the recognition that I deserve from my work. (Category I, 2.766; Category II, 2.454; Category III, 2.457).

Statement 22. Comments that I receive make it obvious that my work accomplishment is recognized. (Category I, 3.095; Category II, 2.609; Category III, 2.659).

Statement 34. I have not received the letters of commendation, appreciation, and recognition that I deserve. (Category I, 2.852; Category II, 2.753; Category III, 2.609).

Statement 46. I do not get the "pats on the back" that I deserve for my work. (Category I, 2.966; Category II, 2.634; Category III, 2.761).

Statement 58. The Army awards system does not provide me or other company grade officers with the rewards that we deserve. (Category I, 2.382; Category II, 2.366; Category III, 2.272).
Statement 70. I believe that I would receive more recognition from my work if I worked for a civilian organization. (Category I, 2,800; Category II, 1,903; Category III, 2,293).

Category I officers were relatively satisfied with the factors within this area of satisfaction except with the Army awards system. They were not satisfied that the awards system gave them or other company grade officers the awards that they deserved. The mean score that Category I officers had on statement number ten indicated only marginal satisfaction with the recognition they received from their work.

Category II officers were relatively dissatisfied with all of the items measured within this area. Their mean scores on statements numbered ten, fifty-eight, and seventy indicated considerable dissatisfaction with the factors to which those statements pertained.

Category III officers also showed relative dissatisfaction with the factors within this area. They demonstrated particular dissatisfaction with the recognition they felt they received from their work, the Army awards system as it pertained to them, and with the comparison of the recognition which they believed they received in their Army jobs to the recognition which they felt they would receive in a civilian job.
SATISFACTION WITH ACHIEVEMENT

This area of job satisfaction ranked very high among the twelve areas for Category I and Category III officers, and relatively low for Category II officers. (See Table 2, page 40)

Category I officers had a mean score of 19.61 in this area of satisfaction. Category II and Category III officers had respective mean scores of 14.74 and 17.70. There were significant differences in the mean scores at the .01 level of confidence among all three categories of officers.

The following statements were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with achievement. The mean scores of the three categories of officers follow the statements.

Statement 11. I do not get a sense of achievement from my work. (Category I, 3.400; Category II, 2.518; Category III, 3.109).

Statement 23. My job is sufficiently stimulating and challenging to give me a feeling of achievement when I complete a task or an assignment. (Category I, 3.425; Category II, 2.618; Category III, 3.163).

Statement 35. I do not feel that I can achieve as much in my Army job as I could if I were working for a civilian organization. (Category I, 2.972; Category II, 1.665; Category III, 2.467).

Statement 47. The goals and objectives of my work are explicit enough to make me aware of my achievement. (Category I, 3.197; Category II, 2.742; Category III, 2.978).
Statement 59. I work at times when I really would not have to, because I get so involved that I hate to quit. (Category I, 3.268; Category II, 2.654; Category III, 3.043).

Statement 71. I could achieve more, but I do not feel that it really makes much difference whether I do or not. (Category I, 3.348; Category II, 2.543; Category III, 2.935).

Category I and Category III demonstrated relative satisfaction with the sense of achievement they received from their work. Category II officers were not satisfied with the achievement they received. Category I and Category III officers also believed their jobs to be stimulating and challenging, whereas Category II officers did not feel they were stimulated or challenged by their jobs.

Category I officers were satisfied they could achieve as much in their Army jobs as they could if they were working for a civilian organization. Category II and Category III officers were relatively dissatisfied with the achievement they could achieve in their Army jobs compared with what they believed they could achieve with a civilian organization.

While all categories of officers were relatively satisfied that the goals and objectives of their jobs were explicit enough, Category II showed only moderate satisfaction in that regard.

Category I and Category III officers indicated that they worked sometimes when they would not have to, and felt they achieved well on their jobs. They also felt that it did make a difference to themselves whether they achieved more or did not achieve more.
Category II officers demonstrated they did not work when they did not have to, and they believed it really did not make much difference whether they achieved more or did not achieve more.

SATISFACTION WITH RESPONSIBILITY

Category I officers had a mean score of 18.30 in this area of satisfaction. Category II officers had a mean score of 16.04, and Category III officers had a mean score of 17.03 in this area. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence in the mean scores among all three categories of officers.

The following statements were used to obtain a measurement of satisfaction with responsibility. The mean scores of the three categories of officers follow the statements.

