5-2014

Skill, Trust, and Deployment: Who's Your Buddy?

Julianne Sutton
Lindenwood University

Recommended Citation

Sutton, Julianne (2014) "Skill, Trust, and Deployment: Who's Your Buddy?," *Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 16 , Article 5.
Available at: https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals/vol1/iss16/5

Skill, Trust, and Deployment: Who's Your Buddy?

Julianne Sutton[4]

Whether or not the gender of a potential buddy in hypothetical military scenarios influenced the participant's decision was assessed. The 25 participants were divided in three groups: one control group, and two experimental groups. The participants were given a role-playing packet with eight scenarios. After each scenario, the participant was asked to choose an option for a buddy to accompany the participant. Four buddy options were given, each ranging in degrees of Relevant Skill or Knowledge, Relevant Experience, and Attitude towards Task. The experimental groups were also given a fourth variable of Gender Identity; where female participants had transgender or non-transgender female buddy options, and male participants had transgender or non-transgender male buddy options. Multiple Regression revealed significance in predicting whether the idealness rating given by the participant would predict which buddy option was chosen. ANOVAs did not reveal significant differences between all groups by gender of the buddy option and idealness rating given, but LSD Post HOC showed significance between Female Experimental and Control groups, suggesting that idealness ratings were not different except if the buddy option had a female gender.

The United States military has a long, complicated history with its relationship to gender. Women were not allowed to even serve in the military before the Women's Armed Services Integration Act, which went into effect after World War II (Kerrigan, 2012). They were seen as the weaker, more docile and emotional sex, and therefore unfit to serve in the armed forces. Kerrigan discussed how the prime objective of the military was to maintain its masculinity. This objective was used to keep certain groups of people from being able to join and serve. These groups were seen as forces that could hurt unit morale, cohesion, and ability to function (Kerrigan, 2012). These groups included women first, then the lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals, and now the transgender individuals.

---

[4] Julianne Sutton, Psychology Department, Lindenwood University.

Correspondence regarding this paper can be addressed to Julianne Sutton, Psychology Department, Lindenwood University, 209 S Kingshighway Street, St. Charles, MO, 63301 or email at jcs401@icloud.com

Kerrigan discussed that the military's main priority is to win wars, not social-political movements, and that deciding where women belong in the military depends on where they are needed, and not on women's rights or gender equality (Schwarskopf, as cited in Kerrigan, 2012). While Kerrigan was speaking only of women in those statements, the same argument could be applied to others by inserting either "gay," "lesbian," "bisexual," (a person who is sexually attracted to males and females) or 'transgender' (a person who does not identify with his or her birth sex) into the sentence. In regards to men only the best of the best are allowed and welcomed into the military. While female, lesbian, gay, and bisexual soldiers are allowed to serve in at least some of the positions in the different military branches, transgender individuals still are barred from service.

Furthermore, the Department of Defense's (DoD) view on transgender individuals is not a positive one. The DoD categorizes being transgender as having a psychosexual condition which makes them unfit for service (Kerrigan, 2012). While the Department of Defense uses false terminology and a now outdated Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), their view is still solid. To enlist a transgender individual would be going against the good order of military service, while being more than he or she could handle psychologically (DOD Federal Globe, 2013).

The United States military is still currently extensively active, having bases in every one of its states, as well as having bases in 30 countries. With the growing tensions in the Middle East, Russia, and the Ukraine, the military is always in need of strong, able-bodied people to fill their ranks. With the ban on transgender service and the needs of the military still active, the question falls to what makes a transgender person unfit to serve? Does it have to do with the skill level, trust, dependability? Or does the main issue fall with their gender?

The military focuses primarily on training their soldiers, particularly their male soldiers. Witten (2007) outlined that the training is centered on a traditionally male body, even though women are also in the forces. This male body becomes a measurement to which other bodies are compared to (Witten, 2007). Witten also points out that problems quickly arise when the divisions between male and female are crossed, as in transgender individuals. If transgender individuals fall in an ambiguous area, does their perceived trustworthiness and skill level also fall?

Wright and Sharp (1979) looked at what they believed to be a sex bias in Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale of 1967. They found a handful of answers on which sex seems to be more or less trustworthy on certain subscales. Their results showed that females were believed more and perceived as less exploitative than men (Wright & Sharp, 1979). Also, female politicians were trusted more than male politicians. Finally, While this study does not directly relate to the military, it shows that when people are asked to trust a person, male and female stand out as more designated choices than "a non-sex-specified group" (Wright & Sharp, 1979, p. 82). A transgender individual would fall in this group, but even still participants referred to those in the non-sex-specified group as if the group comprised solely of men (Broverman, et. al, cited in Wright & Sharp, 1979, p.73). So, in the perceived civilian world, transgender may still not be seen as an option for trust.

What makes up trust, then? Lee, Bond, Russell, Tost, Gonzales, and Scarbrough (2010) looked at perceived team trustworthiness in military simulations. They defined trust with two main components: positive expectations, and a willingness to become vulnerable. (Lee et al., 2010). Trust is an important factor when looking at effective team performance. When it comes to the military, which works as a large group comprised of smaller and smaller groups working together to fulfill a given mission, team performance is vital for success as well as safety. The

article discussed the study done to examine how important creating and keeping team trust was in the military, by placing participants in three-people groups and having them work together through eight missions of a complex military simulation (Lee et al., 2010).

Citing Mayer and Davis (1999), Lee et al. discussed how the complexity of a task a team needs to complete could impact the factors involved with perceived trustworthiness. Lee et al. (2010) found that when it came to perceived trustworthiness, ability and competence were the most important factors. A person's skill came up as the most important part of deciding to trust that person with that job. What was not discussed by Lee et al., though, was how gender played a factor. The gender of the participants was not mentioned at all, only that participants came from a predominantly Hispanic university in the United States (Lee et al, 2010, p. 242), and that none of the participants had military background. Since the gender of the participants was left out, it can easily be that they were all of the same gender, and that most likely, they were all male. Had the results shown differently if the participants were of different genders? Also, the simulations were all of the peacekeeping kind, what would happen with conflict was put into play?

