

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED  
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE  
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND  
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON  
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;  
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

UNANNOUNCED

# RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

NUMBER 55-6

11 140 55

12

13

14

AGB-PAB-Rm-55-6

9

Research memo.

6

ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONAL STATISTICS, DA FORM 67-2:  
REASON FOR REPORT AND DAYS OF DUTY.

100-7-84

THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE.  
THE COPY FURNISHED TO DDC CONTAINED A  
SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT  
REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

DDC  
REFILED  
RECEIVED  
JAN 24 1962  
A

79 12 19 62

NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

DDC FILE COPY

PERSONNEL RESEARCH BRANCH

PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND PROCEDURES DIVISION, TAGO

003 650

not

/

## **DISCLAIMER NOTICE**

**THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DDC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.**

**ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONAL STATISTICS, DA FORM 67-2:  
REASON FOR REPORT AND DAYS OF DUTY**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Since July 1947, the Statistical and Accounting Branch (SAB) of TAGO has prepared an IBM detail card for each scored efficiency report entering into an officer's OEL. Each card contains 78 items of administrative and rating information. Several studies on the rating and administrative portions of DA AGO Form 67-2 have been conducted or are currently in progress (See RMA-7-20 series of projects).

This project attempts to study two administrative items (Reason for Report and Days of Duty) as part of the continuing analysis of operational data on the Officer Efficiency Report. The basic problem is to determine whether any differences exist in the efficiency scores of officers who are rated for various reasons and for differing lengths of duty time, and the relationship of these items to other variables.

**II. OBJECTIVES**

1. To determine the proportion of officers who are rated for each of six different reasons for rendering the report.
2. To describe the relationships between reason for report and grade of rated officer or efficiency rating.
3. To determine the proportion of officers who are rated for varying periods of duty time.
4. To describe the relationships between period of time covered by the report and grade of rated officer or score on the report.
5. To describe any operational problems which have been revealed by the analyses above. For example, is the rating officer who is permanently transferred to another station more lenient in rating his subordinates?

**III. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION**

**A. SAMPLE**

SAB, TAGO provided a reproduced deck of 23,498 detail cards representing all unabbreviated Form 67-2 efficiency reports with terminal dates from 1 January 1951 through 30 June 1951 on all Regular warrant and commissioned officers. During this six-month period, each officer received only one regular report, either annual or semiannual, plus any special report rendered in accordance with AR 600-185 dated 25 August 1950.

A random sample of these detail cards was obtained by sorting on Army Serial Numbers ending in either one of two selected digits. This yielded a study sample of 5753 cards, which comprised 22.5 percent of all the cards available.

## B. VARIABLES

### 1. Efficiency Rating

Army Standard Rating (ASR) on DA AGO Form 67-2. The Form 67-2 raw score converts to a standard rating within the range of 51 to 150.

### 2. Grade

All grades from warrant officer, junior grade, through general officer. All pay grades of chief warrant officer were combined, but junior warrant officer was grouped as a separate grade.

### 3. Reason for Report

Regular Report--rendered periodically according to prescribed dates.

- (1) Semiannual for all grades below lt col and annual for lt col and higher.

Special Report--rendered for:

- (2) Permanent change of station of rated officer
- (3) Permanent change of station of rating officer
- (4) Change of duty of rated officer
- (5) Change of duty of rating officer
- (6) Other--such as extremely poor or outstanding performance

### 4. Period of Report

This variable refers to the actual number of duty days on which the efficiency report is based.

- a. 0-30
- b. 31-60
- c. 61-90
- d. 91-120
- e. 121-150
- f. 151-180
- g. 181-210
- h. 211-360.

(No completely satisfactory explanation can be offered for some officers being rated for a period in excess of 365 days. It may be assumed that administrative errors occurred.)

### C. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

1. For each reason for report, and for all reasons combined, the number of cases, percentage of total, mean ASR, and standard deviation of mean ASR were computed by grade and for all grades combined.

2. For each period of report, the number of cases, percentage of total, mean ASR, and standard deviation of mean ASR were computed by grade and for all grades combined.

### IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

#### A. REASON FOR REPORT

Table 1 shows that of the 5735 officers in the sample, 3407 or 59 percent had a regular report rendered on them during the six-month period covered by this study. The remaining 41 percent of the officers received special reports. Most of these special reports fell into two broad categories: (1) permanent change of station of either rates or rater (22 percent), (2) change of duty of rates or rater (14 percent). This left 5 percent of all the reports for the "other" category.

