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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this investigation was to measure the attitude of Oklahoma State University (OSU) freshmen toward Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and related topics and then to compare the attitudes of randomly selected freshmen and the attitudes of students participating in ROTC in order to determine the relationships between attitude and participation.

An understanding of these attitudes is vitally important to the Army ROTC section of the Department of Military Studies. ROTC's effectiveness, and thereby its continued existence on OSU's campus, is conditioned by the attitudes of the students, administrators, and faculty.

This investigation keyed on student attitudes, which, regardless of influencing factors, ultimately are manifested in participation or non-participation in ROTC. Freshmen were selected as study subjects, because a decision to participate in ROTC normally must be made in the freshman or sophomore years. Limiting this study to freshmen accomplished three specific goals: (1) it measured the attitudes of students who were potential candidates for either the two-year program or the compressed four-year program (see Appendix B); (2) it provided a truer picture of the attitudes of freshmen who are the primary targets of ROTC recruiting efforts; and (3) it enabled this researcher to use particular methods of
data-gathering which insured a larger sample than available through other random methods.

Background

The purpose of the general ROTC program is to produce junior officers in the U.S. Army who are well-qualified in those military skills and subjects normally required by all junior officers regardless of branch (1). More detailed explanations of ROTC purpose, objectives, importance, and goals are included in Appendix A. A comprehensive description of Army ROTC is provided in Appendix B.

The underlying, primary purpose of this study was to provide information which would enable the Army ROTC detachment at OSU to increase the effectiveness of its student relations and recruiting programs. To do this the ROTC cadre must be able to communicate with the students. Effective communication requires an "understanding" of the needs, desires, and attitudes of students. Importance of understanding attitudes was well-stated by Shaw and Wright (2):

Attitudes, the end products of the socialization process, significantly influence man's responses to cultural products, to other persons, and to groups of persons. If the attitude of a person toward a given object, or class of objects, is known, it can be used in conjunction with situational and other dispositional variables to predict and explain reactions of the person to that class of objects. To the extent that principles governing the change of attitudes are known, they may be used to manipulate the individual's reaction to relevant objects (as is exemplified in psychotherapy, education, and propaganda) (p. 1).

Effective communication is the key to influencing responses and manipulating the individual's reaction to particular objects. For the ROTC cadre to create the most favorable impression of the ROTC program, it must be cognizant of student perceptions and attitudes concerning
ROTC. How the student perceives and interprets ROTC efforts to influence him is determined largely by his attitudes toward himself, toward the ROTC cadre, toward facilities of the university, and toward the ROTC program.

While a study of individual attitudes toward themselves is too complex for inclusion in this investigation, an examination of attitudes toward the ROTC cadre, facilities, and program was within the scope of this survey.

This study will assist the ROTC cadre to evaluate its audience—the persons for whom its recruiting message is intended. Students also are a public relations "public," a specific part of the community.

Knowing the audience or specific public is crucial in selling an idea or product. Textbooks in communications theory, public relations, advertising, and marketing, list audience evaluation as a fundamental principle. Berlo (3, p. 16) states: "Purpose and audience are not separable. All communication behavior has as its purpose the eliciting of a specific response from a specific person (or group of persons)."

Cutlip and Center (4, p. 6) also highly rate audience-knowledge. They say the first of three primary functions of the public relations practitioner is "to ascertain and evaluate public opinion as it relates to his organization. . . ." They (4, p. 25) further state that the highest level job in public relations is "the determination of need, definition of goals, and recommended steps in carrying out the project."

This principle also applies to advertising according to The Committee of Advertising (5):

The advertiser has begun to realize that in order to sell effectively, he must satisfy the needs and wants of the consumer—first, by understanding the nature of those needs and
wants, and second, by providing the products which will satisfy them (p. 71).

Virtually all marketing textbooks discuss consumerism, consumer problems, consumer behavior, consumer decision-making and buying motives, and targeting the ultimate consumer. Frey and Halterman (6, p. 133) assert that consumers "are without question the ultimate focal point of all marketing activity."

An analogy can be made between selling and persuasion. Both attempt to influence the target audience to make a particular decision.

A primary function of the ROTC section is to persuade students to enroll in military science courses and to participate in ROTC. A distinction is made between enrollment and participation because it is possible to enroll in a military science course without making any commitment to continue in the "program."

Recruiting has become the primary mission of the ROTC detachment. Efforts to recruit and retain cadets exceed all other activities, including instruction, in the demand upon the time and attention of the ROTC cadre (1).

Colonel Thomas L. Kelly (1), Professor of Military Science (PMS) at OSU, made the following estimate of percentage working time spent by cadre in each major functional area: recruiting, 35 percent; training, 35 percent; administrative tasks, 15 percent; counseling, 10 percent; retention, 4 percent; and other activities including safety, security, equal opportunity and drug abuse seminars, 1 percent.

Major Charles L. Littnan (7), Assistant PMS, estimates that each cadre member during the two weeks before the beginning of the fall semester spends 75 percent of his time in recruiting-related activity. In mid-semester, each individual devotes about 40 percent of his time to
recruitment and retention. Littnan pointed out that one officer is a full-time enrollment (recruitment) officer.

There are two major reasons for emphasis on recruiting. The first is the requirements of the Department of the Army concerning enrollment and commissioning quotas. Second is the substantial increased need for ROTC-trained junior officers in the Army within the next few years.

Army-wide regulations and policy set no quotas for Military Science (MS) I and MS II enrollment; however, each university or college which has a ROTC detachment must enroll at least 17 students in MS III and must graduate and commission a minimum of 15 second lieutenants each year. This requirement may seem small for a large university, but it often is difficult to reach these goals. If the university fails to maintain required ROTC enrollment, the school is placed on probation by the Department of the Army. After two years of declining enrollment, the ROTC detachment may be withdrawn.

Additionally, ROTC detachments are organized into ROTC regions; and regional headquarters establish enrollment goals for all classes including MS I and MS II. Regional quotas are based on an untested hypothesis that there must be a very high "front-end" enrollment in MS I and MS II to retain a sufficient number of MS III and MS IV students.

The Army ROTC enrollment figures (see Table I) illustrate the low percentage of university students who enroll in ROTC and the large attrition rate.

Although OSU meets the required minimums, the number of students commissioned has declined substantially (see Figure 1) since the elimination of the Selective Service System draft in 1973. The ROTC cadre must
TABLE I
ARMY ROTC ENROLLMENT AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY IN FALL, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Enrollment</th>
<th>ROTC</th>
<th>Percent in ROTC</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
<th>ROTC</th>
<th>Percent in ROTC</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>ROTC</th>
<th>Percent in ROTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>5,513</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>18,777</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>10,886</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>7,891</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include graduate and special students. Enrollment figures are for OSU main campus only.
spend a great percentage of its time recruiting to insure that OSU continues to maintain the numerical standard established by the Army.
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Figure 1. Number of Students Commissioned Through Army ROTC at OSU in the Past Six Years

As an example, 9 of the 39 MS III and MS IV students are participants in the two-year ROTC program (see Appendix B) and were recruited on-campus. Without these 9 students, OSU would not meet the required minimums for MS III students and potential commissioned officers. A major effort is expended by the ROTC cadre to identify potential MS III cadets and to persuade them to enter the two-year program.

Poor retention of cadets into the MS III program is due to many factors. One is that upon entry into the advanced program (MS III and MS IV) the student signs a contract which obligates him to serve in the Army Reserve or active Army. "The SROTC [senior ROTC] attrition study for SY 75-76 indicates that 34 percent of the ROTC cadet attrition is due to disinterest in the service or disinterest in ROTC" (8). Also,
many basic program cadets who might desire to continue in ROTC are ineligible for entry into the advanced program because of some physical disability or limitation, academic deficiency, personal problems, or personality characteristics not compatible with Army leadership expectations (7).

The headquarters of the Third ROTC Region, which includes OSU, has established retention goals for all detachments in the region. The OSU detachment has been directed to strive to enroll 1.4 percent of all eligible freshmen, to retain 45 percent of MS I students for MS II, to retain 65 percent of MS II students for MS III, and to retain 95 percent of MS III students for MS IV (9).

Paradoxically, the degree of commitment toward ROTC by students is inversely related to the size of the college or university. According to a study by Card and Shanner (10):

Size of college attended is significantly related to commitment with cadets from small schools (less than 3,000 students) having the highest commitment, followed by cadets from medium-sized schools (3,000-12,000 students), and finally by cadets from large schools (over 12,000 students) (p. 33).

The Third ROTC Region recognizes this relationship by establishing decreasing enrollment goals (in terms of percentage of freshman class) as the size of the school increases. Schools with less than 1,000 freshmen have a goal of 6.8 percent. Schools with more than 1,000 but less than 2,000 freshmen have a goal of 4.7 percent. Schools with more than 2,000 but less than 2,500 freshmen have a goal of 3.5 percent. Schools with more than 2,500 but less than 3,500 freshmen have a goal of 1.8 percent. Large schools including OSU with more than 3,500 freshmen have a goal of 1.4 percent.
While OSU's enrollment objectives are in the smallest percentage category, this reflects the particular problem of large universities concerning ROTC recruiting.

It was not the purpose of this study to determine why small schools attract a greater percentage of students in their ROTC program. Nevertheless, some of the factors such as the greater opportunities at a large university for social activities and leadership experience are expected to be reflected in the attitudes of OSU students.

Results of previous national surveys about the reasons cadets enter ROTC programs are discussed in Chapter III.

Another reason for emphasis on recruiting is the substantial increase of ROTC-trained Army junior officers needed within the next few years. This increase is to fill the major deficit of trained junior leaders in the Army Reserve.

Littnan (7) summarized the situation: "By 1981, the total Army ROTC production has to double. Now we're producing about 6,000 (commissioned officers each year). By 1981, the requirement will be about 10,500."

The national enrollment trend is slightly up but not rapidly enough. Many eastern schools whose ROTC detachments were almost destroyed during the Vietnam years are experiencing the greatest enrollment gains (7).

The original purpose of ROTC was to train leaders for the Reserves. Even today, ROTC is the main source of Reserve and National Guard officers as well as officers on active duty. Major General Charles C. Rogers (11), Deputy Chief of Staff for ROTC, remarked that "Through the foreseeable future only about 40 to 50 percent of our commissionees will be coming on active duty."
This situation means that the graduating student has several viable options of serving obligated time. Only Army ROTC-scholarship students are guaranteed service on active duty. Others who apply for active duty may get it; however, currently anyone who does not want active duty can be guaranteed by contract Active Duty for Training (ADT). An officer on ADT is released from active duty after a three-month initial training period.

The parent headquarters of all ROTC activities is the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). TRADOC supports the front-end loading theory. TRADOC (8) estimated that 34,500 freshman cadets were needed in the school year 1977-78 to commission 10,638 in 1982.

There is no scholarly information on the effectiveness of front-end loading. No one has attempted a large scale follow-through of four-year program cadets by name to check retainability (7). A large number of commissionees are graduates of the two-year program. As a matter of fact, the relative success of the two-year program has led some senior ROTC administrators to suggest that the four-year program be eliminated in favor of a greatly expanded two-year program (1). It is assumed that, as more students are exposed to ROTC training, the number who decide to stay in the program will increase. But there is no way, based on current data, to estimate a specific retention percentage.

There are some data to support the idea that most "motivated" cadets who stay for all four years, seek out ROTC, or at least they make their decision early in their ROTC experience.

In an informal survey of MS I students last year, 31 students responded to a question concerning "the likelihood of going through all
four years of ROTC and obtaining a commission as a second lieutenant" (12). The results are shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Likelihood of Obtaining a Commission](image)

In response to the question, "What is your primary reason for being in this class?", 22 students said they were seeking either more information about the military or a commission (12).

Littnan (7) said it is easy to select the "gung ho" ROTC cadets who are likely to stay in the program. He estimates that of 87 freshman cadets in core ROTC classes, 20 are definitely ROTC-oriented. At a time when ROTC curriculum is designed to appeal to a broad base of students, these "gung ho" cadets complain that they are not challenged enough. Curriculum is discussed in greater detail later in this section.

According to Littnan, the University of Alabama is held up as a model to other schools in the ROTC recruiting program of the Third ROTC Region. However, there are peculiar circumstances. At Alabama, many athletes are encouraged by the athletic director and football coach "Bear" Bryant to enroll in ROTC. As a result of the influence of these
opinion leaders, coaches, and athletes, many students enroll in the basic programs, but Alabama ROTC has a huge attrition rate.

Although it is desirable to enroll as many freshman students as possible, it is very possible that recruiting solely to pad front-end loading statistics is ineffective as the "point of diminishing returns" (the point at which continued effort fails to produce worthwhile results) is quickly reached. This possibility is at the heart of an evaluation of the ROTC recruiting effort. While this was not the focus of this study, it is hoped that results of this study are useful in determining the ultimate success of local recruiting efforts, including establishment of an optional curriculum and promotional activities.

As an example, efforts to recruit last year's high school seniors who had expressed an interest in attending OSU included "hundreds of phone calls, thousands of letters, invitations to visit the campus, and personal contact," and these efforts "just did not produce" (7).

In an effort to attract more students, the ROTC departments of many universities, including OSU, have developed an optional curriculum. The purpose of providing optional courses, which students can elect in lieu of the core courses, is to try to promote interest in the general ROTC program by showing that an orientation to the military can be fun and interesting. Optional courses include Adventures in Military History (which in the past consisted of instruction in the Army of the western frontier, oriental self-defense methods, and war gaming), Riflery and Archery, and Rappeling, Orienteering and Hunter Safety. There are no hard core data concerning the effectiveness of the optional courses; however, the instructors do not believe the courses are effective in recruiting the type of cadets who will enter the advanced program. Captain
Jim Fitter (13) admitted: "I don't know of any student who continued in ROTC as a direct result of his presence in my Orienteering, Rappelling, and Hunter Safety class." An outline of the Military Science curriculum is included as Appendix C.

