December 6, 2002

Human Capital

Results of the Survey Regarding Undue Influence on Army Component Members to Join Non-Federal Entities

(D-2003-032)

Department of Defense
Office of the Inspector General

Quality *Integrity* *Accountability*

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this report, visit the Web site of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at www.dodig.osd.mil/audit/reports or contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or fax (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8940 (DSN 664-8940) or fax (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General of the Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, VA 22202-4704

Defense Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to Hotline@dodig.osd.mil; or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

CW	Chief Warrant
DAIG	Department of the Army Inspector General
JER	Joint Ethics Regulation
NFE	Non-Federal Entity
OGC	Office of the General Counsel
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
PO	Private Organization
USD(P&R)	Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
WO	Warrant Officer

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202–4704

December 6, 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS

SUBJECT: Report on the Results of the Survey Regarding Undue Influence on Army Component Members to Join Non-Federal Entities (Report No. D-2003-032)

We are providing this report for your information and use. We conducted the evaluation in response to your request that we survey Army personnel to assess the implementation of policies with regard to inappropriate coercion or pressure for Army members to join various non-Federal entities.

We appreciate the cooperation that we received during this evaluation. We commend the personnel at the Army Training and Doctrine Command for their assistance in the timely completion of this evaluation. Questions on this report should be directed to Mr. Michael A. Joseph at (757) 872-4801, extension 223, or Mr. Timothy J. Tonkovic at (757) 872-4763. See Appendix G for the report distribution. The team members are listed inside the back cover.

Thomas F. Gimble
for David K Steensma
Deputy Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense

Report No. D-2003-032 **December 6, 2002**
(Project No. D2002LF-0154)

Results of the Survey Regarding Undue Influence on Army Component Members to Join Non-Federal Entities

Executive Summary

Who Should Read This Report and Why? Personnel in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness responsible for military personnel policies and military commanders and personnel responsible for ethics and standards of conduct regulations should read this report. The report discusses the results of a survey concerning coercion or pressure to join non-Federal entities. A non-Federal entity is a self-sustaining non-Federal person or organization that is established, operated, and controlled by any individual(s) acting outside the scope of any official capacity as officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government.

Background. On June 7, 2002, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness requested that the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense assess the implementation of policies with regard to inappropriate coercion or pressure for Army members to join various non-Federal entities. The Under Secretary requested that the evaluation include a quick-look type of survey of active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard personnel on the nature of any such practices (coercion or pressure) by commanders or supervisors and assess compliance with applicable standards. The Under Secretary requested that the evaluation be completed in 60 to 90 days.

Representatives from the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense surveyed 2,914 active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard members from August 12 through August 23, 2002, at eight judgmentally selected training installations. The surveys were designed and processed with emphasis on ensuring the anonymity of all respondents.

Results. The respondents to our survey indicated that DoD prohibitions on coercing or pressuring Army members to join non-Federal entities have not been fully implemented or complied with. The following summarizes the results of the surveys.

- Eighteen percent of the respondents stated they were aware of a situation occurring in the last 12 months regarding coercion or pressure related to non-Federal entity membership and 19 percent were aware of a situation that occurred more than 12 months ago.

- Thirty-one percent of the respondents stated that the Army had provided adequate training about joining non-Federal entities, 38 percent said the training was not adequate, and 31 percent did not know.

- Thirty-eight percent of the respondents stated that the Army had provided adequate guidance about prohibiting commanders or supervisors from coercing or pressuring personnel to join non-Federal entities, 30 percent said the guidance was inadequate, and 32 percent did not know.

- Eighteen percent of the respondents stated their belief that commanders or supervisors were tracking membership in non-Federal entities.

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on October 23, 2002. No written response to this report was required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Background 1

Limitations on Use of Report Data 3

Objectives 3

Implementation of Policies Regarding Coercion or Pressure to Join Non-Federal Entities 4

Appendixes

A. Scope and Methodology 11
B. Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness Memorandum 15
C. Non-Federal Entities (NFEs) Questionnaire 16
D. Individual Responses to Situations Involving NFEs That Occurred in the Last 12 Months 18
E. Individual Responses to Situations Involving NFEs That Occurred More Than 12 Months Ago 21
F. Synopsis of Army Inspector General Reports on Coercion or Pressure Related to NFE Membership 24
G. Report Distribution 25

Background

On June 7, 2002, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD[P&R]) requested the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) of the Department of Defense conduct a survey of active Army, Army Reserves, and Army National Guard personnel with regard to coercion or pressure to join non-Federal entities (NFEs). The USD(P&R) requested that we provide results of the survey in 60 to 90 days of the request. The USD(P&R) request is in Appendix B.

Assessment of the Environment With Respect to DoD and Army Policies. Representatives from the OIG of the Department of Defense developed and administered a survey that focused on incidents of coercion or pressure regarding NFE membership and the respondent's awareness of Army training, guidance, and possible tracking of NFE membership. Two questions asked respondents about experiences with eight situations involving NFEs during two time frames: the last 12 months and more than 12 months ago. The survey is in Appendix C. For purposes of this report, the term Army component means the active Army, the Army Reserve, or the Army National Guard.

DoD Policy Guidance. DoD Directive 5500.7, "Standards of Conduct," November 2, 1994, establishes policy, responsibilities, and procedures relating to standards of conduct in the Department of Defense. The directive states that DoD shall have a single source of standards of ethical conduct and ethics guidance and authorizes the publication of the Joint Ethics Regulation (JER) as the single source for ethical standards. The directive also establishes that the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) of the Department of Defense shall have approval authority for DoD component documents implementing or supplementing the JER.

