RAND

NATIONAL DEFENSE
RESEARCH INSTITUTE

This PDF document was made available from www.rand.org as a public
service of the RAND Corporation.

Jump down to document ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research
organization providing objective analysis and effective
solutions that address the challenges facing the public
and private sectors around the world.

Support RAND

Purchase this document

Browse Books & Publications

Make a charitable contribution

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore RAND National Defense Research Institute

View document details

Who Is "Joint"?

New Evidence from the 2005
Joint Officer Management
Census Survey

Sheila Nataraj Kirby, Al Crego, Harry J. Thie,
Margaret C. Harrell, Kimberly Curry,
Michael S. Tseng

Summary

Several recent studies have suggested the need for the Department of Defense (DoD) to revisit joint manpower matters and develop a strategic approach to Joint Officer Management (JOM) and Joint Professional Military Education (JPME). For example, an independent study[1] authorized under the 2002 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) indicated that JOM and JPME require updating in practice, policy, and law to meet the demands of a new era more effectively and that such changes should be undertaken as part of an overall strategic approach to developing the officer corps for joint warfare.

In fiscal year (FY) 2003, DoD asked the RAND National Defense Research Institute (NDRI) to undertake an analysis that was intentionally broad, one that would look beyond manpower issues to establish the context for officer development in joint matters. The results of that earlier effort are documented in Thie et al. (2005), which presents the findings of the joint officer analysis, a conceptual strategic approach for joint officer management, and recommendations for operationalizing the strategic plan.

This current work builds on that earlier effort. While the overall project has broader goals, its principal goal is to operationalize the strategic approach for joint officer management in the active component through extensive data analysis and complex modeling. As a lead-in to this effort, the research sponsor and another organization conducted a Web-based survey of individuals serving in billets that were likely to either require prior joint experience or joint education or provide officers with joint experience. The Joint Officer Management (JOM) Census survey (or JOM survey) was conducted in summer 2005. Surveyed billets include those currently on the Joint Duty Assignment List (JDAL), non-JDAL billets in external organizations that have some billets on the JDAL, and non-JDAL internal service billets nominated by the services as providing joint experience or requiring joint experience or joint education.

This report provides an overview of the survey responses. It examines officers' answers regarding their assignments, including the extent to which they believe their assignments provide them with joint experience or require them to have had prior joint education, training, or experience and whether and how these answers differ across organizations and/or services where the billets are located.

This study is designed to set the stage for future, more complex analysis. The next phase of this project will examine the extent to which prior "jointness" is required by billets and whether sufficient numbers of officers with joint education, training, and experience are likely to be available to satisfy that requirement.

---

[1] Booz Allen Hamilton, 2003.

Survey Methodology

The JOM survey addresses the following types of billets:

- Billets currently on the JDAL[2]
- Non-JDAL billets in external organizations that have some billets on the JDAL
- Internal service billets not on the JDAL that were nominated by the services as providing joint experience or requiring joint experience or joint education.

Services and external organizations were asked to identify (1) billets for which a prerequisite joint education course and/or experience gained through a previous joint tour of duty might better qualify an officer to perform the mission requirements of his or her position and (2) billets that provide officers with significant experience in joint matters (for example, billets that provide incumbents with multinational, multiservice, or interagency experience) and thus could be deemed to be similar to joint duty assignments. Each service used its own criteria for nominating billets.

Although the intention had been to survey all billets that met the criteria above—in other words, to conduct a census of actual and potential JDA billets—the survey actually encompassed a subset of billets rather than the census because of an outdated sampling frame and some inadvertently excluded organizations. The 30,043 billets that were surveyed included 8,475 JDAL billets (out of 9,700 billets in 2004); 6,384 billets in external organizations (which encompassed almost all the billets in most of the major billet organizations with some exceptions, most notably intelligence organizations); and 15,184 service-nominated billets (which presumably covered all the billets the services designated as meeting their criteria). We received a total of 21,214 responses—a response rate of 71 percent. However, the response rates varied considerably across billet organizations.

