

2

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



AD A138562

DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 5 1984
S B

THESIS

IDENTIFICATION OF SUCCESSFUL CAREER PATTERNS FOR
U.S. ARMY ADJUTANT GENERAL CORPS OFFICERS

By

John D. Warren

and

Jerry J. Novosad, Jr.

September 1985

Thesis Advisor:

Dick Bishop

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

DTIC FILE COPY

84 03 02 060

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A238562	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Identification of Successful Career Patterns for U.S. Army Adjutant General Corps Officers		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis September 1983
7. AUTHOR(s) John D. Warren and Jerry J. Novosad, Jr.		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE September 1983
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 113
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Adjutant General Corps, Career Model, Career Ladder, Career Development, Army Assignments, Career Planning		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Adjutant General Corps (AGC) of the U.S. Army has, over the recent past, been faced with lower than average promotion rates at the field grade levels. This trend raised many questions during the 1982 World Wide Adjutant General Conference. Questions centered on impact of branch transfer from other corps into the AGC, the importance of combat unit affiliation and training which is not often afforded the accessioned AGC officer and the lack of an identified career path for accessioned AGC to follow which would contribute		

20. ABSTRACT (Cont.)

to the ability of AGC officers to determine appropriate assignments to ensure maximum experience for career progression. This thesis attempts to answer assignment and training questions through the development of a career model based solely on the assignment patterns and acquired training of AGC officers selected or promoted to the rank of Colonel.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

Identification of Successful Career Patterns for U.S. Army
Adjutant General Corps Officers

by

John D. Warren
Captain, United States Army
B.S. B.A., University of Florida, 1972

and

Jerry J. Novosad, Jr.
Captain, United States Army
B.B.A., University of Texas, 1972

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 1983

Authors:

John D. Warren

Jerry J. Novosad, Jr.

Approved by:

William D. Bailey

Thesis Advisor

Richard C. L. Sprague

Second Reader

Richard L. Cates

Chairman, Department of Administrative Sciences

K. T. Marshall

Dean of Information and Policy Sciences

ABSTRACT

The Adjutant General Corps (AGC) of the U.S. Army has, over the recent past, been faced with lower than average promotion rates at the field grade levels. This trend raised many questions during the 1982 World Wide Adjutant General Conference. Questions centered on impact of branch transfer from other corps into the AGC, the importance of combat unit affiliation and training which is not often afforded the accessioned AGC officer and the lack of an identified career path for accessioned AGC to follow which would contribute to the ability of AGC officers to determine appropriate assignments to ensure maximum experience for career progression. This thesis attempts to answer assignment and training questions through the development of a career model based on the assignment patterns and acquired training of AGC officers selected or promoted to the rank of Colonel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	11
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	15
III.	METHODOLOGY	19
	A. BACKGROUND	19
	B. POPULATION	20
	C. SAMPLE	21
	D. DATA COLLECTION	22
	E. IDENTIFICATION OF DATA	22
	F. STATISTICAL METHODS USED IN THE ANALYSIS	23
	G. QUESTIONNAIRE PROCEDURE	24
IV.	ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	25
	A. SOURCE OF COMMISSIONING	25
	B. TYPE OF COMMISSION AT TIME OF ENTRY OF ACTIVE DUTY	26
	C. BRANCH AT TIME OF COMMISSIONING	26
	D. MILITARY TRAINING	28
	1. AGC Training	28
	2. Combat Training	28
	E. CIVILIAN EDUCATION LEVEL	29
	F. MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL	30
	G. ALTERNATE SPECIALTIES OTHER THAN 41 OR 42	33
	H. ASSIGNMENTS TO UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGC ..	34

I. ASSIGNMENTS AS DIVISION ADJUTANT GENERAL OR BATTALION COMMANDER	36
J. ASSIGNMENTS	37
1. Lieutenant Phase	39
a. Type of Assignment	39
b. Level of Assignment	40
c. Combat Affiliation	42
d. Adjutant General Affiliation	43
2. Captain Phase	43
a. Type of Assignment	43
b. Level of Assignment	44
c. Combat Affiliation	46
d. Adjutant General Affiliation	47
3. Rank of Major	48
a. Type of Assignment	48
b. Organization Level of Assignment	49
c. Combat Affiliation	51
d. Adjutant General Affiliation	51
4. Lieutenant Colonel Phase	52
a. Type of Assignment	52
b. Level of Assignment	53
c. Combat Affiliation	54
d. Adjutant General Affiliation	55
5. Company Grade and Field Grade	56
a. Type of Assignment	56
b. Level of Assignment	57

c.	Combat Affiliation	60
d.	Adjutant General Affiliation	61
K.	QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS	61
1.	Questions Concerning The Model	62
a.	Do You Feel the Level of Assignment Indicated for Each Rank is Correct? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	62
b.	Is There an Assignment at a Parti- cular Rank That You Feel is Inappro- priate or Should be Held at Another Rank? Yes/No Explain if Necessary ...	63
c.	Do You Feel the Pattern of Civilian Education is Correct? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	64
d.	Do You Feel the Pattern of Military Training is Correct? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	64
e.	Would You Recommend Any Other Assign- ments at a Particular Rank? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	64
f.	Do You Feel an Official Career Model Would be Beneficial to Junior AFC Officers for Career Planning Purposes? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	65
2.	Questions Concerning the 1982 Adjutant General World-Wide Conference Topics	66
a.	Do You Feel Branch Transfers Fare Better Than Accessed AGC Officers in Competition for Key Career Enhancing AGC Assignment? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	67
b.	Do You Feel Branch Transfers Fare Better Than Accessed AGC Officers in Competition for Promotion? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	67
c.	Do You Feel Combat Arms Affiliation (Assignments and Training) Enhance	

	Assignment and Promotion Selection for Accessed AGC Officers? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	68
d.	Do You Feel That With the Majority of Our Most Successful Officers in the Officer Corps, Having Had Strong Association With Combat Arms Coupled With a Narrow Understanding of the Role of the AGC, Measure Candidates for Promotion Based on Their Own Frame of Reference When They Sit on Promotion Boards and Therefore Reduces Promotion Chances for Accessed AGC Officers? Yes/No Explain if Necessary	69
V.	ADJUTANT GENERAL CAREER MODEL AND DISCUSSION	70
	A. CAREER MODEL	70
	B. DISCUSSION OF THE MODEL	75
	C. DISCUSSION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS	82
VI.	CONCLUSION	84
	APPENDIX A: ASSIGNMENT CODING SCHEME	89
	APPENDIX B: LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR LIEUTENANTS	91
	APPENDIX C: LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR CAPTAIN	93
	APPENDIX D: LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR MAJOR	95
	APPENDIX E: LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL	97
	APPENDIX F: LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE	99
	APPENDIX G: THESIS QUESTIONNAIRE	103
	APPENDIX H: COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE	106
	LIST OF REFERENCES	109
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	110
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	112

LIST OF TABLES

I.	SOURCE OF COMMISSIONING	25
II.	TYPE OF COMMISSION AT TIME OF ENTRY OF ACTIVE DUTY	26
III.	BRANCH AT TIME OF COMMISSIONING	26
IV.	OTHER BRANCHES IN WHICH SERVICE WAS BEGUN	27
V.	CIVILIAN EDUCATION LEVEL	29
VI.	MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL	30
VII.	BRANCH TRANSFER/ACCESSIONED AGC SIMILARITIES	31
VIII.	ALTERNATE SPECIALTIES OTHER THAN 41 OR 42	33
IX.	ASSIGNMENTS TO UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGC	35
X.	RANK AT WHICH OFFICERS ARE ASSIGNED TO UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGC	36
XI.	ASSIGNMENTS AS DIVISION ADJUTANT GENERAL OR BATTALION COMMANDER	37
XII.	LIEUTENANT PHASE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT	39
XIII.	LIEUTENANT PHASE--COMBAT AFFILIATION	42
XIV.	LIEUTENANT PHASE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION ..	43
XV.	CAPTAIN PHASE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT	43
XVI.	CAPTAIN PHASE--COMBAT AFFILIATION	46
XVII.	CAPTAIN PHASE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION	47
XVIII.	RANK OF MAJOR--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT	48
XVIX.	RANK OF MAJOR--COMBAT AFFILIATION	51
XX.	RANK OF MAJOR--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION	51
XXI.	LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHASE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT	52

XXII.	LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHASE--COMBAT AFFILIATION	54
XXIII.	LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHASE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION	55
XXIV.	COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT	56
XXV.	COMPARISON BETWEEN COMPANY GRADE BRANCH TRANSFERS AND AGC OFFICERS	56
XXVI.	COMPARISON BETWEEN FIELD GRADE BRANCH TRANSFERS AND AGC OFFICERS	57
XXVII.	COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE--COMBAT AFFILIATION	60
XXVIII.	COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION	61
XXIX.	SIX QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE MODEL	62
XXX.	RECOMMENDED ADDITIONS TO THE MODEL	65
XXXI.	FOUR QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE 1982 ADJUTANT GENERAL WORLD-WIDE CONFERENCE TOPICS	66
XXXII.	CAREER MODEL	71

I. INTRODUCTION

The Adjutant General Corp. (AGC) of the U.S. Army is responsible for the development and administration of Army policies and programs dealing with personnel and administration. Officers who are accessioned into the Army as AGC officers gain valuable experience and training in the administration of army personnel systems and their impact on the soldier as company grade officers.

Much of this gained expertise is lost to the Army, however, by below Army average selection rates for promotion to Major [Ref. 1]. The gap in the personnel inventory for AGC officers created by these low selection rates is filled by officers who branch transfer into the AGC or are awarded alternate specialties in the AGC field. Often these officers have little previous experience in the field and display little aptitude, proficiency or potential for personnel management or administration. It is perceived, however, that these officers fare better than accessioned AGC officers in competition for key career enhancing AGC assignment and selection for promotion. This seems to be substantiated by the continued lower than Army average selection rate to LTC for AGC officers.

The hypothesis derived from this perception, is that branch transfers and especially officers with alternate

specialties in the AG field have a stronger association with combat oriented skills/training and unit command experience than their accessioned AG counterparts. Additionally, many of the Army's most successful officers, who are eligible to sit on promotion boards, have had strong association with combat arms and therefore measure candidates for promotion based on their own frame of reference (Meta Theory).

Seen as contributing to the failure of AGC officers to successfully compete for promotion is the lack of an identified career pattern for them to follow. Many of the Army's branches have well defined career patterns to follow.¹ Progression through these patterns is congruent with on-time promotion. For example, an Infantry officer will normally perform jobs of platoon leader and company executive officer as a Lieutenant. At the grade of Captain, jobs performed should be battalion staff and commander of a company. At the grade of Major, he should seek the job of battalion executive officer to prepare himself for battalion commander at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. Following and successfully completing this career pattern will normally lead to

¹The Army consists of three arms of service, each divided into specialized branches to support its mission. Combat Arms: Infantry, Artillery, Air Defense Artillery, Armor, Aviation. Combat Support Arms: Chemical, Engineering, Military Intelligence, Military Police, Signal Corps. Combat Service Support Arms: Adjutant General Corps, Finance, Ordinance, Quartermaster, Transportation.

promotion to Colonel. AGC officers do not have such a clearly defined career pattern because of the diversification of AGC assignments.

AGC assignments are spread across many other branches' career patterns and, therefore, it becomes unclear which positions are necessary to give an officer the experience needed to make him qualified and ensure parity with contemporaries in the eyes of the promotion selection boards.

In 1974 when the current Officer Personnel Management System (OPMS) was implemented, the Army attempted to identify career patterns for all branches. As OPMS matured as a system, these initial career patterns proved invalid and have since been rescinded. The Department of the Army recently published DA Pamphlets 600-3-41 and 600-3-42 which list in general terms the assignments necessary for qualification in specialty 41 and 42. The pamphlets, however, fall short of giving an officer a clear cut path to follow for success.

The reason for low selection rates and the resulting impact on the management and administration of Army personnel systems have been widely discussed within the Army. These areas were major topics during the 1982 World Wide Adjutant General Conference held at Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana.

It is the objective of this thesis to investigate these problems and their causes by examining the selection criteria of a successful AGC officer at the rank of Colonel

and the ability for newly accessioned AGC officers to meet those criteria during their career.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining a career model to follow has not been a popular approach in the Army. The idea is too closely tied to "ticket punching." If officers had a career path to follow, an assignment officer would not have a very strong argument to assign officers to jobs which were not on the path. The old phrase of "Do what you do well and this job will not hurt you" just would not make sense. Also, at a specific point in time, certain assignments are not available and that is difficult for an officer to understand who is facing his last chance at being a Chief Personnel Services Division, or Company Commander, for example.

