



12-1-1978

## Commander's Call and the Air Force Now Film: Meeting the needs of Air Force Internal Communcation?

Joseph G. Wojtecki Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Wojtecki, Joseph G. Jr., "Commander's Call and the Air Force Now Film: Meeting the needs of Air Force Internal Communcation?" (1978). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2648.

<https://commons.und.edu/theses/2648>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [zeineb.yousif@library.und.edu](mailto:zeineb.yousif@library.und.edu).

COMMANDER'S CALL AND THE AIR FORCE NOW FILM: MEETING

THE NEEDS OF AIR FORCE INTERNAL COMMUNICATION?

by  
Joseph G. Wojtecki, Jr.

Bachelor of Science, Kent State University, 1968

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

December  
1978

This thesis submitted by Joseph G. Wojtecki, Jr. in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Harold Stegman  
(Chairman)

John F. Haddad

Raymond T. Hecker

William Johnson  
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

COMMANDER'S CALL AND THE AIR FORCE NOW FILM: MEETING THE  
Title NEEDS OF AIR FORCE INTERNAL COMMUNICATION?

Department Speech

Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature Joseph G. Westrich, Jr.

Date November 29, 1978

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the contributions to this project of Dr. Hazel Heiman, advisor, teacher and committee chairman, for her patient encouragement and generous donations of time and assistance, and of Dr. Stephen Rendahl, committee member, teacher and friend, for cultivating my interest in organizational communication, and Dr. Raymond Fischer for serving on my committee. Their able tutelage has made my exploration of Speech Communication stimulating and rewarding.

I would also like to gratefully acknowledge the expert and invaluable service of Mrs. Lorraine Rose for transferring this to the typed page in such a professional manner.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of my wife, Inta, for her unfaltering faith and patience during several years of effort to which this thesis is the culmination.

The debt I owe cannot be repaid. I can only say thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. COMMANDER'S CALL . . . . .	6
III. AIR FORCE NOW . . . . .	22
IV. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	31
V. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	35
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	71
APPENDICES . . . . .	78
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire I . . . . .	79
APPENDIX B. Questionnaire II . . . . .	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Distribution of Significant Differences by Variables . . . . .	36
2.	How Often Do You Discuss Commander's Call Topics with Friends Afterwards . . . . .	38
3.	Do You Like the Sound Track (Music) in Air Force Now . . . . .	39
4.	Do You Like to Attend Commander's Calls . . . . .	42
5.	How Valuable Has Commander's Call Been to You . . . . .	44
6.	How Valuable Has Commander's Call Been to You . . . . .	45
7.	How Valuable Has Commander's Call Been for Your Unit or Squadron . . . . .	47
8.	What Do You Find Most Worthwhile at Commander's Call . . . . .	48
9.	How Often Do You Discuss Commander's Call Topics with Friends Afterwards . . . . .	51
10.	Air Force Now Should Be a Mandatory Part of Commander's Call . . . . .	53
11.	How Often Do You Discuss Air Force Now Topics with Friends Afterwards . . . . .	55
12.	How Valuable Has Commander's Call Been for Your Unit or Squadron . . . . .	57
13.	What Do You Find Most Worthwhile at Commander's Call . . . . .	58
14.	If Commander's Call were Optional Would You Attend . . . . .	60
15.	Enjoyment . . . . .	62
16.	Value . . . . .	63
17.	Optional Attendance . . . . .	64

## ABSTRACT

The U.S. Air Force is a diversified organization of nearly half a million people based worldwide. Because of its nature and complex mission, the organization has unique internal communication needs. One program established to satisfy those needs is Commander's Call, and a mandatory component of each Commander's Call is the latest edition of the Air Force Now film. Because Commander's Call is held monthly at the unit level and attendance is mandatory for all personnel, and because a fifteen to thirty minute color sound-on film is produced monthly for it, the program represents a substantial investment of resources and a strong commitment to internal communication.

This study asks whether Commander's Call and the Air Force Now are in fact meeting the needs of Air Force internal communication. A field research method employing the survey technique was used to collect data from an independent sample drawn from the military population at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, a base whose mission is to maintain long range missiles and bomber aircraft on strategic alert. The study asks whether position in the military rank structure, degree of job satisfaction or command position affect attitudes toward Commander's Call. It also asks whether attitudes toward Commander's Call influence attitudes toward Air Force Now, and whether Air Force Now enhances or detracts from Commander's Call. Finally, it asks whether attitudes toward Air Force Now and Commander's Call warrant their continued use.



The findings indicate that job satisfaction and command position variables significantly affect attitudes toward Commander's Call. They also indicate that the film and the program are probably evaluated independently, and the film is regarded with significantly more favor than Commander's Call. Finally they indicate that valuation of both programs are generally favorable, and no evidence exists that they should be discontinued.

There is strong evidence, however, to support the overall conclusion that certain changes in the programs would enhance their communication effectiveness. Those changes include more solicitation by commanders of the topics considered salient by their subordinates, more commander flexibility as to where, when and how to conduct the program, and an Air Force wide program to collect, analyze and respond to feed-back by participants.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

A living organism relies upon an internal system of component parts, mutually supportive and interdependent, operating together in order to survive and function. Nature provides a complex nervous system to transmit vital data among these unique and often vastly dissimilar components. Without this network of internal communication it would not be possible for the components to work in consonance; and reduced to a mere collection of isolated parts the organism would die.

In the same way, an organization comprised of a system of component parts must communicate internally in order to survive and function. As an organization grows and diversifies, the demands placed upon its communication network increase in volume and complexity. The U.S. Air Force is a large, complex organization comprised of ten major commands, hundreds of installations, thousands of units and over half a million people. It operates world-wide and last year a budget of over \$33 billion was spent. As a complex organization of enormous scope the Air Force must direct considerable attention to its internal communications or risk disharmony and counter-productivity among its components. Neglect or ineptitude in satisfying its fundamental internal communication needs could lead to organizational failure in the Air Force as quickly and as surely as in any lesser organization or organism.

This paper examines one of the organizational communications programs employed by the Air Force to facilitate the transfer of information internally. The Commander's Call program was conceived to span the greatest vertical distance within the organizational hierarchy, from the top level of management to the smallest, but most essential entity, that is the individual.

The Commander's Call program is conducted under the supervision of the Office of Information, a staff agency responsible directly to the commander at each echelon within the organization. While much of the content of each Commander's Call is left to the option of the local commander, the basic structure of the program is clearly specified by regulations. The governing directive requires that, as a minimum, the following be met (1:4):

1. Commander's Call be held monthly during normal duty hours for at least one hour.
2. The commander personally conduct the Commander's Call.
3. Attendance be mandatory for all personnel.
4. The Air Force Now film be shown at every Commander's Call.

The directives are equally clear regarding certain things that are not to be done at Commander's Call. These preclude conducting military training, taking disciplinary actions or substituting for established complaint channels (1:4).

The Air Force Now film is of particular interest in this study because it represents an apparently unique application of the medium. An investigation has failed to reveal businesses, industries or institutions, other than the military, which regularly produce a motion

picture for the singular purpose of communicating with its own employees throughout the entire organization. Other organizations produce films, but none so regularly nor for so exclusive a purpose. The Air Force Now is produced monthly and, although public showing is officially authorized and encouraged, its primary purpose is to support the Commander's Call program. In fact, airmen identify Air Force Now so closely with Commander's Call the terms are frequently used interchangeably.

Specifically, this study will review previous research on the effectiveness of Commander's Call as an internal information program and do additional research on the effectiveness of the Air Force Now film. The findings in this study will be compared with the previous studies. Further, because of the close association established between the program and the film, an attempt to provide some statistical basis for determining whether the film enhances or detracts from the program will be made. That question has not previously been studied.

To justify the need for this study one need not look beyond the cost. One half million Air Force members are required to attend Commander's Call for at least one hour per month. Added to the hourly salary cost is the time lost from other work directly in support of the mission, and the time of the commanders and the information staffs in preparing for Commander's Call. There is also the cost of the Air Force Now film. While costs vary depending upon the content of each film, a former Air Force Now producer estimated unofficially that the costs averaged ten thousand dollars per minute to produce the twenty to thirty minute film (2:1). This does not include distribution costs of the 350 copies made monthly.

The magnitude of the Commander's Call budget implies a deep commitment by the Air Force to satisfying its organizational communication needs. But the organization stops short of fulfilling that obligation by not complying with an established principle of management (including communications management). That is, they fail to evaluate the program's effectiveness. That omission provides further justification for this study. Andrew B. Chase, Jr., of DuPont, in an article on managing downward communications in organizations identified five causes of problems found in the internal communications of over one hundred fifty firms (3:81). One of those was management's failure to take time to evaluate the effectiveness of communications. Despite the fact that all of its own texts on management stress the importance of monitoring feedback, the Air Force has made little effort to periodically measure the communication effectiveness of its expensive Commander's Call program. With the exception of one study commissioned in 1964 the Air Force has paid the bill for over twenty years without asking if it was receiving its money's worth.

To provide a somewhat accurate perspective on the Commander's Call program, it must be noted that it is not the only channel used for internal organizational communication. The responsibility is shared by more traditional media such as magazines, base newspapers, brochures and in some locations, radio and television. However, Commander's Call is the most unique, expensive and controversial. It is therefore the one chosen for study.

To discover the attitudes of the Air Force people toward the Commander's Call program, the Air Force Now film and their respective

effectiveness as information channels this study will seek answers to the following questions:

1. Does position in the rank structure affect attitudes toward the Commander's Call program?
2. Does degree of job satisfaction affect attitudes toward the Commander's Call program?
3. Are persons in command positions more favorable than non-commanders toward the Commander's Call program?
4. Do attitudes toward Commander's Call affect attitudes toward the Air Force Now film?
5. Does the Air Force Now film enhance or detract from the Commander's Call program?
6. Do attitudes toward the Commander's Call program warrant its continued use?
7. Do attitudes toward the Air Force Now film warrant its continued use?

To provide a foundation for answering these questions, the following chapters will describe previous research regarding the Commander's Call program and the Air Force Now film. Subsequent chapters will describe the method used for this study, provide an analysis of the data collected and offer some conclusions and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### COMMANDER'S CALL

The purpose for which Commander's Call exists has been recognized, especially in military organizations, for some time. The objectives of the Air Force's internal information program today are clearly specified in regulations (4:1):

- "1. To keep Air Force personnel clearly and completely informed about Air Force missions and about the Air Force, DOD, and national policies, decisions and actions that are of interest to all Air Force personnel.
- "2. To stress the importance of the individual as the primary instrument of aero space power and emphasize his responsibilities as a member of the Air Force.
- "3. To develop in each Air Force member an awareness of his responsibilities as a citizen of the United States."

This chapter will briefly trace the background of the Commander's Call in its present form and report on previous research which attempted to measure its effectiveness in meeting these objectives.

Commander's Call, in one form or another, existed even before the Air Force was created as a separate service in 1947. While the concept and continuity has not varied since then, there have been other titles, such as "The Information Hour" and "The Commander's Hour." The program has always involved assembling the troops for a talk by the local commander and a current events news film. In the thirty years since the Air Force was organized the only change has been the format of the film and the faces of those attending.

Since the formation is mandatory and since the commander does speak face to face with those whom he commands, the opportunity for communication undoubtedly exists. Perhaps because the opportunity appears obvious, little attempt has been made to verify that communication actually occurs. But does communication; that is, a favorable influencing of the attendees' attitudes, occur? In 1964 the first of six separate studies was conducted to measure Commander's Call effectiveness. Of these only the first, and a second follow-up study were officially requested by the Air Force. The other four were conducted by officer students for academic credit with no official sanction to conduct the research and no official interest in the findings.

The first study of Commander's Call was conducted by Gerhard D. Wiebe and associates in July 1964 (5:1). The study was commissioned by the Air University at Maxwell AFB, Alabama. There is no indication given why official interest suddenly developed in the Commander's Call program. But for whatever reason it was undertaken, the Wiebe study raised more questions than it answered. Wiebe observed several Commander's Call programs at various bases and conducted thirty-six interviews with participants. He also interviewed information officers attending the Air Force Information Course at Boston University. He reviewed the governing directives and sent an eight question questionnaire to all Air Force information officers (5:1).

Wiebe's questions were oriented toward the officers' duties in preparing for and conducting Commander's Call rather than toward evaluating the effectiveness of the program (5:8). Questions asked by Wiebe included:



- "1. Do you coordinate and supervise the distribution of films for Commander's Calls?
- "2. How often do you take time to review the mandatory films?
- "3. How often do you read the film briefs?
- "4. Indicate duties you perform regularly in connection with Commander's Calls.
- "5. How many Commander's Calls are held monthly in units for which you are information officer?
- "6. How many of these do you attend regularly?
- "7. What suggestions do you have for increasing the IO's effectiveness in promoting the success of Commander's Call?
- "8. How often do the people who gather for Commander's Call gather for other meetings?"

Wiebe received 202 returns, or 90 percent of the distributed questionnaires.

From this data Wiebe made six conclusions (5:14-21):

- "1. Commander's Call, as generally practiced, is ineffective.
- "2. The basic nature of Commander's Call should be changed to allow more local flexibility.
- "3. Commanders do not place high priority on Commander's Call.
- "4. Communication at Commander's Call flows one way.
- "5. In terms of presentation, Commander's Call is well done and well received.
- "6. Among squadron commanders, 78 percent felt Commander's Call was of moderate or high value as a management tool."

Wiebe's first four conclusions are consistent with later findings of other studies. Conclusions 5 and 6 appear to be in self-contradiction.

Several aspects of the Wiebe study can be questioned. First, he relied upon information officers for the bulk of his data. As the staff members charged with the responsibility for monitoring Commander's Call, they were probably biased and did not provide objective data to support the conclusions. He presented conclusions with only thirty six interviews with Commander's Call participants. The study did not answer the following questions:

1. Were Commander's Calls conducted in accordance with governing directives?

2. Were governing directives and program objectives realistic?

3. Did perceptions of the audience about Commander's Call effectiveness agree with those of the commanders who conduct them?