Table 1

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CASES, THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF ASR'S BY REASON FOR REPORT  
(N = 5735)

| Reason for Report                        | N's  | M's   | S.D. | %   |
|--|------|-------|------|-----|
| 1 - Regular                              | 3407 | 109.4 | 17.7 | 59  |
| 2 - Permanent Change of Station of Rates | 683  | 104.3 | 20.1 | 12  |
| 3 - Permanent Change of Station of Rater | 345  | 109.5 | 17.8 | 10  |
| 4 - Change of Duty of Rates              | 473  | 104.9 | 20.6 | 8   |
| 5 - Change of Duty of Rater              | 361  | 109.5 | 18.0 | 6   |
| 6 - Other                                | 264  | 110.6 | 17.2 | 5   |
| 7 - Total                                | 5735 | 108.5 | 18.4 | 100 |

As shown in Table 2, the percentage of special reports rendered on each grade varies between 32 and 63 percent. The unusually high proportion of special reports for first and second lieutenants is undoubtedly due to more frequent personnel actions affecting this group.

Administrative Form with handwritten entries:

- Administrative/
- Administrative Files
- Approved by: *[Signature]*
- Special *23*

Table 2  
 PERCENTAGE OF OFFICERS WITHIN EACH GRADE WHO RECEIVE  
 A SPECIAL REPORT  
 (N = 5733)

| Grade              | Total No. of Reports | No. of Special Reports | Percentage of Special Reports |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| General            | 101                  | 36                     | 36                            |
| Colonel            | 804                  | 279                    | 35                            |
| Lieutenant Colonel | 1365                 | 500                    | 37                            |
| Major              | 914                  | 302                    | 33                            |
| Captain            | 1127                 | 449                    | 40                            |
| First Lieutenant   | 789                  | 479                    | 61                            |
| Second Lieutenant  | 248                  | 139                    | 56                            |
| CWO                | 148                  | 47                     | 32                            |
| WOJG               | 197                  | 75                     | 38                            |
| TOTAL              | 5733                 | 2326                   | 41                            |

The mean ASR for the total sample of officers (Table 1) is 108.5. The mean ASR's for two of the reasons for report diverge significantly (one percent level) from this grand mean--the means of 104.5 and 104.9 for those officers who had either a change of duty or were assigned to another station. One logical explanation for these lowered ratings may be a tendency for the less efficient officer to be reassigned to another duty or transferred to another unit. However, the large standard deviation associated with these means would seem to indicate that many capable officers are transferred out of an organization or are assigned to other duties.

When comparisons of mean ASR (see Table 3) are made by grade, generals and second lieutenants appear to be an exception to this generalization. Apparently, such officers' duties and stations are changed without particular regard to their efficiency. Nevertheless the general finding suggests that when personnel actions of this type are made for other grades, many of these officers may not have been doing a particularly good job.

Grade differences in ratings are always of considerable interest. When reason for report is held constant as in Table 3, the usual grade patterns in ratings appear: general officers score very high; ratings gradually increase with commissioned grade; and chief warrant officers score higher than junior warrant officers and the mean ratings for these two grades are roughly equivalent to those of captain and first lieutenant, respectively. Although this pattern is generally maintained for each reason for report,

Table 3

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CASES, THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF ASR'S BY GRADE AND BRANCH FOR REPORT

(N = 5755)