Statement 12. I am given an adequate amount of responsibility. (Category I, 3.532; Category II, 3.197; Category III, 3.370).

Statement 24. The Army provides for an adequate amount of increased responsibility as an officer grows and develops. (Category I, 3.249; Category II, 2.673; Category III, 2.913).

Statement 36. The amount of responsibility that I am given is too much in relation to the authority that I have. (Category I, 3.089; Category II, 2.823; Category III, 2.685).

Statement 48. I am not given the amount of responsibility that an officer in my position should have. (Category I, 3.308; Category II, 3.058; Category III, 3.152).
Statement 60. A person with my abilities would have more responsibility in a civilian job. (Category I, 2.855; Category II, 2.169; Category III, 2.598).

Statement 72. I am given responsibility for things that are really not within the boundaries of my job. (Category I, 2.262; Category II, 2.122; Category III, 2.315).

The three categories of officers were relatively satisfied they were given an adequate amount of responsibility. They felt that they had the amount of responsibility that officers in their positions should have.

Category I and Category III officers were relatively satisfied with the amount of increased responsibility officers received as they grew and developed. Category II officers were not as satisfied in that regard.

Category I and Category II officers were relatively satisfied with the amount of responsibility they were given in relation to the authority that they held. Category III officers were not as satisfied with the balance of responsibility and authority.

Category I officers were relatively satisfied with the amount of responsibility they had in relation to the amount that they would have in a civilian job. Category II and Category III were relatively dissatisfied with that comparison.

All three categories of officers were unsatisfied with the amount of responsibility that they were given which was outside the boundaries of their jobs.
SUMMARY

There were significant differences in the mean scores of the three categories of officers in nearly all areas of job satisfaction. Category I officers were generally the most satisfied of the three categories. Category III officers had mean scores which were between the mean scores of Category I and Category II officers in all of the twelve areas with the exception of the area of pay and fringe benefits and the area of job security. Category II officers were the least satisfied in all areas except the two areas mentioned in the preceding sentence.

Chapter 5 presents a summary and recommendations which are based on the data which was presented in Chapter 4.
French (1964) stated that some attention to human needs was essential if management desired to minimize excessive personnel turnover, absenteeism, apathy, work stoppages, and other defense mechanisms. Rush (1971) claimed that jobs could be improved to enhance the motivation of employees. French observed, also, that to make organizational goals and human satisfactions congruent was in management's own best interest.

The provisions of the Selective Service Act expired on June 30, 1973. The military draft at that time ceased as a motivator for young, qualified individuals to apply for commissions as an alternative to being drafted into enlisted service. The Army has always been concerned about attracting and retaining outstanding commissioned personnel. That concern became even more vital when the draft ended.

These observations were in the writer's mind when he undertook this study. The purpose of this study was to measure, analyze, and interpret the job satisfaction of selected company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps.

The study compared the measurements of job satisfaction of three categories of company grade officers of the Army Medical Service Corps. Category I officers were those who stated that they intended to remain on active duty. Category II officers were those
officers who stated that they did not intend to remain on active duty, and Category III officers were those who were uncertain about remaining on active duty.

Two null hypotheses were made in order to guide the study. They were as follows:

1. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the overall job satisfaction felt by company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps, who have between six months and forty-eight months on active commissioned service and who intend to remain on active duty, and the overall job satisfaction felt by their counterparts who do not intend to remain on active duty.

2. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the satisfaction felt by officers in these same two categories toward the following twelve areas of their jobs: pay and fringe benefits, job security, administration and policies, status, interpersonal relations with colleagues, relationship with immediate superior, Army way of life, work itself, professional growth and development, recognition, achievement, and responsibility.

Hypothesis number one was rejected. The study found that there was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the overall job satisfaction obtained by Category I and Category II officers.

Hypothesis number two was rejected except when applied to the area of job security. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence between the Category I officers and the
Category II officers in all areas except in the area of job security.
There was no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the area of job security between the amounts of satisfaction held by Category I and Category II officers. (See Table 3, page 66)

The following recommendations were based upon the findings of this study:

OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION

Category I officers were significantly more satisfied, overall, with their jobs than were Category II or Category III officers. Category III officers were significantly more satisfied, overall, than were Category II officers.