Curşeu and Schruijer (2010) also defined trust in relation to an allowance to be vulnerable. Trust is gained by sharing information in a better fashion, as well as a higher amount of synergy within teams (Curşeu & Schruijer, 2010). The researchers wanted to see if gender and nationality has an impact on team effectiveness and trust. Nationality and gender were two forms of diversity that were studied. They found that nationality diversity effected team effectiveness in a negative indirect way, while team performance was affected in a positive indirect way. Gender diversity did not hold any significant effects, suggesting that when there is conflict, other factors rise to the occasion that could hurt trust.

When it comes to military combat, however, where does trust fall in its influence? Considering that the United States currently deploys hundreds of thousands of soldiers every

year to various places such as Iraq, Afghanistan, and South Korea, trust must play a significant role. Sweeny, Thompson, and Blanton (2009) looked at trust and combat within leadership and team members in the military. Here again, they defined trust along the same guidelines as Lee et al. (2010).

Dependability is based in trust, and Sweeny et al. (2009) discuss three ways a person can earn an "attribution of dependability" (p. 237). First, the person must demonstrate interdependence. Second, the person must have shared common interest of the person on the other end of the relationship. Finally, the person must have a "cooperative motivational orientation" (Kelley & Thibaut, as cited in Sweeny, Thompson & Blanton, p. 238). The results of their study showed that three factors influence trust: relationship, person, and organizational factors (Sweeny, Thompson & Blanton, 2009). The person factors relate to credibility, the level of trustworthiness and reliability a person has.

Again, gender is still not mentioned as a factor relating to trust. Both the male and female pronouns were used when describing possible leaders/subordinates, and while participants did include women, the majority was men. This was not brought up as a limitation. In all of the studies reviewed thus far, gender does not seem to be a factor, and yet, there are still rules and regulations restricting females, as well as anyone who does not comply with his or her biological sex.

The present study wishes to look at is if gender is an important factor when trusting another solider in a task in a high-stress environment, such as a combat deployment. Would the same results that Lee et al (2010) found be true if a potential partner in a task was a transgender individual? Or would the presence of the non-binary gender paired with the negative stigma trump that individual's ability and skill level?

Participants were separated into one control group and two experimental groups, and given a role-playing packet and asked to fill it out playing a soldier deployed in Afghanistan. A demographic survey, eight scenarios, and eight sets of four or five rating sections made up the packet. After each scenario, the participant chose a buddy to accompany him or her in the scenario, and then rated on a Likert scale the importance of that buddy's Relevant Skill or Knowledge, Relevant Experience, Attitude towards Task, and Gender Identity. The control group did not rate Gender Identity, as it was not presented in any of the scenarios.

The scenario buddy options were made so that one option would appear to be superior to the other options, in ranging degrees of obviousness. Experimental groups were given the gender of the buddy, while control groups were not. Male participants were given options with only male and transgender male buddies, and female participants were given only options with female and transgender female buddies.

Method

Participants

Both Lindenwood University students and family and friends of the Principal Investigator were recruited through sign-up sheets and Social Media requests. There were a total of 25 participants, 9 men, and 16 women. No participants identified as Transgender. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 24, with one participant as an outlier at the age of 35. The majority were recruited through the Lindenwood University Participant Pool, while a fraction were recruited outside of the participant pool. There were 14 participants in the experimental group, and 9 in the control group.

Materials

A consent form was given and afterwards a short demographic survey asking gender and age (see Appendices A and B) was used, followed by a role-playing packet. The packets came in three versions: a control version, and two experimental versions. Each version had eight scenarios that would describe an event occurring during a United States Army deployment to Afghanistan. A rating section on a scale of 1 being least important, to 5 being most important was used to rate either three or four traits (see Appendix C), depending on whether or not the participant was put in the experimental or control group.

The control version of the packets did not have any mention of gender or gender pronouns in the scenario buddy options, nor did gender appear in the rating section after the scenarios (see Appendix D). Gender was included in the buddy options for both experimental groups. The experimental versions were based on what gender the participant identified as in the demographic survey. For those participants who identified as male, all of the buddy options were either male or transgender male. For those participants who identified as female, all of the buddy options were either female or transgender female. Lastly, an Information Letter was given last, one for the Lindenwood Participant Pool participants, and one for those outside of the Lindenwood Participant Pool (Appendices E and F).

The scenario options appeared the same for all the packets, but the order of the options was changed at random depending on the packet. The only difference between the options was the inclusion or exclusion of the gender of the buddy. The buddy options were made so that one would appear as a more ideal option over the others, in different ranges of obviousness. An answer key for the answers was made to be able to compare results between groups. The order followed as Brown, Williams, Campbell, Neal, Morgan, Simpson, Hanks, and Barber. Brown,

Campbell, and Barber were always listed as non-transgender as filler scenarios, while the remaining were always listed as transgender.

Procedure

Each participant was given a short demographic survey first. Based upon the gender of the participant (options being female, male, transgender, prefer not to say), the participant was then given a certain version of the role-playing packet. The participants would then have to choose one of four options for a buddy to help them in the scenario presented. After the scenarios, the participants were asked to rate either three or four traits: *Relevant Skill or Knowledge* (RELEVANT SKILL OR KNOWLEDGE), *Relevant Experience* Relevant Experience, *Attitude towards Task* (ATT), and *Gender Identity* Gender Identity. The control group was not asked to rate Gender Identity, while the experimental groups were.

Results

Overall, the control group chose the predetermined superior buddy more often than the experimental group. The control group missed an average of 1.363 out of 8 superior options, and the experimental group missed an average of 2. There were 3 out of 11 that completely matched the intended answer sheet from the control group. None of the participants in the experimental group completely matched the intended answer sheet. Full results are shown in Table 1.

When looking at the options chosen for the experimental group, there was an averagely equal divide between the amount of transgender options and non-transgender options. Transgender options were chosen equally 50% of the time, 60% of the time, or 40% of the time. No other variations occurred showing a preference to either transgender or non-transgender options.

When comparing the options chosen over the superior options, a slight preference could be found towards non-transgender options. Only 4 out of 15 participants chose either one transgender option over another transgender option, with one choosing a non-transgender option

over another non-transgender option. The remaining 11 participants chose non-transgender

options over transgender options, when the transgender option was the superior option.

Participants in the experimental group were more likely to choose options that were not

predetermined superior over the control group. The largest discrepancies were found in Scenario

Five, with smaller discrepancies found in Scenarios Two, and Four.