DoD Regulation 5500.7-R, "Joint Ethics Regulation," August 30, 1993 (amended), prescribes the standards of conduct required of all DoD employees, provides ethics training guidance, and sets general responsibilities and enforcement procedures.

The JER defines an NFE as a self-sustaining non-Federal person or organization that is established, operated, and controlled by any individual(s) acting outside the scope of any official capacity as officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government. Subsection 3-209 states that endorsement of an NFE, event, product, service, or enterprise may be neither stated nor implied by DoD or DoD employees in their official capacities and that titles, positions, or organization names may not be used to suggest official endorsement or preferential treatment of any NFE.

There are exceptions to subsection 3-209. Subsection 3-210 permits endorsement for fundraising and membership drives for the Combined Federal Campaign; emergency and disaster appeals approved by the Office of Personnel Management; the Army Emergency Relief; and other organizations composed primarily of DoD employees or their dependents when fundraising among their

own members for the benefit of their members. The exceptions are authorized by Executive order or the Code of Federal Regulations and are covered under separate directives that prohibit employee coercion in any way to participate in or contribute to any fundraising or membership drive.

Subsections 3-209 and 3-210 are considered general orders and are applicable to all military members without further implementation. Violations of general orders may be punishable as violations of lawful general orders under Article 92 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Army Command Policy and Guidance. Army Regulation 600-20, "Army Command Policy," July 15, 1999, discusses Army policy on basic responsibilities of command, military discipline, and conduct. The regulation states that in support of NFEs, post commanders and heads of Army staff agencies do the following.

- Ensure membership among personnel under their jurisdiction is truly voluntary.
- Prohibit any practice that involves or implies compulsion, coercion, influence, or reprisal in the conduct of membership campaigns. Prohibitions include repeated orientations, meetings, or similar counseling of persons who have chosen not to join after given a chance to do so. It also includes using membership statistics in support of supervisory influence.
- Prohibit any practice that involves or implies Army sponsorship or endorsement of an entity or its activities.
- Prohibit the use of Government property, facilities, or services as an inducement to join an NFE.

Army Regulation 600-20 does not prohibit commanders from informing personnel about membership in NFEs. When doing so, commanders will ensure that they do not use coercion or favor one organization over another.

Army Regulation 210-22, "Private Organizations on Department of the Army Installations," November 1, 2001, provides policy and procedures for authorizing and operating private organizations[1] (POs) on Army installations. Chapter 4, which discusses Army personnel participation in POs operating on Army installations, requires neutrality in dealing with POs and prohibits employees from coercing, influencing, or compelling other employees to join POs.

[1] A private organization is a self-sustaining and non-Federal entity, incorporated or unincorporated, which is operated on DoD installations with the written consent of the installation commander, or higher authority, by individuals acting exclusively outside the scope of any official capacity as officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government.

Limitations on Use of Report Data

The time constraints of the evaluation did not permit the use of a statistical sample. Because the active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard locations visited and the individual respondents were not randomly selected, the results cannot be generalized or statistically projected to the universe of the entire Army or to the individual components. Additionally, the survey results are descriptive and are not intended to be used for comparative purposes. Component and pay grade respondent populations are not proportional to the actual Army component populations and the occupational skills of the respondents may not be representative of each Army component. Additionally, the survey responses and written comments reflect the perceptions of Army personnel concerning pressure to join NFEs and cannot be validated.

Objectives

The overall evaluation objective was to evaluate the Army implementation of and compliance with DoD and Army policies with regard to coercing or pressuring Army personnel to join various NFEs. Specifically, we evaluated whether active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard personnel were coerced or pressured to join NFEs. See Appendix A for a discussion of the evaluation scope and methodology. See Appendix F for a synopsis of Army Inspector General reports related to coercion or pressure related to NFE membership.

Implementation of Policies Regarding Coercion or Pressure to Join Non-Federal Entities

Active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard members responding to the survey indicated that DoD prohibitions on coercing or pressuring Army members to join NFEs have not been fully implemented or complied with. The following summarizes the results of the surveys.

- Eighteen percent of the respondents stated they were aware of a situation occurring in the last 12 months regarding coercion or pressure related to NFE membership. Nineteen percent of the respondents stated they were aware of a situation occurring more than 12 months ago regarding coercion or pressure related to NFE membership.

- Overall, 31 percent of the respondents stated that the Army had provided adequate training about joining NFEs. Thirty-eight percent said the training was not adequate, and 31 percent said they did not know whether the training was adequate.

- Thirty-eight percent of the respondents stated that the Army had provided adequate guidance about prohibiting commanders or supervisors from coercing or pressuring personnel to join NFEs. Thirty percent of the respondents said the Army had not provided adequate guidance on prohibitions related to coercion and pressure to join NFEs, and 32 percent said they did not know whether the Army guidance was adequate.

- Overall, 18 percent of the respondents stated their belief that commanders or supervisors were tracking membership in NFEs.

Respondent Population

Representatives from the OIG of the Department of Defense surveyed 2,914 Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard members from August 12 through August 23, 2002. Of the 2,914 surveys, 4 were returned blank. As a result, there were 2,910 surveys that contained at least one usable response to at least one question.

For purposes of this report, we refer to five pay grade categories: junior enlisted (E1-E4), senior enlisted (E5-E9), warrant officers (WO1-CW[Chief Warrant]5), junior officers (O1-O3), and field grade officers (O4-O6). General officers (O7-O10) were identified on the survey as a separate category but none responded to our survey. Twenty-one respondents (less than 1 percent) left the Army

component affiliation or pay grade question blank. Table 1 provides the enlisted, warrant officer, and officer composition, by Army component, of respondents to our survey.

