

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 049

CE 004 808

AUTHOR Katz, Aaron; Rafacz, Bernard A.
 TITLE Impact of Increasing Preference Options in the Marine Corps. Final Report. No. 75-12.
 INSTITUTION Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, Calif.
 REPORT NO NFRDC-TR-75-12
 PUB DATE Nov 74
 NOTE : 90p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$4.43 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS *Job Satisfaction; Longitudinal Studies; *Military Service; *Occupational Choice; *Occupational Surveys; Questionnaires; Recruitment; Tables (Data); *Vocational Interests

IDENTIFIERS Marine Assignment Preference Schedule; *Marine Corps

ABSTRACT

The impact of increasing preference options in the Marine Corps was studied by administering the Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS) to all new recruits between October 1972 and April 1973, to whom no special training commitment had been made. Enlistees indicated their occupational preference on MAPS administered at entry to, at completion of, and six months after completing recruit training. Selections was made from 28 Marine Corps ground occupational fields. The third administration of MAPS included self-evaluations on job satisfaction and service plans. Concurrently with the third MAPS administration, supervisory evaluations were obtained on job satisfaction and service plans and supervisory evaluations were obtained on job performance. Occupational preferences were found to be inconsistent from one administration of MAPS to another. Statistically significant differences were observed on supervisory and/or self-evaluations between individuals in an occupational field/area they preferred versus those in the same field/area who had chosen some other field/area. The differences between groups based on preferences expressed at entry into basic training are statistically significant. However, they are so small that the association between granting preference options and job satisfaction/job performance has not been clearly demonstrated. Assessment instruments are appended. (Author)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED112049

NPRDC TR 75-12

November 1974

IMPACT OF INCREASING PREFERENCE
OPTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

Aaron Katz
Bernard A. Rafacz

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 004 808

Reviewed by
M. F. Wiskoff

Approved by
James J. Regan
Technical Director

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California 92152



28 Marine Corps ground occupational fields. The third administration of MAPS included self-evaluations on job satisfaction and service plans. Concurrently with the third MAPS administration, supervisory evaluations were obtained on job performance. Occupational preferences were found to be rather unstable (inconsistent) from one administration of MAPS to another. Statistically significant differences were observed on supervisory and/or self-evaluations between individuals in an occupational field/area they preferred versus those in the same field/area who had chosen some other field/area. The differences between groups based on preferences expressed at entry into basic training are statistically significant. However, they are so small that the association between granting preference options and job satisfaction/job performance has not been clearly demonstrated.

Three recommendations are presented for possible consideration: (1) provide a wider dissemination of information on Marine Corps occupational fields to potential recruits, (2) use occupational choice as an inducement for re-enlistment, and (3) after determining recruit's aptitude, interests, and abilities, prepare a subset of the occupational fields in which he has the most potential for his selection.

FOREWORD

This research was performed under Exploratory Development Task Area PF55.521.101 (Marine Corps Personnel Resources Management) and Work Unit Number PF55.521.101.03.05 (Impact of Increasing Preference Options in the Marine Corps). It was initiated at the request of Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, which is considering offering occupational preference options to new recruits as a means of inducing personnel to enlist in the Marine Corps.

The authors wish to express appreciation to Arthur C. F. Gilbert, and John C. Mazzuchi for their contributions to the design of the study, and for the development of the Marine Assignment Preference Schedules and the Job Rating Scale.

Appreciation is also expressed to E. B. Cobb and E. A. Dover of Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, for their efforts in overseeing the data collection effort.

SUMMARY

Problem

The Marine Corps, as well as the other Armed Forces, has been faced with the problem of attracting personnel in sufficient quantity to meet present and projected manpower requirements. To ameliorate that problem, the Marine Corps has been considering the feasibility and desirability of granting Marine recruits job preference options.

Purpose

This research effort attempts to determine what effect granting occupational preference options to enlistees would have on their perceptions of the Marine Corps, as well as on their job satisfaction, job performance, and service plans. A second purpose is to determine whether the occupational preferences expressed by new entrants into the Marine Corps remain stable over the early stages of the first enlistment.

Approach

A longitudinal study approach was used to obtain the occupational preference (out of 28 possible ground fields) of Marine recruits through administration of questionnaires (Marine Assignment Preference Schedules (MAPS)) at entrance to recruit training, at completion of recruit training, and 6 months after completion of recruit training. The latter questionnaire included items on job satisfaction and service plans. Simultaneously with the administration of the third questionnaire, a job rating scale measuring aspects of job performance was completed by supervisors of these enlistees.

The 28 occupational fields were grouped into four occupational areas - (Combat and Combat Arms, Administrative Specialties, Technical Specialties, and Electronics and Communications) in accordance with the groupings provided in Occupational Opportunities in the U.S. Marine Corps, a guide for counselors. Individuals expressing a preference for an occupational field within a particular area were considered to prefer working in that area.

The answers to five of the job-performance items in the job-rating scale and the 14 job-satisfaction items in the third questionnaire were used to compare two groups working in the same occupational field (and area). One group had expressed a preference for working in the field (and area) and the others had not. Analyses were conducted based upon preferences expressed at each of three points: (1) entry into basic training, (2) completion of basic training, and (3) 6 months after completion of basic training.

Findings

To ascertain the value placed upon choice of duty assignment, new recruits were asked to decide between choice of duty assignment and place of duty. New recruits showed considerably greater preference for choice of duty assignment (64.43% versus 35.57%). This preference increased over the period of recruit training (75.79% versus 24.21%). When the importance of choice of duty assignment and place of duty were evaluated separately, the same trends were found.

The four most preferred occupational fields selected at entry to basic training were Motor Transport (23.65%), Military Police and Corrections (14.77%), Infantry (8.65%), and Construction, Equipment and Shore Party (7.84%). Stability or consistency of preference for an occupational field from one MAPS administration to another was generally quite low. Overall stability was highest (40.87%) between the administration of MAPS I (entry) and II (end of recruit training); next highest (31.24%) between MAPS II and III (6 months after completion of recruit training); and lowest (25.26%) between MAPS I and III. Greater stability was obtained when the fields were grouped into four areas: (1) Combat and Combat Arms, (2) Administrative Specialties, (3) Technical Specialists, and (4) Electronics and Communications. The stability of occupational preference by area was 62.73% between MAPS I and II, 50.60% between MAPS I and III, and 57.03% between MAPS II and III.

Only four out of 28 occupational fields could be used to compare individuals who preferred those fields with those who preferred another. They were: (1) Infantry, (2) Construction, Equipment and Shore Party, (3) Motor Transport, and (4) Military Police and Corrections. The others could not be used because of the small number of individuals assigned to those particular fields and/or the small number assigned to a field who had expressed a preference for working in it.

It was found that individuals working in the Motor Transport field who preferred it at MAPS I were more satisfied with their present assignment, but less interested in pursuing a Marine Corps career than those who did not ($p < .05$). Further, the self-evaluations of those who preferred Motor Transport at MAPS II indicated that they had a greater interest in doing their work, and placed less importance on learning a trade or skill while serving in the Marine Corps than did those who had other occupational preferences at MAPS II. Personnel working in a Military Police and Corrections duty MOS who preferred this MOS at MAPS II expressed greater satisfaction with benefits received from the Marine Corps than those with other preferences ($p < .05$). The latter group was more negative about reenlisting in the Marine Corps than the former ($p < .05$).

Supervisory evaluations were obtained concurrently with MAPS III preferences and self-evaluations. In each of the four occupational fields noted above, enlistees who preferred to be working in their current

occupational field indicated greater interest in their work and greater satisfaction with their present job assignments than those who preferred to be in another field (p 's $< .05$). No other common statistically significant group differences were found.

When samples of recruits working in any one of the four areas were grouped on the basis of whether or not they had indicated a preference for working in that area at MAPS I, II, and III respectively, and compared on the 5 supervisory evaluations and 14 self-evaluations, the same pattern emerged. Few statistically significant differences were found when individuals were grouped on the basis of MAPS I occupational area preferences; more were found when groupings were made based on MAPS II preferences, and the largest number were found when groupings were based on MAPS III preferences. The only statistically significant differences between groups were based on the occupational area preferences expressed at MAPS III. These differences related to supervisory evaluation on attitude toward the Marine Corps, and self-evaluations on (1) freedom in doing one's job, (2) importance job has for the Marine Corps, and (3) interest in and satisfaction with present job assignment (p 's $< .05$). Enlistees who were working in the occupational area preferred not only were evaluated more favorably by their supervisors with respect to attitude toward the Marine Corps, but also indicated greater satisfaction with the above aspects of their jobs than others.

Conclusions

1. The occupational preferences of Marine Corps recruits are rather unstable (i.e., inconsistent from administration to administration) over the early period of their first enlistment.

2. Statistically significant differences were observed on supervisory and/or self-evaluations between individuals in an occupational field/area they preferred versus those in the same field/area who had expressed preference for some other field/area. The differences between groups based on preferences expressed at entry into basic training are statistically significant. However, they are so small that the association between granting preference options and job satisfaction/job performance has not been clearly demonstrated.

Recommendations

Offering recruits the opportunity to work in their preferred occupational field appears to be an attractive inducement for enlistment. The present research effort has not completely explored its potential value to the Marine Corps. However, the following suggestions are offered for consideration:

1. Information on Marine Corps occupational fields should be widely disseminated to potential recruits through a wide variety of media before they express their preferred occupational field. This could result in greater stability of job preference options and increased job performance and satisfaction.

2. Since Marines are familiar with most occupational areas by the end of their first enlistment, using occupational choice as an inducement for reenlistment may result in many overall benefits to reenlistees and the Corps.

3. Results of tests measuring a recruits' aptitude, interests, and abilities could be used to identify those fields which hold the most potential or where job satisfaction would be greater. Selecting an occupational field from this limited set of options should be more beneficial to the recruit.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Purpose	1
Background	1
APPROACH	2
Research Design	2
Assessment Instruments	2
RESULTS	6
Representativeness of Samples on Occupational Preferences at Entry	6
Most Important Reason for Enlistment	6
Importance of occupational Choice Versus Place of Duty	9
Occupational Preferences at MAPS I, II, and III	11
Stability of Occupational Preferences	13
Assignments and Preferences for Working in Occupational Fields and Areas	18
Comparisons within Occupational Fields Between Groups Who Preferred Field and Groups Having Other Preferences	21
Comparisons within Occupational Areas Between Groups Who Preferred Area and Groups Having Other Preferences	38
DISCUSSION	54
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
REFERENCES	57
APPENDIX Assessment Instruments	59

TABLES

	Page
1. Occupational Fields and Occupational Areas	3
2. Occupational Preferences on Administration I of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)	7
3. Most Important Reason for Enlistment	8
4. Importance of Getting Choice of Job Assignment vs Place of Duty	9
5. Importance of Getting Choice of Job Assignment	10
6. Importance of Getting Choice of Place of Duty	10
7. Occupational Preference at Administration I, II, and III of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)	12
8. Stability of Occupational Preferences for Administrations I, II, and III of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)	14
9. Conditional Frequency Counts for 28 Marine Corps Occupational Fields	15
10. Stability of Occupational Preferences by Occupational Area for Administrations I, II, and III of Marine Assignment Schedule (MAPS)	17
11. Occupational Assignments by Fields and Occupational Preference for these Fields at Administration I of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)	17
12. Duty Assignment by Occupational Area and Preference for Area at Administration I of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)	20
13. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Infantry MOS (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	26
14. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party MOS (Groups based on Administration I Preferences)	27

TABLES (continued)

	Page
15. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Military Police and Corrections MOS (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	28
16. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Motor Transport MOS (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	29
17. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Infantry MOS (Groups based on Administration II Preferences)	30
18. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party MOS (Groups Based on Administration II Preferences)	31
19. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Motor Transport MOS (Groups Based on Administration II Preferences)	32
20. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Military Police and Corrections MOS (Groups based on Administration II Preferences)	33
21. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Infantry MOS (Groups Based on Administration III Preferences)	34
22. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party MOS (Groups Based on Administration III Preferences)	35
23. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Motor Transport MOS (Groups Based on Administration III MOS)	36

TABLES (continued)

	Page
24. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Military Police and Corrections MOS (Groups Based on Administration III MOS)	37
25. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	42
26. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Administrative Specialties Area (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	43
27. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Technical Specialists Area (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	44
28. Sample, Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Electronics and Communications Area (Groups Based on Administration I Preferences)	45
29. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area (Groups Based on Administration II Preferences)	46
30. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Administrative Specialties Area (Groups Based on Administrative II Preferences)	47
31. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Technical Specialists Area (Groups Based on Administration II Preferences)	48
32. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Electronics and Communications Area (Groups Based on Administration II Preferences)	49

TABLES (Continued)

	Page
33. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area (Groups Based on Administration III Preferences)	50
34. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Administrative Specialties Area (Groups Based on Administration III Preferences)	51
35. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area (Groups Based on Administration III Preferences)	52
36. Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations, Between Two Groups Working in Electronics and Communications Area (Groups Based on Administration III Preferences)	53

IMPACT OF INCREASING PREFERENCE OPTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

INTRODUCTION

Problem

The personnel assignment methods of the military services have traditionally been directed at utilizing the talents and skills of the available manpower pool in the best interests of each of the services. When responding to the needs of the services, it is not always possible to satisfy the needs and desires of the individual. In today's social climate, the desire of young people to exert greater control over their lives (Bowers, 1973) points to the urgency of focusing more attention on individual preferences in both training and job assignment.

The Marine Corps, as well as the other Armed Forces, has been faced with the problem of attracting personnel in sufficient quantity to meet present and projected manpower requirements. The Corps is considering the feasibility and desirability of granting Marine recruits job preference options as a possible means of ameliorating that problem. As part of this process, the present research is intended to shed some light on the merits of granting preference options as a recruiting inducement.

Purpose

The purpose of this research is twofold. First, to evaluate the merits of granting occupational preference options to enlistees, it is essential to determine what effect the introduction of such a policy would have on enlistees' perceptions of the Marine Corps and their jobs, as well as their performance and service plans. Next, it is necessary to study the stability of occupational preference options expressed over the early stages of the first enlistment.