Comparing Experimental Group Answers

Scenario Two. Scenario Two involved training for a ten mile race in Afghanistan, and finishing

the race in the top 100 runners. Out of the participants, 11 chose the predetermined Private

Williams as a buddy, while two chose Private Johnson, and two chose Private Thompson. Private

Johnson, like Williams, was a transgender option, while Thompson was not. Williams was

predetermined because of his/her high motivation, running abilities, and previous involvement in

a ten miler race.

Private Johnson was an easy-going workout partner who was opened to suggestions, but

had not ran more than four miles, which is not even half of the race, suggestion that he/she would

not be able to finish the full ten miles. Those participants who chose rated Attitude Towards

Task as the "Most Important" aspect, and both Relevant Skill or Knowledge and Relevant

Experience as a 2 (Somewhat Important). Gender Identity was rated as "Least Important", which

is fitting given that both Williams and Johnson were transgender options.

Private Thompson was a non-transgender option who scored in the top ten of the last 10

mile he/she competed in. He/she was described as a tough workout partner, who scored very

high on the Physical Fitness Test. But, Thompson was not open to suggestions and tended to

stick to workouts that complemented his/her love of lifting, which is not a cardio workout such

as a run. One participant's ratings conflicted with the answer, as that participant rated Attitude

Towards Task, Relevant Skill or Knowledge, and Relevant Experience as "Most Important", and

Gender Identity as a 3 (Neutral). The other participant who chose this option rated Relevant Skill or Knowledge, Relevant Experience, and Attitude Towards Task as "Most Important", 2 (Somewhat Important), and "Most Important" respectively. Gender Identity was rated as a 2 (Somewhat Important). This could show more of a preference towards non-transgender options for that participant.

Scenario Four. Scenario Four had participants teach a class to other soldiers on the base. The predetermined option was Private Neal, which was chosen by 13 of the 15 experimental participants. Private Neal scored the minimum-accepted score on the vocational test to become a linguist, and taught several classes before. Neal was also good at preparing discussion questions and enjoyed interacting with others. Neal was a transgender option.

One option chosen over Neal was Private Chambers, who was a non-transgender option. He/she scored four points higher than Neal, and is one of the most skilled linguists in the participant's work group. But, Chambers feels nervous around others and has never taught a class before. The participant who chose Chambers had conflicting ratings. Relevant Skill or Knowledge was given a 2 (Somewhat Important), Relevant Experience a 3 (Neutral), and Attitude Towards Task as "Most Important". Gender Identity was rated as a 3 (Neutral).

The other option chosen was the other non-transgender option, Private Hopkins. Hopkins scored the minimum score on the vocational test, and has never taught a class before, but is good as created PowerPoint slides. Here, ratings are conflicted again. Relevant Skill or Knowledge is rated as "Most Important", with Relevant Experience as a 3 (Neutral), Attitude Towards Task as a 2 (Somewhat Important), and Gender Identity as "Least Important".

Scenario Five. Scenario Five dealt with getting mail from the mail room, located 30 minutes away by foot. The participant was allowed to use a vehicle, if he or she chose a buddy who had the specific authorization to drive that vehicle. Out of the 15 participants, over half (7) chose

Private Peterson, a non-transgender option. The superior option was Private Morgan, which was chosen by only two of the participants. Six out of seven of the participants rated Attitude Toward Task the "Most Important" aspect to choosing a buddy. When comparing Morgan and Peterson, Morgan was more hesitant to drive to mailroom, because it cut into lunch time, but knew where the mailroom was. Peterson was happy to drive, but did not know where the mailroom was. The participant would be responsible for navigating, and only had little knowledge of the route to the mailroom. One participant rated Relevant Skill or Knowledge as a 2 (Somewhat Important), and both Relevant Experience and Attitude Towards Task as a 4 (Somewhat Not Important), but still chose Peterson. Four out of six rated Gender Identity as "Least Important", with one rating it as a 4 (Somewhat Not Important), and one rating it as a 3 (Neutral).

Multiple Regression Analysis Multiple Regression analyses were done individual per scenario to see if the idealness rating of the scenario candidate chosen by the participant could predict what candidate was chosen. Significance was found in scenarios one through four, and eight. Scenario Seven showed no variability, as all of the participants chose the same, predetermined candidate. Scenario Five did not show significance; $\beta = .404$, $t(21) = 1.740$, $p.= .095$. Scenario Six was reaching significance, $\beta = .100$, $t(21) = 2.041$, $p.= .054$, but did not fully reach statistical significance with $p < .05$. Full results are shown in Table 2.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Analyses of Variance were also done individually per scenario to see if the type of packet (either control, experimental male, or experimental female) correlated with the idealness rating given to the candidate chosen in each scenario. Only Scenario One found significance, $F (2, 22) = 4.531$, $p. = .023$. Full results listed in Table 2. LSD Post Hoc tests were completed for each scenario. Scenarios One and Four found significance between the experimental female and control group, while Scenarios Four and Eight were approaching significance; Scenario Four with the experimental female and control group, and Scenario Eight

with both the experimental female and control, and the experimental male and control. Full results listed in Table 3.

LSD Post HOC LSD Post HOC tests were done after every ANOVA. Here, significance was found in two scenarios, and significance was approaching in two scenarios. Those results are shown in Table 4.

Discussion

Overall, the control group and experimental group only missed choosing superior options by an average of 1.363 and 2 options, respectively. When looking at these numbers broadly, not a huge gap exists, suggesting that gender did not play a huge role in the decision of the participant. Some discrepancies were evident, however, when looking more in-depth at specific scenarios answers and corresponding ratings.

Scenario Five: Attitude over Skill or Experience As stated earlier, 7 out of the 15 participants chose Private Peterson over the predetermined Private Morgan. All except one rated *Attitude Toward Task* as the most important part of the decision. Peterson was described as a person who does not know how to get to the mailroom, but is happy to drive if the participant agrees to navigate. The participant is told that he/she has been to the mailroom a few times, but feels that navigating may push the time limit. "Pushing the time limit" was added in to discourage the participant from choosing this option. Private Morgan knew how to get to the mailroom, which would help speed the scenario along. Morgan was hesitant to drive because it cut into lunch, making Morgan have a lower outward attitude towards the scenario. That outward attitude could have been what pushed participants to choose a buddy that was more agreeable. The "happy to drive" could even extend so far as to compensate for the participants' shaky knowledge of how to get the mailroom, as maybe Peterson could have been so happy as to ask for directions along the way if the participant and he/she got lost on their way to the mailroom.

