

JIMMY L. MITCHELL
Lt. Col. USAF (Retired)
926 Toepperwein Road
Converse, TX 78109-2420

8 June 1989

Headquarters, USAF/DPXA
The Pentagon, Room 5C360
Washington, D.C. 20330-5060

Dear Sir,

I have recently read a study done for your office titled "Professional Development of Officers Specializing in the Scientific Utilization Area" dated March 21, 1989, and submitted by Syllogistics, Inc. of Springfield, VA (Contract No. F49642-88-D002, Delivery Order No. 5004, Task 6). The author of the study is, unfortunately, not identified in the report.

As a retired AFS 2675 officer (1966 - 1985) and the primary author of the December 1984 "Occupational Survey Report: Behavioral Scientists (AFS 2675), Scientific Managers (AFSC 2616), and Related Specialties", I would like to compliment your interest in sponsoring further study of these problems. However, I also want to comment on the research approach, sample, analysis method, and conclusions of the Syllogistics, Inc. report, as well as make some suggestions on future decisions involving AFS 267X.

Let me start by saying that I fully support the "Officer first, then scientist" concept. Air Force behavioral scientists must develop an overall perspective of Air Force operational functions and the manpower, personnel, and training systems if they are to be worth anything - preferably through experience in some type of operational assignment. I think Perspective is critical for any successful behavioral scientist.

The recent study conducted for DPXOA was to help in "planning for future manning of the various research and analysis offices serving the personnel community in some way or another (p.1)". Yet the study itself focused primarily on Personnel Officers (73XX and Y73XX) and a limited portion of the 26XX community (AFHRL, AFMPC, and DPX). The largest concentrations of 267X officers in the Air Force, namely the USAF Occupational Measurement Center (30%+ of all 267X assigned), the Air Force Academy DFBL faculty (20%), and the Human Factors community (5%+), are largely ignored even though these organizations also primarily serve the personnel community (in one way or another). The USAFOMC writes personnel tests (AFR 35-4, AFP 35-8), develops Military Standards (AFR 50-44) and PFE study manuals (AFP 50-34, Vol. 1 & 2), conducts occupational analysis of specialties (AFR 35-2), reviews AFR 39-1 and 36-1 proposed changes, Specialty Training Standards, etc. The USAFA faculty conducts on-going organizational and attitudinal research in addition to their teaching, and often does special studies for the Air Staff. The Human Factors community deals with many MPT-related areas, particularly for new weapons systems which Personnel will have to cope with in future years.

At the recent National Security Industrial Association (NSIA) conference in San Antonio (9 - 11 May 1989), speaker after speaker stressed an integrated Manpower, Personnel, Training, and Safety (MPTS) theme for future weapon systems development as well as on-going military management and R & D. An integrated MPTS focal point has now been established within HQ USAF with creation of an MPTS office within the Manpower functional area. The trends noted by NSIA speakers suggest that we should not deal with one of these functional areas in isolation, without considering the impact on the other MPTS functions.

In considering the professional development of scientists, the Syllogistics, Inc. report provided an overview of the FY87 Inventory of 26XX Officers by grade (Table 2, p.4) but displayed no distribution of that inventory by major organization or function (except those 261X managers associated with personnel). In this respect, the study has an excessively narrow focus and ignores a major part of the problem. I would suggest that the lack of a broader organizational perspective results in a somewhat biased picture of the problem and runs counter to recent trends in Air Force management philosophy. An integrated approach is needed which examines not only the Personnel Plans needs, but those in all other areas serviced by the behavioral scientist (AFS 267X) and related specialties (this approach was what we strived for in the 1984 OSR).

The Syllogistics, Inc. report asserts that:

"The mathematical and scientific techniques typically used by the 268X and 267X are not generally understood by most of the Air Force. To this end, a new specialty has been created that is related to the 26XX field as it is used in the personnel community. That is the Y73XX specialty. These personnel, which have a masters degree in manpower-personnel-training analysis from the Navy Post Graduate School, are to be used as translators between the analysts and the personnel functional experts. The concept is to take personnel officers and give them basic training in how to use analysis so that they can perform this translation function" (p. 5).