| Grade   | N's  | M's   | S.D. | %  |
|---|------|-------|------|----|
| <u>Annual or Semiannual*</u>                          |      |       |      |    |
| A - Generals  | 65   | 123.6 | 13.6 | 1  |
| B - Colonels  | 565  | 113.5 | 16.2 | 10 |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels                               | 865  | 112.2 | 16.0 | 15 |
| D - Majors  | 612  | 110.8 | 16.2 | 11 |
| E - Captains  | 678  | 105.9 | 18.6 | 12 |
| F - First Lieutenants                                 | 290  | 102.7 | 18.1 | 5  |
| G - Second Lieutenants                                | 109  | 99.6  | 19.5 | 2  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)                             | 101  | 107.5 | 18.0 | 2  |
| I - WOJK  | 122  | 103.6 | 21.4 | 2  |
| T - All Grades Combined                               | 5407 | 109.4 | 17.7 | 20 |
| <u>Permanent Grade of Station of Rated Officers*</u>  |      |       |      |    |
| A - Generals  | 14   | 125.7 | 9.7  | 0  |
| B - Colonels  | 109  | 106.7 | 18.2 | 2  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels                               | 156  | 106.4 | 20.1 | 3  |
| D - Majors  | 88   | 104.9 | 21.1 | 2  |
| E - Captains  | 155  | 103.8 | 19.3 | 3  |
| F - First Lieutenants                                 | 112  | 98.7  | 20.3 | 2  |
| G - Second Lieutenants                                | 20   | 100.6 | 18.3 | 0  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)                             | 17   | 103.8 | 22.0 | 0  |
| I - WOJK  | 12   | 94.2  | 17.9 | 0  |
| T - All Grades Combined                               | 675  | 104.3 | 20.1 | 12 |
| <u>Permanent Grade of Station of Rating Officers*</u> |      |       |      |    |
| A - Generals  | 12   | 120.1 | 9.8  | 0  |
| B - Colonels  | 92   | 109.8 | 18.2 | 2  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels                               | 142  | 110.2 | 19.2 | 2  |
| D - Majors  | 84   | 112.9 | 16.8 | 1  |
| E - Captains  | 84   | 111.2 | 14.6 | 1  |
| F - First Lieutenants                                 | 79   | 106.4 | 15.7 | 1  |
| G - Second Lieutenants                                | 23   | 96.4  | 16.4 | 0  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)                             | 13   | 102.2 | 19.8 | 0  |
| I - WOJK  | 19   | 105.0 | 21.3 | 0  |
| T - All Grades Combined                               | 545  | 109.5 | 17.8 | 10 |

(Table 3--Cont'd)

| Grade                                     | N's         | N's          | S.D.        | †          |
|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| <u>Change of Duty of Rated Officers*</u>  |             |              |             |            |
| A - Generals                              | 4           | 120.2        | 19.2        | 3          |
| B - Colonels                              | 24          | 106.6        | 17.5        | 0          |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels:                  | 82          | 107.6        | 22.1        | 1          |
| D - Majors                                | 62          | 104.1        | 18.8        | 1          |
| E - Captains                              | 91          | 109.8        | 19.5        | 2          |
| F - First Lieutenants                     | 154         | 103.9        | 19.8        | 2          |
| G - Second Lieutenants                    | 50          | 102.0        | 22.5        | 1          |
| H - CMO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)                 | 5           | 101.4        | 15.1        | 0          |
| I - WOJG                                  | 21          | 100.8        | 25.1        | 0          |
| T - All Grades Combined                   | 473         | 104.9        | 20.6        | 8          |
| <u>Change of Duty of Rating Officers*</u> |             |              |             |            |
| A - Generals                              | 3           | -            | -           | 0          |
| B - Colonels                              | 25          | 109.1        | 10.2        | 0          |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels                   | 73          | 113.2        | 17.1        | 1          |
| D - Majors                                | 48          | 110.1        | 16.6        | 1          |
| E - Captains                              | 80          | 111.3        | 16.7        | 1          |
| F - First Lieutenants:                    | 79          | 107.0        | 17.9        | 1          |
| G - Second Lieutenants                    | 29          | 100.9        | 22.6        | 1          |
| H - CMO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)                 | 10          | 107.0        | 18.2        | 0          |
| I - WOJG                                  | 17          | 111.1        | 23.9        | 0          |
| T - All Grades Combined                   | 361         | 109.5        | 18.0        | 6          |
| <u>Other*</u>                             |             |              |             |            |
| A - Generals                              | 6           | 130.2        | 2.8         | 0          |
| B - Colonels                              | 29          | 108.3        | 19.5        | 1          |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels                   | 47          | 110.2        | 18.4        | 1          |
| D - Majors                                | 20          | 105.0        | 17.5        | 0          |
| E - Captains                              | 39          | 110.1        | 21.2        | 1          |
| F - First Lieutenants                     | 95          | 113.5        | 12.8        | 2          |
| G - Second Lieutenants                    | 20          | 107.7        | 15.6        | 0          |
| H - CMO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)                 | 2           | 107.0        | 26.0        | 0          |
| I - WOJG                                  | 6           | 99.0         | 11.1        | 0          |
| T - All Grades Combined                   | 204         | 110.6        | 17.2        | 3          |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>                        | <b>7733</b> | <b>108.5</b> | <b>18.4</b> | <b>100</b> |

\*Reason for Report

there are frequent reversals in the trend when the report is rendered for special reasons. The pattern of grade differential is shown more clearly in Table 4, where ratings decrease from 123.7 for generals to 100.6 for second lieutenants.