Background

The findings of two studies previously cited by Gilbert and Yellen (1973) indicate that it would be worthwhile to conduct additional research on granting preference options to recruits. The first indicated that although the Marine Corps could accommodate granting occupational preferences, the merits of doing so required further study (Decision Systems Associates, 1970). In the second study, it was found that the majority of recruits were satisfied with the assignments they received despite the fact that only a small percentage of them were assigned to occupations in the desired DOD grouping (Hoehn, Wilson, and Richards, 1972).

The present study builds upon the earlier study by Gilbert and Yellen (1973). They found that when Marine Recruits in the third week of basic training were asked to select the single occupational field (out of 28) to which they would like to be assigned, the most frequently

selected fields were: (1) Motor Transport, (2) Military Police and Corrections, (3) Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party, (4) Utilities, and (5) Infantry. The present study carries the research one step further by investigating the consequences of utilizing occupational preference options as a means for inducing individuals to enlist in the Marine Corps.

APPROACH

Research Design

The current investigation utilized a longitudinal research procedure in which a sample of enlisted personnel was studied at three different points in time during the first enlistment -- prior to basic training, at completion of basic training, and 6 months after completion of basic training. Occupational preferences at these three points were compared to determine stability or consistency. Preference was made from the 28 occupational fields listed in Table 1.¹ In this table, the 28 occupational fields are grouped into four occupational areas, in accordance with the groupings provided in Occupational Opportunities in the U. S. Marine Corps, a guide for counselors.² Individuals expressing a preference for an occupational field within a particular area were considered to prefer working in that particular occupational area. Personnel working in a particular field/area who had preferred that field/area at each of the three points in the first enlistment were compared statistically with those who were working in the field/area but who had not expressed that particular preference. Comparisons were conducted on the bases of job satisfaction, job performance, and service plans.

Assessment Instrument

The instrument utilized for obtaining occupational preference at entry into recruit training and at its completion was the Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS Rev. 3 Appendix). To obtain occupational preferences 6 months after the completion of recruit training, MAPS Rev. 4, was utilized (Appendix). Simultaneously with the third MAPS administration, supervisory evaluations of job performance were obtained. The three MAPS administrations will be referred to as MAPS I, II, and III, respectively, throughout this report.

¹These 28 occupational fields included all those classified as ground occupations by the Marine Corps except for Lithography, Training Support, and Band. The first two were excluded because of their small manpower requirements. Band was excluded because of its unique entrance requirements.

²This brochure indicates that the occupational fields within each grouping require similar aptitudes.

TABLE 1

Occupational Fields And Occupational Areas

Combat and Combat Arms Area

- 03 Infantry
- 08 Field Artillery
- 18 Tank and Amphibian Tractor
- 67 Air Control and Anti-Air Warfare

Administrative Specialties Area

- 01 Personnel and Administration
- 02 Intelligence
- 04 Logistics
- 30 Supply Administration and Operations
- 31 Transportation
- 34 Auditing, Finance and Accounting
- 41 Marine Corps Exchange
- 43 Public Affairs
- 44 Legal Services

Technical Specialists Area

- 11 Utilities
- 13 Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party
- 14 Drafting, Surveying and Mapping
- 21 Armament Repair
- 23 Ammunition and Explosive Ordnance Disposal
- 32 Supply Services
- 33 Food Services
- 35 Motor Transport
- 46 Photography
- 57 Nuclear, Biological and Chemical
- 58 Military Police and Corrections

Electronics and Communications Area

- 25 Operational Communications
- 28 Telecommunications Maintenance
- 40 Data Systems
- 59 Electronics Maintenance

MAPS I was administered to 13,624 recruits who had enlisted in the Marine Corps for the first time between October 1972 and April 1973 and to whom no prior training commitment had been made. Of the recruits administered MAPS I, 7,506 were also administered MAPS III,³ and 3,180 were included in the MAPS III sample.⁴ The size of the MAPS III sample was further reduced from 3,180 to 2,480 due to lack of information on duty MOS (i.e., job man was working in) in the Manpower Management System (MMS) files of the Marine Corps.

The data requested by the various questionnaires is listed below:

1. MAPS I and II (MAPS, Rev. 3)

A. Occupational Preference

28 Occupational fields

B. Self-Evaluations

1. Most important reason for enlisting in the Marine Corps
2. Importance of job assignment versus place of duty
3. Importance of getting choice of job assignment
4. Importance of getting choice of place of duty
5. Career intentions
6. Reenlistment intentions
7. Certainty of job field desired after getting out of the Marine Corps

³The reduction of the sample from 13,624 to 7,506 at MAPS II can be credited in large part to the attrition rate encountered for first-term enlistees and the necessity of excluding recruits with missing critical data fields.

⁴The size of the sample at MAPS III is attributed to the expected administrative problems encountered in tracing recruits 6 months after basic training. This includes the attempt to obtain supervisory evaluations in conjunction with recruit preference. Furthermore, there is always the expected nonresponse rate encountered in surveys of a longitudinal nature.

2. MAPS III (MAPS, Rev. 4)

A. Occupational Preference

28 Occupational fields

B. Self-Evaluations

1. Evaluation of training received for present job
2. Evaluation of chances for promotion
3. Evaluation of freedom in doing job
4. Importance to Marine Corps of job
5. Interest in doing his work
6. Satisfaction with present job assignment
7. Importance of learning a trade/skill while serving in the Marine Corps
8. Importance of improving education while serving in the Marine Corps
9. Extent serving in the Marine Corps has improved self confidence
10. Extent serving in the Marine Corps has helped individual become more of a man
11. Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay
12. Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits
13. Reenlistment intentions
14. Career intentions

3. Job Rating Scale

A. Supervisory evaluations (administered simultaneously with MAPS III)

1. Ability to get along with others on the job
2. Ability to learn duties of his job
3. Interest in his work
4. Performance on the job
5. Attitude towards the Marine Corps
6. Frequency of observation of man's work
7. Length of time man has been supervised by rater

RESULTS

Representativeness of Samples on Occupational Preferences at Entry

Table 2 presents the occupational preferences at entry of all individuals to whom MAPS I had been administered and of the samples available at each stage of data analysis. This table indicates that both the data available for comparison analysis of MAPS I and II (N=7,452), and that available for comparison analysis of MAPS I, II, and III (N=2,480) were representative of all those to whom MAPS I had been administered (N=13,504), insofar as occupational preferences at entry into basic training is concerned. The differences in percentage of preference for any occupational field between all those to whom MAPS I had administered and those in each of the smaller samples were all less than 1%, except for Motor Transport in the sample available for the analysis of MAPS I, II, and III data. In the latter case, the difference was 1.72%.

Most Important Reason for Enlistment

Distribution of the most important reasons for enlistment, as obtained from Part B, item 1 of MAPS I and II, is presented in Table 3. In both administrations, the reasons "to learn a trade or skill", and "I always wanted to be a Marine" were the first and second choices respectively. "To learn a trade or skill" was selected by 26.13% of the recruits in MAPS I and 28.23% of those in MAPS II. The corresponding percentages for "I always wanted to be a Marine" were 20.32% for MAPS I and 20.27% for MAPS II.

TABLE 2

Occupational Preferences at Administration I
of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)

Occupational Field Preferred	Two-Digit Code	Total ADM. I (N=13,504) ^a	Individuals Having MAPS I & II Data (N=7,452) ^b	Individuals Having MAPS I,II,III and Duty MOS Data (N=2,480)
		%	%	%
Personnel & Administration	01	2.71	2.98	3.10
Intelligence	02	1.65	1.88	2.05
Infantry	03	8.65	8.66	8.02
Logistics	04	0.59	0.48	0.60
Field Artillery	08	1.15	1.09	1.12
Utilities	11	4.59	4.75	5.04
Construction, Equip- ment, & Shore Party	13	7.84	7.88	8.66
Drafting, Surveying & Mapping	14	2.37	2.46	2.90
Tank & Amphibian Tractor	18	3.53	3.15	2.82
Armament Repair	21	1.28	1.27	1.49
Ammunition & Explosive Ordnance Disposal	23	0.77	0.68	0.52
Operational Communi- cations	25	1.48	1.49	1.65
Telecommunications Maintenance	28	2.42	2.42	2.45
Supply Administration & Operations	30	1.88	1.95	1.89
Transportation	31	2.19	2.17	2.41
Supply Services	32	0.48	0.52	0.48
Food Services	33	1.96	1.62	1.69
Auditing, Finance & Accounting	34	1.09	1.11	1.45
Motor Transport	35	23.65	23.94	21.93
Data Systems	40	3.46	3.53	3.91
Marine Corps Exchange	41	0.59	0.54	0.40
Public Affairs	43	1.19	1.17	0.96
Legal Services	44	0.79	0.86	1.25
Photography	46	2.19	2.39	2.25
Nuclear, Biological & Chemical	57	0.42	0.52	0.60
Military Police & Corrections	58	14.77	14.24	14.43
Electronics Main- tenance	59	4.60	4.80	4.47
Air Control & Anti- Air Warfare	67	1.56	1.48	1.33

^aDoes not include 116 individuals who omitted occupational preference.

^bDoes not include 54 individuals who omitted occupational preference.

TABLE 3

Most Important Reason for Enlistment

Reason	MAPS I (N=7,416)	MAPS II (N=7,171)
I always wanted to be a Marine	20.32%	20.27%
For travel and excitement	5.09%	4.19%
To learn a trade or skill	26.13%	28.23%
Because the pay is good	1.68%	0.43%
To get away from home	1.83%	0.99%
To serve my country	9.02%	12.91%
To become more mature and self-reliant	11.97%	8.82%
Friends are (have been) Marines	0.79%	0.62%
To keep from being drafted	2.56%	1.96%
Could not find a job	2.57%	1.38%
A career in the Marines looked good to me	5.77%	7.46%
To get away from problems	1.87%	1.07%
To get a better education	9.07%	10.61%
Family members are (have been) Marines	1.28%	1.00%

Importance of Occupational Choice Versus Place of Duty

In Part B, Item 2 of MAPS I and II, recruits were asked to indicate the relative importance of obtaining their choice of job assignment and getting their choice of place of duty. The findings are presented in Table 4. Initially, desire for choice of job assignment exceeded that for choice of place of duty to a considerable degree (64.43% vs 35.57%). This preference gradually increased over the period of basic training. At the end of recruit training, desire for choice of job assignment rose to 75.79% and that for choice of place of duty declined to 24.21%.

TABLE 4

Importance of Getting Choice of Job Assignment
vs Place of Duty
(N=7,095)

	Administration	
	I	II
	%	%
Job Assignment	64.43	75.79
Place of Duty	35.57	24.21
	100.00	100.00

The growing concern during recruit training over the kinds of jobs they would be engaged in rather than with where they would be located is also illustrated by responses to questions on the importance of job assignment and place of duty (MAPS I and II, Part B, Items 3 and 4), when the importance of each choice was made independently of the other. The findings of these questions are presented in Tables 5 and 6. The percentage of recruits who considered getting the choice of job assignment "very important" increased from 65.69% to 70.84% from the beginning to the end of recruit training. The percentage of recruits who indicated that choice of place of duty was "very important" decreased from 43.76% to 35.70%. Finally, the percentage of recruits who indicated that choice of place of duty made "little difference" to them increased from 16.36% to 20.87%.

Further evidence of the great concern of recruits with their job assignments is revealed by an examination of the most important reason for enlistment shown earlier in Table 3. As pointed out, "to learn a trade of skill" was the most frequently given single reason for enlistment both at entry (26.13%) and at the completion of recruit training (28.23%).

TABLE 5
Importance of Getting Choice of Job Assignment
(N=7,091)

	Administration	
	I	II
	%	%
Very Important	65.69	70.84
Fairly Important	27.72	24.90
Makes Little Difference	<u>6.59</u>	<u>4.26</u>
	100.00	100.00

TABLE 6
Importance of Getting Choice of Place of Duty
(N=7,036)

	Administration	
	I	II
	%	%
Very Important	43.76	35.70
Fairly Important	39.88	43.43
Makes Little Difference	<u>16.36</u>	<u>20.87</u>
	100.00	100.00

Occupational Preferences at MAPS I, II, and III

Table 7 presents the percentages of recruits who preferred each of the 28 occupational fields at entry, end of recruit training and 6 months after the completion of recruit training (MAPS I, II, and III respectively).

The four most preferred occupational fields at these three points of time are listed below:

<u>MAPS I</u>		<u>MAPS II</u>	
Motor Transport	23.65%	Motor Transport	29.32%
Military Police and Corrections	14.77	Military Police and Corrections	14.30
Infantry	8.65	Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party	6.73
Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party	7.84	Utilities	5.18
<u>MAPS III</u>			
Military Police and Corrections	15.46%		
Motor Transport	14.60		
Construction, Equip- ment, and Shore Party	7.90		
Data Systems	7.62		

Examination of the above listings reveals that three occupational fields (Motor Transport; Military Police and Corrections; and Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party) are common. Further, there is a large drop in preference for Motor Transport from MAPS II to III. A third observation that could be made is that Infantry appears on the listing for MAPS I but is missing from listings for MAPS II and III. Table 7 indicates that preference for the Infantry dropped from 8.65% at MAPS I to 2.80% at MAPS II and remained at about the same level when measured again at MAPS III.