James W. Walker has indicated that executives in civilian industries also feel there are some risks. Some think that career planning raises individual expectations and puts additional strains on personnel systems such as training and assignment practices and policies, and increases employee anxiety about future work in relation to personal interest, abilities and goals. They also fear that career modeling and planning lead to greater employee demand for career development resources [Ref. 2: pp. 2-3].

Career planning can be a benefit, not a hinderance. The key to effective career planning is to develop realistic, not raised, expectations. To do this requires facts to stimulate

and guide training. Officers do not need to be asking, "How can I know what I want to do if I don't know the alternatives?" James W. Walker feels the most common void in the resources needed to support career planning is the lack of information on career opportunities. A career model provides these facts and alternatives. Career planning will result in strengthened employee commitment to their careers and personal development plans [Ref. 2: pp. 5-6].

In a Business Week article in 1980, Marilyn A. Morgan equated career pathing to career planning. What is needed is information available for a decision when one has to be made concerning a career. In its present and simplest form, it involves setting down in a schematic major goals and interim objectives. This will establish bench marks that will let one know whether he is on track [Ref. 3: pp. 223].

Elmer H. Burack and Nicholas Matheys [Ref. 4: pp. 2-8] are also strong advocates of the use of career models or paths. The traditional models are career ladders based on promotion paths important in the past. These ladders tend to parallel authority structure and are developed from analysis of previous promotion patterns. These career ladders provide clear pathways for movement between jobs and are also a workable basis for self-directed activity by individuals to map out their own careers.

James W. Walker states, "Career paths are not new. ...they are objective descriptions of sequential work experiences, as opposed to subjective individual feelings about career progress, personal development, status, or satisfaction." They are needed for the development of senior management talent [Ref. 5: p. 2].

In some companies, career paths are a step by step progression tied to years of service. These are developed by:

1. Examining the paths followed in the past to the top.
2. Identifying entry and exit points into the path.
3. Defining requirements for entry, education, training, specialization, experience, and years of service.
4. Identifying important job experiences which lead to the top.

These models describe a generalized or idealized route for advancement. They should be related to actual work activities, skills, and knowledge requirements [Ref. 5: p. 3]. The example of possible assignments at certain grades in DA Pamphlet 600-3-41 and 600-3-42 are not sufficient. James W. Walker believes that one of the most difficult and least practical approaches to career planning is for individuals to plan their own career progress and seek assignments or jobs as they arise and are needed. Managers review individual plans, select the best qualified when an assignment is made, and counsel the individual when his

career plans are unrealistic or cannot be fulfilled [Ref. 6: p. 69]. With the current emphasis placed on the career development of officers by their commanders, the Army seems to be in line with this method, but a career model is missing for officers to plan their career. Many large firms provide the career paths, but do not allow any employee involvement in selection for assignments [Ref. 7: p. 23]. This is a reflection of some of the fears about career planning discussed earlier.

There is also support for career models in a study conducted for the Army Research Institute. A model counseling system was being developed, part of which was to provide career counseling service for junior officers. Of high interest to the officers surveyed was career patterns for basic branches. As part of the study, a career model for Infantry officers was designed [Ref. 8: pp. 6-7].

III. METHODOLOGY

A. BACKGROUND

The focus of the study is to develop a career model based solely on the assignment patterns of AGC officers who have been selected or promoted to the rank of colonel on or before normal time-in-service/time-in-grade. The development of this model is based on identifying common trends in the areas of:

- type, source and branch of commissioning;
- military and civilian educational level;
- military specialty training;
- initial and alternate specialty combination;
- unit of assignment;
- types of assignment (positions); and
- combat/non-combat unit of assignment affiliation.

From the model, three major issues of concern for the AGC will be addressed.

1. What is the availability of training and positions for accessioned AGC officers in following the proposed career model?

2. What is the impact of officers who transfer from other branches on the advancement for accessioned AGC officers?

3. Validity of the hypothesis concerning the requirement for combat training and/or assignment association for career success.

While performance of an officer in any given assignment is the most critical criterion of success, it is not addressed in this study. The authors feel that the subjectivity of performance ratings rendered and the differences in degree of difficulty of assignments have because of job scope, span of control and environment would make the target of this study too wide. The focus is on assignments and acquired training.

Some individuals may disclaim the validity of using the findings as a model for future AGC officers to follow due to the changing environment in which the military officer operates. The major premise of the authors is that the Army recognizes certain assignments, training and officer backgrounds that better qualify officers for promotion than others. While the environment may change, these areas will continue to be recognized as long as the mission of the Army remains the same.

B. POPULATION

The population selected was AGC colonels who possess a combination of specialty codes 41 (Personnel Programs Management) or 42 (Administrative and Personnel Systems Management).² These specialties are traditionally identified

²As of 1982 specialty code 41 is no longer awarded as an entry specialty for newly commissioned officers.

as primarily AGC specialties and are used to code positions in authorization documents that govern the personnel administration and management of Army personnel and programs.

C. SAMPLE

The initial sample selected consisted of 68 AGC officers who had been selected or promoted to the rank of colonel between the dates of 1 January 1981 to 31 October 1982. This sample contains all the AGC officers selected for promotion to colonel from the last two promotion boards. It is the most current group of AGC colonels available from which a model can be developed. From this sample, 17 officers were eliminated leaving 51 officers who met the criteria of having a specialty combination of 41/42. Of the 17 eliminated, 14 had specialty combinations other than 41/42. The remaining three were female officers who were eliminated due to the recent integration of the Women's Army Corps (WAC) into the AGC and other branches. Their assignment history could not be compared to their male counterparts.³ Additionally, females are not allowed by public law to hold combat arms specialties or serve in combat arms units. Comparison of assignments in these areas is critical to this study and inclusion of female officers would skew the findings.

³Prior to 1979, all female officers were commissioned and assigned to Womens Army Corps.

D. DATA COLLECTION

Information required for this thesis was obtained from four primary sources:

- official records of individual officers;
- current and historical information maintained by the Army; and
- Army regulations and pamphlets.
- Responses from questionnaires sent to the officers in the sample data base.

Secondary data was obtained from published books, articles, and reports.

E. IDENTIFICATION OF DATA

In developing the model, data elements common to all officers throughout their career were considered. The data elements selected are as follows:

- type of commission at time of entry on active duty;
- source of commission;
- highest military and civilian educational level;
- military training;
- military officer specialties; and
- assignments (type, level, association with combat designated units, Ag or Non-AG position).

Additionally, the following information was examined because of interest expressed by the AGC during the 1981 World Wide Adjutant General Conference and Colonel Division, U.S. Army Military Personnel Center, Alexandria, Virginia:

- number of branch transfers;
- specific assignments to the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, the Military Personnel Center, the Adjutant Center, and Ft. Harrison;
- Battalion Command assignments; and
- Adjutant General assignments.

F. STATISTICAL METHODS USED IN THE ANALYSIS

The basic analysis strategy was to utilize descriptive statistics by identifying frequency of occurrence for each item of interest. Frequency distribution then would be used to indicate patterns suggesting a common career path. With the exception of assignment data, all other data were extracted from individual officer record briefs and manually categorized into specific subsets under each item. Due to the complexity and amount of information for assignments, this data was coded from the individual officer record briefs into computer entry format using the coding scheme shown in Appendix A. In some cases, historical information was extracted from DA Form 66 when it was not available on the officer record brief.

Coded information was then analyzed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to compare and develop frequencies. Cross tabulation totals were also programmed to break out information expected to be of interest. The full capability of cross tabulation could not be used due to the use of nominal scale to represent the data.

Two techniques were used to analyze the responses from returned questionnaires. The frequency of yes/no answers was tabulated and content analysis was used to examine the comments added by the officers.

G. QUESTIONNAIRE PROCEDURE

A questionnaire was sent to each officer in the sample data base after the model was developed (Appendix G). The primary purpose was to increase the validity of the model by presenting it to the officers from whose careers it was based upon. Each officer was asked specific questions about the model. The secondary purpose of the questionnaire was to ask the officers questions concerning certain issues raised during the 1982 Adjutant General World-Wide Conference which this thesis also addresses.

The questionnaire was dispatched with a cover letter of explanation (Appendix H) which outlined the purpose of the thesis. The questions were separated on two sheets of paper according to the primary or secondary purpose of the question, each with an introductory paragraph. A self-addressed franked envelope was also provided.

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A. SOURCE OF COMMISSIONING

The following tables of data and pursuant discussions are the results of analysis of the sample data base. Unless otherwise identified, the tables refer to the entire sample.

TABLE I
SOURCE OF COMMISSIONING

Category	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Military Academy	1	2
Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)	47	92
Officer Candidate School (OCS)	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
	51	100

The low percentage of military academy commissions was expected due to past Army policies restricting commissioning of academy graduates into Service Support Branches. The one academy graduate represents a branch transfer from the Infantry.

The high percentage of ROTC commissions was also expected. This was again due to the Army's restriction of academy graduates selecting Combat Service Support Branches. The majority of all officers comes from ROTC.

B. TYPE OF COMMISSION AT TIME OF ENTRY OF ACTIVE DUTY

TABLE II

TYPE OF COMMISSIONS AT TIME OF ENTRY OF ACTIVITY DUTY

Category	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Regular Army (RA)	7	14
United States Army Reserve (USAR)	<u>44</u>	<u>86</u>
	51	100

The large percentage of USAR commissions was due to Army commissioning policies. Only honor graduates of ROTC and OCS are allowed to option to apply for RA commissioning. The majority of the commissions of the sample, 98 percent, were commissioned from ROTC and OCS.

C. BRANCH AT TIME OF COMMISSIONING

TABLE III

BRANCH AT TIME OF COMMISSIONING

Category	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
AGC	26	51
OTHER	<u>25</u>	<u>49</u>
	51	100

This item reveals that almost half of the officers promoted to Colonel began their careers in a branch other than the AGC.

TABLE IV
OTHER BRANCHES IN WHICH SERVICE WAS BEGUN

Category	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Infantry	16	64
Armor	3	12
Air Defense	1	4
Field Artillery	1	4
Engineer Corps	2	8
Military Police	1	4
Medical Service Corps	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
	25	100

Combining the Combat Arm Branches, the first four categories, 84 percent (21 officers) of the branch transfers had extensive combat training and affiliation prior to their transfer.

Accessioned AGC officers not only compete among themselves for training, assignments, and promotion but face significant competition from other branches, especially the combat arms (41 percent of the sample). Based on these percentages, accessioned AGC officers have less opportunity

for advancement due to the number of non-accessioned AGC officers vieing for possible promotion billets.

Considering a total 30 year career, a specific number of officers are accessioned into the AGC so that there will be enough remaining on active duty to fill required billets at the end of the 30-year cycle. The more branch transfers there are, the more competition accessioned AGC officers have for these few billets.

D. MILITARY TRAINING

1. AGC Training

All officers (100 percent) had received AGC related training during their careers. AGC related training includes AGC Basic and/or Advance Courses, and any military courses in the administration and management of personnel.

2. Combat Training

Eighty percent (41 officers) had received combat training during their career. The remaining, 20 percent (10 officers), were accessioned AGC officers. Combat training includes combat arms Basic and/or Advance Courses and combat related training, airborne, ranger, jungle warfare, etc. Looking at only the accessioned AGC officers (Total 26), 62 percent (16 officers) had combat training versus 38 percent (10 officers) that had no combat training.

E. CIVILIAN EDUCATION LEVEL

TABLE V
CIVILIAN EDUCATION LEVEL

Category	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Master Degree	44	86
Graduate Work (At least one year)	1	2
Bachelor Degree	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>
	51	100

This indicates that completion or recognition of graduate work is a benefit towards promotion. This is significant because the Army only provides advanced degree schooling to meet specific Department of the Army requirements. Currently approximately only 8 percent of officer assignments require master degrees and only 11 percent of the officer corp in any given year group is selected to attend graduate school on a fully funded basis. Another 5 percent attend under the partially funded programs available. Of the officers in the sample who obtained their advanced degree after entry on active duty, the majority of officers obtained their degree on their personal time.