Scenario Two: Conflicting Answers and Ratings Scenario Two only had a discrepancy of 2 participants out of 15 who did not chose the predetermined superior buddy, Private Williams. One participant chose another transgender option over Williams, and one chose Private Thompson, a non-transgender option. Private Williams was described as an option that failed the last Physical Fitness test, but only by one event, which was the push-ups. Since the scenario had to do with winning a race, failing the push-ups is irrelevant. Williams was high-spirited and enjoyed motivating co-workers. This, paired with past experience and success at a previous race, made him/her a more obvious superior option.

The participant that chose Private Johnson, the other transgender option, had slightly conflicting ratings. Johnson was described as passing the Physical Fitness test with an average score, and being an easy-going workout partner who takes suggestions. He/she has never run ten miles, suggesting that he/she would not be able to finish a full ten miles. The participant rated Relevant Skill or Knowledge and Relevant Experience as a 2 (Somewhat Important), which conflicts with the description of Johnson. Only being able to complete four miles is not even half of the race, and that kind of information would generally seem to be very important to the success of the run. Attitude Towards Task was rated as Most Important, but the goal for the scenario was to complete the run in the top 100, making experience or skill more important than attitude. Gender Identity was rated as Least Important, which fits since both the predetermined option and the option chosen were transgender.

The participant that chose Private Thompson had conflicting ratings as well. Private Thompson was described as a person passed the Physical Fitness test with a very high score, and is a tough workout partner. Thompson does not take suggestions from others, and tends to stick to workouts that compliment his/her love of lifting, which is not a cardio workout such as a race. The participant rated Relevant Skill or Knowledge, Relevant Experience, and Attitude Toward

Task as Most Important, and Gender Identity as a 3 (Neutral). Here, the attitude and skill

conflict. Attitude was defined as a willingness to work, help out, listen, and easy to get along

with. Thompson does not take suggestions from others, and sticks to a workout that does not

compliment a race, making his/her outward attitude undesirable for the scenario. While

Thompson may have been a successful runner, sticking to workouts that do not help a race would

give him/her a low knowledge desirability as well, as that was defined as amount of help that can

be brought to the situation. With a neutral Gender Identity rating, a preference cannot be found.

Scenario Four: Gender over Experience, Skill, and Attitude Scenario Four had participants

choose a buddy to help teach a class to other soldiers. Here, a small discrepancy was found with

two participants, who were the same two participants showing discrepancies in Scenario Two.

The superior option was Private Neal, a transgender option who scored the minimum vocational

test score. Neal had taught classes before, had good public speaking ability, and was good at

preparing discussion questions, as well as enjoyed interacting with others, making him/her a

more obvious superior option.

Private Hopkins was chosen by one participant. Hopkins was a non-transgender option

who scored the minimum test score, was good at preparing PowerPoint slides, but had never

previously taught a class before. The participant rated Relevant Skill or Knowledge as Most

Important, Relevant Experience as a 3 (Neutral), and Attitude Towards Task as a 2 (Somewhat

Important). Hopkins may have scored the minimum score like Neal, but had no previous

experience in giving a class. That would give him/her a low score in experience, which would

make him/her less desirable. The participant rated as something neutral, which conflicts with

why Hopkins was chosen. Hopkins did have knowledge of how to create PowerPoint slides, but

nowhere in the scenario was mentioned that PowerPoint would even be used, making his

knowledge level more irrelevant than "Most Important", as is the participant rated it. Gender

Identity was rated as "Least Important", which conflicts with the more superior option, who was transgender.

Private Chambers was the other option chosen by one participant. He/she scored high on the vocational test, and was described as one of the best linguists in the work group, giving him/her a high skill or knowledge level. Chambers had never taught a class before though, and felt nervous around others. The participant rated Relevant Skill or Knowledge as a 2 (Somewhat Important), and Relevant Experience as a 3 (Neutral). Chambers' most desirable quality was not rated as most important, and whether or not he/she had taught a class previously was rated as irrelevant. Chambers was described as never having volunteered to teach before, which could both imply that she did not want to, or did was never asked. Attitude Towards Task was rated as "Most Important", but Chambers' tendency to feel nervous around people combined with his/her possible unwillingness to teach a class should have discouraged the participant from choosing Chambers as a buddy. Gender Identity was rated as a 3 (Neutral), which conflicts with the superior option, who was transgender.

Scenario Seven Scenario Seven showed no variability in its results since all of the participants chose the superior option. The scenario involved giving a presentation to a high-ranking officer. A superior option was described as someone who can work efficiently and match the participants' demeanor. Here, the superior option was Private Hanks, a transgender option. Private Hanks was described as only having one downside: being a slow worker. Otherwise, he/she was described as a person who has presented three previous times to a high-ranking officer, giving him/her a high ranking in Relevant Experience. He/she is also said to be excellent at answering questions, which could be counted as high in Attitude Towards Task. Private Hanks also tends to over-prepare, giving him/her a high Relevant Skill or Knowledge ranking.

For Private Hanks, the Relevant Skill or Knowledge, Relevant Experience, and Attitude Towards Task were all rated as either "Most Important" or 2 (Somewhat Important), with one participant rating Relevant Skill or Knowledge a 3 (Neutral), and three participants each rating Relevant Experience and Attitude Towards Task a 3 (Neutral). Gender Identity was rated as either "Least Important" (N= 8), 2 (Somewhat Not Important; N = 5), and 3 (Neutral; N= 1). Regardless of the ratings, the answer was still chosen across the groups. When looking at the other available buddy options, two had never presented in front of a high-ranking officer before, and one had but had very little motivation to do any work for the presentation.

Of the other two who did not have experience, Private Gilbert and Private Bolton, Private Gilbert would seem to be an ideal candidate, but was described as feeling under the weather and unsure as to whether or not he/she would be able to make the presentation. The fear of having to present alone could have deterred participants from choosing this option. Private Bolton often suffered from anxiety and stage fright, which led to him/her forgetting previously researched material. This could make the participant have to pick up after Private Bolton's slack, which makes him/her less ideal for a candidate.

Multiple Regression Multiple Regression analyses were done to see if the idealness rating given could have predicted the candidate chosen. In the present study, the independent variables were the idealness rating (Relevant Skill or Knowledge + Relevant Experience + Attitude Towards Task / 3) given by the participants per scenario. The dependent variables were the superior candidates. As seen in Table 1, significance was found in 6 out of 8 scenarios, with the remaining scenarios approaching significance. The independent variables accounted up to 34% in one scenario of influence on the participants' choice on a buddy.

