The Right Soldier for the Right Job: Assessing Complex Military Occupations

by

Lieutenant Colonel Derrick C. Long
United States Army

Under the Direction of:
Professor Susan E. Martin

United States Army War College
Class of 2017

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution is Unlimited

The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
The United States Army has initiated an aggressive campaign to develop operational concepts and force structure to deal with the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous characteristics of the future strategic operational environment. However, while these concepts and plans are being developed, the human dimension component should also be addressed. The most important component in the Army are its Soldiers, because they are the ones that will be asked to fight and will in this complex world. Therefore, the Army should develop a process to assess and select future Soldiers in challenging and complex MOS career fields. This research was based on using the 35P (Cryptologic-linguist) and 18 series (Special Forces) MOS to determine if the Army should develop a comprehensive assessment and selection process to determine an individual's cognitive skills, personality and emotional traits at the Military Entrance Processing Station and before Basic Combat Training. Based on the data collection and analysis, the Army should develop and implement a comprehensive process to assess and select 35P initial entry candidates using 10-Core 35P attributes.
The Right Soldier for the Right Job: Assessing Complex Military Occupations

(8681 words)

Abstract

The United States Army has initiated an aggressive campaign to develop operational concepts and force structure to deal with the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous characteristics of the future strategic operational environment. However, while these concepts and plans are being developed, the human dimension component should also be addressed. The most important component in the Army are its Soldiers, because they are the ones that will be asked to fight and will in this complex world. Therefore, the Army should develop a process to assess and select future Soldiers in challenging and complex MOS career fields. This research was based on using the 35P (Cryptologic-linguist) and 18 series (Special Forces) MOS to determine if the Army should develop a comprehensive assessment and selection process to determine an individual’s cognitive skills, personality and emotional traits at the Military Entrance Processing Station and before Basic Combat Training. Based on the data collection and analysis, the Army should develop and implement a comprehensive process to assess and select 35P initial entry candidates using 10-Core 35P attributes.
The Right Soldier for the Right Job: Assessing Complex Military Occupations

During the Cold War between the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the United States (U.S.), some could argue that the world was more predictable and stable with only two super powers competing for power and influence. However, since the collapse of the USSR, the U.S. has taken the role of the last remaining super power with an explicit and implicit task to provide leadership and to maintain the global world-order. This particular status has resulted in the U.S. getting involved in multiple conflicts to protect its national interest and or to protect its allies. In President Obama’s National Security Strategy, he stated “there is no shortage of challenges that demand continued American leadership. The potential proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, poses a grave risk. Even as we have decimated al-Qaeda’s core leadership, more diffuse networks of al-Qaeda’s, ISIL, and affiliated groups threaten U.S. citizens, interests, allies, and partners”.

After the horrific attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in 2001, the U.S. has been in a constant state of conflict, which has consumed a tremendous amount of resources and human treasure. As the U.S. ended major combat operations in Iraq (Operation Iraqi Freedom) with the subsequent withdrawal of all forces in December 2011, most policy makers and the public were uncomfortable with U.S. troops remaining in Iraq and wanted the conflict to end. Approximately three years later, General John Campbell, the Commander of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) officially handed over the responsibility for securing Afghanistan to the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF). Although this marked an end of major combat operations by U.S. forces against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban (Operation Enduring
Freedom), the U.S. maintains a force of approximately 9,000 troops with the mission to train and assist the ANSF and to conduct counterterrorism and stability operations. Similar to Operation Iraqi Freedom, some policy makers and the public remain skeptical of the number of troops required and they want the conflict to eventually end. Although these conflicts were considered military successes, most would argue that the current level of violence and instability in these regions will continue to complicate the United States’ ability to protect its interest and maintain the global world-order.

Consequently, shortly after the U.S. withdrawal in Iraq, the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) was able take advantage of a weak and ineffective Iraq government. The Islamic State successfully defected Iraq forces, and seized key cites and terrain in Iraq and Syria to establish an Islamic caliphate\(^3\). Under the leadership of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the self-proclaimed Caliph\(^4\), ISIL has been able to use devoted and capable forces to adapt to the changing environment in the region and exploit the weaknesses of their enemies.\(^5\) Additionally, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi was also able to effectively assess the operational environment in Syria and exploit the chaos of the civil war to create the ISIL capital in Raqqa, Syria.

Although U.S. and coalition forces have been able to successfully push back ISIL and re-take some major cities and key terrain in Iraq, ISIL is far from defeated in Iraq, Syria, and in other areas around the world. The organization has been able to export its ideology and mobilize fighters and supporters in North Africa, Asia, and Europe; with the ability to inspire devastating “lone wolf” attackers in the United States. So, even if the U.S. and its allies are able to “degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL”\(^6\), there will likely be other violent extremist organizations (VEO) ready to take its place. Supporting this
prediction, are the overwhelming combination of threats from various VEOs and non-state actors, and the actions of aggressive nation-states e.g.

- The Federal Republic of Russia’s attempts to destabilize eastern Europe by supporting pro-Russian separatists in Ukraine and annexing Crimea, and attempts to delegitimize the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) by threatening its neighbors
- The People’s Republic of North Korea’s continuous threats against the Republic of Korea and testing of ballistic missiles with the potential of reaching the continental United States
- The People’s Republic of China’s territorial disputes in the South China Sea and East China Sea, which threaten sea lines/trade routes in the region that are critical the United States’ economic prosperity and dominance. All evidence suggests that the international stressors described above, and others that are in the emergent phase, will continue and will likely become more complicated and challenging in the near future. Therefore, senior U.S. Army civilians and military leaders should continue to assess the future strategic environment to prepare and posture the force to operate and win in complex world. The first line of attack for winning remains the selection, training and development of the Soldiers for the future strategic environment.