Table 1. Number and Percent of Respondents

Component and Pay Grade	Number of Respondents	Percent of the
Active Army—41 percent of total respondents		
Field grade officer	37	3
Junior officer	510	43
Warrant officer	109	9
Senior enlisted	351	29
Junior enlisted	193	16
Subtotal	**1,200**	**100**
Army Reserve—25 percent of total respondents		
Field grade officer	179	25
Junior officer	66	9
Warrant officer	22	3
Senior enlisted	361	50
Junior enlisted	96	13
Subtotal	**724**	**100**
Army National Guard—33 percent of total		
Field grade officer	95	10
Junior officer	110	11
Warrant officer	101	10
Senior enlisted	297	31
Junior enlisted	362	38
Subtotal	**965**	**100**
Unknown Component and/or pay grade	21	
Total	**2,910**	

Variables such as a respondent's occupational specialty, geographic location, unit personnel structure, or Army component mission might have impacted the responses. The survey consisted of questions related to demographics, situations involving coercion or pressure regarding NFEs occurring in the last 12 months, situations involving coercion or pressure regarding NFEs that occurred more than 12 months ago, adequacy of Army training and guidance, and perceived tracking of NFE membership.

Coercion or Pressure Regarding NFE Membership

Active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard members responding to the survey indicated that DoD prohibitions on coercing or pressuring Army members to join non-Federal entities have not been fully implemented or complied with. Many of the respondents indicated that they were aware of situations involving coercion or pressure related to NFE membership that occurred in the last 12 months or more than 12 months ago.

Situations That Occurred in the Last 12 Months. Eighteen percent of the total respondents indicated that they were aware of at least one occurrence of coercion or pressure related to membership in NFEs that occurred in the last 12 months. The 18 percent includes every respondent that answered "yes" to at least one of the eight specific situations of coercion or pressure in question 3 of the survey. (See Appendix C, subparts "a" through "h" of question 3.)

Table 2 shows the percent of respondents, by component and pay grade, who answered "yes" to at least one of the eight situations.

Table 2. Percent of Respondents Who Were Aware of at Least One Situation in the Last 12 Months Involving Coercion or Pressure Related to NFE Membership

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	8	25	18	36	16
Army Reserve	1	6	14	18	9
Army National Guard	8	10	33	30	27

Note: Respondents who did not indicate Army component and/or pay grade are not included in this table.

The percent of active Army respondents who stated that coercion or pressure related to NFE membership had occurred in the last 12 months was lowest among junior enlisted members and highest among junior officers. The percent of Army Reserve respondents stating that coercion or pressure related to NFE membership had occurred in the last 12 months was lowest among junior enlisted members and highest among junior officers. The percent of Army National Guard respondents stating that coercion or pressure related to NFE membership had occurred in the last 12 months was lowest among junior enlisted members and highest among warrant officers.

Table 3 shows the "yes" responses, as a percent, for all of the respondents who provided a usable response to one or more of the eight specific situations involving coercion or pressure in question 3 of the survey.

Table 3. Percent of Respondents Who Experienced Specific Situations of Coercion or Pressure Involving NFEs in the Last 12 Months

Type of Situation	Percent Who Answered "Yes" to a Situation
Coercion or pressure to join an NFE	9
Coercion or pressure to attend an event for the purpose of joining an NFE	9
Asked to justify why member was not a member of a specific NFE	8
Selected as a point of contact for an NFE membership drive	2
Commander or supervisor used his or her title or position to support NFE membership drive	8
Granted or provided privileges for joining an NFE	4
Granted promotions for joining an NFE	1
Threatened with adverse action as a result of not joining an NFE (for example, denied training or lowered performance evaluation)	2

Situations That Occurred More Than 12 Months Ago. Nineteen percent of the total respondents indicated that they were aware of at least one occurrence of coercion or pressure related to NFE membership that occurred more than 12 months ago. The 19 percent includes every respondent who answered "yes" to one or more of the eight specific situations of coercion or pressure in question 4 of the survey. (See Appendix C, subparts "a" through "h" of question 4.)

Table 4 shows the percent of respondents, by component and pay grade, who answered "yes" to at least one of the eight situations.

Table 4. Percent of Respondents Who Were Aware of at Least One Situation More Than 12 Months Ago Involving Coercion or Pressure Related to NFE Membership

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	5	21	21	34	19
Army Reserve	2	7	9	27	34
Army National Guard	6	11	36	26	41

Note: Respondents who did not indicate Army component and/or pay grade are not included in this table.

The percent of active Army respondents who stated that coercion or pressure related to NFE membership had occurred more than 12 months ago was lowest among junior enlisted members and highest among junior officers. The percent of Army Reserve respondents who stated that coercion or pressure related to NFE

membership had occurred more than 12 months ago was lowest among junior enlisted members and highest among field grade officers. The percent of Army National Guard respondents who stated that coercion or pressure related to NFE membership had occurred more than 12 months ago was lowest among junior enlisted members and highest among field grade officers.

Table 5 shows the "yes" responses, as a percent, for all of the respondents who provided a usable response to one or more of the eight specific situations involving coercion or pressure in question 4 of the survey.