Categorization of Billets

We used two major classification schemes to examine the differences in the responses:

- **JDAL Status**: Billets are categorized into one of three groups: billets currently on the JDAL; non-JDAL billets in external organizations with some billets on the JDAL; internal service billets (which are not on the JDAL by law) that were nominated by the four services.
- **Major Billet Organization**: Billets are categorized according to the organization in which the billet is currently assigned. Those mutually exclusive groups include the following:

---

[2] A Joint Duty Assignment (JDA) is an assignment to a billet in a multiservice or multinational command/activity that is involved in the integrated employment or support of the land, sea, and air forces of at least two of the three Military Departments. The Joint Duty Assignment List is a consolidated roster that contains all billets that are approved JDAs for which joint credit can be applied. Billets are added to and deleted from the JDAL, and there is a validation process to review positions nominated for addition. Because of problems with the sampling frame, not all JDAL billets were included in the survey.

    – U.S. Army
    – U.S. Navy
    – U.S. Air Force
    – U.S. Marine Corps
    – Joint Staff
    – Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD)
    – U.S. Central Command joint task force (CENTCOM JTF)
    – International organizations
    – Combat support agencies (CSAs)
    – Other non-OSD defense agencies
    – OSD defense agencies
    – Educational agencies
    – Geographic commands
    – Force provider
    – Functional commands.[3]

About half the billets in the responding sample had been nominated by the services, 29 percent were JDAL billets, and the remaining billets were non-JDAL billets in external organizations. Together, the Army and Air Force billets account for 40 percent of the responding sample. Navy billets account for a little less than 10 percent of the sample, and the Marine Corps accounts for 0.3 percent of the sample.

Caveats

Sample sizes are quite small for some groups; thus, the findings should be seen as suggestive rather than definitive. Because we are unable to correct for nonresponse, it is important to view the findings here as being representative of the responding sample and not the entire universe of joint or potentially joint officers.

Although we show differences in characteristics of the billets nominated by the four services, it is important to remember that these billets cannot and should not be directly compared. The services were provided with broad criteria for nominating billets; however, how the criteria should be operationalized and any additional criteria to be used were left up to the individual services. As a result, the billets nominated by the services are wide-ranging, with the Marine Corps being the most selective and most parsimonious in its nominations. Thus, one should not expect these billets to be comparable or draw inferences regarding how "joint" billets in one service are compared with those in another.

Typical Metrics of "Jointness"

The JOM survey gathered information by asking questions about a number of billet characteristics that are generally regarded as defining jointness—types of tasks performed during a

---

[3] See Table 3.1 in Chapter Three for a crosswalk between organizations that were surveyed and the categorization used here.

typical workweek; supervision of the billet by non–own-service or civilian personnel; frequency and number of interactions with non–own-service organizations and personnel; the need for joint professional education or prior joint experience for successful job performance; and types of joint experience provided by the billet. There are other measures of jointness, but these characteristics are a reasonable subset to use for purposes of this analysis. We use officers' responses to these questions to provide a broad-brush picture of how billets in various organizations rank along the various dimensions.

Table S.1 defines the set of indicators used to characterize jointness. Tables S.2 through S.4 describe the billets along the various dimensions by JDAL category and billet organization.

Tasks Performed During a Typical Workweek

Four tasks were selected as representing "highly joint" activities—(1) providing strategic direction and integration; (2) developing/assessing joint policies; (3) developing/assessing joint doctrine; and (4) fostering multinational, interagency, or regional relations. Officers were much more likely to report doing the first task than the other three, as shown in Table S.2. Close to 80 percent of JDAL officers performed one or more of these tasks,[4] and 27 percent

Table S.1
Definitions of Indicators Used to Characterize "Jointness"