Army ROTC has attempted to remove as many of the "inconveniences" of military science training as possible. MS I and MS II students are no longer required to wear a uniform to class except to a one-hour drill each week. Optional-course students who have no drill may take the first two years of ROTC training without wearing a uniform. Also, the infamous Army haircut policy applies only to MS III and MS IV cadets.

Seven recruiting brochures are available to OSU students. The major areas of emphasis in these brochures are listed in Table II. This table shows that the four most heavily emphasized areas are leadership and managerial training, explanation of obligatory service, scholarship opportunities, and the $100-per-month subsidy for MS III and MS IV cadets. A function of this study is to evaluate student perception of the importance of these emphasis areas.

Although the Army strongly emphasizes the financial benefits of ROTC (i.e., scholarships and subsistence allowance), a study (14) in 1977-78 of 198,641 freshmen representing 374 colleges and universities indicates the 33.9 percent have no concern about financing college and 49.4 percent have only some concern. Only 16.4 percent indicated a major concern. Of 19 sources of financial support listed in the study, only support from parents and family, minor withdrawals from savings, and part-time employment were selected by a substantial number of students. The other 16 sources were selected by only 1.5 to 32.7 percent of the students.
TABLE II

ROTC ADVERTISING EMPHASIS: A STUDY
OF SEVEN BROCHURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>( X ) Theme of Brochure*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Applicable to Civilian Use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Financial Value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Obligatory Service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 Per Month Allowance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Requirement of Time in School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Advantages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement/Other Financial Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One brochure was totally related to scholarships. Another was totally related to applicability of ROTC leadership and management training in civilian industry.

The success of the ROTC program concerns the university administration as well as the U.S. Army. Kelly (1) said the university administration has been very cooperative. He added, "Dr. Boger (Oklahoma State University president) often asks me why OSU students don't take ROTC, and he has promised his cooperation in any area short of direct promotion."

Kelly also stated that there is little or no anti-military or anti-ROTC hostility on this campus and that the university faculty accepts the ROTC instructor as an equal member of the university staff.
This acceptance as equals is so complete that in a sense it creates a minor problem for the ROTC. The ROTC cadre would like the academic counselors of the other departments to recommend Military Science courses to their advisees. Littnan (7) offers some speculation based on his conversations with instructors and advisers from other departments about why advisers are reluctant to recommend Military Science:

Most [instructors and advisers] consider ROTC like any other department so they don't want to show any favoritism toward ROTC over any other department. Instructors are not aware or sensitive to the great problems and needs of the Ready Reserve and National Guard, and they don't feel they have any reason to promote ROTC. We need to show them that ROTC is not competitive with other departments. We complement them.

The Army is not the only military service recruiting on the OSU campus. It is important to note that there is an Air Force ROTC department, and the Navy and Marine Corps recruit on campus for their special officer programs.

Representatives of the other services agree there is no overt antimilitary sentiment at OSU. Both the Navy and Marine recruiters (15) (16) state they have always been treated courteously at OSU. Both list the university as the best in Oklahoma for recruiting. Both representatives state that on each four-day recruiting trip they will talk seriously to about 30 students. Only about half these students take the qualification tests, and many fail the examination. The Marine Corps representative, Captain Harold Mashburn, Jr., reports that he will net about two qualified applicants per recruiting trip and he visits OSU about once a month. He estimates there are 21 students at OSU currently involved in the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders course. Captain Mashburn (16) made an interesting comment about the students who fail the aptitude or physical examinations: "The ones who are disqualified are the ones who want to
get in the most. They don't have as many opportunities as the 100 percent-qualified people. The competition is for the best people."

In the preceding discussion, the importance of this survey has been established. The background information gives the reader the necessary understanding of the functions, circumstances, and anxieties of the Army ROTC department at OSU. The major focal points of all ROTC cadre activities are recruitment and retention. To be effective, the ROTC cadre must understand its target audience. This study will provide information concerning student attitudes toward ROTC which hopefully will assist the ROTC cadre in accomplishing these goals.
CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Up to this point there has been a detailed discussion of the Army ROTC and its recruiting effort. With this background and an explanation of the importance of this study, the general nature and scope of this thesis are fairly apparent. However, in this section the specific problem to be studied is stated.

The apparent problem is "Do the attitudes of Oklahoma State University freshman students toward Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) affect participation in ROTC?" The answer to this question is obviously yes. The relationship is built into the question by the definition of "attitude." New York University researcher Fred N. Kerlinger (17, p. 495) defines attitude as "an organized predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a referent or cognitive object." Therefore, if an attitude is the predisposition or the inclination to perceive and behave toward an object (ROTC) in a particular manner, participation in ROTC is a direct result of behavior toward ROTC. Shaw and Wright (2) devote the first chapter of their book to an explanation of "the nature of attitudes." However, a detailed discussion is not necessary as the point has been adequately made. Attitude affects behavior, and participation is a form of behavior.

The problem is "How does the attitude of OSU freshmen toward ROTC affect participation in ROTC?" It has been established there is a
relationship between attitude and participation. This relationship can be tested as the variables can be measured.

The problem can be considered from a slightly different perspective. What specific attitudes significantly affect participation in ROTC?

Additionally, there are a number of other questions which should be addressed in this survey.

How influential are the efforts of the ROTC cadre in the student's decision to participate or not to participate in ROTC? The answer to this question should have a direct effect upon the recruiting program of the OSU Army ROTC department.

How does attitude of students toward the military in general affect their perception of ROTC?

What are non-participants' attitudes toward participants?

Do students have sufficient factual background to make an "intelligent" decision concerning ROTC participation?

Is there a "Vietnam backlash" affecting student attitude toward ROTC?

Are the students aware of the many occupational specialties available in the Army? Do they realize that the Army is more than infantry and the other combat arms?

How do students perceive leadership training in ROTC?

How do students perceive ROTC scholarship opportunities?

This study is intended to be an investigation of the attitudes of students toward ROTC and how these attitudes are manifested in ROTC participation.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A search for literature specifically related to a study of student attitudes toward ROTC revealed only two studies, both of which were conducted by or for professional research institutes. Both studies provided much interesting information but only a limited amount of information useful to the development of this survey.

A study by Card and Shanner (10) entitled "Development of a ROTC/Army Career Commitment Model" for the American Institute for Research (AIR) focused on determining the factors which affect one's commitment toward ROTC and toward the Army. The 1976 publication was the result of a two-year research project.

A research team from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI) conducted a study in 1974 on the "Attitudes of H.S. Seniors, College Students, and ROTC Cadets on Army ROTC" (18). The study was prepared for N. W. Ayer ABH International.

The AIR study (10, p. 1) sampled "representative cross-sections of individuals at different stages of the career commitment process . . . to simulate a longitudinal orientation." Data were collected from survey questionnaires filled out by nationwide samples of high school seniors, college students (ROTC and non-ROTC), and ROTC-graduate Army officers in their period of obligated Army service. The issues studied were: Who
joins ROTC? Why? Which members of ROTC remain on as career Army officers? Why?

The major accomplishment of this study was the development of a model which shows the factors affecting a person's decision to enroll in ROTC and to continue in ROTC. The model/diagram also indicates the interrelationships and direction of the factors involved in this ROTC/Army commitment process. The diagram is included as Appendix D of this study.

This model provides a wealth of information concerning the relative significance of certain attributes toward ROTC commitment. The findings of the AIR study (10) include such statements as:

An ROTC/Army career is most attractive to rural residents, and least attractive to suburban residents. Size of college attended is significantly related to commitment, with cadets from small schools (less than 3,000 students) having the highest commitment, followed by cadets from medium-sized schools (3,000-12,000 students) and finally by cadets from large schools (over 12,000 students) (p. 33).

Early exposure to a career path (fathers and other relatives with military service experiences) increases subsequent participation in and commitment to the career path (p. 57).

While this type of information provides some basis for targeting certain groups as potential audiences for ROTC recruiting messages, it illustrates the limited capability of the local ROTC detachment to manipulate these variables. They are attributes beyond the control of the ROTC staff. Students arrive at Oklahoma State University with these attributes "ready-made." Of all the factors included in the model, most are completely non-manipulable by the ROTC cadre; some can be in varying degrees influenced by ROTC; and only the "quality of the ROTC program" is directly controlled by the local detachment (in accordance with regional and national regulations and policies).
Since the demographic and sociological facts concerning each student are established by the time he becomes a part of the audience for local ROTC messages, this study sought to determine which, if any, psychological variables could be modified to produce a more favorable attitude toward ROTC. This certainly is not meant to suggest that psychological variables can be isolated from the total being of each individual; nevertheless, categorical relationships can be studied.

Data from the AIR study (10) were useful in the development of questionnaire items.

The major purposes of the VPI study (18, p. II-1) were to increase the efficiency of the recruiting program, to report on current attitudes toward careers and the military and Army ROTC, and to determine the characteristics of young people who were the potential cadets.

The VPI study, although entitled "Attitudes of H.S. Seniors, College Students, and ROTC Cadets on Army ROTC," was more a study of characteristics and sociological data than a study of attitudes. There are several sections of the survey instrument which do deal with attitudes and value judgments.

The major finding of this study in regard to attitude toward the military in 1974 was that there was substantial negative feelings toward participation in the military. This was demonstrated by responses to questions concerning obligation toward military service and rank orderings of various professions in accordance with desirability ratings.

The following table (Table III) from the VPI study (18, p. IV-28) shows the breakdown of responses of high school students to the question, "Which one of the statements best describes your current feelings about the armed services?"
TABLE III
OBLIGATION TO MILITARY SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that it is my duty to serve in the armed services.</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that I have the duty to serve if needed.</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will not serve even if called.</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I haven't given any thought to military service.</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV shows the rank ordering of professions by various groups in the VPI study (18, pp. III-12, IV-22, V-18).

Although an examination of the data in these two tables is alarming to someone involved in ROTC recruiting, there may be several modifying factors. First, the VPI study is four years old, and the changing socio-political situation is likely to result in a shift in attitudes and relative values. The large number of high school students who said they would not serve even if called may be prone to youthful overstatement; high school students, in general, are not known for a deep sense of obligation and responsibility. This statement is supported by comparing responses of high school students and college students in the VPI study (18, p. V-26). Only 10.9 percent of college men and 10.8 percent of college women said they would not serve if called. The low rating of the Army officers as a desirable occupation by every group except ROTC cadets may indicate that the military service is just not for everyone. Desirability and prestige are not the same. This is indicated by 89 percent of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cadets</th>
<th>Non-Cadets</th>
<th>Perception of Attitudes of Parents and Personal Contacts</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Army Officer</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scientist</td>
<td>Author/Artist</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business Manager</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Author/Artist</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engineer</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Author/Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lawyer</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Author/Artist</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Worker</td>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Craftsperson</td>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>Army Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Minister</td>
<td>Army Officer</td>
<td>Army Officer</td>
<td>Salesperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Salesperson</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV
DESIRABILITY OF VARIOUS OCCUPATIONS
the respondents saying that a strong military force must be maintained and by 72 percent who believe that military officers are competent and represent a high level of patriotism and professionalism.

The VPI survey gathered data from ten high schools, three community colleges, and eight universities. Although these schools represent all major regions of the United States except the Pacific Northwest, this study cannot be considered a national random sample.

There is little value in generalizing the conclusions of the VPI research team. The effects of time, lack of input from any schools within 500 miles of Oklahoma State University, and the possibility of extraneous variance limit the value of these data.

The list of questionnaire items included in the VPI study was extremely helpful in generating ideas developed in the survey of Oklahoma State University students.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This section describes the planned methodology of the study, including: (1) variables and their relationship, (2) hypothesis, (3) operational definitions of the variables, (4) methods of measurement, and (5) a descriptive account of how the study was conducted.

Variables and Their Relationship

To evaluate attitudes toward ROTC and the relationship between attitudes and participation, we must be able to place a numerical value on these concepts to measure them. We can measure the variables. Kerlinger (17, p. 29) defines a variable as "a symbol to which numerals or values are assigned." He gives a detailed explanation of the various types of variables: "The most important and useful way to categorize variables is as independent and dependent. . . . An independent variable is the presumed cause and the dependent variable is the presumed effect" (p. 35).

Kerlinger (17, p. 37) explains the importance of understanding independent and dependent variables. "Note that if one has a knowledge of independent variable measures and a relation . . . one can predict with considerable accuracy the dependent variable measures."

A major purpose of this study was to gain some power of prediction of how students perceive and react to various messages concerning ROTC.
If the ROTC cadre are aware of student attitudes and adjust recruiting and public relations messages in accordance with these attitudes, it is logical to assume these adjusted messages will be more effective than previous attempts to communicate. Communication is dependent upon the source of the message and the receiver having some shared knowledge or experience upon which the message is built. Also the message must appeal to some need or desire of the receiver if there is to be any motivation for the receiver to listen to or read the message.

In this study, the independent variables, the presumed causes, were the attitudes toward ROTC. The dependent variable, the presumed effect, was participation/non-participation in ROTC. It is recognized that this was not a pure relationship, one cause and one effect.

This study could be categorized as survey research. Kerlinger (17) says:

Survey research studies large and small populations (or universes) by selecting and studying samples chosen from the population to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (p. 410).