The amount of overall job satisfaction that company grade officers of the Army Medical Service Corps gained from their jobs was directly related to: (1) their decision to remain on active duty, (2) their decision to leave active duty, or (3) their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

Recommendation 1. For the best interest of the Army, the researcher recommended that the Army continue in its attempts to determine ways to make job satisfaction and organizational goals congruent, and to apply those ways whenever it is feasible to do so.

PAY AND FRINGE BENEFITS

There was a significant difference in the levels of satisfaction held by Category I and Category II officers in this area. There was also a significant difference in the levels of
Table 3

Significant Differences in Mean Scores at the .01 Level Among the Three Categories of Officers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Significant Difference Between Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay and Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Security</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administration and Policies</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Status</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interpersonal Relations with Colleagues</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship with Immediate Superior</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Army Way of Life</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Itself</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professional Growth and Development</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recognition</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Achievement</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsibility</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overall job satisfaction was yes for all three categories
satisfaction maintained by Category I and Category III officers.
There was not a significant difference, however, between the levels
of satisfaction felt by Category II and Category III officers.

The amount of satisfaction held by officers in this area of
their jobs directly related to their decisions to remain on active
duty or to leave active duty.

The dual system of pay and fringe benefits can confuse
officers. Real income was believed to be difficult for officers to
determine. Allowances for housing and subsistence were tax free
items of income. Medical and dental care provisions were often
overlooked in arriving at a total income figure, as were commissary
and post exchange privileges. The retirement benefits could also be
overlooked in determining true income.

Recommendation 2. It was recommended that the Army prepare
tables showing true income and that the tables be distributed to all
Army personnel.

Recommendation 3. It was recommended that a one hour class
on the subject of "real income" be added to the curriculums of all
basic and orientation courses taught at the various service schools.

JOB SECURITY

There was no significant difference between the satisfaction
held by Category I officers and Category II officers in this area.
There was a significant difference between the levels of satisfaction
maintained by Category I and Category II officers. There was also
a significant difference between the levels of satisfaction felt by
Category II and Category III officers in this area.

There was no direct relationship between the decisions that
Category I and Category II officers had made in regard to remaining
on active duty or leaving active duty and the levels of satisfaction
that they had in this area.

This area was the only one in which there was not a significant
difference between the satisfaction maintained by Category I and
Category II officers. Perhaps a reasonable explanation would be that
since Category II officers intended to leave the Army, the amount of
job security that the Army offered was not an important consideration.

Category III officers had the lowest level of satisfaction
within this area. It may be logical to interpret that fact as being
a reason for their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

Recommendation 4. The researcher recommended that involuntary
releases of officers from active duty be based solely on record of
performance, and that Regular Army officers and Army Reserve officers
receive equal treatment in determining which officers should be
involuntarily released.

ADMINISTRATION AND POLICIES

There were significant differences among all three categories
of officers in the levels of satisfaction maintained by the three
categories. Category I officers demonstrated the highest level of
satisfaction and Category II officers had the lowest level, in this
area of job satisfaction.
The amount of satisfaction that the three categories of officers held in the area of administration and policies was directly related to their decisions to remain on active duty, or to leave active duty, or their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

A great deal was done, particularly between the years 1970 and 1973, to reduce the amount of irritation that personnel felt as the result of overly restrictive personnel regulations. This study pointed out, however, an amount of dissatisfaction remained in this area of job satisfaction.

Administrative "red tape" was found to be the item which received the lowest mean score of any of the seventy-two items measured by this study. Officers who participated in this study also demonstrated their dissatisfaction with such systems of administration as efficiency reporting systems, supply requisitioning systems, patient admissions and dispositions systems, and other systems.

**Recommendation 5.** It was recommended that the Army's suggestions system be utilized to identify areas in which a reduction in the amount of administrative "red tape" could be accomplished.

**Recommendation 6.** The researcher suggested that the Army study its administrative systems for the purpose of streamlining them.

**Recommendation 7.** It was recommended that such policies as mandatory attendance at certain social functions, monthly parades, and staff meetings be reduced to the minimum amount feasible.
STATUS

There were significant differences in the levels of satisfaction obtained by Category I and Category II officers in this area. There was also a significant difference between the levels of satisfaction demonstrated by Category I and Category III officers. However, there was no significant difference in the levels of satisfaction maintained by Category II and Category III officers in this area of job satisfaction.

There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction held by the officers who took part in this study and their decisions as to whether or not they would remain on active duty.