Looking at the difference between branch transfer and accessioned AGC officers it was found that 80 percent (20) of

the branch transfers versus 93 percent (24) of the accessioned AGC officers had master degrees. The one officer with one year graduate work was an accessioned AGC officer. A further review of the assignment and training history of the 6 officers with only bachelor degrees revealed that all had combat related training with three of the branch transfer officers and the one accessioned AGC officers having assignments as Adjutant General at Division Level. This indicates that this type training and assignment may improve chances to promotion in lieu of a master degree. In regards to the branch transfer, their assignment to combat units early in their careers requires more time in field training and exercises which leaves less time for attaining a masters degree on their own time. This may be a reason for lack of a graduate degree and be a consideration in selection for promotion.

F. MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL

TABLE VI
MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL

Category	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Senior Service College (SSC)	27	53
Deferred SSC	4	10
SSC Correspondence	2	4
Command and General Staff College	<u>17</u>	<u>13</u>
	51	100

Selection for SSC is extremely competitive and attainment is considered a milestone for promotion to general rank. By combining the first three categories, 67 percent (33) attained or will attain SSC at the time of writing this study.

Officers are not usually selected for SSC until they have been selected for promotion to Colonel. Selection is therefore not significant for advancement to Colonel. Because of its importance in the career of officers, it is of interest to compare the branch transfers to accessioned AGC officers and similarities in assignments and training prior to selection.

TABLE VII
BRANCH TRANSFER/ACCESSIONED AGC SIMILARITIES

Category	Branch Transfer		Accessioned AGC	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
SSC	14	56	14	54
Deferred SSC	2	8	2	8
SSC Correspondence	2	8	0	0
CGC	<u>7</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>38</u>
	25	100	26	100

By combining the first three categories 72 percent (18) of the branch transfer versus 62 percent (16) of the

accessioned AGC officers attained or will attain SSC. Selection is almost evenly distributed among the officers.

Because of the large number of branch transfers with combat training, it is of interest to determine the influence of combat training acquired by accessioned AGC officers.

Of the 16 accessioned AGC officers selected for SSC, 63 percent (10) had received combat related training. This reveals that almost twice as many officers selected had received combat training.

Further analysis of assignment history reveals that 94 percent (15) of accessioned AGC officers selected for SSC had previous assignments as Division Adjutant Generals. The remaining officers had performed duties as Battalion Commanders for which selection is highly competitive. Comparing these findings to branch transfers, we see that 89 percent (16) branch transfers selected for SSC had previous assignments as Division Adjutant General. The remaining 2 officers had performed duties as Battalion Commanders.

The combined findings indicate that 100 percent (34) of the officers selected for SSC had either assignments as Division Adjutant General or Battalion Commander.

Also of interest is that 100 percent of the accessioned AGC officers had completed their master's degree prior to selection to SSC. Eighty-eight percent (16) of the branch transfers had completed their master's degree prior to

selection. The two remaining branch transfers obtained their master's degree under the partially funded, Cooperative Degree Program while assigned to SSC.

G. ALTERNATE SPECIALTIES OTHER THAN 41 OR 42

While officers with specialty combinations other than 41 or 42 were eliminated from the study, their selection of alternate specialty was investigated.

TABLE VIII
ALTERNATE SPECIALTIES OTHER THAN 41 OR 42

Initial Specialty	Alternate Specialty	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
41	43 ¹	1	20.0
	53 ²	<u>4</u>	<u>80.0</u>
		5	100.0
42	43	3	37.5
	46 ³	1	12.5
	53	<u>4</u>	<u>50.0</u>
		8	100.0

¹Specialty Code 43: Army Club Management

²Specialty Code 46: Public Affairs

³Specialty Code 53: Automated Data Processing Officer

By combining the sample (51 officers) with officers having alternate specialties other than 41 or 42 (13) we see that of the male officers promoted to Colonel, 80 percent had

specialty combination 41/42 versus 20 percent with other than 41 or 42. This is in line with Department of Army projections that 80 percent of all AGC officers have 41 or 42 specialty combinations to meet present and future needs [Ref. 9].

Of interest is the limited number of alternate specialties represented. Currently AGC officers are eligible for 27 alternate specialties. Only those specialties designated as combat arms are restricted from selection by AGC officers. Alternate specialties are awarded no later than the eighth year of service based on background, education, potential, and the needs of the Army. While inconclusive, findings indicate that specialties 43, 46 or 53 should be seriously considered by those officers desiring alternate specialties in other than 41 or 42.

H. ASSIGNMENTS TO UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGC

Units identified below are recognized as units whose primary missions are the administration and management of Army personnel. Due to the level of these assignments and the potential for beneficial experience in the AGC field, assignments to one or more of these units is considered by AGC officers as career enhancing.

- Deputy Chief of Staff Personnel (DCSPER), Pentagon, Washington, D. C.
- Military Personnel Center (MILPERCEN), 200 Stovall St., Alexandria, VA.

- Soldier Support Center (SSCT), Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN.
- The Adjutant General's Office, Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA.

TABLE IX
ASSIGNMENTS TO UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGC

Category	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)		
	All Officers	Branch Transfers	Accessioned AGC
Only one assignment (any unit)	17/ 33	9/ 36	8/ 31
Multiple assignments (one or more units)	31/ 61	14/ 56	17/ 65
No Assignments	<u>3/ 6</u>	<u>2/ 8</u>	<u>1/ 4</u>
	51/100	25/100	26/100

Combining the first two categories we see that 94 percent (48 officers) had at least one tour during their career and 61 percent (31 officers) had multiple assignments.

Indications are that assignment to these units, especially DCSPER and MILPERCEN may enhance promotion eligibility. Additionally, because of the mission of these units, which provides AGC officers with invaluable experience, and the high visibility these units have with the Army at large, it may indicate that a large number of AGC

officers actively seek these units for assignment due to the perception of promotion enhancement.

Further analysis to determine at what rank officers were assigned to these units revealed the following:

TABLE X
RANK AT WHICH OFFICERS ARE ASSIGNED TO UNITS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGC

Category	Absolute Frequency			
	LT	CPT	MAJ	LTC
DSCPER	0	3	20	17
MILPERCEN	0	0	14	14
SST	0	5	4	5
TAG	0	2	7	5

This data reveals that the majority of assignments to these units occurred during the rank of major and lieutenant colonel. This supports the indication that at the ranks of lieutenant and captain, officers should not seek assignments at these levels but remain at the company level.

I. ASSIGNMENTS AS DIVISION ADJUTANT GENERAL OR BATTALION COMMANDER

Assignment as Division Adjutant General Battalions or equivalent commands are perceived by the AGC as career enhancing assignments and a prerequisite for promotion to Colonel.

TABLE XI
ASSIGNMENTS AS DIVISION ADJUTANT GENERAL
OR BATTALION COMMANDER

Category	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Div AG	31/ 60.7	11/ 48	19/ 73.0
BN CDR	3/ 5.8	1/ 4	2/ 7.6
Both	10/ 19.6	5/ 20	5/ 19.2
None	<u>7/ 13.7</u>	<u>7/ 28</u>	<u>0/ 0.0</u>
	51/100.0	25/100	26/100.0

By combining the first three categories we see that 86.3 percent (44 officers) had either assignments as Division Adjutant Generals or Battalion Commanders with the majority assigned as Division Adjutant General. Of interest is that 100 percent of the accessioned AGC officers had this type of assignment indicating these assignments as possibly contributing to their promotion potential. Additionally, the branch transfers who were promoted may indicate that their combat affiliation and training may have kept them competitive for promotion in lieu of these assignments.

J. ASSIGNMENTS

Assignments were identified at each rank of an officer's career. Additionally, assignments were broken down into four categories, each with specific subcategories. The first

category was Type of Assignment. This describes the relationship of the officers to the number of subordinates under his control and the type of job he held. These were determined by identifying changes in job titles and specialty designation. Numbers presented do not represent number of officers but different jobs. Subcategories are:

- With Troops: Describes positions associated with combat troops. This subcategory was necessary because of the large number of branch transfers.
- Staff: Describes general and special staff as well as Headquarters staff positions. Examples are, Adjutant General, Secretary of the General Staff.
- Staff with Troops: Describes personnel management and administrative positions requiring coordination of a number of subordinates. Examples are Chiefs of Personnel Actions, Management, Records, Administrative Services, Promotion Branches.
- Special: Describes position requiring special training and spans all officer's military specialties. Examples are instructors, attaches, protocol officers, organizational effectiveness, race relations.
- Commander: Commander of a detachment, company regional personnel center, personnel service company, or battalion.

The second category was Level of Assignment. This describes the type of unit to which the officer was assigned to. Level of Assignment was broken into 15 subcategories which are identified at Appendix A.

The third category was Combat Affiliation. This described whether or not the officer's unit of assignment was combat oriented. An example would be 21st Infantry Division. Combat affiliation was determined by unit designation and

associated with each types of assignment an officer had. Numbers presented do not reflect number of officers but total numbers of types of assignment with combat or non-combat units.

The fourth category was Adjutant General Affiliation. This described whether or not the officer was performing duties associated with administration and management of personnel. Adjutant General Affiliation was determined by duty billet and specialty.

1. Lieutenant Phase

a. Type of Assignment

TABLE XII
LIEUTENANT PHASE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
With Troops	64/ 31.2	50/ 47.7	14/ 14.3
Staff	62/ 30.2	25/ 23.4	37/ 37.8
Staff With Troops	53/ 25.9	13/ 12.1	40/ 40.8
Special	4/ 2.0	2/ 1.9	2/ 2.0
Command	<u>22/ 10.7</u>	<u>17/ 15.9</u>	<u>5/ 5.1</u>
	205/100.0	107/100.0	98/100.0

The total number of type of assignments, 205, indicates that at the lieutenant phase each officer had on the average 4 (205/51) changes in the type of assignments.

Looking at the total sample, types of assignments were almost evenly distributed over the first three subcategories representing 87.3 percent (179) of the total.

Comparing branch transfers to accessioned AGC officer, a shift from "with troops" to "staff" and "staff with troops" is indicated. This is explained by the initial assignment of officers in their entry specialties. Branch transfers are utilized at combat unit level while AGC are utilized in support units identified as staff level. The accessioned AGC officers with subcategory "with troops" were those officers who had received Regular Army commissions at time of entry on active duty and were branched detailed to combat arms for a period of one year prior to performing duties as an AGC officer.

The difference between subcategory "command" is explained by the limited number of command opportunities for AGC officers in relation to combat arms at this grade.

It is also worth noting the low utilization of officers in the subcategory "special". Those officers who had performed duties in this category also had performed duties in at least one of the other categories.

b. Level of Assignment

For clarity of presentation, only those levels of assignments that have a relative frequency of 10 percent or

higher at each subcategory are presented below. An analysis of all levels is presented at Appendix B.

The total number of levels of assignments, 166, indicates at the lieutenant phase each officer had, on the average, three changes (166/51) in the unit of assignment.

Of the total number of level of assignments, 50 percent (83) were at company level, 11.4 percent (19) were at division level and 11.4 percent (19) were at post headquarters. Seventy-two and nine-tenths percent (121) of all levels of assignment were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with battalion at 7.8 percent the next highest.

The breakout by branch transfers at different levels (95) reveals that 66.3 percent (63) were at company level and 12.6 percent (12) were at division. Seventy-eight and nine-tenths percent (75) of all levels of assignment for branch transfers were at these levels. The rest were below the 10 percent relative frequency with battalion at 6 percent, the next highest.

The breakout by accessioned AGC officers at different levels of assignment (71) reveals that 28.2 percent (20) were at company level, 22.5 percent (16) were at post headquarters, and 9.9 percent (rounded to 10 percent) (7) at both battalion and division. Seventy and four-tenths percent (50) of all levels of assignment for AGC officers were at

these levels. The rest were below the 10 percent relative frequency with overseas headquarters at 7.0 percent the next highest.

The breakout by level of assignments presented above for both branch transfers and accessioned AGC officers is explained due to the majority of available positions at company level for lieutenants.

By examining the spread of assignments among the other levels, presented at Appendix B, it is indicated that at the lieutenant phase, assignment performance should be concentrated at the levels of company, post headquarters, battalion and division.

c. Combat Affiliation

TABLE XIII
LIEUTENANT PHASE--COMBAT AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Combat Affiliated	121/ 58.5	81/ 75.7	40/ 40.8
Non-Combat Affiliated	<u>84/ 41.5</u>	<u>26/ 24.3</u>	<u>58/ 59.2</u>
	205/100.0	107/100.0	98/100.0

Distribution of totals may be explained by the influence of branch transfers and branch details of accessioned AGC officers.

d. Adjutant General Affiliation

TABLE XIV

LIEUTENANT PHASE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Adjutant General	99/ 48.3	30/ 28	69/ 70.4
Other	<u>106/ 41.7</u>	<u>77/ 72</u>	<u>29/ 29.6</u>
	207/100.0	107/100	98/100.0

The Distribution of these totals is explained by the influence of branch transfers. Of interest, however, is the narrow difference between the two. The indication is that after initial assignments of branch transfers in combat specialties many branch transfer officers were placed in Adjutant Corp related positions.