Metric	Indicator
Tasks performed during the typical workweek	Percentage of officers providing strategic direction and integration
	Percentage of officers developing/assessing joint policies
	Percentage of officers developing/assessing joint doctrine
	Percentage of officers fostering multinational, interagency, or regional relations
	Percentage of officers performing three or more of these tasks
Interactions with non–own-service organizations and personnel	Median number of non–own-service organizations with whom officers interact monthly or more frequently
	Median number of non–own-service personnel with whom officers interact monthly or more frequently
Supervision of billet by non–own-service personnel/civilians	Percentage of officers reporting being supervised by one or more non–own-service supervisor/civilian/non–U.S. military personnel or civilian
Need for joint professional education or prior joint experience	Percentage of officers reporting that JPME II is required or desired for the assignment
	Percentage of officers reporting that prior joint experience is required or desired for the assignment
Types of joint experience provided by the billet	Percentage of officers reporting getting significant experience in multiservice matters
	Percentage of officers reporting getting significant experience in multinational matters
	Percentage of officers reporting getting significant experience in interagency matters
	Percentage of officers reporting getting significant experience in all three areas

---

[4] See Chapter Five for further details.

Table S.2
Rankings of Billet Categories Based on Tasks Performed During the Typical Workweek

	Percentage of Officers Providing Strategic Direction and Integration	Rank	Percentage of Officers Developing or Assessing Joint Policies	Rank	Percentage of Officers Developing or Assessing Joint Doctrine	Rank	Percentage of Officers Fostering Multinational, Interagency, or Regional Relations	Rank	Percentage of Officers Performing Three or More of These Tasks	Rank
JDAL Category										
JDAL billets	59.0	1	37.5	1	32.8	1	31.6	1	27.0	1
Non-JDAL billets in external organizations	45.2	2	22.8	2	18.8	2	21.3	2	14.6	2
Service-nominated billets	34.0	3	12.1	3	12.9	3	15.0	3	8.5	3
Major Billet Organization										
Joint Staff	68.3	2	54.4	1	44.1	2	21.6	8	36.4	1
OSD	77.6	1	45.2	2	22.8	8	24.7	6	25.5	5
CENTCOM JTF	42.4	12	18.3	12	11.2	15	33.5	3	10.4	12
Army	26.4	15	10.2	15	12.7	13	17.1	11	8	14
Navy	33.1	14	11.8	14	11.5	14	16.4	12	7.9	15
Air Force	40.7	13	13.6	13	13.1	12	12.4	13	9	13
Marine Corps	55.4	5	36.9	6	41.5	4	20.0	9	23.1	8
International organizations	47.1	10	33.6	7	25.4	7	48.8	1	24.6	6
CSAs	46.3	11	18.8	11	14.8	11	25.1	5	12	11
Other non-OSD defense agencies	54.7	6	25.4	10	21.4	9	27.5	4	20.5	9
OSD defense agencies	57.1	4	31.7	9	20.5	10	9.3	14	18	10
Educational agencies	49.8	9	40.5	4	43.5	3	24.1	7	30.4	2
Geographic commands	52.5	7	32.1	8	28.6	6	34.5	2	23.6	7
Force provider	50.7	8	40.1	5	46.0	1	19.6	10	28.2	4
Functional commands	62.3	3	41.0	3	38.6	5	8.7	15	28.3	3

NOTES: This table summarizes data found in Tables 5.1 and 5.4 in Chapter Five.
Organizations with equal percentages of officers meeting the particular criterion were given the same rank.

of JDAL officers performed at least three of these tasks. In contrast, only 45 percent of officers in internal service billets performed any of these joint tasks, and less than 10 percent of officers in internal service billets performed three or more of these tasks. The non-JDAL, non-service billets ranked in the middle, with 60 percent of officers performing at least one of the four tasks and 15 percent performing at least three of the tasks. Eighty-five percent of officers in Joint Staff or OSD staff billets and 75 percent of officers in Marine Corps, international organization, force provider, and functional command billets performed one or more of these tasks. Between 22 and 36 percent of officers at these organizations performed three or more of these tasks.