Table 5. Percent of Respondents Who Experienced Specific Situations of Coercion or Pressure Involving NFEs More Than 12 Months Ago

Type of Situation	Percent Who Answered "Yes" to a Situation
Coercion or pressure to join an NFE	13
Coercion or pressure to attend an event for the purpose of joining an NFE	11
Asked to justify why member was not a member of a specific NFE	10
Selected as a point of contact for an NFE membership drive	2
Commander or supervisor used his or her title or position to support NFE membership drive	10
Granted or provided privileges for joining an NFE	5
Granted promotions for joining an NFE	1
Threatened with adverse action as a result of not joining an NFE (for example, denied training or lowered performance evaluation)	3

The numbers of responses to each of the specific situations are broken out by pay grade and by Army component in Appendixes D and E.

Army Training, Guidance, and Tracking of NFE Membership

The survey included questions that were designed to assess Army members' perceptions regarding the adequacy of Army training and guidance, and the perceived tracking of membership in NFEs.

Adequacy of Training. Thirty-one percent of all respondents stated they believed that the Army had provided adequate training about joining NFEs. Thirty-eight percent of all respondents stated they believed the Army had not provided adequate training about joining NFEs, and 31 percent said they did not know. Table 6 shows the respondents, by Army component and pay grade, who stated they believed the NFE training was adequate.

Table 6. Percent of Respondents Who Believed NFE Training Was Adequate					
Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	21	32	44	37	58
Army Reserve	16	27	45	35	37
Army National Guard	23	30	32	30	37

Note: Respondents who did not indicate Army component and/or pay grade are not included in this table.

Sufficiency of Army Guidance. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents stated they believed that the Army had provided sufficient guidance about prohibiting commanders or supervisors from coercing, pressuring, or requiring personnel to join NFEs. Thirty percent of the respondents stated they believed the Army had not provided adequate guidance, and 32 percent said they did not know whether the guidance was adequate. Table 7 shows the percent of respondents by Army component and pay grade who stated they believed NFE guidance was sufficient.

Table 7. Percent of Respondents Who Believed NFE Guidance Was Adequate					
Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	32	37	50	40	68
Army Reserve	30	35	45	41	42
Army National Guard	36	36	37	38	48

Note: Respondents who did not indicate Army component and/or pay grade are not included in this table.

Membership in NFEs. Overall, 18 percent of the respondents stated they believed their commanders or supervisors were tracking membership in NFEs. Forty-three percent perceived that commanders or supervisors were not tracking membership, and 39 percent said they did not know. Table 8 shows the percent of respondents by Army component and pay grade who believed NFE membership was tracked.

Table 8. Percent of Respondents Who Believed Membership Was Tracked					
Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Army	9	19	13	32	14
Army Reserve	3	6	9	20	16
Army National Guard	7	14	46	29	49

Note: Respondents who did not indicate Army component and/or pay grade are not included in this table.

Comments Regarding NFE Membership. The survey provided a section where respondents could expand on any of their answers or provide additional comments about pressure to join NFEs. We received 386 comments. Some of the 2,910 respondents provided more than one comment. Fifty-six of the comments were not relevant to the subject of coercion or pressure to join NFEs and 63 of the comments addressed NFE awareness or training. Of the 267 remaining

comments, we considered 31 to be positive in nature, 228 to be negative, and 8 to be neutral. The respondents made more than 10 negative comments about each of the following 6 entities: the Army Aviation Association of America, the Army Emergency Relief, the Association of the United States Army, the Combined Federal Campaign, the National Guard Association of the United States, and officer's and enlisted clubs.

Prior Army Coverage of NFEs

In February 1998, the Department of the Army Inspector General (DAIG) issued the "Special Inspection of the Army's Relationship With Private Organizations." The DAIG stated that the frequency of noncompliance with NFE policies seemed to be on the increase. The report recommendations were designed to preserve and maximize the good benefits of NFEs and were intended to clearly articulate what can and cannot be done to support NFEs. The report recommendations were also intended to inform commanders and supervisors about inappropriate influence and protect them from unfair criticism. The DAIG concluded that increased awareness through education followed by systematic compliance would resolve the problems the Army was experiencing with its relationship with POs.

In addition to the DAIG report, we identified installation Inspector General reports at two of the eight sites visited that addressed NFEs. One report stated that regulations, policy, and law were widely and selectively disobeyed, resulting in a strong appearance of endorsement and preferential treatment of NFEs. The other report found that 10 percent of surveyed soldiers perceived they were pressured to join an NFE and 27 percent said they were required to attend presentations encouraging participation in certain NFEs. In addition, the second report stated that DoD employees were using official time to conduct NFE business and that there was perceived or actual preferential treatment of some NFEs. The reports are summarized in Appendix F.

Conclusion

Although we agree that NFEs provide important benefits and opportunities to Army component personnel, our survey results show that many respondents were aware of situations of coercion or pressure to join NFEs. Additionally, while there is a wide array of guidance in the Army that supplements or implements the JER guidance, many respondents believed the Army has not provided adequate guidance.

Because the USD(P&R) requested the survey results in such a short time frame, we are still in the process of analyzing the survey responses and other information collected. Accordingly, this report does not include recommendations for corrective actions. We will provide recommendations separately when we have completed our analysis.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We reviewed pertinent policies, guidance, and laws dated from October 1992 through November 2001 related to standards of conduct and ethics. From June 28 through August 2, 2002, teams from the OIG of the Department of Defense met with personnel from the offices of the Chief of the Army Reserve, the National Guard Bureau, the Army Reserve Command, and the Training and Doctrine Command to identify installations to be visited. We visited judgmentally selected Army installations in the continental United States.