Future Strategic Environment

Some scholars, military strategists, and policy makers describe the current strategic environment as volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (UVCA).
However, the National Intelligence Council’s Global Trends 2030 predicts and even
darker future. Global Trends 2030 describes a world characterized by:

(a) Increased regional conflicts that will spill over and create global instability
(b) Increased in the global population that will place greater demands on food
   and water sources
(c) The emergence of more military and economic peer-competitors to the U.S.
(d) A decline of U.S. power and influence
(e) The development of new multilateral and bilateral alliances that go against
   U.S. national interest
(f) The proliferation of lethal and disruptive technologies
(g) Demographic shifts related to population increases in Africa and Asia
(h) Mass migration to urban areas and mega-cites

In the face of these trends, and according to the U.S. Army’s 2014 Army
Operating Concept (AOC), the following five characteristics will have significant impact
on Soldiers in the future operational environment (EO):

1) **Increased speed of human interaction and events.** The increasing
   speed at which information is produced and made available, through
   multiple means, including social media is increasing the momentum of
   interaction among people.

2) **Potential for overmatch.** The likelihood of technological surprise and
   the potential for operating in degraded conditions is increasing as a
   result of decades of study and investment by U.S. adversaries.

3) **Contested in all domains.** Besides conflict in the land domain, the Army
   may be called upon to conduct operations into air, sea, cyber and
   space domains.
4) Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is an increasing threat to the U.S. and to global stability in general.

5) Operations among populations in complex terrain. Adversaries will limit traditional U.S. tactical advantages by operating in megacities and other complex terrain.\^11

Based on these trends and predictions, the Army’s ability to fight and win in the future strategic environment will challenge leaders at all levels and the Soldiers they will lead into combat. Since the first Persian Gulf War in 1991, current and potential future adversaries, have witnessed the strength, lethality, and technological advances of the U.S. military in combat; and most will not attempt a conventional force-on-force conflict with the U.S.\^12 So, in future conflicts, these adversaries will seek to exploit the U.S. military weaknesses by attempting to degrade its technological advantages, deny access to ports, airfields, and sea lines choke points (e.g., Straits of Hormuz in Persian Gulf, Suez Canal in the Red Sea and Straits of Malacca in the Indian Ocean) and attempt to prevent force build-ups in specific region and countries, and force the U.S. to fight in highly populated cities.\^13 As mentioned in the AOC, the speed of information and access to social media will force the U.S. to operate within the human domain with continuous scrutiny by the public.\^14 The added pressures and expectations of the U.S. to operate and win in the future strategic environments further reinforces the necessity to examine how the Army should access and select the “Right Soldier for the Right Job”.

**Future Soldiers**

Since the creation of the Continental Army in 1776, Soldiers have been the means to fight and win major wars. These Soldiers have fought on almost every continent and region in the world, in the most austere environment and challenging terrain, with the stated goal to win its nation’s wars. In Carl H. Builder's, *The Masks of
War, he describes how the U.S. Armed Services differ from each other in their “devotion, possessiveness, or pride towards their equipment and skills”.\textsuperscript{15} For example, the U.S. Air Force is more attached to their planes and technology, the U.S. Navy is attached to their ships and command at sea, but the U.S. Army takes greatest pride is in the skill of soldiering rather than in their equipment.\textsuperscript{16} Although the future strategic environment will require advance weapons and technologies, the Soldier has and will always remain the Army’s center of gravity.\textsuperscript{17}

The Global War on Terrorism has tested the U.S. Army Soldier’s ability to fight a decentralized, unconventional and asymmetric enemy with the ability to blend into civilian populations and unleash deadly terrorist attacks without regard for their lives or the lives of their victims. Although Soldiers continue to meet these challenges while achieving tremendous success on the battlefield, future conflicts will require Soldiers at all levels to have a common understanding of the strategic environment and the ways in which their actions can have strategic and political implications. However, there are some Soldiers who have a greater probability of encountering situations that impact the strategic environment due to the challenging and complex nature of their Military Occupational Specialty (MOS). These Soldiers will be required to conduct sensitive tasks and missions that can enhance success and mitigate the risks in an UVCA environment. For example, the U.S. Army Special Forces (18-B/D/C/E/F or series)\textsuperscript{18} Soldiers are among the most talented and proficient in the world, and will likely be force-multipliers in any future conflict because of their ability to quickly adapt to the environment and conduct highly sensitive operations. To accomplish their mission, the Special Forces (SF) Soldiers undergo a comprehensive assessment and selection
process to determine their suitability because of the nature of its challenging and complex mission requirements. Therefore, it is important to examine another MOS with similar challenging and complex mission requirements to determine if the Army should develop a comprehensive assessment and selection process to determine the “Right Soldier for the Right Job”.

Research Methodology and Design

Currently, the Army does not have a comprehensive approach to assess a Soldier’s cognitive and non-cognitive abilities for selection into specific MOSs. This research will examine if the Army should develop a process to assess and select future Soldiers in challenging and complex MOSs. This qualitative research is based on using the 35P (Cryptologic-linguist) and 18 series (Special Forces) MOS as case studies and a short survey to determine if the Army should develop a comprehensive cognitive and non-cognitive (e.g., personality/emotional and social) assessment and selection process at Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS) and before Basic Combat Training (BCT).

The qualitative inquiry, as applied in these case studies provides a high level of internal validity because of both MOSs entry requirements and standards, unique mission requirements and impacts as forces multiplier in the future strategic environment. Although each MOS mission requirements are vastly different, the research described here, is focused on the current assessment and selection process to become a 35P and 18 series. The current process to become a 35P as an Initial Entry Trainee (IET), physical (e.g. health and fitness) cognitive and non-cognitive requirements to qualify for the MOS, will be described and used to demonstrate how
using a comprehensive testing and evaluation process is an effective method in determining the correct placement of soldiers in this complex and challenging MOS.