Survey research studies variables as they exist because "many important variables cannot be studied experimentally, because they are not manipulable" (17, p. 346). The variables are attribute variables which can be measured rather than active variables which can be actively manipulated. Kerlinger (17) gives some examples of attribute variables:

... it is impossible or at least difficult to manipulate many variables. All variables that are human characteristics --intelligence, aptitude, sex, socio-economic status, field dependence, education, need for achievement, and attitudes, for example--are attribute variables (attributes) ready-made. They are, so to speak, already manipulated (p. 38).

Since there is little or nothing one can do to change attributes or sociological facts, this study attempted to determine which psychological
variables, which may be manipulable in certain circumstances, affected attitudes toward ROTC and participation in ROTC.

Hypothesis

As previously mentioned, a major purpose of this study was to gain some power of prediction of how students perceived and reacted to various messages concerning ROTC. The assumption was that a favorable reaction toward ROTC messages and a favorable attitude toward ROTC would be manifested in support for the ROTC program and ultimately in ROTC participation.

The hypothesis of this study was that there is a direct, positive relationship between attitude toward ROTC and participation in ROTC. The more favorable the attitude, the more likely that person would participate.

Several assumptions are related to this hypothesis. One was that students enrolled in ROTC would have more highly favorable attitudes toward ROTC than non-participants. MS III and MS IV cadets, who were participants in the advanced course, would have highly favorable attitudes; their anticipated reward for participation was great enough to cause them to perceive their period of obligated military service as worthwhile.

There is little or no hostility toward the military on the OSU campus. This assumption is supported by the opinions and experiences of the ROTC cadre and recruiters from the other services. "We are generally well-received when recruiting," said Major Charles Littnan (7), Assistant Professor of Military Science (APMS) at OSU. Colonel Thomas Kelly (1), OSU PMS, Dave Punneo (15), recruiter for Naval officer program, and
Captain Harold Mashburn, Jr. (16), recruiter for Marine Corps officer programs, stated they had never had a hostile encounter with an OSU student.

On the other hand, there were no indicators of widespread student support of ROTC. It appeared that ROTC was tolerated but not supported and that students were extremely apathetic toward ROTC.

**Operational Definitions**

Definitions of independent and dependent variables, survey research, and attributes were discussed in the section of this chapter concerning variables and their relationship.

This study did not have a classical independent/dependent variables situation. That is, it dealt with non-manipulative attributes. Various presumed causes were not controlled. Attributes, as they existed, were studied. According to Kerlinger (17):

... survey research focuses on people. ...

The social scientific nature of survey research is revealed by the nature of its variables; which can be classified as sociological facts and opinions and attitudes. Sociological facts are attributes of individuals that spring from their membership in social groups: sex, income, political and religious affiliation, socio-economic status, education, age, living expenses, occupation, race, and so on.

The second type of variable is psychological and includes opinions and attitudes, on the one hand, and behavior, on the other. ... The sociological variables are then related in some manner to the psychological variables (p. 411).

Survey research is probably best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes (p. 422).

In this context this study dealt with sociological facts affecting psychological variables and psychological variables affecting behavior. So on one hand, sociological facts were the presumed cause of attitudes and attitudes were the presumed cause of behavior (or participation in ROTC).
This study had two primary variables: attitudes and participation in ROTC. Kerlinger (17, p. 495) defines an attitude as "an organized predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a referent or cognitive object."

The writer wanted to know what and how the freshman students felt about ROTC and how they perceived messages about ROTC. This knowledge could enhance understanding how the students are predisposed to behave toward ROTC and to predict how the students would react to various messages.

Army ROTC is a program which provides college-trained officers for the U.S. Army, Army National Guard, and the U.S. Army Reserve. The ROTC course of instruction includes leadership and management training and a basic military orientation. A more complete description of ROTC is provided in Appendix B.

Participation in ROTC is determined by enrollment in a military science course and is characterized by the student's intention to receive a basic military orientation. The student's intention is an important determinant of participation because it is possible for a student who has negative feelings toward the military and ROTC to enroll in a "fun in the sun" course of "adventure training" (such as Orienteering, Rappelling, and Hunter Safety) offered by the Department of Military Science.

The primary subjects of this study were students characterized as first semester freshmen. These were students who had earned less than 12 semester-hours of academic credit. Freshmen include both male and female students.
Shaw and Wright (2) explain measurement of attitudes:

When we attempt to measure attitudes, we assign numerals to persons according to a set of rules that are intended to create an isomorphism between the assigned numeral and the person's attitude toward the object in question. Since an attitude is a hypothetical, or latent, variable rather than an immediately observable variable, attitude measurement consists of the assessment of an individual's responses to a set of situations. The set of situations is usually a set of statements (items) about the attitude object to which the individual responds with a set of specified response categories, e.g., 'agree' and 'disagree.' The value assigned to an individual's response to a given item is called an item score, and the number derived from his item score represents his position on the latent attitude variable (p. 15).

In short, the typical attitude scale measures the acceptance of evaluative statements about the attitude object. . . . It is doubtful that complex social behavior can be predicted without a knowledge of attitude. To study attitude requires that they be measured (p. 14).

To measure the OSU freshman students' attitudes toward ROTC, we used a seven-point Likert-type scale. Kerlinger (17) describes a Likert scale as:

... a set of attitude items, all of which are considered of approximately equal 'attitude value,' and to each of which subjects respond with degrees of agreement or disagreement (intensity). The scores of the items of such a scale are summed, or summed and averaged, to yield an individual's attitude score. As in all attitude scales, the purpose of the summated rating scale is to place an individual somewhere on an agreement continuum of the attitude in question (p. 496).

The survey subjects were asked to mark the appropriate place which represents their attitude along the seven-point agreement continuum. An example of a scale item is:

ROTC cadets are more patriotic than students in general.

Strongly Agree

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Strongly Disagree
The respondents were told to mark the No. 4 position if they were undecided.

The numerals under scale positions, as shown above, were not included on the student survey, to avoid any response bias which could result from disclosure of the scoring system.

To guard against response set, that is, marking the same position on all items or answering for reasons other than the content of the item, and to avoid a sense of acquiescence, and to avoid responding as deemed socially desirable, some items were worded favorably toward ROTC and some were worded unfavorably toward ROTC.

However, the highest scale value was always given to the response choice indicative of the most favorable attitude. The most favorable, specific response—strongly agree or strongly disagree—depended upon whether the item was worded positively or negatively.

In selecting items for inclusion in a scale, two criteria, as explained by Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (19), are commonly used:

First, the items must elicit responses which are psychologically related to the attitude being measured. . . . A second criterion requires that the items differentiate among the people who are at different points along the dimension being measured (pp. 186-87).

The items were checked for internal consistency. Originally it was planned to eliminate items that did not discriminate, as suggested by Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (19):

Items which fail to show a substantial correlation with the total score, or which show little discriminatory power in relation to high or low scores are eliminated to ensure that the questionnaire is 'internally consistent'—that is, that every item is related to the same general attitude (p. 196).

However, since the survey reliability was very high, it was not necessary to readminister the survey and to throw out the non-discriminatory items.
these two different groups, the adequacy, validity and discriminatory power of items were tested. It also laid the groundwork for establishing scale reliability.

There were several considerations in development of survey items. Items must be within the framework of the respondents' experiences to enable informed response. The item must not suggest a particular response. It must be written clearly without being too general or specific. The item should not be objectionable or offensive (20, pp. 423-62).

Items should be easily understood, simply-worded, not vague, unbiased, and provide useful information. Double-barrel items, which suggest more than one idea, should be avoided (21, p. 137). Also to be avoided are items so worded that everyone would respond the same or items which depend on knowledge of little known facts (22, p. 10). Items should progress in a logical sequence. Simply stated, avoid opinion items which are factual, irrelevant to the attitude object, or non-discriminatory.

On the basis of results obtained from the criterion of internal consistency, the most differentiating statements were to be selected for the final form of the opinionnaire. According to Murphy and Likert (23, p. 288), the criterion of internal consistency is much easier to use and yields essentially the same results. However, as noted, it was not necessary to readminister the survey.

Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (19) believe that use of a Likert-type scale also offered several advantages over other types of attitude scales, primarily the Thurstone-type scale:

First, it permits the use of items which are not manifestly related to the attitude being studied. In the Thurstone method, the necessity of agreement among judges tends to
Although there was no reason to assume the scale had established equal intervals between points on the continuum, the scale can be treated as an ordinal scale. It still was possible to make many useful comparisons.

Even though every effort was made to maintain simplicity in this survey, to maximize its usefulness to persons who have not had any formal research training, Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (19, p. 193) assert that "the precise measurement of attitudes is perhaps inevitably a complex affair."

Data-Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure was to be conducted in the following steps: (1) assemble a large number of relevant items; (2) administer this survey to two test groups; (3) check items for discriminatory power and internal consistency; (4) readminister the survey instrument; and (5) analyze the data collected.

The first step was conducted through a careful review of the literature available on related subjects, discussion with subject matter experts in military science instruction and behavioral research (i.e., ROTC cadre and my faculty advisers), discussion with selected students, and the author's personal experiences and ideas.

The initial items were tested by administering them to two test groups. One group comprised 64 ROTC cadets and the other group comprised 60, randomly selected, freshman English Composition students. It was believed that these two groups had different attitudes toward ROTC. The cadets should have extremely favorable attitudes while the other students should be more negative toward ROTC and military conformity. By using
limit items to content which obviously related to the attitude in question. Second, it is simpler to construct. Third, it is likely to be more reliable than a Thurstone-type scale of the same number of items. Within limits, the reliability of a scale increases as the number of possible alternative responses is increased; the Likert-type scale permits the expression of several (usually five) degrees of agreement-disagreement, whereas the Thurstone scale allows only a choice between two alternative responses ('Agree' and 'Do not agree'). Fourth, the range of responses permitted to an item in a Likert-type questionnaire provides, in effect, more precise information about the individual's opinion on the issue covered by the single item (p. 196).

The Likert scale requires a response to each item. The responses to particular items may be almost as important as the general, overall conclusions of the survey to future users of the information. The Likert scale also provides a measure of the intensity of the attitude as the respondent indicates how strongly he agrees or disagrees. Also Guilford (24, p. 460) points out: "It is a quite common finding that the Likert method leads to scores with higher reliabilities with fewer items than does the Thurstone method."

Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (19) state that the main disadvantages of the Likert-type scale are:

... many patterns of response to the various items may produce the same score ... a Likert scale does not permit any assertions about equality of differences (the difference between scores of 20 and 25 is not equal to the difference between scores of 5 and of 10) (p. 197).

The disadvantages were not critical to purposes of this survey. The multi-pattern problem was minimized by the scrutiny each item received individually.

This study was not intended to be the final, authoritative study of student attitudes toward ROTC. The purpose was to evaluate the attitudes of a specific public on one university campus. This was a heuristic study. Further studies can attempt experimental methods to test the
effectiveness of various messages. Experimental methods were not used in this research because of lack of resources and authority to manipulate schedules of students in order to manipulate variables experimentally.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS

The principal effort of the analysis compared responses of ROTC participants and non-participants to determine how attitudes affect participation and what specific items were most influential.

Internal consistency of the items used was very high. Using a split-half method of checking reliability, the correlation coefficient between the odd and even responses was .89787 with a shared variation of almost 81 percent. The reliability was computed using only the scalable items. Of the 87 items in the survey, 34 were considered unscalable. Most of the unscalable items were included in the survey because the data provide specific information useful to the Military Science Department. Some of the items were originally thought to be scalable and were determined to be unscalable in subsequent consideration after the survey was administered.

Twenty-six items were related to attitudes toward the military services, and 27 items were related to the attitudes toward ROTC. A complete list of the items broken down into several categories (favorable to military, unfavorable to military, favorable to ROTC, unfavorable to ROTC, and unscalable) is included in Appendix E.

Data collected included a breakdown of responses by raw numbers and percentages at each point along the continuum of each statement. Although
these data permit an extensively detailed analysis and may provide additional information for future researchers, analysis of these data for each of the 87 items was much too complex for purposes of this study. These data are available in the Oklahoma State University Military Science Department.

Basis of comparison of the variables were mean scores and the standard deviations. The seven-point scale used in the survey is explained in Chapter IV. Basically, a mean of 7 is the most favorable toward ROTC; 1 is the most unfavorable; and 4 indicates no opinion.

The mean for the ROTC group was 5.08 on a 7-point scale. This means that the group mean falls within the "slightly agree" category for all items favorable to the military and ROTC. The non-ROTC responses averaged 3.99 which means that as a group the non-ROTC respondents were "undecided" or they neither agreed nor disagreed. The difference between the group means is only 1.09.

The reason for using a 7-point scale instead of a 5-point scale was to gain more variation in attitude scores. However, even on a 7-point scale the difference between groups is only 1.09. Nevertheless, statistical tests indicate the difference in attitude on 48 of the 53 scalable items was statistically significant. That is, these differences would occur by chance less than five times in 100. On 39 items the difference in attitude would occur by chance less than one time in 1000.

The largest standard deviations for any item were 1.86 for the ROTC group and 1.84 for the non-ROTC group, and most items had a much lower standard deviation.

On only 3 items was there a two-point or greater difference between groups.
The 3 items with a major (2-point) difference between groups means dealt with participation in ROTC or the investment of time in ROTC. The non-participants (in ROTC) were much less in favor of talking to a military sciences instructor about ROTC (3.80 to 5.94), participating in ROTC (3.79 to 6.37), and receiving an ROTC scholarship (3.79 to 6.03). The chances of differences this great occurring by chance are less than one in 1000.

The ROTC group means were more positive on the scale for all but one item.