To query active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard personnel on their experiences related to coercion or pressure to join NFEs, personnel from the OIG of the Department of Defense developed a survey that was administered to 2,914 Army component members. The survey focused on perceptions of undue influence to join NFEs. We administered the surveys at eight training locations in a classroom environment. Members from the active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard were located at each installation; however, teams concentrated on the dominant Army affiliation at each installation. The students at the installations who responded to the survey represented numerous Army occupational skills and installations.

Of the 2,914 surveys administered, 4 were returned blank, leaving 2,910 usable surveys. Analysis of the data from the 2,910 surveys showed the number of responses for each question varied. For example, not all respondents answered all questions, and some respondents answered only one or two parts of a multipart question. As a result, baselines for the results presented in this report vary, depending on the number of respondents who provided usable responses to each part of each question.

For example, Army component-wide information in this report may have been based on as many as 2,910 responses. For questions that were analyzed by component and pay grade, the maximum baseline was 2,889 because 21 individuals did not complete the component or pay grade demographic question. The survey shown in Appendix C asked the respondents to identify their current pay grade. One of the categories was general officer pay grade O7 through O10. None of the 2,910 respondents indicated they were of the O7 through O10 pay grade. As a result, the O7 through O10 pay grade was not included in our analysis.

Nothing in the survey or in the processing of the survey allowed us to identify a specific respondent or unit. To ensure that Army members would understand the survey, we tested the draft survey at one Army installation and with a group of military officers in the OIG of the Department of Defense. The comments from the test participants were, in some cases, incorporated into the final survey.

We performed this evaluation from June through October 2002 according to standards implemented by the OIG of the Department of Defense. We did not review management controls because the evaluation was limited to the implementation of and compliance with policies regarding membership in NFEs. In addition, the survey results could not be validated because the results reflect

the perceptions of Army personnel concerning pressure to join NFEs. Also, the USD(P&R) requested a prompt response to his request because of concerns about morale issues caused by undue command influence. Because this report is a summarization of data, we did not include all elements of a finding as suggested by the Government Auditing Standards. This report does not include recommendations for actions to correct the problems discussed in the report. Recommendations will be made separately.

Representativeness of Survey Results. In a statistical sense, the representativeness of a sample is determined by whether the method of its selection was random or involved human judgment. Our samples were judgmental. The results of the surveys discussed in this report are representative only of the respondents to the survey and should not be generalized to the entire Army. The time constraints of the evaluation did not permit use of a sampling plan that would have allowed the results to be projected to the Army in total or to the individual Army components. Other limitations regarding the survey results include the following.

- Army training locations were judgmentally selected or were selected as a result of discussions with Army component headquarters personnel. At the locations visited, classroom and individual respondents were not randomly selected. We were unable to determine selection probabilities. Therefore, the survey results cannot be statistically projected.

- The proportions of junior and field grade officers, warrant officers, and junior and senior enlisted members in our judgmental sample differ from component to component and are not proportional to the overall populations. As a result, survey responses are not representative of an Army component. Additionally, occupational skills of the respondents may not be representative of the population of the Army or its components.

- Many of the responses reflect Army members' perceptions, the accuracy of which cannot be validated.

- The survey results are descriptive and are not intended to be used for comparative purposes.

Administering the Survey. Before administering the survey to Army component members, representatives from the OIG of the Department of Defense read the following prepared proctor statement.

> Good morning (afternoon). We are from the Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General. I am **(your name)** and **(introduce co-workers)**.
>
> The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness has tasked the DoD Inspector General to assess the implementation of DoD and Army policies regarding pressure and/or coercion to join

non-Federal entities. We have been tasked to question Army personnel and report the results back to the Under Secretary by mid-September.

We are asking you to complete a short survey about your perceptions or experiences related to coercion or pressure to join non-Federal entities. You will be asked questions related to two time periods: recent situations during the last 12 months and older situations beyond 12 months ago. The same survey is being administered at seven other active Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard locations. For this survey, the term "non-Federal entities" means a self-sustaining, non-Federal organization established and operated outside the scope of the Federal Government.

Examples of non-Federal entities include the American Legion, the Association of the United States Army, the Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Association, the Army Reserve Association, the National Guard Association of the United States, or the Military Order of the Purple Heart. Also included are professional organizations such as the American Society of Military Comptrollers (a non-Federal entity for financial and comptroller personnel). Remember that these organizations are just examples – we are not trying to limit you to the entities I have just mentioned.

The following entities should ***NOT*** be considered when answering this survey: Officer and Enlisted Clubs, the Combined Federal Campaign, Emergency and Disaster Appeals, the Army Emergency Relief, and other organizations composed primarily of DoD employees or their dependents when fundraising among their own members for the benefit of their members. For example, bake sales and car washes.

Filling out this survey should take about 10 minutes and your answers will remain anonymous. The survey is designed to ensure that individuals cannot be identified. In that regard, please do not mark the surveys in any identifying manner, except to answer the questions.

If you wish to discuss issues about pressure to join non-Federal entities that are not covered in the survey or you wish to expand on any of your answers, feel free to submit additional comments in the comments section at the end of the survey. In addition, we are handing out cards with an e-mail address and telephone number in case anyone desires to provide comments at a later time. If you call the 1-800 number, mention that your call is in reference to this survey. All correspondence is received by the Director of the DoD Hotline who ensures the anonymity of the callers.

Thank you for your cooperation.

To protect the anonymity of the respondents, we did not use any individual identifiers, either explicit or implicit, in the design, execution, or analysis of the survey. That meant that a limited amount of demographic information was collected. The final data file has no identifiers, and it is impossible to determine from which Army member the survey originated.