TABLE 7

Occupational Preferences
at Administration I, II, and III
Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)

Occupational Field Preferred	Two-Digit Code	Administration		
		I (N=13,504)	II (N=7,330)	III (N=2,897)
		%	%	%
Personnel & Administration	01	2.71	2.91	5.03
Intelligence	02	1.65	1.60	2.96
Infantry	03	8.65	2.80	2.83
Logistics	04	0.59	0.55	0.41
Field Artillery	08	1.15	0.72	0.51
Utilities	11	4.59	5.18	6.17
Construction, Equipment, & Shore Party	13	7.84	6.73	7.90
Drafting, Surveying & Mapping	14	2.37	1.94	2.89
Tank & Amphibian Tractor	18	3.53	2.17	1.76
Armament Repair	21	1.28	0.87	1.20
Ammunition & Explosive Ordnance Disposal	23	0.77	0.41	1.10
Operational Communications	25	1.48	1.75	3.00
Telecommunications Maintenance	28	2.42	2.66	3.14
Supply Administration & Operations	30	1.88	3.56	4.45
Transportation	31	2.19	2.43	1.51
Supply Services	32	0.48	0.38	0.24
Food Services	33	1.96	2.54	1.03
Auditing, Finance, & Accounting	34	1.09	1.30	1.55
Motor Transport	35	23.65	29.32	14.60
Data Systems	40	3.46	4.67	7.62
Marine Corps Exchange	41	0.59	0.83	0.89
Public Affairs	43	1.19	1.38	2.34
Legal Services	44	0.79	1.15	1.41
Photography	46	2.19	2.56	4.10
Nuclear, Biological, & Chemical	57	0.42	0.34	0.31
Military Police & Corrections	58	14.77	14.30	15.46
Electronics Maintenance	59	4.60	3.49	3.31
Air Control & Anti-Air Warfare	67	1.56	1.49	1.82

Stability of Occupational Preferences

The stability of occupational preferences was studied by comparing that indicated on MAPS I and II, I and III, and II and III. In this study, stability has been defined as the extent to which individuals in a later administration of MAPS maintained a preference for an occupational field made in an earlier administration. Table 8 shows that the level of stability was generally quite low. Overall stability was highest between administration of MAPS I and II (41.83%), next highest between II and III, (31.24%) and lowest between I and III (25.26%). The movement of preferences for each of the 28 occupational fields between the administration of MAPS I and MAPS II is presented in Table 9.

The difference in the time interval between administrations of MAPS could account for the relative levels of stability. The greater the time interval, the greater the opportunity for recruits to acquire additional information on Marine Corps occupational fields and to obtain experience in a particular occupational field. Since new recruits probably are quite naive with respect to military occupational fields, a high degree of stability should not be expected during the early stages of the first enlistment.

The most stable occupational fields are listed below:

<u>MAPS I to II</u>		<u>MAPS II to III</u>	
Motor Transport	67.14%*	Military Police and Corrections	42.34%
Auditing, Finance and Accounting	50.00%	Data Systems	41.54%
Military Police and Corrections	49.71%	Photography	40.74%
Data Systems	48.46%	Drafting, Surveying and Mapping	38.59%
Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party	45.66%	Construction, Equipment and Shore Party	35.89%

* 67% of those who selected Motor Transport at MAPS I also selected that field at MAPS II.

TABLE 8

Stability of Occupational Preferences
for Administrations I, II, and III of Marine
Assignment Preference Schedules (MAPS)

Occupational Field Preferred	Two-Digit Code	Administrations		
		I to II (N=7,281)	I to III (N=2,897)	II to III (N=2,858)
		%	%	%
Personnel & Administration	01	32.11 ^a	20.22 ^b	27.65 ^c
Intelligence	02	23.57	25.75	35.71
Infantry	03	14.22	10.83	17.64
Logistics	04	2.86	0.00	0.00
Field Artillery	08	12.66	2.77	6.25
Utilities	11	41.57	26.05	34.96
Construction, Equip- ment, & Shore Party	13	45.66	27.35	35.89
Drafting, Surveying & Mapping	14	39.44	34.14	38.59
Tank & Amphibian Tractor	18	20.43	9.63	25.00
Armament Repair	21	10.87	2.63	5.26
Ammunition & Explosive Ordnance Disposal	23	7.84	10.52	33.33
Operational Communica- tions	25	24.77	4.34	19.23
Telecommunications Maintenance	28	25.57	21.51	14.92
Supply Administration & Operations	30	35.21	13.55	16.84
Transportation	31	17.42	5.88	15.38
Supply Services	32	2.63	6.25	0.00
Food Services	33	41.03	17.94	15.51
Auditing, Finance, & Accounting	34	50.00	27.50	25.45
Motor Transport	35	67.14	32.95	35.12
Data Systems	40	48.46	35.96	41.54
Marine Corps Exchange	41	17.95	0.00	6.25
Public Affairs	43	25.00	20.58	31.25
Legal Services	44	31.75	26.31	20.83
Photography	46	40.94	28.35	40.74
Nuclear, Biological, & Chemical	57	30.56	0.00	0.00
Military Police & Corrections	58	49.71	38.69	42.34
Electronics Maintenance	59	26.36	18.32	16.36
Air Control & Anti-Air Warfare	67	28.43	20.93	18.18
Overall Stability		41.83%	25.26%	31.24%

^a 32.11% of those recruits who chose Personnel & Administration at Administration I also chose Personnel & Administration at Administration II.

^b 20.22% of those recruits who chose Personnel & Administration at Administration I also chose Personnel & Administration at Administration III.

^c 27.65% of those recruits who chose Personnel & Administration at Administration II also chose Personnel & Administration at Administration III.

TABLE 9

Conditional Frequency Counts
for 28 Marine Corps Occupational Fields

Occupational Field	Administration II																												67 Total
	01	02	03	04	08	11	13	14	18	21	23	25	28	30	31	32	33	34	35	40	41	43	44	46	47	58	59		
01	7	7	5	4																									
02	3	33	3	1																									
03	8	19	89	8	10	26	38	5	24	8	4	10	9	17	14	3	20	7	156	15	6	5	5	9	1	92	9	10	
04																													
08	1	1	1	1	10	1	9	7	7			3	1	1	3	2	4												
11	4	3	5	2		143	8	5	2	3	1	4	5	6	6	3	10	1	71	9	4	1	2	8		14	24		
13	5	2	6	2	3	18	263	8	4	2	3	8	7	9	12	1	7	1	138	14	2	2	2	5		36	12		
14	7	4	3	1	1	5	4	71	2	1	2	4	5	1	3	1	1	3	15	12	1	2	3	8		13	5		
18	3	2	6	2	3	4	16	3	47	5	2	1	8	8	4	1	4	65	6	4	3	1	2	2		21	4		
21	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	2	2	10	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	33	3	3						10	4		
23	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	4	2	2	2	3	1	1	4	9	2	2	1	1	1	1		7	2		
25	2	2	2	1	1	6	5	2	2	1	1	27	7	3	1	1	4	1	20	2						15	4		
28	3	2	2	1	1	12	5	2	2	1	1	7	45	4	1	1	1	23	12	2	1	1	5			13	25		
30	6	1	1	3	7	7	7	1	1			1	3	50	4	2	5	3	19	4	1	2	4			13	3		
31	3	1	1	1	1	6	2	2	1			2	1	11	27	1	4	59	4	5	2	2	5			15	2		
32	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	10	3	1	1					2	1		
33	3	1	1	8	2																								
34	9	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	5	6	2	48	2	14	2	1	1	2			6	1		
35	20	9	25	4	7	57	61	8	29	13	4	16	26	39	31	4	29	1	1173	23	7	8	4	25		90	22		
40	14	3	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	3	6	10	4	1	2	7	19	126	3	5	1	5		28	6		
41	4	1	1	3	1		3																						
43	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	6	3	4	2	1	2	1	6	3	2	21	2	7		17	2		
44	5	1	1	1	4			3	1	1	1	2	1	6	3	1	4	4	2	1	1	6	20	2		5	5		
46	2	1	4	1	1	7		4	1	1		2	2	6	7	1	2	2	13	10	3	6	3	70		2	2		
57	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	5								11	1		
58	21	14	23	5	8	19	32	8	17	7	5	9	17	31	19	2	23	6	154	25	9	14	15	10		41	517		
59	10	3	4	7	36	7	6	6	2	1	1	7	26	9	8	5	1	52	17	1	6	2	5			11	31		
67	1	1	4		1	2		1	3			1	3	4	1	1	1	15	9		1	2	2			17	4		
Total	210	117	202	39	53	379	491	141	158	64	30	128	193	257	175	28	182	94	2135	341	61	101	84	187	25	1042	256	108	7281

MAPS I to III

Military Police and Corrections	38.69%
Data Systems	35.96%
Drafting, Surveying and Mapping	34.14%
Motor Transport	32.95%
Photography	28.35%

Examination of the above listings reveals the presence of occupational fields that have civilian counterparts. These fields are likely to be more familiar to personnel who have been in the military service for a short period of time than those that do not have civilian equivalents.

Stability of occupational preferences by occupational area between the three administrations of MAPS is presented in Table 10. As expected when more inclusive groupings are formed, the level of stability was raised. It can also be noted that, in each comparison, the Technical Specialists area showed the highest stability, and the Combat and Combat Arms area, the lowest stability. This finding is partly a result of the number of occupational fields that have been included in an occupational area. Again, as expected, lower stability was found between administrations that were the most separated in time. The stability between administrations of MAPS I and II was 62.73% whereas that found between administrations of I and III was 50.60%. The stability between administrations of II and III was intermediate in value, falling at 57.03%.

TABLE 10

Stability of Occupational Preferences
by Occupational Area
for Administrations I, II, and III of
Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)

<u>Area</u>	<u>Administrations</u>		
	<u>I to II</u> <u>(N=7,281)</u>	<u>I to III</u> <u>(N=2,897)</u>	<u>II to III</u> <u>(N=2,858)</u>
Combat and Combat Arms	24.30%	16.41%	24.61%
Administrative Specialties	48.12	37.82	44.24
Technical Specialists	78.39	63.63	66.27
Electronics and Communications	46.08	42.43	46.36
Overall	62.73%	50.60%	57.03%

Assignments and Preferences for Working in Occupational Fields and Areas

Table 11 presents the number of individuals who had received duty assignments to each of the 28 occupational fields. This information was obtained from the Manpower Management System (MMS) files of the Marine Corps. For each of these fields, this table gives the number of individuals assigned to the field at administration of MAPS I. This number is also expressed as a percentage of the total number of individuals in this sample who were working in this occupational field (i.e., those who had received a duty assignment to an MOS in this field). Table 11 reveals that there are only four occupational fields in which sample sizes were adequate to conduct a realistic analysis. They are (1) Infantry, (2) Construction Equipment, and Shore Party, (3) Motor Transport, and (4) Military Police and Correction.

As had been indicated earlier, the 28 occupational fields were grouped into 4 occupational areas, and assignments to those areas were matched with occupational preferences at MAPS I. Table 12 presents the total number of personnel assigned to each occupational area and the number who preferred that area at the first administration of MAPS.

TABLE 11

Occupational Assignments by Fields and
Occupational Preferences for these Fields at
Administration I of Marine Assignment
Preference Schedule (MAPS)

Duty Assignment	Two-Digit Code	Total Number in Duty Assignment (N=2,480)	Number in Duty Assignment Who Preferred it at ADM. I	% in Duty Assignment Who Preferred it at ADM. I
Personnel & Administration	01	423	22	5.20
Intelligence	02	6	0	0.00
Infantry	03	548	52	9.48
Logistics	04	16	0	0.00
Field Artillery	08	52	5	9.61
Utilities	11	37	5	13.51
Construction, Equipment, & Shore Party	13	108	15	13.88
Drafting, Surveying & Mapping	14	7	0	0.00
Tank & Amphibian Tractor	18	69	2	2.89
Armament Repair	21	69	1	1.44
Ammunition & Explosive Ordnance Disposal	23	6	0	0.00
Operational Communications	25	290	7	2.41
Telecommunications Maintenance	28	9	0	0.00
Supply Administration & Operations	30	251	6	2.39
Transportation	31	20	0	0.00
Supply Services	32	6	0	0.00
Food Services	33	60	3	5.00
Auditing, Finance, & Accounting	34	40	1	2.50
Motor Transport	35	209	62	29.66
Data Systems	40	73	4	5.47
Marine Corps Exchange	41	4	0	0.00
Public Affairs	43	4	0	0.00
Legal Services	44	32	1	3.12
Photography	46	3	1	33.33
Nuclear, Biological, & Chemical	57	3	0	0.00
Military Police & Corrections	58	107	25	23.36
Electronics Maintenance	59	6	1	16.66
Air Control & Anti-Air Warfare	67	22	0	0.00

18

TABLE 12

Duty Assignment by Occupational Area and Preference for Area at Administration I of Marine Assignment Preference Schedule (MAPS)

Occupational Area	Total No. of Personnel in Duty Assignment	No. in Duty Assignment Who Preferred Area at ADM. I	% in Duty Assignment Who Preferred Area at ADM. I
Combat and Combat Arms	691	100	14.47
Administrative Specialties	796	143	17.96
Technical Specialists *	615	388	63.08
Electronics & Communications	378	58	15.34

*The above table shows that the percentage of personnel assigned to the Technical Specialists area who had expressed a preference for working in this area at MAPS I (63.08%) was substantially larger than that for the other three areas (14.47% to 17.96%). This can be attributed to the initial greater popularity of fields in this area.

Comparisons within Occupational Fields between Groups who Preferred Field and Groups Having other Preferences

Individuals working in each occupational field were separated into two subgroups: (1) those who had expressed a preference for working in the occupational field, and (2) those who had not expressed a preference for that field. Separation into subgroups was made on the bases of preference at entry into basic training, at completion of recruit training, and 6 months after the completion of recruit training. Within each occupational field in which both the total sample size and the number of individuals in each of the subgroups were adequate, comparisons were made in the means of the self and supervisory evaluations. The means were compared by a procedure described by Natrella (1966), which is intended for use in situations where the sample sizes of the two groups are unequal and the variance of the two groups cannot be assumed to be equal. In computing statistical significance, the 5% level of confidence was utilized throughout this study.

As indicated earlier, there were only four occupational fields in which it was possible to divide the sample and study differences between those who preferred the occupational field and those who did not prefer it. These fields were: (1) Infantry, (2), Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party, (3) Motor Transport, and (4) Military Police and Corrections. Although the granting of occupational preferences to recruits would have to take place at enlistment in order for this policy to serve as an inducement in recruiting, preferences were studied at entry into basic training, (MAPS I), at the completion of basic training (MAPS II), and 6 months after the completion of basic training (MAPS III).

Comparisons were made on 14 self-evaluations in MAPS III (Part B, Items 1-14) and on the first five supervisory evaluations in the Job Rating Scale.