This research includes a comprehensive literature review, collection of expert opinion data on required attributes and elements of those attributes for 35Ps in both tactical (e.g. combat units) and strategic assignments (e.g. non-combat units). To measure the non-cognitive requirements for this MOS, 10 attributes were selected from a review of Special Forces attributes, the interpersonal knowledge, skills, and attributes from the U.S. Army Research Institute, and the NEO personality inventory-revised (NEO PI-R). The attributes were then evaluated and analyzed to design a 10-question survey with 36 sub-elements. This detailed approach, enabled a further refinement of our understanding of the critical components necessary for the 35P to be effective.

Survey participants were drawn from a population of 35Ps currently serving or having served in strategic, operational, and/or tactical assignments, and Military Intelligence leaders that have led/supervised 35Ps at these levels. Following approval from the U.S. Army War College Institution Review Board (IRB), which determined that the project was not considered human subject research, 272 surveys were sent to 35Ps and MI leaders in U.S. Forces Command (FORSCOM), U.S. Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC), and U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM). Survey participant’s personally identifiable information (PII) is not included to protect the participants. However, all participants were asked, to provide their rank/grade, years of service, number of combat tours, and assignments and length of tour in strategic and tactical
units. The participants were provided a copy of the survey and asked to rate the 36 elements, of the 10 higher level attributes, in terms of importance, using a 5 point Likert scale, for 35Ps. Surveys were completed separately for tactical and strategic assignments.

Subject Matter Expert (SME) rating data, obtained from the survey, was used to examine the criticality of both the individual elements, and the combined, higher-order attributes, from which they were derived, for 35Ps in terms of:

(a) Commonality to all assignments
(b) Differences based on assignments to units with direct combat mission vs. supporting missions
(c) Degree of difference between the two assignments

The findings of the research compared and contrasted the existing assessment and selection process for 35Ps and 18 series MOS to determine proficiency and effectiveness of both processes. Results were used to develop recommendations regarding the adequacy of the current selection methods and propose changes to the assessment and assignment of potential 35P candidates.

Case Studies

This research used the 35P (Cryptologic-Linguist) MOS as case study to explain the history of the career field, describe what makes it challenging and complex, and the current entry level assessment and selection process to qualify for the MOS. The 18 series (Special Forces) MOS is also used to explain the history of the career field, describe what makes it challenging and complex, and the current entry level assessment and selection process to qualify for the MOS. These two case studies were
analyzed, to determine if the Army can or should implement a comprehensive assessment and selection process for initial entry 35P candidates.

**The Cryptologic-Linguist (35P)**

In 1930, the Signal Intelligence Service (SIS) was formed to produce the Army’s own codes and cipher devices and to decrypt the communications of potential adversaries. However, during World War II, the SIS became critical intelligence organization because its ability to collect, analyze, and disseminate critical Communications Intelligence (COMINT) to military commanders and policy makers in every major conflict. Prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese Empire, the SIS used a MAGIC device to decrypt Japanese diplomatic messages. Although the MAGIC device was highly successful, it was not able to collect information on the pending attack on Pearl Harbor because the high-level Japanese diplomatic messages did not contain details about military plans and Consular traffic that did contain military information, was not considered a top priority at the time. Additionally, the MAGIC device was so sensitive, only a few senior officials and COMINT analyst knew of its existence, and even less had access to all of the information it collected; which utterly impaired it utility.

After the intelligence failure of Pearl Harbor, the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson reorganized the SIS under the command of COL Carter Clark’s newly formed Military Intelligence Division (MID). Under COL Clark’s leadership, the SIS was able to allow a sufficient number of analyst access to COMINT, to enable them to develop and refine multiple intelligence reports to provide accurate information on enemy activities. During World War II, the SIS became the Signal Security Agency (SSA) and it continued to provide timely and accurate information on the Germany forces in North Africa and
Europe, and the Japanese forces in the Pacific. However, the SSA’s most significant achievement was working with the British intelligence and using the ULTRA system to decipher the German Enigma communications and other high-level German systems. This breakthrough enabled allied forces to intercept highly classified information on Germany military forces composition and disposition on land, air, and sea. Some have even suggested that intelligence collected with the ULTRA system helped change the tide of war and enabled the Allied forces to defeat Germany.

In the early days of the SIS and later the SSA, most of the members were civilians working out of Arlington Hall in Washington D.C. However, once the war started the Army recognized the need to recruit and train military personal to field positions in divisional signal companies and signal radio intelligence companies.

On October 1942, the Signal Corps Cryptographic School was created. At first, the school only trained commissioned officers in the following MOSs: Message Center Officer, Cryptographic (MOS 0224); Cryptanalytic Officer, General (MOS 9600); Cryptanalytic Officer, Translator (MOS 9604); Cryptanalytic Officer, Traffic Analyst (MOS 9605). Shortly afterwards, enlisted soldiers were recruited and trained at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey in Crypto-analytics and linguistics. However, before the end of the war all the signal service companies (e.g. corps signal radio intelligence companies) where authorized eight officers and one hundred twenty-one enlisted men.