Data Collection. Classes at each of the training locations were chosen based on their size and the pay grades of students within the class. OIG team members distributed and collected surveys in each class. Although each OIG team knew approximately how many students would be in each class, final numbers fluctuated due to last minute cancellations or schedule changes.

Data Processing. Completed surveys and respondent answers were entered into a computerized database. Each survey was assigned a unique record number, entered into the database, and tabulated. Each computer-processed data entry was verified for accuracy.

Analytical Approach. We used partial responses if a meaningful interpretation was possible, maximizing the use of the information collected.

Use of Technical Assistance. Personnel from the Quantitative Methods Division, OIG of the Department of Defense reviewed the methodology used to determine the existence of coercion or pressure regarding NFE membership discussed in this report.

Appendix B. Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness Memorandum

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

JUN 7 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Request for Survey

Recent incidents have raised a possible issue regarding the sufficiency of implementation, by some Department of Defense (DoD) components, of DoD and service policy with regard to pressuring or coercing subordinates to join various non-federal organizations. To assist this office in determining whether compliance with current regulations and directives is consistent and complete, I request that you conduct a quick look type of survey of active Army, Army Reserve and Army National Guard personnel on the nature of any such practices by commanders or supervisors and assess compliance with applicable standards. I am interested in your findings as to whether such non-compliant practices are pervasive or whether the recent incidents represent anomalies.

I would appreciate receiving your survey results within 60 to 90 days and recognize that this timeframe may preclude a large sample, at least initially. I also recognize that, based on those results, you may determine that further evaluation effort in the Army or other DoD components is appropriate and feasible.

I appreciate your support on this important matter. My staff point of contact is Lieutenant Colonel Sally Jo Hall, who may be reached at (703) 693-9393 and her email address is sally.hall@osd.mil.

David S. C. Chu

cc:
VCSA
Chief, Army Reserve
Chief, NGB

Appendix C. Non-Federal Entities Questionnaire

Department of Defense Inspector General RCS: Exempt

Non-Federal Entities Questionnaire

Concerns About This Questionnaire

This questionnaire is being administered as one component of an Inspector General of the Department of Defense evaluation of compliance with DoD and Service policies on joining or endorsing various non-Federal entities. The questionnaire asks about your experiences and perceptions.

WILL MY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES BE KEPT PRIVATE?

Yes. There is no information being collected that could be used to identify individuals. Your responses will be combined with those from other personnel and will be used to report the experiences and perceptions of respondents in your Service. **Do not use any personal names anywhere on this questionnaire.**

WHY ME?

Installations and units have been selected to form a sample of members of the Active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard. Based on your responses and the responses of others, conclusions may be drawn about the experiences and perceptions of Service members. The validity of these conclusions depends, in part, on receiving enough completed questionnaires from individuals like yourself.

WHY SHOULD I BOTHER? DO QUESTIONNAIRES CHANGE ANYTHING?

Although no decisions about you alone will be made based on this questionnaire, questionnaire findings may result in changes that affect you and other Service members.

Privacy Notice

AUTHORITY: This questionnaire is being conducted by the Department of Defense Inspector General under authority of the Inspector General Act and at the request of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. The subject of the request was implementation and compliance with policies regarding undue influence to join non-Federal entities.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Information collected through this questionnaire will be used to report experiences and perceptions of military members about the implementation of and compliance with policies regarding undue influence to join non-Federal entities. This information may assist in the formulation of policies to improve the military working environment and relevant personnel policies.

ROUTINE USES: None.

DISCLOSURE: Providing information through this questionnaire is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, maximum participation is encouraged. Your questionnaire form is anonymous. No identifying information is being collected that could identify individuals. Only summary statistics will be reported.

Begin Questionnaire Here

(select answers that you believe are most appropriate)

The Joint Ethics Regulation (DoD 5500.7-R) limits endorsement of and establishes rules relating to participation in non-Federal entities. It defines a non-Federal entity as a self-sustaining, non-Federal person or organization established, operated, and controlled by any individual(s) acting outside the scope of any official capacity as officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government. A non-Federal entity may operate on DoD installations if approved by the installation commander or higher authority under applicable regulations. The Army also has regulations about participating in non-Federal entities.

These entities should NOT be considered when answering this questionnaire:

1. **Officer and Enlisted Clubs**
2. **The Combined Federal Campaign (CFC)**
3. **Emergency and disaster appeals**
4. **Army Emergency Relief (AER)**
5. **Other organizations composed primarily of DoD employees or their dependents when fundraising among their own members for the benefit of their members (for example: bake sales and car washes).**

1. **What is your Army component?** *(Fill in one circle.)*
   - ○ Active Army
   - ○ Army Reserve (Including those on Active Duty)
   - ○ Army National Guard (Including those on Active Duty)

2. **What is your rank?** *(Fill in one circle.)*
   - ○ E1 - E4
   - ○ E5 - E9
   - ○ WO1 - CW5
   - ○ O1 - O3
   - ○ O4 - O6
   - ○ O7 - O10

1

3. **Are you aware of any situation *in the past 12 months*, where a commander or supervisor:** *(Fill in **one** circle for **each** item.)*

		Yes	No
a.	Coerced, pressured, or required you to join a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
b.	Coerced, pressured, or required you to attend a presentation or activity for the purpose of joining a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
c.	Asked you to justify why you are *NOT* a member of a specific non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
d.	Selected you as a unit point of contact for a non-Federal entity membership drive?.....	❍	❍
e.	Used his/her title, office, or position to support membership drives sponsored by a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
f.	Granted/provided privileges, or benefits, to you for joining a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
g.	Granted promotions to you for joining a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
h.	Took or threatened to take adverse action against you as a result of *NOT* joining a non-Federal entity (for example, denied training opportunities, lowered performance evaluations, denied promotions)?....	❍	❍