It is not clear why the Y73XX positions were not designated as 267X or 268X positions (to provide qualified 73XX officers with career broadening opportunities and to possibly make use of existing 26XX capabilities). It might be more realistic to code such positions with authorized alternative AFSs so that they could be filled by qualified officers from any of these AFSs - after all, the objective is to get the most qualified individual (which, at any given time, might be a Y73XX, 2675, 2685, or a 2616).

[From 1961 to 1975, we had Personnel Measurement Psychologists (2696F and later 2675C) who specialized in personnel-related support; however, shreds were dropped in 1975 because low total numbers made it difficult to manage assignments. It is quite possible that the same problem will eventually arise with your Y73XX officers...].

The Syllogistics, Inc. study approached the problem through study of "abbreviated career histories of officers who have been in the personnel research and analysis activities within the last decade and who have successfully competed for colonel. This review was conducted to see if

there were any assignment or education patterns that might provide historical insights that would be useful in developing career guidance for the young 26XX officers" (p.5). It concludes, "there is no established track."

I note that only three of the 21 Colonels listed were 267X officers (Berry, Birdlebough, and Curran). The list is more heavily oriented to 73XX and 268X officers. It ignores other Colonels (such as some former 75XX officers) who served the MPT community (such as Colonel Ron Baker, the recently retired USAFOMC Commander and former ATC/XPT; Colonel Bobby Tindall, present USAFOMC Commander, formerly Air Staff and TPDC) and a number of retired Colonels who were successful 267X officers (such as Col. Dan Fulgham, former AFHRL Commander, now with Southwest Research in San Antonio; Col. Lyle Kaapke, former OMC Commander and CCAF President, now of Tucson and periodic teaching with USC overseas programs; Col. Jim Carpenter, former AFHRL/MO Chief, now faculty member at St. Mary's University), as well as past and present USAFA DFBL heads (Col W. E. Rosenbach, now with Gettysburg College, Col John Williams, or Col Richard Hughes). My point is that the Syllogistics study sample was unfortunately a somewhat limited, biased sample. A much broader perspective is needed.

While analyzing the Occupational Survey data in 1984, I worked closely with the guys at MPCYP to identify successful 267X career paths. We pulled career briefs for all 267X and MPT-related 2616 officers and sat down one weekend to analyze the types of career paths of successful officers (loosely defined as Lt Col or Col promotion potential). There were five major patterns; the least potential for success were those who remained only in 2675 their whole career (very few do) and the most successful were those rated officers entering 267X as a senior Captain or Major (often after an AFIT-sponsored education tour) who later moved into Plans or Analysis functions, or who had sought out an assignment as a unit commander. For nonrated scientists who entered the field from some operational or support area as a Captain, promotion potential to Lt Col appeared quite good (with an advanced degree), although O-6 promotion was very doubtful. Unfortunately, this analysis effort was informal; no report was developed (due to reassignments from MPCYP and pending retirements). None-the-less, it does demonstrate that a broader career path analysis is possible and can be done with the total population (if someone is willing to invest the time and effort).

With reference to the "Specialist versus Generalist" dilemma (p. 7 of the Syllogistics study), I have already noted my belief in an "Officer First" philosophy. The comments quoted from General Marquez can, however, be taken as a strong argument for a broader, integrated MPT approach to leadership and professional development. The question is not just a conflict between a functional versus a specialist orientation, but one of how to provide the opportunities and the information needed for scientific officers to make realistic, informed decisions on their own futures, and for organizations to be able to locate the best qualified individuals.

I fully agree and support the comments of General Welch quoted in the Syllogistics report (pp. 8 - 9); this is how the system should work. I would particularly note his comment that "we need to take the secrets out of an officer's professional development and show our people that the system will take care of them as long as they concentrate on their jobs"

(quoted on p. 9). I believe that and lived my Air Force career by it.