1. MAPS I Preferences

As indicated by the findings presented in Tables 13, 14 and 15, which are based upon occupational preferences made at MAPS I, there were no statistically significant differences in means on the measures studied between groups working within: (1) Infantry, (2) Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party, and (3) Military Police and Corrections. In the Motor Transport field (Table 16), statistically significant differences were found in the following items:

Self-Evaluations

Satisfaction with present job assignment
Career intentions

As shown in this table, those enlistees who preferred to work in this occupational field at MAPS I indicated greater satisfaction with their present job assignment than did those who did not. On the other hand, those who

preferred Motor Transport at this time were more negative about becoming career Marines than those who had other preferences.

2. MAPS II Preferences

Again, but based upon occupational preferences made at MAPS II (Tables 17 and 18), there were no statistically significant differences in supervisory or self-evaluations between groups working within: (1) Infantry and (2) Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party. In the Motor Transport field (Table 19), significant differences were found on the following items:

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to learn duties on the job
Interest in his work
Performance on the job

Self-Evaluations

Interest in doing your work
Importance of learning a trade/skill
while in the Marine Corps

Those who preferred the Motor Transport MOS at MAPS II were rated by their supervisors as more capable of learning their duties, more interested in their work, and more effective in performing their jobs than were those who had not. In addition, those who had preferred Motor Transport at MAPS II reported more interest in doing their work and placed less importance on learning a trade or skill while serving in the Marine Corps than those who had a preference for other occupational fields.

In the Military Police and Corrections field, (Table 20), the following statistically significant differences were obtained:

Self-Evaluations

Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits
Reenlistment intentions

Those who preferred to work in the Military Police and Corrections MOS at MAPS II were more positive about reenlisting in the Marine Corps and less satisfied with Marine Corps benefits than those who did not.

3. MAPS III Preferences

Statistically significant differences in mean evaluations between groups based on occupational preference at MAPS III were obtained in each of the four occupational fields studied. These differences are as follows:

a. Infantry (Table 21):

Self-Evaluations

Chances for promotion
Freedom in doing your job
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Importance of learning a trade/skill
while in Marine Corps
Reenlistment intentions
Career intentions

Among individuals working in the Infantry MOS at MAPS III, enlistees who preferred to be in the Infantry as compared to those who did not share this preference, were more positive with regard to their chances for promotion, reported greater freedom in doing their jobs, expressed greater interest in and satisfaction with their job assignments, and were more favorably disposed to reenlistment and making a career of the Marine Corps. On the other hand, enlistees who were in the Infantry but preferred to be in another occupational field evaluated learning a trade/skill while in the Marine Corps as more important than those who had expressed a preference for and were working in the Infantry.

b. Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party (Table 22):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on the job

Self-Evaluations

Training received for present job
Freedom in doing your job
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay
Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits

Supervisors of enlistees in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party gave higher evaluations on ability to get along with their co-workers to those enlistees who indicated a preference for this field at MAPS III than they did to personnel who preferred another field of work. Enlistees who desired to be in this MOS viewed the following more favorably than did those who preferred to be in another occupational field: training received for present job, freedom in doing their job, interest in doing their work, satisfaction with present job assignment, and satisfaction with Marine Corps pay and benefits.

c. Motor Transport (Table 23):

Self-Evaluations

Chances for promotion
Importance your job has for Marine Corps
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment

Individuals working in the Motor Transport field who preferred this MOS at MAPS III judged their jobs to be of greater importance to the Marine Corps and reported greater interest and satisfaction with their present job assignments than did personnel who had other occupational preferences. However, the latter group had more favorable perceptions of their chances for promotion.

d. Military Police and Corrections (Table 24):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on the job
Ability to learn duties on the job
Interest in his work
Man's attitude toward Marine Corps

Self-Evaluations

Training received from present job
Chances for promotion
Importance your job has for Marine Corps
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Extent serving in Marine Corps has
improved your self-confidence
Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay
Reenlistment intentions
Career intentions

Supervisors of enlistees working in the Military Police and Corrections field evaluated those who preferred to be in this field at MAPS III as more capable of getting along with others on the job, more capable of learning their job duties, having greater interest in their work, and having a more positive attitude toward the Marine Corps than did enlistees who preferred to be in another occupational field. Enlistees who preferred to be in this field viewed the training received for their present jobs and their chances for promotion more favorably than did those who preferred to be working in another field. The former group considered their jobs to be of greater importance to the Marine Corps and expressed greater interest in and satisfaction with their present job assignments. They were also more satisfied with Marine Corps pay and, to a greater extent, believed that serving in the Marine Corps had improved their self-confidence.

Furthermore, enlistees who preferred to be working in the field were more favorably disposed toward reenlistment and pursuing a Marine Corps career than those who preferred to be in another occupational field.

TABLE 13

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Infantry MOS

(Group A Preferred Infantry at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Infantry at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^b
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	49	3.80	0.87	484	3.88	0.91	-0.08	0.63	59
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	49	3.65	1.06	484	3.66	1.04	-0.01	0.05	58
3.	Interest in his work.	49	3.10	1.39	484	3.38	1.37	-0.28	1.60	58
4.	Performance on the job.	49	3.27	1.20	484	3.50	1.37	-0.23	1.42	60
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	49	3.18	1.74	478	3.21	1.42	-0.03	0.15	57
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	44	3.50	1.23	457	3.66	0.96	-0.16	0.94	50
9.	Chances for promotion.	44	3.20	1.56	457	3.22	1.12	-0.02	0.10	49
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	44	3.20	0.96	456	3.21	0.89	-0.01	0.05	51
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	44	4.14	1.10	456	4.29	0.93	-0.15	0.96	51
12.	Interest in doing your work.	44	3.68	1.11	456	3.58	1.53	0.10	0.58	56
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	43	2.53	1.21	457	2.63	1.58	-0.10	0.55	53
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	44	4.32	1.34	457	4.59	0.70	-0.27	1.50	48
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	44	4.36	1.07	457	4.54	0.77	-0.18	1.11	49
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	44	3.68	1.34	456	3.99	1.12	-0.31	1.72	51
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	44	3.55	1.84	456	3.84	1.42	-0.29	1.37	50
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	44	2.86	1.70	456	3.14	1.18	-0.28	1.36	49
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	44	3.50	1.79	457	3.83	1.15	-0.33	1.61	49
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	44	2.61	1.54	457	2.65	1.50	-0.04	0.16	52
21.	Career intentions.	44	2.16	1.39	456	2.38	1.37	-0.22	1.21	52

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

^bSignificant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 14

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party MOS

(Group A Preferred Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		T Value ^a	df ^a			
		N	Mean	Variance	N			Mean	Variance	Mean Diff.
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	15	3.80	1.74	91	3.74	1.06	0.06	0.18	17
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	15	3.53	1.98	90	3.51	0.84	0.02	0.06	16
3.	Interest in his work.	15	3.13	2.12	91	3.36	1.43	-0.23	0.58	18
4.	Performance on the job.	15	3.47	2.12	91	3.31	1.17	0.16	0.40	17
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	15	2.67	1.81	91	2.93	1.53	-0.26	0.72	15
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	11	3.00	1.00	81	3.26	1.34	-0.26	0.79	15
9.	Chances for promotion.	11	2.91	1.29	81	3.10	1.29	-0.19	0.52	13
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	11	3.45	0.67	81	3.52	0.85	-0.07	0.24	14
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	11	3.82	1.36	81	4.01	1.26	-0.19	0.52	13
12.	Interest in doing your work.	11	3.36	1.45	81	3.95	1.35	-0.59	1.52	13
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	11	3.00	2.60	81	3.05	1.60	-0.05	0.10	12
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	11	4.64	0.45	81	4.16	1.39	0.48	1.97	21
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	11	4.36	1.05	81	4.38	1.04	-0.02	0.06	13
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	11	3.64	0.85	81	3.58	1.57	0.06	0.18	17
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	11	3.64	1.05	81	3.57	1.45	0.07	0.20	15
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	11	2.73	1.62	81	2.65	1.25	0.08	0.18	13
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	11	3.45	1.87	81	3.74	1.52	-0.29	0.66	13
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	11	2.18	0.96	81	2.47	1.40	-0.29	0.89	15
21.	Career intentions.	11	2.09	1.09	81	2.11	1.30	-0.02	0.06	14

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 15

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Military Police and Corrections

(Group A Preferred Military Police and Corrections at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Military Police and Corrections at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Variance	N	Variance					
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	25	4.32	0.73	82	4.22	0.84	0.10	0.51	44
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	25	3.88	0.69	82	3.96	0.92	-0.08	0.42	47
3.	Interest in his work.	25	3.92	0.99	82	3.87	1.13	0.05	0.23	43
4.	Performance on the job.	25	3.92	0.91	82	3.87	1.11	0.05	0.24	45
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	25	3.84	1.06	81	3.84	1.11	0.00	0.00	42
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	24	3.38	1.20	76	3.70	0.88	-0.32	1.30	35
9.	Chances for promotion.	24	3.17	1.36	80	3.45	1.04	-0.28	1.07	35
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	24	3.42	0.60	80	3.54	0.96	-0.12	0.63	49
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	24	4.04	1.00	80	4.43	0.80	-0.39	1.69	36
12.	Interest in doing your work.	24	4.08	0.86	80	4.30	0.82	-0.22	1.01	38
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	24	3.21	1.48	80	3.73	1.52	-0.52	1.82	40
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	24	4.33	0.93	80	4.61	0.54	-0.28	1.31	32
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	24	4.50	0.61	80	4.49	0.66	0.01	0.07	40
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	24	3.50	1.83	80	4.10	1.43	-0.60	1.96	36
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	24	3.25	1.85	80	3.81	1.37	-0.56	1.83	35
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	24	3.08	1.12	80	3.36	1.60	-0.28	1.08	46
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	24	3.79	1.13	80	4.11	1.06	-0.32	1.31	38
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	24	2.75	1.07	80	3.10	1.64	-0.35	1.37	48
21.	Career intentions.	24	2.54	0.78	80	2.81	1.45	-0.27	1.20	53

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.
*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 16
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Motor Transport MOS

(Group A Preferred Motor Transport at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Motor Transport at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Variance	N	Variance					
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	62	3.89	1.22	142	3.83	1.04	0.06	0.34	110
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	62	3.63	1.42	142	3.61	1.20	0.02	0.09	110
3.	Interest in his work.	62	3.52	1.27	142	3.43	1.59	0.09	0.49	131
4.	Performance on the job.	62	3.44	1.36	142	3.46	1.33	-0.02	0.13	116
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	62	3.32	1.44	141	3.13	1.50	0.19	1.06	121
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	54	3.33	1.47	128	3.47	1.10	-0.14	0.72	89
9.	Chances for promotion.	54	3.04	1.36	128	3.13	1.10	-0.09	0.48	92
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	53	3.72	0.75	128	3.58	1.00	0.14	0.94	114
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	54	4.30	0.97	127	4.36	0.93	-0.06	0.41	100
12.	Interest in doing your work.	54	4.31	1.01	128	4.11	1.12	0.20	1.24	106
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	54	3.69	1.20	127	3.30	1.45	0.39	2.10*	111
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	54	4.26	1.21	127	4.43	0.85	-0.17	1.02	87
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	54	4.28	1.11	128	4.46	0.97	-0.18	1.09	96
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	54	3.78	1.38	128	3.92	1.19	-0.14	0.77	95
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	54	3.78	1.31	128	3.77	1.39	0.01	0.02	104
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	54	3.07	1.47	128	2.88	1.16	0.19	1.01	91
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	54	3.67	1.13	128	3.80	1.15	-0.13	0.80	102
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	54	2.39	1.37	128	2.61	1.33	-0.22	1.17	100
21.	Career intentions.	54	1.98	1.11	128	2.40	1.34	-0.42	2.36*	111

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 17

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Infantry MOS

(Group A Preferred Infantry at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Infantry at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	t Value ^a	df ^b		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	28	3.89	0.99	498	3.88	0.89	0.01	0.09	30
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	28	3.46	1.00	498	3.66	1.04	-0.20	1.01	30
3.	Interest in his work.	28	3.32	0.97	498	3.36	1.40	-0.04	0.20	32
4.	Performance on the job.	28	3.43	0.77	498	3.48	1.37	-0.05	0.28	33
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	28	3.36	1.65	492	3.21	1.44	0.15	0.60	30
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	28	3.64	1.35	465	3.65	0.96	-0.01	0.05	30
9.	Chances for promotion.	28	3.29	1.03	465	3.23	1.16	0.06	0.28	31
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	28	3.18	1.12	464	3.23	0.89	-0.05	0.24	30
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	28	4.18	1.34	464	4.28	0.93	-0.10	0.44	29
12.	Interest in doing your work.	28	3.39	1.58	464	3.61	1.48	-0.22	0.90	30
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	28	2.46	1.29	464	2.64	1.57	-0.18	0.80	31
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	28	4.61	0.62	465	4.55	0.78	0.06	0.34	32
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	28	4.61	0.69	465	4.52	0.81	0.09	0.55	31
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	28	3.71	1.47	464	3.99	1.08	-0.28	1.19	30
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	28	3.64	1.42	464	3.83	1.41	-0.19	0.80	31
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	27	2.89	1.33	465	3.13	1.21	-0.24	1.06	29
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	28	3.54	1.59	465	3.84	1.16	-0.30	1.26	30
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	28	2.64	1.94	465	2.65	1.47	-0.01	0.02	30
21.	Career intentions.	28	2.36	1.50	464	2.37	1.36	-0.01	0.06	30