Based on this set of indicators, JDAL and non-JDAL billets in external organizations rank either first or second among JDAL categories, while internal service billets rank third. When we examine major billet organizations, billets assigned to the Joint Staff, OSD staff, educational agencies, force provider, and the functional commands seem to rank high on these measures of "jointness." The rankings of the others are more mixed, with some ranking high on tasks performed and others ranking high on the "providing strategic direction and integration" indicator. The Marine Corps billets rank higher than the other three services on all four measures of jointness.

Frequency and Number of Interactions with Non–Own-Service Organizations and Personnel

Officers in JDAL billets tended to interact frequently with the highest number of non–own-service organizations (six) while officers assigned to internal service billets interacted with one (see Table S.3). Officers serving in the OSD or Joint Staff reported interacting with between nine and 13 non–own-service organizations frequently. The defense agencies, combat support agencies, and the combatant commands reported interacting with five non–own-service organizations. CENTCOM JTF, educational agency, and international organization billets interacted frequently with two to three organizations. Among the services, officers in Marine Corps billets interacted with three non–own-service organizations compared with one for the Army and Air Force.

Overall, using the median, JDAL and non-JDAL billet officers reported interactions with five types of personnel, compared with two for officers serving in the billets nominated by the services. Officers serving in CENTCOM JTF, educational agencies, and geographic commands reported interacting frequently with six types of personnel (excluding own-service personnel), while all other non-service billets reported interacting with five types of non–own-service personnel. Among the services, the median for the Navy and Marine Corps billets was four types of personnel compared with two for the Army and Air Force billets.

Supervision of Billet by Non–Own-Service Personnel

Not unexpectedly, close to 80 percent of JDAL billets and about 75 percent of non-JDAL billets in external organizations are supervised by at least one non–own-service supervisor, compared with a little more than 20 percent of the service-nominated billets (see Table S.3).

Officers serving in OSD staff or OSD defense agency billets are almost all supervised by at least one non–own-service supervisor, and this was true of 75 percent or more of officers assigned to other agencies, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands. Only 45 percent of

Table S.3
Rankings of Billet Categories Based on Frequent Interactions with Non–Own-Service Organizations and Personnel and Non–Own-Service Supervision

	Median Number of Non–Own-Service Organizations with Whom Officers Interact Monthly or More Frequently	Rank	Median Number of Non–Own-Service Personnel with Whom Officers Interact Monthly or More Frequently	Rank	Percentage of Billets Supervised by Non–Own-Service Supervisors or Civilians	Rank
JDAL Category						
JDAL billets	6	1	5	1	78	1
Non-JDAL billets in external organizations	4	2	5	1	75.4	2
Service-nominated billets	1	3	2	3	21	3
Major Billet Organization						
Joint Staff	13	1	5	4	77.8	8
OSD	9	2	5	4	94.6	2
CENTCOM JTF	3	9	6	1	50.1	10
Army	1	14	2	14	8.9	15
Navy	2	12	4	12	29.6	12
Air Force	1	14	2	14	26.8	13
Marine Corps	3	9	4	12	13.8	14
International organizations	2	12	5	4	45.5	11
CSAs	5	3	5	4	83.9	4
Other non-OSD defense agencies	5	3	5	4	83.7	6
OSD defense agencies	5	3	5	4	96.1	1
Educational agencies	3	9	6	1	85.5	3
Geographic commands	5	3	6	1	74.5	9
Force provider	5	3	5	4	83.9	5
Functional commands	5	3	5	4	79	7

NOTES: This table summarizes data found in Tables 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7 in Chapter Four and Figures 3.2 and 3.3 in Chapter Three. Organizations with the same median number or equal percentages of officers meeting the particular criterion were given the same rank.

those serving in international organizations reported having at least one non–own-service supervisor. Of the major billet organizations, the four services, particularly the Army and Marine Corps, were the least likely to have supervisors from other organizations.