Career counseling and officer professional development for a field as small as the 267X and 268X areas (or for a Y73XX) is, however, a very difficult problem. The problem, for a specialized AFS like the 267X (or 268X or Y73XX), is that the formal Personnel and Officer Professional Development programs cannot devote the time to properly meet the needs of a few very diverse and specialized individuals. In a small functional community, the functional leadership of that community must fill the gap by providing information and counseling for those who want it.

Being assigned in the San Antonio area, I worked informally with 5 of the last 7 AFMPC career monitors for the 26XX area. Most were very sincere individuals trying to do a good job. However, as one of the early ones observed to me, it is impossible to provide all the information and personal contact desired by 200+ psychologists when he had some 2000 other scientists and engineers to service. He would refer many of the more general inquiries to me since he knew I would spend the time to discuss psychology jobs with interested officers (it was in my interest to do so to identify the right people for OMC; and I wanted to anyway). One of the things I quickly learned was that 267X officers, particularly young ones, have very little information or insight about the jobs in the specialty. Although small, the specialty is very diverse and many jobs are one-deep positions (which tend to come and go very quickly).

In the 1972 - 1974 time frame, we began Career Development luncheons once a month at Lackland for the young behavioral scientists at USAFOMC and AFHRL, both then located at Lackland, with a guest speaker who talked about their work or an Air Force program. The MPC career development officer participated about once a year. This was a very successful program, but required lots of arranging and understanding commanders.

These career development luncheons could not, by their very nature, reach out beyond San Antonio to involve the rest of the 267X career field (except when I could catch one in town and get them to be a guest speaker). Yet most young 267X officers were really interested in getting more career development information than was officially available.

As a result of this background, while I was in an AFIT program at Purdue in 1975, I began publishing a newsletter for 267X officers, the Air Force Psychology News which tried to provide career development information for this community (see example issue at Atch 1). I published AFPN for 10 years, from 1975 through 1984. Funds for publishing it came from voluntary donations by active duty and retired behavioral scientists (and one advertisement from USAA, secured through Col Ferrari, USAA VP; who got a masters in psychology through AFIT in 1948; I worked with him when he was AFIT Vice Commandant 1969 - 1971).

In this publication, I tried to promote career development and planning, provide hard data on promotions, etc. to give people a realistic perspective on selection rates, and to just let people know what was going on in the various psychology-related organizations (and learn for myself as well). The mailing list also included a sizeable number of retired officers and civilians who remain very interested in what is going on in the Air Force psychology and MPT community. The increase in mailing

costs in the early 1980's really became very difficult to handle.

[Eventually, in the early 1980s, the career development luncheons got lumped with Project Warrior functions; there were some very excellent programs for the young officers. Gradually, the career development orientation got diluted, and the luncheon activities petered out.]

I ceased publication of the AFPN in early 1985 upon my retirement from the military since I joined a firm doing R & D for the Air Force and it would not be appropriate or ethical for me to continue as primary Editor/Publisher. I was unable to find an active duty volunteer to take over as primary editor who I would trust to preserve the newsletter's positive, career development orientation (although I negotiated with several individuals who had that potential). It was a big disappointment [I am willing to help it get restarted if we can find the right person and keep it an unofficial publication; I still have \$143.25 in holdover funds to do so. I would still like to collect and edit the retired news...].

The Air Force association of clinical psychologists also publishes a newsletter and their editor (Major Dick Bloom) suggested merging the two publications in order to service both communities; this proposal was defeated by a vote of their membership at their annual meeting in 1985 or 1986. I still get a copy of their publication, which is a good career information and development vehicle.