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

^bSignificant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 18

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party MOS

(Group A Preferred Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A		N	Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a	
		Mean	Variance		Mean	Variance				
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	21	4.10	0.99	83	3.66	1.15	0.44	1.75	34
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	21	3.76	1.09	82	3.49	0.97	0.27	1.09	31
3.	Interest in his work.	21	3.62	1.35	83	3.28	1.52	0.34	1.19	34
4.	Performance on the job.	21	3.71	0.81	83	3.25	1.34	0.46	1.97	40
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	21	3.24	1.79	83	2.84	1.48	0.40	1.23	30
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	18	3.11	1.40	72	3.21	1.32	-0.10	0.31	27
9.	Chances for promotion.	18	3.00	1.29	72	3.11	1.31	-0.11	0.37	27
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	18	3.83	0.74	72	3.43	0.78	0.40	1.77	28
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	18	3.94	1.58	72	3.96	1.20	-0.02	0.04	25
12.	Interest in doing your work.	18	4.06	1.23	72	3.76	1.54	0.30	0.97	30
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	18	3.39	2.25	72	2.88	1.55	0.51	1.34	24
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	18	4.44	1.20	72	4.18	1.33	0.26	0.90	28
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	18	4.33	1.41	72	4.39	0.97	-0.06	0.18	24
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	18	4.00	0.94	72	3.50	1.49	0.50	1.85	34
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	18	3.89	0.81	72	3.46	1.55	0.43	1.67	37
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	18	3.06	1.11	72	2.58	1.26	0.48	1.68	29
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	18	3.89	1.52	72	3.65	1.58	0.24	0.72	28
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	18	2.28	1.15	72	2.42	1.43	-0.14	0.48	30
21.	Career intentions.	18	2.17	1.09	72	2.07	1.33	0.10	0.35	30

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 19

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation
Between Two Groups Working in Motor Transport MOS

(Group A Preferred Motor Transport at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Motor Transport at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	97	3.99	0.91	105	3.72	1.14	0.27	1.87	202
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	97	3.82	1.04	105	3.43	1.38	0.39	2.56*	201
3.	Interest in his work.	97	3.63	1.13	105	3.30	1.71	0.33	2.00*	199
4.	Performance on the job.	97	3.65	1.06	105	3.28	1.47	0.37	2.36*	201
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	97	3.35	1.31	104	3.05	1.56	0.30	1.79	201
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	87	3.41	1.34	93	3.46	1.08	-0.05	0.30	175
9.	Chances for promotion.	87	3.18	1.13	93	3.04	1.22	0.14	0.87	180
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	86	3.60	0.97	93	3.66	0.88	-0.06	0.36	176
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	87	4.40	0.71	92	4.30	1.16	0.10	0.68	173
12.	Interest in doing your work.	87	4.39	0.73	93	3.96	1.37	0.43	2.86*	170
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	87	3.59	1.29	92	3.28	1.39	0.31	1.75	179
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	87	4.22	1.34	92	4.53	0.58	-0.31	2.13*	149
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	87	4.28	1.25	93	4.52	0.80	-0.24	1.59	166
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	87	3.79	1.28	93	3.98	1.13	-0.19	1.13	177
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	87	3.74	1.36	93	3.81	1.38	-0.07	0.41	179
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	87	2.95	1.42	93	2.97	1.12	-0.02	0.08	174
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	87	3.74	1.20	93	3.84	1.05	-0.10	0.65	177
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	87	2.56	1.32	93	2.55	1.38	0.01	0.09	180
21.	Career intentions.	87	2.22	1.29	93	2.33	1.29	-0.11	0.68	179

Note.--

^a Degrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 20

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Military Police and Corrections

(Group A Preferred Military Police and Corrections at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Military Police and Corrections at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value	df ^a
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	42	4.10	1.02	64	4.33	0.67	-0.23	1.25	76
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	42	3.86	1.15	64	3.98	0.68	-0.21	0.65	73
3.	Interest in his work.	42	3.79	1.25	64	3.94	1.01	-0.15	0.71	83
4.	Performance on the job.	42	3.83	1.22	64	3.89	0.96	-0.06	0.27	82
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	41	3.88	1.26	64	3.81	1.01	0.07	0.30	80
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	39	3.69	1.01	60	3.58	0.96	0.11	0.53	82
9.	Chances for promotion.	40	3.40	1.17	63	3.38	1.11	0.02	0.09	83
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	40	3.40	0.91	63	3.57	0.86	-0.17	0.90	83
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	40	4.28	0.87	63	4.37	0.88	-0.09	0.48	85
12.	Interest in doing your work.	40	4.35	0.75	63	4.17	0.89	0.18	0.97	91
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	40	3.58	1.43	63	3.60	1.63	-0.02	0.11	89
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	40	4.55	0.66	63	4.54	0.64	0.01	0.06	84
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	40	4.45	0.77	63	4.51	0.58	-0.06	0.34	76
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	40	4.03	1.56	63	3.95	1.56	0.08	0.29	85
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	40	3.60	1.43	63	3.76	1.57	-0.16	0.66	88
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	40	3.30	1.24	63	3.29	1.69	0.01	0.06	94
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	40	3.75	1.17	63	4.22	0.98	-0.47	2.23*	80
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	40	3.35	1.52	63	2.84	1.39	0.51	2.08*	82
21.	Career intentions.	40	2.85	1.21	63	2.71	1.34	0.14	0.60	88

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 21
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Infantry MOS

(Group A Preferred Infantry at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Infantry at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^b
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	24	3.79	1.13	465	3.89	0.88	-0.10	0.45	25
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	24	3.67	0.93	465	3.68	1.03	-0.01	0.04	26
3.	Interest in his work.	24	3.50	2.17	465	3.38	1.25	0.12	0.39	25
4.	Performance on the job.	24	3.67	1.71	465	3.50	1.23	0.17	0.62	25
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	24	3.54	1.48	459	3.23	1.37	0.31	1.23	25
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	26	4.00	0.96	476	3.63	0.98	0.37	1.86	28
9.	Chances for promotion.	26	3.73	0.92	476	3.19	1.16	0.54	2.76*	29
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	26	3.85	0.70	475	3.18	0.89	0.67	3.94*	29
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	26	4.50	0.90	475	4.26	0.97	0.24	1.26	28
12.	Interest in doing your work.	26	4.35	0.64	475	3.55	1.52	0.80	4.80*	33
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	26	3.73	1.48	475	2.56	1.48	1.17	4.76*	28
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	26	3.77	2.02	476	4.61	0.65	-0.84	2.98*	26
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	26	4.50	1.06	476	4.53	0.78	-0.03	0.13	27
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	26	4.23	0.82	475	3.95	1.16	0.28	1.51	29
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	26	4.04	1.00	475	3.79	1.48	0.25	1.20	30
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	25	3.40	1.25	476	3.10	1.22	0.30	1.30	27
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	26	4.04	1.08	476	3.79	1.22	0.25	1.17	28
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	26	3.31	1.18	476	2.61	1.49	0.70	3.18*	29
21.	Career intentions.	26	2.96	1.32	475	2.33	1.36	0.63	2.74*	28

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 22

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party MOS

(Group A Preferred Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Construction, Equipment, and Shore Party at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	28	4.07	0.88	62	3.60	1.23	0.47	2.09*	63
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	28	3.54	1.00	61	3.52	0.99	0.02	0.05	54
3.	Interest in his work.	28	3.61	1.36	62	3.26	1.47	0.35	1.30	56
4.	Performance on the job.	28	3.54	1.15	62	3.27	1.25	0.27	1.06	56
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	28	2.96	1.81	62	2.89	1.58	0.07	0.26	51
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	29	3.83	0.58	63	2.94	1.45	0.89	4.30*	84
9.	Chances for promotion.	29	3.14	1.05	63	3.10	1.44	0.04	0.18	65
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	29	3.83	0.58	63	3.41	0.89	0.42	2.25*	69
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	29	4.28	0.85	63	3.86	1.41	0.42	1.84	71
12.	Interest in doing your work.	29	4.48	0.40	63	3.54	1.67	0.94	4.69*	92
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	29	3.97	1.03	63	2.57	1.44	1.40	5.76*	66
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	29	4.48	0.97	63	4.10	1.41	0.38	1.64	67
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	29	4.38	0.82	63	4.38	1.14	0.00	0.01	66
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	29	3.83	0.79	63	3.46	1.77	0.37	1.56	81
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	29	3.79	0.81	63	3.48	1.64	0.31	1.36	77
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	29	3.14	0.77	63	2.48	1.35	0.66	3.03*	73
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	29	4.14	0.98	63	3.56	1.70	0.58	2.36*	73
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	29	2.59	1.32	63	2.33	1.39	0.26	0.97	57
21.	Career intentions.	29	2.34	1.45	63	1.97	1.16	0.37	1.44	51

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant of the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 23

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Motor Transport MOS

(Group A Preferred Motor Transport at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Motor Transport at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a	
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>									
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	79	4.01	0.86	99	3.86	0.15	1.07	174
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	79	3.76	1.01	99	3.68	0.08	0.53	174
3.	Interest in his work.	79	3.65	1.33	99	3.47	0.18	0.98	170
4.	Performance on the job.	79	3.57	1.09	99	3.52	0.05	0.34	172
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	79	3.38	1.21	98	3.22	0.16	0.90	174
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>									
8.	Training received for present job.	82	3.41	1.21	101	3.44	-0.03	0.13	175
9.	Chances for promotion.	82	2.87	1.06	101	3.30	-0.43	2.75*	179
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	81	3.63	0.86	101	3.61	0.02	0.11	178
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	82	4.51	0.57	100	4.21	0.30	2.19*	177
12.	Interest in doing your work.	82	4.44	0.67	101	3.95	0.49	3.35*	180
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	82	3.77	1.41	100	3.13	0.64	3.73*	169
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	82	4.44	0.72	100	4.34	0.10	0.69	182
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	82	4.40	1.03	101	4.42	-0.02	0.09	174
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	82	3.87	1.28	101	3.90	-0.03	0.21	174
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	82	3.83	1.13	101	3.73	0.10	0.57	182
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	82	3.00	1.28	101	2.91	0.09	0.53	175
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	82	3.83	0.96	101	3.72	0.11	0.68	182
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	82	2.57	1.38	101	2.53	0.04	0.22	174
21.	Career intentions.	82	2.30	1.35	101	2.27	0.03	0.22	174

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 24

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations
Between Two Groups Working in Military Police and Corrections

(Group A Preferred Military Police and Corrections at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Military Police and Corrections at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
	<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>									
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	70	4.41	0.65	34	4.00	0.73	0.41	2.36*	64
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	70	4.14	0.65	34	3.65	0.84	0.49	2.69*	60
3.	Interest in his work.	70	4.09	0.89	34	3.56	1.04	0.53	2.53*	63
4.	Performance on the job.	70	4.03	0.84	34	3.68	1.13	0.35	1.65	59
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	70	4.01	0.94	34	3.50	1.29	0.51	2.27*	59
	<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>									
8.	Training received for present job.	66	3.80	0.96	34	3.26	0.81	0.54	2.75*	74
9.	Chances for promotion.	70	3.59	1.03	34	2.97	1.06	0.62	2.87*	66
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	70	3.60	0.85	34	3.32	0.89	0.38	1.41	66
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	70	4.49	0.72	34	4.03	1.06	0.46	2.24*	57
12.	Interest in doing your work.	70	4.56	0.54	34	3.62	0.85	0.94	5.20*	55
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	70	4.00	1.13	34	2.79	1.44	1.21	4.98*	60
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	70	4.53	0.69	34	4.59	0.55	-0.06	0.37	74
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	70	4.44	0.69	34	4.59	0.55	-0.15	0.90	74
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	70	4.21	1.10	34	3.44	2.19	0.77	2.73*	51
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	70	3.86	1.20	34	3.32	2.04	0.54	1.92	54
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	70	3.49	1.30	34	2.91	1.72	0.58	2.18*	59
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	70	4.11	0.97	34	3.88	1.32	0.23	1.01	59
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	70	3.23	1.43	34	2.59	1.46	0.64	2.54*	66
21.	Career intentions.	70	2.96	1.20	34	2.32	1.26	0.64	2.72*	66

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at the 5% level of confidence.

Comparisons within Occupational Areas between Groups who Preferred Area and Groups Having Other Preferences*

1. MAPS I Preferences

Tables 25-28 present the mean differences on items of the Job Rating Scale (Supervisory Evaluations) and MAPS III (Self-Evaluations) between two groups of individuals working within the same occupational area but differing in occupational preference on MAPS I.

The following statistically significant differences were found:

a. Administrative Specialties (Table 26):

Self-Evaluations

Satisfaction with present job assignment

b. Technical Specialists (Table 27):

Self-Evaluations

Career intentions

Personnel who indicated a preference for working in the Administrative area on MAPS I were more satisfied with their job assignments than were those working in this area who had a different preference. On the other hand, individuals who were working as Technical Specialists and preferred it on MAPS I were more negative with respect to making a career of the Marine Corps than those who did not prefer this area on MAPS I.

2. MAPS II Preferences

Enlistees working in a particular occupational area were separated into two groups, based on whether or not they had expressed a preference for working in that particular occupational area at MAPS II (Tables 29-32). Significant differences were found in the following items:

a. Administrative Specialties (Table 30):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on the job

Self-Evaluations

Interest in doing your work

Satisfaction with present job assignment

*Comparisons were made by utilizing the identical procedure used for comparing groups working within an occupational field.

b. Technical Specialists (Table 31):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on the job
Ability to learn duties on the job
Interest in his work
Performance on the job
Man's attitude toward Marine Corps

Self-Evaluations

Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment

c. Electronics and Communications (Table 32):

Self-Evaluations

Freedom in doing your job
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment

All significant differences based on MAPS II preferences were in the direction of more favorable evaluations for individuals working in the occupational area preferred.