Table 4

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CASES, THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF AGR'S BY GRADE (N = 5735)

| Grade                     | N's  | M's   | S.D. | %   |
|---------------------------|------|-------|------|-----|
| A - Generals              | 101  | 123.6 | 11.9 | 2   |
| B - Colonels              | 844  | 111.6 | 16.9 | 15  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels   | 1365 | 110.8 | 17.6 | 24  |
| D - Majors                | 914  | 109.8 | 17.2 | 16  |
| E - Captains              | 1127 | 106.8 | 18.6 | 20  |
| F - First Lieutenants     | 709  | 104.7 | 18.4 | 14  |
| G - Second Lieutenants    | 248  | 100.6 | 20.0 | 4   |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4) | 148  | 106.1 | 18.9 | 3   |
| I - WDJG                  | 197  | 103.4 | 21.9 | 3   |
| J - All Grades Combined   | 5735 | 108.5 | 18.4 | 100 |

#### B. DAYS OF DUTY

Table 5 shows the frequency distribution of the number of duty days and the mean AGR received by officers in each interval of 30 duty days. The last interval (211-300 days) includes all reports covering a period greater than 7 months. As may be expected, the largest number of reports (22%) occurred in this last interval. However, almost as many reports (20%) were rendered for the 61-90 day period. A handful of reports were completed for a period of 30 days or less and only four percent of all ratings covered 60 or less days. The remaining four time periods each had from 10-15 percent of all reports. Although the differences among the mean AGR's for each duty period may be statistically significant in some instances, the mean ratings (and standard deviations) are very close, except the mean rating of 113.2 for the 211-300 day interval. This high mean is attributable to the relatively greater percentage of higher ranking officers included in this interval.

Table 5

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CASES, THE MEAN AND STANDARD  
DEVIATION OF AER'S BY NUMBER OF DAYS OF DUTY  
(N = 5733)

| Days of Duty | N's  | M's   | S.D. | %   |
|--------------|------|-------|------|-----|
| 1-30         | 18   | 108.6 | 17.4 | 0   |
| 31-60        | 216  | 109.3 | 19.6 | 4   |
| 61-90        | 1175 | 105.4 | 19.5 | 20  |
| 91-120       | 859  | 107.8 | 18.2 | 15  |
| 121-150      | 600  | 108.2 | 18.0 | 10  |
| 151-180      | 809  | 106.6 | 18.6 | 14  |
| 181-210      | 797  | 108.5 | 17.4 | 14  |
| 211-360      | 1279 | 113.2 | 17.0 | 22  |
| Total        | 5733 | 108.5 | 18.4 | 100 |

Table 6 shows that 87 percent of the officers rated for this length of duty time are lieutenant colonels and above (grades which normally receive the highest mean AER's), although these grades constitute only 40 percent of the total sample.

Just as grade differentials in ratings were noted when analysis was made within reason for report, the length of period of observation shows a similar trend. For example, in the category 211-360 duty days, general officers score well above the others; and as commissioned grade decreases, mean AER progressively decreases. This general pattern occurs for the other time periods, although there are various shifts and reversals in the trend. General officers consistently obtain top ratings within any given time interval; next in line are either colonels, majors, or lieutenant colonels; and lieutenants usually obtain the lowest ratings.

One interesting problem is the extent to which time in grade affects efficiency rating. Although a longitudinal analysis may more effectively answer this question, the data of Table 6 permit some insight into this problem. If a comparison of ratings is made among the intervals of duty time within each commissioned grade, officers who are rated for the period of time, 210 days and over, tend to obtain the highest mean ratings. However, there is no systematic grade pattern in the ratings of officers when comparison is made within the other time intervals. Only among the second lieutenants does there seem to be any semblance of a tendency for ratings to increase progressively with an increase in the period of observation. However, the N's in this instance are too small to be reliable.