4. What is the comparative effectiveness of program components such as films, lectures, question and answer sessions, etc.?

The results of Wiebe's study contributed to several paradoxes. The consensus at Air University after reviewing the Wiebe study was that it was not sufficiently reliable in design or execution to provide valid insights into Commander's Call effectiveness. So Air University convened an Ad Hoc Committee in February 1965 to review and expand the Wiebe study. The Committee was comprised of military and Department of the Air Force civilian scholars (5:1-2).

The Ad Hoc Committee departed significantly from Wiebe's methodology by surveying the populations assigned to Maxwell and nearby Gunter Air Force Bases. The survey was randomly drawn and represented all grades through lieutenant colonel. Since both bases were populated largely by officer students from all Air Force commands with highly diverse backgrounds, the committee reasoned the results could be projected Air Force wide. Of the returned 2674 questionnaires, 190 which were from officers with recent command positions were tabulated separately.

The Committee's questionnaire asked thirty-three questions. Some were quantitative and dealt with the respondents' backgrounds and the administration of Commander's Calls. But most were qualitative and, in contrast to Wiebe's, were designed to measure the effectiveness of the program (6:53-59). The largest group of respondents

was first lieutenants through majors who were resident students at Squadron Officer School and Air Command and Staff College. The second largest group was permanent party enlisted members below the grade of staff sergeant who were not students and who could be assumed to be airmen on their first enlistment (5:4-5).

The Committee's thorough questionnaire provided the first data on Commander's Call effectiveness (5:4-14). It was found that, in accordance with regulations, nearly 100 percent of the programs included the mandatory films, 93 percent were held during duty hours, and 78 percent included recognition of individual achievements. However, it was found that in violation of directives, 70 percent included military training and 56 percent included disciplinary lectures or reprimands.

Comparing the reactions to Commander's Calls, the Committee established that 25 percent found the program enjoyable while 28 percent indicated they were moderately enjoyable and 28 percent were neutral. Twenty-eight percent found the program usually worth the time invested while another 28 percent found it occasionally so and 22 percent found it not worth the while. Also, 43 percent found the program to be only of moderate personal value while 35 percent found it of little or no value (6:55-56).

The Committee also established the initial data on the use of films in Commander's Call. Two separate films were required, the Air Force News Review and a Feature film. The former more closely resembles the Air Force Now used today. The findings showed that 15 percent felt the Air Force News Review was of great value, 47 percent of moderate

and 22 percent of little or no value. Comparatively only 7 percent felt the Feature film was of great value, while 45 percent rated it of moderate value and 25 percent of little or no value. Fifteen percent thought the number of films shown during the program should be increased while 22 percent favored a decrease and 37 percent favored no change (6:56-58).

The respondents were also asked for their perceptions of how well the Commander's Call program met its implied objectives, that is, the objectives cited earlier for the Air Force's internal information program, since no specific objectives for Commander's Call have been separately established. Asked if the program contributed to the retention of skilled people in the Air Force, 56 percent replied very little. Forty-one percent found the program contributed very little to the development of enthusiastic spokesmen for the Air Force and the American way of life. Asked if the program contributed to unit identification and pride, 49 percent replied very little. And asked if the program contributed to the units operational effectiveness, 43 percent said very little. In each case, then, the largest group respondents found that Commander's Call demonstrated very little effectiveness in achieving its objectives (6:57-58).

All of the aforementioned respondents were non-commanders and while on the whole the Committee found that the 190 officers with command experience were in general agreement with the majority of respondents, there were some notable differences. The commanders thought Commander's Calls were slightly more valuable than did non-commanders. Commanders also slightly exceeded non-commanders in their estimations of the program's contribution to unit effectiveness, but were less convinced about the retention of personnel and production of the films.

The Committee reported findings that basically agreed with Wiebe's first four. They did not, however, support his fifth and sixth findings. Based upon the second study's findings the committee proposed the following recommendations (5:21):

- "1. That the Commander's Call program not be continued indefinitely in its current form.
- "2. That the local commander be given flexibility in structuring the program to meet his own needs.
- "3. That the use of required films be made voluntary.
- "4. That question and answer periods and feed-back evaluations be encouraged.
- "5. That program objectives be reviewed and commanders be charged with specific responsibility for achieving them.
- "6. That Commander's Call effectiveness be made a continuing inspection item."

The Ad Hoc Committee produced a report which was vastly superior to the preceding Wiebe report, but both reports suggested that the program was not meeting its assigned objectives and it was doubtful whether the Air Force was receiving a fair return on the time and resources invested. The Committee filed its report in April 1965, but there is no evidence that Air University made any recommendations to higher authority or reported its findings to any level of command and thus no changes were made.

Subsequent to the first two studies there have been four unsanctioned studies by officer students in Air University for academic credit.

The first of these studies was conducted by Michael Pennefather in May 1972 (6:1). It was concurrent with a resurgence of command interest in internal communication programs, probably as a result of an increase of social problems, drug and racial incidents, within the service (6:6-13). Pennefather's study compares and contrasts three perspectives on Commander's Call: the view of Air Force leadership,

the view of the governing directives, and the view of the participants.

To determine leadership's view, Pennefather collected a series of quotations from various government and military officials expressing their beliefs that increased communication provided the one best solution to the contemporary social problems. The repeated theme was that more communication was required to reach the new force of better educated, more sophisticated young airmen. There was little reference to message content or media for the communications. Leadership's view is summarized as simply a call for more of it, and to use Commander's Call to that end (6:6-13).

The governing directives viewed by Pennefather were substantially unchanged from those in effect in 1964 and 1965, or from those currently in effect and addressed earlier. To represent the participant's views Pennefather referred to the Ad Hoc Committee's 1965 survey. He conducted his own stratified sampling of fifty students using twenty-eight of the Committee's original questions (6:36-40). He acknowledged the methodological shortcomings of his survey which was constrained by Air University rules regarding questionnaires. Pennefather did not attempt to project his findings against the Air Force population. His stated purpose was merely to test for any significant shifts in the subsequent seven years. He found that in nine of the twenty-eight questions shifts greater than 10 percent occurred. Three of the shifts involved the films and all shifts except one were toward less favorable positions (6:61-65).

Of the ten questions specifically reported previously shifts occurred in five: Asked if they enjoyed going to Commander's Calls

the number who thoroughly enjoyed it decreased from 25 percent to 12 percent while those who were neutral increased from 29 percent to 40 percent, and the number who dreaded going increased from 17 percent to 26 percent. Asked if the program was worthwhile the number who responded that it usually was decreased from 28 percent to 18 percent and the number who responded with very seldom increased from 18 percent to 26 percent. Regarding the value of Air Force Now, those who found it of great value decreased from 15 percent to 2 percent; of moderate value decreased from 47 percent to 32 percent; and of little or no value increased from 22 percent to 40 percent. The same trend occurred for the Feature film and the number who generally favored a decrease in the number of required films increased from 22 percent to 52 percent (6:61-65).

In one question regarding films Pennefather substituted Air Force Now for the Air Force News Review. However, a film which is considered officially to be a vast improvement over its predecessor was regarded by respondents as of little or no value at a 40 percent rate. This was an increase of 18 percent from the previous study.

Pennefather found that fewer people enjoyed Commander's Call in 1972 than in 1965. He also determined that more people considered films not worthwhile, placed less value on them and clearly favored a decrease in the number of films shown. This last reaction is interesting because in 1972 Air Force Now was the only mandatory film.

Pennefather also found that more unauthorized topics were covered in the program in 1972 and there was a growing desire for more two-way communication through question and answer sessions. The only favorable shift noted was in the commander's visibility to his people. The number

of respondents who reported having frequent access to their commanders increased from 35 percent to 64 percent (6:62). In evaluating the significance of this trend, however, it is important to remember that the 1972 survey was comprised exclusively of successful middle managers and totally excluded the lower enlisted ranks who were the second largest group of respondents in 1965.

Analyzing his findings Pennefather observed that the commander is faced with a dilemma caused by incompatible views on Commander's Call objectives between Air Force leadership and the governing directives. While leadership is urging open discussion of contemporary issues, the directives still specify the mission oriented format aimed at retention and operational effectiveness. He saw the result as a weak compromise which satisfies neither set of objectives and contributing to the growing disenchantment of the participants (6:48-49). Pennefather made seven recommendations (6:49-52):

- "1. Program objectives should be reviewed by the Air Staff and brought into consonance with the expressed views of Air Force leadership.
- "2. The governing directives should be rewritten to reflect the changing objectives.
- "3. Two-way communication should be maximized to achieve the objectives.
- "4. Objectives should be obtainable within the time allotted for Commander's Call.
- "5. Commanders' immediate supervisors should emphasize the importance of the program in meaningful terms.
- "6. Films should be made optional.
- "7. The local commander should allow maximum flexibility in structuring and conducting the program."

Pennefather's recommendations are echoes of the earlier studies. Because of the recognized limitations on the validity of his sample population, his research contributed little except to generally suggest the problems identified in 1965 still existed in 1972. In analyzing



his indictment that Commander's Call was failing to keep pace with the times by contrasting its governing directives it is important to note that several things were occurring in 1972 that were different from 1965. First the U.S. was deeply involved in the Vietnam war and the military was consequently lacking public esteem because of an unpopular war. Concurrently the services were just newly committed to an all volunteer force which was causing internal turbulence. And the racial and drug problems which were occurring in the military were merely representative of what was happening throughout the society. While it is probably true that the Commander's Call program was not resolving any of those problems during that unsettled period of time, it is also probably unrealistic to expect that it could.

In January 1973 another student officer, Juri V. Nou, addressed the prevalent attitudes toward Commander's Call from three perspectives (7:1). Nou compared the contrasting viewpoints of three fictitious characters, a junior enlisted member, a senior enlisted member and a unit commander. Nou's characters personified most of the cliches about the green airman, the grizzled old sergeant and the frustrated commander. However, Nou did not collect new data and although he used his characterizations to humorously express dissatisfaction with Commander's Call, he contributed little substance worthy of consideration.

The next research was reported in May 1973 by Teddie E. Sykes whose hypothesis was familiar: the Commander's Call program was stereotyped and perfunctory and was not in tune with contemporary theories of leadership, motivation and communication (8:1-3). In design Sykes' study was nearly an exact replica of Pennefather's.

However, no reference was made to the study to indicate he was aware of its existence. Sykes surveyed a variety of schools of management thought and demonstrated that Commander's Call did not, in practice, conveniently fit the mold of any. Sykes then administered the same 1965 questionnaire to identify any trends which had subsequently developed. Sykes, however, did survey a larger sample, 381 of his fellow officer students. As an improvement over the 1972 study, Sykes only compared those respondents to the 1965 survey who had prior command experience. This provided some compensation for the lack of enlisted responses in his own survey and provided a more direct correlation to the 1965 data. Sykes found the same shifts identified by Pennefather; and although there were some minor variations in percentages, probably because of the larger sample size, the results were so similar they will not be detailed in this review. Sykes did expand upon the scope of Pennefather's study in two areas, however. He analyzed and compared the responses between officers with prior command experience and those without in more depth than had been done previously. He also categorized and presented additional comments offered by his respondents.

In the comparison between prior commanders and others, Sykes determined that commanders consistently hold attitudes more favorable towards Commander's Call (8:38-57). Regarding the emphasis placed on the program, 89 percent of the commanders, compared to 72 percent of the non-commanders, placed moderate or greater emphasis on it. At the same time 24 percent of the non-commanders compared to 9 percent of the commanders placed very little emphasis on it (8:55). The

comparison on the value of the Air Force Now revealed that commanders and non-commanders were nearly reversed in their opinions as to whether the film was of great value or a waste of time (8:46). Eleven percent of commanders and only 4 percent of non-commanders thought it was of great value, while 11 percent of non-commanders and 7 percent of commanders thought it was a waste of time. The majority of both groups, 69 percent of commanders and 60 percent of the others, felt the film was of moderate or little or no value.

In tabulating comments made by his respondents Sykes found that 21 percent made the effort to respond to open-ended questions. Of the comments offered most were on the subject of Commander's Call films (8:68-39). The following is a sample of the comments to the open-ended questions:

- "1. . . . the Air Force Now films are well received . . .
- "2. The movie jazz is not good. A waste of money for the most part.
- "3. Most films provided by the Air Force are an insult to the intelligence of most of the people attending.
- "4. My commander . . . did not bother to show them . . .
- "5. Not sure what 'value' is. Did I enjoy them? Yes. Did they make me a better officer? I doubt it.
- "6. . . . seemed to be enjoyed by all. I thought they were nearly always worthwhile."

Consistent with the previous studies, Sykes concluded that Commander's Call was not providing the effective communication that was expected, and that the films associated with it enjoyed no better reputation than the program itself (8:89-95). Sykes advanced five recommendations, including the same call for a review of program objectives and more leeway for local commanders documented earlier (8:95-96). The slightly different recommendation was that Air Force Now, along with question and answer periods be continued as mandatory on the program's

agenda. If there was a conflict between that recommendation and his data, Sykes did not resolve it.

Despite the fact that it was almost an exact duplication of Pennefather's, Sykes' study is valuable because it further confirmed and expanded earlier findings and is the most thorough study to date.

The final study of Commander's Call to be examined was conducted by Ronald D. Haynes in May 1975 (9:1). Haynes' did not offer new data but was a review and reanalysis of the previous research. His report provides a general summary of earlier conclusions and recommendations.