After World War II, enlisted Soldiers assumed the duties of the Cryptanalytic Translator and, are currently known as Cryptologic Linguists (35P). These Soldiers are in the front lines with combat troops or providing support to combat operations from stateside organizations like the National Security Agency (NSA). Most of what they do
will never be disclosed to the general public because of the sensitive nature of their jobs. The 35P MOS is one of the most difficult jobs for which to qualify, in the Army, because of the mental abilities needed to work in such challenging and complex environments. For example, a proficient 35P has the ability to provide timely and accurate information to help win battles, capture or kill key terrorist leaders, or even prevent a conflict. Conversely, an incompetent 35P can have disastrous effects on the battlefield, which can potentially cost lives. According to the United States Army Recruiting Command (USAREC), “Army Cryptologic Linguist (35P) performs and supervises detection, acquisition, geolocation, identification, and exploitation and analysis of foreign communications at all echelons using signals intelligence/electronic warfare (SIGINT/EW) systems. The cryptologic linguist copies, translates, transcribes, gist’s and/or produces summaries of foreign communication transmissions”. 33

The skills utilized by 35Ps reside at the tactical, operational, and strategic level. Some of the common assignments at the tactical level include, voice-intercept operators in Military Intelligence Companies (MICO) at brigade level units, with various vehicle-mounted and man-portable communications intercept and signal jamming equipment. Additionally, 35Ps assigned to Special Forces units work in Military Intelligence Detachments/Companies as part of Special Operations Team – Alpha (SOT-A) with mostly man-portable communications intercept and direction finding equipment that is designed to support the unique missions of Special Operations Forces (SOF). At the strategic and operational level, 35Ps are assigned, to the INSCOM with duties that support Combatant Commander (CCDR) operational requirements and to NSA supporting strategic/national level requirements. Although the specific details of the
types of equipment, missions, and operational locations are classified, the diversity of assignments and mission sets for 35Ps are unparalleled and exceed the capabilities of most recruits who qualify for service in the Army. Considering the demands on the 35P and the potential impact that they may have at all levels from Tactical to Strategic, it is clearly valuable to examine the entry level requirements and standards currently employed to determine if this current process of accessing and selecting will be adequate to meets challenges these Soldier will face in the future strategic environment.

35P Assessment and Selection Process

As with all first-time recruits, initial entry 35Ps must meet the minimum enlistment standards, which include the following: be at least 17 years old and not have reached the 35th birthday by date of accession\textsuperscript{34}, must pass enlisted physical, must meet conduct eligibility requirements/screening\textsuperscript{35}, must qualify on the Armed Service Vocational Battery (ASVAB)\textsuperscript{36} and other required pre-requisite tests.\textsuperscript{37} Additionally, all recruits must also qualify on the Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS) after the ASVAB.\textsuperscript{38}

In 2016, Army implemented the Occupational Physical Assessment Test (OPAT) for all recruits at MEPS. The OPAT was designed to will help Army recruiters to select the right Soldier for the right job based now upon their potential to accomplish physically demanding tasks of a specific MOS.\textsuperscript{39} The OPAT includes the following events: standing long jump, seated power throw, strength deadlift and the interval aerobic run.\textsuperscript{40} After recruits meet these minimum standards, they are process through a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS). Under the U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command (MEPCOM) here are 12 Battalions throughout the United States with approximately 1 to
6 MEPS in almost every state. Each MEPS provides processing and testing services for all recruits entering the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.

Like all recruits that meet the pre-screening criteria, 35Ps candidates are sent to a local MEPS and follow a very regimented process that is monitored and supervised by military and civilian personal. Each MEPS is responsible for determining if recruits meet the physical qualifications, aptitude, and moral standards as set by each branch of the military, Department of Defense, and federal law. Once at the MEPS, all recruits undergo extensive health examinations by medical officer/doctors. These examinations include: medical history and clinical evaluations, laboratory findings, and other measurements. The mental health screening consist of collecting information that may disqualify recruits, e.g. serious crimes, drug use history and other information that maybe disclosed to the medical officer.

Additionally, all recruits must take ASVAB and earn a certain score and other test and requirements qualify for specific MOSs. To qualify for the 35P MOS, recruits must meet the following standards:

1) Obtain a minimum score of 95 on the aptitude on the ASVAB
2) Obtain a qualifying score of 100 on the Audio Perception Test
3) Demonstrate clear enunciation and comprehension of English and good, standard English grammar skills
4) Recruits who are not native-born US citizens or who have not attended U.S. school since the age of 6 must obtain a minimum score of 80 in reading and listing on the English Comprehension Level Test
5) Must meet TOP SECRET (TS) Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) access eligibility requirements.\textsuperscript{45}

To maintain the 35P MOS, all recruits must pass a Counterintelligence scope polygraph (CSP).\textsuperscript{46} This requirement must be met prior to being awarded the MOS because of the TS-SCI information and equipment used during execution of various missions. Therefore, 35P candidate do not take the CSP until they have completed language training at DLIFLC at the Presidio of Monterey in Monterey, California and before completing Advanced Individual Training (AIT) at Goodfellow Air Force Base in San Angelo, Texas.

The most unique requirement to obtain this MOS is the ability to pass the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) with a specific score to qualify for certain languages. The DLAB test scores are used to assign recruits to specific languages based on the following four categories:

\textbf{Category I\&II}: 95 or higher qualifies for Spanish, French and Indonesian

\textbf{Category III}: 105 or higher qualifies for Hebrew, Persian Farsi, Russian and Tagalog

\textbf{Category IV}: 110 or higher qualifies for Modern Standard Arabic, Arabic-Egyptian, Arabic-Iraq, Arabic-Levantine, Arabic-Sudanese, Chinese Mandarin, Japanese, Korean and Pashto \textsuperscript{47}

If the 35P candidates achieve a passing score on the DLAB, they are informed about the languages for which they qualify, based on the four categories. However, the candidates will not be told in which language they will actually train, until the completion of BCT and before language training at DLIFLC. However, this incremental process is not completely unique to 35P candidates. All recruits, are counseled by Army Recruiters regarding the MOS for which they may qualify, prior to coming to MEPS. If a recruit
does not ultimately meet the Army requirements for that MOS at MEPS, he or she is counseled on the MOSs for which they qualify and is assigned an MOS based on the needs of the Army. Once recruits complete the all aptitude test and medical evaluations and meet the standers for a specific MOS, they are administered the Oath of Enlistment by a commissioned officer, which is normally the MEPS Commander or his or her designee.