The officers of all categories indicated relative dissatisfaction with their statuses within the military community. A commissioned officer, regardless of his rank, has historically been held in high regard within the military community. Perhaps this reality has been taken for granted to the extent that it was desirable to reassure junior officers that their positions were ones of status. Renewed emphasis upon assuring young officers that they had important, executive positions seemed appropriate.

Recommendation 8. The researcher recommended that the Chief of Staff of the United States Army renew the emphasis upon assuring junior officers that they have important, leadership positions within the Army. A message, through commands, from the Chief of Staff, which addressed the subject of junior officer status could accomplish the objective.
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WITH COLLEAGUES

There were differences in the levels of satisfaction demonstrated by the three categories of officers. Category I officers held the highest level of satisfaction within this area, Category III officers were next, and Category II officers had the lowest level of satisfaction.

There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction that officers received from this area and their decisions to remain on active duty, or to leave active duty, or their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

All three categories of officers held a relatively high level of satisfaction in this area. However, the data indicated that there was room for improvement.

Recommendation 9. The Army may improve the relationships among company grade officers by stressing the importance of teamwork and coordination of efforts among them. It was recommended that junior boards be used to a greater extent to encourage teamwork. It was also recommended that post and local commanders sponsor an increased number of social events for junior officers.

RELATIONSHIP WITH IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR

There were significant differences in the amounts of satisfaction that officers of all three categories expressed in this area of job satisfaction. Category I officers were the most satisfied in this area, followed by Category III officers, and Category II officers were the least satisfied.
There was a direct relationship between the amounts of satisfaction that officers held in this area and their decisions to remain on active duty, or to leave active duty, or their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

All categories were relatively satisfied in this area. However, they all indicated relative dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of performance counseling that they received from their immediate superiors. There was no regulation which required immediate superiors to counsel with their subordinate officers. Army Regulation 623-105, however, does encourage that performance counseling be a part of officer evaluation.

Recommendation 10. It was recommended that performance counseling be emphasized as an integral part of effective personnel management. Instruction in this field could be included in the curriculums of advanced officer courses.

ARMY WAY OF LIFE

There were significant differences in the levels of satisfaction maintained by all three categories of officers in this area of job satisfaction. Category I officers were the most satisfied, Category III officers were next, and Category II officers were the least satisfied.

This area of satisfaction was rated relatively low; mean scores of all three categories were low in comparison to the other eleven areas.
There was a direct relationship between the amounts of satisfaction that the three categories of officers obtained from this area of satisfaction and their decisions about whether or not they would remain on active duty.

Based upon the data, the following recommendations were made:

Recommendation 11. The Army should attempt to insure that its environment is more attractive to the officers, their wives, and their children. Family separations and reassignment which uproot families should be held to the minimum number possible. The rationale behind the requirements for reassignments should be explained to the members affected by the reassignment.

Recommendation 12. The Army might consider providing better family recreational and cultural facilities and opportunities. This could be done on a pay-for-use basis. Such facilities as craft shops and picnic and camping areas, and such events as art shows and dramatic presentations may be worthy of consideration.

WORK ITSELF

This area of job satisfaction was ranked the highest among the twelve areas by Category I and Category III officers.

There was a significant difference among the three categories of officers in the amounts of satisfaction they received from this area of job satisfaction. Category I officers held the highest level of satisfaction, Category III officers were next, and Category II officers had the lowest level of satisfaction in this area.
There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction that officers received from this area and their decisions about whether or not to remain on active duty.

**Recommendation 13.** Both the Army and its personnel would benefit from continued efforts to make work satisfying to young officers. It was recommended that young officers be made aware of the importance of their contributions.

**PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT**

There were significant differences in the levels of satisfaction obtained by the three categories of officers in this area of job satisfaction. Category I officers had the highest level of satisfaction, Category III officers were next, and Category II officers had the lowest level of satisfaction in this area.

There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction that officers demonstrated in this area of job satisfaction and their decisions to remain on active duty, or to leave active duty, or their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

**Recommendation 14.** The researcher recommended that the Army make company grade officers more aware of opportunities for civilian and military educational programs available to them if they qualified and remained on active duty.

**Recommendation 15.** It is recommended that a class on the subject of "normal career progression" be included in the curriculums
of officer basic and orientation courses. It appeared advantageous to make officers more aware of career patterns.

**Recommendation 16.** The Department of the Army may consider a more equitable distribution of authorized general officer spaces among the various branches of the Army. The fact that the Medical Service Corps had but one authorized general officer space had an adverse effect upon the officers who participated in this study.