2. Captain Phase

a. Type of Assignment

TABLE XV

CAPTAIN PHASE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
With Troops	1/ .5	1/ 1	0/ 0
Staff	94/ 45.9	58/ 58	36/ 34.3
Staff With Troops	90/ 43.9	28/ 28	62/ 59.0
Special	6/ 2.9	3/ 3	3/ 2.9
Command	<u>14/ 6.8</u>	<u>10/ 10</u>	<u>4/ 3.8</u>
	205/100.0	100/100	105/100.0

The total number of 205 indicates that at the captain phase each officer had, on the average, 4 (205/51) changes in the type of assignments.

A shift from "with troops" to "staff" and "staff with troop" for branch transfers indicates movement of these officers into jobs such as Division Personnel or Supply or Logistics Officers, Corps and Headquarters Staff position, and Executive Officers.

Accessioned Adjutant Corp officers continue to have a large percentage of officers filling staff with troop positions. These positions are recognized as requiring a degree of managerial skills for coordination of activities and personnel. As in the lieutenant phase, utilization of officers in subcategory "special" is low.

b. Level of Assignment

For clarity of presentation only those levels of assignment that have a relative frequency of 10 percent or higher at each subcategory are presented below. An analysis of all levels is presented at Appendix C.

The total number of level of assignment, 168, indicates at the captain phase each officer had, on the average, 3 (168/51) units of assignment.

Of the total number of Level of Assignments, 16.7 percent (28) were at the company level, 14.3 percent (24) were at division level, 13.1 percent (22) at overseas

headquarters, and 10.7 percent (18) at brigade, and 10.1 percent (17) at post headquarters. Sixty-four and eight-tenths percent (107) of all Level of Assignments were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with schools (Training Centers) at 8.9 percent (15).

The breakout by branch transfers at different levels (84) reveals that 19 percent (16) were at company level, 14.3 percent (12) at both brigade and overseas headquarters level, 13.1 percent (11) at post headquarters, and 10.7 percent (9) at division level. Seventy-one percent (60) of all levels of assignments for branch transfers were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with schools (Training Center) at 8 percent, the next highest.

The breakout by accessioned AGC officers at different levels (84) reveals that 17.9 percent (15) were at division level, 14.3 percent (12) were at company level, 11.9 percent (10) at Headquarters Department of the Army, and 16.9 percent (10) at overseas headquarters. Fifty-five and nine-tenths percent (47) of all levels of assignment for accessioned AGC officers were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with schools (Training Center) at 9.5 percent, the next highest.

While company level assignments continue to be the predominant level of assignment we see a shift to more

brigade and overseas headquarter level assignments. Since the vast majority of these assignments are "staff" and "staff with troops" it coincides with the finding of the category type of assignment. Also officers are beginning to be assigned to Headquarter Department of the Army level.

c. Combat Affiliation

TABLE XVI
CAPTAIN PHASE--COMBAT AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Combat Affiliated	74/ 36.1	37/ 37	37/ 35.2
Noncombat Affiliated	<u>131/ 63.9</u>	<u>63/ 63</u>	<u>68/ 64.8</u>
	205/100.0	100/100	105/100.0

Breakout by total indicates a major shift from combat affiliation to noncombat affiliated units. Analysis of branch transfers and accessioned AGC officers shows the shift comes from the branch transfers with accessioned AGC officers changing only slightly over the lieutenant phase. This may indicate a move by branch transfers into those units that will prepare them for careers as Adjutant General officers.

d. Adjutant General Affiliation

TABLE XVII
CAPTAIN PHASE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Adjutant General	173/ 84.4	77/ 77	96/ 91.4
Other	<u>32/ 15.6</u>	<u>23/ 23</u>	<u>9/ 8.6</u>
	205/100.0	100/100	109/100.0

Here we see that branch transfers are moving into Adjutant General positions. The increase for accessioned AGC officers can be explained by the return of branch detailed officers back to the Adjutant General Corp.

The major shift of branch transfers into Adjutant General indicates that they have begun to receive Adjutant General Corp training and experience at a relatively early time in their careers. This would dispel the hypotheses expressed during the Adjutant General Corp World-Wide Conference that branch transfers lacked training and experience in the Adjutant General field.

3. Rank of Major

a. Type of Assignment

TABLE XVIII
RANK OF MAJOR--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Staff	145/ 50.7	75/ 52.7	70/ 49.3
Staff with Troops	115/ 40.2	54/ 37.5	61/ 43.0
Special	10/ 3.5	5/ 3.5	5/ 3.5
Command	<u>16/ 5.6</u>	<u>10/ 6.9</u>	<u>6/ 4.2</u>
	286/100.0	144/100.0	142/100.0

The total number of 286 assignments indicates that at the rank of Major each officer had, on the average, 5.6 (286/51) changes in the type of assignment. The absence of "with troop" assignments indicates the majority of officers had branch transferred into the AGC by the end of the rank of Major phase.

The comparison of branch transfer and accessioned AGC officers indicates equality of assignment for all subcategories with the exception of Command. With all the majority of branch transfer officers now transferred into the Adjutant General Corp, the number of command billets available are equal for all officers but indications are that

branch transfers have a slightly better chance for those positions.

b. Organization Level of Assignment

For clarity of presentation only those levels of assignment that have a relative frequency of 10 percent or higher at each subcategory are presented below. An analysis of all levels is presented as Appendix D.

The total number of Level Assignments, 230, indicates at the rank of Major each officer had an average of 4.5 (230/51) units of assignments.

Of the total number of Level Assignments, 26.5 percent (61) were assigned to Headquarters Department of the Army, 13 percent (30) were assigned to Division, 12.6 percent (29) were assigned to Overseas Headquarters, and 10.4 percent (24) were assigned to Schools (Training Centers). Sixty-two percent (144) of all levels of assignment were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Company at 8.3 percent (19), the next highest.

The breakout by branch transfers at different levels (118) reveals 23 percent (27) were assigned to Headquarters Department of the Army, 16.1 percent (19) were assigned to Overseas Headquarters, 13.6 percent (16) were assigned to Schools (Training Center). Eleven percent (13) were assigned to Company, and 10.2 percent to Division.

Seventy-four percent (87) of all levels of assignment were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Major Command at 8.5 percent, the next highest.

The breakout by accessioned AGC officers at different levels reveals that 30.4 percent (34) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, 16.1 percent (18) were at Division, and 10.7 percent (12) were at Post Headquarters. Fifty-seven and one-tenth percent (64) of all levels of assignment for accessioned AGC officers were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Overseas Headquarters at 8.9 percent, the next highest.

At this phase, we see a shift to Headquarters Department of the Army level assignments. While at these levels, there is a concentration of Major assignments for specialty codes 41 or 42, increasing the opportunity for assignments, the Adjutant General Corps officer is now competing against all other branches whose officers have chosen specialty 41 or 42 as their alternate specialty.

c. Combat Affiliation

TABLE XVIX

RANK OF MAJOR--COMBAT AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Combat Affiliated	44/ 15.4	25/ 17.4	19/ 13.4
Noncombat			
Affiliated	<u>242/ 84.6</u>	<u>119/ 82.6</u>	<u>123/ 86.6</u>
	297/100.0	144/100.0	142/100.0

Combat affiliation continues to decline which coincides with moves into higher level units. Comparison between branch transfers and accessioned AGC officers show that they are relatively equal in their distribution between the two subcategories.

d. Adjutant General Affiliation

TABLE XX

RANK OF MAJOR--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Adjutant General	257/ 89.9	126/ 87.5	131/ 92.3
Other	<u>29/ 10.1</u>	<u>18/ 12.5</u>	<u>11/ 7.7</u>
	286/100.0	144/100.0	142/100.0

The positions not identified with the Adjutant General Corp at this rank were of the type Professor Military Sciences, Instructors and General's Aides.

4. Lieutenant Colonel Phase

a. Type of Assignment

TABLE XXI

LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHASE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Staff	125/ 59.8	55/ 58.5	70/ 60.9
Staff with Troop	67/ 32.1	22/ 34.0	35/ 30.4
Special	3/ 1.4	1/ 1.1	2/ 1.7
Command	<u>14/ 6.7</u>	<u>6/ 6.4</u>	<u>8/ 7.0</u>
	209/100.0	94/100.0	115/100.0

The total number of 209 indicates that at the Lieutenant Colonel Phase each officer, on the average, had 4 (209/51) changes in the type of assignment.

As with the rank of Major phase, "staff" "staff with troops" continues to be the most prominent types with a shift to more staff type assignments. "Special" types of assignments continues to be low and in fact at its lowest percentage for all phases.

Of interest is the shift to accessioned AGC officers having a high number of command billets. Command at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel for AGC officers is of units that encompass all aspects of the AGC field. Higher selection rates may indicate that accessioned AGC officers are considered to have a better indoctrination in specialty areas within the AGC.

b. Level of Assignment

For clarity of presentation only those levels of assignment that have a relative frequency 10 percent or higher at each subcategory are presented below. An analysis of all levels is presented at Appendix E.

The total number of Levels of Assignment, 172, indicates at the Lieutenant Colonel Phase each officer had on the average 3.4 (172/51) changes in the units of assignments.

Of the total number of Level of Assignments, 26.2 percent (45) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, and 24.4 percent (42) were at Division, and 9.9 percent (rounded to 10) (17) at Major Command. Sixty and four-tenths percent (104) of all levels of assignment were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Overseas Headquarters at 9.3 percent (16), the next highest.

The breakout by branch transfers at different Levels of Assignment (83) reveals that 32.5 percent (27) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, 24.1 percent (20) were at Division, and 10.8 percent (9) were at Overseas Headquarters. Sixty-seven and four-tenths percent (56) of all Levels of Assignments were at these levels. The rest were below the 10 percent relative frequency with Battalion at 8.4 percent, the next highest.

The breakout by accessioned AGC officers at different Levels of Assignment (89) reveals that 24.7 percent (22) were at Division, 20.2 percent (18) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, and 11.2 percent (10) were at Major Commands. Fifty-six and on-tenth percent (50) of all Levels of Assignment were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Overseas Headquarters at 7.9 percent, the next highest.

c. Combat Affiliation

TABLE XXII
LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHASE--COMBAT AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Combat	46/ 22	20/ 21.3	27/ 23.5
Noncombat	<u>168/ 78</u>	<u>74/ 78.7</u>	<u>88/ 76.5</u>
	209/100	94/100.0	115/100.0

Combat affiliation increased during this phase over the Major Phase from 15.4 percent to 24 percent overall with AGC officers increasing 10 percent. This is directly attributable to the number of officers performing duties as Division Adjutant General.

d. Adjutant General Affiliation

TABLE XXIII

LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHASE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)		
	Total	Branch Transfer	Accessioned AG
Adjutant General	201/ 96.2	93/ 98.9	108/ 93.9
Other	<u>8/ 3.8</u>	<u>1/ 1.1</u>	<u>7/ 6.1</u>
	209/100.0	94/100.0	115/100.0

This indicates that at this phase, officers rarely are assigned outside of their primary AGC specialties. All officers who had performed duties outside their primary specialty had assignments as Adjutant Generals or Battalion Commanders or both.

5. Company Grade and Field Grade Phases

a. Type of Assignment

TABLE XXIV

COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE--TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)	
	Company Grade	Field Grade
With Troops	65/ 15.9	0/ 0
Staff	156/ 38.0	270/ 54.5
Staff with Troops	143/ 34.9	182/ 36.8
Special	10/ 2.4	13/ 2.6
Command	36/ 8.8	30/ 6.1
	410/100.0	495/100.0

During the Company Grade Phase each officer had, on the average, 10 (495/51) and during the Field Grade Phase each officer had, on the average, 8 (410/51) changes in the type of assignment.

Comparison between company grade branch transfer and AGC officers reveals the following.