I have remain involved with AFS 267X career counseling; I still get calls for advice even after 4 and a half years of retirement. Within the last six months, I have talked to two majors and two captains about their careers and job opportunities, helping them think through their possible future career paths. This suggests to me that the need for improved job and career development information is still very real, although I know the AFMPC career development monitor is trying hard to do a good job.

As we concluded in the 1984 OSR, there also remains the lack of single-point functional leadership for the entire specialty. It is a problem which needs attention if behavioral scientists are to be a more effective force in Air Force research and applications for manpower-personnel-training (as was quoted in the Syllogistics study, p 9). Historically, this lack of functional leadership developed after MPCYP moved from the Pentagon to AFMPC (in one of the general moves to reduce the number of military people in the Pentagon) in the mid 1970s. Without a 267X focal point in the Pentagon, the functional manager responsibility became very diffuse - it is typically an informal additional duty anyway, not a stated requirement of a particular position.

Colonels lose their identity as 267X officers, of course, and none of them can or will accept responsibility for the career field as a whole - each has his own responsibilities and problems. [I have heard that in the mid-1980s, such an informal role was offered to the AFHRL, USAFOMC, and USAFA/DFBL commanders/head, but all three declined as it was not a stated requirement of their jobs. This rumor may be apocryphal, but was not denied when I asked one of the individuals involved.]

In my opinion, this 267X functional manager role needs to be in the Pentagon (although a highly knowledgeable and motivated individual could

possibly do it at Randolph in MPC or OMC, with adequate moral support from DPXA). When the DPXA Director is a former 267X officer, the responsibility should be there. If not, then it will probably have to be the senior 267X Lt Col within the DP staff at the Pentagon.

Updated information on 267X and related positions (268X, relevant 261X, Y73XX, and some others) needs to be gathered. I would highly recommend that DPXA ask the USAFOMC Commander to schedule and conduct another occupational survey of all job incumbents. This would serve as a better data base for both the MPC career development officer and for any DPXA role as the functional manager for the career field. It could also include a job history for each individual, to serve as a basis for a thorough analysis of present career paths for these specialties. (As in the previous studies, GS/GM-180 and 222 incumbents should be encouraged to participate on a voluntary basis; as noted in the Syllogistics report, the civilian behavioral scientists are also involved and concerned - they generally feel they lack good career development advice and guidance.) The survey should be of the whole functional area. I would be very happy to help with such an OSR project in any way I can.

I highly recommend that after the OSR is completed, a Utilization and Training Workshop (U & TW) be convened at Randolph, with representatives of the major organizations concerned with Air Force behavioral science. [Such a recommendation in the last OSR was ignored, although we did brief the results to MPCY, at the Psychology in the DoD Symposium, and several other places.] The AFMPC career development monitor should also participate in any U & TW.

Such a meeting should examine the issues involved and develop recommendations as to any future changes in the specialties involved as well as enhancements in career development and career path programs. The group needs to consider how to communicate with the diverse population [For example, you could resurrect the newsletter, or you might want to experiment with computer data files on 267X and related jobs, who is assigned, and expected rotation dates, which could be accessed by any officer involved; Air Weather Service has developed such a system for their officers' career development and planning].

I do not think the majority of the organizations involved would agree to merging the 267X career field with Y73XX at the major level, which is the inferred conclusion of the Syllogistics study. Such a merger essentially would return the career field to its 1954 position (AFS 8836, Human Resources Research Officer and 8816, Human Resources Staff Officer). In my opinion, such officers would end up with less promotion potential than mainstream personnel officers (which is, I suspect, why it was changed in the first place) and scientists (where behavioral scientists have been doing reasonably well through the years; certainly as well as other predominately nonrated fields).

Rather, I would recommend that you consider changing the Y73XX positions to 267X authorizations, or adopting a flexible system where either AFS could fill both kinds of position. This could provide both types of officers with more realistic career broadening and development opportunities. Indeed, it could also involve qualified 75XX officers as well (those with MA in behavioral science or educational measurement).