ANOVAs and LSD Post HOC Analyses of Variances were done to see if the type of packet correlated with the idealness rating given. That is, if the gender (or lack thereof) of the buddy

option chosen correlated with how ideal that buddy option was rated. As seen in Table 2, only

Scenario One showed significance, but the LSD Post Hoc tests showed significance in Scenarios

One and Two, with approaching significance in Scenarios Four and Eight. With the exception of

Scenario Eight, the significance was seen between the Female Experimental and the Control

group, suggesting that the idealness ratings given by the participants did not differ significantly,

unless the buddy options had female genders. Scenario Eight found this difference in both the

Female and Male Experimental groups in comparison to the Control group.

Scenario Eight involved the participant and a buddy retrieving a sensitive piece of

equipment from the supply room on base. The participant was given a vehicle if he or she chose

a buddy option that had the authorization to drive the vehicle. Out of all participants, 76% chose

the superior option, with 24% choosing other options. Only in this scenario were the differences

between the Male Experimental and Control group approaching significance.

The superior option, Private Barber was always a non-transgender option, and described

as a person who had a clean record when it came to speeding tickets. He/she did not know where

the Supply Room was, but was always punctual to shifts, allowing for all of the allotted time to

be used efficiently. The participant was told that he/she knew how to get to the Supply Room, so

this paired with Private Barber's punctuality and clean record made him/her more ideal as a

buddy option for all participants.

References

Curşeu, P., & Schruijer, S. (2010). Does conflict shatter trust or does trust obliterate conflict? revisiting the relationships between team diversity, conflict, and trust. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *14*(1), 66-79.

DOD Federal Globe. (2012). *USA transgender service members*. Retrieved from http://dodfedglobe.ning.com/page/usa-transgender-service

Kerrigan, M. F. (2012). Transgender discrimination in the military: The new don't ask don't tell. *Public Policy and Law Psychology*, *18*(3), 500-518. doi: 10.1037/a0025771

Lee, A., Bond, G., Russel, D., Tost, J., Gonzalez, C., & Scarbrough, P. (2010). Team perceived trustworthiness in a complex military peacekeeping simulation. *Military Psychology*, *22*, 237-261.

Sweeny, P. J., Thompson, V., & Blanton, H. (2009). Trust and influence in combat: An interdependence model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *39*(1), 235-264.

Witten, T. M. (2007). *Gender identity and the military- transgender, transsexual, and intersex-identified individuals in the U.S. armed forces*. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Wright, T., & Sharp, E. (1979). Content and grammatical sex bias on the interpersonal trust scale and differential trust toward women and men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *47*(1), 72-85.

Table 1
Frequencies and Percentage of Superior Answers Chosen

GROUP	S 1*	S 2	S 3	S 4	S 5	S 6	S 7	S 8
SUPERIOR OPTION	22	21	18	21	9	19	25	19
OTHER OPTION	3	4	7	4	20	6	0	6
PERCENTAGE**	88	84	72	84	36	76	100	76

*Note: *S is short for Scenario; **Percentage of participants who chose the superior option*

Table 2
Variable

	R^2	B	Std. Error	β	Sig	Part Correlation
Idealness	.044	1.648	.432	.209	.001*	.209
Idealness 2	.019	1.531	.456	-.137	.003	.137
Idealness 3	.117	1.893	.850	.342	.036	.342
Idealness 4	.102	4.800	.764	-.320	.000	.320
Idealness 5	.026	1.832	1.053	.162	.095	.162
Idealness 6	.010	1.182	.579	.100	.054	.100
Idealness 8	.001	2.911	.541	.037	.000	.037

*Note: *Significance found when p < .05*

Table 3
ANOVAs per scenario and packet type

S	Male Experimental						Female Experimental						Control					
	N	M	SD	SE	F	p	N	M	SD	SE	F	p	N	M	SD	SE	F	p
1	5	1.8	.557	.249	4.531	.023	9	1.5	.376	.125	4.531	.023	11	2.03	.277	.083	4.531	.023
2	5	1.8	.730	.326	2.88	.077	9	1.4	.412	.137	2.88	.077	11	1.98	.348	.104	2.88	.077
3	5	2.3	.849	.380	.111	.896	9	2.4	.600	.200	.111	.896	11	2.50	.756	.221	.111	.896
4	5	1.4	.380	.169	2.313	.123	9	1.4	.372	.124	2.313	.123	11	1.72	.401	.121	2.313	.123
5	5	2.0	.781	.349	.729	.494	9	1.8	.444	.148	.729	.494	11	2.13	.372	.119	.729	.494
6	5	1.2	.599	.266	.950	.403	7	1.4	.424	.100	.950	.403	11	1.64	.502	.152	.950	.403
7	5	1.4	.434	.194	1.936	.168	9	1.4	.408	.136	1.936	.168	11	1.77	.328	.098	1.936	.168
8	5	1.6	.494	.221	2.723	.089	9	1.6	.471	.157	2.723	.089	10	2.13	.548	.173	2.723	.089

Note: Significance found at $p < .05$

Table 4
LSD Post Hoc results

Scenario	Female Experimental and Control		
	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig
1	.511	.170	.006
2	.488	.207	.028
4	.343	.174	.061
8	.466	.234	.060

Note: Significance found at *p <.05*

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The largest limitation to the study was the amount of data gathered. I did not have enough time to adequately examine all of the data I had collected.

Next, there were three typos which were not caught until after data had been collected. While the typos were small and probably did not greatly impact the results, they were still errors which were not fixed until after some participants were already tested. They included a pronoun appearing in the control packet when gender was not supposed to appear at all, and two misspelled words. Also, a formatting error occurred for roughly half of the packets, where the words "Least Important" had been printed underneath the number "4" instead of the number "5", which was where it was supposed to be printed. The directions did include that "5" was associated with being "Least Important" and no noticeable ratings of "4" were seen in packets with this error.

The packet did not allow for any rationales to be explored, which could help explain why some participants chose buddy options over others. The rating section told how the participant felt about the buddy option, but without a rationale section, no concrete reason could be defined for why that buddy option was chosen. This would have been especially helpful in explaining the discrepancies found in Scenarios Two, Four, and Five, as well as the consistency in answers for Scenario Seven. For future research, a rationale section could be added to help explain such answers, especially when conflicts and discrepancies arose.