TABLE XXV

COMPARISON BETWEEN COMPANY GRADE BRANCH TRANSFERS AND AGC OFFICERS

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)	
	Branch Transfer	AGC
With Troops	51/ 24.6	14/ 6.9
Staff	83/ 40.1	73/ 36.0
Staff with Troops	41/ 19.8	102/ 50.2
Special	5/ 2.4	5/ 2.5
Command	27/ 13.0	9/ 4.4
	207/100.0	203/100.0

Of interest is the equality of assignments involving the managing of people for branch transfers and AGC officers. By combining subcategories "with troops", "staff with troops" and "command", we see that 57.5 percent of branch transfers and 61.5 percent of AGC officers had these assignments.

Comparison between Field Grade branch transfers and AGC officers reveals the following.

TABLE XXVI
COMPARISON BETWEEN FIELD GRADE BRANCH TRANSFERS
AND AGC OFFICERS

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency(PCT)	
	Branch Transfer	AGC
With Troops	0/ 0	0/ 0
Staff	130/ 54.6	140/ 54.5
Staff With Troops	86/ 36.1	96/ 37.4
Special	6/ 2.5	7/ 2.7
Command	16/ 6.7	14/ 5.4
	238/100.0	257/100.0

This indicates that for the subcategories presented, there is equality for assignments between branch transfers and AGC officers.

b. Level of Assignments

For clarity of presentation only those levels of assignment that have a relative frequency of 10 percent or

higher at each subcategory are presented below. An analysis of all levels is presented at Appendix F.

The total number of Level of Assignments, 334, indicates at the Company Grade Phase each officer had, on the average, 6.5 (334/51) changes in the units of assignment. The total number of Level of Assignments, 402, indicates at the Field Grade Level each officer had, on the average, 8 (402/51) changes in the units of assignment.

At the Company Grade Level of the total number of Level of Assignments (334), 33.2 percent (111) were at Company Level, 12.9 percent (43) were at Division Level, and 10.8 percent (36) were at Post Headquarters. Fifty-six and nine-tenths percent (190) of all levels of assignments were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Overseas Headquarters at 9.0 (30), the next highest.

The breakout by Company Grade Branch Transfers at different levels of assignments (179) reveals that 44.1 percent (79) were at Company Level and 11.7 percent (21) were at Division. Fifty-five and eight-tenths percent of all Levels of Assignments were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Brigade at 8.9 percent (16) and Overseas Headquarters at 8.4 percent (15), the next highest.

The breakout by Company Grade AGC officers at different levels of assignment (155) reveals that 20.6 percent (32) were at Company level, 14.2 percent (22) were at Division and Post Headquarters. Forty-nine percent (76) of all levels of assignments were at these levels. The rest were below the 10 percent relative frequency with Overseas Headquarters at 9.7 percent, the next highest.

This indicates that at the Company Grade Level both branch transfers and AGC officers had concentrated their assignments at the following levels, Company, Division, Post Headquarters, and Overseas Headquarters.

At the Field Grade Level of the total number of Level of Assignments (402), 26.4 percent (106) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, 17.9 percent (72) were at Division, and 11.2 percent (45) were at Overseas Headquarters. Fifty-five and five-tenths percent (223) of level of all assignments were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Schools at 9.0 percent (36), the next highest.

The breakout by Field Grade branch transfers at different levels of assignments (201) reveals that 26.9 percent (54) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, 15.9 percent (32) were at Division, 13.9 percent (28) were at Overseas Headquarters and 10.9 percent (22) were at Schools. Sixty-seven and six-tenths percent (136) of all assignments

were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Major Commands at 8.5 percent (17), the next highest.

The breakout by Field Grade AGC officers at different levels of assignment (201) reveals that 25.9 percent (52) were at Headquarters Department of the Army, and 19.9 percent (40) were at Division. Forty-five and eight-tenths percent (92) of all assignments were at these levels. The rest were below 10 percent relative frequency with Post Headquarters at 9.0 percent (18) and Major Command at Overseas Headquarters at 8.5 percent (17), the next highest.

This indicates that the Field Grade Level that both branch transfers and AGC officers had concentrated their assignments at Headquarters Department of the Army and Division levels of assignment.

c. Combat Affiliation

TABLE XXVII
COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE--COMBAT AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)	
	Company Grade	Field Grade
Combat	95/ 47.6	90/ 18.2
Noncombat	<u>215/ 52.4</u>	<u>405/ 81.8</u>
	410/100.0	495/100.0

Company Grade combat affiliation is influenced by the large number of branch transfers. Field Grade combat affiliation represents officers performing duties in special type assignments and assignments as Division Adjutants.

d. Adjutant General Affiliation

TABLE XXVIII
COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE--ADJUTANT GENERAL AFFILIATION

Subcategory	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PCT)	
	Company Grade	Field Grade
Adjutant General	272/ 66.3	458/ 92.5
Other	<u>138/ 33.7</u>	<u>37/ 7.5</u>
	410/100.0	495/100.0

This indicates that at the Field Grade Phase, officers concentrate their assignments within the AGC arena to ensure competency and remain competitive with contemporaries.

K. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Each officer in the sample data base was sent a questionnaire. Of these, 23 (45.1%) replies were received and 8 were returned "addressee unknown". The results by question are tabulated below.

1. Questions Concerning The Model

TABLE XXIX
SIX QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE MODEL

Question Number	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PLT)		
	Yes	No	Other
1	14/60.9	9/39.1	0/0
2	6/20.1	16/69.6	1/4.3
3	18/78.3	5/21.7	0/0
4	19/82.6	4/17.4	0/0
5	16/69.6	6/26.1	1/4.3
6	18/78.3	5/21.7	0/0

Analysis by question follows.

- a. Do You Feel the Level of Assignment Indicated For Each Rank is Correct? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

Sixty and nine-tenths percent (14) agreed with the model. Conflict with the model took three general forms. There was only one direct disagreement with the model. One respondent did not recommend Headquarter Department of the Army staff for the rank of Captain. Others who replied "no", included assignments which were of two categories. One was the addition of assignments at levels which did not meet the frequency criteria of 10 percent necessary to be identified as a significant assignment and included in the model. A single recommendation was made to add Joint Command Staff,

Post Adjutant Lieutenant Colonel, General and battalion command. The other category included assignments which, during the point and time in the data bases' officers' careers, were usually held by officers in other branches, and now are considered AGC type jobs. Battalion level S-1 was recommended by three respondents at this level and assignments for lieutenants.

- b. Is There an Assignment at a Particular Rank that You Feel is Inappropriate or Should be Held at Another Rank? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

Of the 6 (30.4%) respondents who replied "yes" to this question, only 3 listed a particular assignment they felt was inappropriate for a rank. Three respondents recommended that majors, not captains, serve as RPC commanders. One respondent recommended that all lieutenants serve in combat arms assignments to gain the experience and training so they can understand better the type of duty the majority of the Army has as a way of life. Another respondent recommended more troop type assignments for majors (the writers assume this means RPC command, and battalion staff type assignments). The respondent who disagreed with captains serving on Headquarters Department of the Army Staff made the same recommendation for this question. One respondent did not answer this question. The remaining 16, 69.6%, did not feel there was an inappropriate assignment for a particular rank in the model.

- c. Do You Feel the Pattern of Civilian Education is Correct? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

Seventy-eight and three-tenths percent (18) of the respondents agreed with the pattern of civilian education in the model. Of the 5 who disagreed, one felt a bachelor degree should be completed before reaching captain. Two respondents recommended graduate degree completion prior to being promoted to lieutenant colonel, and a fourth felt there was no need for a graduate degree. One respondent did not include a recommendation with his answer.

- d. Do You Feel the Pattern of Military Training is Correct? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

The pattern of military training was also supported with only 4 respondents disagreeing with the model. Three respondents recommended that all AGC lieutenants attend combat arms basic careers. This is a reflection of some of the strong feelings by a few of the respondents for combat arms training, experience, and affiliation for all AGC officers. One respondent did not see a need for ranger or airborne school which supports the other side of the combat arms affiliation issue. This will be discussed further in the next section.

- e. Would You Recommend Any Other Assignments at a Particular Rank? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

There is some duplication in the answers to this question and the second question. More than half of the respondents, 69.6% (16), recommended adding some assignments

at various grades. The recommendations are quite numerous and can best be displayed in a tabular form.

TABLE XXX
RECOMMENDED ADDITIONS TO THE MODEL

No. of Officers Making the Recommendation	Assignment	Recommended Rank to Hold the Assignment
3	Battalion S-1	LT and CPT
2	Company Command	LT
1	Chief, SIDERS Inter- face Branch	LT
3	Morale Support Assign- ments	LT and CPT
	Directorate of Personnel and Community Activities	2 for LT and CPT 1 for Major, 2 for LTC
1	District Recruiting Command	Maj. and LTC
3	PSC/RPC Command	Major
3	Secretary of General Staff	1 CPT, 2 Maj
3	Battalion Command	LTC
2	ROTC Instructor	CPT
1	Officer Assignment, G-1	LT and CPT
1	Aide de Camp	LT
2	Reserve Components Duty	CPT
1	General Officer Manage- ment Office	LTC
2	Battalion Staff	Maj.
1	Reception Station Command	CPT

- f. Do You Feel an Official Career Model Would be Beneficial to Junior AGC Officers for Career Planning Purposes? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

Seventy-eight and three-tenths percent of the respondents (18) support the need for a career model. The 5

respondents who did not agree with the idea each had a different reason. One felt it was best to have two unrelated specialties, not 41 and 42 together. He stated this would make it impossible to develop a model. Another stated that all jobs should be considered important, not just the ones on a model. He also emphasized the importance of a good performance in every assignment. A third officer felt this would create an environment for "ticket punching". The fourth respondent was concerned that the model would cause frustration for officers who received assignments which were not on the model. The last respondent who disagreed with the concept stated that it would complicate the job of assignment officers because everyone would only want assignments on the model. These last two support data provided earlier in the Literature Review section [Ref. 2].

2. Questions Concerning the 1982 Adjutant General World-Wide Conference Topics

TABLE XXXI

FOUR QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE 1982 ADJUTANT GENERAL WORLD-WIDE CONFERENCE TOPICS

Question Number	Absolute Frequency/Relative Frequency (PLT)		
	Yes	No	Other
1	7/30.4	13/56.5	3/13.1
2	5/21.7	16/69.6	2/ 8.7
3	19/82.6	2/ 8.7	2/ 8.7
4	7/30.4	14/60.9	2/ 8.7

Analysis by question follows.

- a. Do You Feel Branch Transfers Fare Better Than Accessed AGC Officers in Competition for Key Career Enhancing AGC Assignment? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

A majority of the respondents, 56.5% (13) did not feel branch transfers fared better than accessioned AGC officers for assignments. This does not support the Conference's report. Those who did feel branch transfers get the best assignments, in all but one case, did so for the same reason. That is, branch transfers have a broader range of experience and can better appreciate the type of duty the soldiers they are servicing are performing. This will help them make better personnel service support type decisions. The one differing respondent felt branch transfers had a better chance to be selected for command. Of the three respondents who did not provide a "yes" or "no" answer, one felt it depended on the overall experience of the officer, another felt it depended on how late in an officer's career the transfer occurred (the later the less likely) and the third respondent stated he did not know.

- b. Do You Feel Branch Transfers Fare Better Than Accessed AGC Officers in Competition for Promotion? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

An even greater majority disagreed with the Conference's report, 69.6% (16), on this issue. Seven of the "no" responses had an accompanying comment. Six of them believed an AGC officer should have certain jobs and

experiences and branch transfers were not as qualified as accessioned AGC officers because of their time spent in other branches. One respondent felt that overall performance was the key to promotion. Of the five officers that do believe branch transfers have a better chance at promotions, two provided a "yes" answer only, two again cited the reason as branch transfers having a better appreciation and knowledge of the others they serve, and one respondent felt AGCs were looked upon as "second class citizens by their combat arms brothers." The two remaining respondents did not answer the question.

- c. Do You Feel Combat Arms Affiliation (Assignments and Training) Enhance Assignment and Promotion Selection for Accessed AGC Officers? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

There was overwhelming support for the Conference's report on this issue; 82.6% (19) answered "yes". Twelve of the respondents simply stated "yes", four voiced the better appreciation and understanding of the total Army reason; two felt that since promotion board members are mostly combat arms officers, they would be more familiar with a combat arms branch transfer's assignments since it was more like their past assignments; one officer stated that combat arms experience enables better duty performance; and two respondents did not believe combat arms affiliation had an impact. One felt affiliation did but branch transferring

from another branch did not, and the last respondents answered "maybe".