JDAL billets rank first on both indicators (interaction with non–own-service organizations and interaction with non–own-service personnel); Joint Staff and OSD billets rank first or second. However, CENTCOM JTF billets rank low on the interactions-with-organizations indicator but rank very high on the interactions-with-personnel indicator. Other non-service organizations were in the middle, with the services generally ranking last on these indicators, with the exception of the Marine Corps.

Need for Joint Professional Education and Prior Joint Experience for Billet Assignment

The majority of officers believed that joint professional education (JPME II) and prior experience in a joint environment were required or desired to perform their duties successfully

(see Table S.4).[5] Officers in internal service billets were less likely to report as such, but even among those officers, between 70 and 80 percent believed that such education and experience is required or desired for effective job performance. Among major billet organizations, well over 80 percent of officers in non-service billets and in the Marine Corps billets reported that joint education and experience were required or desired for the assignment.

Although the ranking reflects these percentages, even among those organizations that ranked last, 60–78 percent of officers reported a need for joint education and experience.

Joint Experience Provided by a Billet

JDAL billets provided the most experience in multiservice, multinational, and interagency matters (see Table S.5). Overall, 87 percent of officers in JDAL billets reported that they gained significant experience in multiservice matters, and between 65 and 75 percent reported gaining significant experience in multinational and interagency matters. Officers in

Table S.4
Rankings of Billet Categories Based on Need for Joint Professional Education and Prior Joint Experience in Billet Assignment

	Percentage of Officers Reporting that JPME II Is Required or Desired for the Assignment	Rank	Percentage of Officers Reporting that Prior Joint Experience Is Required or Desired for the Assignment	Rank
JDAL Category				
JDAL billets	91.7	1	88.9	1
Non-JDAL billets in external organizations	86.3	2	84.9	2
Service-nominated billets	70.9	3	69.9	3
Major Billet Organization				
Joint Staff	90.4	5	86.7	5
OSD	91.8	4	90.5	3
CENTCOM JTF	84.7	10	85.3	7
Army	77.7	13	73.7	13
Navy	60.7	15	64.4	15
Air Force	69.6	14	69.1	14
Marine Corps	82.5	12	83.6	9
International organizations	85.1	9	83.1	11
CSAs	84.3	11	84.9	8
Other non-OSD defense agencies	88.1	8	83.2	10
OSD defense agencies	89.9	6	86.3	6
Educational agencies	95.2	1	95.0	1
Geographic commands	93.3	3	90.0	4
Force provider	94.2	2	91.0	2
Functional commands	88.4	7	82.8	12

NOTES: This table summarizes data found in Figures 6.2 and 6.3 and Table 6.10 in Chapter Six. Organizations with equal percentages of officers meeting the particular criterion were given the same rank.

---

[5] Large percentages of officers reported that they had no experience with JPME II. For example, 52 percent of officers in non-JDAL billets in external organizations indicated that they had no experience with JPME II, as did 59 percent of officers in internal service billets. We restricted the responses to those with experience with JPME II when calculating the percentages reporting that JPME II was required or desired.

Table S.5
Rankings of Billet Categories Based on Types of Joint Experience Provided by the Billet