The wording of some of the scenario options may have influenced the participants more than the credentials of the buddies. For example, a handful of participants chose an option that was deemed the least desirable. Upon further explanation, the presence of the word "However" may have influenced the decision. "However" is often used after a negative phrase to introduce a positive phrase. In the scenario, it was used to introduce another negative phrase, but could have

disguised that negative phrase to make the option more desirable. All of the superior options (first superior and second and third superior) had positive and negative qualities about them. The order of the negative qualities could have impacted the decision of the participant, where reading a more desirable trait last may have influenced the participant to choose that option, as the desirable trait was the most quickly retained, and could have overshadowed the negative trait mentioned earlier in the option. For future research, the order of the negative and positive traits could be manipulated at random to see if any changes occur in choosing an option.

Lastly, the amount of data collected may have overshadowed the original hypothesis of the study, making it harder to see if gender had the most influence with a participant's decision. As evident in Scenario Five, Attitude Towards Task seemed more influential than gender, which was an interesting finding, but not the primary goal. Future research could help specify and reduce the amount of extraneous variable to influence the participant's decision. More statistical analyses wanted to be done, but the amount of time to complete the project did not allow for even adequate examining of the statistical analyses that had been done, not to mention ones that I wanted to do. This was due to the amount of time taken to get the project approved by the IRB and PPSRC. If I had gotten approved earlier, I would have had more than my three days to gather participants, and four weeks to analyze my results.

Appendix A

Consent Form
Informed Consent Letter
I, _____ (print name), understand that I will be taking part in a
research project that requires me to complete: 1) a short demographic survey, 2) role-playing
scenarios with questions based on the answers to the role-playing scenarios. This role-playing
scenario will place me in the position of an American soldier who is deployed in Afghanistan. I
will read a scenario and choose a partner based on what I believe is the best help to the scenario.
After, I will answer questions regarding my decisions .I understand that I should be able to
complete this project within 25minutes. I understand that some of the scenarios may make me
uncomfortable. I am aware that I am free to skip any questions in the unlikely event that I feel
uncomfortable answering any of the items on any of the surveys. I am also aware that my
participation in this study is strictly voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw from the study
at any time without any penalty or prejudice. I should not incur any penalty or prejudice because
I cannot complete the study. I understand that the information obtained from my responses will
be analyzed only as part of aggregate data and that all identifying information will be absent
from the data in order to ensure anonymity. I am also aware that my responses will be kept
confidential and that data obtained from this study will only be available for research and
educational purposes. I understand that any questions I may have regarding this study shall be
answered by the researcher(s) involved to my satisfaction. Finally, I verify that I am at least 18
years of age and am legally able to give consent for my participation.
_____ Date: _____
(Signature of participant)
_____ Date: _____
(Signature of researcher obtaining consent)

Principal Investigator: Supervisor:
                                                     Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair
Julianne Sutton   Course Instructor
Student   (636)-949-4371
502-413-1723   mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu
JCS401@icloud.com

Appendix B

Demographic Survey

Please check the appropriate line

I identify as:

_____   Male

_____   Female

_____   Transgender **

_____   Prefer not to say

Age

_____   Years old.

** Transgender (Trans): "An umbrella term for people whose gender identity, expression, or behavior is different from those typically associated with their assigned sex at birth" (National Center for Transgender Equality)

Appendix C

Rating Section
Ranking Section- This will appear after every scenario.
Using the Scale Blow, please rate the importance of the following factors in deciding on a buddy.

Relevant Skill or Knowledge (Amount of help that can be brought to the situation)

1……………………2……………………3……………………………4……………………………5
Most   Least
Important   Important

Relevant Experience

1……………………2……………………3……………………………4……………………………5
Most   Least
Important   Important

Attitude towards Task (Willingness to work, help out, listen, and easy to get along with)

1……………………2……………………3……………………………4……………………………5
Most   Least
Important   Important

Gender Identity (Male, Female, Transgender)

1……………………2……………………3……………………………4……………………………5
Most   Least
Important   Important

Note: The Gender Identity Rating will only be requested of the experimental group but not the control group because only the experimental group will receive information regarding the gender identity of the candidates

Packet Introduction
You have been serving in the United States Army for almost a year. That means you work with decoding and translating foreign documents in languages used by the country you're stationed in. You have been chosen to deploy to Afghanistan. There are a total of forty other people that you know deploying with you. You are a Private, which is the lowest ranking position in the Army.

There will be a number of scenarios that describe your typical work day in Afghanistan. Because you are in a dangerous place, there is one rule you must always follow:

Never go anywhere alone; always bring a buddy.

Each scenario has a goal. After each scenario, please choose who you think would be the best buddy for achieving the goal.

Appendix D

Note: The boldface phrase "transgender/male/female" will appear on the forms given to the experimental groups, but not the control group. The gender identity of the buddy will match the reported gender of the participants, whereby male participants will receive scenarios with buddies in the male and transgender male gender identities, and the female participants will receive scenarios with buddies in the female and transgender female gender identities. The control group will receive scenarios with no reported gender identities.

Scenario One:

Today marks the two weeks of being in Afghanistan. After mid-day, you are given a lunch break by your boss, who advises you to take one of your coworkers with you. The cafeteria is located a half mile away, and the only way to get there today is by foot.

Goal: You only have an hour and a half to get to the cafeteria, eat, and get back to work.

Who do you choose?

☐   Private Jones **is a transgender/male/female who** takes the same route to the cafeteria, regardless of the road conditions. Swearing that route is the fastest, Private Jones assures you that the both of you can beat the long lines at the cafeteria. Private Jones rarely takes advice from other co-workers, even if it is beneficial.

☐   Private Brown **is a transgender/male/female who** knows multiple routes to take to the cafeteria, in case one of the routes is too muddy or too occupied. Some of those routes may be longer, but you know you will get there with minimal trouble. Private Brown is a friendly person, and goes-with-the-flow.

☐   Private Taylor **is a transgender/male/female who** does not know how to get to the cafeteria you wish to go to, and you have to navigate, when you have only been there twice. Private Taylor is considerate of others however, and will not take too long to eat, giving the two of you plenty of time to get back to work if you get lost.