After the oath, most 35P recruits are prepared and shipped to one of two Basic Combat Training units at Fort Jackson, South Carolina or Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Depending on which language they are selected to receive, 35P candidate may be in an IET training status for approximately 1-2 years. The 35P training cycle is one of the longest and most demanding in the Army because of the BCT (8-weeks), DLIFLC (6-15 months), and AIT (6-10 weeks) graduation requirements. This process may take longer if the candidate has to recycle or restart any portion of the training due to academic performance, physical or mental health problems, or misconduct issues.

In essence, the U.S. Army developed and implemented the entry and training process for 35Ps because of the unique challenging and complex nature of the occupation. However, the most challenging and complex portion of this process is determining if a recruit should be allowed to become a 35P; regardless of his or her ability to pass the current mental and physical requirements to obtain the MOS. Although, the process for assessing and selecting 35Ps, is considered rigorous, the U.S Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) has further developed and refined this process.


Special Forces (18 Series)

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Coordinator of Information (COI) under the command of Major General (MG) William J. 'Will Bill' Donovan. The COI’s main purpose was to establish elaborate networks of agents around the world to collect intelligence on enemy activities and weaknesses, to analyze and evaluate this information, and provide reports to military leaders and policy makers. During World War II, the President and Congress established the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) to replace the COI. The OSS’s primary role was to conduct various disruptive and destructive operations behind enemy lines, to aid and train resistance groups, and use radio, pamphlets and other means to erode the morale of the enemy and encourage occupied civilians and military forces.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, MG Donovan believed that highly trained Soldiers with language skills were an essential to OSS mission. He, therefore, created the Operational Groups (OG) to work behind enemy lines to organize, train, and equip local resistance forces and conduct small scale ‘hit and run’ mission against enemy railways and strong points. However, after World War II, the OSS was disbanded in its then form and later became the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). In 1952, former OSS/OG operatives Colonel Aaron Banks and Colonel Russell Volckman lobbied and convinced the Army to maintain an unconventional warfare capability and help establish the Special Operations Division (SOD) of the Psychological Warfare Center in Fort Bragg, North Carolina. The USASOC became successor of the SOD, with the mission to provided special operations forces and capabilities to support the Army, CCDRs and the national command authority. The USASOC consist of over 23,000 active and reserve component Soldiers which consist of Special Forces (e.g., Green Berets),
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Range, Special Operations Aviation, Psychological Operations, Civil Affairs, and other combat support functions (i.e. Signals, Intelligence, and Logistics).

Since the OSS, the US Army Special Forces (SF) have been called to assist, train, and equip foreign militaries and resistance groups, and conduct highly sensitive combat operations in some of the most austere environments with strategic implications. However, the Vietnam Conflict is where SF Soldiers gained the most notoriety and gained most operational experience. During this conflict, SF Soldiers were able to operate in small teams, provide intelligence, conduct low-visibility attacks, and train South Vietnam’s military members. They were and continue to be, the force of choice because of the discreet, precise, and scalable nature of SF operations, which makes SF a more attractive option then large conventional forces. To accomplish this mission, SF Soldiers are organized, trained, and equipped to conduct the following: unconventional warfare, foreign internal defense, counter-insurgency, preparation of the environment, direct action, special reconnaissance, and counterterrorism. These types of operations require highly mature and culturally competent Soldiers that can operate in ambiguous, asymmetric and stressful environments.

SF Assessment and Selection Process

After the creation of the OSS, MG Donovan believed it was necessary to develop an assessment and selection process to determine if operatives were suitable for the tasks they being asked to undertake. To determine the suitability of candidates, the OSS conducted a series of mental and physical tests, to assess the following seven traits/variables:

1) Motivation of assignment (i.e., war morale, interest in proposed mission) and energy and initiative (i.e., activity levels, zest, effort)
2) Effective intelligence (i.e., ability to select strategic goals and the most efficient means to attaining them; quick practical thought; resourcefulness; originality; good judgment in dealing with things, people or ideas)

3) Emotional stability (i.e., ability to govern disturbing emotions, steadiness and endurance under pressure, snafu tolerance, and freedom from neurotic tendencies)

4) Social relations (i.e., ability to get along with others, good will, team player, freedom from disturbing prejudices and annoying traits)

5) Leadership (i.e., social initiative, ability to evoke cooperation, organize and administering ability, accept responsibility)

6) Security (i.e., ability to keep secrets, caution, discretion, ability to bluff and to misled).  

A group of five psychologists developed a three-day assessment program to measure these variables/traits to determine if a candidate was suitable for assignments in the OSS. The utilization of psychologists in the assessment and selection process is still present in the current SF assessment and selection process.

Most SF Soldiers are recruited from within the Army because of the need to have mature and experience candidates. To attend the Special Forces Assessment and Selection (SFAS) course, all candidates must meet the following requirements and standards:

1) Enlisted candidates must be in the pay grade of E-4 to E-7

2) Qualified for or will volunteer for airborne training

3) Able to swim 50-meters wearing combat boots in uniform
4) Pass the Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) with a minimum score of 229

5) Be a U.S citizen

6) Have a minimum general technical (GT) score of 100 or higher

7) Have high school diploma/GED

8) Eligible for a SECRET clearance, score a minimum of 70 on the DLAB, and

9) Not have been convicted of Uniformed Code of Military Justice or have disciplinary action noted in their official military record.\textsuperscript{58}

Once a candidate has met these requirements and standards, SF leaders review his/her file and the candidate is either accepted or not accepted to attend the SFAS course. The entire course is 19 days and includes various physical and mental test to assess candidate’s suitability to join SF. The assessment process is performance and behavior based; as an individual and on a team.\textsuperscript{59} The data collected is applied with weighed effect to the SF-Core attributes\textsuperscript{60} to develop a whole-person profile use holistically is designed to assess help assess and select candidates.\textsuperscript{61}