Haynes made two points in his analysis. First, the evidence accumulated over a lengthy period overwhelmingly point to the conclusion that the program is not effective. He questions why those responsible have not taken action to improve the program. He concludes that the problem is not perceived and therefore they cannot be committed to a solution (9:8-10). Haynes reasoned that since data is available to document the problem, the decision makers are not seeing it because they are not seeking it. He noted that the only feedback provided to the Secretary of the Air Force Office of Information (SAF/OI) is an annual monthly tabulation of the number of units showing and the number not showing Air Force Now (9:6). Until qualitative as well as quantitative information is collected and analyzed by the decision makers no changes can be expected.

Haynes' second point was that although the problem with Commander's Call is well documented it is not so well defined. The majority of those polled offered negative comments, but most were negative for different reasons. Haynes' point is that there is no single

aspect of the program which is responsible for its lack of effectiveness. The whole program and all of its parts need to be methodically reviewed. He concluded that the Air Force cannot afford to continue ignoring Commander's Call (9:34).

Throughout the review of former studies certain themes consistently emerge:

1. The majority of people in the Air Force who attend Commander's Calls do not particularly enjoy going and/or do not feel they benefit significantly from the experience.
2. The program's objectives are not being met and that the program probably should be reviewed and changed.
3. The governing directives are too restrictive and discourage local commander originality.
4. The mandatory films elicit varying opinions, but are generally concluded to be moderately valuable at best.
5. Nobody with authority to change the program has evaluated it and thus it has continued essentially unchanged since 1947.

Of the six studies reported the methodology of only one, the Ad Hoc Committee's report of 1965, seems sufficiently valid for projection against the entire Air Force population. The Wiebe study took the bulk of its data from information officers whose duty it is to support the program rather than from the participants. Pennefather's and Sykes' studies used a high level of stratification of their samples. Both surveyed officer students in the rank of major and above who were competitively selected to attend professional military education programs, in residence, based upon their outstanding military records.

Even the Ad Hoc Committee used a large number of respondents of a select classification who were first term enlisted members assigned to Air University as their primary military duty, and not as students. The fact those respondents were all assigned to Air University and not to a combat component, such as the Strategic Air Command, or the Tactical Air Command, biases the results. But even recognizing the methodological limitations of these studies, the fact that they all arrived at the same conclusions over a span of eleven years is certainly significant, and worthy of serious consideration.

This chapter has dealt with research on the Commander's Call program since its inception. The Air Force Now is so closely associated with Commander's Call that the terms are often thought to be synonymous and inseparable. While this chapter focused primarily on Commander's Call, the following chapter will deal with the Air Force Now and upon research on the film in particular.

## CHAPTER III

### AIR FORCE NOW

Although many years of association may have resulted in a blurring of the individual features of Commander's Call and Air Force Now, the two are certainly distinguishable. After briefly describing and tracing the history of Commander's Call films, this chapter will separate the film from the program and examine its communicative effectiveness independently. This examination cannot be as conclusive as the preceding review of Commander's Call since there has been only one study previously conducted specifically on the film. The study of the Air Force Now film is further restricted by the fact that a search for a similar use of the film medium in public or private organizations, outside the military, to provide comparative data proved unsuccessful. The data available to report here is, therefore, limited.

Air Force Now is a full color, sound tracked production averaging twenty minutes in length. It is produced monthly in 16 mm and distributed to Air Force installations world-wide for Commander's Call. At the time of this writing 108 Air Force Now films have been made. The film is produced and managed by the Aerospace Audio-Visual Service (AAVS), a component of the Military Airlift Command (MAC). The cost of the film varies widely from production to production, depending upon the subject matter filmed. While AAVS personnel currently involved with producing the film could not, or would not provide specific data, in an

interview, a former officer in charge of the film estimated unofficially that the cost averaged ten thousand dollars per minute of the final production (2:1). Distribution costs are not included in that figure.

According to an early staff proposal (10:2), the general objective of Air Force Now is to support the established goals of Commander's Call. Basic guidelines for the film itself emphasize that it should depict a variety of Air Force events and appeal to all Air Force members. The film should be of such quality to be competitive with the audience's free time viewing preferences, but the treatment and techniques employed must not detract from the message of the production. Specific objectives of the film are (10:1):

1. To inform members of the Air Force about operational missions of the Air Force.
2. To interpret, by pictorial means, Air Force internal information objectives.
3. To report events of significance to the Air Force.
4. To motivate Air Force personnel toward appreciation of the Air Force and positive consideration of its career possibilities.
5. To accomplish the above through interesting dynamic and contemporary film techniques.

Air Force Now emerged in 1969 from a long lineage of military films designed for indoctrination, motivation and information. Among its ancestors is The Big Picture produced by the United States Army in the 1940s and 1950s to report Army related developments and events to the ranks. That film also received national public visibility when it was telecast regularly as a public service program. As early as 1941



films were used to indoctrinate new army enlistees by graphically depicting Nazi atrocities. The objective was to instill a sense of purpose and provide the troops with a reason for fighting. The Army found that the film did not achieve its objective since it served more to frighten the new soldiers than to anger them (11:36). Air Force Now, however, is more directly a descendant of the Air Force News Review, a current events film that was shown at Commander's Call when the Air Force became a separate service in 1947. Air Force Now was conceived at a time when the Air Force leadership began to recognize a need for more communication with a new generation of better educated, more sophisticated young members.

Air Force Now departed significantly from its predecessors in both content and format. The newest format was a celluloid magazine; a montage of feature stories telling what the Air Force had done in the past, was doing currently and was planning for the future. It focused variously upon Air Force people doing average and exotic things in average and exotic locations. These featurettes were put together with a matrix of transitions as abrupt as turning the pages of a magazine. Also, like the magazines which publish a special edition on occasion, Air Force Now would produce single theme films in honor of such events as the twenty fifth anniversary of the Air Force. Instead of the traditional newsreel the new film employs the latest techniques of cinematography and sound reproduction merging into a contemporary format aimed directly at the "now" generation. The film incorporates rock music and special effects photography with dialogue and narration abundant with "now" language. Air Force Now has retained essentially the same style and format for ten years.

Early reaction to the Air Force Now came from Col. William R. Edgar, USAF (Ret.) in an article published in an unofficial magazine. The article was titled "Communication with the Young" (12:52). He observed that the Air Force had officially stated a need to communicate with its young members. And one of the most dramatic attempts to do that was the creation of Air Force Now. Edgar's opinions are worthy of note because he was formerly the Director of Information for the Tactical Air Command (12:53):

There is no doubt that "Air Force Now" successfully holds the attention of younger members of the audience and it represents a dazzling display of film-making artistry. But is there not a trap hidden in the film's technical brilliance? I wonder if there could be a danger that "Air Force Now" might tend to emphasize that stories that happen to lend themselves to vivid presentation on film; that is, that a trivial story with good cinematic values might be used in preference to an important story that was visually unexciting.

As a caution against that kind of shallowness of content Edgar stated that youth is more concerned with what is said than how it is said, and that "first you should decide on your message, and only then do you design your communication medium around it" (12:53). He further supported that point (12:53-54):

It is not going to be good enough to slap a little rock music on the sound track and let it go at that. Put yourself in the other fellow's place. Suppose that a group like the Students for a Democratic Society attempted to win your support by showing you a film (at a compulsory formation yet) that outlined their ideas--but with Frances Langford and Glenn Miller on the sound track. You would ask, and rightfully, who are they trying to kid?

Edgar's article was not an indictment against what Air Force Now had done so much as it was a caution against what it might do. The film was still too new to be categorized a success or failure. But he left

the clear implication that the Air Force Now solution to the problem of communicating with the young was perhaps too simplistic and presumptive to achieve its goals.

At the same time Edgar was preparing his article, Grant E. Brollier was conducting the same scholarly research into the effectiveness of Air Force Now (13:1). Brollier, unlike Edgar, did not question the film's central philosophy of couching the same traditional institutional messages in a more contemporary style and format. Instead he accepted the official premise that the Air Force's "generation gap" was in reality a "communication gap," to be dealt with simply by opening more channels of communication. And film, a proven medium for communication, should have great potential in the Air Force's present application of it (13:3).

Brollier's study consisted of surveying three groups who viewed three Air Force Now films. The groups were comprised of both officer students and officers and enlisted members who were permanently assigned to an operational squadron at that base. The viewers were grouped according to rank (13:18). The three groups were comprised of enlisted grades E-4 and below, ages twenty-five and below; enlisted grades E-5 and above, ages twenty-six and above; and officers in the grade of major (O-4), ages over thirty.

The films selected for viewing were AFN 22, 25 and 28. Brollier selected these arbitrarily as representative of three types of approaches used in the film production program (13:20). The first, AFN 22, dealt with human goals. It stressed the importance of having goals to provide direction to life, and that the goals people set affect the way they

relate to others and to their jobs. It contained segments on an Air Force recruiter, an Apollo 15 astronaut and a security policeman whose hobby was surfing. All three discussed their goals. Then AFN 25 stressed the need for good communication, and how commanders could encourage and improve two-way flow. Two films included sequences of a rescue of a downed pilot in Southeast Asia and a documentary of a general's "people program" in Korea. The third, AFN 28, depicted tactical airlift operations in Southeast Asia. Its sequences included airlift deliveries to combat zones under hostile fire and equally hostile weather conditions. The message was a tribute to those who flew those missions.

The films were shown to each group at times which did not conflict with scheduled duties. After each showing a questionnaire was given to each viewer asking the following questions (13:30):

- "1. Was he comfortable with the film?
- "2. Was he disturbed by any of the concepts/ideas presented?
- "3. Did he enjoy the film?
- "4. Could he identify with people in the film?
- "5. Were people in the film representative of military people?
- "6. Was the film beneficial to the Air Force?
- "7. Did the film successfully communicate its messages?
- "8. What messages did the film convey?"

One group did not view AFN 28 so a complete comparison could be made on only two films. Broilier found that with only minor exceptions the younger enlisted members responded least favorably in all areas. The only exceptions were that the older enlisted members felt more disturbed by the films and were less able to identify the films' intended messages. He also found that in five of the eight questions the older enlisted members and the officers responded more favorably along nearly parallel lines than the younger enlisteds. However, in identifying the films'

messages and evaluating the benefit of the films for the Air Force, both the older and younger enlisted members responded more closely and less favorably than the officers. Also in the degree of disturbance felt from viewing the film, the officers and younger enlisteds were more closely aligned and felt less so than the older enlisteds. Considering all viewing groups together, Brollier found that while most found the films moderately enjoyable, the respondents found the films to be of little or no value to the Air Force.

Brollier also found there was significant discrepancy between his respondents' evaluations of the films' success in communicating messages and their ability to correctly identify the intended messages. In the most extreme case 80 percent of the older enlisted felt a film successfully communicated its messages to them, but only 36.4 percent could even partially identify the film's intended messages. Brollier did determine, however, that when viewers were briefed in advance of what messages to look for they could then find them with statistically measurable success.

Another significant finding in Brollier's study was a strong consistency in the comments offered to improve the film. All groups agreed the Air Force Now was superior to the Air Force News Review. But the majority of other comments indicated the viewed films suffered from phoniness, unrealistic scenes and an over identification with youth (13:100).

From his data, Brollier drew these conclusions (13:105):

- "1. The film is enjoyed by most viewers.
- "2. The film is preferred to the Air Force News Review.
- "3. The film is not only entertaining but also informativ.

- "4. The film is useful in bridging the communication gap.
- "5. There is a need for improvement in the way the film is presented to the audience."

Brollier then recommended that commanders thoroughly discuss the theme of each film before showing it to insure that the messages are received as intended. He also encouraged a discussion for reinforcement of the film after viewing. He further recommended that the producers strive harder for realism, to "tell it like it is" and to include reports on undesirable assignments as well as the utopian (13:107).

Brollier's conclusions indicate that although his respondents enjoyed the film they saw very little professional benefit. His data also showed a definite lack of ability by the viewers in correctly identifying the films' messages. It is, therefore, difficult to justify his conclusion that the film is entertaining and informative. He also reported that his respondents criticized the film for an over identification with youth. In view of the fact that the youngest group of viewers responded least favorably in all but one area surveyed seems to suggest that the pitfall suggested by Edgar of over-involvement with media of the expense of message may have been occurring. Apparently from their comments the older respondents recognized, and perhaps resented, that the film was not geared to them; but, the younger group, to whom the film was directed was not receptive. That paradox may be the most important finding to emerge from Brollier's study.

Brollier's research was conducted concurrently with Pennefather's study of Commander's Call reported in the previous chapter and which included some questions involving the Air Force Now. Pennefather's respondents were in general agreement with Brollier's on the value of

the film. Pennefather reported that the largest group of responses, 40 percent, indicated the film was of little or no value. He also found that the majority, 52 percent, of his responses favored elimination of the film. Pennefather did not ask about the enjoyment value of the film.

No other studies on the subject of Air Force Now were found to support or refute Brollier's findings. But the basis for comparison that exist with the previous Commander's Call studies seem to provide agreement that Air Force Now, although a better film, did not produce the cure all of the internal communication gap that some had expected.

While the limited research on the Air Force Now is considered separately from the Commander's Call, this chapter and the previous chapter provide a perspective on the nature of the Air Force's present internal communication program and its problems. The material presented in the previous chapter and this chapter provides a basis for the gathering and presenting of the additional data in this study.

## CHAPTER IV

### METHODOLOGY

This study endeavored to overcome the methodological shortcomings of the studies relating to Commander's Call and more specifically to Air Force Now as described in Chapters II and III. Specifically this study attempted to collect data from a sample population which represents the entire Air Force population to provide a greater degree of validity than that of earlier studies. The main objective of this study is to determine if earlier findings regarding the communication effectiveness of Commander's Call and the Air Force Now are supported by a more representative sample, and, to specifically determine if one component of the program, the film, is more or less effective than the program in its entirety.