- d. Do You Feel that With the Majority of Our Most Successful Officers in the Officer Corps, Having Had Strong Association With Combat Arms Coupled With a Narrow Understanding of the Role of the AGC, Measure Candidates for Promotion Based on Their Own Frame of Reference When They Sit on Promotion Boards and Therefore Reduces Promotion Chances for Accessed AGC Officers? Yes/No Explain if Necessary.

Sixty and nine-tenths percent (14) did not feel this occurred. Seven respondents did not give a specific reason, 6 stated that as senior officers, promotion board members would not let this interfere with doing their job correctly, and one respondent felt promotion board procedures and instructions would not allow this to occur. All 7 "yes" responses did not have a specific reason accompanying the answer, one respondent did not answer the question and one had no opinion.

V. ADJUTANT GENERAL CAREER MODEL AND DISCUSSION

A. CAREER MODEL

The AGC career model contained in Table XXIX, was developed based on the analysis in Chapter IV and reflects a recommended career path and training to be followed by accessioned AGC officers. The career model is broken down by rank, level of assignment, military training, and civilian education. The level of assignment listed for each rank is in order of those most frequently served in at that rank. The assignments listed are those most frequently held at that rank and level of assignment but not prioritized. Additionally, an officer does not have to hold each assignment listed but should become or expect to become qualified in several to receive as much training and experience as possible before accepting special type assignments (Ex. Organizational effectiveness, instructor, recruiting).

TABLE XXXII

CAREER MODEL

Phase	Level of Assignment	Assignment	Military Training	Civilian Training
Lieutenant	Company	Assistant Chief/Chief: Personnel Actions Personnel Records Personnel Management Administrative Services Replacement Officer Postal Operations Officer	Adjutant General Basic Course Postal Operations Combat Arms Correspondence Courses Airborne/Ranger School	Bachelor Degree Completion
	Post Headquarters	Installation Adjutant Assistant Chief/Chief: Personnel Actions Personnel Records Personnel Management Administrative Services Replacement Officer Postal Operations Officer		
	Division	Assistant Chief/Chief: Personnel Actions Personnel Records Personnel Management Administrative Services Replacement Officer Postal Operations Officer		

TABLE XXXII (Continued)

Phase	Level of Assignment	Assignment	Military Training	Civilian Training
Captain	Division	Chief: Personnel Actions Personnel Records Personnel Management Administrative Services Replacement Officer Postal Operations Officer Assistant GI Secretary General Staff	Adjutant General Advance Course Military Personnel Officer Course Combat Arms Cor- respondence Course Airborne/Ranger School Combined Arms Ser- vices Staff School ¹	Bachelor Degree Completion Graduate Degree Work
	Company	Chief: Personnel Actions Personnel Records Personnel Management Administrative Services Replacement Officer Postal Operations Officer Assistant GI Secretary General Staff Commander: Personnel Services Co. Adjutant General Co. Postal Detachment Replacement Detachment Regional Personnel Center		

¹Currently required by Department of the Army for all active duty officers.

TABLE XXXII (Continued)

Phase	Level of Assignment	Assignment	Military Training	Civilian Training
	Headquarters Department of the Army ²	Personnel Staff Officer Personnel Management Officer Personnel Administrative Officer		
	Overseas Headquarters ³	Chief Administrative Services Officer Personnel Staff Officer Personnel Management Officer		
Major	Headquarters Department of the Army ²	Personnel Staff Officer Personnel Actions Officer Personnel Administrative Officer Chief Special Actions Officer Branch Chief	Command General Staff College Military Personnel Office Course	Graduate Degree Completion
	Division	Chief Personnel Service Division Deputy Adjutant General Assistant G1		

²Headquarters Department of the Army includes DCSPER, MILPERCEN, TAG, and Joint Chiefs of Staff.

³Overseas Headquarters includes PERSOOM Europe and Korea, and Headquarters Europe and Korea.

TABLE XXIII (Continued)

Phase	Level of Assignment	Assignment	Military Training	Civilian Training
	Post Headquarters	Deputy Adjutant General Chief Personnel Service Division Deputy Adjutant General Assistant GI		
Lieutenant Colonel	Division	Adjutant General Division GI	Senior Service College	Graduate Degree Completion
	Headquarters Department of the Army	Branch Chiefs Personnel Staff Officer Personnel Administrative Officer Chief General Management Officer		
	Major Command	Branch Chiefs Personnel Staff Officer		

B. DISCUSSION OF THE MODEL

The analysis, findings and the career model developed along with the concerns and questions raised by the AGC as presented in the introduction will be discussed in the following section.

The ability for an accessioned AGC officer to obtain identified training and positions is good. Physical combat arms related experience is currently non-existent due to the discontinuance of combat arms branch detailing for the AG accession. Even with the reinstatement of this program, expected in the near future, actual numbers of officers receiving this experience will be limited. Officers can, however, apply for and obtain training certification in the combat arms branch through official correspondence courses. Combat related training such as airborne is currently available for those who desire it and service situation is conducive for attending this training between assignments. Airborne training is available on a limited basis for senior ROTC students.

All accessioned AGC officers will attend the basic and advanced courses at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana. While there, officers have the opportunity to request additional training offered such as Military Personnel Officer and Postal Operation Courses. Currently all officers will attend the Combined Arms Services Staff School (CAS³). While only a

limited number of officers will be selected to attend the Command and Staff School (CSC), officers can receive equivalent training and credit for the CSC through correspondence courses.

With the exception of commander, positions identified in the model are common at the levels represented. Officers assigned to these levels should expect to serve in these positions. Officers seeking command can expect a 22.2 percent command opportunity based on a 24-month tour during the grade of Captain and a 9.1 percent command opportunity based on a 30-month tour during grade of Major [Ref. 10]. Also, specific position titles are highly visible and well known by all officers and therefore can be identified by promotion board members as to the requirements to fulfill and complete assignments to them.

The Army's program for fully and partially funded advance civilian education is severely limited. Advanced civilian education, however, is readily available at most Army installations at the officers' expense. Major accredited universities offer night and weekend classes which lead to award of master degrees. Also most universities accept Army training and experience as credit which reduces total number of hours required for a master degree. Also a liberal policy of transferring credits from one university to another to accommodate preassignments.

The most interesting finding is that 49 percent of the sample were branch transfers. This fact, on the surface, will have a definite impact on the career progression of the accessioned AGC officer. With an Army planned attrition rate of 80 percent for any given AGC year group by their twentieth year a 50 percent infusion of branch transfers effectively doubles the attrition rate for accessioned AGC officers. However, two major factors, promotion and normal retention rates, must be researched before a concrete statement can be made.

The Army only allows branch transfers to another branch to meet projected manning strength for individual branches. Perceived lower than average selection rates for promotion [Ref. 1] and lower retention rates for AGC officers contribute to the need for branch transfers. In regards to retention rates, AGC officers receive training and skills which are easily transferred to the civilian sector which may cause a large number of AGC officers to leave the service. If this is the case, there would be a large requirement for branch transfers. While retention rates figures were outside the scope of this thesis, efforts to obtain this data as well as actual promotion rates for only AGC officers were found to be unavailable due to Army accounting policies of monitoring specialty codes not branches. Therefore, a concrete statement cannot be made about the impact of branch

transfers. However, the fact that 49 percent of AGC Colonels began their career in another branch is significant enough to be considered as a major impact and warrant further analysis by the AGC.

Turning to the hypothesis of the importance of association with combat oriented skills/training and unit command, findings show that 62 percent of the accessioned AGC officers had some type of combat training with an overall 80 percent of AGC officers having some type of combat training (Paragraph D, Chapter IV). While no concrete statement can be made about the importance of combat training without a comparison of training for officers who were not selected for promotion to Colonel, it is the opinion of the authors that it is an important factor. This opinion is supported by current efforts at Department of Army Level to reinstate and expand the use of combat arms branch detail for combat service support branches.

Based on the low percentage of officers having command experience prior to the rank of Colonel (10.7 percent Lieutenant Phase, 6.8 percent Captain Phase, 5.6 percent Major Phase, 6.9 percent Lieutenant Phase), the necessity for command in career progression for AGC officers is overstated. However, officers who desire commands at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, prior command experience appears to be beneficial. Of those officers within the sample who held

command at Lieutenant Colonel, 70 percent had previous commands.

In regards to the statement that branch transfers are being given preferential consideration for key career enhancing AG assignments "without regard to any demonstrated AGC aptitude, proficiency, potential or level of previous performance" [Ref. 1], the findings, based on officer assignment history, shows that branch transfers, after their initial combat assignments, begin to be utilized in AGC related assignments at battalion and division levels. While they may return to combat positions, the majority of assignments prior to branch transferring are associated with the AGC. Findings also revealed, based on branch transfers attending the AGC Advanced Course, that 66 percent transferred prior to promotion to Major and 34 percent immediately after promotion to Major. These two facts indicate that branch transfers have demonstrated the necessary aptitudes, proficiency, potential with sufficient previous performance prior to transferring.

Officially, no key career enhancing assignments exist. Unofficially, within the ranks of AGC, assignments to MILPERCEN, DCSPER, and TAG along with specific duties as Division Adjutant General and Battalion Commander are recognized as career enhancing. The findings revealed an even distribution among branch transfer and AGC officers for

these assignments (see Table IX, Chapter IV). As for the specific we see that accessioned AGC officers performed these duties more often than branch transfers (see Table XI, Chapter IV). These figures by themselves indicate that the statement of preferential consideration for assignments would be unfounded. What must be kept in mind is that the total number of branch transfers in the AGC, in relation to the total number of accessioned AGC officers, is relatively low (Actual numbers were not available due to Army personnel accounting procedures). This indicates that, in fact, branch transfers may have a better chance to be assigned to one of these units or positions. Findings warrant further analysis by the AGC.

The authors' investigation of officers who were assigned as Battalion Commander and/or Division Adjutant General revealed that officers assigned as Division Adjutant General were more numerous with almost twice as many officers being assigned to this duty than Battalion Commander. Of interest is that 100 percent of the accessioned AGC officers versus 72 percent of the branch transfers had at least one of these assignments. Additionally, distribution of command billets between the two categories showed that seven (7) accessioned AGC officers versus six (6) branch transfers had commands. Four (4) accessioned AGC officers had no previous command experience while all branch transfers had previous commands.

From the sample, for accessioned AGC, assignment as either Division Adjutant General or Battalion Commander is a prerequisite for advancement to Colonel. Additionally, of those officers selected for SSC at the time of writing of this thesis, 92 percent of all AGC officers had previous assignments as Division Adjutants with the remaining officers having served as Battalion Commanders. This indicates the importance of serving in these capacities for selection to SSC.

Due to the low percentage of "special" assignments at all grade levels, it appears that they are not career enhancing. This is especially true at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel where only 1.4 percent of all assignments were of the "special" category. Of those officers who had "special" assignments, all but one officer had gained considerable experience at those levels and positions identified in the model.

As pointed out in Chapter IV, the number of alternate specialties, other than 41 or 42, was limited to three: 43, 56 and 53. The small representation of alternate specialty in itself is of interest but also of interest is that these specialties are not directly supportive of any one branch. Unlike specialties 21 or 25 which are supportive of Engineer and Signal Corps respectively, these specialties provide Army-wide support. While only specialty code 43, Club

Management, falls directly under the AGC, specialty code 46; Public Affairs Officer, and 53; Automated Data Processing Officer, are also often associated with the skills and programs of the AGC. One can easily see an officer with specialty code combinations of 41 and 53 because of automated personnel systems. It is a little hard to see a 41 and 21 combination where there is no direct relationship. What may be important in selection of an alternate specialty outside of 41 or 42 is that there exists a relationship with the AGC or the specialty is not directly supportive of any one branch.

C. DISCUSSION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Analysis of the questionnaire results reveals strong support for the need to have a career model and the developed model itself. There were some surprises from the results of the questions concerning the 1982 Adjutant General World-Wide Conference topics.

Many of the officers who felt there was a need for a career model included a qualifier with their answer. They agreed with the use of a model as a guide only, and not as gospel. This is also the intended use of a career model by the writers. Timing will dictate many assignments along with the needs of the Army. The model should aide assignment officers in making assignment decisions.