According to SF Field Manual, 3-18, “the key to SF success is a selection and training program designed to identify and educate Soldiers with the character and attributes necessary to thrive in complex and ambiguous environments.”\textsuperscript{62} Similar to the OSS process, a team of psychologist are used collect, analyze and interrupt the data during the assessment process; and provide recommendation on a candidate’s suitability to the SF leadership. In 1989, COL Earnest Lenz was the first psychologist and SF trained officer assigned to the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare School and Center (JFKSWCS) assessment and selection program.\textsuperscript{63} He started conducting individual screenings and interviews with each candidates during the entire assessment
and selection process. In fact, these techniques are still used in the current SFAS course, which begins with the administration of some routine tests, soon after the candidates arrive, to include the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 and the Wonderlic Personality Test. After these initial tests, the candidate must complete an intense series of tasks that are designed to measure specific attributes like motivation, fitness, practical intelligence, ability to work in as an individual and team in a stress environment. Once the assessment process is complete, the candidates undergo a selection process. This phase of the process begins with evaluating their mental and physical performance during the entire course, input and recommendations on suitability to the psychologist, and a panel of senior SF officers and non-commissioned officers that vote on the candidates file. If the panel accepts the candidate, he or she is offered the opportunity to attend the Special Forces Qualification Course (SFQC) to qualify for the SF MOS and to wear the coveted Green Beret. A comparison of the SF process to that of the 35P, discussed earlier, reveals that the 35P assessment and selection process does not contain the same degree of analysis and rigor.

Comparing and Analyzing both Assessment and Selection Processes

The current assessment and selection process used by USMEPCOM has been tremendous successful at providing qualified recruits to start their journey to becoming 35Ps. Although the current process is sufficient to qualify recruits for military service, it is not adequate to assess and select 35Ps to operate in the changing and unpredictable characteristics of the future strategic environment. Based on search and analysis, the cognitive and non-cognitive assessment tests are not used concert to provide an adequate, holistic profile which can be used to determine the suitability of the “whole-
person”. For example, ASVAB is a cognitive assessment tool designed to predict “Can Do” performance and proficiency in specific MOSs. The ASVAB is a collection of ten subsets measuring verbal, math, and AFQT composite, and provides a score that correlates to skill sets required from specific MOS, e.g., a high score in Word Knowledge and Electronic Information subsets may qualify a recruit for technical MOSs like 35P (See Figure 1). However, it is not a good predictor of “Will Do” attributes regarding personal discipline, physical fitness, interpersonal skills, and bearing (See Figure 1).

Figure 1. Assessment of Potential

Since 2009, the only Army has used the TAPAS in an attempt to assess personality characteristics important in military occupations and to evaluate recruit’s suitability for military life and the likelihood of successful adjustment. Therefore, the TAPAS was designed to identity and measure the “Will Do” or non-cognitive attributes that are essential for every Soldier to performance but are not fully captured by the
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ASVAB. In short, the TAPAS attempts to identify and measure specific temperament dimensions (i.e., personality and social attribute) to predict a recruits level of resiliency and adaptability to Army culture and environment. However, the Army was not certain the TAPAS was a useful tool in assessment recruits for specific MOS.

In April 2012, the U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) conducted a study to determine if the TAPAS is appropriate to assess Soldiers for specific MOSs. The study was conducted between 2009 and 2011, using a sample group of about 18,000 Soldiers in various combat (e.g., 11B-Infantry) and combat support (e.g., 31B-Military Police, 68W-Combat Medic, 88M-Motor Transport Operator) MOSs. After over three years of data collection and analysis, the research team determined that the TAPAS was a useful predictor of job performance, physical fitness and disciplinary incidents in the sample group for those specific MOSs. However, the research team also acknowledged the limitations of the study by only using these specific MOSs and not a larger sample. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest the TAPAS is a useful tool in combination with the ASVAB to help assess and select recruits for the more challenging and high stress MOSs. Mostly because the temperament dimensions measured in the TAPAS are not specific to the job performance and personality/social attributes required for jobs like the 35P MOS. Additionally, some have suggested that the TAPAS is not being administered to all recruits at every MEPS; and only being given to recruits with a GED. If this is happening, it invalidates the theory of using the ASVAB to measure cognitive potential and TAPAS to measure non-cognitive attributes of each recruits for their MOSs. Although this process is disjointed and will likely not meet the Army’s need to assess
and select Soldiers for the future strategic environment, the USASOC has a validated and proven process.

The SFAS course is unclassified, but the details about the actual standards and methods used to measure candidates cognitive and non-cognitive suitability is considered "sensitive information", and was not available during this research. However, the open-source information obtained was critical to the examination of the SFAS course, and understanding how it relates and differs from the 35P assessment and selection process. The SFAS has successfully developed a comprehensive program that integrates cognitive and non-cognitive testing to assess and select candidates. One of the key components of the non-cognitive assessment process is identifying and measuring the 8-Core SF attributes in each candidate. Since the days of the OSS, the development and utilization of attributes have formed the foundation of the assessing and selecting individuals of high caliber for challenging and complex missions. These attributes are assessed throughout the entire process to determine if a candidate is capable and suitable to become SF Soldier. However, the cornerstone the OSS and current SFAS program is the utilization of highly trained and experienced clinical psychologist to run and supervise the assessment process and provide recommendations during the selection process. Following the SFAS model, the 10 attributes addressed in this paper for purposes of assessing and selecting future 35Ps, were created and validated by current 35Ps with tactical and strategic experience, and leaders who have worked and observed 35Ps in these assignments.