4. **Are you aware of any situation *more than 12 months ago*, where a commander or supervisor:** *(Fill in **one** circle for **each** item.)*

		Yes	No
a.	Coerced, pressured, or required you to join a non-Federal entity?	❍	❍
b.	Coerced, pressured, or required you to attend a presentation or activity for the purpose of joining a non-Federal entity?	❍	❍
c.	Asked you to justify why you are *NOT* a member of a specific non-Federal entity?	❍	❍
d.	Selected you as a unit point of contact for a non-Federal entity membership drive?.....	❍	❍
e.	Used his/her title, office, or position to support membership drives sponsored by a non-Federal entity?..	❍	❍
f.	Granted/provided privileges, or benefits, to you for joining a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
g.	Granted promotions to you for joining a non-Federal entity?.....	❍	❍
h.	Took or threatened to take adverse action against you as a result of *NOT* joining a non-Federal entity (for example, denied training opportunities, lowered performance evaluations, denied promotions)?....	❍	❍

5. **Do you believe that the Army has provided adequate training about joining non-Federal entities?** *(Fill in **one** circle.)*
   - ❍ Yes
   - ❍ No
   - ❍ Don't Know

6. **Do you believe the Army has provided adequate guidance about prohibiting commanders or supervisors from coercing, pressuring, or requiring personnel to join non-Federal entities?** *(Fill in **one** circle.)*
   - ❍ Yes
   - ❍ No
   - ❍ Don't Know

7. **Do you believe your commanders or supervisors are tracking membership in non-Federal entities?** *(Fill in **one** circle.)*
   - ❍ Yes
   - ❍ No
   - ❍ Don't Know

Comments

2

Appendix D. Individual Responses to Situations Involving NFEs That Occurred in the Last 12 Months

Question 3 of the survey in Appendix C asked whether respondents were aware of any of eight situations in the last 12 months involving commanders or supervisors undue influence regarding NFEs. Tables D-1 through D-8 provide summary information, by each of the 8 parts of question 3, for situations that occurred in the last 12 months. Respondent information is shown by pay grade and Army component. Two numbers are provided in the tables' data entries. The first number is how many respondents answered yes to the question; the second is the total number of respondents by component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-1. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Coerced, Pressured, or Required Them to Join an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	7/193	42/350	6/108	102/508	3/37
Army Reserve	1/96	5/358	0/22	8/66	6/178
Army National Guard	6/361	10/294	24/100	22/110	16/94

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-2. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Coerced, Pressured, or Required Them to Attend a Presentation or Activity for the Purpose of Joining an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	8/193	53/347	11/109	106/505	2/37
Army Reserve	0/95	6/359	1/22	4/66	5/178
Army National Guard	9/362	9/295	17/101	19/109	3/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-3. Respondents Who Stated They Were Asked by Commanders or Supervisors to Justify Why They Were Not a Member of a Specific NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	6/193	49/350	7/107	81/507	3/37
Army Reserve	0/95	8/360	0/22	5/66	6/176
Army National Guard	7/361	13/296	16/101	14/110	8/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-4. Respondents Who Were Selected by Commanders or Supervisors as a Unit Point of Contact for an NFE Membership Drive

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	2/193	5/350	3/109	22/509	0/37
Army Reserve	0/96	1/359	1/22	2/66	5/179
Army National Guard	3/361	2/295	2/101	2/110	5/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-5. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Used His/Her Title, Office, or Position to Support Membership Drives Sponsored by an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	4/192	47/349	11/109	91/509	2/37
Army Reserve	0/96	12/359	2/22	5/66	5/179
Army National Guard	5/361	12/294	19/101	18/110	7/94

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-6. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Provided Them Privileges, or Benefits, for Joining an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	6/192	37/348	6/108	44/508	1/37
Army Reserve	1/96	6/360	1/21	1/66	0/179
Army National Guard	13/362	1/294	1/101	5/110	1/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-7. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Granted Them Promotions for Joining an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	2/193	3/348	0/108	3/505	0/37
Army Reserve	0/95	0/355	0/22	0/66	0/177
Army National Guard	9/360	1/294	0/101	0/108	0/94

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table D-8. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Took or Threatened to Take Adverse Action as a Result of Not Joining an NFE (Examples included denied training opportunities, lowered performance evaluations, and denied promotions)

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	1/190	11/347	3/107	10/507	1/37
Army Reserve	0/96	0/358	0/22	0/66	1/176
Army National Guard	2/358	3/295	9/101	4/108	2/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Appendix E. Individual Responses to Situations Involving NFEs That Occurred More Than 12 Months Ago