One unforeseen benefit of the questionnaire results was the recommendations by many of the respondents on additions to the model which reflect the more current beliefs about what a good assignment is today and also on what jobs are being held by AGC officers today that were reserved for other branches in the past. Even though many of the respondents did not command during their careers, it was recommended as assignments for lieutenants, captains, majors, and lieutenant colonels (see Table XXX). Today in the Army, command is supposed to be the job to seek at any grade and in any branch. This was not so in the past; even in the writers' careers as lieutenants, command time was not important. Battalion S-1 assignments for lieutenants and captains is now considered a good AGC assignment. There is even a four-week S-1 course at Fort Benjamin Harrison, home of the AGC.

Of interest is the feeling by most of the respondents that branch transfers do not have an advantage over accessioned AGC officers for assignments and promotion selection. Yet many still felt that combat arms affiliation did enhance their chances for selection for assignment and promotion (see Table XXXI). Although not the majority, there were many who felt the Army should return to branch detailing, 43.5% (10). This issue is currently being studied at Department of the Army level.

VI. CONCLUSION

Background research has suggested the development and use of career models as an important tool in career planning. A career model will not only give officers something to follow setting career goals and judging whether assignments offered to them will be beneficial to their career, but it will also be of use to assignment officers and commanders in planning future assignments for officers and counseling them on their career development. The model can also be used to identify which officers can better withstand an assignment not in the model. These assignments are in the Army inventory and must be filled. What career managers do not want to do is assign officers to these positions whose careers have not followed the model.

Through the analysis of the data, a career model was developed based upon the successful careers of the officers in the sample. The sample represented a successful path for two year groups of AGC officers and is expected to be good for several subsequent year groups. It is the path being followed which provides the training and experience necessary to be the best qualified for promotion to the rank of Colonel as an AGC today.

The thesis seems to disprove the belief expressed in the 1982 World Wide Adjutant General Conference that branch transfers do not have the experience and training necessary to perform well in traditional AGC assignments. The sample indicates that the branch transfers usually occur early enough in the officers' careers to allow for enough assignments in AGC traditional positions to gain experience needed to be qualified for promotion to higher grades. Additionally, many of the officers that did branch transfer did so because they had already been in several assignments that better qualified them as AGC officers than their accessioned branch.

This was also supported by the questionnaire results. As stated earlier, the respondents did not feel that branch transfers fared better than accessioned AGC officers in consideration for assignments and promotion.

If the Adjutant General Corps is genuinely concerned about equitability in the promotion and school selection system as expressed during the 1982 World Wide AGC Conference, immediate action should be taken to capture the necessary data to conduct an indepth analysis. For example, all field grade promotion statistics are only published by specialty. The problem is that because all officers hold two specialties, they are counted twice in the statistics. For example, an officer with the specialty combination of 11

(Infantry) and 42 is counted as being selected in both specialties. The fact that the 11, along with any other specialties a 41 or 42 might have in combination is counted in the statistics for selection rates of the 41 and 42's masks the true selection of pure 41/42 combination AGC officers. Research for this thesis has shown that this statistic is either not captured or is not published.

Changes to personnel assignment policies and training requirements take time to develop and implement. Work needs to begin now, not only because new AGC officers are accessioned each year, but because promotion boards are held each year possibly not selecting good AGC officers who are victims of the system.

Much more research is needed before plans can be developed. More insight about the effects combat arms affiliation and branch transfers can be made if the careers of officers that did not get selected for promotion on or before time are studied. Combat arms affiliation may or may not be abundant in this group. Branch transferred officers could present an entirely different picture either in their training and experience or the impact of their actual numbers. This group may also have a very similar career path which would indicate something else is more important in making an AGC officer successful.

As pointed out earlier, performance has not been addressed in this study. Performance cannot be ignored in determining the success or failure of a career and must be included in further research.

Female officers were excluded from the sample because of their inability by public law to hold combat arms specialties and the interest of this study in the affects of combat arms affiliation. There are a large number of female AGC officers who will need special consideration because of this fact. They present an entirely different situation when considering combat arms affiliation and the impact of branch transfers.

A model cannot be static but must be dynamic and able to change as the Army changes. Future consideration must be planned for and included in the model. The Army is returning to a regimental structure to increase cohesiveness, continuity, and esprit de corps in the units. This is causing many changes in assignment policies which will effect the experience officers receive. Promotion boards must be educated in this regard. Other changes on the horizon could also change a model such as increased needs for automatic data processing. Being ADP qualified may soon be a plus in an AGC officer's qualifications.

The opinions of the officers in the corps should also be considered in developing a model as the questionnaire results

proved. Basing a model solely on past assignment patterns would ignore what is happening today and in the future.

There is a need for career models not only in the AGC but all branches. Research has shown the importance of a career path to follow to the subject officers and their career managers. In 1979 the General Accounting Officer recommended to the Secretary of Defense to establish viable career fields and programs for officers and civilians in personnel management [Ref. 11]. The need has been recognized.

If the Army, as a whole, wants to continue to develop itself based on the integrity of individual branches, it must take action to ensure fair and equitable availability and competition for assignments, training, and promotion for branch accessioned officers. It is the sincere feeling of the authors that the AGC is currently not receiving the fair and equitable consideration.

APPENDIX A
ASSIGNMENTS CODING SCHEME

Data Element	Code	Remarks
Rank	1	Lieutenant
	2	Captain
	3	Major
	4	Lieutenant Colonel
Type Assignment	1	With Troops: Applies to assignments with combat units at company grade level. (Ex. Platoon Leader)
	2	Staff: Assignments designated as staff. Includes G1.
	3	Staff With Troops: Positions with AG units (Chief Personnel Actions, Records, Management, etc.) and Battalion S1.
	4	Special: Instructors, Attaches, Protocol Officer, Directors Military Service.
	5	Commander
Level of Assignment	1	Company, Battery, Detachments, Postal Units.
	2	Battalion, Discom
	4	Brigade, Group
	5	Division, Support Command
	6	Major Command, Agencies
	7	Headquarter DA, DCSPER, MILPERCEN, TAGCEN, Joint Chief of Staff.
	8	O/S Hq Europe, Korea. PERSONMC: Korea, Europe.
	9	Post Headquarters
	10	Schools
	11	Recruiting Station/AFEES
	12	Regional Personnel Centers/Personnel Service Companies.
	13	Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Soldier Support Center.
	14	Corps
	15	MAAG
	16	ROTC

Data Element	Code	Remarks
Combat Affi-	1	Combat Unit
liation	2	Non Combat
Adjutant Gene-	1	AG Position
ral Affilia-	2	Non-AG Position
tion		

APPENDIX B

LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR LIEUTENANTS

TOTAL LIEUTENANT

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	83	50.0
BN	2.	13	7.8
BDE	4.	6	3.6
DIV	5.	19	11.4
MACOM	6.	3	1.8
OSHQ	8.	8	4.8
Post HG	9.	19	11.4
School	10.	4	2.4
Recruiting	11.	4	2.4
Corps	14.	3	1.8
MAAG	15.	4	2.4
	TOTAL	166	100.0

LIEUTENANT BRANCH TRANSFERS

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	63	66.3
BN	2.	6	6.3
BDE	4.	4	4.2
DIV	5.	12	12.6
MACOM	6.	1	1.1
OSHQ	8.	3	3.2
Post HQ	9.	3	3.2
School	10.	2	2.1
Recruiting	11.	1	1.1
	TOTAL	95	100.0

ADJUTANT GENERAL CORPS LIEUTENANT

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	20	28.2
BN	2.	7	9.9
BDE	4.	2	2.8
DIV	5.	7	9.9
MACOM	6.	2	2.8
OSHQ	8.	5	7.0
Post HQ	9.	16	22.5
School	10.	2	2.8
Recruiting	11.	3	4.2
Corps	14.	3	4.2
MAAG	<u>15.</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5.6</u>
	TOTAL	71	100.0

APPENDIX C
LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR CAPTAIN

TOTAL CAPTAIN

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	28	16.7
BN	2.	7	4.2
BDE	4.	18	10.7
DIV	5.	24	14.3
MACOM	6.	9	5.4
HQDA	7.	13	7.7
OSHQ	8.	22	13.1
Post HQ	9.	17	10.1
School	10.	15	8.9
Recruiting	11.	2	1.2
Ft. Harrison	13.	2	1.2
Corps	14.	5	3.0
MAAG	<u>15.</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3.6</u>
	TOTAL	168	100.0

BRANCH TRANSFER CAPTAIN

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	16	19.0
BN	2.	4	4.8
BDE	4.	12	14.3
DIV	5.	9	10.7
NACOM	6.	4	4.8
HQDA	7.	3	3.6
OSHQ	8.	12	14.3
Post HQ	9.	11	13.1
School	10.	7	8.3
Recruiting	11.	2	2.4
Ft. Harrison	13.	1	1.2
Corps	14.	2	2.4
MAAG	15.	1	1.2
TOTAL		84	100.0

ADJUTANT GENERAL CORP CAPTAIN

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	12	14.3
BN	2.	3	3.6
BDE	4.	6	7.1
DIV	5.	15	17.9
MACOM	6.	5	6.0
HQDA	7.	10	11.9
OSHQ	8.	10	11.9
Post HQ	9.	6	7.1
School	10.	8	9.5
Ft. Harrison	13.	1	1.2
Corps	14.	3	3.6
MAAG	15.	5	6.0
TOTAL		84	100.0

APPENDIX D
LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR MAJOR

TOTAL MAJOR

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	19	8.3
BN	2.	5	2.2
BDE	4.	12	5.2
DIV	5.	30	13.0
MACOM	6.	17	7.4
HQDA	7.	61	26.5
OSHQ	8.	29	12.6
Post HQ	9.	13	5.7
School	10.	24	10.4
Personnel CNTR	12.	1	0.4
Ft. Harrison	13.	5	2.2
Corps	14.	4	1.7
MAAG	15.	8	3.5
ROTC	<u>16.</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.9</u>
	TOTAL	230	100.0

BRANCH TRANSFER MAJOR

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	13	11.0
BN	2.	2	1.7
BDE	4.	9	7.6
DIV	5.	12	10.2
MACOM	6.	10	8.5
HQDA	7.	27	22.9
OSHQ	8.	19	16.1
Post HQ	9.	1	0.8
School	10.	16	13.6
Ft. Harrison	13.	1	0.8
Corps	14.	2	1.7
MAAG	15.	5	4.2
ROTC	16.	1	0.8
	TOTAL	118	100.0

ADJUTANT GENERAL CORP MAJOR

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	6	5.4
BN	2.	3	2.7
BDE	4.	3	2.7
DIV	5.	18	16.1
MACOM	6.	7	6.3
HQDA	7.	34	30.4
OSHQ	8.	10	8.9
Post HQ	9.	12	10.7
School	10.	8	7.1
Personnel CNTR	12.	1	0.9
Ft. Harrison	13.	4	3.6
Corps	14.	2	1.8
MAAG	15.	3	2.7
ROTC	16.	1	0.9
	TOTAL	112	100.0

APPENDIX E

LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL

TOTAL LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
BN	2.	13	7.6
BDE	4.	5	2.9
DIV	5.	42	24.4
MACOM	6.	17	9.9
HQDA	7.	45	26.2
OSHQ	8.	16	9.3
Post HQ	9.	7	4.1
School	10.	12	7.0
Recruiting	11.	2	1.2
Personnel CNTR	12.	1	0.6
Ft. Harrison	13.	6	3.5
Corps	14.	3	1.7
ROTC	16.	3	1.7
	TOTAL	172	100.0

BRANCH TRANSFER IEUTENANT COLONEL

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
BN	2.	7	8.4
BDE	4.	1	1.2
DIV	5.	20	24.1
MACOM	6.	7	8.4
HQDA	7.	27	32.5
OSHQ	8.	9	10.8
Post HQ	9.	1	1.2
School	10.	6	7.2
Recruiting	11.	2	2.4
Ft. Harrison	13.	2	2.4
ROTC	16.	1	1.2
	TOTAL	83	100.0

ADJUTANT GENERAL LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
BN	2.	6	6.7
BDE	4.	4	4.5
DIV	5.	22	24.7
MACOM	6.	10	11.2
HQDA	7.	18	20.2
OSHQ	8.	7	7.9
Post HQ	9.	6	6.7
School	10.	6	6.7
Personnel CNTR	12.	1	1.1
Ft. Harrison	13.	4	4.5
Corps	14.	3	3.4
ROTC	16.	2	2.2
	TOTAL	89	100.0

APPENDIX F

LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR COMPANY GRADE AND FIELD GRADE