The method employed is a field study using the survey technique. The subjects were randomly drawn from the military population at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. All subjects were assigned to the Strategic Air Command (SAC), the Air Force's largest command, or tenant commands on the base in support of the SAC units. Every subject was assigned duties directly related to the operation, maintenance or support of strategic aircraft or missile systems. This sample differs from those of previous studies in that it is not comprised of students who were competitively selected for their assignment, and it is drawn at a "northern tier" base, generally regarded as a less desirable



location than the far south. A sample of 300 was selected from the base military population of approximately six thousand by choosing every twentieth name from a roster listing all personnel alphabetically. It was presumed that the sample represented each assigned unit and each rank proportionately. Also included in the sample was every unit commander on the base.

The survey was accomplished by means of two questionnaires. One questionnaire was distributed to every commander and the other questionnaire was distributed to all others. The commanders' questionnaire consisted of eighteen questions asking their attitudes on internal communication in general and Commander's Call and Air Force Now in particular. The questionnaire asked five open-ended questions which solicited unstructured responses, and thirteen questions with five different responses provided for each, from which the respondent was to select the one closest to his own attitude. The questionnaire sent to the non-commanders consisted of twenty-eight questions about Commander's Call and the Air Force Now. It also determined the respondents' ranks and degree of satisfaction with the present job and assignment to the base. The questionnaire also asked five open-ended questions, with the remainder being selective responses. These questionnaires appear in the appendix.

The procedure for administering the survey was to first obtain permission from the Base Commander. His signed authorization appeared on the cover sheet of each questionnaire along with a statement that participation was voluntary. Each respondent was asked to answer every question and to not sign the questionnaire. Also included on the cover

sheet was a statement indicating that the data collected in this research would be used for a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Arts degree in Speech Communication. A supply of questionnaires was distributed to the first sergeants of each unit along with a listing of personnel from that unit who had been selected for the sample. The first sergeants were asked to insure that the questionnaires were delivered, and in the event that some were not deliverable, to offer them to other personnel of the same grade and Air Force specialty code as the originally named personnel. To further insure the anonymity of the respondents, they were asked to return completed questionnaires directly to this student through the base distribution system, rather than return them to the first sergeants. Questionnaires were hand carried personally to the commanders and returned at their convenience through the base distribution system. All of the twenty-five unit commanders returned completed questionnaires as did 194 of the non-commanders, making a total 219 questionnaires returned from 300 sent, for a return rate of 73 percent.

This study was designed, in part, to replicate earlier studies in order to determine whether this sample validated the finding from less representative samples as previously discussed. It was further designed to answer the following specific questions:

1. Does position in the rank structure affect attitudes toward the Commander's Call program?
2. Does degree of job satisfaction affect attitudes toward the Commander's Call program?
3. Are persons in command positions more favorable than non-commanders toward the Commander's Call program?

4. Do attitudes toward Commander's Call affect attitudes toward the Air Force Now film?

5. Does the Air Force Now film enhance or detract from the Commander's Call program?

6. Do attitudes toward the Commander's Call program warrant its continued use?

7. Do attitudes toward the Air Force Now film warrant its continued use?

The respondents in this study were grouped according to rank and degree of job satisfaction, and also whether or not they occupied command positions. The data collected here was analyzed to compare and contrast the central tendencies of the groups and to determine if statistically significant differences exist between them. A chi-square was computed to determine if such differences existed in nineteen selected questions compared against the rank, job satisfaction and command position variables. The analysis also attempted to make specific comparisons and contrast between the Air Force Now film and the Commander's Call program of which it is a component. This study also attempted to find sufficient basis for determining whether one specific program component, the film, enhances or detracts from Commander's Call.

## CHAPTER V

### RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter will present and analyze the data collected as it pertains to the seven questions under study, and it will also summarize trends compiled from remarks offered in response to the open-ended questions in the survey.

The first three of the seven questions required a cross tabulation and chi-square computation of selected questions from the questionnaires to determine if significant differences exist relative to three variables. Table 1 depicts which questions reflected significant differences according to grade, job satisfaction (including satisfaction with assignment at Grand Forks AFB), and command versus non-command position. The question numbers in the left column refer to the corresponding questions in Commander's Call Questionnaire 1 found in appendix A. There is a smaller sample of Commander's Call Questionnaire 2 because the questions were answered by commanders only. After analyzing the data eight questions were selected for comparison of the command versus non-command variable.

#### Does Position in the Rank Structure Affect Attitudes Toward the Commander's Call Program?

The first question asked whether position in the rank structure affects attitudes toward the Commander's Call program. As table 1 shows, only two questions, numbers 13 and 21, out of nineteen compared, produced

TABLE 1  
DISTRIBUTION OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BY VARIABLES

Question	Grade	Variable		
		Job Satisfaction	GFAFB Satisfaction	Command vs Non-Command*
4	0	0	0	. . .
5	0	X	0	. . .
6	0	X	X	. . .
7	0	X	0	X
8	0	X	0	X
9	0	0	0	X
11	0	0	0	. . .
12	0	X	0	X
13	X	X	0	. . .
15	0	X	0	. . .
16	0	X	0	. . .
17	0	X	0	. . .
18	0	X	X	0
20	0	0	0	0
21	X	0	0	0
22	0	X	0	. . .
23	0	0	0	0
24	0	X	0	. . .
27	0	0	X	. . .
Totals	2/19	12/19	4/19	4/8

X = Significant difference @p <.05

0 = No significant difference

\*Only eight questions compared.

significant differences. Question number 13 concerned the frequency with which the respondents discussed Commander's Call topics with friends afterwards. The presumption is made that a tendency to discuss a message later correlates to the impact that message had upon the receiver.

Table 2 shows the cross tabulation of responses to the same question by grade group. It should be noted here that no respondents to questionnaire number 1 fell within the Colonel or Lieutenant Colonel grade group and, thus, only four grade groups are included in the tabulation. This is not a surprising condition since the largest segment of personnel in those grades occupy command positions and, therefore, responded to questionnaire number 2. Grades 2-3 are officers, 4-5 enlisted.

The data showed that all officer respondents seldomly discussed the program, while a substantial percentage of the enlisted respondents did not. Among the officers, 35 percent of the middle grade officers did so occasionally and 40 percent seldomly, while 56.3 percent of the junior officers did so occasionally and 31.3 percent responded seldom. By comparison, 20 percent of the upper enlisted grades discussed the program occasionally, 29.2 percent seldomly and 29.2 percent never. The lower enlisted grades did so at rates of 32.3 percent occasionally, 32.3 percent seldomly and 24.7 percent never. Thus, the upper enlisted grades were shown to be least likely to discuss Commander's Call, followed closely by the lower grade enlisted. No more than 6.3 percent of any grade group discussed the program consistently and no more than 20 percent of any group discussed it frequently.

The data indicate, then, that it is not common practice throughout the rank structure to discuss Commander's Call more than occasionally, but that the officers do so with significantly greater frequency

TABLE 2

HOW OFTEN DO YOU DISCUSS COMMANDER'S CALL TOPICS WITH  
FRIENDS AFTERWARDS

Count	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Row Total	
2	1	4	7	6	0	20	
Row %	5.0	20.0	35.0	40.0	0.0	10.3	
Column %	20.0	15.4	11.9	12.9	0.0		
Total %	0.5	2.1	3.6	4.1	0.0		
Grade	3	1	1	9	5	0	16
	6.3	6.3	56.3	31.3	0.0	8.2	
	20.0	3.8	15.3	8.1	0.0		
	0.5	0.5	4.6	2.6	0.0		
4	1	13	13	19	19	65	
	1.5	20.0	20.0	29.2	29.2		
	20.0	50.0	22.0	30.6	45.2		
	0.5	6.7	6.7	9.8	9.8		
5	2	8	30	30	23	93	
	2.2	8.6	32.3	32.3	24.7	47.9	
	40.0	30.8	50.8	48.4	54.8		
	1.0	4.1	15.5	15.5	11.9		
Column Total	5	26	59	62	42	194	
	2.6	13.4	30.4	32.0	21.6	100.0	

Chi Square = 23.16153 with 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0264

enlisted members. If there is a correlation between message  
message impact, it is possible that officers may be  
Commander's Call communication than enlisted. The  
on added significance in view of the fact that  
primarily conceived and conducted to communicate  
; enlisted members.

Question number 21 concerned attitudes toward the sound track music of the Air Force Now film. Table 3 shows the cross tabulation of responses to this question.

TABLE 3

## DO YOU LIKE THE SOUND TRACK (MUSIC) IN AIR FORCE NOW

Count	Like			Dislike	Very	Row
Row %	very		Neutral	somewhat	much	Total
Column %	much	Somewhat				
Total %						
Grade 2	7	11	2	0	0	20
	35.0	55.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.3
	12.7	13.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	
	3.6	5.7	1.0	0.0	0.0	
Grade 3	12	3	1	0	0	16
	75.0	18.8	6.3	0.0	0.0	8.2
	21.8	3.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	
	6.2	1.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	
Grade 4	16	23	22	3	1	65
	24.6	35.4	33.8	4.6	1.5	33.5
	29.1	27.4	56.4	33.3	14.3	
	8.2	11.9	11.3	1.5	0.5	
Grade 5	20	47	14	6	6	93
	21.5	50.5	15.1	6.5	6.5	47.9
	36.4	56.0	35.9	66.7	85.7	
	10.3	24.2	7.2	3.1	3.1	
Column Total	55	84	39	9	7	194
	28.4	43.3	20.1	4.6	3.6	100.0

Chi Square = 35.68774 with 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0004

Here the data shows that the majority of respondents in each grade group liked the sound track moderately or better. But, again the officers were significantly more favorable in their evaluations than the enlisted. For middle grade officers 90 percent liked the sound



track somewhat or better and the remaining 10 percent were neutral. For junior officers 93.8 percent liked the sound and the other 6.3 percent were neutral. No officer respondents expressed even a moderate dislike for the music. However, for the upper grade enlisted, 60 percent liked the sound at least somewhat and 33.8 percent were neutral; but, in contrast to the officers, 4.6 percent disliked it somewhat and 1.5 percent disliked it very much. Similarly, for the lower grade enlisted, 72 percent liked the sound and 15.1 percent were neutral, while 6.5 percent disliked it somewhat and 6.5 percent disliked it very much.

While only 8.2 percent of the respondents expressing a dislike for the Air Force Now sound track does not constitute a trend of rejection of it, it is significant that all who disliked the music were enlisted, and the lower grade enlisted were least favorable of all. This parallels the previous data concerning later discussion of Commander's Call topics since in both instances the officers clearly emerge as significantly more favorable toward the sound track than the enlisted. This finding is equally surprising because the use of "rock" music, and even the title, Air Force Now, clearly suggest the intentional orientation of the film toward the youth. But, again the implication is that officers may be more receptive to the Commander's Call communication than their subordinates.

While the foregoing analysis has identified two very interesting, but somewhat isolated, instances in which a significant difference in responses can be discerned according to military rank, the data showed no significant differences in the remaining seventeen questions. Those questions included very fundamental evaluations of the specific content

and overall worth of both the Commander's Call program and the Air Force Now film. Since these important questions reflected no significant differences by grade, and since significant differences occurred in only 10.5 percent of the questions tabulated, the results of data are considered to indicate that position in the rank structure does not affect attitudes toward the Commander's Call program.

Does Degree of Job Satisfaction Affect Attitudes  
Toward the Commander's Call Program?

The second of the seven questions under study asked whether degree of job satisfaction affected attitudes toward the Commander's Call program. The presumption is made that at least two factors fundamentally affect the degree of job satisfaction in the military environment. The first is the specific job to which the individual is assigned, and the second is the location of that job. Table 1 shows that in this study varying degrees of job satisfaction resulted in significantly different responses to twelve of the nineteen questions compared. It also shows that satisfaction with assignment to Grand Forks AFB was a significant variable for only four questions, indicating that the job they did was more important to the respondents in this study than the location of that job. It is also noted that only one of the four questions did not also reflect a significant difference relative to job satisfaction.

The first question reflecting a significant difference, number 5, asked whether the respondents liked to attend Commander's Calls. Table 4 shows the cross tabulation of responses to this question according to the satisfaction variable. Position one represents highest satisfaction.

The data shows that 60.1 percent of the respondents were at least moderately happy with their jobs and that 55.4 percent at least moderately

TABLE 4

## DO YOU LIKE TO ATTEND COMMANDER'S CALLS

Count						
Row %						
Column %	Thoroughly	Find	Neutral	Avoid	Dread	Row
Total %	Enjoy	OK			going	Total
1	6	23	10	0	5	44
	13.6	52.3	22.7	0.0	11.4	22.8
	50.0	24.2	26.3	0.0	13.9	
	3.1	11.9	5.2	0.0	2.6	
2	4	42	14	3	9	72
	5.6	58.3	19.4	4.2	12.5	37.3
	33.3	44.2	36.8	25.0	25.0	
3	2	9	5	3	9	28
	7.1	32.1	17.9	10.7	32.1	14.5
	16.7	9.5	13.2	25.0	25.0	
	1.0	4.7	2.6	1.6	4.7	
4	0	18	3	3	7	31
	0.0	58.1	9.7	9.7	22.6	16.1
	0.0	18.9	7.9	25.0	19.4	
	0.0	9.3	1.6	1.6	3.6	
5	0	3	6	3	6	18
	0.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	9.3
	0.0	3.2	15.8	25.0	16.7	
	0.0	1.6	3.1	1.6	3.1	
Column	12	95	38	12	36	193
Total	6.2	49.2	19.7	6.2	18.7	100.0

Chi Square = 33.56551 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0062

enjoyed attending Commander's Call. It also shows that 25.4 percent were at least moderately dissatisfied with their jobs and 24.9 percent at least moderately disliked attending Commander's Call. The correlation seems consistent throughout that as the level of job satisfaction decreased the number of respondents who thoroughly enjoy attending decreased and the

number who dreaded attending increased. The indication is that degree of job satisfaction affects the willingness with which one exposes himself to the organization's communication. This has significance because of the implied objective of Commander's Call to motivate personnel by increasing their awareness of their job's importance.