The one item on which the non-ROTC group indicated a more pro-military attitude than the ROTC group concerned the success of the military in the Vietnam conflict. The non-ROTC students were more supportive of the statement, "The military successfully accomplished its mission in the Vietnam conflict" (3.32 to 2.31). A difference this great would occur by chance less than one time in 1000. However, the mean scores indicate that both groups disagreed (slightly to strongly) with this statement.

Twenty-seven items were included to determine the respondents' attitudes toward factors relating to military life. Previous studies indicated that attitudes toward the military affected attitudes toward ROTC. It was determined to test this relationship on the OSU campus.

A 2 x 3 factorial analysis of variance was used to determine this relationship. The mean attitude for all 27 military items was recorded for each ROTC and non-ROTC respondent. The one-third of respondents whose military means were most favorable toward the military formed the high group. The second highest one-third formed the moderate group, and the lowest one-third formed the low group. The resulting paradigm is Table V.
TABLE V
FAVORABILITY TOWARD MILITARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ROTC</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in the paradigm cells represent the mean attitude toward the ROTC items.

The ROTC group with a mean of 5.48 was significantly more favorable toward ROTC than the non-ROTC group with a mean of 4.22. The F-ratio of 162.5292 greatly exceeds the critical value of 6.84 at the .01 level of confidence (p < .01). This means that the observed mean difference between the two groups' attitudes toward ROTC would occur by chance less than one time in a hundred.

The ROTC participants in all categories of favorability toward the military were more favorable toward ROTC than the non-participants. As a matter of fact, the ROTC respondents in the low military group were more favorable to ROTC than the non-ROTC respondents in the high military group. Therefore, there was no interaction between the relative position on military items and ROTC participation or non-participation.

The eta correlation of .7645 indicated that the relationship between participation in ROTC and favorability toward ROTC was a high-marked
relation. The square of eta showed the commonality of variance between the independent (participation) and dependent (favorability toward ROTC) variables was .5814. This means that more than 58 percent of the variation in scores was accounted for by participation group.

The relationship between relative positions of favorability toward the military and mean attitudes toward ROTC was statistically significant. The F-ratio of 30.8731 greatly exceeds the critical value of 4.78 at the .01 level of confidence (p < .01). The observed mean differences between the military favorability groups would occur by chance less than one time in 100.

The paradigm (Table V) shows a direct relationship between favorability toward the military and favorability toward ROTC. The high military favorability group was most favorable to ROTC. The moderate group's mean attitude toward ROTC was less than the high group but greater than the low group. This relationship held true in each participation group as well as overall means.

The eta correlation was .5877. More than 34 percent of the variation in mean scores was accounted for by relative favorability toward the military.

Therefore, the previous studies which indicated a relationship between attitudes toward the military and ROTC were supported by this study.

Table VI shows the pertinent statistical data on ROTC items. The items are listed in rank order of difference between the means of the ROTC and non-ROTC groups. The difference in the means of the groups was statistically significant for all but one item. The scale values were reversed for all items worded unfavorably toward ROTC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Mean of ROTC Participants</th>
<th>Mean of Non-ROTC Participants</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rank Order by Difference</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability of Chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>No way will participate in ROTC</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Would like ROTC scholarship</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Would talk to ROTC staff</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enjoy adventure training</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Want no identification with ROTC</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21*</td>
<td>Too much an individual</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60*</td>
<td>Friends think ROTC crazy</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73*</td>
<td>Rather be in other activities</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>ROTC ban from campus</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ROTC worthwhile</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ROTC important to nation</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ROTC training useful in civilian job</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26*</td>
<td>ROTC not worth time</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Help communicate skills</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Orientation requirement</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Conform to grooming standards</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey No.</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Mean of ROTC Participants</td>
<td>Mean of Non-ROTC Participants</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Rank Order by Difference</td>
<td>t-Ratio</td>
<td>Probability of Chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Help leadership skills</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Help evaluate management of others</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Help solve problems logically</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Help make sound decisions</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Help develop self-discipline</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Alternative to draft</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Help establish goals</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Respect cadets</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positive contribution to campus</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62*</td>
<td>ROTC requires conformity</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Favorable image</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item negative toward ROTC; scale values were reversed.
The one non-significant item concerned agreement on ROTC maintaining a favorable image on campus. Both groups were basically undecided (ROTC mean 4.72; non-ROTC mean 4.35) but leaning toward slightly agree. The difference (.37) could occur by chance 20 times in 100.

As previously mentioned, the items with the greatest difference in means dealt with willingness to invest time in ROTC. The non-participants did not want to participate in ROTC (3.79), talk to a military science instructor about ROTC (3.80), or receive an ROTC scholarship (3.79).

Although the non-ROTC group was relatively favorable toward participation in ROTC "adventure training" (4.46), the difference between the two groups was still great because the ROTC people were very favorable (6.14, strongly agree).

The next grouping of items dealt with identification and participation in ROTC. The two groups disagree about being identified with ROTC (ROTC 5.95, non-ROTC 4.33, difference 1.62), about ROTC taking away their individualism (ROTC 5.55, non-ROTC 3.95, difference 1.60), and friends believing ROTC participation is crazy (ROTC 5.11, non-ROTC 3.63, difference 1.48).

There was relatively little difference between the groups on items concerning the ROTC cadet image. The item about a favorable image on campus was mentioned before. Both groups were undecided about requirements for conformity in ROTC (ROTC 4.22, non-ROTC 3.76, difference 0.66). Both were undecided to slightly agree about ROTC making a positive contribution to the campus (ROTC 5.14, non-ROTC 4.42, difference 0.72) and about respecting cadets for their participation in ROTC (ROTC 5.33, non-ROTC 4.52, difference 0.81).
It is important to note the consistency of the responses. The ROTC respondents slightly or strongly agreed on all but one ROTC item. The non-ROTC students were consistently undecided (between slightly agree and slightly disagree) on all but one item. The non-participants did not display any strong tendencies in either direction.

Table VII shows the response data for the military items. Again the items are listed in rank order of difference between the means of the ROTC and non-ROTC groups. The difference in means was statistically significant for all but four items. The scale values were reversed for the items unfavorable toward the military.

Although both groups agree military forces are essential to national security, the difference in means was greatest for this item because the ROTC people more strongly agreed with this item than any other in the survey (ROTC, 6.67; non-ROTC, 5.00; difference, 1.67).

As could be expected, they had different perspectives about military service disrupting career goals (ROTC, 5.20; non-ROTC, 3.55; difference, 1.65) and about military careerists as warmongers (ROTC, 5.55; non-ROTC, 4.21; difference, 1.34).

They also differed about the responsibility of all persons to serve if drafted and about the military as a challenging career. The ROTC participants strongly agreed (5.94 and 6.09, respectively) with both statements, and the non-ROTC group tended to slightly agree (4.64 and 4.79, respectively).

It appeared to be a paradox that both groups were more positive about military officers being able to succeed in a civilian job (ROTC, 5.56; non-ROTC, 4.41) than they were about officers being competent in their military duties (ROTC, 4.83; non-ROTC, 4.34).
### TABLE VII
STATISTICAL DATA OF MILITARY ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Mean of ROTC Participants</th>
<th>Mean of Non-ROTC Participants</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rank Order of Difference</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>Probability of Chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Essential to national security</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>Disrupt career goals</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>Warmongers</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responsibility of all</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Challenging career</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Skills useful in civilian job</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Officers could be successful in civilian job</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Officer important to nation</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Prestigious career</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75*</td>
<td>Officers too rigid</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Opportunities for minorities</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Successful in Vietnam</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86*</td>
<td>Military conduct in Vietnam encouraged protest</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47*</td>
<td>Officers with warped values</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59*</td>
<td>Too little money</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey No.</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Mean of ROTC Participants</td>
<td>Mean of Non-ROTC Participants</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Rank Order by Difference</td>
<td>t-Ratio</td>
<td>Probability of Chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77*</td>
<td>Job location important</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Military more ethical</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72*</td>
<td>More opportunity in civilian job</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Greater financial security</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Few redeeming qualities</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>&lt;0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Officers competent</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Disrupts family life</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>&lt;0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>Geographic stability important</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>&gt;0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>Preoccupied with irrelevant details</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&gt;0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44*</td>
<td>Unfavorable to military in Vietnam</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>&gt;0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The differences in means were so small on four items that they could occur by chance 20 or more times in a 100. These items concerned the military disrupting family life (ROTC, 4.33; non-ROTC, 3.95; difference, 0.38), the importance of geographic stability (ROTC, 4.13; non-ROTC, 3.77; difference, 0.36), the military being preoccupied with irrelevant details (ROTC, 4.23; non-ROTC, 3.95, difference, 0.28), and whether the respondent had an unfavorable view of military conduct in Vietnam (ROTC, 4.22; non-ROTC, 4.00; difference, 0.22).

Again the non-ROTC group was very consistently undecided. All non-ROTC means were between 3.06 and 5.00, inclusive.

The ROTC respondents were less consistent on the military items than on the ROTC items. The ROTC means ranged from 2.31 to 6.67.

Since responses to unscaleable items could not be assigned scale values, the raw numbers of respondents who agreed, were undecided, and who disagreed were counted.

Table VIII lists the items with the number of respondents who agreed with the unscaleable statements. The items are in rank order from greatest to least difference. The t-ratio for the ROTC and non-ROTC respondents who agreed with these items was 7.72. The observed difference in the two groups would occur by chance less than one time in a thousand.

The greatest difference in agreements (33) concerned whether an introductory military science course would benefit most students. A very large number of ROTC respondents (52) agreed.

Although there was a large difference (32), both groups (ROTC, 59; non-ROTC, 27) believed they had sufficient contact with ROTC to form reasonable opinions about ROTC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>ROTC Respondents</th>
<th>Non-ROTC Respondents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>MILSC good for all</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ROTC opinions reasonable</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Be in ROTC if had time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Consider ROTC if more money</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Need to know more about ROTC</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Appreciation through contact</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Military attitude affects ROTC attitude</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Patriotism important</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Attitude affected by previous contact</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Parents happy about ROTC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>More responsibility in Army</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ROTC orientation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Specialized training for officers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>More sacrifices in military</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bad aspects in military in civilian jobs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Want to be a leader</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>ROTC ok, but not for me</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Variety in job important</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Guarantee of job</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>No desire for commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>No idea about ROTC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MILSC no sense without commission</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ROTC cadets more patriotic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want manager position</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Don't want uniform</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Leadership in civilian jobs too</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Too male-oriented</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parents strong influence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Maybe ROTC, if in other building</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ROTC women masculine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>ROTC--no time for other activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>ROTC and military obligation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Friends strong influence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>ROTC just another activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neither more available time nor more money would be a particularly persuasive incentive for the non-ROTC respondents to participate in ROTC. Only 16 and 18, respectively, of the non-ROTC students indicated they would more seriously consider ROTC in return.

There was no difference in the number of ROTC and non-ROTC respondents who agreed that friends were a strong influence on their decisions (ROTC, 18; non-ROTC, 18) or that ROTC was just another campus activity (ROTC, 8; non-ROTC, 8).

There was little difference in the number of people in each group who felt that a military obligation made ROTC undesirable (ROTC, 19; non-ROTC, 18; difference, 1).

More than half of the non-ROTC respondents agreed that patriotism is an important characteristic (35), the Army offers specialized training for officers (34), a military career involves more sacrifices than a civilian career (33), they want to be a leader (38), variety in job assignments is important (39), guarantee of a job after graduation is important (39), and they do not want to wear a uniform (31).

Table IX lists the items with the number of respondents who were undecided on the unscaleable statements. The items are in rank order from greatest to least difference. The t-ratio for the ROTC and non-ROTC respondents who were undecided on these items was 16.33. The observed difference in the two groups would occur by chance less than one time in a hundred.

The item with the greatest difference in "undecideds" and with more than 50 percent of the non-ROTC respondents undecided concerned whether junior Army officers are entrusted with more responsibility than most junior executives (ROTC, 8; non-ROTC, 32; difference, 24).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>ROTC Respondents</th>
<th>Non-ROTC Respondents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>MILSC good for all</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ROTC opinions reasonable</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Be in ROTC if had time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Consider ROTC if more money</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Need to know more about ROTC</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Appreciation through contact</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Military attitude affects ROTC</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Patriotism important</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Attitude affected by previous contact</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Parents happy about ROTC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>More responsibility in Army</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ROTC orientation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Specialized training for officers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>More sacrifices in military</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bad aspects in military in civilian jobs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Want to be a leader</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>ROTC ok, but not for me</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Variety in job important</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Guarantee of job</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>No desire for commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>No idea about ROTC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MILSC no sense without commission</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ROTC cadets more patriotic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want manager position</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Don't want uniform</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Leadership in civilian jobs too</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Too male-oriented</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parents strong influence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Maybe ROTC, if in other building</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ROTC women masculine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>ROTC--no time for other activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>ROTC and military obligation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Friends strong influence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>ROTC just another activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other items with major differences were ROTC cadets have no time for other activities (ROTC, 4; non-ROTC, 26; difference, 22), a military obligation makes ROTC undesirable (ROTC, 5; non-ROTC, 27; difference, 22), no desire for a commission (ROTC, 4; non-ROTC; 24; difference, 20), and an introductory MILSC course would benefit most students (ROTC, 6; non-ROTC, 26; difference, 20).

The least difference between groups was recorded for three items. Several respondents were not sure how strong their parents' influence over them was (ROTC, 8; non-ROTC, 13; difference, 5). Some could not decide if ROTC cadets were more patriotic than the average student. A few were also unsure about the importance of variety in job assignments (ROTC, 6; non-ROTC, 11; difference, 5).