**RECOGNITION**

There was a significant difference between the satisfaction held by Category I and Category II officers in this area. There was also a significant difference between the levels of satisfaction maintained by Category I and Category III officers in this area. However, there was no significant difference between the amounts of satisfaction shown by Category II and Category III officers.

There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction gained by officers in this area and their decisions to remain on active duty or to leave active duty.

**Recommendation 17.** It was recommended that the Army stress the needs for immediate superiors to recognize an officer's deserving performance of duty by extending to them oral and written commendations.

**Recommendation 18.** It was also recommended that the Army awards system be better utilized in an effort to recognize the outstanding performances of duty by young officers. Awards should be based on merit to the greatest extent possible. Rank or position should not determine the award of a medal except when regulations
specifically require that they do, such as in the case of the Distinguished Service Medal. Commendation Medals and Meritorious Service Medals should be awarded on the basis of merit.

ACHIEVEMENT

Category I and Category III officers ranked this area of satisfaction very high in comparison to the other twelve areas of job satisfaction. (See Table 2, page 40).

There were significant differences in the levels of satisfaction held by the three categories of officers in this area. Category I officers had the highest mean score in this area, followed by Category III, and Category II officers had the lowest mean score.

There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction that the three categories of officers held in this area and their decisions to remain on active duty, or to leave active duty, or their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

Achievement is certainly among the most important areas of job satisfaction. Herzberg (1966) placed achievement at the top of his list of satisfiers. McClelland (1969) believed that the need to achieve was the principal motivator of a job.

Recommendation 19. It was recommended that the Army continue to emphasize the importance of making company grade officers aware of their work achievements.
RESPONSIBILITY

There were significant differences among all three categories of officers in the levels of satisfaction that they maintained in this area of job satisfaction. Category I officers were the most satisfied. Category III officers were next, and Category II officers were the least satisfied.

There was a direct relationship between the amount of satisfaction held by officers in this area of satisfaction and their decisions to remain on active duty, or to leave active duty, or their uncertainty about remaining on active duty.

**Recommendation 20.** It was recommended that the responsibilities assigned to young officers be compatible with the amount of authority that they were given.

**Recommendation 21.** It was recommended that the responsibilities given to junior officers be within the boundaries of their assigned jobs to the greatest extent possible.

SUMMARY

Company grade officers of the United States Army Medical Service Corps were relatively satisfied with their jobs, as this study pointed out. However, there were shortcomings brought out in this study which seemed to the writer to require corrective action if the Army Medical Service Corps was to maintain its personal strengths in the face of the plan for an all volunteer force.
A definite link between job satisfaction and motivation was cited. This link was discussed in Chapter 2 of the dissertation. In general, it was deemed possible for company grade officers, and indeed all military personnel, to be motivated to do their jobs in even more effective and efficient ways. A knowledge of human needs was seen as essential, if the personnel managers of the Army were to accomplish their missions; that is, to get the job done better by utilizing the abilities and talents of other people. The writer considered all commissioned officers to be personnel managers.

In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, Herzberg's theory was discussed in some detail. As it was pointed out, Herzberg made a distinction between what he termed "satisfiers" and "dissatisfiers." Of the twelve areas of job satisfaction measured by this study, the following five fitted the classification of satisfiers: work itself, professional growth and development, recognition, achievement, and responsibility.

While no conclusions were drawn from the analysis of the rankings that the satisfiers received from the three categories of officers, it was interesting to note that two of the satisfiers, work itself and achievement, had the highest mean scores for Category I officers. The same two areas of job satisfaction were among the top three when ranked by mean scores for Category III officers. Work itself was ranked number five for Category II officers, and achievement was ranked number nine by that category of officers. (See Table 2, page 40)
While Army personnel managers must be concerned with all areas of job satisfaction, perhaps an accelerated interest in the areas of the job which lead to intrinsic rewards would be worthwhile.
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APPENDIX A

OPINIONNAIRE

This instrument is designed to provide you with the opportunity to express your opinions about your job and various areas related to your Army life. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly.

Fill in the spaces below. There is no space for your name. Please do not record your name. All responses are confidential and results will be reported by groups only.

PLEASE DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS

Your present rank ______________________________________________________.

Number of months on active duty ________________________________.

Your present primary duty ________________________________________.

Do you intend at this time to remain on active duty? ____________.