Question number 6 asked whether Commander's Call was valuable to the respondent. That question registered a significant difference relative to both the job satisfaction and assignment satisfaction variables. Table 5 shows the cross tabulation of this question according to job satisfaction.

The data shows the same general correlation as the previous question. Those who possessed a high level of job satisfaction placed a higher value on Commander's Call than those who did not. But in contrast to the previous question, the data shows that the majority of respondents find the program to be of little value. This indicates that at least some of the respondents who enjoy attending Commander's Call do not see any personal value in doing so. This raises questions concerning the returns the Air Force receives for its investment in the program.

Table 6 shows the same question cross tabulated for the assignment satisfaction variable.

The data shows a situation somewhat different from that occurring with the job satisfaction variable. Only 46 percent of the respondents were moderately or better satisfied with their assignment to Grand Forks and 39.8 percent were moderately or more dissatisfied, indicating more polarization of attitudes than occurred previously. In the occurrence of those neutral or dissatisfied regarding assignment there is a slightly

TABLE 5

HOW VALUABLE HAS COMMANDER'S CALL BEEN TO YOU

Count	Great Value	Moderate	Neither/ Nor	No Value	Waste Time	Row Total
Row %						
Column %						
Total %						
1	6	20	12	2	4	44
	13.6	45.5	27.3	4.5	9.1	23.0
	66.7	27.4	21.4	10.0	12.1	
	3.1	10.5	6.3	1.0	2.1	
2	1	32	21	7	11	72
	1.4	44.4	29.2	9.7	15.3	37.7
	11.1	43.8	37.5	35.0	33.3	
	0.5	16.8	11.0	3.7	5.8	
3	1	7	12	2	5	27
	3.7	25.9	44.4	7.4	18.5	14.1
	11.1	9.6	21.4	10.0	15.2	
	0.5	3.7	6.3	1.0	2.6	
4	1	12	4	6	7	30
	3.3	40.0	13.3	20.0	23.3	15.7
	11.1	16.4	7.1	30.0	21.2	
	0.5	6.3	2.1	3.1	3.7	
5	0	2	7	3	6	18
	0.0	11.1	38.9	16.7	33.3	9.4
	0.0	2.7	12.5	15.0	18.2	
	0.0	1.0	3.7	1.6	3.1	
Column Total	9	73	56	20	33	191
	4.7	38.2	29.3	10.5	17.3	100.0

Chi Square = 31.62227 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0112

TABLE 6

HOW VALUABLE HAS COMMANDER'S CALL BEEN TO YOU

Count						
Row %						
Column %	Great	Moderate	Neither/ Nor	No	Waste	Row
Total %	Value			Value	Time	Total
1	2	12	3	2	4	23
	8.7	52.2	13.0	8.7	17.4	12.0
	22.2	16.7	5.4	9.5	12.1	
	1.0	6.3	1.6	1.0	2.1	
2	0	26	22	5	12	65
	0.0	40.0	33.8	7.7	18.5	14.0
	0.0	36.1	39.3	23.8	36.4	
	0.0	13.6	11.5	2.6	6.3	
3	5	8	11	2	1	27
	18.5	29.6	40.7	7.4	3.7	14.1
	55.6	11.1	19.6	9.5	3.0	
	2.6	4.2	5.8	1.0	0.5	
4	1	15	11	6	8	41
	2.4	36.6	26.8	14.6	19.5	21.5
	11.1	20.8	19.6	28.6	24.2	
	0.5	7.9	5.8	3.1	4.2	
5	1	11	9	5	8	35
	2.9	31.4	25.7	17.1	22.9	18.3
	11.1	15.3	16.1	28.6	24.2	
	0.5	5.8	4.7	3.1	4.2	
Column	9	72	56	21	33	191
Total	4.7	37.7	29.3	11.0	17.3	100.0

Chi Square = 28.10492 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0307

increased tendency to rate the value of the program high although there was no corresponding increase in the tendency of those satisfied to rate the value of the program low. And while there was a more definite split between respondents who did and did not like their assignment, the distribution of total responses to the value of the program did not vary more than one-half percent between the two satisfaction variables. The indication is that dissatisfaction, whether based upon job or assignment resulted in very similar attitudes regarding the value of Commander's Call to the individuals attending.

Question number 7 asked whether Commander's Call was valuable for the unit, and the results are presented in Table 7 according to level of job satisfaction.

Here the data shows that 60.7 percent of the respondents were at least moderately satisfied with their jobs and 51.1 percent felt Commander's Call was at least moderately valuable to the unit. By comparison, the 51.1 percent is 8.2 percent more than those who perceived a personal value in the previous question at the same level of job satisfaction. It is also noteworthy that while 24.4 percent were moderately or less satisfied with their jobs, only 5.4 percent found the program of no value or a waste of time for the unit. That represents 22.4 percent fewer than found it of no value or a waste of time personally. At the same time the percentage of those attributing neutral value for the unit increased from 29.3 to 43.6. This indicates that respondents were less sure or less concerned as to whether Commander's Call was of no value to the unit than to themselves.

Table 8 presents the results to the question which asked what component of Commander's Call was most worthwhile.

TABLE 7

HOW VALUABLE HAS COMMANDER'S CALL BEEN FOR YOUR UNIT OR SQUADRON

Count	Great	Moderate	Neither/ Nor	No	Waste	Row	
Row %	Value			Value	Time	Total	
Column %							
Total %							
Job Satisfaction	1	9	22	10	2	0	43
		20.9	51.2	23.3	4.7	0.0	22.9
		50.0	28.2	12.2	25.0	0.0	
		4.8	11.7	5.3	1.1	0.0	
	2	6	28	37	0	0	71
		8.5	39.4	52.1	0.0	0.0	37.8
		33.3	35.9	45.1	0.0	0.0	
		3.2	14.9	19.7	0.0	0.0	
	3	2	11	13	1	1	28
		7.1	39.3	46.4	3.6	3.6	14.9
		11.1	14.1	15.9	12.5	50.0	
		1.1	5.9	6.9	0.5	0.5	
	4	0	14	13	2	0	29
		0.0	48.3	44.8	6.9	0.0	15.4
		0.0	17.9	15.9	25.0	0.0	
		0.0	7.4	6.9	1.1	0.0	
5	1	3	9	3	1	17	
	5.9	17.6	52.9	17.6	5.9	9.0	
	5.6	3.8	11.0	37.5	50.0		
	0.5	1.6	4.8	1.6	0.5		
Column	18	78	82	8	2	188	
Total	9.6	41.5	43.6	4.3	1.1	100.0	

Chi Square = 36.05814 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0028



TABLE 8

## WHAT DO YOU FIND MOST WORTHWHILE AT COMMANDER'S CALL

Count	Awards	AFN	Unit Information	AF News	Question/ Answer	Row Total
1	3	11	9	6	8	39
Row %	12.8	28.2	23.1	15.4	20.5	23.2
Column %	62.5	13.8	25.7	42.9	25.8	
Total %	3.0	6.5	5.4	3.6	4.8	
2	0	38	10	5	9	62
Row %	0.0	61.3	16.1	8.1	14.5	36.9
Column %	0.0	47.5	28.6	35.7	29.0	
Total %	0.0	22.6	6.0	3.0	5.4	
3	0	15	9	1	2	27
Row %	0.0	55.6	33.3	3.7	7.4	16.1
Column %	0.0	18.8	25.7	7.1	6.5	
Total %	0.0	8.9	5.4	0.6	1.2	
4	2	11	5	1	7	26
Row %	7.7	42.3	19.2	3.8	26.9	15.5
Column %	25.0	13.8	14.3	7.1	22.6	
Total %	1.2	6.5	3.0	0.6	4.2	
5	1	5	2	1	5	14
Row %	7.1	35.7	14.3	7.1	35.7	8.3
Column %	12.5	6.3	5.7	7.1	16.1	
Total %	0.6	3.0	1.2	0.6	3.0	
Column Total	8	80	35	14	31	168
	4.2	47.6	20.8	8.3	18.5	100.0

Chi Square = 29.08415 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0234

Here the data showed that respondents ranked the components in the following order.

1. Air Force Now film 47.6 percent
2. Local unit information 20.8 percent
3. Question and answer periods 18.5 percent
4. Air Force information 8.3 percent
5. Awards presentations 4.8 percent

The ranking remained constant with fairly consistent percentages descending through the top three levels of job satisfaction. However, in cases where moderate job dissatisfaction occurred the second place shifted strongly to the question and answer period. When job dissatisfaction was strongest the question and answer period equaled the Air Force Now as most worthwhile. This would indicate that when dissatisfaction is present the value placed upon question and answer periods increases commensurate with the degree of dissatisfaction. This finding takes on added significance if the assumption is made that those subjects which the dissatisfied respondents desire to question are the same subjects which contribute to their dissatisfaction. This suggests that question and answer periods could be effective in dealing with job dissatisfaction. It is also significant to later questions in this study that Air Force Now consistently ranks first among the Commander's Call components.

Question number 12 asked whether the respondents would attend if Commander's Calls were optional. The data showed the same correlation found previously; that is, those with higher job satisfaction would attend more often than those with less job satisfaction. While 60.2 percent possessed a moderate or higher level of job satisfaction, 66 percent said they would attend at least occasionally. Of those with moderate

or greater dissatisfaction 47.1 percent said they would never attend. Question 12 added no new implications and the cross tabulation table is omitted since the results fit the previously established pattern without significant variation.

Question number 13 asked whether respondents discussed Commander's Call topic with friends later. Earlier this question also registered a significant difference according to grade group. Table 9 shows the results according to job satisfaction.

The data did not show the same correlation with job satisfaction previously noted. Although those with moderate or higher job satisfaction accounted for 60 percent of those who consistently discussed the topic and 5.9 percent of those who frequently discussed them, overall only 16.1 percent of the respondents discussed the topics more than occasionally. Those with moderate or greater job dissatisfaction accounted for only 33.9 percent of those who seldom discussed the topics and 33.3 percent of those who never discussed them, while overall 53.9 percent of the respondents discussed topics less than occasionally. The indication here is that even a high degree of job satisfaction does not increase the likelihood that the Commander's Call topics will be discussed at a later time. It is interesting to note, however, that among the few who did consistently discuss the topics, the number with moderate job dissatisfaction equalled the number with moderate satisfaction.

Questions number 15, 16 and 17 asked whether the respondents enjoyed, were informed by or were entertained by the Air Force Now film. The data shows the same correlation of more favorable responses from those with higher levels of job satisfaction. These questions

TABLE 9

HOW OFTEN DO YOU DISCUSS COMMANDER'S CALL TOPICS WITH FRIENDS AFTERWARDS

Count Row % Column % Total %	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Row
						Total
1	1	13	14	10	6	44
	2.3	29.5	31.8	22.7	13.6	22.8
	20.0	50.0	24.1	16.1	14.3	
	0.5	6.7	7.3	5.2	3.1	
2	2	7	27	24	12	72
	2.8	9.7	37.5	33.3	16.7	37.3
	40.0	26.9	46.6	38.7	28.6	
	1.0	3.6	14.0	12.4	6.2	
3	0	3	8	7	10	28
	0.0	10.7	28.6	25.0	35.7	14.5
	0.0	11.5	13.8	11.3	23.8	
	0.0	1.6	4.1	3.6	5.2	
4	2	2	6	16	5	31
	6.5	6.5	19.4	51.6	16.1	16.1
	40.0	7.7	10.3	25.8	11.9	
	1.0	1.0	3.1	8.3	2.6	
5	0	1	3	5	9	18
	0.0	5.6	16.7	27.8	50.0	9.3
	0.0	3.8	5.2	8.1	21.4	
	0.0	0.5	1.6	2.6	4.7	
Column Total	5	26	58	62	42	193
	2.6	13.6	30.1	32.1	21.8	100.0

Chi Square = 35.17213 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0038

resulted in a strong tendency of favorable responses throughout. Seventy six point two percent of the respondents enjoyed, 77.2 percent were informed by, and 69.9 percent were entertained by the film to a moderate or greater degree. This indicates a general appreciation of the film

even by some who are otherwise dissatisfied. Question 16 also registered a significant difference relative to assignment satisfaction. The only difference seen in the data between the satisfaction variables is the same polarization of assignment satisfaction noted in question number 6.

Question number 18 asked about the worth of the Air Force Now to the respondents. Like the previous three questions, the data showed that the responses had the same correlation between more favorable positions and higher job satisfaction. However, on the question of worth the strong majority of favorable responses previously noted was not evident. Only 50.8 percent said the film was more than occasionally worthwhile. The results indicate that some of the respondents with higher job satisfaction, and some who enjoy and find the film informative and entertaining, do not consider it frequently worthwhile. This suggests that perhaps some regard the film more a diversion or recreation than an important communications medium. Question number 18 also registered a significant difference relative to the assignment satisfaction variable, but, as in question number 16, no additional significance is evident.

Question number 22 asked whether the respondents agreed that Air Force Now should be a mandatory component of Commander's Call. Table 10 presents the results according to degree of job satisfaction.

The data showed that the majority of the respondents either moderately or strongly agreed down through a moderate level of job dissatisfaction. However, when the level of dissatisfaction was highest the responses shifted strongly to positions of disagreement. Whereas overall only 29.1 of the respondents disagreed with the question, 77.7 percent of those highly dissatisfied disagreed. This indicates that as dissatisfaction increased the respondents emphasis shifted away from the Air Force Now.