Data Collection and Analysis

Based on the model used in the SFAS course, 10-Core 35P attributes were developed, that could be used in the assessment and selection process for this MOS.
These attributes were chosen by analyzing and comparing the SF core attributes, the Army Research Institute’s interpersonal knowledge and skills attributes and the NEO personality inventory-revised to determine the appropriate cognitive and non-cognitive attributes that could be measured in a new 35P assessment and selection process. The 10-Core 35P attributes include the following:

1) **Perseverance** (having commitment, physical or mental resolve, motivated, gives effort to the cause, does not quit),

2) **Adaptability** (ability to maintain composure while responding to or adjusting one’s own thinking and actions to fit a changing environment, ability to think and solve problems in unconventional ways, ability to recognize and navigate within multiple social networks),

3) **Team Player** (ability to work on a team for a greater purpose than himself/herself, dependable and loyal, works selflessly with a sense of duty, respects others and recognizes diversity),

4) **Cultural Competence** (ability to coordinate work, or interact with other people that are of different cultures and social backgrounds),

5) **Courage** (acting on own convictions despite consequences, willing to sacrifice for a cause, not paralyzed by fear or failure),

6) **Dependability** (high degree of conscientiousness, disciplined and well organized, respectful of laws and regulations),

7) **Positive and Cooperative** (sincere in motivations, open to compromise, optimistic regarding the motivations of others),
8) **Social Competence** (comfortable with new people, comfortable in group settings, can interact confidently with individuals at all organizational levels, can interact confidently with individuals from differing disciplines or social backgrounds),

9) **Stability** (able to function under stressful circumstances, balanced in his/her approach to interpersonal conflict, can discriminate and identify real problems, focused on resolving problems when they occur, capable of significant self-restraint),

10) **Clear and Effective Communication** (can clearly and concisely state a problem, understands and can apply metaphors, has a broad vocabulary, uses limited or no slang when speaking, understands and uses English grammar correctly.\(^{81}\)

To assess the importance of these attributes, **70 (272 distributed - 26\% Response Rate)** surveys were collected from 35Ps and MI leaders in FORSOCM, TRADOC, INSCOM, and USASOC. The demographics of the participants included: 2 (4\%) Colonel (COL/O-6), 1 (2\%) Lieutenant Colonel (LTC/O-5), 7 (10\%) Sargent First Class (SFC/E-7), **18 (25\%)** Staff Sargent (SSG/E-6), **22 (31\%)** Sargent (SGT/E-4), and **20 (28\%)** Specialist (SPC/E-4). Based on this data, most of participants were enlisted 35Ps between the ranks of SSG to SPC. (See Figure 2)
Based on the military experience and history of the participants, responses were divided into the following five groups and the survey response data from each group was compared to the others to identify convergence or divergence in scores based on rank or experience. Where no clear differences were found between groups, the group response data was merged:

1) The small group of **COLs and LTC** (n=3) were examined together. Average years of service (YoS) was 26 years, and all had one or more combat tours and served in both strategic and tactical assignments.

2) **SFCs** (n=7) average YoS was 17 years, and all had one or more combat tours, and all but one had both strategic and tactical assignments;

3) **SSGs** (n=18) average YoS was 11 years of service, Fourteen with one or more combat tours, 7 with both strategic and tactical assignments, 7 with only strategic assignments, and 4 with only tactical assignments;
4) **SGTs** \((n=22)\) average YoS was 6 years, 8 with one or more combat tours, 9 with both strategic and tactical assignments, 10 with only strategic assignments, and 3 with only tactical assignments;

5) **SPCs** \((n=20)\) average YoS was 4 years, 3 with one or more combat tours, 2 with both strategic and tactical assignments, 14 with only strategic assignments, and 4 with only tactical assignments (see Figures 3 and 4.)

![Figure 3. Average Years of Service](image-url)
Although each group varied in YoS, combat tours, and assignment history, the analysis of the data yielded only slight deviations in how each group rated all 10 attributes.

Note that each attribute contained 3 to 5 sub-components so the maximum score that could accrue to each attribute differed e.g., an attribute with three subcomponents, each with a maximum Likert score of 5 (indicating that the subcomponent is considered critically important to 35P performance) would have a maximum total score of 15 and a mean of 5, within rating. An attribute with 5 subcomponents would have a maximum total score of 25.

Means were calculated to make the Attributes comparable and the scores were used to develop an overall score for each attribute. Additionally, data were examined in terms of how each of the participants rank ordered the attributes. (See Table 1)
Table 1. Overall Attributes Average and Ranking  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>COL/LTC</th>
<th>E-7</th>
<th>E-6</th>
<th>E-5</th>
<th>E-4</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTABILITY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPENDABILITY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM PLAYER</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSEVERANCE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILITY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL COMPETANCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURAGE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE AND COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was high consensus among all participants that ADAPTABILITY ranked #1, and POSITIVE and COOPERATIVE was ranked #10. The data could be useful in determining if an IET Soldier is a viable candidate to become a 35P. For example, if a psychologist was able to determine if an IET Soldier at MEPS possess all of these attributes but scores significantly higher in the top five attributes, he or she is likely the best candidate to become a 35P. (see Table 3) However, other candidates that score lower but still possess all 10 attributes could also be considered for the MOS.

Data was then analyzed in terms of the relevance of the Attributes to Strategic vs. Tactical roles. Participants with strategic experience rank ordered

DEPENDABILITY, PERSEVERANCE, STABILITY, CLEAR and EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, and CULTURAL COMPETENCE as the most desirable attributes for 35Ps in strategic assignments. (See Table 2)
Table 2. Strategic Attributes Average and Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>STRATEGIC</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPENDABILITY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSEVERANCE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILITY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM PLAYER</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTABILITY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURAGE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE AND COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data indicates that 35Ps in strategic assignments should: (a) Be well organized, (b) Not likely to give up under duress, (c) Be capable of functioning in stressful situations (d) Possess good oral and written communications skills, and (e) Be able work and interact with people of different cultures and social backgrounds in garrison and permissive environments. Additionally, this data could be useful in determining if a 35P candidate is more suitable to work in strategic verses tactical assignments. For example, if a psychologist was able to determine if an IET Soldier scores higher in these top five attributes, he or she is likely a good candidate to serve in a strategic assignment after the completion of AIT.