Question 4 of the survey in Appendix C asked whether respondents were aware of any of eight situations occurring more than 12 months ago that involved commanders or supervisors undue influence regarding NFEs. Tables E-1 through E-8 provide summary information, by each of the 8 parts of question 4, for situations that occurred more than 12 months ago. Respondent information is shown by pay grade and Army component. Two numbers are provided in the tables' data entries. The first number is how many respondents answered yes to the question; the second is the total number of respondents by component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-1. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Coerced, Pressured, or Required Them to Join an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	5/189	43/348	19/109	133/510	5/37
Army Reserve	0/93	5/358	0/22	15/66	48/179
Army National Guard	4/356	17/297	32/100	20/110	29/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-2. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Coerced, Pressured, or Required Them to Attend a Presentation or Activity for the Purpose of Joining an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	4/189	45/350	13/108	108/510	5/37
Army Reserve	1/95	11/356	1/22	9/66	39/179
Army National Guard	4/359	14/297	17/99	16/110	16/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-3. Respondents Who Stated They Were Asked by Commanders or Supervisors to Justify Why They Were Not a Member of a Specific NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	5/189	36/349	16/109	104/509	2/36
Army Reserve	0/95	6/357	1/22	10/66	33/179
Army National Guard	5/358	15/297	23/101	16/110	15/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-4. Respondents Who Were Selected by Commanders or Supervisors as a Unit Point of Contact for an NFE Membership Drive

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	2/190	5/351	2/109	24/510	0/37
Army Reserve	0/95	1/358	1/22	2/66	7/179
Army National Guard	1/359	2/297	1/101	3/110	6/95

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-5. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Used His/Her Title, Office, or Position to Support Membership Drives Sponsored by an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	2/190	38/348	12/109	85/510	4/37
Army Reserve	1/95	15/358	1/22	9/66	33/179
Army National Guard	4/358	15/297	26/101	13/110	21/94

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-6. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Provided Them Privileges, or Benefits, for Joining an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	5/189	33/350	11/109	54/510	1/37
Army Reserve	1/95	4/359	1/22	3/66	6/178
Army National Guard	12/358	3/296	4/101	5/110	1/94

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-7. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Granted Them Promotions for Joining an NFE

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	2/189	3/350	0/109	2/510	0/37
Army Reserve	0/95	1/357	0/22	0/66	0/178
Army National Guard	6/358	0/294	0/101	2/110	0/94

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Table E-8. Respondents Who Stated Commanders or Supervisors Took or Threatened to Take Adverse Action as a Result of Not Joining an NFE (Examples included denied training opportunities, lowered performance evaluations, and denied promotions)

Component	E1-E4	E5-E9	WO1-CW5	O1-O3	O4-O6
Active Army	2/185	10/348	7/108	23/509	0/37
Army Reserve	0/95	2/355	0/22	3/66	16/178
Army National Guard	2/354	6/296	10/101	4/109	3/93

The first number is the number of respondents who answered yes to the question. The second number is the total number of respondents in that component and pay grade who provided a usable answer to the question.

Appendix F. Synopsis of Army Inspector General Reports on Coercion or Pressure Related to NFE Membership

Department of the Army Inspector General report, "Special Inspection of the Army's Relationship With Private Organizations," February 1998, assessed the Army's relationship with private organizations (POs). The assessment was conducted at 11 Army major commands, 23 installations, and 125 battalions and was based on interviews of more than 6,500 personnel from September 1996 through June 1997. Overall, the assessment found that the Army was selectively complying with its policies on POs. More specifically, systemic issues were identified with official endorsement and preferential treatment of select POs, coercion of soldiers, and improper use of Government resources. The report recommended changes to Army policies in Army Regulation 210-1, "Private Organizations on Department of the Army Installations and Official Participation in Private Organizations." Army Regulation 210-1 was rescinded in July 1998, and its replacement, Army Regulation 210-22, was issued on November 1, 2001.

Army Aviation Center Inspector General report, "Special Inspection of Private Organizations (POs)," August 1999, reported violations, the appearance of violations, and perceived violations of Army regulations, DoD directives, and Executive orders related to preferential treatment and endorsement of POs. Guidance was widely and selectively disobeyed, resulting in a strong appearance of endorsement and preferential treatment of POs. In addition, Army leaders serving on boards as officers or advisers in POs failed to separate official and personal duties and responsibilities. DoD employees were subjected to repeated attempts and coercion to join some POs. DoD employees were routinely using Federal Government resources for PO business during duty hours without proper authorization. DoD employees were soliciting funds and sponsorship and services of commercial businesses on behalf of POs during duty hours, in uniform, and in their official capacity. Incentives were given to personnel and units who contributed to or had the highest contribution to the Combined Federal Campaign and Army Emergency Relief. The report also identified a lack of penalty for violations.

Army Fort Benning Inspector General report, "Private Organizations on Fort Benning," Spring 2000, stated that 10 percent of the surveyed soldiers perceived they were pressured to join a PO, 27 percent said they were required to attend presentations encouraging participation in certain POs, and 10 percent were pressured to participate in fundraising activities. In addition, the inspection found that DoD employees were using official time to conduct PO business and that there was perceived or actual preferential treatment of some POs.

Appendix G. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer
Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
General Counsel

Department of the Army

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
General Counsel
Inspector General
Chief of the Army Reserve
Chief of the National Guard Bureau
Auditor General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Naval Inspector General
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Armed Services
House Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management, and Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy, Committee on Government Reform

Team Members

The Readiness and Logistics Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing of the Department of Defense prepared this report. Personnel of the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense who contributed to the report are listed below.

Shelton R. Young
Michael A. Joseph
Scott J. Grady
Sanford W. Tomlin
Timothy J. Tonkovic
Dawn M. Borum
G. Paul Johnson
Robert J. Hanlon
Anna P. Martin
James A. O'Connell
Robin T. Parrish
Mary J. Gibson
Danny O. Hatten
Elmer J. Smith
Eva M. Zahn
Lynnell E. Hines
J. Steven Epps
Mary Ann Hubbell
William F. Lanyi
Carmen J. Malone
Frank C. Sonsini
H. David Barton
Elizabeth L.N. Shifflett