TABLE 10

AIP FORCE NOW SHOULD BE A MANDATORY PART OF COMMANDER'S CALL

Count						
Row %						
Column %	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Neutral	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Row Total
Total %						
Job Satisfaction	1	10	15	9	6	44
		22.7	34.1	20.5	13.6	22.9
		21.7	30.6	22.0	23.1	13.3
		5.2	7.8	4.7	3.1	2.1
Job Satisfaction	2	15	24	15	5	72
		20.8	33.3	20.8	6.9	37.5
		7.8	12.5	7.8	2.6	6.8
Job Satisfaction	3	9	3	10	3	28
		32.1	10.7	35.7	10.7	14.6
		19.6	6.1	24.4	11.5	10.0
		4.7	1.5	5.2	1.6	1.6
Job Satisfaction	4	9	6	7	6	30
		30.0	20.0	23.3	20.0	15.6
		19.6	12.2	17.1	23.1	6.7
		4.7	3.1	3.6	3.1	1.0
Job Satisfaction	5	3	1	0	6	18
		16.7	5.6	0.0	33.3	9.4
		6.5	2.0	0.0	23.1	26.7
		1.6	0.5	0.0	3.1	4.2
Column Total	46	49	41	26	30	192
	24.0	25.5	21.4	13.5	15.6	100.0

Chi Square = 38.77840 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0012

This is consistent with the earlier finding that emphasis on question and answer periods increases with degree of dissatisfaction and holds generally the same implication that respondents wanted an opportunity to discuss the source of their dissatisfaction.

Question number 24 asked how often Air Force Now should be produced, and again the data followed the established pattern. Most of the respondents with high job satisfaction, 57.4 percent, said monthly and half with high dissatisfaction, said never. It is interesting to note that the shift of the majority of responses from favorable positions of quarterly or monthly to unfavorable positions of annually or never, occurred between moderate and high dissatisfaction. This trend occurred previously and indicates that not until dissatisfaction reaches a high level is it manifested in negative attitudes towards organizational communication.

Question number 27 asked whether respondents discussed the topics in Air Force Now with friends later, and significant differences were found only relative to assignment satisfaction, not job satisfaction. Table 11 presents the results.

The data shows that despite the approximate balance between those satisfied and dissatisfied with their assignments, the same tendency to not discuss topics, noted previously for Commander's Call, occurred again for the film. In this case, 47.4 percent seldom or never discussed the topics, while only 20.9 percent discussed them more than occasionally. The indication is that regardless of the reason for dissatisfaction, or whether the subject was Commander's Call or Air Force Now, the respondents did not tend to find the topics worthy of discussion at a later time. The basis for speculating as to why this is the only question which was found significant according to assignment satisfaction but not job satisfaction is not apparent.

The results of data have shown that for nineteen questions compared against two satisfaction variables a significant difference was

TABLE 11

HOW OFTEN DO YOU' DISCUSS AIR FORCE NOW TOPICS WITH FRIENDS AFTERWARDS

Count							Row
Row %						Total	
Column %	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Total	
Total %							
Assignment Satisfaction	1	0	7	8	4	4	23
		0.0	30.4	34.8	17.4	17.4	12.0
		0.0	18.9	13.1	7.4	10.8	
		0.0	3.6	4.2	2.1	2.1	
	2	0	14	26	16	9	65
		0.0	21.5	40.0	24.6	13.8	33.9
		0.0	37.8	42.6	29.6	24.3	
		0.0	7.3	13.5	8.3	4.7	
	3	2	6	5	11	3	27
		7.4	22.2	18.5	40.7	11.1	14.1
		66.7	16.2	8.2	20.4	8.1	
		1.0	3.1	2.6	5.7	1.6	
	4	1	6	16	12	7	42
	2.4	14.3	38.1	28.6	16.7	21.9	
	33.3	16.2	26.2	22.2	18.9		
	0.5	3.1	8.3	6.3	3.6		
5	0	4	6	11	14	35	
	0.0	11.4	17.1	31.4	40.0	18.2	
	0.0	10.8	9.8	20.4	37.8		
	0.0	2.1	3.1	5.7	7.3		
Column	3	37	61	54	37	192	
Total	1.6	19.3	31.8	28.1	19.3	100.0	

Chi Square = 30.08971 with 16 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0175

detected in thirteen for a rate of 68.4 percent. Of these, twelve differences were attributable to job satisfaction variance, one to assignment satisfaction variance and three to both. Since a clear majority of the questions did reflect significant differences, the statistics are considered to indicate that degree of job satisfaction (including assignment



satisfaction) does affect attitudes toward the Commander's Call program. Specifically, the correlation has been established that as degree of job satisfaction increases, the attitudes toward Commander's Call become more favorable.

Are Persons in Command Positions More Favorable Than  
Non-Commanders Toward the Commander's Call Program?

The third of the seven questions under study asked whether persons in command positions were more favorable than non-commanders toward the Commander's Call program. Table 1 showed that in this study the command variable resulted in significantly different responses to four of the eight questions compared. Three of the four questions also yielded significant differences according to job satisfaction, and the fourth was not significant by any previous variable.

The question of how valuable was Commander's Call for the unit was the first question reflecting a significant difference. Table 12 cross tabulates the responses by the command variable. Type 2 are commanders.

The data showed that the majority, 56.1 percent, of all respondents placed at least moderate value on Commander's Call for the unit. But 40 percent of the commanders said the program was of great value, while only 9.5 percent of the non-commanders rated the value as great. Consistently, only 4 percent of the commanders found the program neutral, and none of no value to the unit, while 43.9 percent of the non-commanders found it neutral and 4.6 percent of less value. The largest group of commander responses rate the program moderately valuable while the largest group of non-commanders rated it neutral. The indication is that while there is general agreement that the program is valuable for the unit, commanders seem to be significantly more committed to that position than non-

TABLE 12

HOW VALUABLE HAS COMMANDER'S CALL BEEN FOR YOUR UNIT OR SQUADRON

Count						
Row %						
Column %	Great	Moderate	Neutral	No	Waste	Row
Total %	Value	Value		Value	of	Total
					Time	
1	18	78	83	8	2	189
	9.5	41.3	43.9	4.2	1.1	88.3
Type	64.3	84.8	98.8	100.0	100.0	
	8.4	36.4	38.8	3.7	0.9	
2	10	14	1	0	0	25
	40.0	56.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	11.7
	35.7	15.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	
	4.7	6.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	
Column	28	92	84	8	2	214
Total	13.1	43.0	39.3	3.7	0.9	100.0

Chi Square = 27.07249 with 4 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0000

commanders. This suggests that commanders perceive they are communicating with their subordinates at Commander's Call with greater effectiveness than their subordinates perceive.

Question number 8 asked which component of Commander's Call was most worthwhile. Table 13 presents the results.

The data shows that non-commanders ranked the components as previously discussed, with the Air Force Now film first, awards presentations last, questions and answers in the middle and unit news substantially more worthwhile than Air Force news. Commanders, however, rated unit information highest by 40 percent to 20.7 percent compared to non-commanders. Commanders also placed greater value on questions and answers and awards presentations by 36.0 percent to 18.3 percent and

TABLE 13

## WHAT DO YOU FIND MOST WORTHWHILE AT COMMANDER'S CALL

Count						Row
Row %						Total
Column %	Awards	AFN	Unit	AF	Questions/	Row
Total %			Information	Information	Answers	Total
1	8	81	35	14	31	169
Type	4.7	47.9	20.7	8.3	18.3	37.1
	66.7	98.8	77.8	93.3	77.5	
	4.1	41.8	18.0	7.2	16.0	
2	4	1	10	1	9	25
	16.0	4.0	40.0	4.0	36.0	12.9
	33.3	1.2	22.2	6.7	22.5	
	2.1	0.5	5.2	0.5	4.6	
Column	12	82	45	15	40	194
Total	6.2	42.3	23.2	7.7	20.6	100.0

Chi Square = 21.71544 with 4 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0002

16.0 percent to 4.7 percent respectively. But the greatest disappointment occurred concerning the Air Force Now which commanders rated at only 4.0 percent compared to 47.9 percent for non-commanders. The comparative rankings are shown below:

Commanders

1. Local unit information - 40 percent
2. Question and answer periods - 36 percent
3. Awards and presentations - 16 percent
4. Air Force Information - 4 percent
5. Air Force Now film - 4 percent

Non-commanders

1. Air Force Now film - 47.9 percent
2. Local unit information - 20.7 percent
3. Question and answer periods - 18.3 percent
4. Air Force information - 8.3 percent
5. Awards presentations - 4.7 percent

This finding indicates that, except for widely discrepant views regarding the film, commanders and non-commanders rank the components in nearly the same sequence. This suggests that non-commanders value the Air Force Now substantially more than commanders, and awards presentations substantially less. The implication here is that commanders might structure their program and allot times differently if they better understood the attitudes of their subordinates.

Question number 9 asked which component of the Commander's Call program was least worthwhile. The data simply confirmed the previous question by reversing the ranking.

Question number 12 asked if Commander's Calls were optional would commanders conduct them, and would non-commanders attend. Table 14 presents the responses.

The data showed both commanders, 64 percent, and non-commanders, 29.2 percent, agreed that the program should be held frequently. Nearly equivalent percentages also agreed on occasionally and seldom, in that order. The significant difference was that no commanders would hold the program frequently or never, while non-commanders said they would attend on those bases at rates of 10.4 percent and 17.7 percent respectively. This would indicate that the majority of commanders would conduct and

TABLE 14

IF COMMANDER'S CALL WERE OPTIONAL WOULD YOU ATTEND

Count						Row
Row %						Total
Column %	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Total
Total %						
1	20	56	51	31	34	192
Type	10.4	29.2	26.6	16.1	17.7	88.5
	100.0	77.8	89.5	91.2	100.0	
	9.2	25.8	23.5	14.3	15.7	
2	0	16	6	3	0	25
Type	0.0	64.0	24.0	12.0	0.0	11.5
	0.0	22.2	10.5	8.8	0.0	
	0.0	7.4	2.8	1.4	0.0	
Column Total	20	72	57	34	34	217
	9.2	33.2	26.3	15.7	15.7	100.0

Chi Square = 15.41827 with 4 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0039

the majority of non-commanders would attend Commander's Calls on at least an occasional basis. If the presumption is made that the response "always" implies more frequently than the existing monthly rate, the finding suggests that most commanders, and the largest group of non-commanders are satisfied with the present frequency. However, a substantial number of other responses suggest some commanders desire more latitude in when they are required to hold the program.

The data shows that for half of the eight questions compared by the command variable there are significant differences. All of the four questions in which no differences were found dealt specifically with the Air Force Now. This indicates that the only disagreement which exists between commanders and non-commanders regarding the film is its relative

importance at Commander's Call. Since 50 percent of the questions did reflect significant differences, the data are considered to indicate that persons in command positions are more favorable than non-commanders toward Commander's Call, but with the qualification that they are less favorable regarding Air Force Now as a component of it.

Do Attitudes Toward Commander's Call Affect Attitudes  
Toward the Air Force Now Film?

The fourth of the seven questions under study asked whether attitudes toward Commander's Call affect attitudes toward the Air Force Now film. The answer to that lies in the level of consistency between attitudes toward the former and the latter. No specific computation was made to compare the evaluations of each by individual respondent, so exact trends cannot be reported. Instead certain parallel questions about Commander's Call and the Air Force Now film were selected for comparison of overall responses. The presumption is that if the same question is asked about both programs with substantially different results, the indication would be that both were evaluated independently. However, if responses closely approximate each other, the indication would be that the attitudes toward one probably influences the attitudes toward the other. Data used for this comparison was drawn exclusively from the responses of non-commanders.

Six questions were selected for this analysis. Question number 5 asked if the respondents liked to attend Commander's Call; and question number 15 asked if they enjoyed the Air Force Now film. Question number 6 asked how valuable Commander's Call was to the respondents; and question number 18 asked if the topics in Air Force Now were

worthwhile. Question number 12 asked if the respondents would attend optional Commander's Calls; and question number 23 asked if they would attend optional Air Force Now films.

A comparison of the questions of enjoyment produced the results shown in table 15.

TABLE 15  
ENJOYMENT

Response	Question 5 Commander's Call		Question 15 Air Force Now	
	N	%	N	%
1. Thoroughly enjoy	12	6.2	58	29.2
2. Find it OK	95	49.0	90	46.4
3. Neither care nor don't care	39	20.1	23	11.9
4. Avoid going	12	6.2	12	6.2
5. Dread going	36	18.6	11	5.7
6. No response	0	0	0	0

The data shows that the responses followed generally the same trends to the extent that the majority of respondents found both programs to be acceptable or better. However, the favorable responses to the film substantially exceeded those to the Commander's Call by the rate of 76.3 percent to 55.2 percent. Also 18.6 percent dread attending Commander's Call while only 5.7 percent felt similarly about the film. The indication is that the respondents placed significantly greater enjoyment value upon the film. This is consistent with the rank ordering of Commander's Call components noted earlier and

suggests that the film is enjoyed measurably more than the program as a whole.

A comparison of the questions of value of the Commander's Call program and the Air Force Now topics produced the results shown in table 16.

TABLE 16

## VALUE

Response	Question 6 Commander's Call			Question 18 Air Force Now	
	N	%		N	%
1. Great value	9	4.6	Always	34	17.5
2. Moderate value	73	37.6	Frequently	64	33.0
3. Neither helps nor hinders	56	28.9	Occasionally	63	32.5
4. No value	21	10.8	Seldom	25	12.9
5. Waste of time	33	17.0	Never	8	4.1
6. No response	2	1.0	No response	0	0

The data showed that the largest group of respondents chose the moderately positive position on both questions. Again, however, the positive responses to the film substantially exceeded those to Commander's Call. In fact, a slight majority, 50.5 percent, of the film's responses were positive, while only 42.2 percent were positive toward Commander's Call. There were correspondingly fewer negative responses to the film, 17 percent compared to 27.8 percent. As in the previous question, the indication is that the respondents placed significantly higher value upon the film than upon the Commander's Call overall.