Table X lists the items with the number of respondents who disagreed with the unscaleable statements. The items are in rank order from greatest to least difference. The t-ratio for the ROTC and non-ROTC respondents who disagreed on these items was 3.958. The observed difference in the two groups would occur by chance less than one time in a hundred.

The greatest difference between the two groups was on the statement, "I have no desire to receive a military commission" (ROTC, 58; non-ROTC, 15; difference, 43).

As expected, many ROTC respondents disagreed with statements about ROTC OK but not for me (ROTC, 49; non-ROTC, 11; difference, 38), no idea about ROTC (ROTC, 52; non-ROTC, 15; difference, 37), and a military obligation makes ROTC undesirable (ROTC, 40; non-ROTC, 9; difference, 31).

There was no difference between groups concerning whether attitude toward ROTC was affected by previous contact with military officers (ROTC, 12; non-ROTC, 12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>ROTC Respondents</th>
<th>Non-ROTC Respondents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>No desire for a commission</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>ROTC ok, but not for me</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>No idea about ROTC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>ROTC and military obligation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Maybe ROTC, if in other building</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MILSC no sense without commission</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Don't want uniform</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>ROTC--no time for other activities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Friends strong influence</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>ROTC just another activity</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ROTC women masculine</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>ROTC too male-oriented</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Leadership in civilian jobs too</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ROTC cadets more patriotic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Be in ROTC if had time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bad aspects of military in civilian jobs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Consider ROTC if more money</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ROTC orientation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ROTC opinions reasonable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Need to know more about ROTC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>More sacrifices in military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>More responsibility in Army</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parents strong influence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Want manager position</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Parents happy about ROTC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Military attitude affects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Patriotism important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Variety in jobs important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Appreciation through contact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Specialized training for officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>MILSC good for all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Want to be a leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Guarantee of job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Attitude affected by previous contact</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Few students in both groups disagreed with statements, "I want to be a leader" (ROTC, 2; non-ROTC, 3; difference, 1), and "It is important to me to have a job guaranteed after graduation" (ROTC, 5; non-ROTC, 6; difference, 1).

No ROTC students and only three non-ROTC students disagreed with the item about the Army offering specialized training for officers.

Few students disagreed with the importance of variety in job assignments (ROTC, 1; non-ROTC, 5; difference, 4).

To understand the study sample and to compare the demographic categories into which most participants and non-participants fell, an analysis was made of each demographic item comparing the participant and non-participant groups. The results show that there was little unexplained difference between the two groups. This supports the statistical data indicating a correlation between ROTC participation and responses to the items.

Male ROTC participants outnumbered female ROTC participants more than five to one. This was expected since women were not allowed to participate until a few years ago and since military service is still thought of as a predominantly male responsibility. In the non-participant category, male-female ratio was almost even with the majority of respondents (54%) being male. This percentage was fairly consistent with the male-female ratio in the freshman population.

ROTC students were divided almost evenly between those students living in dormitories and living off-campus. It is interesting to note that less than 5 percent of ROTC students lived in a fraternity/sorority house. Almost 90 percent of the non-ROTC students lived in the dormitories. This
was not surprising since most freshmen are required by University policy to live in dormitories.

More than 75 percent of all respondents were in the 18-20 age bracket.

More than 94 percent of all respondents were unmarried. Virtually all of the non-ROTC group were single.

More than 84 percent of the ROTC group and 92 percent of the non-ROTC group were Caucasian. The percentage of blacks and other minorities was greater in the ROTC group than in the non-ROTC group.

The respondents were almost identically matched concerning the size of the town/city in which they lived when they attended high school. The participant and non-participant group percentages were very close in every category of this item. Overall, most of the students were from a small town, small city, or large city; fewer students described their place of residence as rural or suburban.

Responses to the demographic item on family income level resembled a typical curve with most responses in middle categories. While the $10,000 to $19,999 category was the most frequently selected for both groups, ROTC students overall appeared to be from slightly less wealthy families. There were more ROTC students in the lowest income category, and less in the highest category.

The breakout of high school average grades was also a standard curve. Most students considered themselves as B students. More of the ROTC people than non-ROTC fell into the perceived C category.

Percentages of respondents who participated in high school varsity athletics were almost identical for both groups.
More non-ROTC students (64 to 58%) held elective leadership positions in high school.

While most students in both groups classified themselves as average on a political spectrum, the ROTC students were more willing to list themselves as conservative in relation to age-group peers. Conservative-liberal ratio of the ROTC group was more than 2.5 to 1.0. The non-ROTC group ratio was 2 to 1 more liberal than conservative.

Career goals were generally defined for both groups. Both selected the middle category. For the ROTC group, almost two-thirds were in this group with slightly more than one-third saying their career goals were well-defined and with very few saying they had no defined career goals. However, the non-ROTC group was fairly evenly split on this point. While 42 percent had generally defined career goals, more than 40 percent had well-defined goals, and 17 percent had not defined their goals.

While 42 percent of the ROTC group had some previous military training including prior ROTC experiences, more than 98 percent of the non-ROTC group had no military training.

Most ROTC students decided to come to OSU after graduation from high school. More than 78 percent of this group decided in their senior year of high school or later. Most of the non-ROTC students made their decision as seniors, and almost 85 percent decided in high school. The biggest difference between the groups is that the after-graduation was the largest ROTC category; however, 90 percent of non-ROTC students had selected their college/university before graduation.

Almost 78 percent of non-ROTC students had never seriously considered enrolling in a military science course.
Compared to the non-ROTC students, the ROTC students had a higher percentage of Arts and Sciences (45.31 to 33.90%) and Home Economics majors (7.81 to 1.69%). The two groups were almost even in their percentages of Education (4.69 to 6.78%) and Engineering majors (15.63 to 13.56%). The two academic areas in which the ROTC percentages fell short of the non-ROTC group percentages were Agriculture (9.38 to 20.34%) and Business (17.19 to 23.73%).

Originally, a part of this study was to determine the interactive effects of several combinations of variables using the Type VI design, a three-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures on two factors. The design would rotate the factors and consider them two at a time. The non-repeating factor would be participation in ROTC (participants and non-participants). However, it was determined that this part of the study would not justify the additional investment of time and money for several reasons. Some demographic variables, such as age, marital status, and previous military training, are not valid repeating factors because an overwhelming majority of respondents fell into one category. Other potential factors, such as political classification (i.e., conservative), are hard to use as a practical recruiting tool. All of the non-ROTC responses were tightly packed in the center of the continuum. Most importantly, a design of that nature would have provided more bits of information than the users of this study (the OSU Military Science Department) could understand or use.

It is important to remember in the analysis and the conclusion that attitudes toward ROTC are not fixed in the minds of students. That is, students are not aware of these attitudes because they have never thought about ROTC. This survey forced the respondent to think and respond to
attitude statements. While the survey may accurately measure attitudes, it has limitations in its usefulness in predicting behavior because of this awareness factor and the "lack of attitude" of the non-ROTC students.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The apparent problem of this study is "Do the attitudes of Oklahoma State University freshman students toward ROTC affect participation in ROTC?" The answer to this question is obviously yes, because the relationship is built into the question by the definition of "attitude," an organized predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a referent or cognitive object. The true problem is "How does the attitude of Oklahoma State University freshman students toward ROTC affect participation in ROTC?"

In this study the independent variables, the presumed causes, are attitudes toward ROTC. The dependent variable, the presumed effect, is participation/non-participation in ROTC. This is not a pure relationship, one cause and one effect. The variables were not studied experimentally because they would be very difficult to manipulate. These variables are attribute variables which can be measured rather than active variables which can be actively manipulated. This study can be categorized as survey research.

The hypothesis of this study is that there is a direct, positive relationship between attitude toward ROTC and participation in ROTC. The more favorable the attitude, the more likely that person will participate.
To measure attitudes of Oklahoma State University freshman students and ROTC students toward ROTC, a seven-point, Likert-type scale was used. The survey subjects were asked to mark the appropriate place which represents their attitude along a seven-point agreement continuum from wholeheartedly agree to wholeheartedly disagree. The number four position on the scale was an undecided or neither agree/disagree position. Some of the attitude statements were worded favorably toward ROTC and some were unfavorable toward ROTC. However, the highest scale value, used in the analysis of data, was always given to the response choice which is indicative of the most favorable attitude. The survey consisted of 17 demographic questions and 87 attitude statements. The attitude statements were developed from a review of the literature, discussion with experts in military science instruction and behavioral research, and my personal experiences and ideas. This was a lengthy survey, and it was anticipated that the length would be cut by the elimination of non-discriminatory items when the survey was readministered. It was administered to two groups. One group consisted of 64 ROTC cadets, and the other group was composed of 60, randomly selected, freshman English Composition students. However, because of the very high statistical reliability and correlation coefficient of this sample, it was determined that this sample provided reliable information, and it was not necessary to readminister a trimmed-down survey instrument.

Conclusions

The hypothesis is supported by the findings of the study. The hypothesis is that there is a direct, positive relationship between attitude toward ROTC and participation in ROTC. The more favorable the attitude,
the more likely the person will participate. The ROTC respondents consistently had a more favorable (toward ROTC) attitude than the non-participants in ROTC. The average mean of the responses to the survey items was higher for the ROTC group (5.08 to 3.99 for the non-ROTC group, difference of 1.09). Also the ROTC group mean scores were more positive on the scale for all but one item.

The ROTC group with an average mean of 5.48 in the factorial analysis was significantly more favorable toward ROTC than the non-ROTC group with an average mean of 4.22. The difference between the two groups' attitudes toward ROTC would occur by chance less than one time in a hundred.

The relationship between participation in ROTC and favorability toward ROTC is highly correlated with an eta of .7645. More than 58 percent of the variation in scores was accounted for by grouping the respondents as ROTC participants and non-participants.

There is also a significant, positive relationship between attitudes toward the military and attitudes toward ROTC. Previous studies had indicated this relationship, so 27 items were included in this study to determine the respondents' attitudes toward the military. The respondents were divided into three categories based on favorability toward the military. The high military favorability group was most favorable to ROTC. The moderate group's mean attitude was less than the high group but greater than the low group. Differences in attitude as great as observed between these categories would occur by chance less than one time in a hundred. The eta correlation was .5877. More than 34 percent of the variation in mean attitude scores was accounted for by relative favorability toward the military.
It was previously mentioned that a corollary hypothesis was that ROTC is tolerated at Oklahoma State University but not supported, and that the students are extremely apathetic toward ROTC. This was demonstrated by the results of the survey. The average mean score of the ROTC group was 5.08 on a seven-point scale. This means the group mean falls within the "slightly agree" category. The non-ROTC responses averaged 3.99, which means that as a group the non-ROTC respondents were "undecided" or neither agreed nor disagreed. The difference between the groups was only 1.09.

The apathy of most freshman students toward ROTC was readily apparent in the results of the analysis of the data. The group mean (3.99) was almost a perfect "middle-of-the-scale" or no opinion. On only one of the 53 scalable items did the group mean exceed 5.0 (5.13). Therefore, on only one discriminatory item did the non-ROTC students have a moderately strong opinion. On all other items the means ranged from 3.21 to 5.0, which indicates the group, at best, slightly disagreed or slightly agreed.

The true apathetic nature of the students was demonstrated by their responses to several items which indicate that although they have no strong opinions concerning most of the items, they were not interested in getting any information or experience with ROTC. They were "undecided" about whether they have any idea what ROTC is like ("don't have any idea," 4.00), whether they have sufficient information to form reasonable opinions (4.55), whether they would enroll in an ROTC course ("no way," 3.79. This is a negatively-worded item, so the scale was reversed. On negatively-worded items, scores lower than 4 indicate agreement rather than disagreement.) They are also undecided about whether they would
try a "mil sci" course if they had time (3.91), whether they would give more consideration to enrolling if they had an orientation to ROTC prior to enrollment (3.75), whether freshmen should be required to attend an orientation (3.44), whether they would be influenced by a $100-increase in the subsistence allowance paid to advanced ROTC students (3.77), and whether they would be persuaded to enroll in ROTC if they knew more about ROTC (3.91). They were not sure whether they would be willing to spend a few minutes talking to an ROTC staff member about ROTC (3.80). They would not even agree with the statement, "ROTC is OK, but it's not for me" (4.51).

Although these students are apathetic, they were not hostile. There is no significant anti-ROTC feeling on this campus. This fact is illustrated by the experiences of the ROTC staff and military recruiters at Oklahoma State University and by the survey data. In a sense it is good that the students are so middle-of-the-road, because it leaves the possibility of positively influencing them with the "right sales pitch and product."

The responses of the ROTC participants were often close to the non-ROTC group, but the range of ROTC responses was much greater (2.14 to 6.67). The overall average difference in means was only 1.09. On only three items was there a two-point or greater difference. However, on 48 of 53 items the observed difference in group means was large enough to be considered statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. This means that they could occur by chance only five times in a hundred. Thirty-nine of those items were significant at the .001 level and could occur by chance only one time in a thousand. Although the students participating in ROTC have significantly stronger feelings in some areas
than do the non-ROTC students, OSU ROTC is not a breeding place of super-patriotic, "gung ho" militarists. This general impression of sameness is also supported by the demographic data. Basically, the students in each group are very similar demographically.

The ROTC group was more predominantly male, but that is being changed by current recruiting practices which encourage female participation.

Ninety percent of the freshmen lived in dormitories. The greater number of ROTC students living off-campus was due to the fact that many of the ROTC respondents were not freshmen. It is noteworthy that so few of the ROTC students belonged to a fraternity or sorority (4.69 percent compared to 8.47 of the freshmen non-ROTC group). Perhaps the "Greek" students have so many organized activities and house responsibilities they do not feel a need to get involved in academic activities or classes outside the area of their academic major and general education requirements.