3. MAPS III Preferences

Many statistically significant differences in supervisory and self-evaluations were found between personnel working in each of the four occupational areas who had preferred that area on MAPS III and those who preferred another area at that time. The items on which statistically significant differences were found are listed below:

a. Combat and Combat Arms (Table 33):

Supervisory Evaluations

Man's attitude toward the Marine Corps

Self-Evaluations

Chances for promotion
Freedom in doing your job
Importance your job has for Marine Corps
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Importance of learning a trade/skill while
in Marine Corps

b. Administrative Specialties (Table 34):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on job
Ability to learn duties on the job
Interest in his work
Performance on the job
Man's attitude toward Marine Corps

Self-Evaluations

Training received for present job
Chances for promotion
Freedom in doing your job
Importance your job has for Marine Corps
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Extent serving in Marine Corps has
improved your self confidence
Extent serving in Marine Corps has
helped you become more of a man
Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay
Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits
Career intentions

c. Technical Specialists (Table 35):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on job
Ability to learn duties on the job
Interest in his work
Performance on the job
Man's attitude toward Marine Corps

Self-Evaluations

Training received for present job
Freedom in doing your job
Importance your job has for Marine Corps
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Extent serving in Marine Corps has
improved your self-confidence
Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay
Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits
Reenlistment intentions
Career intentions

d. Electronics and Communications (Table 36):

Supervisory Evaluations

Ability to get along with others on job
Ability to learn duties on the job
Interest in his work
Performance on the job
Man's attitude toward Marine Corps

Self-Evaluations

Training received for present job
Chances for promotion
Freedom in doing your job
Importance your job has for Marine Corps
Interest in doing your work
Satisfaction with present job assignment
Extent serving in Marine Corps has
helped you become more of a man
Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay
Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits

All significant differences based on MAPS III area preferences were in favor of individuals working in the occupational area they preferred except for the item, "Importance of learning a trade/skill while in the Marine Corps", in the Combat and Combat Arms sample. In this instance, personnel working in that area who preferred another area on MAPS III placed greater importance on learning a trade/skill than did personnel who preferred working in the area.

TABLE 25
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between
Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area

(Group A Preferred Combat and Combat Arms at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Combat and Combat Arms at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a
		N	Mean Variance	N	Mean Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>								
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	56	3.82 0.88	614	3.90 0.89	-0.08	0.57	66
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	56	3.66 1.14	614	3.65 1.03	0.01	0.06	65
3.	Interest in his work.	56	3.11 1.48	614	3.41 1.32	-0.30	1.79	65
4.	Performance on the job.	56	3.29 1.30	614	3.52 1.32	-0.23	1.45	66
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	56	3.20 1.83	608	3.21 1.37	-0.01	0.05	63
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>								
8.	Training received for present job.	50	3.56 1.15	574	3.60 1.01	-0.04	0.24	57
9.	Chances for promotion.	50	3.14 1.63	574	3.20 1.08	-0.06	0.33	55
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	50	3.20 0.90	573	3.26 0.88	-0.06	0.42	58
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	50	4.24 1.04	572	4.28 0.90	-0.04	0.27	57
12.	Interest in doing your work.	50	3.70 1.03	573	3.61 1.46	0.09	0.62	62
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	49	2.55 1.17	574	2.72 1.53	-0.17	1.03	60
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	50	4.36 1.26	574	4.54 0.78	-0.18	1.11	55
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	50	4.40 1.02	574	4.53 0.75	-0.13	0.90	56
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	50	3.70 1.23	573	3.95 1.12	-0.25	1.56	57
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	50	3.64 1.75	572	3.78 1.44	-0.14	0.74	57
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	50	2.80 1.63	573	3.11 1.21	-0.31	1.66	56
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	50	3.56 1.76	573	3.78 1.19	-0.22	1.15	55
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	50	2.50 1.56	574	2.61 1.52	-0.11	0.58	58
21.	Career intentions.	50	2.10 1.36	573	2.35 1.57	-0.25	1.44	58

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 26
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between
Two Groups Working in Administrative Specialties Area

(Group A Preferred Administrative Specialties at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Administrative Specialties at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a	
		N	Variance	N	Variance				
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>									
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	29	4.07	0.92	744	4.23	0.84	0.88	30
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	29	3.62	1.03	744	3.94	0.96	1.66	30
3.	Interest in his work.	29	3.66	1.38	744	3.77	1.27	0.52	30
4.	Performance on the job.	29	3.72	0.92	744	3.82	1.11	0.53	31
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	29	3.31	1.44	743	3.44	1.22	0.56	30
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>									
8.	Training received for present job.	30	3.50	1.84	720	3.04	1.56	1.81	31
9.	Chances for promotion.	30	3.37	0.72	722	3.30	1.10	0.44	33
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	30	3.77	0.81	721	3.73	0.82	0.22	32
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	29	4.41	0.61	722	4.22	0.88	1.31	32
12.	Interest in doing your work.	30	4.10	1.06	722	3.79	1.21	1.60	32
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	30	4.00	1.31	722	3.31	1.42	3.22*	32
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	30	3.97	2.03	722	4.14	1.38	0.66	31
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	30	4.27	1.24	721	4.36	1.02	0.46	31
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	30	3.33	2.09	722	3.69	1.27	1.34	31
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	30	3.27	2.13	720	3.51	1.42	0.91	31
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	30	3.07	1.44	721	3.02	1.21	0.22	31
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	30	3.93	0.69	718	3.78	1.13	1.00	33
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	30	2.50	2.05	722	2.37	1.40	0.50	31
21.	Career intentions.	30	2.27	1.93	722	2.14	1.25	0.50	31

Note:--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 27
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between
Two Groups Working in Technical Specialists Area

(Group A Preferred Technical Specialists at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Technical Specialists at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	112	3.96	1.20	491	3.88	1.06	0.08	0.70	160
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	112	3.68	1.25	490	3.63	1.10	0.05	0.38	160
3.	Interest in his work.	112	3.54	1.40	491	3.48	1.54	0.06	0.51	172
4.	Performance on the job.	112	3.55	1.35	491	3.51	1.27	0.04	0.40	163
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	112	3.32	1.46	488	3.23	1.53	0.09	0.74	169
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	98	3.31	1.41	454	3.47	1.12	-0.16	1.27	133
9.	Chances for promotion.	98	3.07	1.28	457	3.15	1.17	-0.08	0.60	138
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	97	3.60	0.70	458	3.49	0.93	0.11	1.11	156
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	98	4.18	1.04	456	4.31	0.95	-0.13	1.11	139
12.	Interest in doing your work.	98	4.13	1.13	458	3.96	1.34	0.17	1.41	152
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	98	3.44	1.51	457	3.27	1.64	0.17	1.23	147
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	98	4.37	0.98	457	4.44	0.91	-0.07	0.64	139
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	98	4.37	0.96	458	4.45	0.88	-0.08	0.72	139
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	98	3.64	1.51	458	3.84	1.35	-0.20	1.44	137
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	98	3.59	1.54	457	3.72	1.39	-0.13	0.93	138
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	98	3.02	1.36	458	2.98	1.21	0.04	0.28	137
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	98	3.63	1.25	457	3.85	1.14	-0.22	1.75	139
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	98	2.45	1.28	458	2.66	1.41	-0.21	1.69	147
21.	Career intentions.	98	2.12	1.06	458	2.38	1.36	-0.26	2.18*	157

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 28
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between
Two Groups Working in Electronics and Communications Area

(Group A Preferred Electronics and Communications at Administration I)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Electronics and Communications at Administration I)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	12	4.17	0.88	355	4.09	0.81	0.08	0.29	12
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	12	3.92	0.81	355	3.89	0.83	0.03	0.11	12
3.	Interest in his work.	12	3.67	2.06	355	3.70	1.07	-0.03	0.09	11
4.	Performance on the job.	12	3.50	1.55	355	3.70	0.86	-0.20	0.56	11
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	12	3.50	1.00	354	3.40	1.07	0.10	0.35	12
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	11	3.55	0.67	349	3.34	1.10	0.21	0.81	11
9.	Chances for promotion.	11	3.73	0.82	350	3.25	1.03	0.48	1.73	11
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	11	4.00	1.00	350	3.57	0.73	0.43	1.41	11
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	11	4.45	0.47	350	4.35	0.91	0.10	0.47	11
12.	Interest in doing your work.	11	4.00	1.20	350	3.77	1.24	0.23	0.68	11
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	11	3.82	1.36	350	3.20	1.31	0.62	1.72	11
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	11	4.36	1.05	350	4.24	1.28	0.12	0.40	11
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	11	4.00	1.00	350	4.38	1.06	-0.38	1.25	11
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	11	3.91	0.69	350	3.73	1.35	0.18	0.68	12
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	11	3.36	1.45	349	3.52	1.46	-0.16	0.42	11
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	11	2.64	1.45	350	2.95	1.13	-0.31	0.86	11
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	11	3.64	1.05	350	3.77	1.19	-0.13	0.41	11
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	11	1.82	0.96	350	2.31	1.38	-0.49	1.64	11
21.	Career intentions.	11	1.73	0.82	350	2.08	1.22	-0.35	1.25	11

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 29

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area

(Group A Preferred Combat and Combat Arms at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Combat and Combat Arms at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^b		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	41	3.98	0.92	623	3.89	0.88	0.09	0.58	45
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	41	3.56	1.00	623	3.65	1.04	-0.09	0.57	46
3.	Interest in his work.	41	3.34	0.93	623	3.39	1.37	-0.05	0.31	48
4.	Performance on the job.	41	3.49	0.81	623	3.50	1.34	-0.01	0.09	50
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	41	3.41	1.45	617	3.20	1.40	0.21	1.10	46
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	40	3.63	1.21	576	3.60	1.00	0.03	0.15	44
9.	Chances for promotion.	40	3.23	1.05	576	3.21	1.12	0.02	0.10	45
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	40	3.33	1.05	575	3.26	0.87	0.07	0.40	44
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	40	4.18	1.23	574	4.28	0.89	-0.10	0.56	43
12.	Interest in doing your work.	40	3.45	1.48	575	3.63	1.41	-0.18	0.91	45
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	40	2.55	1.23	575	2.73	1.52	-0.18	0.96	46
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	40	4.55	0.82	576	4.52	0.82	0.03	0.20	45
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	40	4.60	0.61	576	4.52	0.79	0.08	0.64	47
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	40	3.73	1.28	575	3.96	1.09	-0.23	1.29	44
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	40	3.78	1.36	574	3.78	1.44	0.00	0.03	45
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	39	2.92	1.18	576	3.10	1.25	-0.18	0.99	44
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	40	3.68	1.46	575	3.79	1.21	-0.11	0.59	44
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	40	2.43	1.89	576	2.62	1.50	-0.19	0.88	44
21.	Career intentions.	40	2.18	1.48	575	2.35	1.36	-0.17	0.87	44

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 30
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between
Two Groups Working in Administrative Specialties Area

(Group A Preferred Administrative Specialties at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Administrative Specialties at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^b		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	64	4.42	0.53	700	4.21	0.86	0.21	2.18*	83
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	64	3.98	0.81	700	3.93	0.97	0.05	0.50	78
3.	Interest in his work.	64	3.88	1.13	700	3.76	1.27	0.12	0.84	77
4.	Performance on the job.	64	3.97	0.82	700	3.81	1.12	0.16	1.36	80
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	64	3.42	1.07	699	3.43	1.24	-0.01	0.07	77
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	63	3.22	1.69	676	3.03	1.57	0.20	1.13	73
9.	Chances for promotion.	63	3.29	1.11	678	3.30	1.08	-0.01	0.09	74
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	62	3.94	0.75	678	3.72	0.81	0.22	1.88	74
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	63	4.38	0.53	677	4.21	0.90	0.17	1.78	84
12.	Interest in doing your work.	63	4.24	0.64	678	3.76	1.25	0.48	4.41*	87
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	63	3.68	1.28	678	3.30	1.43	0.38	2.57*	76
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	63	4.17	1.53	678	4.12	1.41	0.05	0.33	73
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	63	4.38	1.14	677	4.35	1.03	0.03	0.21	73
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	63	3.59	1.50	678	3.69	1.28	-0.10	0.61	72
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	62	3.52	1.50	677	3.50	1.45	0.02	0.11	73
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	63	3.13	0.98	677	3.01	1.23	0.12	0.87	78
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	62	3.66	0.95	675	3.79	1.13	-0.13	0.97	75
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	63	2.38	1.98	678	2.37	1.39	0.01	0.08	71
21.	Career intentions.	63	2.14	1.71	678	2.14	1.25	0.00	0.02	71

Note.--

^a Degrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 31
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between
Two Groups Working in Technical Specialists Area

(Group A Preferred Technical Specialists at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Technical Specialists at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	179	4.02	0.93	415	3.84	1.13	0.18	2.01*	371
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	179	3.80	1.06	414	3.59	1.13	0.21	2.34*	350
3.	Interest in his work.	179	3.66	1.21	415	3.43	1.58	0.23	2.25*	385
4.	Performance on the job.	179	3.70	1.07	415	3.45	1.33	0.25	2.64*	376
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	178	3.46	1.37	413	3.17	1.53	0.29	2.73*	356
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	162	3.46	1.27	382	3.43	1.14	0.03	0.32	291
9.	Chances for promotion.	163	3.22	1.12	384	3.11	1.22	0.11	1.11	319
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	162	3.58	0.92	385	3.49	0.88	0.09	1.06	298
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	163	4.31	0.91	384	4.27	1.00	0.04	0.46	321
12.	Interest in doing your work.	163	4.30	0.88	385	3.85	1.44	0.45	4.72*	389
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	163	3.54	1.47	384	3.19	1.64	0.35	3.03*	323
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	163	4.38	1.06	384	4.44	0.87	-0.06	0.66	281
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	163	4.33	1.12	385	4.47	0.81	-0.14	1.50	266
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	163	3.87	1.36	385	3.79	1.35	0.08	0.67	306
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	163	3.71	1.39	384	3.69	1.44	0.02	0.16	312
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	163	3.06	1.30	385	2.98	1.19	0.08	0.75	295
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	163	3.76	1.22	384	3.84	1.13	-0.08	0.79	296
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	163	2.70	1.48	385	2.59	1.35	0.11	0.93	294
21.	Career intentions.	163	2.34	1.29	385	2.33	1.31	0.01	0.15	310

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 32

Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between Two Groups Working in Electronics and Communication Area