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you agree, probably agree, probably disagree, or disagree with each statement. Mark your answer in the following manner:

If you agree with the statement, circle "A". . . . A PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably agree with the statement, circle "PA". . . . . A PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably disagree with the statement, circle "PD" . . . . A PA PD D

If you disagree with the statement, circle "D" . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D
PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL STATEMENTS

1. I am reasonably satisfied with my income at the present time in that it provides me with a satisfactory standard of living. 

2. The Army does not provide me with a sufficient amount of job security.

3. I do not feel that regulations pertaining to grooming and personal appearance are too restrictive.

4. As an Army officer, I have a respected position in society.

5. My fellow officers are supportive and helpful.

6. I am satisfied with the amount and quality of performance counseling that I receive from my boss.

7. "Army life" provides too little by way of cultural opportunities.

8. My work load is not so great that it places an undue burden on me.

9. The Army does not provide satisfactorily for higher level assignments as an officer gains experience.

10. I do not get the recognition that I deserve from my work.

11. I do not get a sense of achievement from my work.

12. I am given an adequate amount of responsibility.

13. My military income is not as high as I would expect to be making in a civilian job.

14. If I were to remain in the Army, I would not worry much about being released through a reduction in force (RIF).

15. I find the Army rank and hierarchy system unsatisfactory.

16. An MSC officer is respected by branches of the Army outside the Army Medical Department.
17. Fellow officers of my organization take advantage of each other ................ A PA PD D

18. My boss is fair and impartial in dealing with me and other subordinates .................. A PA PD D

19. The Army provides a good environment in which to raise a family ....................... A PA PD D

20. My work load is sufficiently interesting to keep me active involved without its becoming a drag .... A PA PD D

21. I am satisfied with the opportunities available to me for advanced degree and/or post graduate work if I were to remain on active duty .................. A PA PD D

22. Comments that I receive make it obvious that my work accomplishment is recognized ................ A PA PD D

23. My work is sufficiently stimulating and challenging to give me a feeling of achievement when I complete a task or an assignment ................ A PA PD D

24. The Army provides for an adequate amount of increased responsibility as an officer grows and develops .................. A PA PD D

25. The military pay schedule provides for adequate pay increased for longevity and promotions ................ A PA PD D

26. The Army does not provide as much job security as most civilian organizations do .................. A PA PD D

27. I do not object to such courtesies as saluting and addressing superiors with, "Sir" .................. A PA PD D

28. An MSC officer is respected by other branches of the Army Medical Department ................ A PA PD D

29. I enjoy socializing with my fellow officers .................. A PA PD D

30. I am able to communicate freely with my boss .................. A PA PD D

31. I am favorably impressed with the opportunities for travel in foreign countries that overseas assignments provide ................ A PA PD D

32. I have not been adequately prepared for my job .................. A PA PD D

33. I am satisfied with the opportunities available to me within the Army for military education; that is, advanced officer course, MOS schools, Command and General Staff College, etc. .................. A PA PD D
34. I have not received the letters of commendation, appreciation, and recognition that I deserve .... A PA PD D

35. I do not feel that I can achieve as much in my Army job as I could if I were working for a civilian organization .... A PA PD D

36. The amount of responsibility that I am given is too much in relation to the authority that I have .... A PA PD D

37. Post housing or housing available to me at a cost equal to my quarter's allowance is satisfactory ... A PA PD D

38. I do not object to the fact that Regular Army officers have greater job security than Army Reserve officers have .... A PA PD D

39. Compared with other large organizations, the Army has too much administrative "red tape" .... A PA PD D

40. I do not receive the respect that I deserve from the members of my organization .... A PA PD D

41. I am favorably impressed with the quality of my fellow officers .... A PA PD D

42. My boss takes a sincere interest in me and in my work A PA PD D

43. The Army provides a way of life that an Army wife can enjoy .... A PA PD D

44. I get a great deal of satisfaction from my work ... A PA PD D

45. My job is not providing me with good training for higher level assignments .... A PA PD D

46. I do not get the "pats on the back" that I deserve for my work .... A PA PD D

47. The goals and objectives of my work are explicit enough to make me aware of my achievement .... A PA PD D

48. I am not given the amount of responsibility that an officer in my position should have .... A PA PD D

49. The military retirement system as it presently exists is satisfactory .... A PA PD D

50. The fact that a good number of officers have been involuntarily released from active duty after several years of active duty has very little or no effect upon my decision to remain in the service or to leave the service .... A PA PD D
51. Such systems as efficiency reporting systems, supply requisitioning systems, patient admissions and dispositions systems, and others are satisfactory as far as I am concerned . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