One demographic area of major difference was political philosophy. The ROTC group considered themselves more conservative than their peers by a 2.5 to 1.0 margin, but the non-participants considered themselves more liberal by a 2 to 1 ratio. Perhaps this is a partial result of youthful idealism, and the freshmen will "mellow" after a year or two of college. Nevertheless, this may be the only demographic item with a great enough difference in response to warrant considerations of ways to utilize this information in a recruiting campaign.

The ROTC group had fewer people with no defined career goals. This can reasonably be attributed to the fact that many college students do
not select a career field until after a year or more of college, and many freshman students are still undecided.

The difference in group composition by academic major area can be explained by the relationship of career opportunities in the service and the academic major. For example, the military offers many opportunities for arts and science majors but few opportunities for agriculture majors to use their education. Although there are many career opportunities for business majors in the military, the relatively low number of business majors in ROTC is explained by the credit hours policy of the Business College. Lower division ROTC hours are not allowed for credit by the Business College; therefore, many students take other electives for which they may receive academic credit.

The lure of financial rewards for participation in ROTC was not a strong inducement to the freshmen. They did not believe that they would be persuaded to enroll in ROTC in return for an increased subsistence allowance (3.77) or for an ROTC scholarship (3.79).

Non-ROTC students to some degree (attitude means between 4.20 and 4.54) acknowledged that military science courses can help develop self-discipline, ability to make sound decisions, ability to solve problems logically, leadership, communications skills related to managerial effectiveness, and ability to recognize and evaluate the managerial skills of others. But basically, these scores indicate that the student was undecided. He was also undecided about the value of ROTC training in the civilian job market (4.48), and he was not impressed with opportunities for "adventure training" (4.46). These have been the major emphasis areas in ROTC recruiting for several years, and these are ROTC's
best selling points. Nevertheless, ROTC has to do a much better job of convincing the typical freshman student.

Only 18 percent of the non-ROTC students indicated a strong disagreement with a requirement to meet military grooming standards. Perhaps this is not such a pervasive distracting factor for ROTC as has been traditionally thought.

Parents and friends may not be strong influences on student decisions concerning enrollment. The students were unsure about their influence (parents 4.07, friends 3.73); however, previous experiences indicate that in many cases, parents and/or friends can be a deciding influence. What should be discomforting to ROTC officials is the students' projection that their parents would not be particularly pleased if the student participated in ROTC (parents would be pleased 3.91).

According to the survey, Thatcher Hall's location on campus and facilities have no influence on the students' decisions to participate in ROTC (3.56). However, again the respondents were basically undecided, and higher visibility on campus would obviously attract more students.

The students agreed it was important to have a guaranteed job after graduation (5.24). Emphasizing military service as a job option (not pushing it as a career) may be an effective recruiting tool.

Part of the survey goal was to determine how does attitude affect participation. A theory which was supported by the information gathered in this study was that participation only results when the attitude is strong enough to encourage action. The ROTC students' attitude means were consistently positive, and apparently, they saw some reward for making the effort to enroll in military science courses. On the other hand, the non-participants were so undecided about ROTC that it, apparently, was not
worth the effort to denounce, investigate, or participate in ROTC. It was much easier to ignore it, and there was no punishment (other than possibly missing an opportunity) for doing so. This was another example of the classic motivation theory.

The military personnel at Oklahoma State University need to be more visible on campus in order to remind students that ROTC does exist at Oklahoma State University and to disseminate information about ROTC. They have not been influential in students' perception of ROTC and the military. Several questions in the survey dealt with attitudes toward military persons, and the non-ROTC students were undecided about all of them. The ROTC participants who have had some experiences with the ROTC staff expressed positive attitudes on these survey items.

Non-ROTC students were basically undecided but somewhat respectful of students who are ROTC cadets (4.52).

There was no Vietnam backlash. The two groups differed only slightly in attitude toward the U.S. military effort in Vietnam (4.22 for the ROTC students and 4.00 for the non-ROTC students). Although both groups disagreed with the statement which stated that the U.S. forces successfully accomplished their mission, the non-ROTC was actually more positive (3.32 to 2.31).

Both groups recognize the opportunities in many career fields for officers in the military (5.83 for ROTC students and 4.89--one of their highest means--for the non-ROTC students).

As previously mentioned, the attitudes toward ROTC were not fixed in the minds of the non-ROTC students. They have never given serious consideration to ROTC. This survey forced the students to think and respond to attitude statements. While the survey may accurately measure
attitudes, it has limitations in its usefulness in predicting behavior because of this awareness factor and the "lack of attitude" of the non-ROTC students. An appropriate stimulus could shift the weight of student attitudes from neutral toward one end of the scale. It is apparent that traditional recruiting efforts have not been extremely successful, and a continuation of these efforts will not be successful in the near future. A successful recruiting and public relations effort must "capture the imagination" of the students. It has to be innovative enough to gain their attention and to cause them to want to learn more.

Recommendations

The relationship between attitudes toward ROTC and attitudes toward the military enable the Military Science Department to approach the non-ROTC student in two ways to persuade the student to participate in ROTC. The first way is to boost his awareness and appreciation of ROTC directly. The second way is to boost his awareness and appreciation of the military and, indirectly, of ROTC.

The main thrust must be to provide information and to increase awareness of ROTC on campus. The non-ROTC students were undecided on all points. More information will enable them to reassess their position and to take a more definitive stand. This could cause a shift from neutral to one end of the scale. Hopefully, most will shift in a positive direction. This would eliminate the "awareness factor" discussed in the previous two chapters.

Several programs to increase the flow of information concerning ROTC throughout the campus have not been successful because of limited access to the students. Restrictive university policies or procedures, such as
no freshman orientation, compound the problem. Nevertheless, special
efforts must be made to keep all channels open and to take advantage of
all opportunities. Opportunities to discuss ROTC with faculty advisers
and other opinion leaders, to contact students through special promotions
such as Career Day, and to sponsor activities for selected students or
campus-wide should be used to the Department's advantage.

A strong publicity and advertising campaign in local media helps to
keep ROTC/military science in the "public's eye."

Several other possibilities involve the participation of cadre mem-
bers to enhance contact with the students and visibility of the military
across the campus. There are several techniques which can be used to
boost visibility.

Cadre members should offer to advise or speak to student groups and
clubs. They should offer to speak to civic organizations. They should
be active in civic and university faculty organizations. They should par-
ticipate in campus activities and attend student sporting events and
student plays. They should be encouraged to enroll in University courses
outside the Military Science Department, and they should attend class in
uniform. They should walk across campus in uniform--avoid driving--to
conduct business with another office of the University. They should be
encouraged to take coffee breaks in the Student Union. They should wear
an ROTC-identifying article of clothing (i.e., T-shirt or sweatshirt
with an ROTC emblem) when participating in physical training or recrea-
tional activities on the campus.

The ROTC program has several potentially strong selling points such
as scholarships, leadership training, and financial aid. However, past
recruiting efforts to "sell" these benefits have fallen short because
the department has not been able to capture the attention of the students.

The students will not voluntarily seek information about ROTC. The typical apathy toward ROTC was previously noted. The Military Science Department has to take their message to the students, and the message needs a new "package."

The package is a new curriculum for the basic level program. The new curriculum should emphasize interesting and important courses for all students even those with no interest in military science. The new emphasis should be on personal development. The curriculum can include courses on leadership, social skills, job preparation, communications skills, management techniques, personnel management, sales techniques, and current military and political issues. This plan can be implemented without disrupting the "hardcore" military program needed at the advanced ROTC level to prepare students to become commissioned officers. It is expected that the association with military science and military professionalism and quality instruction will cause the students to form more positive attitudes toward ROTC and the military.

There are several leads to be gained from the survey (demographic data). The recruiting effort should be made on the campus to freshman students. Many of the students most interested in ROTC do not decide to come to Oklahoma State University until after they graduate from high school. Recruit in the dormitories. Almost 90 percent of freshman students live in the dormitories. Also recruit in the "Greek" community because the new curriculum complements the social and leadership training of the fraternities and sororities.

Since the ROTC students so overwhelmingly considered themselves as conservative in political philosophy, the department should make a
special effort to speak to the conservative student organizations on campus.

Parents should not be considered a primarily target group of ROTC recruiting messages. The data indicate that parents are not a strong influencing force on student enrollment decisions.

Since most students feel it is very important to have a guaranteed job after graduation, the guaranteed Active Duty for Training (ADT) option which obligates the commissioned officer to three months of active duty may be an effective incentive. This option allows the student to plan for several career and temporary job contingencies without disrupting civilian career plans.

There are several recommendations for anyone who would continue with this survey. This was meant to be a heuristic study. Further studies can attempt experimental methods to test the effectiveness of various messages.

Several mistakes were made in this survey. Too much useless information was gathered. The survey was too long. Although the non-ROTC group was limited to freshmen for several specific reasons, the ROTC group was not all freshmen, and this prevented many possibilities for direct comparison of the groups.

A future study based on this study should eliminate the low discriminatory items and administer it to a much larger sample. It might collect sufficient data to make a more detailed study of interactions possible.

Two studies of a limited scope that would complement and illuminate this survey are to survey freshman students on basic ROTC facts to determine their knowledge of the ROTC program and to survey new military
science course students at the beginning and end of their first semester in ROTC to determine attitude changes as a result of exposure to military instructors and ROTC.
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APPENDIX A

SENIOR ROTC POLICY STATEMENT
Policy Statement--Senior Division Reserve

Officers' Training Corps (ROTC)*

Purpose: To attract well-educated officers for the Army in sufficient numbers to meet Army requirements; to provide a program at college level institutions which will attract, motivate, and prepare selected students with potential to serve as commissioned officers in the Regular Army or the U.S. Army Reserve. Additionally, it provides a mutually advantageous arrangement between the Army and institutions of higher learning to assist in the education of future officer personnel and a channel of communication between our military leadership and our developing educated manpower.

Objectives of the Program: To provide an understanding of the fundamental concepts and principles of military art and science. To develop a basic understanding of associated professional knowledge; a strong sense of personal integrity, honor, and individual responsibility; and, an appreciation of the requirements for national security in order to prepare students for commissioning and to establish a sound basis for their future professional development and effective performance in the Army.

Importance of the Program: ROTC draws young men for training from all geographical, economic, and social strata of our society. It also draws from the many educational disciplines required for the modern Army. It insures that men educated at a broad spectrum of American institutions of higher learning are commissioned annually into the officer corps. For the foreseeable future, the ROTC will continue to be the major source of newly commissioned officers for the Active Army, to include Regular Army appointments, and the Reserve forces. Further, ROTC is the most economical source for new officer accessions.

Character of the Program: Army ROTC is characterized by its flexibility in order to develop progressive programs that mutually benefit the Army, the participating host institution, and the student.

Desired Learning Outcomes

1. A broad educational base including, in addition to those subjects integral to the degree field, certain academic subjects of particular value in both civilian and military pursuits.

2. A general knowledge of the historical development of the U.S. Army and of the Army's role in support of national objectives.

3. A working knowledge of the general organizational structure of the Army, and of how the various components thereof operate as a team in the fulfillment of overall objectives.

*This information comes from Program of Instruction, Ft. Monroe, Va., U.S. Continental Army Command, 1970.
4. A strong sense of personal integrity, honor, and individual responsibility; knowledge of the human relationships involved and an understanding of the responsibilities inherent in assignments within the military service.

5. Ability to communicate effectively both orally and in writing.

6. Sufficient knowledge of military life to insure a smooth transition from the normal civilian environment.

Relationship With Host Institution:

a. The ROTC program is a cooperative effort mutually and contractually agreed to by the Army and host institution as a means of providing junior officer leadership in the interest of national security. The Army must continue to maintain a cordial and cooperative relationship with host institutions based on mutual respect and understanding of the responsibilities and interests of each part. The mutual goal of this cooperative enterprise is the continuing production of well-educated young men with leadership potential for civilian enterprise and national defense.

b. The Army continues to be receptive to valid criticism, regardless of source, as a means of maintaining a viable program. The Army recognizes the right of orderly campus dissent. However, institutions must understand that the Army cannot ignore anti-ROTC activities which unjustifiably degrade and distort the Army image. Thus, the Army looks to its institutional hosts to provide support for the ROTC program on campus.

c. No Army officer shall be assigned to an institution without prior approval of the authorities of that institution, and no Army officer will be continued on duty after institutional authorities have requested his relief for cause.
APPENDIX B

ARMY ROTC BASIC FACTS
What is Army ROTC?*

Army ROTC (Reserve Officers' Training Corps) is a program which provides college-trained officers for the U.S. Army, the Army National-Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve. The college-level program is offered at more than 280 host institutions. In addition, over 600 other schools offer Army ROTC through cross-enrollment. The high-school-level Junior ROTC program is offered in over 650 secondary schools.

Why Take Army ROTC?

The theory of offering Army ROTC to students on college campuses is perhaps best explained in the words of Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point. "ROTC is not the presence of the military in the university, but rather the presence of the university in the military."

Through ROTC, the Army gains officers with diverse educational backgrounds and contemporary ideas.

ROTC graduates have the chance to use their ideas in positions of leadership, and they enable the Army to relate to the thoughts and feelings of our ever-changing society.

ROTC enhances a student's education by providing unique leadership and management experience found in few college courses. It helps develop self-discipline, physical stamina, and poise. Students develop qualities basic to success in any worthwhile career. They earn commissions in the U.S. Army, while earning their college degrees.