A comparison of the questions of optional attendance and viewing produced the results presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17  
OPTIONAL ATTENDANCE

Response	Question 12 Commander's Call		Question 23 Air Force Now	
	N	%	N	%
1. Always	20	10.3	46	23.7
2. Frequently	56	28.9	55	28.4
3. Occasionally	51	26.3	53	27.3
4. Seldom	31	16.0	17	8.8
5. Never	34	17.5	23	11.9
6. No response	2	1.0	0	0

Again the data showed that favorable responses to the film substantially exceeded favorable responses to the Commander's Call, but, again both were generally favorable. Here 79.4 percent would voluntarily view the film at least occasionally, while only 65.5 percent would voluntarily attend Commander's Call. The same indications suggested by the two previous questions, therefore, seemed to also hold true for optional attendance.

These results showed that by at least three selected measures, substantial levels of inconsistency existed between responses to the Commander's Call program and the Air Force Now film. Further, the data showed that the trend of the differences was consistently toward more favorable positions for the film. If the presumption that

inconsistencies in the responses to the program indicate they are independently evaluated is accepted, then the qualified answer to the fourth question is that attitude toward Commander's Call do not negatively affect attitudes toward Air Force Now, to the extent that respondents cannot distinguish between them. This is a significant qualification, however the results of the data cannot conclusively support the interpretation that no cross-influence occurs. The doubt which remains is, if the programs were presented separately would the perceived value of Air Force Now become more favorable and/or would the perceived value of Commander's Call become less favorable? The results are insufficient to support further speculation.

Does the Air Force Now Film Enhance or Detract  
from the Commander's Call Program?

These same data are, however, considered to be sufficient to provide an answer to the fifth question under study. That question asked whether Air Force Now enhances or detracts from the Commander's Call program. Considering the data just presented in analysis of the fourth question, and reconsidering the wide margin by which non-commanders ranked the film as the most worthwhile component of the program, the trend becomes obvious. Here, then, the data are considered to show the Air Force Now does substantially enhance, and does not detract from, the Commander's Call program.

Do Attitudes Toward the Commander's Call Program and  
the Air Force Now Film Warrant Their Continued Use?

The two remaining questions under study asked whether attitudes toward Commander's Call and the Air Force Now film warrant their continued use. The data is incomplete to support answers to those

questions without including a brief analysis of the remarks made in response to the open-ended questions. In answering question 6 and 7 only the remarks made by non-commanders will be used since as the consumers of the communication their attitudes seem more pertinent to the questions under study. The questionnaire asked five open-ended questions, two concerning Commander's Call and three concerning the film.

Question 10 asked what topics the respondents would like included in the Commander's Call. Of the 194 respondents, 62 or 31.9 percent answered the question. Seven of the answers were non-constructive negative expressions about the program; such as, "I'm against it," or "Drop it, it's a waste of time." Other suggestions which occurred repeatedly were: More information on unit sports, less information on Air Force wide topics, include free beer with the program. But the majority of responses were substantive and constructive and seemed to identify subjects of immediate personal interest or concern to the individual. These suggestions included such representative topics as career planning, educational opportunities, promotion trends, benefit changes and assignment policies. This interest in matters that directly affect the respondents is consistent with the earlier reported finding that local unit news was the second ranked component of Commander's Call by worth. The fact that this same concern for more locally important information reappears in the unstructured responses is significant when related to the earlier finding that commanders perceive these topics to be even more important than do their subordinates. The indication here is that commanders may be incorrectly selecting the local topics for discussion. There is suggested need

to periodically determine what matters are of concern to the unit members and address those topics at Commander's Call.

Question 14 simply solicited any additional remarks on Commander's Call the respondent wished to make. Only 22.2 percent responded and slightly over half of those were non-constructive negative expressions. While most of the constructive and substantive responses duplicated the content oriented remarks noted in the previous question, the subject of where and when and how the program is held was repeatedly addressed. The trend of responses clearly indicates that the program should be held less formally only when necessary and then away from the duty section.

Although it was repeatedly expressed that Commander's Call should be held only when necessary, only a minority responded to this question, and thus it is not totally comparable to the overall survey results. Earlier question 11 specifically asked how often Commander's Calls should occur. Here 28.4 percent said only when necessary and 39.2 percent said monthly. It is possible that some of those who wanted the program only when important matters require, felt strongly enough to say so twice. On the other hand, the responses to question 14 could be a venting of hostile attitudes toward the program in the majority of the cases, and a basic reaffirmation of the responses to question number 11 in the remaining cases.

Question 19 asked what topics should be included in the Air Force Now. Seventy-nine respondents answered this question for a rate of 40.7 percent, and only 6 or 7.9 percent were non-substantive negative expressions. Two general types of responses repeatedly occurred for this question. The first continued the trend of the previous

questions showing a definite interest in topics which affect the individuals personally. Again the subjects of assignment, promotions, pay and education prevailed. The second general type of response reflected dissatisfaction with a perceived tendency of Air Force Now to emphasize aircraft and pilots in glamorous situations, rather than "real" people in less exotic jobs. There was a repeated call to include topics on missiles, security police, "pencil pushers" and northern tier assignments. The indication is that these viewers have been saturated with glamorous and exciting topics, and would prefer the film to tell their own experiences to the rest of the Air Force. It should be noted that the responses did not seem to indicate a jealousy of the glamorous jobs; instead, a feeling that the viewers' jobs were equally important and worthy of being filmed. This suggests that the respondents have both a significant level of pride in their jobs and an implied regard for Air Force Now as a means for publicity among their contemporaries.

Question 26 asked the respondents to state what they thought Air Force Now was trying to say. This question received the most responses of all open-ended questions with 113, or 58.2 percent responding. After eliminating only three non-substantive negative expressions, the nearly unanimous response was that the film showed the Air Force "keeping up with the times" and "what's happening." The word "propaganda" appeared in five responses and, although a negative connotation may have been implied, they were not regarded negatively since the film is quite correctly designated as propaganda. However, a secondary trend, perhaps associated with the respondents' intended meaning of the word appears. The trend indicates perceptible feeling that the film presents an

unrealistic depiction of Air Force life. The charge of "phoniness" and "only the good side" was stated frequently. While not the majority opinion, this trend indicates that the credibility of the film may suffer as the result of over concentration on glamour and exotic content. This suggests that more acknowledgement of the contributions made by "average" people would increase the film acceptance by the viewers.

Question 28 solicited generally unstructured responses to the Air Force Now. There were 44 responses for a 22.7 percent rate and only 9.1 percent were non-substantive negative expressions. The answers followed the same pattern as the responses to the previous two questions; those who responded generally liked the film, but wanted to see their own jobs publicized, and, to a lesser degree, felt the film was "phony." One respondent thought the film should be on television so the public at large could view it. Overall the unstructured responses were favorable toward the film.

In summary, the analysis of the tabulated data and the responses to the five open-ended questions showed consistently that both Commander's Call, and to a greater degree, Air Force Now were regarded favorably by the majority of respondents. A significant percentage attached at least moderate value to the programs and most would attend them voluntarily on at least an occasional basis. The remarks contributed some meaningful criticisms and suggestions, but generally supported the other findings in terms of overall favorable attitudes. The results of the data collected indicate that the respondents' attitudes do not warrant the discontinuance of either Commander's Call or the Air Force Now. However, neither do the data results warrant continuation without some modification.

The final chapter of this study will draw some specific conclusions from this chapter and recommend some modification and suggest some improvements for the Commander's Call and the Air Force Now films.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognition of the need for effective internal communication in military organizations is not new. Preparing for revolution General George Washington said: "Impress on the mind of every man, from the first to the lowest, the importance of the cause and what it is they are contending for." In the introduction to this study it was noted that the Air Force has recognized and committed substantial resources to meet that need. But the obstacles confronting the internal communication programs of an organization with the scope and diversity of the modern Air Force are exponentially more complex than Washington's. The fundamental objective of this study was to determine whether the Commander's Call program and the Air Force Now film, as the predominate components of the internal information program, are meeting the Air Force's needs.

The study first reviewed several previous studies of Commander's Call and the film and summarized those findings. In general others found that Commander's Call was not meeting its objectives, and that those attending did not particularly enjoy or perceive great benefit from doing so. Findings regarding the film generally suggested that while the film was enjoyed by most, it was perceived to be of moderate value at best.

This study attempted to validate some selected findings of the previous studies done between 1964 and 1975 by drawing from a more



representative sample, and to gain additional specific information concerning the effect of certain variables on attitudes toward the program and the film separately. The data collected was analyzed to answer seven specific questions.

It was found that the questions which duplicated earlier studies concerning the levels of enjoyment and value and matters of content and frequency, produced essentially the same results. Despite slight variations in percentages, the overall trends are sufficient) similar to conclude that the findings of the earlier studies are indeed valid; and that essentially the same situation has continued to exist since the first study in 1964 and this study.

The seven questions posed by this study revealed some additional new information. This study determined that position in the rank structure usually did not significantly affect responses to most of the questions. The exceptions, however, showed that officers and enlisted differ on attitudes toward discussing Commander's Call topics with friends and toward the music in the Air Force Now film. Surprisingly, the officers were more favorable concerning the music. Even though the grade usually does not significantly affect attitudes toward Commander's Call or Air Force Now, an additional conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that when differences do occur, they are likely to be between officer and enlisted lines.

This study also determined that degree of job satisfaction did significantly affect attitudes toward Commander's Call and Air Force Now. The correlation found was that those with greater job satisfaction held generally more favorable attitudes toward both programs. It also found that satisfaction with the specific job being performed was a

significantly more salient variable than the assignment location where job was performed. Therefore it can be concluded that job dissatisfaction creates a dissonance in the communication process which impedes the exchange of messages. This study also found that effective use of question and answer periods within the Commander's Call program are perceived by those experiencing job dissatisfaction as a viable means of reducing the dissatisfaction, and thus the dissonance. In other words, it is suggested that a properly conducted Commander's Call might be a major factor in the solution of its own problems.

This study also determined that persons in command positions varied significantly from non-commanders in attitudes toward Commander's Call. Predictably, the commanders were consistently more favorable. Speculation could be made that this phenomenon is explainable within commitment theory; that is, since commanders are required by regulation to publicly support Commander's Call, their personal attitudes consequently shift toward a more favorable position to maintain internal consistency. The conclusion, nevertheless, is that commanders place high value upon Commander's Call and can be assumed to be committed to its successful implementation. This is logical since commanders experience the greatest risk relative to internal communication because a unit failure is often equated to a personal failure on the commander's part.

This study did not conclusively determine whether attitudes toward Commander's Call affected attitudes toward the Air Force Now film. There was insufficient control of the variables to draw that conclusion. It did, however, determine that the Air Force Now solicits significantly more favorable attitudes than does Commander's Call. And on that basis it can be further concluded that some degree of independent

significantly more salient variable than the assignment location where job was performed. Therefore it can be concluded that job dissatisfaction creates a dissonance in the communication process which impedes the exchange of messages. This study also found that effective use of question and answer periods within the Commander's Call program are perceived by those experiencing job dissatisfaction as a viable means of reducing the dissatisfaction, and thus the dissonance. In other words, it is suggested that a properly conducted Commander's Call might be a major factor in the solution of its own problems.

This study also determined that persons in command positions varied significantly from non-commanders in attitudes toward Commander's Call. Predictably, the commanders were consistently more favorable. Speculation could be made that this phenomenon is explainable within commitment theory; that is, since commanders are required by regulation to publicly support Commander's Call, their personal attitudes consequently shift toward a more favorable position to maintain internal consistency. The conclusion, nevertheless, is that commanders place high value upon Commander's Call and can be assumed to be committed to its successful implementation. This is logical since commanders experience the greatest risk relative to internal communication because a unit failure is often equated to a personal failure on the commander's part.

This study did not conclusively determine whether attitudes toward Commander's Call affected attitudes toward the Air Force Now film. There was insufficient control of the variables to draw that conclusion. It did, however, determine that the Air Force Now solicits significantly more favorable attitudes than does Commander's Call. And on that basis it can be further concluded that some degree of independent

evaluation of the two programs does occur, but that is not to say that some degree of cross-influence does not also occur. On the same basis it can be concluded that the Air Force Now does enhance, rather than detract from, the Commander's Call program.

On the basis of the tabulated data and the remarks offered by the respondents to open-ended questions, this study determined that there was no evidence that attitudes toward Commander's Call or Air Force Now warranted their discontinuation. It can be concluded, therefore, that both programs make a substantial contribution to the Air Force's internal information program, and that they do so in a manner not directly duplicated by any other media presently being employed. At the same time it must be noted that both programs also provide an excellent opportunity to permit ever more effective communication and better meet the needs of the Air Force internal information program.

From the conclusions drawn in this study some recommendations can be made as to how the Commander's Call and Air Force Now programs might fulfill more of their communication potential. The following four recommendations are suggested:

1. Commanders should solicit from their subordinates topics which they find most salient and address them thoroughly at Commander's Call.
2. Air Force Now question and answer periods should remain mandatory, but commanders should be given the latitude to use remaining time to the best of their discretion.
3. Commander's Call should be convened by the commander when he considers that his units situation warrants it.

4. Air Force authorities should develop a method to periodically measure and feed-back members' attitudes toward Commander's Call and Air Force Now.

Considering the first recommendation, the fact that job satisfaction was found to be a significant factor in receptiveness to communication, and that commanders and non-commanders disagreed significantly on the relative worth of Commander's Call components; a need for the commander to know what his subordinates value is clearly indicated. It is anticipated that many of the topics suggested by subordinates would relate directly to factors causing job dissatisfaction. Correcting, or at least addressing those would better predispose the subordinates for further communication. Also, knowing which program components his subordinates valued, the commander could more effectively structure his Commander's Call.