In contrast to the results from participants with Strategic Experience, participants with tactical experience rank ordered TEAM PLAYER, PERSEVERANCE, ADAPTABILITY, COURAGE, and DEPENDABILITY as the most desirable attributes for 35Ps in tactical assignment. (See Figure 3.)
Table 3. Tactical Attributes Average and Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>TACTICAL</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEAM PLAYER</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSEVERANCE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTABILITY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURAGE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPENDABILITY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILITY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE AND COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data could indicate that 35Ps in tactical assignments should: (a) Have the ability to work well with others, (b) Think and act in a changing environment (c) Not paralyzed by fear and (d) Remain well organized in austere or non-permissive environments. As in the manner in which the results for strategic candidates can be applied, this data can contribute to determining if a 35P candidate is more suitable to work in tactical verses strategic assignments. For example, if a psychologist was able to determine if an IET Soldier scores higher in these top five attributes, he or she is likely a good candidate to serve in a tactical assignment after the completion of AIT.

As described earlier, each attribute contained 3 to 5 sub-components, and the scores were aggregated to develop an overall score for each attribute. Means were calculated, to make the attributes comparable to each other. The Attributes were ranked in importance by their mean scores across participant groups. However, the degree of importance in some of subcomponent of the attributes varied e.g., an attribute of with a mean score of 15 out of a 20 because one subcomponent was scored 5 (Critically Important), two subcomponents scored 4 (Very Important) and one subcomponent
scored 2 (Less Important). The differences in scoring between the subcomponents were examined and found to be minor (range 1-2 points). However, the data collected on each attribute with subcomponents did not indicate any significant degree of lesser importance that would invalidate any of the subcomponents. This sub-component information could be useful in the development of any future assessment instrument or battery test at MEPS. For example, a psychologist could use this data to refine the assessment of a candidate based on subcomponent scores of an attribute to determine level of suitability for the 35P MOS.

Recommendations

The U.S. Army spends about $73,000 on each new recruit from the time the individual walks into a recruiting station, completes the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) screening and testing process, goes to Basic Combat Training (BCT) and Advanced Individual Training (AIT), and arrives at his or her first duty station.\textsuperscript{88} However, these costs can vary based the length and location of the training and other special training that may be required to become fully qualified in a specific MOS. For example, it cost approximately $250,000 to product a 35P from the time the recruit walks into a recruiting station, completes the MEPS screening and testing process, goes to BCT, language training, and AIT.\textsuperscript{89} Currently, there are 1087 E-1 to E-4 35Ps serving the Army, which cost approximately $271,750.00 to produce.\textsuperscript{90}

Although this a significant amount of money to produce one MOS, the Army continues to make the investment in these Soldiers because of what they can provide our military commanders and policy makers. The 35P MOS is considered a challenging and complex because the rigorous training and educational requirements, and these Soldiers ability to provide timely and accurate intelligence at the tactical, operational,
and strategic level. However, based on the research, the Army has not invested in a comprehensive process to ensure it is getting a greater return on its investment.

Currently, none of the 10-Core 35P attributes are being used to assess and select 35Ps at MEPS. By using the 35P and SOF MOS as case studies, this research has made a strong case that the current 35P screening and testing process for initial entry 35P candidates, at MEPS, is not adequate to properly assess and select Soldiers for the MOS. This conclusion is supported by the fact that, all relevant aspects of the candidates’ physical, cognitive and non-cognitive abilities and attributes are not collected and analyzed, to determine suitability for the MOS. Conversely, the SOF MOS assessment and selection process provides an excellent model for how the Army can improve the current process at MEPS because it uses all aspects if the candidate’s physical, cognitive, and non-cognitive abilities and attributes are assessed and used in the selection process.

Although SOF candidates are recruited from within the Army and have different skill sets, the basic process of assessing and selecting can be modified and replicated at MEPS. The Army should continue to conduct cognitive testing using the ASVAB and non-cognitive testing using the TAPAS, physical fitness testing using the OPAT, physical medical screening and criminal background checks. However, the Army should develop a non-cognitive test to determine each candidate’s suitability based on the 10-Core 35P attributes developed in this research. Additionally, this process would require the Army to assign psychologists at each MEPS to collect, analyze and interrupt the data during the assessment process; and provide recommendation on a candidate’s suitability to the MEPS commander, and before the recruit is sent to BCT. The
psychologist should have the ability to study and evaluate the results of each 35P candidate’s medical records and criminal background file, and the OPAT, ASVAB, and TAPAS testing results. Additionally, the psychologist should conduct a final in-person interview with each candidate prior to making an assessment and recommendations to the MEPS commander. This information should be provided to the U.S. Army Human Resources Command as a tool to determine strategic and tactical assignments for each 35P before the completion of AIT. This will provide the cognitive and non-cognitive assessment process to determine the suitability of the whole-person to select the “Right Soldier for the Right Job”.

Although this research provided the preliminary data and analysis to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment and selection process specifically for the 35P MOS, this process can be modified and replicated for other MOSs using a similar research methodology and design. Additional research by a team of researchers to include psychologists will be required to determine how to properly develop at tool or test to assess and select these Soldiers at MEPS using the 10-Core 35P Attributes and related sub-components and for Soldiers that transfer into the 35P MOS from other MOS career fields.
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The General Education Diploma (GED), is for those without High School Diploma. It is a battery of tests to certify aptitude, knowledge and skills. College Transfer, “What is a GED,” http://www.collegetransfer.net/AskCT/WhatisaGED (accessed May 1, 2017).
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