Dr. Roy Hudson, former President of Hampton Institute, sums it up as follows: "Our youth need to be guided and inspired by people and organizations dedicated to principles encouraging and permitting the full development of the whole person—intellectually and personally. In my estimation, ROTC is such an organization."

Brief History

The tradition of military instruction on civilian college campuses began in 1819 when Captain Alden Partridge, former Superintendent at West Point, established the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy, which later became Norwich University. The idea of military instruction in civilian colleges soon spread to other institutions, including Virginia Military Institute, The University of Tennessee, and The Citadel. The Land Grant Act of 1862 (Morrill Act) reinforced this tradition by specifying that courses in military tactics should be offered at the colleges and universities established as a result of this act.

Although 105 colleges and universities offered this instruction by the turn of the century, the college military instruction program was not directly associated with Army needs. The National Defense Act of 1916 turned away from the idea of an expandable Regular Army and firmly established the traditional American concept of a citizens' Army as the keystone of our defense forces. It merged the National Guard, the Army Reserve, and Regular Army into the Army of the United States. Officers for this expanded citizens' Army were to be given military instruction in colleges and universities under a Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Army ROTC was firmly established in the form in which it is known today.

By the beginning of World War I, ROTC had placed some 90,000 officers in the Reserve pool. In 1917 and 1918, the majority of these were called to active duty.

At the outbreak of World War II, more than 56,000 Army ROTC officers were called to active duty within a six-month period. By the end of World War II, more than 100,000 had served. Since 1945, more than 328,000 individuals have received commissions through Army ROTC.

The ROTC Vitalization Act of 1964

In 1964, Congress passed the ROTC Vitalization Act, which made the program more attractive and more effective. This legislation provided four major changes in the college-level ROTC program.

1. Five thousand five hundred, Army ROTC scholarships (four- and two-year) were provided outstanding students in the four-year program who were highly motivated toward an Army career. In 1971, this number was increased to 6,500, and awards for three years' duration were authorized. Students entering the two-year program also became eligible for scholarships.

2. The two-year program opened Army ROTC to junior or community college graduates and to four-year college students who had not taken Army ROTC. Six weeks of leadership instruction at a Basic Camp prior to the junior year of college became a prerequisite for entry into this program.

3. Financial assistance for Advanced Course and scholarship students was established at $50 per month. In 1971, this allowance was increased to $100 per month.

4. Advanced Course cadets and those on scholarships were required to enlist in the Army Reserve.

The 1964 act also provided for expanding the Army Junior ROTC program to 650 units. In 1976, this ceiling was lifted, and additional high schools are expected to establish units in the coming years.

Army ROTC College Programs

The four-year Army ROTC program is divided into two parts: the Basic Course and the Advanced Course.
The Basic Course is usually taken in the freshman and sophomore years. No military commitment is incurred during this time, and students may withdraw at any time through the end of the second year. Subjects cover the areas of management principles; national defense; military history; leadership development; and military courtesy, discipline and customs. Various social and professional enrichment activities are available in conjunction with the Military Science program. Uniforms, necessary textbooks, and materials are furnished without cost to the student.

After completing the Basic Course, students who have demonstrated officer potential and meet Army physical standards are eligible to enroll in the Advanced Course.

The Advanced Course is normally taken in the final two years of college. Instruction includes further leadership development, organization and management, tactics, and administration.

A paid five-week Advanced Camp is held during the summer between the junior and senior years. This camp permits cadets to put into practice the principles and theories they have acquired in the classroom. It also exposes them to the stresses of Army life in a tactical or field environment.

All cadets in the Advanced Course receive uniforms, necessary military science textbooks, pay for the Advanced Camp, and a living allowance of up to $1,000 each school year.

The Two-Year Program

The two-year program is designed for community and junior college graduates and students at four-year colleges who have not taken Army ROTC during their first two years.

Students can take advantage of this opportunity by successfully completing a paid six-week Basic Camp after their sophomore year and enrolling in the ROTC Advanced Course in their junior and senior years, provided they meet enrollment requirements. Except for this camp, the requirements for and obligations incurred in the two- and four-year programs are the same.

Army Junior ROTC Program

Army Junior ROTC is a high school instructional program which stresses development of good citizenship. No service obligation is incurred by participation; however, advanced placement in Senior ROTC and advanced enlisted rank for initial entry into military service is authorized.

Army ROTC Scholarships

Army ROTC scholarships are offered for four, three, and two years. The four-year scholarships are awarded on a worldwide competitive basis to U.S. citizens who will be entering college as freshmen. The three-
and two-year scholarships are awarded competitively to students who are enrolled or are eligible for advanced placement in ROTC, including those who are cross-enrolled.

Students who attend the Basic Camp of the two-year program may also compete for two-year scholarships.

The scholarships pay for tuition, textbooks, lab fees, and a living allowance of up to $1,000 each year the scholarship is in effect. The value of the scholarship depends on the tuition and other educational costs of the university or college attended.

A two-year scholarship program for active duty Army enlisted personnel was initiated in 1974.

Army Nurse Corps

To qualify for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps (ANC), ROTC graduates must have a Baccalaureate of Science degree in nursing from a nationally accredited nursing program, and they must successfully pass a state board examination. Students who are enrolled in a nursing program at other than an Army ROTC host institution may still participate in Army ROTC through cross-enrollment, provided the graduate can meet all the professional criteria. Cadets applying for appointment in the ANC, who meet all professional requirements, will be branched ANC and serve as Army nurses on active duty, in the Army National Guard, or in the Army Reserve.

Professional Activities

ROTC also offers a variety of social and professional activities. Scabbard and Blade is the Advanced Course national honor fraternity. The Pershing Rifles promotes military ideals as exemplified by General John J. Pershing. The Society of American Military Engineers promotes the national engineering potential for defense. ROTC companies of the Association of the U.S. Army provide professional exchanges among cadets and military and civic leaders.

All ROTC units offer instruction in some type of adventure training, such as mountaineering, rappelling, ranger, airborne, and orienteering. These activities offer leadership opportunities which improve proficiency and military skills and enhance confidence. Cadets frequently participate in activities associated with social work and civic projects.

The Military Service Obligation

Before entering the Advanced Course, an individual must sign a contract that certifies an understanding of the service obligation. This obligation may be fulfilled by serving in various ways, depending on the individual's personal preference and the needs of the Army at the time of commissioning. Scholarship graduates serve four years on active duty and two in the Reserve. Nonscholarship graduates may serve three years on active duty and the remaining three years in the Reserve; or they may volunteer or be chosen to serve on Active Duty for Training (ADT). If
ADT is selected, the active duty obligation is from three to six months with the remainder of the eight-year obligation spent in the Reserve where officers assume roles as important as those of their counterparts on active duty.

The Future

Army ROTC graduates are leaders, thinkers, decision makers. They meet problems readily and solve them quickly. They take charge of any situation, from beginning to end.

While they're getting this valuable experience, they enjoy a lifestyle that has its own unique advantages. Quarters are provided on nearly all posts. Medical care and hospitalization are provided by the Army at home or abroad. The officers' club provides activities that are comparable to those in the civilian community; it is a focal point for regular, on-post social functions, dining, or just plain relaxation.

They earn Army retirement credit whether they serve in the active Army, the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve.

They find that their background in ROTC and as an Army officer is an asset to offer a potential employer if a decision is made to pursue a civilian career. Industry leaders who are looking for experienced managers know that the skills of an officer can be important to them in their operations. ROTC graduates find that the practical experience they gain in managing people and in making things happen puts them far ahead of the many college graduates competing for the jobs that lead to top management positions, as evidenced by comments of many employers of ROTC graduates, such as the following:

"ROTC training while pursuing a college degree enables an individual to develop leadership skills concurrently with academic skills. This combination is excellent background for entrance into management. Thus, ROTC graduates not only have the personal satisfaction of rendering a service to their country but are developing qualifications for movement into the industrial mainstream."

D. W. Braithwaite, Director-Corporate Employment
United States Steel Corporation

"It is my conviction that the skills, discipline, and experiences gained through the ROTC program and subsequent serving of our country as an officer cannot be duplicated in any other fashion, at any age. Having gone through the ROTC program myself, I can only offer an unqualified endorsement."

W. Thomas York, President, AMF Incorporated

"Poise and confidence come with experience in leadership positions. ROTC has proven to be an excellent environment in which to generate the ability to make sound decisions relating to given situations. Industry and business and, indeed, all
walks of life require and reward those who can analyze, appraise and then commit available resources to achieve defined goals. ROTC provides a generously equipped laboratory in which to test young men and those who acquit themselves well will always be in demand in our society."

Fred W. O'Green, President, Litton Industries, Inc.

Those are the facts about Army ROTC. It isn't a snap. Some students think it's extra work. Others think it's a challenge. But most everybody who completes the program agrees on one thing: it's worth it! That's because Army ROTC is leadership, pure and simple. It can be used anywhere. It can be used anytime: from the day of graduation until the day of retirement.

How to Enroll

Students planning to attend an institution that hosts Army ROTC should visit the Professor of Military Science (PMS) during the registration period. Then, the course can be integrated with normal registration procedures. Students interested in the two-year program should contact a PMS early in their sophomore year of college to find out when their applications must be submitted.

For additional information, write: Army ROTC, Fort Monroe, VA 23651. (NOTE: Detailed information on the Army ROTC scholarship program is contained in RPI677, "Army ROTC Scholarships," and RPI666A, "Scholarships for Men and Women on Active Duty." RPI666 contains additional information of interest to veterans, and RPI667, "Gentlemen, You Have Decisions to Make," contains additional information on the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. RPI675, "The Army ROTC Two-Year Program," contains additional information on that program.)

Benefits for Cadets While in the Program

Four-Year Program Cadets

1. Uniforms will be provided.
2. A living allowance of up to $1,000 each year during the Advanced course.
3. Pay for the five-week Advanced Camp, plus food and clothing.
4. Servicemen's Group Life Insurance while attending and traveling to and from camp.
5. Medical and hospital care for disease or injuries incurred in connection with camp attendance.
6. Immunizations against typhoid, smallpox, tetanus-diphtheria, influenza, meningitis, and poliomyelitis prior to attendance at or during camps.
7. Paid transportation to and from camps.
8. Periodic medical examinations while in cadet status.
10. At the discretion of the Professor of Military Science and institutional officials, credit may be granted for MS I and MS II for
prior military service or JROTC participation. Credit in ROTC may also be granted for certain other academic courses.

11. Opportunity for adventure training in airborne, ranger, mountaineering, rafting, and others.

Two-Year Program Cadets

1. All of the above, except item 10.
2. Pay for six-week Basic Camp, during the summer prior to enrollment in MS III. Food, uniforms, equipment, travel, and quarters are also furnished at no cost while at camp.

Scholarship Cadets

1. All benefits listed for four-year program cadets, except items 2 and 10.
2. Full tuition for each year of the scholarship, plus a living allowance of up to $1,000 each academic year the award is in effect.
3. Textbooks and workbooks for all courses in which enrolled.
4. Laboratory fees, if required in cadet's course of study, including all expenses and deposits (excluding uniform deposits).
5. Equipment such as slide rules, drawing instruments, and similar equipment, if required for cadet's course of study.
6. Graduate fee, diploma fee, cap and gown fee, and similar fees related to graduation.
7. Classroom materials and other educational expenses required of all students.
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OUTLINE OF MILITARY SCIENCE CURRICULUM FOR FALL, 1978
MS I
1st Semester
Introduction to Military Science
Army Missions
Custons, Courtesies, Benefits, Traditions
Code of Conduct, Survival, Geneva Convention
Map Reading
Lab
Dismounted Drill
M14 Care and Cleaning
Physical Fitness
Race Relations/Equal Opportunity
2nd Semester
Squad Tactics
Leadership
Orienteering
Marksmanship

MS II
1st Semester
Methods of Instruction
Personnel Management
Army's Role in Support of National Objectives
2nd Semester
Adventures in Military History
Orienteering, Rappelling, Hunter Safety
European Military History

MS III
1st Semester
Leadership
Platoon Tactics (Offense)
2nd Semester
Platoon Tactics (Defense)
Branches of the Army
Officer Personnel Management System (OPMS)
Advanced Camp Briefing
Map Reading

MS IV
1st Semester
Personnel Management
Organizational Effectiveness
Enlisted Personnel Management System (EPMS)
Small Unit Administration
2nd Semester

American Military History
Lab
Command and Staff Positions
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ROTC/ARMY COMMITMENT MODEL
Figure 3. A Framework for Viewing the ROTC/Army Career Commitment Process
APPENDIX E

ATTITUDE SURVEY AND SURVEY ITEMS
Attitude Survey

The purpose of this survey is to ascertain the attitudes of OSU freshmen toward Army ROTC (Reserve Officers' Training Corps).

You have been selected as a member of a test group to participate in this survey and, therefore, it is not necessary for you to identify yourself. Your response to the following survey statements will be used to verify the validity of the statements and to compile statistical data related to Army ROTC.

Your assistance in completing this survey is extremely important in determining the future policies of ROTC on the OSU campus and in developing an ROTC program which meets the needs and desires of OSU students.

Please respond to the demographic questions by placing the number of the correct response in the space to the left of each question.