(Group A Preferred Electronics and Communications at Administration II)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Electronics and Communications at Administration II)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	50	4.16	0.83	312	4.10	0.78	0.06	0.46	65
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	50	3.96	1.02	312	3.88	0.80	0.08	0.52	62
3.	Interest in his work.	50	3.72	1.35	312	3.71	1.06	0.01	0.09	63
4.	Performance on the job.	50	3.74	1.22	312	3.70	0.81	0.04	0.23	60
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	50	3.40	1.02	311	3.40	1.07	0.00	0.01	67
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	48	3.46	0.85	305	3.33	1.12	0.13	0.87	69
9.	Chances for promotion.	49	3.29	0.96	305	3.25	1.04	0.04	0.24	67
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	49	3.82	0.74	305	3.53	0.74	0.29	2.13*	65
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	49	4.35	0.90	305	4.35	0.91	0.00	0.03	65
12.	Interest in doing your work.	49	4.08	1.03	305	3.74	1.25	0.34	2.17*	69
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	49	3.67	1.06	305	3.14	1.34	0.53	3.30*	70
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	49	4.27	1.07	305	4.25	1.29	0.02	0.12	69
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	49	4.45	0.92	305	4.36	1.10	0.09	0.61	69
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	49	3.71	0.88	305	3.73	1.42	-0.02	0.09	77
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	49	3.20	1.58	304	3.55	1.43	-0.35	1.78	63
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	49	2.94	1.10	305	2.95	1.15	-0.01	0.05	66
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	49	3.61	1.33	305	3.78	1.16	-0.17	0.98	63
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	49	2.16	1.35	305	2.32	1.37	-0.16	0.87	65
21.	Career intentions.	49	2.00	1.21	305	2.08	1.20	-0.08	0.47	65

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 33
Sample Size, Means, Variance, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between
Two Groups Working in Combat and Combat Arms Area

(Group A Preferred Combat and Combat Arms at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Combat and Combat Arms at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a	
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>									
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	50	3.96	0.81	556	3.90	0.06	0.43	59
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	50	3.70	0.62	556	3.67	0.03	0.27	66
3.	Interest in his work.	50	3.72	1.39	556	3.39	0.33	1.92	58
4.	Performance on the job.	50	3.80	1.10	556	3.50	0.30	1.92	60
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	50	3.56	1.11	550	3.21	0.35	2.22*	61
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>									
8.	Training received for present job.	53	3.85	1.02	572	3.58	0.27	1.87	62
9.	Chances for promotion.	53	3.60	1.05	572	3.16	0.44	3.04*	63
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	53	3.89	0.64	571	3.19	0.70	5.94*	66
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	53	4.53	0.64	570	4.25	0.28	2.42*	68
12.	Interest in doing your work.	53	4.43	0.48	571	3.53	0.90	8.35*	86
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	53	3.85	1.21	571	2.60	1.25	7.86*	64
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	53	4.06	1.55	572	4.57	0.72	2.95*	57
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	53	4.43	0.87	572	4.53	-0.10	0.72	61
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	53	4.06	1.02	571	3.93	0.13	0.88	64
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	53	3.87	1.04	570	3.76	0.11	0.71	67
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	52	3.29	1.11	572	3.08	0.21	1.38	62
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	53	3.83	1.14	571	3.76	0.07	0.43	63
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	53	2.81	1.66	572	2.59	0.22	1.22	61
21.	Career intentions.	53	2.47	1.37	571	2.32	0.15	0.92	62

Note.---

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 34

Sample Size, Means, Variance and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between Two Groups Working in Administrative Specialties Area

(Group A Preferred Administrative Specialties at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Administrative Specialties at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A			Group B			Mean Diff.	T Value ^d	df ^a
		N	Mean	Variance	N	Mean	Variance			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	190	4.49	0.46	538	4.14	0.93	0.35	5.39*	473
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	190	4.12	0.60	538	3.86	1.05	0.26	3.58*	437
3.	Interest in his work.	190	4.13	0.76	538	3.66	1.36	0.47	5.78*	444
4.	Performance on the job.	190	4.06	0.71	538	3.75	1.16	0.31	4.00*	422
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	189	3.72	0.95	538	3.35	1.29	0.37	4.28*	382
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	198	3.40	1.45	548	2.93	1.57	0.47	4.69*	363
9.	Chances for promotion.	198	3.50	0.97	550	3.22	1.12	0.28	3.36*	372
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	197	3.90	0.62	550	3.67	0.88	0.23	3.46*	411
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	198	4.47	0.59	549	4.13	0.95	0.34	4.99*	442
12.	Interest in doing your work.	198	4.44	0.41	550	3.57	1.31	0.87	13.17*	620
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	198	4.23	0.65	550	3.01	1.33	1.22	16.07*	498
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	198	4.05	1.49	550	4.17	1.38	-0.12	1.25	338
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	198	4.37	1.05	549	4.36	1.04	0.01	0.16	348
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	198	3.92	1.05	550	3.59	1.37	0.33	3.78*	396
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	198	3.73	1.31	548	3.41	1.49	0.32	3.24*	371
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	198	3.19	1.11	549	2.95	1.23	0.24	2.65*	367
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	197	4.01	0.83	547	3.70	1.19	0.31	3.93*	413
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	198	2.47	1.43	550	2.34	1.42	0.13	1.32	349
21.	Career intentions.	198	2.31	1.40	550	2.09	1.22	0.22	2.34*	329

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 35

Sample Size, Means, Variance and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluation Between Two Groups Working in Technical Specialists Area

(Group A Preferred Technical Specialists at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Technical Specialists at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a		
		N	Mean	Variance	N				Mean	Variance
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>										
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	222	4.14	0.90	322	3.81	1.03	0.33	3.83*	497
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	222	3.87	1.00	321	3.58	1.04	0.29	3.29*	484
3.	Interest in his work.	222	3.82	1.29	322	3.39	1.42	0.43	4.23*	491
4.	Performance on the job.	222	3.73	1.15	322	3.46	1.17	0.27	2.89*	481
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	222	3.50	1.37	320	3.19	1.46	0.31	3.06*	487
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>										
8.	Training received for present job.	223	3.61	1.07	328	3.32	1.22	0.29	3.22*	499
9.	Chances for promotion.	227	3.21	1.19	328	3.09	1.20	0.12	1.27	490
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	226	3.64	0.79	328	3.43	0.94	0.21	2.69*	512
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	227	4.50	0.65	326	4.13	1.14	0.37	4.61*	549
12.	Interest in doing your work.	227	4.50	0.57	328	3.63	1.52	0.87	10.33*	547
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	227	3.87	1.32	327	2.90	1.47	0.97	9.58*	504
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	227	4.48	0.76	327	4.39	1.03	0.09	1.18	529
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	227	4.43	0.81	328	4.43	0.96	0.00	0.02	512
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	227	3.93	1.33	328	3.72	1.41	0.21	2.07*	497
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	227	3.75	1.26	327	3.65	1.52	0.10	0.94	516
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	227	3.14	1.21	328	2.90	1.22	0.24	2.53*	490
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	227	3.95	0.99	327	3.73	1.27	0.22	2.46*	523
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	227	2.78	1.46	328	2.52	1.33	0.26	2.52*	473
21.	Career intentions.	227	2.52	1.37	328	2.21	1.25	0.31	3.10*	473

Note.--

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

TABLE 36
Sample Size, Means, Variances, and Mean Differences on Supervisory and Self-Evaluations Between Two Groups Working in Electronics and Communications Area

(Group A Preferred Electronics and Communications at Administration III)
(Group B Did Not Prefer Electronics and Communications at Administration III)

Item No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Mean Diff.	T Value ^a	df ^a
		N	Mean	Variance	N			
<u>Job Rating Form (Supervisory Evaluation)</u>								
1.	Ability to get along with others on job.	110	4.29	0.61	240	4.02	0.87	251
2.	Ability to learn duties on the job.	110	4.15	0.62	240	3.78	0.90	254
3.	Interest in his work.	110	4.07	0.77	240	3.53	1.14	256
4.	Performance on the job.	110	3.93	0.58	240	3.59	1.00	274
5.	Man's attitude toward Marine Corps.	110	3.65	0.76	239	3.31	1.13	256
<u>MAPS III (Self-Evaluation)</u>								
8.	Training received for present job.	112	3.53	0.99	247	3.26	1.10	227
9.	Chances for promotion.	113	3.50	0.73	247	3.15	1.13	267
10.	Freedom in doing your job.	113	3.88	0.47	247	3.45	0.81	282
11.	Importance your job has for Marine Corps.	113	4.55	0.39	247	4.27	1.10	336
12.	Interest in doing your work.	113	4.32	0.59	247	3.53	1.33	313
13.	Satisfaction with present job assignment.	113	3.96	0.72	247	2.88	1.24	282
14.	Importance of learning a trade/skill while in Marine Corps.	113	4.28	1.12	247	4.22	1.35	239
15.	Importance of improving education while in Marine Corps.	113	4.44	0.70	247	4.34	1.23	285
16.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has improved your self-confidence.	113	3.85	1.13	247	3.68	1.42	244
17.	Extent serving in Marine Corps has helped you become more of a man.	113	3.72	1.28	246	3.43	1.51	237
18.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps pay.	113	3.23	0.98	247	2.81	1.15	235
19.	Satisfaction with Marine Corps benefits.	113	3.98	0.89	247	3.66	1.29	260
20.	Reenlistment intentions.	113	2.37	1.41	247	2.26	1.33	213
21.	Career intentions.	113	2.06	1.18	247	2.06	1.22	222

Note.---

^aDegrees of freedom adjusted for unequal sample sizes and unequal variances.

*Significant at 5% level of confidence.

DISCUSSION

As indicated in the findings, stability of occupational preferences was quite low. The difference in the time interval between administrations of MAPS could account for the relative levels of stability. The greater the time interval between administrations, the greater the opportunity for recruits to acquire additional information on Marine Corps occupational fields and to obtain experience in a particular occupational field. Since the average new recruit probably is quite naive with respect to military occupational fields, a high degree of stability in occupational preference should not be expected during the early stages of the first enlistment.

Within the four occupational fields (Infantry; Construction, Equipment and Shore Party; Motor Transport; and Military Police and Corrections) and the four occupational areas (Combat and Combat Arms; Administrative Specialties; Technical Specialists; Electronics and Communications) analyses were made in which sample sizes were adequate. It was found that the number of significant differences in job satisfaction, job performance, and service plans between (1) individuals working within their preferred occupational field/area, and (2) those working in the same field/area but who preferred another increased when preferences are made at later points in time.

An occupational preference must be obtained prior to enlistment if it is to serve as an enlistment inducement, and early in basic training if it is to serve as a basis for making assignments. This fact that evaluations of groups made up on the basis of occupational preferences obtained 6 months after the completion of recruit training showed many more statistically significant differences than those for groups based on initial preferences is probably of little practical value. At that point, important decisions regarding personnel assignments have already been made, personnel have been trained or are undergoing training, and most are working in occupational field. Further, the concurrent data collection on occupational choice, self-evaluations, and supervisory evaluations at Administration III probably influenced the results. Experience while working in an occupational field is not the only factor involved in making an occupational choice, particularly when an enlistee has definite ideas on what he would like to do while serving in the Marine Corps. Still, an enlistee is more likely to express a preference for the field in which he has been working if his experiences therein have been preponderantly favorable, and more likely to express a preference for another field if these experiences have been mostly negative in character. These positive or negative experiences are likely to be reflected in both the self-evaluations and the supervisory evaluations that are collected concurrently with MAPS III. These circumstances would help to account for the much larger number of significant differences obtained in supervisory and self-evaluations when groups are separated on the basis of occupational choice made after they had been on the job than that made prior to the beginning of their work experience. Another

factor which could have contributed to the increased number of significant differences in evaluations between groups when preferences are made at later points in time might be the increased knowledge of Marine Corps occupational fields acquired over this period of service.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the present study indicate that the occupational preferences of the Marine Corps recruits are rather unstable over the early period of their first enlistment. Within the four occupational fields in which sample sizes were adequate, and within the four occupational areas, individuals who received job assignments preferred at entry into basic training generally have not demonstrated greater job satisfaction, better job performance, or more favorable attitudes toward reenlistment or pursuing a Marine Corps career.

The few statistically significant differences that have been found are too small to be of practical significance. The fact that the later occupational preferences are made, the more statistically significant differences in evaluations are obtained, is probably of little practical value.

A means of ameliorating the instability in occupational preferences observed is by deriving a minimal set of occupational fields (from the total of 28) from which the recruit is to choose an occupational preference. This minimal set is that set having the greatest association with his interests, abilities, and aptitude, and that in which his estimated job performance would be greatest. It is easier for a recruit to choose the most desired occupational field from a smaller set.

An extension of this effort is to correlate recruit occupational preferences (as a function of interests and ability variables) with Marine Corps manpower requirements. Essentially, this involves developing techniques for trading-off manpower requirements with the expressed occupational preferences.

Occupational choice is more likely (1) to be made on a more realistic basis and (2) to be more stable if choice is made after a recruit has acquired adequate knowledge of the various occupational fields. Most Marine Corps recruits have not had the opportunity to learn about Marine Corps occupational fields until they have had some Marine Corps experience. Yet the offering of occupational preference to recruits appears to be an attractive inducement for enlistment. Thus, if occupational preference is to be used for this purpose, considerable effort needs to be made to provide information about the various fields to prospective recruits prior to their enlistment. Information could be provided through a wide variety of media; lectures, demonstrations, newspapers, books,

film, radio, and television. Once adequate information is disseminated, it should be possible to collect sufficient data to conduct an investigation on the affect that granting occupational preference options to Marine Corps recruits will have on performance, job satisfaction, and service plans.

There is another situation in which the granting of occupational preferences options could be utilized to the possible benefit of the Marine Corps. Consideration may need to be given to making the Marine Corps more attractive to men already in the service. One means for accomplishing this goal would be by offering an enlistee who is eligible for reenlistment the opportunity to work in a field of his choice. During the first enlistment, recruits are often assigned to occupational fields based upon the needs of the service, and many first enlistees find themselves in a field that has little or no interest to them.

Research into the feasibility and merits of offering occupational preference options to Marine Corps first-term reenlistees seems to make sense. During the first enlistment, men have the opportunity of (1) becoming familiar with the Marine Corps and the various occupational fields which contribute to the successful accomplishment of its mission, and (2) to appraise their own abilities by evaluating them against the requirements for satisfactory performance in a particular occupational field. They are, therefore, in a good position to make realistic occupational choices.