Table 5

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CASES, THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION  
OF ASR'S BY GRADE AND DAYS OF DUTY  
(N = 3733)

| Grade                     | N's  | M's   | S.D. | %  |
|---------------------------|------|-------|------|----|
| <u>1-30 Days of Duty</u>  |      |       |      |    |
| A - All General Officers  | 1    | 135.0 | 0    | 0  |
| B - Colonels              | 1    | 124.0 | 0    | 0  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels   | 1    | 126.0 | 0    | 0  |
| D - Majors                | 3    | 119.4 | 14.3 | 0  |
| E - Captains              | 3    | 107.7 | 16.4 | 0  |
| F - First Lieutenants     | 4    | 112.2 | 21.9 | 0  |
| G - Second Lieutenants    | 2    | 87.5  | 2.5  | 0  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4) | 0    | -     | -    | 0  |
| X - WOJG                  | 1    | 110.0 | 0    | 0  |
| T - All Grades Combined   | 18   | 108.6 | 17.4 | 0  |
| <u>31-60 Days of Duty</u> |      |       |      |    |
| A - All General Officers  | 3    | 115.3 | 19.3 | 0  |
| B - Colonels              | 23   | 117.5 | 12.7 | 0  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels   | 36   | 108.9 | 19.6 | 1  |
| D - Majors                | 42   | 109.0 | 19.3 | 1  |
| E - Captains              | 44   | 110.9 | 16.3 | 1  |
| F - First Lieutenants     | 42   | 107.2 | 20.9 | 1  |
| G - Second Lieutenants    | 18   | 98.6  | 22.6 | 0  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4) | 1    | 134.0 | 0    | 0  |
| X - WOJG                  | 3    | 108.6 | 22.3 | 0  |
| T - All Grades Combined   | 216  | 109.3 | 19.6 | 4  |
| <u>61-90 Days of Duty</u> |      |       |      |    |
| A - All General Officers  | 8    | 124.1 | 7.1  | 0  |
| B - Colonels              | 82   | 107.7 | 17.6 | 1  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels   | 181  | 106.6 | 18.6 | 3  |
| D - Majors                | 172  | 107.4 | 18.2 | 3  |
| E - Captains              | 234  | 106.2 | 19.9 | 3  |
| F - First Lieutenants     | 266  | 104.1 | 18.3 | 3  |
| G - Second Lieutenants    | 30   | 98.7  | 19.8 | 2  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4) | 27   | 104.3 | 19.4 | 0  |
| X - WOJG                  | 30   | 102.2 | 23.3 | 1  |
| T - All Grades Combined   | 1173 | 105.4 | 19.3 | 20 |

(Table 6--Cont'd)

| Grade                       | N's | N's   | A.D. | †  |
|-----------------------------|-----|-------|------|----|
| <u>91-120 Days of Duty</u>  |     |       |      |    |
| A - All General Officers    | 12  | 115.8 | 8.8  | 0  |
| B - Colonels                | 92  | 112.0 | 14.8 | 2  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels     | 198 | 111.4 | 16.6 | 2  |
| D - Majors                  | 139 | 108.8 | 18.5 | 2  |
| E - Captains                | 163 | 107.5 | 18.1 | 3  |
| F - First Lieutenants       | 180 | 105.9 | 18.4 | 3  |
| G - Second Lieutenants      | 73  | 100.8 | 22.0 | 1  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)   | 18  | 103.4 | 17.0 | 0  |
| X - WOJG                    | 27  | 105.0 | 19.5 | 0  |
| T - All Grades Combined     | 839 | 107.8 | 18.2 | 15 |
| <u>121-150 Days of Duty</u> |     |       |      |    |
| A - All General Officers    | 5   | 119.8 | 10.3 | 0  |
| B - Colonels                | 73  | 107.4 | 17.6 | 1  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels     | 141 | 110.8 | 16.9 | 2  |
| D - Majors                  | 95  | 109.9 | 17.6 | 2  |
| E - Captains                | 116 | 110.6 | 16.3 | 2  |
| F - First Lieutenants       | 87  | 105.4 | 19.4 | 2  |
| G - Second Lieutenants      | 30  | 105.7 | 13.5 | 1  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)   | 24  | 99.3  | 21.2 | 0  |
| X - WOJG                    | 29  | 102.2 | 22.4 | 1  |
| T - All Grades Combined     | 600 | 108.2 | 18.0 | 10 |
| <u>151-180 Days of Duty</u> |     |       |      |    |
| A - All General Officers    | 5   | 118.8 | 10.0 | 0  |
| B - Colonels                | 49  | 107.6 | 18.4 | 1  |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels     | 110 | 105.9 | 20.1 | 2  |
| D - Majors                  | 201 | 111.3 | 16.5 | 4  |
| E - Captains                | 220 | 104.9 | 18.8 | 4  |
| F - First Lieutenants       | 113 | 100.6 | 17.5 | 2  |
| G - Second Lieutenants      | 35  | 100.9 | 21.2 | 0  |
| H - CWO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)   | 44  | 110.1 | 19.0 | 1  |
| X - WOJG                    | 42  | 106.8 | 18.0 | 1  |
| T - All Grades Combined     | 809 | 106.6 | 18.6 | 14 |