	Percentage of Officers Reporting Getting Significant Experience in Multiservice Matters	Rank	Percentage of Officers Reporting Getting Significant Experience in Multinational Matters	Rank	Percentage of Officers Reporting Getting Significant Experience in Interagency Matters	Rank	Percentage of Officers Reporting Getting Significant Experience in All Three Areas	Rank
JDAL Category								
JDAL billets	86.9	1	65.0	1	75.1	2	53.4	1
Non-JDAL billets in external organizations	79.1	2	56.7	2	75.9	1	47.5	2
Service-nominated billets	48.9	3	39.6	3	43.8	3	23.5	3
Major Billet Organization								
Joint Staff	89.3	2	57.1	5	74.4	7	51.6	4
OSD	92.5	1	55.8	6	84.6	2	50.6	5
CENTCOM JTF	82.4	7	81.2	2	71.9	8	63.1	2
Army	49.7	14	50.4	10	42.1	15	28.5	11
Navy	52.3	13	37.2	12	43.6	14	23.8	14
Air Force	46.2	15	31.3	14	45.7	12	19.1	15
Marine Corps	77.1	10	45.9	11	44.3	13	24.6	13
International organizations	65.9	12	96.3	1	47.8	11	39.5	9
CSAs	77.8	9	54.3	8	81.3	5	45.8	7
Other non-OSD defense agencies	75.8	11	55.4	7	81.6	4	48.3	6
OSD defense agencies	86.4	4	36.6	13	85.1	1	34.8	10
Educational agencies	81.4	8	71.7	4	83.1	3	65.0	1
Geographic commands	88.7	3	73.2	3	76.7	6	59.8	3
Force provider	85.9	5	51.5	9	62.1	10	45.8	8
Functional commands	82.7	6	30.5	15	62.7	9	26.5	12

NOTES: This table summarizes data found in Figures 6.7 through 6.12 and Table 6.10 in Chapter Six. Organizations with equal percentages of officers meeting the particular criterion were given the same rank.

non-JDAL, non-service billets were much less likely to report gaining experience with multi-national matters than with multiservice or interagency matters. Compared with officers in non-service billets, officers in service-nominated billets were less likely to report gaining experience in these areas

More than 70 percent of the non-service organizations provide significant experience in multiservice matters, and this is also true of Marine Corps billets. By comparison, 46–52 percent of the Army, Navy, and Air Force billets provide such experience. Other billets that ranked high on this indicator were educational agency, OSD defense agency, geographic command, and force provider billets.

Almost all officers assigned to international organizations reported getting significant experience in multinational matters. Other organizations that ranked high on this indicator include CENTCOM JTF, geographic commands, and educational agencies, with 70–80 percent of officers in these organizations agreeing or strongly agreeing that their billets provide significant experience in multinational matters.

With a few exceptions, non-service billets provide significant amounts of experience in interagency matters. Those serving in OSD staff or other agency billets were particularly likely to agree strongly with this statement. About 40–45 percent of officers in internal service billets reported getting such experience.

Ninety percent or more of JDAL and non-JDAL, non-service billets provide experience in at least one of the three joint areas (multiservice, multinational, or interagency). About half provide experience in all three areas, compared with 24 percent of internal service billets. Well over 85 percent of billets, except for those in the services, provide significant experience in at least one of these areas, and, with some exceptions, well over 70 percent provide significant experience in two of the areas. More than half of the billets in the educational agencies, CENTCOM JTF, geographic commands, Joint Staff, and OSD staff provide significant experience in all three areas.

Not unexpectedly, JDAL billets rank first on every indicator. Educational agencies, CENTCOM JTF billets, and billets in the geographic commands rank very high on providing significant experience in all three areas.

Conclusions

The 2005 Joint Officer Management Census survey was designed to elicit information on joint billets on the JDAL, potential joint billets in external organizations with some billets on the JDAL, and internal service billets nominated by the services as requiring or providing joint experience. The findings provide a rich, descriptive portrait of the experiences of officers in the various joint or potential joint billets. In Chapter Eight, we show how the data can be used to support more-analytical models of joint officer supply and demand: (1) to estimate numbers of billets available to provide joint duty assignments based on experiences afforded by the billets and (2) to estimate demand for joint duty billets based on reported need for joint education, joint education, or both.

However, grouping the billets as we have done for ease of exposition and to portray overall trends hides important information. In deciding whether a particular billet provides joint experience or requires joint experience, training, and/or education—and as such deserves recognition as a joint duty assignment—the billet ultimately needs to be examined on

its own merits. That is the purpose of the next phase of this project. Continuing work by RAND will examine the extent to which prior jointness is required by billets and whether sufficient numbers of officers with joint education, training, and experience are likely to be available to satisfy that requirement.