One of the key problems in AFS 267X is the lack of overseas assignment opportunities. There are only three such assignments presently (Exchange positions with Canada's National Defence Headquarters for occupational analysts and the Australian Air Force in Melbourne for MPT researchers, and very recently a new 267X position at HQ USAFE). I helped set up the one with Canada as a way to improve career development opportunities for OMC analysts and am extremely pleased with the creation of the new one in Europe. At one time, HQ AFSC was trying to get one 2675A (Human Factors) position for each MAJCOM Headquarters, including overseas commands, but this effort apparently did not succeed. [Exchange programs with the US Army, US Navy, US Marine Corps, and other countries are also possible; for the occupational analysis and R & D programs, such additional exchange programs could be very mutually beneficial. In the job analysis area, the other US services very much need AF help right now as they convert to ASCII CODAP. Another very good candidate would be an exchange between AFMPC and the Canadian Applied Research Unit at Willowdale, north of Toronto; there was some preliminary discussion with the CF Directorate of Personnel in about 1984 of an additional exchange.]

I want to compliment the Syllogistics, Inc. report in terms of the author's emphasis on career broadening and the need for some type of systematized development (career pathing) opportunities. I fully support the idea that 2nd Lts should not be assigned directly to AFHRL or MPC; more experienced personnel are needed. I know Col. Berry when he was AFHRL/ID chief was very concerned and at one point refused to take any more new Lts in the division.

Long ago, in 1973, while I was executive officer (and career development officer) for USAFOMC (then at Lackland), I developed a proposal that all new 267X officers should be channeled into a career broadening tour for their second assignment (in personnel, manpower, security police, or any other AFS involving practical human relations activities or flightline activities) preferably at an overseas location. But they would also be tagged in the personnel system to return to AFS 267X for follow on assignments, to bring that career broadening experience back into the scientific community. [Unfortunately, that proposal never got out of ATC; it was deemed at the time that such ideas were beyond ATC's area of responsibility. I never understood that decision, since I considered making suggestions well within any officer's responsibilities.]

In 1978 - 79, we tried at OMC to set up a career path with the career development officer where new Lts would learn about the Air Force MPT system at OMC (in WAPS test development or as an occupational analyst, supplemented by our career development luncheons and counseling, etc.) and then move to other 267X positions at AFHRL, MPC, and other locations. After a year or so, the USAFA/DFBL objected to OMC getting all their 267X graduates and pressured MPC to send some to AFHRL and human factors assignments. I concurred with the human factors route, particularly when we worked with the Flight Test Center at Edwards and the Human Factors branch at Wright-Patterson to insure that the USAFA graduates would be able to get in appropriate masters programs, so they could upgrade to 2675 within a couple of years. In any case, the USAFA pressure was successful, and the idea of a planned career pathing through OMC to other agencies was not fulfilled.

I still maintain that it is preferable to have new 2nd Lts serve a tour at OMC or another operational unit before assignment to AFHRL or MPC; and I truly believe that OMC is willing to serve that kind of career pathing function. You might want to discuss that with Colonel Tindall and his division chiefs sometime. However, this needs to be done somewhat systematically, to insure that a masters program in applied behavioral science is available where they can complete a degree through subsidized off-duty study. Their graduate programs need to be monitored for Air Force relevance (currently, I hear, some are in counseling programs...).

The Syllogistics study concludes:

..."Professional development guidance to the young 26XX officers needs to address how these officers obtain advanced education and functional or general Air Force experience. It must also recognize that some of these officers may want to continue as 'pure analysts' serving in several functional areas. There are many paths and sequencing alternatives as seen from reviewing career histories of individuals who have served in this arena. Manning of these offices and the associated professional development guidance must balance these objectives and weave the 26XX officers in and out of the various activities. The recent establishment of personnel analysis offices at some of the major commands should facilitate this." (p. 20).

Obviously, I totally agree with this conclusion, except for the last sentence (if the Y73XX positions are reclassified as 267X positions, I would even agree with that). However, the Syllogistics study makes no recommendations on how to get there from the current situation.