Before such a program is adopted, information is required on the extent that occupational field options would probably affect the reenlistment plans of men who are either uncertain of their service plans or who are planning to leave the Marine Corps at the end of their first enlistment. Information on the occupational field in which men were assigned during their first enlistment and that desired for the second enlistment would provide some indication of the training needs and costs for men who are willing to take advantage of this reenlistment offer. It would also provide information on the number of enlistees who would like to move into occupational fields in which there is a need for additional personnel. This study could also determine the extent to which personnel have the aptitude area scores appropriate for entering the specific occupational fields they would prefer during a second enlistment. Such data is required before a decision can be made on whether occupational field options should be offered to first-term reenlistees as a general policy, or only to those personnel who have the desire and aptitude for working in those fields in which there is need for additional personnel.

REFERENCES

- Bowers, D. G. Values and their impact for Navy and civilian respondents. ONR Contract No. N00014-67-A-0181-0048 technical report, June 1973
- Decision Systems Associates, Inc. Recruit occupational preference. Rockville, Md.: Decision Systems Associates, Inc., 1970
- Gilbert, A. C. F. & Yellen, T. M. I. Occupational choices in the Marine Corps. Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, Cal., 1973 (NPRDC TR 74-7)
- Hoehn, A. J., Wilson, T. R., & Richards, J. A. Recruits military preferences and their accommodation by the military services. Manpower Development Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Air Force Systems Command, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 1972 (AFHR-TR 72-19)
- Natrella, M. G. Experimental Statistics. National Bureau of Standards Handbook 91. Washington: Government Printing Office, October 1966, 3, 26-30

APPENDIX

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

MAPS REV. 3

MAPS REV. 4

JOB RATING SCALE

MARINE

ASSIGNMENT

PREFERENCE

SCHEDULE



HEADQUARTERS
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

INTRODUCTION

The Marine Corps wants to know how recruits feel about the job they might be assigned.

In Part A of this survey, you are asked to choose the job field you would most like to work in while you serve in the Marines.

In Part B, you are asked to answer some questions about your enlistment in the Corps.

Name (Please print) _____
Last First Middle

Social Security Number

--	--	--

 --

--	--

 --

--	--	--	--

(Print one number in each box)

Turn the page and go to Part A

PART A

Below is a list of Military Occupational Fields (JOB FIELDS) in the Marine Corps. To give you an idea of the various kinds of jobs that are in each JOB FIELD, there are a few jobs given as examples, or in some cases a description of the job activities.

You are to read through all the JOB FIELDS, with their examples or description, on this page and on the next page. After you have read about the jobs on both pages, select the ONE job field you would most like to be assigned to.

Mark your choice by placing an "X" in the box next to the JOB FIELD you would most like to work in.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Personnel & Administration</u>
Examples:
Administrative Clerk
Stenographer | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Construction, Equipment,
& Shore Party</u>
Examples:
Combat Engineer
Metal Worker
Engineer Equipment Operator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Intelligence</u>
Collection & evaluation of
information about enemy
forces | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Drafting, Surveying, &
Mapping</u>
Examples:
Surveyer
Illustrator
Map Compiler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Infantry</u>
Examples:
Rifleman
Machine Gunner
Mortar Man | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Tank & Amphibian Tractor</u>
Examples:
Tank Crewman
Armored Amphibian Crewman |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Logistics</u>
Movement of troops,
supplies and equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Armament Repair</u>
Examples:
Repair Ship Machinist
Artillery Weapons Repairman
Infantry Weapons Repairman
Tracked Vehicle Repairman |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Field Artillery</u>
Examples:
Artillery Batteryman
Artillery Radar Operator
Artillery Fire Control Man | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Ammunition & Explosive
Ordnance Disposal</u>
Examples:
Ammunition Technician
Explosive Ordnance
Disposal Technician |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities</u>
Examples:
Plumber & Water Supply Man
Refrigeration Mechanic
Electrician | |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Operational Communications</u>
Examples:
Wireman
Field Radio Operator
Communications Center Man</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Telecommunications Maintenance</u>
Examples:
Telephone-Teletype Technician
Radio Repairman
Electronic Instrument Repairman</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Supply Administration & Operations</u>
Examples:
Supply Administrative Man
General Warehouseman
Procurement Supply Man</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation</u>
Examples:
Freight Transportation Clerk
Passenger Transportation Clerk</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Supply Services</u>
Examples:
Office Machine Repairman
Reclamation & Salvage Man</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Food Service</u>
Examples:
Baker
Cook</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Auditing, Finance, & Accounting</u>
Paying personnel, paying for materials, and keeping financial records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Motor Transport</u>
Examples:
Motor Vehicle Operator
Body Repairman
Automotive Mechanic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Data Systems</u>
Examples:
Card Punch Operator
Computer Operator
Programmer</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Marine Corps Exchange</u>
Examples:
Exchange Man
Bookkeeper</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Affairs</u>
Examples:
Press Information Man
Radio & TV Information Man</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Legal Services</u>
Clerical duties in legal office</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Photography</u>
Examples:
Cameraman
Film Editor</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Nuclear, Biological, & Chemical</u>
Detection & decontamination of nuclear, biological, & chemical substances</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Military Police & Corrections</u>
Examples:
Military Policeman
Criminal Investigator</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Electronics Maintenance</u>
Examples:
Electronic & Mechanical Repairman
Ground Radar Technician</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Control and Anti-Air Warfare</u>
Examples:
Missile System Operator
Anti-Air Warfare
Batteryman</p> |
|--|--|

Now turn the page and go to PART B.

PART B

Answer all of the following questions on this page and on the next two pages.

1. From the following list, choose the three most important reasons why you enlisted in the Marine Corps.

Place a 1 on the line next to the most important reason,
a 2 on the line next to the second most important reason,
and a 3 on the line next to the third most important reason.

- I always wanted to be a Marine
- For travel and excitement
- To learn a trade or skill
- Because the pay is good
- To get away from home
- To serve my country
- To become more mature and self-reliant
- Friends are (have been) Marines
- To keep from being drafted
- Could not find a job
- A career in the Marines looked good to me
- To get away from problems
- To get a better education
- Family members are (have been) Marines

Go on to the next page.

Answer questions 2 through 8 by placing an "X" on the line next to your answer.

2. What is more important to you, getting your choice of job assignment, or getting your choice of place of duty?

_____ Job Assignment

_____ Place of Duty

3. How important is getting your choice of job assignment?

_____ Very Important

_____ Fairly Important

_____ Makes Little Difference

4. How important is getting your choice of place of duty?

_____ Very Important

_____ Fairly Important

_____ Makes Little Difference

5. Are you thinking about a career in the Marine Corps?

_____ Yes

_____ Not Sure

_____ No

6. After your present enlistment is up, do you plan to reenlist?

_____ Yes

_____ Not Sure

_____ No

Turn and go on to the next page.

7. Do you know what kind of job field you want to work in when you get out of the Marines?

___ Yes

___ Fairly Sure

___ No

8. Name the job field you want to work in when you get out of the Marines.

* * *

Developed by
NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY
Washington, D. C.
A Laboratory of the Bureau of Naval Personnel

MARINE

ASSIGNMENT

PREFERENCE

SCHEDULE



HEADQUARTERS
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

DIRECTIONS

The Marine Corps wants to know how you feel about your present job.

In Part A of this survey, you are asked to choose the job field you would most like to work in while you serve in the Marines.

In Part B, you are asked to answer some questions about your present job assignment.

Be sure that you answer every question in this survey as accurately as possible. When you have finished, seal the survey in the envelope provided and return it to the person who gave it to you.

Name (Please print) _____

Last

First

Middle

Social Security Number

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	--	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	--	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----	----------------------	----------------------	----	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Pay Grade

<input type="text"/>

Present MOS Number

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Today's Date

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Month

Day

Year

Turn the page and go to Part A

- Operational Communications
Examples:
Wireman
Field Radio Operator
Communications Center Man
- Telecommunications Maintenance
Examples:
Telephone-Teletype Technician
Radio Repairman
Electronic Instrument Repairman
- Supply Administration & Operations
Examples:
Supply Administrative Man
General Warehouseman
Procurement Supply Man
- Transportation
Examples:
Freight Transportation Clerk
Passenger Transportation Clerk
- Supply Services
Examples:
Office Machine Repairman
Reclamation & Salvage Man
- Food Service
Examples:
Baker
Cook
- Auditing, Finance, & Accounting
Paying personnel, paying for materials, and keeping financial records
- Motor Transport
Examples:
Motor Vehicle Operator
Body Repairman
Automotive Mechanic
- Data Systems
Examples:
Card Punch Operator
Computer Operator
Programmer
- Marine Corps Exchange
Examples:
Exchange Man
Bookkeeper
- Public Affairs
Examples:
Press Information Man
Radio & TV Information Man
- Legal Services
Clerical duties in legal office
- Photography
Examples:
Cameraman
Film Editor
- Nuclear, Biological, & Chemical
Detection & decontamination of nuclear, biological, & chemical substances
- Military Police & Corrections
Examples:
Military Policeman
Criminal Investigator
- Electronics Maintenance
Examples:
Electronic & Mechanical Repairman
Ground Radar Technician
- Air Control and Anti-Air Warfare
Examples:
Missile System Operator
Anti-Air Warfare
Batteryman

Now turn the page and go to PART B.

PART B

DIRECTIONS

Answer all the following questions on this page and on the next page. On the line provided before each question, write the number of the answer that comes the closest to your opinion.

Note that all of the answers are on a scale of 1 to 5.

- _____ A How was the training you received for your present job?
1 2 3 4 5
poor fair average good excellent
- _____ B What are your chances for promotion?
1 2 3 4 5
poor fair average good excellent
- _____ C How much freedom do you have in doing your job?
1 2 3 4 5
none very little some pretty much very much
- _____ D How much importance do you think your job has for the Marine Corps?
1 2 3 4 5
none very little some pretty much very much
- _____ E How much interest do you have in doing your work?
1 2 3 4 5
none very little some pretty much very much
- _____ F All things considered, how satisfied are you with your present job assignment?
1 2 3
not at all satisfied not very satisfied fairly satisfied
4 5
pretty satisfied very satisfied
- _____ G How important is learning a trade or skill to you while serving in the Marine Corps?
1 2 3
not at all important not very important fairly important
4 5
pretty important very important

Go on to the next page.

___ H How important is improving your education to you while serving in the Marine Corps?

1	2	3
not at all important	not very important	fairly important
4	5	
pretty important	very important	

___ I How much has serving in the Marine Corps improved your self-confidence?

1	2	3	4	5
none	very little	some	pretty much	very much

___ J How much has serving in the Marine Corps helped you to become more of a man?

1	2	3	4	5
none	very little	some	pretty much	very much

___ K How satisfied are you with the pay you receive from the Marine Corps?

1	2	3
not at all satisfied	not very satisfied	fairly satisfied
4	5	
pretty satisfied	very satisfied	

___ L How satisfied are you with the benefits you receive from the Marine Corps?

1	2	3
not at all satisfied	not very satisfied	fairly satisfied
4	5	
pretty satisfied	very satisfied	

___ M After your present enlistment is up, do you plan to reenlist?

1	2	3	4	5
no	probably no	not sure	probably yes	yes

___ N Do you think you will become a career Marine?

1	2	3	4	5
no	probably no	not sure	probably yes	yes

Developed by
NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY
Washington, D. C.
A Laboratory of the Bureau of Naval Personnel

JOB RATING SCALE - MCBu1 5040 Series
Recruit Assignment Preference

DIRECTIONS

A. You have been selected to rate the Marines whose names you have been given because of your observation of these men on the job. Enter the name, social security number, and primary MOS number of the Marine being rated.

Name (Print) _____

Social Security Number

--	--	--

 --

--	--

 --

--	--	--	--

Primary MOS Number

--	--	--	--

B. On this rating scale there are four questions for you to answer. Question 1 has four parts dealing with the job performance of the Marine being rated. Question 2 asks you to evaluate the man's attitude towards the Corps. Questions 3 and 4 ask about how often and how long a time you have supervised the man's work.

For each question you are given five answers to choose from; above each answer is a number. On the line next to each question, write the number of the answer that comes the closest to your opinion.

Answer all of the following questions as carefully and as accurately as you can. Be sure to answer all four parts of question 1.

QUESTIONS 2, 3, AND 4 ARE
ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE!

1. Rate the person whose name appears above on each of the following:

_____ His ability to get along with others on the job.

1 2 3 4 5
poor fair average good excellent

_____ His ability to learn the duties of his job.

1 2 3 4 5
poor fair average good excellent

_____ His interest in his work.

1 2 3 4 5
poor fair average good excellent

_____ His performance on the job.

1 2 3 4 5
poor fair average good excellent

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Chief of Naval Operations (OP-987E)
(OP-964)
Chief of Naval Personnel (PERS+1)
(PERS-2b)
(PERS-2x)
(PERS-212)
(PERS-22)
(PERS-4)
(PERS-402)
(PERS-5)
(PERS-54)
(PERS-6)
(PERS-6c)
(PERS-10c)
Chief of Naval Material (MAT-03LM)
(MAT-03OB)
(MAT-03OM)
(MAT-03424)
Chief of Naval Research (Code 458)
(Code 450) (4)
Commandant of the Marine Corps (M)
(RD&S)
(MPI)
(MPI-20)
Commander, Navy Recruiting Command (NRC-20)
Commanding Officer, Naval Health Research Center
Commanding General, Marine Corps
Development and Education Command, Quantico
Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton
Superintendent, United States Naval Academy
Superintendent, Naval Postgraduate School
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego
Director, 1st Marine Corps District, Garden City
Director, 4th Marine Corps District, Philadelphia
Director, 8th Marine Corps District, New Orleans
Director, 9th Marine Corps District, Overland Parks
Director, 12th Marine Corps District, San Francisco
Director, Institute of Naval Studies, Arlington
Director, Institute of Naval Studies, Cambridge
U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Research and Development
Manpower Development Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory,
Air Force Systems Command, Brooks Air Force Base
Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base

Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC),
Lackland Air Force Base
Occupational Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC),
Lackland Air Force Base
Chief, Training and Procurement Division, Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington
Human Resources Research Office, Washington
Defense Documentation Center (12)