52. I take pride in wearing my uniform . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

53. My fellow officers have high personal standards . . A PA PD D

54. My boss helps me to feel that I am an important part of the organizational team . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

55. I am dissatisfied with the amount of moving that is required by reassignments . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

56. My work is important and worthwhile . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

57. The position that I could reasonably expect to attain in the Army would not be as high as what I would expect to attain with a civilian organization . . . . A PA PD D

58. The Army awards system does not provide me or other company grade officers with the awards we deserve . . A PA PD D

59. I work at times when I really would not have to, because I get so involved that I hate to quit . . . . A PA PD D

60. A person with my abilities would have more responsibility in a civilian job . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

61. Provisions for health care services for military personnel and their dependents are satisfactory . . A PA PD D

62. Since whether or not an officer is retained on active duty is dependent upon how well he performs, I agree with the Army's policy of forcing out those officers who "do not meet the standards for retention" . . . . A PA PD D

63. I do not object to such policies as mandatory attendance at certain social functions, monthly parades, weekly staff meetings, etc. . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

64. My rank does not afford me much status within the military community . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

65. Relationships among my fellow officers are superficial . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

66. I have a great deal of respect for my boss . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

67. I find the inevitability of unaccompanied tours unacceptable . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D
68. I usually feel good at the end of a day's work because I have a sense of accomplishment.  

69. The fact that the Medical Service Corps has but one authorized general officer has an adverse effect on me.  

70. I believe that I would receive more recognition from my work if I worked for a civilian organization.  

71. I could achieve more, but I do not feel that it really makes much difference whether I do or not.  

72. I am given responsibility for things that are really not within the boundaries of my job.
APPENDIX B

455 Highland Park Drive
Baton Rouge, LA  70808
2 March 1973

Dear Fellow MSC Officer,

In an effort to determine the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among the younger officers of our Medical Service Corps, I am surveying selected officers as part of the requirements for a Doctor of Education degree at Louisiana State University. I ask for your assistance in this study.

I stress the fact that your responses to the statements will be strictly confidential. All responses will be reported by groups only. Your name is not asked for and will not be used.

I do not need to tell you how important it is that I receive your responses to the statements on the opinionaire. Time is a critical factor, since I hope to complete the study by mid-June. Please complete the enclosed opinionaire and return it to me as soon as you can. I would appreciate it very much if you could get it back to me by the 30th of March. A self-addressed, franked envelope is enclosed.

I thank you in advance for your help in this effort.

Sincerely,

Lyle D. Stockmoe
Major, MSC
U. S. Army
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Dear Fellow Officer,

The enclosed opinionaire gives you an opportunity to express your thoughts about many facets of your job and your life in the Army. I urge you to complete the opinionaire and to return it to Major Stockmoe as soon as you can.

Of course your cooperation is essential to Major Stockmoe's completion of his research. More important, perhaps, is the fact that this research could offer some needed answers to all of us who are concerned about better personnel management.

You are one of one-thousand who have been randomly selected to participate. Your response and the responses of all other participants will be anonymous.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD WEBB III
Lieutenant Colonel, MSC
Chief, MSC Career Activities Office
Personnel and Training
Lyle Dennis Stockmoe was born in Hunter, North Dakota, on July 19, 1935. His parents were Joseph I. Stockmoe and Lucille Hull Stockmoe. He completed his elementary education at the Hunter Public School, and attended high school at Hunter High School and Page High School. He graduated from high school at Page, North Dakota, in 1953.

He was in the United States Army from April 1954, through March 1956. He attended college at Wahpeton State School of Science, Wahpeton, North Dakota, from September through November 1956. At that time, he transferred to Valley City State College at Valley City, North Dakota, and received his B.S. degree from that college in 1959.

He taught in the public schools at Lisbon, North Dakota, from 1959 through 1962. He did his graduate work for an M.Ed. degree at the University of North Dakota in 1962 and 1963, and received that degree in 1963.

He entered active military duty with the United States Army Medical Service Corps as a first lieutenant in January 1964. He served at Fort Polk, Louisiana, the Republic of Vietnam, and at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, between the years of 1964 and 1970.

In September 1970 he entered the Graduate School of Louisiana State University where he is presently a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education.
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