TOTAL COMPANY GRADE

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	111	33.2
BN	2.	20	6.0
BDE	4.	24	7.2
DIV	5.	43	12.9
MACOM	6.	12	3.6
HQDA	7.	13	3.9
OSHQ	8.	30	9.0
Post HQ	9.	36	10.8
School	10.	19	5.7
Recruiting	11.	6	1.8
Ft. Harrison	13.	2	0.6
Corps	14.	8	2.4
MAAG	<u>15.</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3.0</u>
	TOTAL	334	100.0

TOTAL FIELD GRADE

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	19	4.7
BN	2.	18	4.5
BDE	4.	17	4.2
DIV	5.	72	17.9
MACOM	6.	34	8.5
HQDA	7.	106	26.4
OSHQ	8.	45	11.2
Post HQ	9.	20	5.0
School	10.	36	9.0
Recruiting	11.	2	0.5
Personnel CNTR	12.	2	0.5
Ft. Harrison	13.	11	2.7
Corps	14.	7	1.7
MAAG	15.	8	2.0
ROTC	16.	5	1.2
	TOTAL	402	100.0

COMPANY GRADE BRANCH TRANSFERS

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	79	44.1
BN	2.	10	5.6
BDE	4.	16	8.9
DIV	5.	21	11.7
MACOM	6.	5	2.8
HQDA	7.	3	1.7
OSHQ	8.	15	8.4
Post HQ	9.	14	7.8
School	10.	9	5.0
Recruiting	11.	3	1.7
Ft. Harrison	13.	1	0.6
Corps	14.	2	1.1
MAAG	15.	1	0.6
	TOTAL	179	100.0

FIELD GRADE BRANCH TRANSFERS

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	13	6.5
BN	2.	9	4.5
BDE	4.	10	5.0
DIV	5.	32	15.9
MACOM	6.	17	8.5
HQDA	7.	54	26.9
OSHQ	8.	28	13.9
Post HQ	9.	2	1.0
School	10.	22	10.9
Recruiting	11.	2	1.0
Ft. Harrison	13.	3	1.5
Corps	14.	2	1.0
MAAG	15.	5	2.5
ROTC	16.	2	1.0
	TOTAL	201	100.0

COMPANY GRADE ADJUTANT GENERAL CORP

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	32	20.6
BN	2.	10	6.5
BDE	4.	8	5.2
DIV	5.	22	14.2
MACOM	6.	7	4.5
HQDA	7.	10	6.5
OSHQ	8.	15	9.7
Post HQ	9.	22	14.2
School	10.	10	6.5
Recruiting	11.	3	1.9
Ft. Harrison	13.	1	0.6
Corps	14.	6	3.9
MAAG	15.	9	5.8
	TOTAL	155	100.0

FIELD GRADE ADJUTANT GENERAL CORP

Category Label	Code	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (PCT)
Company	1.	6	3.0
BN	2.	9	4.5
BDE	4.	7	3.5
DIV	5.	40	19.9
MACOM	6.	17	8.5
HQDA	7.	52	25.9
OSHQ	8.	17	8.5
Post HQ	9.	18	9.0
School	10.	14	7.0
Personnel CNTR	12.	2	1.0
Ft. Harrison	13.	8	4.0
Corps	14.	5	2.5
MAAG	15.	3	1.5
ROTC	16.	3	1.5
	TOTAL	201	100.0

APPENDIX G
THESIS QUESTIONNAIRE

We request that you answer the following questions concerning the model and provide whatever remarks you feel are appropriate. Your responses will be kept anonymous.

1. Do you feel the level of assignment indicated for each rank is correct? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

2. Is there an assignment at a particular rank that you feel is inappropriate or should be held at another rank? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

3. Do you feel the pattern of civilian education is correct? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

4. Do you feel the pattern of military training is correct? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

5. Would you recommend any other assignments at a particular rank? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

6. Do you feel an official career model would be beneficial to junior AGC officers for career planning purposes? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

The following addresses questions that were raised during the 1982 Adjutant General World-Wide Conference and additional areas being investigated for our thesis.

1. Do you feel branch transfers fare better than accessed AGC officers in competition for key career enhancing AGC assignment? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

2. Do you feel branch transfers fare better than accessed AGC officers in competition for promotion? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

3. Do you feel combat arms affiliation (assignments and training) enhance assignment and promotion selection for accessed AGC officers? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

4. Do you feel that with the majority of our most successful officers in the officer corps, having had strong association with combat arms coupled with a narrow understanding of the role of the AGC, measure candidates for promotion based on their own frame of reference when they sit on promotion boards and therefore reduces promotion chances for accessed AGC officers? Yes / No Explain if necessary.

Additional Comments:

Again we must receive your responses by 24 August 1983 to be included in our study. The enclosed self-addressed envelope can be used to mail your response. Attach any additional sheets needed.

APPENDIX H
COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Administrative Sciences Department
Monterey, California 93940

July 21, 1983

CPT John D. Warren and I are currently students at the Naval Postgraduate School pursuing a degree in Organization Development. One of the requirements for degree completion is to write a thesis which we are doing jointly.

The purpose of our thesis is to develop a career model for Adjutant General Corps officers to follow to be promoted to the rank of Colonel on or before normal time-in-service/time in grade. Additionally, the influence of combat arms association, and the impact the large numbers of branch transfers in the AGC has on accessed AG officers' careers will be addressed. The thesis is of interest to the branch proponent at the Soldiers Support Center at Fort Benjamin Harrison and Colonel's Division in OPMD, MILPERCEN.

Inclosure one is a model developed from data extracted from the official files of AGC officers who had been selected or promoted to the rank of Colonel between the dates 1 January 1981 to 31 October 1982, and whose specialties are 41 and 42. Frequency distribution was used to indicate patterns which suggest a common career path.

While performance in any given assignment is the most critical criterion of success, it is not addressed in our thesis. This is due to the subjectivity of performance rating rendered and the difference in degree of difficulty

assignments have because of job scope, span of control, and environment.

We have sent this packet to every officer in the sample in an effort to validate the model and gain additional insight. We request that you study the model and answer the questions at Inclosure Two. Your input will be an important factor in finalizing the career model. Hopefully the model will be of use to all future AGC officers and the basis for additional research.

The addresses used in mailing the packets were the official address Colonel's Division, MILPERCEN, provided in November, 1982. We realize many of them are outdated and may have caused a delay in your receipt of the packet. Additionally, we are under a time constraint to complete the thesis. If at all possible your response is needed by 24 August 1983.

Knowing which jobs to plan for and hold to become qualified for promotion is only one part of becoming successful. All officers receive advice from superiors and assignment officers on which assignments to seek. We feel there should be official guidance to help young officers plan their careers. Your input may help in the development of official guidance for new AGC officers.

Jerry Novosad
CPT, AGC

2 Incl AS

AGC CAREER MODEL

As mentioned in the cover letter, assignments and experience are not the only, or most important qualifiers for promotion. They are, though, indicators of potential performance based upon prior training received on the job. The following is the model developed as explained in the cover letter. It is broken down by rank, level of assignment, assignment, military training and civilian education. The level of assignment listed for each rank is in order of those most frequently served in at that rank. The assignments listed are those most frequently held at that rank and level of assignment. They are not prioritized. Additionally, an officer does not have to hold each assignment listed, but should become qualified in several to receive as much experience and training as possible.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Department of the Army, After Action Report: The Adjutant General World Wide Proponency Conference, 14-16 June 1982, 14 September 19982.
2. Walker, James W., "Does Career Planning Rock the Boat?", Human Resource Management, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring 1978, pp. 2-7.
3. Morgan, Marliyn A., "Plotting A Route to the Top", Business Week, 1980, pp. 233-234.
4. Barack, Elmer H., Nicholas, Mathys, "Career Ladders, Pathing and Planning: Some Neglected Basics", Human Resource Management, Vol. 18, No. 2, Summer, 1979, pp. 2-8.
5. Walker, James W., "Let's Get Realistic About Career Paths", Human Resource Management, Vol. 15, No. 3, Fall, 1976, pp. 2-7.
6. Walker, James W., "Individual Career Planning", Business Horizons, Vol. 16, No. 1, February, 1973, p. 69.
7. Bower, D. D., Hall, D. L., "Career Planning for Employee Development: A Primer for Managers", California Management Review, Vol. 20, No. 2, Winter, 1977, p. 23.
8. Conmy, Joseph B. Jr., Fredeman, David V., Koratkin, Authur L., Development of Interactive Dialogue Modules, Army Research. Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, August 1977, pp. 1, 6, 7, 9.
9. Department of Army, Survey of AG Officer Perceptions of Single Versus Dual Specialties, 1976, p. 1.
10. Military Personnel Center, Personnel Programs Managment, OPMS Specialty Code 42 Official Briefing, May 1982.
11. General Accounting Report, Military and Civilian Managers of Defense Manpower: Improvements Possible In Their Experience, Training and Rewards, Volume 1, February 16, 1979.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Pamphlet, DA DAM 600-3 (Officer Professional Development and Utilization).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 600-101 (Officer Personnel Management System Specialty Proponency).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 611-101 (Commissioned Officer Specialty Classification System).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 621-1 (Training of Military Personnel at Civilian Institutions).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 621-108 (Military Personnel Requirements for Graduate Level Education).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 623-105 (Officer Evaluation Reporting System).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 351-1 (Military Education and Training).

Department of the Army, U.S. Army Regulation, AR 351-16 (Selection, Administration and Assignments for Officer Students to Service Schools).

Department of the Army Promotion Statistics for Major and Lieutenant Colonels, Years 76-82.

Digman, Lester A., "How Well Managed Organizations Develop Their Executives", Organization Dynamics, Vol. 17, No. 2, Autumn, 1978.

Estes, Brian, "Counseling and Planning for Employee Development: A Supervisor's Guide", U.S. Civil Service Commission, TLA560.

Gould, Sam, "Characteristics of Career Planners In Upwardly Mobile Occupations", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 22, No. 3, September, 1979.

Kneeland, Steven L., "Managing Your Career", Sales and Marketing Management In Canada, January-February, 1980.

Lopez, F. E., Rockmore, W. B., Hesselman, G. A., "The Development of An Integrated Career Planning Program At Gulf Power Company", Personnel Administrator, Vol. 25, No. 10, October, 1980.

Pinto, Patrick R., "Career Development Trends for the 80's: Better Managers, Higher Productivity", Training, Vol. 17, No. 4, April, 1980.

Quinn, R. P., "The Chosen Few: A Study of Discrimination in Executive Selection", Institute for Social Research, 1968.

Schwartz, Irving R., "Try This Model HRD System: It Matches Individual and Organizational Goals", Training, Vol. 16, No. 11, November, 1979.

Simon, J. L., Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Emperical Investigation, 2nd Edition, Random House, 1978.

Veiga, John F., "Plateaued Versus Nonplateaued Managers: Career Patterns, Attitudes, and Path Potential", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 24, No. 3, September, 1981.

Wallace, Patricia E., "Career Ladder Positions and Task Performance as Viewed by Records Management Professionals", Records Management Quarterly, Vol. 15, No. 4, October, 1981.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	2
3. Assistant for Analysis, Evaluation (NMPC-6C) Human Resource Management & Personal Affairs Department Navy Military Personnel Command Washington, D.C. 20370	1
4. Director, Human Resource Management Division (NMPC-62) Human Resource Management & Personal Affairs Department Navy Military Personnel Command Washington, D.C. 20370	1
5. Director for HRM Plans and Policy (OP-150) Human Resource Management Division Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel & Training) Washington, D.C. 20370	1
6. Commanding Officer Human Resource Management School Naval Air Station Memphis Millington, Tennessee 38054	1
7. Commanding Officer Human Resource Management Center London Box 23 FPO, New York 09510	1
8. Commanding Officer Human Resource Management Center 5621-23 Tidewater Drive Norfolk, Virginia 23509	1

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 9. | Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860 | 1 |
| 10. | Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
Naval Training Center
San Diego, California 92133 | 1 |
| 11. | Commanding Officer
Organizational Effectiveness Center
& School
Fort Ord, California 93941 | 1 |
| 12. | Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
Commonwealth Building, Room 1144
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209 | 1 |
| 13. | Deputy Director for Special Proponency
& Doctrine Literature
AG School, USAIPRM (LTC Eleck)
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana 46216 | 1 |
| 14. | CPT(P) Jerry J. Novosad, Jr.
2636 Armada St.
Herndon, Virginia 22070 | 5 |
| 15. | CPT(P) John D. Warren
HHC 1st PERSCOM
APO New York 09081 | 5 |