In this letter, I have included several recommendations which I think would you get started in that direction.

1. Request a new OSR to provide an updated data base for career development and decision making.
2. Convene a U & T Workshop when the OSR is finished, and charge the participants to develop some realistic options.
3. Define, through DPXA staff decision or perhaps through the same U & TW, who should be the 267X functional manager and what his or her role should be (versus the AFMPC career development monitor).
4. Also define some realistic career paths, involving both 267X and operational assignment sequences, which also insure the opportunity for appropriate advanced degree programs. This could, perhaps, be an additional charge to the U & TW.
5. Set up appropriate mechanisms for full dissemination of all this information to career field incumbents (an unofficial newsletter or perhaps by a dial-up computer information system, which could be periodically updated).

You might also want to examine the Canadian Forces Personnel Selection Officer (PSO) model - they have a loose functional PSO Corps, with a

designated functional manager (recently upgraded to a Colonel position), official newsletter, annual dinner, and distinctive insignia (their chief is Colonel Frank Pinch in CDF HQ in Ottawa). Or examine the USAF clinical psychologists' approach, with a recognized senior advocate, a semi-official association, newsletter, annual meeting, etc.

I noted these organizations in the 1984 OSR, but avoided recommending moving totally to such a "corps" concept since, if improperly done, this solution can lead to the perception of excessive "occupationalism" versus "officer" orientation. Both the Canadian PSO corps and USAF clinicians suffer that problem to some degree (the USAF clinicians have less since they have a very narrowly defined function in the Air Force and are under the broader protective cover of the USAF Medical Services Corps).

If you want to avoid the Corps type of solution, it would still be possible to set up a semi-official professional organization to support this kind of professional development and career motivational activities. You might wish to use this fall's Military Testing Association annual conference in San Antonio (6 - 10 November; co-hosted by the USAFOMC and AFHRL at the St. Anthony Hotel) as the forum for an initial organizational meeting, or the Psychology in the DoD Symposium at the USAFA next April. This semi-official approach has some very strong advantages (including involvement of DAF and other interested civilians as well as military, inclusion of retired officers and perhaps cadets/students, independent funding for any publications, etc.), as long as there are strong ties to and cooperation with the various agencies and activities involved (including the MPC career development officer, etc.). The problem (for Air Force management) with such organizations is that they sometimes find ways to bring pressure on the formal system for progressive changes...

Finally, I would like to note some concluding comments from the 1984 OSR which deserve more visibility:

"When job attitudes were examined, a very positive overall picture emerged of Air Force Behavioral Scientists as interested in their jobs and highly motivated for a full military career. There has been a very positive improvement between 1981 and 1984. ...

Air Force Behavioral Scientists hold about the same ... job attitudes as the majority of Air Force officers, but they are more likely to remain in the USAF than officers in general. The majority want to remain in the scientific (26XX) area, but only about 30 percent expect to remain as 2675 officers their entire career. ...

Thus, members of this specialty appear to be interested, motivated individuals who anticipate a full career with the Air Force as officers and scientists." (page 105 of the OSR).

The phrasing of these conclusions was very deliberate; my perception is that most AFS 267X officers are USAF Officers first and foremost, but are also specialists in the behavioral sciences by virtue of their academic backgrounds and interests. Given a little help, they can and will do an outstanding job for the Air Force.

As you can see from this letter, I have been involved and concerned for these AFS 267X (and 26XX) problems for a number of years (and have been frustrated at not being able to do more about them). I am extremely pleased that you are resurfacing some of the issues which need to be resolved but I do not think that the Syllogistics study of the problem was adequate for making good decisions. More needs to be done.

If I can help in any way toward the resolution of these issues, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Jimmy L. Mitchell, PhD
926 Toepperwein Road
Converse, TX 78109-2420
(512) 658-8847

Atch: AFPN copy