Demographic Questions:

____ 1. What is your sex?
   1. Male
   2. Female

____ 2. Where do you live during the school year?
   1. Dorm
   2. Fraternity or sorority house
   3. Off-campus

____ 3. What is your age?
   1. 17 years or less
   2. 18-20 years
   3. 21-25 years
   4. 26 years or more

____ 4. What is your marital status?
   1. Single
   2. Married

____ 5. What is your race?
   1. Caucasian
   2. Black/Afro-American
   3. Chicano/Spanish-American
   4. Other. Specify: ________

____ 6. How would you describe where you lived when you were in high school?
   1. Rural
   2. Small town (1,500 to 20,000)
   3. Small city (20,000 to 100,000)
   4. Suburb of large city
   5. Large city (more than 100,000)
7. What is the approximate income level of your family?
   1. Less than $10,000 per year
   2. $10,000 to 19,999 per year
   3. $20,000 to 29,999 per year
   4. $30,000 or more per year
   5. Don't know

8. What was your average grade in high school?
   1. A
   2. B
   3. C or below

9. Did you participate in varsity athletics in high school?
   1. Yes
   2. No

10. While in high school did you hold any elective offices in social, service, or student government organizations?
    1. Yes
    2. No

11. Compared to others your age, do you consider your political beliefs to be:
    1. More liberal
    2. Average
    3. More conservative

12. Are you in Army or Air Force ROTC?
    1. Yes
    2. No

13. Are your career goals:
    1. Well-defined
    2. Generally defined
    3. Not defined at all

14. Do you have any previous military training (for example: JROTC, ROTC, National Guard, military school, active Armed Forces, etc.)?
    1. Yes
    2. No

15. When did you decide to attend OSU?
    1. Before high school
    2. High school freshman, sophomore, or junior years
    3. High school senior
    4. After graduate from high school

16. Have you given serious consideration to enrolling in a military science course?
    1. Yes
    2. No
17. What is your major academic area?

1. Agriculture
2. Arts & Sciences
3. Business
4. Education
5. Engineering
6. Home Economics
Attitude Statements

Please respond to each statement by circling the point on the agreement continuum which most nearly reflects your attitude toward the particular statement. Note that some statements are negatively worded, so consider each statement individually.

For example:

If you wholeheartedly agree with the statement, you should circle WA.

Strongly agree WA SA A U D SD WD Strongly disagree

If you agree substantially but not wholeheartedly, you should circle SA.

Strongly agree WA (SA A U D SD WD Strongly disagree

If you agree slightly, circle A.

Strongly agree WA SA A U D SD WD Strongly disagree

If you are undecided or neither agree nor disagree, circle U.

Strongly agree WA SA A U D SD WD Strongly disagree

The direction toward which one circles depends upon which of the two ends of the scale most nearly reflects your attitude.

Please respond to each statement the best you can. There are no right or wrong answers. Go through the survey rapidly but carefully. Do not go back once an item is marked.

1. Military service is disruptive to a stable family life. WA SA A U D SD WD
2. Everyone has a responsibility to serve in the military if drafted. WA SA A U D SD WD
3. Military science courses help develop self-discipline. WA SA A U D SD WD
4. I would enjoy the adventure training (rappelling, mountain climbing, etc.) available through ROTC. WA SA A U D SD WD
5. The military offers greater opportunities for achievement for women and ethnic/racial minority members than most civilian careers. WA SA A U D SD WD
6. ROTC makes a positive contribution to this campus WA SA A U D SD WD
7. Military service has few redeeming qualities. WA SA A U D SD WD
8. I would be willing to spend a few minutes talking to an ROTC staff member about ROTC.
9. There is no sense taking any military science courses if a person is not interested in receiving a military commission.
10. Military service would disrupt my progression toward my career goals.
11. My attitude toward the military directly influences my attitude toward ROTC.
12. The opinions of my parents are a strong influence on my decisions.
13. There is no way I would participate in ROTC.
14. ROTC cadets are more patriotic than the average student.
15. An Army officer makes an important contribution to the nation.
16. I would not want to be identified as a ROTC cadet.
17. Geographic stability is important to me.
18. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to establish reasonable goals.
19. ROTC should be banned from this campus.
20. ROTC cadets maintain a favorable image on campus.
21. I am too much an individual to enjoy participation in ROTC.
22. I want to work in a managerial position.
23. ROTC provides some worthwhile experiences.
24. Military service offers challenging career opportunities.
25. I consider patriotism as an important personal characteristic.
26. ROTC is not worth the time required.
27. Most female participants in ROTC have masculine personalities.
28. The maintenance of a strong military force is essential to national security.
29. Most career military persons are warmongers.
30. I respect cadets for their participation in ROTC.
31. I don't have any idea what ROTC is like.
32. The military successfully accomplished its mission in the Vietnam conflict.

33. The military is preoccupied with irrelevant details.

34. Variety in job tasks is important to me.

35. The military offers a greater sense of camaraderie (brotherly spirit among co-workers) than a civilian career.

36. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to make sound decisions.

37. I would like to have an ROTC scholarship.

38. I have no desire to receive a military commission.

39. I want to be a leader.

40. I have had sufficient contact with representatives of ROTC and with ROTC literature and advertising to form reasonable opinions about ROTC.

41. Almost all military officers possess talents and skills which would enable them to be successful in a civilian career.

42. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to solve problems logically.

43. I might have given more consideration to enrolling in a military science course if I had received an ROTC orientation before enrollment.

44. I have an unfavorable opinion of the exploits of the U.S. military forces in Vietnam.

45. It does not bother me to have to conform to particular grooming and appearance standards (for example, haircut length).

46. A military career requires more personal sacrifices than a civilian career.

47. Most career military officers have a warped sense of values.

48. The military services offer specialized training in many career fields for officers.

49. My previous contact with military officers affects my attitude toward ROTC.

50. An ROTC cadet doesn't have time to regularly participate in other campus activities.

51. ROTC training is useful in the civilian job market.
52. ROTC, as a source of military officers, makes an important contribution to the nation.

53. A military career offers greater financial security (through pay, benefits, retirement) than most civilian careers.

54. If a selective service draft was reinstituted, and chances were fairly good that I might be drafted to serve as an enlisted soldier in the Army, I would enroll in ROTC as an alternative form of service.

55. The undesirable characteristics of the military are present to a large extent in large civilian corporations.

56. Military science courses help develop leadership skills.

57. The opinions of my friends are a strong influence on my decisions.

58. Military service is a prestigious career.

59. I can't earn enough money in the military to satisfy me.

60. My friends would think I was "crazy" if I enrolled in a military science course.

61. Almost all military officers are highly competent and professional.

62. ROTC requires conformity at the expense of individualism.

63. ROTC is just another campus activity.

64. Military science courses help develop communication skills related to managerial effectiveness.

65. Most students would benefit from an introductory military science course.

66. I would not want to wear a uniform regularly.

67. My parents would be pleased if I participated in ROTC.

68. I would enroll in a military science course if I had the time.

69. The military stresses a higher moral code of honesty and integrity than civilian companies.

70. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to recognize and evaluate the managerial skills of others.
71. If the monthly allowance given to advanced ROTC cadets was increased from $100 to $200, I would seriously consider enrolling in advanced ROTC.

72. An individual has a greater chance to reach his maximum potential in a civilian career than in the military.

73. I would rather spend my available time in other campus activities instead of ROTC.

74. Military service develops skills which are useful in the civilian job market.

75. Most military officers are too rigid and unimaginative.

76. ROTC is okay, but it's not for me.

77. The geographic location of my job is very important to me.

78. I might have given more consideration to enrolling in a military science course if the classes were conducted in a different building.

79. The junior Army officer is entrusted with more responsibility than most junior executives.

80. An obligation to serve in the military makes ROTC undesirable.

81. It is important to me to have a job guaranteed after graduation.

82. All freshman students should be required to attend a short ROTC orientation before enrollment.

83. If I knew more about ROTC, I might be persuaded to enroll in a military science course.

84. Leadership opportunities in civilian careers are as great as in a military career.

85. ROTC is too male-oriented to be attractive to females.

86. The conduct and operations of the U.S. military forces in Vietnam gave anti-war demonstrators in the United States legitimate reasons to protest.

87. My previous contact with military officers has increased my appreciation of ROTC.
Survey Items

The following items were included on the attitude survey. The order of the items on the survey was selected at random using a random numbers table.

The unscalable statements may have double meanings or reflect neither a favorable nor unfavorable attitude toward the military or ROTC. They were included in the survey for their value in providing an all-around perspective of ROTC, but the responses to these statements were not included in the statistical determination of reliability.

The statements pertaining to attitudes toward the military were included because previous studies have indicated that these attitudes so directly and completely affect attitudes toward ROTC that they must be considered.

ROTC Statements (Favorable to ROTC)

2. I would enjoy the adventure training (rapelling, mountain climbing, etc.) available through ROTC.
3. ROTC makes a positive contribution to this campus.
4. I would be willing to spend a few minutes talking to an ROTC staff member about ROTC.
5. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to establish reasonable goals.
6. ROTC cadets maintain a favorable image on campus.
7. ROTC provides some worthwhile experiences.
8. I respect cadets for their participation in ROTC.
9. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to make sound decisions.
10. I would like to have an ROTC scholarship.
11. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to solve problems logically.
12. It does not bother me to have to conform to particular grooming and appearance standards (for example, haircut length).
13. ROTC training is useful in the civilian job market.
14. ROTC, as a source of military officers, makes an important contribution to the nation.
15. If a selective service draft was reinstituted, and chances were fairly good that I might be drafted to serve as an enlisted soldier in the Army, I would enroll in ROTC as an alternative form of service.

16. Military science courses help develop leadership skills.

17. Military science courses help develop communication skills related to managerial effectiveness.

18. ROTC participation assists in developing the ability to recognize and evaluate the managerial skills of others.

19. All freshmen students should be required to attend a short ROTC orientation before enrollment.

ROTC Statements (Unfavorable to ROTC)

1. There is no way I would participate in ROTC.
2. I would not want to be identified as an ROTC cadet.
3. ROTC should be banned from this campus.
4. I am too much an individual to enjoy participation in ROTC.
5. My friends would think I was "crazy" if I enrolled in a military science course.
6. ROTC requires conformity at the expense of individualism.
7. I would rather spend my available time in other campus activities instead of ROTC.
8. ROTC is not worth the time required.

Military Statements (Favorable to Military)

1. Everyone has a responsibility to serve in the military if drafted.
2. The military offers greater opportunities for achievement for women and ethnic/racial minority members than most civilian careers.
3. An Army officer makes an important contribution to the nation.
4. Military service offers challenging career opportunities.
5. The maintenance of a strong military force is essential to national security.
7. The military offers a greater sense of camaraderie (brotherly spirit among co-workers) than a civilian career.
8. Almost all military officers possess talents and skills which would enable them to be successful in a civilian career.
9. A military career offers greater financial security (through pay, benefits, retirement) than most civilian careers.

10. Military service is a prestigious career.

11. Almost all military officers are highly competent and professional.

12. The military stresses a higher moral code of honesty and integrity than civilian companies.

13. Military service develops skills which are useful in the civilian job market.

Military Statements (Unfavorable to Military)

1. Military service is disruptive to a stable family life.

2. Military service has few redeeming qualities.

3. Military service would disrupt my progression toward my career goals.

4. Geographic stability is important to me.

5. Most career military persons are warmongers.

6. The military is preoccupied with irrelevant details.

7. I have an unfavorable opinion of the exploits of the U.S. military forces in Vietnam.

8. Most career military officers have a warped sense of values.

9. I can't earn enough money in the military to satisfy me.

10. An individual has a greater chance to reach his maximum potential in a civilian career than in the military.

11. Most military officers are too rigid and unimaginative.

12. The geographic location of my job is important to me.

13. The conduct and operations of the U.S. military forces in Vietnam gave anti-war demonstrators in the United States legitimate reasons to protest.

Unscalable Statements

1. There is no sense in taking any military science courses if a person is not interested in receiving a military commission.

2. My attitude toward the military directly influences my attitude toward ROTC.

3. The opinions of my parents are a strong influence on my decisions.

4. ROTC cadets are more patriotic than the average student.

5. I want to work in a managerial position.
6. I consider patriotism as an important characteristic.
7. Most female participants in ROTC have masculine personalities.
8. I don't have any idea what ROTC is like.
9. Variety in job tasks is important to me.
10. I have no desire to receive a military commission.
11. I want to be a leader.
12. I have had sufficient contact with representatives of ROTC and with
ROTC literature and advertising to form reasonable opinions about
ROTC.
13. I might have given more consideration to enrolling in a military
science course if I had received an ROTC orientation before enroll-
ment.
14. A military career requires more personal sacrifices than a civilian
career.
15. The military services offer specialized training in many career
fields for officers.
16. My previous contact with military officers affects my attitude
toward ROTC.
17. An ROTC cadet doesn't have time to regularly participate in other
campus activities.
18. The undesirable characteristics of the military are present to a
large extent in large civilian corporations.
19. The opinions of my friends are a strong influence on my decisions.
20. ROTC is just another campus activity.
21. Most students would benefit from an introductory military science
course.
22. I would not want to wear a uniform regularly.
23. My parents would be pleased if I participated in ROTC.
24. I would enroll in a military science course if I had the time.
25. If the monthly allowance given to advanced ROTC cadets was increased
from $100 to $200, I would seriously consider enrolling in advanced
ROTC.
26. ROTC is okay, but it's not for me.
27. I might have given more consideration to enrolling in a military
science course if the classes were conducted in a different build-
ing.
28. The junior Army officer is entrusted with more responsibility than
most junior executives.
29. An obligation to serve in the military makes ROTC undesirable.
30. It is important to me to have a job guaranteed after graduation.
31. If I knew more about ROTC, I might be persuaded to enroll in a military science course.
32. Leadership opportunities in civilian careers are as great as in a military career.
33. ROTC is too male-oriented to be attractive to females.
34. My previous contact with military officers has increased my appreciation of ROTC.
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