☐   Private Smith **is a transgender/male/female who** has been to the cafeteria you wish to use several times, and knows without a doubt how to get there, but is busy with extra work. You would have to wait an extra 30 minutes until the work is finished to go eat. Private Smith is meticulous about his work and will not rush to get done quickly, pushing your time limit.

Scenario Two

After lunch, your boss reminds you and your coworkers that you could sign up for the Army Ten Miler, a ten-mile run where any soldier on the base could participate. Your boss wishes to put together a group to represent the linguist at the race. You decide to start working out on a more regular basis, but want a workout partner that you will be able to work with easily, and to help keep motivation high.

Goal: For the company is get into the top 100 runners.

Who do you choose?

☐   Private Williams is **a transgender/male/female who** failed the last Physical Fitness Test, passing the run, and the sit-ups, but because the push-up events were failed, a passing grade was not achieved. Private Williams passed the run in the top seven runners of the company, and is high-spirited and likes to motivate fellow coworkers. Private Williams has participated in the Ten Miler before, and is very excited to do it again.

☐   Private Thompson is **a transgender/male/female who** scored high on the Physical Fitness Tests, and is a tough workout partner. Private Thompson tends to only stick to workouts complimenting his love of intense lifting. Private Thompson scored in the top ten runners in the last Ten Miler.

☐   Private Johnson is **a transgender/male/female who** scored average on the Physical Fitness Tests, and is an easy-going workout partner, taking suggestions on routines without problem. Private Johnson has not run more than four miles.

☐   Private Harris is **a transgender/male/female who** scored average on the last Physical Fitness Tests, the best events being in the two-mile run, and the push-ups. Only runs because it's mandatory, and although natural skill is present, Private Harris' motivation level is very low. Since there is little enjoyment, Private Harris only participates in the Ten Miler annually because it is encouraged.

Scenario Three

A month has passed since you got to the base in Afghanistan. Recently, one of your coworkers was injured in a base attack and was sent back to the United States to recover. This made you start thinking about your current surroundings overseas. You would like to go speak to the base's chaplain, because the chaplain is nice and easy to talk to, regardless of your current religious standing. You do not want to go alone, especially since you have never gone to see the chaplain before, but you do not want anyone to judge you, or make the trip a public ordeal.

Goal: Get to the chaplain and back, without any of your coworkers knowing.

Who do you choose?

☐   Private Green **is a transgender/male/female who is** an easy person to talk to, but is very open about personal experiences, and may share to other co-workers about going with you. Private Green has been to the chaplain before and knows how you must feel going for the first time.

☐   Private Allen **is a transgender/male/female who** dislikes going to the chaplain, as it is far away from where you work on the base. However, Private Allen rarely helps others when asked, and knows to be discreet when asked.

☐   Private Robinson **is a transgender/male/female who** has never been to the chaplain, but does not mind going. Private Robinson is very detailed about writing appointments on a chalk board in your work area, making sure everyone knows where the other co-workers are at all times.

☐   Private Campbell **is a transgender/male/female who** may be quiet and reserved, but has often agreed to accompany other co-workers places such as the cafeteria and mail room. Private Campbell does not share about personal details to other co-workers, including the chaplain, and does not quite see why you feel the urge to see him.

Scenario Four
You are in charge of teaching a beginner level class for soldiers who are interested in becoming linguists. The class is three weeks long, with three fifty-minute sessions each week. You are given the option of having a partner teach with you, which you decide to take to make your work load easier. You want someone who is skilled at being a linguist as well, and can listen and follow directions. The class is starting in one week, so you do not have a lot of time to prepare.

Goal: Prepare and teach a class for beginning linguists, covering as much basic information as you can.

Who do you choose?

☐   Private Hopkins **is a transgender/male/female who** is quick to help out in most situations, and scored a 91 on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), which is a test to help determine which work discipline would be best for a soldier. The minimum score accepted for linguists is a 91. Private Hopkins has never taught class before but is good at creating Power Point slides.

☐   Private Chambers **is a transgender/male/female who** scored a 95 on the ASVAB and is one of the most skilled linguists in your work group. Private Chambers feels nervous around others, and has never volunteered to teach a class before.

☐   Private Rhodes **is a transgender/male/female who** scored a 93 on the ASVAB, but dislikes group projects. Continuously showing up late for work, Private Rhodes is not very dependable when it comes to turning in projects on time. Private Rhodes was given an opportunity to teach a class before, but turned it down.

☐   Private Neal **is a transgender/male/female who** scored a 91 on the ASVAB and is good at public speaking. Having taught several classes before, Private Neal is skilled at preparing discussion questions and enjoys interacting with others.

Scenario Five

Every other Monday, two people from your group of coworkers are selected to pick up mail from the post office on the base. Hoping to be getting a package from home, you volunteer to go. Your boss is allowing you to go during your lunch break, allowing you an extra half hour to get all of the mail and still eat. The post office is located thirty minutes away by foot. You also have access to a vehicle if you choose to use it. The vehicle requires special authorization to drive it, and you do not have that authorization.

Goal: Get the mail from the post office, bring back to your work area, eat lunch, and get back to work in the two hour time limit.

Who do you choose?

☐   Private Reed **is a transgender/male/female who** does not have the authorization to drive the vehicle, so you would have to walk to the post office. However, Private Reed has been to the post office several times and is happy to give you access to a rolling cart which would allow you to push the letters and packages back to your work line.

☐   Private Morgan **is a transgender/male/female who** has the authorization to drive the vehicle, making the trip much quicker and easier. Private Morgan is a slow driver, but knows the base well. Private Morgan is hesitant to take the time to drive the vehicle, because it will cut into lunch time.

☐   Private Cooper **is a transgender/male/female whose** authorization to drive the vehicle was revoked because the vehicle was crashed into a building. Private Cooper does know the way around the base, but you would have to walk to the post office and hand-carry the letters and packages back. Private Cooper is more than happy to accompany you on this trip.

☐   Private Peterson **is a transgender/male/female who** has the authorization, but does not know where the post office is. You have been there a few times before, but feel that navigating yourself would push your time limit. Private Peterson is happy to drive if you agree to navigate.

Scenario Six

You and your group of your co-workers are chosen for a once a week Tower Guard at the look-out tower closest to your work area. You, a partner, and a soldier from another work discipline will pull a several-hour-long shift watching for suspicious activity for the border area around the look-out tower. You no longer have the security of working in a secure building. An enemy force can attack if it is not spotted in time. Having a partner you can trust in case of emergencies is vital.