(Table 6—Cont'd)

| Grade                       | N's  | N's   | A.D. | \$  |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|------|-----|
| <u>181-210 Days of Duty</u> |      |       |      |     |
| A - All General Officers    | 6    | 126.5 | 4.6  | 0   |
| B - Colonels                | 60   | 109.3 | 17.6 | 1   |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels     | 175  | 111.0 | 16.7 | 3   |
| D - Majors                  | 185  | 111.1 | 14.7 | 5   |
| E - Captains                | 216  | 106.0 | 19.1 | 4   |
| F - First Lieutenants       | 74   | 103.8 | 17.2 | 1   |
| G - Second Lieutenants      | 7    | 104.3 | 15.8 | 0   |
| H - CMO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)   | 34   | 107.5 | 15.2 | 1   |
| I - WOJG                    | 40   | 101.9 | 21.6 | 1   |
| T - All Grades Combined     | 797  | 108.3 | 17.4 | 14  |
| <u>211-240 Days of Duty</u> |      |       |      |     |
| A - All General Officers    | 61   | 125.8 | 11.5 | 1   |
| B - Colonels                | 462  | 113.2 | 16.7 | 8   |
| C - Lieutenant Colonels     | 586  | 112.9 | 17.1 | 10  |
| D - Majors                  | 70   | 111.9 | 17.4 | 1   |
| E - Captains                | 71   | 107.5 | 15.4 | 1   |
| F - First Lieutenants       | 23   | 107.9 | 14.8 | 0   |
| G - Second Lieutenants      | 3    | 107.0 | 0.8  | 0   |
| H - CMO (W-2 + W-3 + W-4)   | 0    | -     | -    | 0   |
| I - WOJG                    | 3    | 96.0  | 39.6 | 0   |
| Z - All Grades Combined     | 1279 | 113.2 | 17.0 | 22  |
| GRAND TOTAL                 | 7753 | 108.5 | 18.4 | 100 |

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

79 percent of the total sample of 2735 Regular Army officers received a regular report, and 41 percent received a special report. Lieutenants received a higher percentage of special reports than any other group of officers; this is probably due to more frequent personnel actions taken on the lower grades. Officers who change station, or who are assigned to other duties, tend to receive relatively low ratings--suggesting that the officer who is functioning at a low level of efficiency is most likely to be transferred or to have his duty assignment changed. The lone exception is the second lieutenant--his duties and/or station appears to change with less regard for his efficiency.

In general, grade differences in ratings observed in earlier studies hold true in this case--there is a gradual increase in efficiency rating with an increase in commissioned grade.

42 percent of all officers are rated for a period covering over 7 months, roughly 55 percent are rated for a period of from 5 to 7 months, 20 percent are rated for a period of from 2 to 5 months, and only a very small fraction are rated for a period less than 2 months. Officers who are rated for a period longer than 7 months tend to obtain higher ratings than officers of the same grade who are rated for a period less than 7 months.

A word of caution is needed in interpreting the results of this study. The findings with regard to the number of special and regular reports can be considered applicable only to the population of Regular Army officers who were rated during the period 16 January 48 to 11 September 50. Prior and subsequent to this period, Army regulations governing efficiency reports were different from the regulations then in force. For example, during this period the grades of major and below were rated for a semiannual period; lieutenant colonels and above were rated on an annual basis. In an earlier period, Army regulations directed that all officers, regardless of rank, be rated on a semiannual basis. In contrast, current regulations require the rendering of reports on an annual basis for all grades. The effect of such changes in the regulations is to alter the proportion of regular to special reports. Only to the extent that conditions have not changed are the results applicable to any specific grade. However, the findings with regard to the relationships between reasons for report and grade or AER's, and the information on days of duty should hold true for the present.

### PERSONNEL

Program Coordinator: David J. Chealer

Acting Project Director: Alexander R. Robins

Statistical Advisor: Walter A. Klinger