Considering the second recommendation, the clear predominance of Air Force Now in the component ranking by non-commanders, and the increased value placed upon questions and answers by those with high levels of dissatisfaction, there can be little question that these components should remain intact. Beyond that, however, the very diversification of the Air Force organization suggests that nobody is better qualified than the commander to determine what sort of messages need to be communicated to his specific unit. An Air Force commander has an extremely responsible job in terms of the value of the resources he manages. There is no reason to suppose that he cannot also manage his communication at a local level as well.

Considering the third recommendation, it is evident from the data that many respondents, commanders and non-commanders favor a

monthly Commander's Call. For the same reasons cited above, it seems unnecessary to restrict a commander who determines it to be in his best interest to hold one less often. The fact that a substantial percentage of respondents selected a frequency other than monthly suggests that many Commander's Calls are attended by personnel, and commanders, who do not perceive a need to be there. If the attendees do not want to be there, it follows that the success of the Commander's Call is likely to be reduced. The presumption is made that no Commander's Call is better than a poorly conceived one, since the latter could be counter-productive to good communication. Thus, the commander should make the determination.

The fourth recommendation is simply a motion to close the communication loop. The most elementary model of communication shows that the process is not complete without feed-back. In the Air Force no such feed-back is collected regarding internal communication, which is questionable management policy. Certainly the Air Force continually tests, evaluates, modifies and retests other programs such as weapon system acquisition programs. Are not communication programs sufficiently important to warrant the same level of management? A communication evaluation program does not exist today.

These recommendations are not put forth as ultimate solutions to the existing problems, or as a prescription for the perfect organizational communication program, but they are thought to represent reasonable and well-founded steps which could further refine a basically sound program. While it is doubtful that the recommendations will ever come to the attention of individuals with the authority to implement

them, it is at least hoped that they will be of benefit to some future student of Air Force internal information and contribute something of substance to what is known about communication behavior in organizations.

APPENDICES



APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE I

To be answered by all grades. Please respond to all questions.

Non-Commanders  
N=194

PART I - COMMANDER'S CALL

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. What is your grade?		
1. Col or Lt Col	0	0
2. Major or Capt	20	10.3
3. 1st or 2nd Lt	16	8.2
4. SSgt thru CMSgt	65	33.5
5. Amn thru Sgt	93	47.9
2. Are you satisfied with your present job in the Air Force?		
1. Very satisfied	44	22.7
2. Moderately satisfied	72	37.1
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	28	14.4
4. Moderately dissatisfied	31	16.0
5. Very dissatisfied	18	9.3
6. No response	1	0.5
3. Are you satisfied to be at Grand Forks AFB?		
1. Very satisfied	23	11.9
2. Moderately satisfied	66	34.0
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	27	13.9
4. Moderately dissatisfied	42	21.6
5. Very dissatisfied	35	18.0
6. No response	1	0.5
4. Do you attend Commander's Calls?		
1. Always	104	53.6
2. Frequently	57	29.4
3. Occasionally	19	9.8
4. Seldom	12	6.2
5. Never	2	1.0
5. Do you like to attend Commander's Calls?		
1. Thoroughly enjoy	12	6.2
2. Find it OK	95	49.0
3. Neither care nor don't care	39	20.1
4. Avoid going	12	6.2
5. Dread going	36	18.6

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
6. How valuable has Commander's Call been to you?		
1. Great value	9	4.6
2. Moderate value	73	37.6
3. Neither helps nor hinders	56	28.9
4. No value	21	10.8
5. Waste of time	33	17.0
6. No response	2	1.0
7. How valuable has Commander's Call been for your unit or squadron?		
1. Great value	18	9.3
2. Moderate value	78	40.2
3. Neither help nor hinder	83	42.8
4. No value	8	4.1
5. Waste of time	2	1.0
6. No response	5	2.6
8. What do you find most worthwhile at Commander's Call?		
1. Awards presentations	8	4.1
2. Air Force Now film	81	41.8
3. Base/unit news/information	35	18.0
4. Air Force news/information	14	7.2
5. Question/answer period	31	16.0
6. No response	25	12.9
9. What do you find least worthwhile at Commander's Call?		
1. Awards presentations	64	33.0
2. Air Force Now film	31	16.0
3. Base/unit news/information	17	8.8
4. Air Force news/information	27	13.9
5. Question/answer period	40	20.6
6. No response	15	7.7
10. What topics would you like to have included in Commander's Call? 62 responses		
11. How often should Commander's Call be held?		
1. Every two weeks	3	1.5
2. Monthly	76	39.2
3. Quarterly	48	24.7
4. Only when important matters require it	55	28.4
5. Never	10	5.2
6. No response	2	1.0

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
12. If Commander's Call were optional would you attend?		
1. Always	20	10.3
2. Frequently	56	28.9
3. Occasionally	51	26.3
4. Seldom	31	16.0
5. Never	34	17.5
6. No response	2	1.0

13. How often do you discuss Commander's Call with friends afterwards?		
1. Always	5	2.6
2. Frequently	26	13.4
3. Occasionally	59	30.4
4. Seldom	62	32.0
5. Never	42	21.6

14. Please make any additional comments regarding Commander's Call. Be specific.

43 responses

#### PART II - AIR FORCE NOW FILM

15. Do you enjoy the Air Force Now film?		
1. Thoroughly enjoy	58	29.9
2. Find it OK	90	46.4
3. Neither like nor dislike	23	11.9
4. Dislike	12	6.2
5. Thoroughly dislike	11	5.7

16. Do you find the Air Force Now film informative?		
1. Very informative	54	27.8
2. Moderately informative	95	49.0
3. Neither informative nor uninformative	22	11.3
4. Moderately uninformative	15	7.7
5. Very uninformative	8	4.1

17. Do you find the Air Force Now film entertaining?		
1. Very entertaining	40	20.6
2. Moderately entertaining	96	49.5
3. Neither entertaining nor annoying	33	17.0
4. Moderately annoying	12	6.2
5. Very annoying	13	6.7

	No.	Percentage
18. Are the topics in Air Force Now worthwhile to you?		
1. Always	34	17.5
2. Frequently	64	33.0
3. Occasionally	63	32.5
4. Seldom	25	12.9
5. Never	8	4.1
19. What kind of topics would you like to have included in Air Force Now? 79 responses		
20. Do you like the photography in Air Force Now?		
1. Like very much	94	48.5
2. Like somewhat	67	34.5
3. Neither like nor dislike	25	12.9
4. Dislike somewhat	1	0.5
5. Dislike very much	6	3.1
6. No response	1	0.5
21. Do you like the soundtrack (music) in Air Force Now?		
1. Like very much	55	28.4
2. Like somewhat	84	43.3
3. Neither like nor dislike	39	20.1
4. Dislike somewhat	9	4.6
5. Dislike very much	7	3.6
22. Air Force Now should be a mandatory part of Commander's Call.		
1. Strongly agree	46	23.7
2. Moderately agree	49	25.3
3. Neither agree nor disagree	42	21.6
4. Moderately disagree	26	13.4
5. Strongly disagree	30	15.5
6. No response	1	0.5
23. If Air Force Now were optional would you view it?		
1. Always	46	23.7
2. Frequently	55	28.4
3. Occasionally	53	27.3
4. Seldom	17	8.8
5. Never	23	11.9
24. How often do you think Air Force Now should be produced?		
1. Monthly	87	44.8
2. Quarterly	61	31.4
3. Semiannually	13	6.7
4. Annually	14	7.2
5. Never	16	8.2
6. No response	3	1.5

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
25. How many Air Force Now films have you seen?		
1. More than 40	54	27.8
2. 30 - 40	24	12.4
3. 20 - 30	41	21.1
4. 10 - 20	49	25.3
5. Fewer than 10	25	12.9
6. No response	1	0.5
26. What do you think the Air Force is trying to say in Air Force Now? 113 responses		
27. How often do you discuss Air Force Now topics with friends afterwards?		
1. Always	3	1.5
2. Frequently	37	19.1
3. Occasionally	62	32.0
4. Seldom	54	27.8
5. Never	37	19.1
5. No response	1	0.5
28. Please make any additional comments regarding the Air Force Now film. Be specific. 44 responses		

THANK YOU

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE II

To be answered by Commander's Only. Please respond to all questions.

		Commanders N=25	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1.	How do you rate the effectiveness of internal communications within your unit?		
1.	Excellent	10	40.0
2.	Good	10	40.0
3.	Average	5	20.0
4.	Below average	0	0
5.	Poor	0	0
2.	What value do you place upon effective internal communications in the unit?		
1.	Great value	24	96.0
2.	Moderate value	1	4.0
3.	Neither helps nor hinders	0	0
4.	No value	0	0
5.	Waste of time	0	0
3.	What value do you place upon Commander's Call as a communication medium in your unit?		
1.	Great value	10	40.0
2.	Moderate value	14	56.0
3.	Neither helps nor hinders	1	4.0
4.	No value	0	0
5.	Waste of time	0	0
4.	What value do you place upon Air Force Now films as part of the Commander's Call program?		
1.	Great value	3	12.0
2.	Moderate value	15	60.0
3.	Neither helps nor hinders	5	20.0
4.	No value	0	0
5.	Waste of time	2	8.0

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
5. Current directives place too many restrictions on what I can include in Commander's Call.		
1. Strongly agree	4	16.0
2. Agree	8	32.0
3. Neither agree nor disagree	2	8.0
4. Disagree	10	40.0
5. Strongly disagree	1	4.0
6. What do you find most worthwhile at Commanler's Calls?		
1. Awards presentations	4	16.0
2. Air Force Now film	1	4.0
3. Base/unit news/information	10	40.0
4. Air Force new/information	1	4.0
5. Question/answer period	9	36.0
7. What do you find least worthwhile at Commander's Calls?		
1. Awards presentations	3	12.0
2. Air Force Now film	11	44.0
3. Base/unit news/information	1	4.0
4. Air Force news/information	8	32.0
5. Question/answer period	1	4.0
6. No response	1	4.0
8. Given the option what would you add to Commander's Call that is presently restricted by AFR 30-1 and AFR 190-18? 18 responses		
9. If Commander's Call were optional would you hold one?		
1. Always	0	0
2. Frequently	16	64.0
3. Occasionally	6	24.0
4. Seldom	3	12.0
5. Never	0	0
10. If Air Force Now were optional would you include it in Commander's Call?		
1. Always	5	20.0
2. Frequently	9	36.0
3. Occasionally	8	32.0
4. Seldom	3	12.0
5. Never	0	0

- |   | <u>No.</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------|
| 11. How would you rate the photographic quality of Air Force Now?                                   |            |                   |
| 1. Excellent  | 19         | 76.0              |
| 2. Good   | 4          | 16.0              |
| 3. Average  | 2          | 8.0               |
| 4. Below average  | 0          | 0                 |
| 5. Poor   | 0          | 0                 |
| 12. Are the topics in Air Force Now worthwhile to your people?                                      |            |                   |
| 1. Always   | 2          | 8.0               |
| 2. Frequently   | 11         | 44.0              |
| 3. Occasionally   | 10         | 40.0              |
| 4. Seldom   | 2          | 8.0               |
| 5. Never  | 0          | 0                 |
| 13. What kind of topics would you like to have included in Air Force Now?<br>19 responses           |            |                   |
| 14. How would you rate the soundtrack (music) in Air Force Now?                                     |            |                   |
| 1. Excellent  | 11         | 44.0              |
| 2. Good   | 10         | 40.0              |
| 3. Average  | 4          | 16.0              |
| 4. Below average  | 0          | 0                 |
| 5. Poor   | 0          | 0                 |
| 15. What do you think the Air Force is trying to communicate through Air Force Now?<br>22 responses |            |                   |
| 16. How often do you discuss Commander's Call effectiveness with fellow commanders?                 |            |                   |
| 1. Always   | 0          | 0                 |
| 2. Frequently   | 1          | 4.0               |
| 3. Occasionally   | 17         | 68.0              |
| 4. Seldom   | 6          | 24.0              |
| 5. Never  | 1          | 4.0               |
| 17. Please make any additional comments regarding Commander's Call. Be specific.<br>13 responses    |            |                   |
| 18. Please make any additional comments regarding Air Force Now. Be specific.<br>11 responses       |            |                   |

THANK YOU



#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. U.S. Air Force. Air Force Information Program. Regulation 190-18 (1972).
2. Scheffield, Dick. Captain. Producer, Air Force Now. Interview, 16 November 1977.
3. Huseman, Richard C.; Logue, Cal M.; and Freshley, Dwight L., eds. Readings in Interpersonal and Organizational Communication. Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc., 1973.
4. U.S. Air Force. USAF Information Program. Regulation 190-41 (1973).
5. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, "Commander's Call Study." Alabama: Air University, Maxwell AFB, April 1965.
6. Pennefather, Michael. "An Analysis of the Commander's Call Program." Master's Thesis, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, May 1972.
7. Nou, Juri V. "Commander's Call: Views and Reflections." Master's Thesis, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, January 1973.
8. Sykes, Teddy E. "Commander's Call. A Challenge and an Opportunity - to Communicate." Master's Thesis, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, May 1973.
9. Haynes, Ronald D. "Commander's Call - Worth a Fair Share?" Master's Thesis, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, May 1975.
10. Oswald, Jack H., Major. "Concepts and Analysis of the Air Force Now." Letter, Secretary of the Air Force Office of Information/Internal (SAFOI/I), Washington, D.C., April 1969.
11. Barnes, John B. "Audience Effectiveness Evaluation Program for Air Force Motion Picture and TV Production." Master's Thesis, Michigan State University, 1970.
12. Edgar, William R., Col., USAF (Ret.). "Communication with the Young." Air Force Magazine, Vol. 55, October 1972, pp. 52-55.
13. Brollier, Grant E. "Air Force Now Film: A Way to Communicate." Master's Thesis, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, May 1972.