Goal: Keeping an eye on the border of the base.

Who do you choose?

- ☐ Private Simpson **is a transgender/male/female who** has pulled tower guard several times in a previous deployment. Private Simpson is level-headed, and knows how to stay calm in times of havoc.
- ☐ Private Jacobs **is a transgender/male/female who** has pulled tower guard before in a previous deployment, but gets anxious easily and panics often. A little coaxing will help Private Jacobs calm down and think clearly.
- ☐ Private Peters **is a transgender/male/female who** has never pulled tower guard before, but is quick-thinker in emergency situations, and knows how to keep a group together to work towards a common goal.
- ☐ Private Armstrong **is a transgender/male/female who** has never pulled tower guard before, and is scared about the idea. Private Armstrong tends to freeze up during tense situations.

Scenario Seven

Next week, you and a partner are preparing for a presentation to present to a high-ranking officer. The project is vital to an overall mission in your department. To effectively execute the presentation, you need to be calm, collected, and assertive in the way you speak. The data must be collected first, and you can break it up between you and a partner. You want to work with someone who is responsible and can match your demeanor.

Goal: Gather enough data for the presentation, and put together an organized presentation. Who do you choose?

- [ ] Private Carlson **is a transgender/ male/female who** tends to show up to work late, and has a low motivation level to complete projects on time. Private Carlson is a skilled presenter, and has presented in front of a high-ranking officer multiple times in the past.

- [ ] Private Gilbert **is a transgender /male/female** who is responsible for all of the individual assigned work, often turning it in early. Private Gilbert is excited to present for the first time in front of a high-ranking officer; however, Private Gilbert has been feeling under the weather lately, and may be going to sick hall, making him unable to present.

- [ ] Private Bolton **is a transgender/male/female** who is dedicated, but gets stage fright easily, leading to stuttering and forgetting the details of the researched material. This would be Private Bolton's first time presenting in front of a high-ranking officer.

- [ ] Private Hanks **is a transgender/male/female** who may be a slow worker, but is very thorough and a great public speaker. Private Hanks tends to over-prepare, and is an excellent person to answer any questions. This would be Private Hanks' third time presenting in front of a high-ranking officer.

Scenario Eight

A new piece of equipment has just arrived that will aid you and your co-workers about understanding foreign communication transmissions. The piece of equipment is high on the security list, and must be handled with extreme care and caution. You are being given a standard vehicle, which you have the authorization to drive, and a partner to assist you. One person must sign for the equipment, have it checked for its working condition, and secure it the entire way back. The other person must drive the vehicle. The supply room is located twenty minutes by car from your work station, and you know how to get there. Your boss is giving you two hours to complete this task.

Goal: Retrieve the piece of equipment and return to your work station in two hours.

Who do you choose?

☐   Private Higgins **is a transgender/ male/female who** has the authorization to drive the vehicle as well, allowing you to secure the equipment in the vehicle and keep it secure during the drive back. Private Higgins knows how to get to Supply, but often speeds, putting both of you at risk for getting pulled over by the military police and getting a ticket.

☐   Private Fletcher **is a transgender /male/female who** does not have the authorization to drive the vehicle and is not allowed to sign the vehicle to his name. If you choose Private Fletcher as your buddy, you would have to walk there and back with the equipment, which is something Private Fletcher has done before, and is happy to do with you.

☐   Private Barber **is transgender/male/female who** also has the authorization to drive the vehicle, and has a clean record when it comes to speeding tickets. Private Barber has never been to Supply before, but is punctual for her work shifts, allowing you two to maximize your time to get the equipment.

☐   Private Chandler **is a transgender/male/female who** does have the authorization to drive the vehicle, but has gotten into an accident the last time he drove the vehicle to Supply, making him a timid driver. Private Chandler can be authorized to sign for the equipment, allowing you to drive the vehicle if you choose to.

Appendix E

Information Letter

Thank you for participating in my study. The role-playing scenario and questions were used to see whether gender placed any significance on choosing a battle buddy in a high-stress environment, such as deployment. Currently, transgender individuals are not allowed to serve in the military because they are not seen as capable soldiers. The primary focus was looking at how participants, such as yourself, responded to having a transgender option, and if that option influenced your decision. Secondly, I wanted to see if there were any trends in gender and trust; females trusting more females, transgender trusting transgender, etc., as this can help the military and Department of Defense, not only in its regulations regarding transgender individuals, but making sure soldiers feel safe around those they are deployed with.

Please note that I am not interested in your individual results; rather, I am only interested in the results of a large group of consumers, which you are now a part of. No identifying information about you will be associated with any of the findings.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding any portion of this study, please do not hesitate to bring them up now or in the future. My contact information is found at the bottom of this letter. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the findings of this study at a later date, please contact me and I will make it available to you at the completion of this project.

If you found that participating in the study caused you distress and you would like assistance, please contact the Lindenwood Student Counseling and Resource Center at 636-949-4889.

Thank you again for your valuable contribution to this study.

Sincerely,

Principal Investigator:
Julianne Sutton
502-413-1723
JCS401@icloud.com

Supervisor:
Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair
636-949-4371
 (mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu)

Appendix F

Information Letter
Thank you for participating in my study. The role-playing scenario and questions were used to see whether gender placed any significance on choosing a battle buddy in a high-stress environment, such as deployment. Currently, transgender individuals are not allowed to serve in the military because they are not seen as capable soldiers. The primary focus was looking at how participants, such as yourself, responded to having a transgender option, and if that option influenced your decision. Secondly, I wanted to see if there were any trends in gender and trust; females trusting more females, transgender trusting transgender, etc., as this can help the military and Department of Defense, not only in its regulations regarding transgender individuals, but making sure soldiers feel safe around those they are deployed with.

Please note that I am not interested in your individual results; rather, I am only interested in the results of a large group of consumers, which you are now a part of. No identifying information about you will be associated with any of the findings.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding any portion of this study, please do not hesitate to bring them up now or in the future. My contact information is found at the bottom of this letter. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the findings of this study at a later date, please contact me and I will make it available to you at the completion of this project.

If you found that participating in the study caused you distress and you wish to discuss it, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you again for your valuable contribution to this study.

Sincerely,

Principal Investigator:
Julianne Sutton
502-413-1723
JCS401@icloud.com

Supervisor:
Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair
636-949-4371
 (mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu)