

AD-A076 973

AIR FORCE OCCUPATIONAL MEASUREMENT CENTER RANDOLPH AFB TX F/G 5/1
MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS CAREER LADDER, AFSC 391X0A/B.(U)
OCT 79 K J KRAMER

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

1 OF 1
AD-
A076973



END
DATE
FILMED

12-79
DDC

AD A 076973

DDC FILE COPY

LEVEL II OCCUPATIONAL SURVEY REPORT

2

9 Final rept.



DDC
REFINER
NOV 19 1979
RESERVE
E

10 Kenneth J. Kramer

6

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS CAREER LADDER

AFSC 391X0A/B

1277

11

OCTOBER 1979

AFPT 90-391-380

OCCUPATIONAL SURVEY BRANCH
USAF OCCUPATIONAL MEASUREMENT CENTER
RANDOLPH AFB TEXAS 78148

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

703

408 889

79 11 09 062

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NUMBER
PREFACE	3
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	4
INTRODUCTION	5
SURVEY METHODOLOGY	6
RESULTS	10
Analysis of Career Ladder Structure	10
Job Group Descriptions	12
Analysis of DAFSC Groups	20
Comparison of AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions with DAFSC Groups	38
Analysis of TAFMS Groups	41
Analysis of Task Difficulty	47
Analysis of Training Emphasis	53
Analysis of Training Documents	57
Analysis of Major Command Differences	60
Comparison of Current Survey to Previous Survey	62
IMPLICATIONS	64
APPENDIX A	65

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist.	Avail and/or special
A	

PREFACE

This report presents the results of a detailed Air Force Occupational Survey of the Maintenance Analysis career ladder (AFSCs 39130A, 39150A, 39170A, 39130B, 39150B, 39170B, 39199, and CEM Code 39300). The project was undertaken at the request of 3ABR39130A/B course officials at the Chanute Technical Training Center and was directed by USAF Program Technical Training, Volume II. The project was designed to provide technical training officials with additional data on the 391X0 career ladder and associated technical training courses. Authority for conducting occupational surveys is contained in AFR 35-2. Computer outputs from which the report was produced are available for use by operating and training officials.

Mr. David E. Williams, Inventory Development Specialist, developed the survey instrument. Second Lieutenant Kenneth J. Kramer analyzed the data and wrote the final report. This report has been reviewed and approved by Lieutenant Colonel Jimmy L. Mitchell, Chief, Airman Career Ladders Analysis Section, Occupational Survey Branch, USAF Occupational Measurement Center, Randolph AFB, Texas 78148.

Computer programs for analyzing the occupational data were designed by Dr. Raymond E. Christal, Occupational and Manpower Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL), and were written by the Project Analysis and Programming Branch, Computational Sciences Division, AFHRL.

Copies of this report are available to air staff sections, major commands, and other interested training and management personnel upon request to the USAF Occupational Measurement Center, attention of the Chief, Occupational Survey Branch (OMY), Randolph AFB, Texas, 78148.

This report has been reviewed and is approved.

BILLY C. McMASTER, Col, USAF
Commander
USAF Occupational Measurement
Center

WALTER E. DRISKILL, Ph.D.
Chief, Occupational Survey Branch
USAF Occupational Measurement
Center

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1. Survey Coverage: From February to June 1979, consolidated base personnel offices worldwide administered the 391X0A/B job inventory to Maintenance Analysis incumbents. The 616 respondents comprising the final survey sample represent 67 percent of the 925 members assigned to the specialty.
2. Career Ladder Structure: The analysis of the specialty organization of the 391X0A/B career ladder identified two clusters and one independent job type. One cluster consisted of A-shred aerospace vehicle production analysts whereas the other cluster consisted of B-shred communication electronic meteorological (CEM) maintenance data analysts. The independent job type consisted of 391X0 personnel at an air logistics center. Overall, the specialty structure analysis supports the present career field organization.
3. Career Ladder Progression: The 391X0 incumbents at all skill levels still perform all aspects of production analysis. The only progression in the career ladder occurs at the 7- and 9-skill levels where personnel add supervisory duties to the core of technical tasks performed.
4. AFR 39-1 Evaluation: Overall, the AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions provide a good overview of the duties and responsibilities of the career field. However, a clear reference to the statistical calculations performed by career ladder incumbents may be warranted in future 391X0A/B specialty descriptions.
5. Analysis of Training Documents: The 391X0 STS generally provides a good comprehensive overview of the job performed by 391X0A/B incumbents. However, several computer product evaluation tasks may warrant inclusion in future STS revisions. The POIs for A- and B-shred entry level training presently include substantial statistics training which is utilized by less than 30 percent of first-term incumbents. Tasks involving evaluation of computer products and report preparation may need to be included in future POI revisions.
6. Implications: The maintenance analysis career ladder is a basically stable specialty which is properly structured with two distinct subspecialties ("shredouts"). Some problems were evident in the relatively high percentages of incumbents who felt their training was not being properly utilized in their present job.

OCCUPATIONAL SURVEY REPORT
MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS CAREER LADDER
(AFSC 391X0A/B)

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of an occupational survey of the Maintenance Analysis career ladders (AFSC 391X0A/B) completed by the Occupational Survey Branch, USAF Occupational Measurement Center, in September 1979. Members of the Maintenance Analysis specialty aid maintenance managers by analyzing, interpreting, and summarizing the various forms of maintenance data available on aircraft, missile, and communications systems. The specialty members' duties revolve around collecting maintenance data, analyzing maintenance reports, calculating maintenance capabilities, and reporting maintenance analysis findings.

The career ladder was established in September 1960 as the Maintenance Analysis Specialty, AFSC 434X0. The career ladder received its present numerical designation of AFSC 391X0 in March 1970. In the March 1970 reorganization, the 5- and 7-skill level Maintenance Analysis incumbents were split into three shredouts: A - Aerospace Weapons System; B - Communication-Electronic; and C - Motor Vehicle. Three-skill level incumbents were not given shred designations until January 1973. The most recent changes in the career field occurred in October 1978. The 391X0C shredout was realigned into the Vehicle Maintenance area as a completely separate specialty, AFSC 472X4, Motor Vehicle Analysis, and the maintenance manager (CEM Code 39300) was added to specialty structure.

Currently, 391X0A/B personnel enter the career ladder by attending either the 3ABR39130A or 3ABR39130B course at Chanute AFB IL. Upon completion of the self-paced courses, graduates are awarded a 3-skill level DAFSC.

A previous occupational survey of the Maintenance Analysis specialty was performed in October 1973. The survey instrument for the 1973 report, AFPT 90-391-104, consisted of 277 tasks grouped under ten duty sections and a background information section of 45 variables. The previous inventory surveyed 750 Maintenance Analysis respondents.

The current survey instrument was initiated as an update of the consolidated task inventory bank (CTIB) developed by the Occupational Measurement Center. However, at the request of 3ABR39130A/B course officials, the inventory was administered to incumbents in the field in order to provide data for use in the management of training programs.

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

Major areas addressed in the report include: (1) development and administration of the survey instrument; (2) the specialty structure found within the career field and its relationship to skill level and experience level groups; (3) a comparison of the specialty structure with career field documents such as the AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions; and (4) an analysis of the training provided to 391X0 incumbents.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Inventory Development

The data collection instrument for this occupational survey was USAF Job Inventory AFPT 90-391-380. As a starting point, the tasks from the 1973 inventory were updated. Further refinement of the task list was accomplished through a comprehensive research of publications and directives and through interviews with training and classification personnel. From this process, a new tentative task list was made up. The Inventory Development Specialist then conducted personal interviews with 12 subject matter specialists at Chanute and Kelly AFBs to review the tentative task list for completeness and accuracy. After making the necessary revisions, a final inventory consisting of 357 tasks grouped under 17 duty headings was published.

Survey Administration

During the period February through June 1979, consolidated base personnel offices in operational units worldwide administered the inventory booklets to job incumbents holding Maintenance Analysis DAFSCs. The job incumbents were selected by a computer generated mailing list obtained from master personnel data tapes maintained by the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL).

Each individual who participated in the survey completed a background information section and then checked tasks performed in their current job. Each incumbent then rated each of the tasks performed on a nine-point scale showing the relative time spent on that task as compared to all other tasks checked. The relative time ratings range from one (very small amount of time spent) through five (average amount of time spent) to nine (very large amount of time spent).

To determine relative time spent for each task checked by a respondent, all an incumbent's ratings are assumed to account for 100 percent of his or her time spent on the job and are summed. Each task rating is then divided by the total task ratings and multiplied by 100. This procedure provides an index of the relative time spent on each task. This data can be summed for groups of tasks to portray how any individual's work time is spent or can be summed across individuals to display the average percent time spent on a task by any group.

Survey Sample

Table 1 reflects the percentage distribution, by DAFSC groups, of assigned personnel in the 391X0A/B career ladder as of July 1979 and the distribution of incumbents in the survey sample. The 616 respondents making up the survey sample represent 67 percent of the 925 members assigned to the specialty. Tables 2 and 3 reflect the distribution of the survey sample in terms of major command and TAFMS groups. Overall, the survey sample provides a good representation of the 391X0A/B career ladder.

Data Processing and Analysis

Task responses and background information from each returned inventory booklet were optically scanned. Other biographical information was keypunched onto disks and entered directly into the computer. Once both sets of data were in the computer, they were merged to form a complete case record for each respondent. Comprehensive Occupational Data Analysis Programs (CODAP) techniques were then applied to the data.

CODAP produces job descriptions for respondents based on their responses to specific inventory tasks. These descriptions reflect: a) percent members performing each task; b) the average percent time spent by members performing; c) the average percent time spent by all members; and d) the cumulative average percent time spent by all members for each task in the inventory.

A key aspect of the USAF occupational analysis program is to examine the structure of career ladders in terms of what people are doing in the field rather than how official career ladder documents say they are organized. A cluster analysis is accomplished to group respondents who perform common jobs, based on the similarity of tasks performed and the time spent performing those tasks.

The information gathered from the cluster analysis is then used to formulate an understanding of current utilization patterns within the career ladder and to examine the accuracy and completeness of career ladder documents (e.g., AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions and Specialty Training Standards).

TABLE 1
DAFSC DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY SAMPLE

<u>DAFSC</u>	<u>NUMBER ASSIGNED</u>	<u>NUMBER SURVEYED</u>	<u>PERCENT OF ASSIGNED SAMPLED</u>
39130A	85	30	35%
39150A	284	211	74%
39170A	316	202	64%
39130B	0*	3	*
39150B	67	52	78%
39170B	86	57	66%
39199	<u>87</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>70%</u>
TOTAL	925	616	67%
CEM CODE 39300	**	13	**

* A DELETION OF 391X0B SLOTS EFFECTIVE IN APRIL 1979 REMOVED ALL PRESENT 39130B AUTHORIZATIONS AND JULY MANNING FIGURES INDICATE THAT NONE ARE PRESENTLY ASSIGNED. HOWEVER, DURING THE TIME OF THE SURVEY, THREE RESPONDENTS INDICATED THEY HAD NOT YET ATTAINED A 5-SKILL LEVEL DESIGNATION. (THIS INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED FROM MPCRAW2)

** CEM CODE 39300 PERSONNEL SUPERVISE THE 391X0 AND 392X0 CAREER LADDERS. SPECIFIC CEM CODE 39300 AUTHORIZATIONS BY CAREER LADDER ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

TABLE 2
COMMAND REPRESENTATION OF SURVEY SAMPLE

COMMAND	391X0A		391X0B	
	PERCENT OF ASSIGNED	PERCENT OF SAMPLE	PERCENT OF ASSIGNED	PERCENT OF SAMPLE
ADCOM	4	4	11	11
ATC	4	6	0	2
AFCS	1	2	69	61
AFLC	2	6	*	*
MAC	11	11	0	0
SAC	30	26	*	2
AFSC	3	4	5	12
TAC	24	15	5	5
USAFE	13	15	5	5
PACAF	4	4	0	0
OTHER	4	7	4	2
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

* INDICATES LESS THAN ONE PERCENT

TABLE 3
TAFMS DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY SAMPLE

	MONTHS IN SERVICE		
	1-48	49-96	97+
NUMBER OF AFS 391X0A IN SAMPLE	68	150	224
PERCENT OF AFS 391X0A IN SAMPLE	16%	34%	50%
NUMBER OF AFS 391X0B IN SAMPLE	18	31	63
PERCENT OF AFS 391X0B IN SAMPLE	16%	28%	56%

RESULTS

The major findings of the job typing analyses are presented in this section. Also included is a discussion of special group analyses, such as Duty AFSC groups, Time in Career Field (TICF) groups, etc.

Analysis of the Career Ladder Structure

As explained previously, the use of the Comprehensive Occupational Data Analysis Programs makes possible an analysis of a career ladder's job structure based upon the task data collected from incumbents. The basic identifying group used in the hierarchical job structuring is the Job Type. A job type is a group of individuals who perform many of the same tasks and spend similar amounts of time performing these tasks. When there is a substantial degree of similarity between different job types, they are grouped together in a Cluster. Finally, there are often specialized jobs that are too dissimilar to be grouped into any cluster. These unique groups are labeled Independent Job Types.

Based on task and time similarity, the Maintenance Analysis career ladder best divides into the two job clusters and one independent job type depicted in Figure 1. The two clusters with their respective job types and the independent job type are listed below.

I. AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (SPC092, N=456)

- a. Aircraft Production Analysts (SPC075, N=199)
- b. Missile Production Analysts (GRP129, N=12)
- c. Aerospace Vehicle First-Line Supervisors (SPC073, N=113)
- d. Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis Supervisors (SPC074, N=47)
- e. Aerospace Vehicle MAJCOM Production Analysts (SPC076, N=19)
- f. Aerospace Vehicle Staff Analysts (SPC077, N=41)

II. COMMUNICATION-ELECTRONIC-METEOROLOGICAL (CEM) PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (GRP051, N=102)

- a. CEM Production Analysts (SPC072, N=77)
- b. CEM Production Analyst First-Line Supervisors (GRP112, N=8)
- c. CEM Staff Analysts (GRP209, N=7)


III. LOGISTICS CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (GRP033, N=16)

The groups identified above account for 89 percent of the survey sample. The remaining 11 percent of the sample do not group meaningfully due to their particular task responses. Two of the ungrouped incumbents teach in the resident training courses at Chanute

FIGURE 1

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS CAREER LADDER STRUCTURE
AFS 391X0A/B

TOTAL SAMPLE
(N=642)



AFB and several other respondents are assigned to various major command staffs. The remaining unmatched incumbents describe themselves as production analysis specialists or technicians and are stationed at various aircraft maintenance squadrons, communications squadrons, communications groups, or aircraft wings.

Job Group Descriptions

The following paragraphs are brief descriptions of the clusters and job types identified in the specialty structure analysis. Further background information on the clusters and job types are listed in Tables 4 through 7. Appendix A also lists representative tasks, differentiating tasks, and additional background information for each of the clusters and job types discussed in the analysis.

1. AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (N=456). This extremely large cluster (71 percent of the survey sample) performs all facets of aerospace vehicle production analysis. Incumbents in this cluster analyze maintenance data concerning only aircraft or missile systems. The vast majority of incumbents in the cluster perform an essentially similar analysis process. Incumbents monitor and evaluate maintenance data inputs and outputs, organize and evaluate maintenance data, and then write reports or brief on maintenance trends and capabilities.

The vast majority of cluster members hold either 391X0A or 39199 DAFSCs, or the 39300 CEM Code (see Table 4). Sixty-three percent of the members feel their job is interesting while 73 percent feel their talents are well utilized. Interestingly, only 59 percent feel their training is well utilized (see Table 6). The cluster contains six job types. Primary differences between the job types concern differences in levels of assignments, types of aerospace vehicle maintenance data used, and number of supervisory tasks performed.

Ia. Aircraft Production Analysts (N=199). Members of this job type perform base-level aircraft production analysis functions. Incumbents prepare punch card transcript forms, evaluate computer outputs, compile data, and prepare written narratives of maintenance summaries. Sixty-nine percent of the group hold a 3- or 5-skill level DAFSC (see Table 4). As indicated in Table 6, only 51 percent of the incumbents feel their job is interesting and this is the lowest job interest rating within the Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis Cluster.

Ib. Missile Production Analysts (N=12). Members of this job type perform the basic maintenance analysis process but work solely on missile maintenance data. Table 6 indicates incumbents in the job type generally feel their job is interesting and feel their talents are well utilized. However, only 33 percent of the group feel their training is well utilized.

Ic. Aerospace Vehicle First-Line Supervisors (N=113). Members of this job type perform the basic maintenance analysis process on both aircraft and missile systems in addition to taking on supervisory duties. The incumbents perform an average of 105 tasks and have the broadest job in the Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis cluster. In addition to their maintenance analysis functions, the incumbents perform supervisory tasks like drafting correspondence and supervising DAFSC 39150A incumbents. Eighty-three percent of the members supervise an average of four subordinates. Over 70 percent of the incumbents feel their job is interesting and that their training and talents are well utilized (see Table 6).

Id. Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis Supervisors (N=47). These supervisors perform some production analysis tasks, such as compiling data for aircraft summaries and preparing written narratives or maintenance summaries. However, the incumbents are involved in supervisory activities, such as counseling subordinates, interpreting policies, establishing work priorities, and scheduling work assignments. Over 90 percent of the members supervise an average of four subordinates. The group averages only 51 tasks and has a somewhat narrower job than the first-line supervisor (see Table 4). Job satisfaction indices for the group parallel those of the cluster as a whole (see Table 6).

Ie. Aerospace Vehicle MAJCOM Production Analysts (N=19). While predominantly located at various major command headquarters, members of this job type still analyze missile and aircraft maintenance data and prepare written narratives. However, incumbents also perform evaluative tasks, such as writing staff studies and evaluating technical orders, inspection reports, and source documents. The job type has the highest average grade within the cluster (6.9, see Table 4). Sixty-three percent of the members feel their job is interesting and 68 percent feel their talents are well utilized. However, only 42 percent feel their training is well utilized.

If. Aerospace Vehicle Staff Analysts (N=41). Located at some major commands and various aircraft wings, these analysts compile and evaluate data and prepare written narratives. However, the members are more involved with statistical tasks than any job type in the cluster. Incumbents perform statistical tasks like calculating standard deviations, calculating means, medians and modes, and calculating lines of regression. The job interest and felt utilization of talents of the group are above average for the cluster although only 58 percent of the incumbents feel their training is well utilized.

II. COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONIC-METEROLOGICAL (CEM) PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (N=102). This cluster comprises 16 percent of the survey sample and is primarily composed of predominantly 391X0B incumbents (see Table 5). Almost 60 percent of the cluster are assigned to the Air Force Communications Service. The CEM Production Analysis incumbents perform a maintenance analysis process similar to that performed by the Aerospace Vehicle Production

Analysis Cluster. CEM Production Analysis incumbents still evaluate computer inputs and outputs, compile data, and write reports on maintenance summaries. However, the group only analyzes CEM production maintenance data and does not analyze aircraft or missile data. As a cluster, only 50 percent of the respondents feel their job is interesting. Sixty-two percent of the group feel their talents are well utilized but only 48 percent feel their training is well utilized. The job satisfaction indices for the cluster are lower than those for the Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis cluster (see Tables 6 and 7).

There are three job types within the cluster. The job types are Production Analysts, Analyst First-Line Supervisors, and Staff Analysts. The CEM production analysis cluster does not have a predominantly supervisory job group or a MAJCOM job group as does the Aerospace Vehicle cluster.

Ila. CEM Production Analysts (N=77). This group analyzes communications squadron or group level CEM maintenance data. Incumbents compile data, evaluate data inputs and outputs, and prepare maintenance summaries. The job satisfaction indices of the group paralleled those of the cluster as a whole (see Table 7).

Iib. CEM Production Analyst First-Line Supervisors (N=8). These supervisors are still involved with CEM maintenance data production analysis functions. However, the incumbents take on supervisory duties. Tasks performed included interpreting policies for subordinates, making staff assistance visits, preparing airman performance reports, and establishing work priorities. Sixty-two percent of the members feel their job is interesting and that their talents are well utilized. Only 13 percent of the group feel their training is well utilized.

Iic. CEM Staff Analysts (N=7). Located at major command or wing level positions, the incumbents of this group perform CEM maintenance data production analysis. However, the group performs statistical calculations more than any other group in the cluster. Incumbents perform statistical tasks like calculating standard deviations, calculating mean times to restore equipment, and calculating means, medians, and modes. All job satisfaction indices for the group are below average for the cluster (see Table 7).

III. LOGISTICS CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=16). This independent job type, whose incumbents are predominantly located at the Air Logistics Center at Tinker AFB, present an interesting contrast to the rest of the maintenance analysis career ladder. These incumbents spend a very large amount of time evaluating computer inputs or outputs and computing data for engineering changes. Members of the job type do not seem to perform the same maintenance data analysis process common to the rest of the career ladder. Rather, the group compiles information from the maintenance summaries produced by the rest of the career ladder. The group performs an average of ten tasks which is by far the lowest average in the career ladder (see

Tables 4 and 5). The group members also have the lowest job interest and felt utilization of talents and training of any job type identified in the specialty structure analysis (see Tables 6 and 7).

Summary

The specialty structure analysis of the 391X0A/B specialty reveals several interesting points. First, since the two clusters in the analysis centered around either A- or B-shredout personnel, the present classification structure is supported. Second, there seems to be a definite job progression especially in the Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis cluster. Incumbents in the career ladder progress from that of worker to first-line supervisor to supervisor. Third, the Logistics Center Production Analysts perform a distinctly different job from the rest of the career ladder. Fourth, the job interest indices for the CEM Production Analysis cluster are somewhat lower than those for the Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis cluster. Lastly, the felt utilization of training indices for both career ladder shreds are somewhat low. Moreover, the felt utilization of training for several job groups, such as Missile Production Analysts and the Logistic Center Production Analysts, are extremely low.

TABLE 4
BACKGROUND DATA FOR THE AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER

	AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (N=456)	AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=199)	MISSILE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=12)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS (N=113)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=47)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAJOR PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=19)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE STAFF ANALYSTS (N=41)
PERCENT OF SAMPLE	71%	31%	2%	18%	7%	3%	6%
DAFSC DISTRIBUTION							
39130	3%	7%	8%	1%	0%	5%	5%
39150	38%	62%	42%	17%	15%	0%	34%
39170	44%	28%	50%	61%	51%	42%	46%
39199	12%	2%	0%	20%	17%	42%	12%
CEM CODE 39300	3%	1%	0%	0%	15%	11%	3%
OTHER	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
PERCENT IN EACH SHED							
A	83%	95%	100%	81%	68%	42%	81%
B	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
OTHER*	16%	4%	0%	19%	32%	58%	17%
AVERAGE GRADE	5.3	4.5	4.4	6.0	6.4	6.9	5.2
AVERAGE NUMBER OF TASKS PERFORMED	71	49	63	105	51	41	65
AVERAGE MONTHS IN CAREER FIELD	73	52	63	82	105	129	72
AVERAGE MONTHS IN SERVICE	141	92	123	177	201	221	123
PERCENT MEMBERS IN FIRST ENLISTMENT	11%	23%	17%	NONE	2%	5%	12%
JOB DIFFICULTY INDEX	14.8	12.5	13.7	18.4	12.5	13.4	15.9

* INCLUDES DAFSC 39199 AND CEM CODE 39300 PERSONNEL

TABLE 5
BACKGROUND DATA FOR THE CLM PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER AND LOGISTICS CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS JOB TYPE

	CLM PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (N=102)	CLM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=17)	CLM PRODUCTION ANALYST FIRST- LINE SUPERVISORS (N=6)	CLM STAFF ANALYSTS (N=7)	LOGISTIC CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=16)
PERCENT OF SAMPLE	16%	12%	1%	1%	2%
DAFSC DISTRIBUTION					
39130	3%	3%	0%	0%	33%
39150	44%	46%	0%	57%	56%
39170	46%	46%	75%	43%	31%
39199	7%	5%	25%	0%	0%
CLM CODE 39300	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
PERCENT IN EACH SIBED					
A	3%	1%	0%	0%	100%
B	87%	90%	75%	100%	0%
NOT REPORTED	11%	9%	25%	0%	0%
AVERAGE GRADE	5.2	5.0	6.5	5.1	4.8
AVERAGE NUMBER OF TASKS PERFORMED	62	68	51	39	10
AVERAGE MONTHS IN CAREER FIELD	52	50	89	40	51
AVERAGE MONTHS IN SERVICE	128	116	222	119	109
PERCENT MEMBERS IN FIRST ENLISTMENT	16%	20%	NONE	NONE	6%
JOB DIFFICULTY INDEX	13.0	13.6	12.9	12.2	3.8

TABLE 6
JOB SATISFACTION INDICES FOR THE AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER
(PERCENT RESPONDENTS PERFORMING)

	AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (N=56)	AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=19)	MISSILE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=12)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS (N=11)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS SUPERVISORS (N=4)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=19)	AEROSPACE VEHICLE STAFF ANALYSTS (N=41)
EXPRESSED JOB INTEREST							
DULL	18%	21%	17%	13%	21%	21%	5%
SO-SO	16%	22%	8%	14%	13%	16%	10%
INTERESTING	63%	51%	75%	71%	60%	63%	80%
NOT REPORTED	3%	4%	0%	2%	6%	0%	5%
PERCEIVED UTILIZATION OF TALENTS							
LITTLE OR NOT AT ALL	36%	32%	25%	19%	26%	32%	15%
FAIRLY WELL OR BETTER	73%	67%	75%	81%	70%	68%	78%
NOT REPORTED	1%	1%	0%	0%	4%	0%	7%
PERCEIVED UTILIZATION OF TRAINING							
LITTLE OR NOT AT ALL	39%	46%	67%	29%	34%	58%	37%
FAIRLY WELL OR BETTER	59%	53%	33%	71%	64%	42%	58%
NOT REPORTED	2%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	5%
REENLISTMENT INTENTION							
NO	28%	28%	25%	27%	36%	16%	22%
PROBABLY NO	11%	15%	0%	10%	4%	16%	12%
PROBABLY YES	22%	25%	50%	20%	13%	32%	17%
YES	36%	29%	25%	39%	43%	36%	44%
NOT REPORTED	3%	3%	0%	4%	4%	0%	5%

TABLE 7

JOB SATISFACTION INDICES FOR THE CEM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS CLUSTER AND LOGISTICS PRODUCTION ANALYSTS JOB TYPE
(PERCENT MEMBERS RESPONDING)

	CEM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS CLUSTER (N=102)	CEM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=77)	CEM PRODUCTION ANALYST FIRST- LINE SUPERVISORS (N=8)	CEM STAFF ANALYSTS (N=7)	LOGISTIC CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (N=16)
<u>EXPRESSED JOB INTEREST:</u>					
DULL	22%	23%	13%	29%	38%
SO-SO	19%	18%	25%	14%	31%
INTERESTING	50%	50%	62%	47%	31%
NOT REPORTED	9%	9%	0%	14%	0%
<u>PERCEIVED UTILIZATION OF TALENTS:</u>					
LITTLE OR NOT AT ALL	37%	39%	38%	43%	69%
FAIRLY WELL OR BETTER	62%	60%	62%	57%	31%
NOT REPORTED	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<u>PERCEIVED UTILIZATION OF TRAINING:</u>					
LITTLE OR NOT AT ALL	51%	46%	87%	57%	69%
FAIRLY WELL OR BETTER	48%	53%	13%	43%	31%
NOT REPORTED	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<u>REEMLISTMENT INTENTIONS:</u>					
NO	32%	31%	25%	43%	36%
PROBABLY NO	12%	9%	25%	14%	18%
PROBABLY YES	26%	29%	25%	29%	18%
YES	28%	29%	25%	14%	25%
NOT REPORTED	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%

Analysis of DAFSC Groups

The tasks performed by DAFSC groups are also examined as part of each occupational analysis. The aim of the DAFSC analysis is to identify differences among personnel performing at different skill levels within each career ladder shredout. DAFSC group data is then used to analyze the accuracy and completeness of AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions. In other sections of this report, DAFSC group data is used to analyze career field training documents, such as the Specialty Training Standard (STS) and technical training Plans of Instruction (POIs).

The shredouts within the Maintenance Analysis career ladder reflect the same homogeneity found within the Aerospace Vehicle and CEM Production Analysis clusters identified in the career ladder structure. All A-shred personnel perform a similar analysis process on missile or aircraft maintenance data. All B-shred personnel perform a similar analysis process on CEM maintenance data. Tables 8 and 9 reflect the homogeneity of the A- and B-shreds in that 22 tasks are performed by more than 50 percent of all A-shred incumbents and 28 tasks are performed by more than 50 percent of all B-shred incumbents. Tables 10 through 14 list representative tasks and best differentiating tasks for A-shred DAFSC groups. Tables 15 through 17 list representative tasks and best differentiating tasks for B-shred DAFSC groups. Tables 18 through 22 highlight representative tasks for DAFSC 39199 and CEM Code 39300 personnel as well as best differentiating tasks between DAFSC 39199 personnel and personnel holding skill designations of DAFSC 39170A, DAFSC 39170B, or CEM Code 39300.

391X0A Skill Level Groups

DAFSC 39130A Maintenance Analysts have the narrowest job in the shred as they perform an average of 33 tasks. The DAFSC 39130A incumbent's job is exclusively technically oriented as they perform tasks such as evaluating data outputs, preparing charts, and preparing aircraft maintenance reports and summaries (see Table 10). Although 3-skill level incumbents perform a low average number of tasks, they still perform the basic aircraft and missile analysis steps performed by the other A-shred skill level groups.

DAFSC 39150A incumbents take on a broader job than their 3-skill level counterparts, as they perform an average of 47 tasks. A-shred 5-skill level incumbents still evaluate data outputs, prepare charts, and prepare aircraft or missile maintenance reports or summaries (see Table 11). However, as Table 12 indicates, a higher percentage of DAFSC 39150A respondents evaluate data inputs and compile data than DAFSC 39130A personnel. Table 12 also shows that DAFSC 39150A personnel do not construct some types of charts or perform some statistical calculations to the extent the DAFSC 39130A respondents perform them.

The DAFSC 39170A incumbents perform the same technical job as their 3- and 5-skill level counterparts while also performing some supervisory tasks (see Tables 13 and 14). DAFSC 39170A incumbents still perform the basic maintenance analysis functions. However, the 7-skill level respondent performs supervisory duties such as interpreting policies for subordinates, planning and assigning work assignments, and preparing airman performance reports (APRs) (see Table 14). The DAFSC 39170A respondents, with the addition of their supervisory tasks, have the broadest job of any A-shred skill level groups as they perform an average of 68 tasks.

391X0B Skill Level Groups

Due to the eliminations of DAFSC 391X0B authorizations in April 1979, which was mentioned previously, 39130B authorizations are now zero and none are presently assigned to the career field. However, three survey respondents did indicate they were at the 3-skill level at the time of the survey administration. Since the three respondents are not a large enough sample for an analysis of 3-skill level job performance, there will be no 39130B DAFSC analysis in this report.

DAFSC 39150B respondents perform an exclusively technical job encompassing an analysis process similar to that performed by A-shred DAFSC incumbents. DAFSC 39150B incumbents evaluate computer inputs and outputs, compile CEM maintenance data, construct charts, and prepare maintenance reports on CEM equipment (see Table 15). DAFSC 39150B respondents perform an average of 60 tasks. A majority of the B-shred 5-skill level personnel in the survey fall in the B-shred production analysis group in the career ladder structure.

B-shred 7-skill level personnel compile CEM data, evaluate computer products, construct charts, and prepare CEM maintenance reports (see Table 16). However, as Table 17 indicates, DAFSC 39170B incumbents take on supervisory duties and fewer are involved in certain technical areas, such as data auditing and report preparation. Supervisory duties performed by DAFSC 39170B incumbents include supervising 39150B personnel, counseling subordinates, and preparing airman performance reports (see Table 17).

DAFSC 39199 and CEM Code 39300 Groups

DAFSC 39199 respondents have the broadest job of any skill level group, as they perform an average of 91 tasks. Table 18 indicates DAFSC 39199 respondents perform both technical and supervisory tasks. DAFSC 39199 respondents still perform the basic analysis process of evaluating computer products, compiling data, and preparing maintenance reports. However, Maintenance Analysis Superintendents also advise chiefs of maintenance, establish work priorities, and analyze workload requirements. Tables 20 and 21 indicate the tasks best differentiating between DAFSC 39199 personnel and A- and B-shred

7-skill level personnel. The tables indicate DAFSC 39199 personnel still perform technical tasks but are more involved in supervisory tasks than are 7-skill level incumbents.

CEM Code 39300 respondents, as Table 22 indicates, are still involved in both supervisory and technical duties, although they are much less involved in technical tasks than their 9-skill level counterparts. CEM Code 39300 personnel prepare APRs, analyze work load requirements, and make staff assistance visits. Table 19 lists representative tasks performed by CEM Code 39300 personnel.

Summary

A- and B-shred DAFSC groups reflect a progression from analysts at the 3- and 5-skill levels to first-line supervisors at the 7- and 9-skill levels to managers at the CEM Code 39300 level. The most interesting fact concerning the DAFSC groups of both shreds is that the technical job of performing maintenance analyses on either aircraft, missiles, or CEM equipment is observable in the 3-, 5-, 7-, and 9-skill level groups. That is to say, all A- and B-shred personnel are involved in production analysis until they are senior level supervisors. Seven and 9-skill level personnel take on supervisory tasks but they do not relinquish their technical jobs as production analysts. Where CEM Code personnel in many specialties are oriented to management and supervision exclusively, in CEM Code 39300 positions, incumbents perform some technical maintenance analysis tasks (such as evaluating computer products).

TABLE 8

TASKS PERFORMED BY 50 PERCENT OR MORE OF ALL 391XOA PERSONNEL
(N=446)

TASK	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	77
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	76
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	71
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	70
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	68
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	68
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	67
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	66
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	61
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	61
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	61
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	59
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	59
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	58
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE	58
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	57
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	57
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	54
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	52
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	51

TABLE 9

TASKS PERFORMED BY 50 PERCENT OR MORE OF ALL 391X0B PERSONNEL
(N=112)

TASK	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	76
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	75
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	71
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	71
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	68
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	66
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	63
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	63
J245 CORRECT CEM SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	63
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	63
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	62
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	62
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	59
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	58
M282 PREPARE CEM STUDIES	58
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	57
J247 ESTABLISH CEM WORK CENTER PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OR RESUBMISSION OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS	57
E108 FILE MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL LISTS	56
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	56
K260 REVIEW CEM FULLY MISSION CAPABLE RATES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	56
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	54
L272 CALCULATE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERROR RATES	54
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	52
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	52
K259 REVIEW CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	51
M283 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	51
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	50
J248 REVIEW CEM EQUIPMENT UTILIZATION OR STATUS REPORTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	50

TABLE 10

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC 39130A INCUMBENTS
(N=30)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	60
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	60
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	53
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	53
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	50
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	47
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	43
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	43
F177 REVIEW WORK UNIT CODES (WUC) FOR ACCURACY	43
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	40
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	40
E162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	40
G194 IDENTIFY AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	37
A3 DEVELOP ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS	33
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	33
H210 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEMS RELIABILITY	33
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	33
G201 REVIEW AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR ACCURACY	27
G189 CORRECT AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	20

TABLE 11

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC 39150A INCUMBENTS
(N=211)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	74
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	71
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	71
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	70
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	65
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	65
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	64
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	62
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	62
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	60
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	54
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	52
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	52
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	51
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	51
G179 COMPILE AIRCRAFT SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS DATA	51
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	49
I228 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE WORK CENTER CAPABILITIES	48
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	48
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	44

TABLE 12

TASKS BEST DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN 39130A AND 39150A DAFSC RESPONDENTS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39130A	DAFSC 39150A	DIFFERENCE
Q352 CONSTRUCT FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION GRAPHS	33	13	+20
Q332 CALCULATE LINES OF REGRESSION	33	14	+19
Q328 CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION USING PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION METHODS	30	13	+17
Q340 CALCULATE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS USING COMPUTATIONAL METHODS	23	7	+16
Q353 CONSTRUCT FREQUENCY TABLES	20	7	+13
Q341 CALCULATE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS USING GRAPHIC METHODS	23	10	+13
Q347 CALCULATE VALIDITY OF INDIVIDUAL	20	9	+11
Q354 CONSTRUCT MEAN TIME AND RANGE CHARTS	20	9	+11
G179 COMPILE AIRCRAFT SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS DATA	13	51	-38
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	23	59	-36
E106 COMPILE DATA FOR DAEDALIAN TROPHY NOMINATIONS	3	34	-31
H211 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS	7	37	-30
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	17	45	-28
I228 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE WORK CENTER CAPABILITIES	20	48	-28
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	33	62	-29
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	23	51	-28
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	43	71	-28

TABLE 13

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC 39170A INCUMBENTS
(N=61)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	86
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	86
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	83
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	79
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	77
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	75
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	74
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	70
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	70
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	69
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	69
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	69
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	67
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	67
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	64
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	64
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	63
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	63
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	59
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	56

TABLE 14

TASKS BEST DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN 39150A AND 39170A DAFSC RESPONDENTS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39150A	DAFSC 39170A	DIFFERENCE
E111 FILE SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE REPORTS	27	17	+10
F174 REVIEW MASTER IDENTIFICATION INPUTS FOR ACCURACY	25	17	+ 8
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	64	56	+ 8
G189 CORRECT AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	32	25	+ 7
E116 FILE VEHICLE STATUS DATA	13	7	+ 6
E114 FILE VEHICLE OPERATIONS REPORTS	8	2	+ 6
E113 FILE VEHICLE MASTER LISTS	8	3	+ 5
Q343 CALCULATE QUANTILES OR PERCENTILES	14	10	+ 4
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	21	64	-43
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	15	56	-41
C79 PREPARE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	17	54	-37
A16 SCHEDULE LEAVES OR PASSES	7	44	-37
A7 ESTABLISH WORK PRIORITIES	22	59	-37
A1 ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO DUTY POSITIONS	6	42	-36
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	45	80	-35
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONNEL OR MILITARY RELATED PROBLEMS	25	58	-33

TABLE 15

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC 39150B RESPONDENTS
(N=52)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	80
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	73
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	69
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	69
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	67
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	67
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	65
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	65
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	63
Q337 CALCULATE MEAN TIME TO RESTORE (MTTR) EQUIPMENT TO OPERABLE STATUS	63
J247 ESTABLISH CEM WORK CENTER PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OR RESUBMISSION OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS	62
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	60
E129 PREPARE EQUIPMENT DOWNTIME AND WORK UNIT CODE SUMMARIES	60
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	58
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	58
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	58
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	57
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	55
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	46
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	40

TABLE 16

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC 39170B RESPONDENTS
(N=57)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUPUTS	81
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	75
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	74
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	70
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	70
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	70
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	68
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	68
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	67
M282 PREPARE CEM STUDIES	65
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	65
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	61
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	61
E107 FILE CORRESPONDENCE	60
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	58
J249 REVIEW CEM INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	58
K259 REVIEW CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	56
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	56
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	56
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	49

TABLE 17

TASKS BEST DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN 39150B AND 39170B RESPONDENTS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39150B	DAFSC 39170B	DIFFERENCE
A3 DEVELOP ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS	33	9	+24
F149 AUDIT DAILY INPUTS	65	49	+16
E111 FILE SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE REPORTS	37	21	+16
K255 EVALUATE CEM MAN-HOUR UTILIZATION REPORTS	42	28	+14
F172 PREPARE WORK CENTER MANPOWER STATUS SUMMARIES	33	19	+14
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	69	56	+13
Q344 CALCULATE RELIABILITY OF DATA BY STATISTICAL COMPARISONS METHODS	25	14	+11
B48 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39150B)	6	40	-34
C79 PREPARE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	12	46	-34
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONAL OR MILITARY RELATED PROBLEMS	12	46	-34
C78 MAKE STAFF ASSISTANCE VISITS	27	52	-25
J249 REVIEW CEM INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	33	58	-25
A16 SCHEDULE LEAVES OR PASSES	10	33	-23
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	23	46	-23
A14 PREPARE OR UPDATE LOCAL OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS	37	58	-21

TABLE 18
 REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC 39199 RESPONDENTS
 (N=61)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	95
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	93
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	90
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	89
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	89
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	87
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	85
C79 PREPARE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	80
A7 ESTABLISH WORK PRIORITIES	79
B25 DEVELOP WORK METHODS OR PROCEDURES	78
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	77
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	77
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONAL OR MILITARY RELATED PROBLEMS	77
F167 PREPARE BRIEFINGS EXCLUDING TRAINING BRIEFINGS	74
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	72
B50 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIANS (AFSC 39170A)	69
C66 EVALUATE INSPECTION REPORTS OR PROCEDURES	69
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	66
C54 ANALYZE WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS	66
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	57

TABLE 19
 REPRESENTATIVE TASKS PERFORMED BY CEM CODE 39300 INCUMBENTS
 (N=13)

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	92
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	92
C79 PREPARE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	92
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONAL OR MILITARY RELATED PROBLEMS	92
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	85
A7 ESTABLISH WORK PRIORITIES	85
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	77
C54 ANALYZE WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS	77
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	69
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	69
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	69
B53 SUPERVISE MILITARY PERSONNEL WITH AFSCS OTHER THAN 391X0	62
B50 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIANS (AFSC 39170A)	62
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	62
F167 PREPARE BRIEFINGS EXCLUDING TRAINING BRIEFINGS	62
C74 EVALUATE SUGGESTIONS	62
G183 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE PERFORMANCE	54
C68 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE OR USE OF WORKSPACES, EQUIPMENT, OR SUPPLIES	46
D101 PREPARE OR UPDATE TRAINING RECORDS	38
C78 MAKE STAFF ASSISTANCE VISITS	38

TABLE 20

TASKS BEST DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN 39170A AND 39199 DAFSC RESPONDENTS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39170A	DAFSC 39199	DIFFERENCE
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	75	54	+21
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	70	54	+16
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	67	54	+13
G189 CORRECT AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	25	13	+12
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	56	44	+12
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	69	57	+12
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	64	52	+12
H212 CALCULATE MAN-HOURS PER SORTIE COST DATA	49	38	+11
D84 ASSIGN OJT TRAINERS	18	54	-36
A1 ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO DUTY POSITIONS	42	77	-35
C80 VALIDATE MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	21	56	-35
A5 ESTABLISH PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS	34	69	-35
B41 PREPARE PERSONNEL ACTION REQUESTS	24	57	-33
A13 PREPARE JOB DESCRIPTIONS	24	57	-33
B31 ESTABLISH PUBLICATION FILES	22	55	-33
A16 SCHEDULE LEAVES OR PASSES	45	77	-32

TABLE 21

TASKS BEST DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN 39170B AND 39199 RESPONDENTS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39170B	DAFSC 39199	DIFFERENCE
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	70	8	+62
M282 PREPARE CEM STUDIES	65	10	+55
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	61	10	+51
J249 REVIEW CEM INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	58	8	+50
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	56	7	+49
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	61	13	+48
J247 ESTABLISH CEM WORK CENTER PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OR RESUBMISSION OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS	56	10	+46
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	56	10	+46
B50 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIANS (AFSC 39170A)	4	69	-65
A1 ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO DUTY POSITIONS	18	77	-59
A2 ASSIGN SPONSORS FOR NEW PERSONNEL	19	73	-54
B41 PREPARE PERSONNEL ACTION REQUESTS	8	57	-49

TABLE 22

TASKS BEST DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN DAFSC 39199 AND CEM CODE 39300 RESPONDENTS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39199	CEM CODE 39300	DIFFERENCE
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	89	39	+50
G201 REVIEW AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION			
SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR ACCURACY	48	0	+48
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	52	8	+44
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	51	8	+43
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	43	0	+43
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL			
REQUEST CARDS	57	15	+42
Q345 CALCULATE STANDARD DEVIATIONS	49	8	+41
H211 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT SCHEDULING			
EFFECTIVENESS	41	0	+41
B36 IMPLEMENT SECURITY PROGRAMS OR PROCEDURES	18	38	-20
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONAL OR MILITARY RELATED			
PROBLEMS	77	92	-15
C79 PREPARE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	80	92	-12
C54 ANALYZE WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS	66	77	-11
B53 SUPERVISE MILITARY PERSONNEL WITH AFSCs OTHER THAN 391X0	51	62	-11
A12 PLAN SECURITY PROGRAMS	13	23	-10
C64 EVALUATE INDIVIDUALS FOR PROMOTIONS, DEMOTIONS OR			
RECLASSIFICATIONS	44	54	-10
C76 EVALUATE WORK SCHEDULES	44	54	-10

Comparison of AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions with DAFSC Groups

The AFR 39-1 Specialty Descriptions, dated 15 October 1978, for AFSCs 39130A/B, 39150A/B, 39170A/B, 39199, and CEM Code 39300 were compared with survey data for the various DAFSC groups. Except for one area, the specialty descriptions appear to be complete and accurately portray the duties and responsibilities of the personnel in these career ladders.

The one area in which the AFR 39-1 specialty descriptions appear to be deficient is in the area of the calculations performed by career ladder incumbents. Table 23 highlights the percentages of the DAFSC groups performing the calculation tasks. Table 23 indicates that a percentage of each DAFSC group performs every calculation task in the inventory. However, there is no clear mention of statistical calculations in the present specialty descriptions. Hence, it may be necessary to include a more clear reference to the calculations performed by 391X0A/B personnel in future 391X0A/B specialty descriptions.

TABLE 23

CALCULATIONS TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC GROUPS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39130A/B (N=34)	DAFSC 39150A/B (N=270)	DAFSC 39170A/B (N=262)	DAFSC 39199 AND CEM CODE 39300 (N=74)
Q328 CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION USING PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION METHODS	26	13	16	18
Q329 CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION USING SPEARMAN'S RANK ORDER CORRELATION METHOD	21	15	21	24
Q330 CALCULATE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES APPLYING NONPARAMETRIC TESTS	15	16	25	24
Q331 CALCULATE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES USING PARAMETRIC TESTS	15	16	26	27
Q332 CALCULATE LINES OF REGRESSION	29	16	21	36
Q333 CALCULATE MEAN DEVIATIONS	24	33	41	36
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	26	44	50	43
Q335 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN MAINTENANCE (MTBM)	9	23	30	32
Q336 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN OCCURRENCES (MTBO) OF DOWNTIME FAILURES	6	17	18	19
Q337 CALCULATE MEAN TIME TO RESTORE (MTTR) EQUIPMENT TO OPERABLE STATUS	6	20	24	22
Q338 CALCULATE MEANS, MEDIAN, OR MODES FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	38	39	48	46
Q339 CALCULATE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS	9	16	26	31
Q340 CALCULATE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS USING COMPUTATIONAL METHODS	21	9	16	20
Q341 CALCULATE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS USING GRAPHIC METHODS	21	14	16	19
Q342 CALCULATE QUANTILE DEVIATIONS	12	5	5	11
Q343 CALCULATE QUANTILES OR PERCENTILES	18	16	11	18
Q344 CALCULATE RELIABILITY OF DATA BY STATISTICAL COMPARISONS METHOD	18	20	20	30

TABLE 23 (CONTINUED)

CALCULATIONS TASKS PERFORMED BY DAFSC GROUPS
(PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING)

TASKS	DAFSC 39130A/B (N=34)	DAFSC 39150A/B (N=270)	DAFSC 39170A/B (N=262)	DAFSC 39199 AND CEM CODE 39300 (N=74)
Q345 CALCULATE STANDARD DEVIATIONS	35	39	47	42
Q346 CALCULATE STANDARD ERRORS OF MEANS	15	19	21	19
Q347 CALCULATE VALIDITY OF INDIVIDUAL SAMPLES	18	10	12	19
Q348 CALCULATE WORK CENTER CAPABILITY	32	39	44	39
Q349 CONSTRUCT C CHARTS FOR DEFECTS	12	11	15	15
Q350 CONSTRUCT CONTROL CHARTS FOR AVERAGES	21	26	26	32
Q351 CONSTRUCT CONTROL CHARTS FOR INDIVIDUAL MEASURES	24	21	21	27
Q352 CONSTRUCT FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION GRAPHS	32	14	21	28
Q353 CONSTRUCT FREQUENCY TABLES	21	5	13	18
Q354 CONSTRUCT MEAN TIME AND RANGE CHARTS	18	11	13	14
Q355 CONSTRUCT P CHART FOR DEFEATS	15	9	11	14
Q356 PERFORM TIME SERIES (SECULAR TREND) ANALYSIS	12	17	26	18
Q357 PRESENT BRIEFINGS TO EXPLAIN RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO CORRECT ADVERSE TRENDS	6	14	28	53

Analysis of TAFMS Groups

An analysis of personnel by years of Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS) occurs in this section of the report. The analysis centers around the 1-48 months TAFMS groups in the A- and B-shreds.

Tables 24 and 25 list the relative percent time spent on inventory duties by various A- and B-shred TAFMS groups. Generally, TAFMS groups show the same progression, from worker to first-line supervisor to supervisor, found in the DAFSC analysis. Table 24 indicates A-shred groups with low amounts of TAFMS are technically oriented and spend little time in supervisory tasks. The A-shred groups with higher amounts of TAFMS are still technically oriented but also take on ever-increasing supervisory duties. Table 25 indicates a similar worker-to-supervisor progression exists for B-shred TAFMS groups with one exception. The B-shred first term incumbents appear to spend more time in supervisory tasks than do senior TAFMS B-shred incumbents. This apparent contradiction can be explained by the types of "supervisory" tasks B-shred first term respondents are performing. B-shred first term personnel perform supervisory tasks like updating operating instructions, evaluating computer products, and directing maintenance of status boards and graphs. When first term supervisory tasks are compared to the senior TAFMS groups' supervisory tasks like supervising 39150B personnel, the first term "supervisory" task performance is more believable.

For the purposes of analyzing training, the TAFMS analysis concentrates on A- and B-shred first enlistment groups. Table 26 highlights the top 20 tasks performed by A-shred first term personnel. Table 27 highlights the top 20 tasks performed by B-shred first term incumbents.

Table 26 indicates first term A-shred airmen compile data, construct graphs, evaluate computer outputs, and prepare reports. In short, first term A-shred airmen perform a full production analysis function. First term A-shred respondents comprise 11 percent of the Aerospace Vehicle Production Analysis cluster. Within the cluster, first term A-shred incumbents comprise 23 percent of the aircraft production analysts and 17 percent of the missile production analysts (see Appendix A).

Table 27 indicates B-shred first term personnel compile data, evaluate computer products, construct charts, and prepare reports. The B-shred first term incumbents also appear to perform a full production analysis function. All the B-shred first term incumbents are found in the CEM production analysts job type.

Due to a high number of retrainees coming into the career ladder, an analysis of time in career field (TICF) groups was made in conjunction with the TAFMS analysis. However, since the TICF analysis found the tasks performed by first termers and 1-48 month TICF incumbents to be very similar, a separate reporting, of TICF data would be redundant.

Summary

In summary, A- and B-shred groups with low amounts of TAFMS are, for the most part, technically oriented. With advancing TAFMS, groups take on some supervisory tasks but the incumbents still perform the basic production analysis function. Senior A- and B-shred TAFMS groups take on additional supervisory tasks but also retain technical involvement in production analysis functions. First term incumbents in both shreds were found to be performing a full analysis function.

TABLE 24

PERCENT TIME SPENT ON DUTIES BY A-SHED TAFMS GROUPS

DUTY	TAFMS GROUPS					
	1-48 MONTHS (N=68)	49-96 MONTHS (N=150)	97-144 MONTHS (N=95)	145-192 MONTHS (N=54)	193-240 MONTHS (N=62)	241+ MONTHS (N=13)
A ORGANIZING AND PLANNING	3	4	5	6	6	10
B DIRECTING AND IMPLEMENTING	6	7	12	13	15	16
C INSPECTING AND EVALUATING	7	10	13	14	13	15
D TRAINING	1	2	3	3	6	2
E PREPARING, UPDATING, AND FILING FORMS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS	16	17	14	11	13	13
F PERFORMING MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS	20	18	16	17	14	13
G COLLECTING AND AUDITING AEROSPACE VEHICLE DATA	15	13	12	11	12	10
H ANALYZING AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE MAN-HOURS AND MAINTENANCE DATA REPORTS	14	14	12	11	12	10
I CALCULATING AEROSPACE VEHICLE MANNING, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITY CAPABILITIES	4	5	4	4	4	4
J COLLECTING AND AUDITING COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONIC METEOROLOGICAL (CEM) DATA	1	*	*	*	*	*
K ANALYZING CEM MAINTENANCE MAN-HOURS AND MAINTENANCE DATA REPORTS	1	*	0	0	*	0
L CALCULATING CEM MANNING, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITY CAPABILITIES	1	*	0	0	*	0
M PREPARING AND PRESENTING CEM STUDIES AND BRIEFINGS	*	*	0	0	*	0
N COLLECTING AND AUDITING MOTOR VEHICLE DATA	*	*	0	0	*	0
O ANALYZING MOTOR VEHICLE MAINTENANCE MAN-HOURS AND MAINTENANCE DATA REPORTS	*	*	0	0	*	0
P CALCULATING MOTOR VEHICLE MANNING EQUIPMENT AND FACILITY	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q PERFORMING GENERAL CALCULATIONS AND ANALYSIS FUNCTIONS	10	9	9	8	8	6

* INDICATES LESS THAN ONE PERCENT

TABLE 25

PERCENT TIME SPENT ON DUTIES BY B-SHRED TAPMS GROUPS

DUTY	TAPMS GROUPS					
	1-48 MONTHS (N=18)	49-96 MONTHS (N=31)	97-144 MONTHS (N=27)	145-192 MONTHS (N=11)	193-240 MONTHS (N=20)	241+ MONTHS (N=5)
A ORGANIZING AND PLANNING	7	3	5	5	3	5
B DIRECTING AND IMPLEMENTING	6	7	9	11	11	8
C INSPECTING AND EVALUATING	8	8	10	14	13	6
D TRAINING	5	2	4	7	3	3
E PREPARING, UPDATING, AND FILING FORMS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS	12	13	10	10	11	11
F PERFORMING MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS	20	23	15	18	16	21
G COLLECTING AND AUDITING AEROSPACE VEHICLE DATA	0	*	1	0	2	0
H ANALYZING AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE MAN-HOURS AND MAINTENANCE DATA REPORTS	1	1	5	*	1	1
I CALCULATING AEROSPACE VEHICLE MANNING, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITY CAPABILITIES	*	*	*	0	*	0
J COLLECTING AND AUDITING COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONIC METEOROLOGICAL (CEM) DATA	10	8	7	8	9	10
K ANALYZING CEM MAINTENANCE MAN-HOURS AND MAINTENANCE DATA REPORTS	7	7	8	6	7	12
L CALCULATING CEM MANNING, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITY CAPABILITIES	7	7	9	5	4	7
M PREPARING AND PRESENTING CEM STUDIES AND BRIEFINGS	4	6	7	7	7	5
N COLLECTING AND AUDITING MOTOR VEHICLE DATA	*	*	*	*	0	0
O ANALYZING MOTOR VEHICLE MAINTENANCE MAN-HOURS AND MAINTENANCE DATA REPORTS	*	*	*	*	0	0
P CALCULATING MOTOR VEHICLE MANNING EQUIPMENT AND FACILITY	*	*	*	*	0	0
Q PERFORMING GENERAL CALCULATIONS AND ANALYSIS FUNCTIONS	12	12	11	8	13	11

* INDICATES LESS THAN ONE PERCENT

TABLE 26

TOP 20 TASKS PERFORMED BY A-SHRED 1-48 MONTHS TAFMS RESPONDENTS

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	68
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	66
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	62
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	60
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	57
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	53
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	53
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	53
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	51
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	47
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	47
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	43
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	43
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	43
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	43
G194 IDENTIFY AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	43
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	40
G179 COMPILE AIRCRAFT SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS DATA	37
G201 REVIEW AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR ACCURACY	35
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	35

TABLE 27

TOP 20 TASKS PERFORMED BY B-SHRED 1-48 MONTHS RESPONDENTS

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	83
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	78
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	78
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	72
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	72
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	67
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	67
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	67
Q337 CALCULATE MEAN TIME TO RESTORE (MTTR) EQUIPMENT TO OPERABLE STATUS	67
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	61
J247 ESTABLISH CEM WORK CENTER PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OR RESUBMISSION OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS	61
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	61
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	61
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	61
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	61
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	50
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	44
A14 PREPARE OR UPDATE LOCAL OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS	33
E111 FILE SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE REPORTS	33
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	28

Analysis of Task Difficulty

From a listing of airmen identified for this job survey, A- and B-shredout incumbents holding the 7-skill level from various commands and locations were selected to rate task difficulty. Tasks were rated on a nine-point scale from extremely low to extremely high difficulty, with difficulty defined as the length of time it takes an average airman to learn to do the task. Interrater reliability (as assessed through components of variance of standardized group means) for the 64 raters returning usable booklets was .93. Ratings were adjusted so tasks of average difficulty have ratings of 5.00.

Table 28 lists the 15 tasks rated most difficult by 391X0A/B respondents. Generally the tasks rated most difficult related to performing calculations, forecasting, and writing narratives.

Table 29 lists tasks rated as average in difficulty. Tasks having average task difficulty ratings include compiling data and making various maintenance analysis calculations.

The 15 tasks rated least difficult by 391X0A/B respondents are listed in Table 30. The tasks rated as least difficult involved scheduling leaves, assigning sponsors, and filing various maintenance analysis documents.

Job Difficulty Indices (JDIs)

Once the task difficulty index is computed for each item, it is possible to compute the Job Difficulty Index (JDI) for the groups identified in the survey analysis. This index provides a relative measure of which jobs, when compared to all other jobs in the career ladder, are more or less difficult. An equation using the number of tasks performed and the average difficulty per unit time spent as variables is the basis for the JDI index. The index ranges from one for very easy jobs to 25 for very difficult jobs. The indices are adjusted so the average job difficulty index is 13.00. The JDI is computed for the clusters, job types, and independent job types identified in the Specialty Structure. These indices are listed in Table 31.

Overall, the Aerospace Vehicle First-Line Supervisors and the Aerospace Vehicle Staff Analysts have the highest job difficulty indices of the groups identified in the specialty structure. The first-line supervisors' high JDI can be attributed to the breadth of the job they perform. The group performs the basic maintenance analysis functions but also takes on supervisory duties. The First-Line Supervisors perform the highest average number of tasks in the career ladder. The Aerospace Vehicle Staff Analysts' high JDI can be attributed to both a larger number of tasks performed and the highest average task difficulty per unit time spent (ATDPUTS) index of any job group identified. The Staff Analysts' high ATDPUTS rating comes part from their performance of the more difficult calculation tasks. The remaining job types under the two clusters have average indices of job difficulty.

The most glaring difference in JDIs occurs between the Logistics Center Production Analysts and the rest of the career field. The Logistics Center Production Analysts have an extremely low JDI. The group concentrates only in computer related tasks and does not perform difficult statistics or writing tasks.

TABLE 28

THE 15 MOST DIFFICULT TASKS AS RATED BY 391X0A/B RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TASK DIFFICULTY INDEX	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
A21 WRITE SPECIALTY KNOWLEDGE TESTS (SKT)	7.89	2
Q330 CALCULATE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES APPLYING NONPARAMETRIC TESTS	7.31	21
Q331 CALCULATE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES USING PARAMETRIC TESTS	7.26	21
Q357 PRESENT BRIEFINGS TO EXPLAIN RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO CORRECT ADVERSE TRENDS	7.20	24
Q328 CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION USING PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION METHODS	7.15	16
Q329 CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION USING SPEARMAN'S RANK ORDER CORRELATION METHOD	6.95	19
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	6.93	50
K256 FORCAST CEM SYSTEM OR COMPONENT FAILURES	6.87	7
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	6.85	67
A4 DRAFT BUDGET OR FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS	6.80	6
Q340 CALCULATE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS USING COMPUTATIONAL METHODS	6.73	14
Q332 CALCULATE LINES OF REGRESSION	6.66	22
M283 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	6.62	10
H219 FORECAST AEROSPACE VEHICLE COMPONENT OR SYSTEM FAILURES	6.61	15
M277 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON PROJECTED CEM REQUIREMENTS	6.58	2

TABLE 29

TASKS RATED AVERAGE IN DIFFICULTY BY 391X0A/B RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TASK DIFFICULTY INDEX	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	5.77	56
F172 PREPARE WORK CENTER MANPOWER STATUS SUMMARIES	5.56	35
I233 CALCULATE AIRCRAFT MISSION EQUIPMENT AVAILABILITIES	5.45	16
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	5.31	16
Q335 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN MAINTENANCE (MTBM)	5.23	26
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	5.19	41
I237 CALCULATE MISSILE FACILITY REQUIREMENTS	5.11	1
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	5.00	60
Q338 CALCULATE MEANS, MEDIAN, OR MODES FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	4.90	43
H212 CALCULATE MAN-HOURS PER SORTIE COST DATA	4.57	32
G204 REVIEW AIRCRAFT INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	4.46	11
E138 PREPARE RECORD OF ANALYSIS STUDIES	4.37	41
A3 DEVELOP ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS	4.28	27
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	4.17	48
F177 REVIEW WORK UNIT CODES (WUC) FOR ACCURACY	4.03	46

TABLE 30

THE 15 LEAST DIFFICULT TASKS AS RATED BY 391X0A/B RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TASK DIFFICULTY INDEX	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
A16 SCHEDULE LEAVES OR PASSES	2.67	30
E143 PREPARE VEHICLE SERV-O-PLATE FORMS (AF FORM 1252)	2.62	1
E137 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA TRANSMITTAL FORMS (AF FORM 285)	2.62	12
E112 FILE VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT WORK ORDER FORMS (AF FORM 1823)	2.53	2
E111 FILE SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE REPORTS	2.37	22
E117 FILE WORK ORDER DETAIL INQUIRY REPORTS	2.36	3
E114 FILE VEHICLE OPERATIONS REPORTS	2.35	5
E113 FILE VEHICLE MASTER LISTS	2.34	5
E108 FILE MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL LISTS	2.33	31
E109 FILE MINOR MAINTENANCE WORK ORDER FORMS (AF FORM 1927)	2.32	2
E118 FILE WORK ORDER MASTER FILE STATUS REPORTS	2.26	4
A2 ASSIGN SPONSORS FOR NEW PERSONNEL	2.15	25
E115 FILE VEHICLE QUALITY CONTROL INSPECTION REPORTS	2.13	3
E116 FILE VEHICLE STATUS DATA	2.02	9
E110 FILE QUARTERLY MOTOR VEHICLE REPORTS	2.01	2

TABLE 31

JOB DIFFICULTY DATA AND RELATED DATA FOR SPECIALTY STRUCTURE GROUPS

SPECIALTY STRUCTURE GROUPS	FIRST JOB DIFFICULTY INDEX	AVERAGE NUMBER OF TASKS PERFORMED	ATDPUTS*
AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (SPC092)	14.3	68	5.3
AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (SPC075)	12.5	49	5.2
MISSILE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (GRP129)	13.7	63	5.2
AEROSPACE VEHICLE FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS (SPC073)	18.4	105	5.3
AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS SUPERVISORS (SPC074)	12.5	51	5.2
AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAJCOM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (SPC076)	13.4	41	5.5
AEROSPACE VEHICLE STAFF ANALYSTS (SPC077)	15.9	65	5.5
COMMUNICATION-ELECTRONIC-METEOROLOGICAL (CEM) PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER (GRP051)	13.0	62	5.2
CEM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (SPC072)	13.6	68	5.1
CEM PRODUCTION ANALYST FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS (GRP112)	12.9	51	5.3
CEM STAFF ANALYSTS (GRP209)	12.2	39	5.4
LOGISTICS CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS (GRP033)	3.8	10	4.9

* AVERAGE TASK DIFFICULTY PER UNIT TIME SPENT

Analysis of Training Emphasis

Training emphasis data consists of a rating of inventory tasks indicating the relative emphasis which should be placed on these tasks in structured training for first-term personnel. Structured training is defined as training provided at resident technical schools, field training detachments (FTD), Mobile Training Teams (MTT), formal OJT, Career Development Courses (CDC), or any other organized training method. Training emphasis data was solicited independently from 125 7-skill level personnel in the 391X0 shredouts. The incumbents were asked to rate the tasks on a ten-point scale from zero (no training emphasis) to nine (extremely heavy training emphasis). The interrater reliability for the 64 A-shred respondents who returned booklets was .98. The A-shred-out training emphasis rating had a mean of 1.9 and a standard deviation of 3.0. The interrater reliability for the 19 B-shred respondents was .92. The B-shred training emphasis ratings had a mean of 1.5 and a standard deviation of 2.8.

Tables 32 and 33 list the tasks rated highest in training emphasis by A- and B-shred incumbents. Generally tasks rated high in training emphasis concern BLIS retrieval formats, report preparation, and some calculation tasks.

Tables 34 and 35 list tasks with average training emphasis for both shreds. Generally tasks rated average in difficulty involve establishing procedures, formats, and files or updating files and formats.

Tables 36 and 37 list tasks with below average training emphasis ratings for 391X0A/B incumbents. Generally tasks rated below average for 391X0A respondents concern CEM production analysis whereas tasks rated below average for 391X0B personnel involve aerospace vehicle production analysis.

TABLE 32

THE 15 TASKS RATED HIGHEST FOR TRAINING EMPHASIS BY 391X0A RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TRAINING EMPHASIS RATING	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	6.49	66
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	6.43	38
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	6.35	40
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	6.29	57
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	6.24	51
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	6.19	53
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	6.06	53
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	6.04	49
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	6.01	68
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	5.88	43
H212 CALCULATE MAN-HOURS PER SORTIE COST DATA	5.68	34
I232 CALCULATE AIRCRAFT MAN-HOUR UTILIZATION FACTORS	5.62	31
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	5.60	47
I228 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE WORK CENTER CAPABILITIES	5.60	28
I234 CALCULATE AIRCRAFT MISSION MAINTENANCE CAPABILITIES	5.60	18

TABLE 33

THE 15 TASKS RATED HIGHEST FOR TRAINING EMPHASIS BY 391X0B RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TRAINING EMPHASIS RATING	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	7.16	51
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	6.89	66
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	6.58	53
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	6.58	43
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	6.21	34
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	6.16	6
Q337 CALCULATE MEAN TIME TO RESTORE (MTTR) EQUIPMENT TO OPERABLE STATUS	6.05	4
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	5.68	43
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	5.63	4
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	5.53	40
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	5.53	1
Q335 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN MAINTENANCE (MTBM)	5.37	13
E131 PREPARE GROUND CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS DATA REPORTS	5.16	4
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	5.11	47
L269 CALCULATE CEM SYSTEMS RELIABILITY	5.05	4

TABLE 34

TASKS OF AVERAGE TRAINING EMPHASIS AS RATED BY 391X0A RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TRAINING EMPHASIS RATING	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B28 DIRECT OR IMPLEMENT OJT PROGRAMS	2.91	4
C73 EVALUATE SOURCE DOCUMENTS OTHER THAN TOs	2.76	13
F178 UPDATE PUBLICATION FILES	2.72	9
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	2.60	9
E108 FILE MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL LISTS	2.44	37
F159 ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR TIMING OF REPORTS FORWARDED TO CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE	2.32	9
A5 ESTABLISH PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS	2.24	4
D98 EVALUATE OJT TRAINEES	2.16	1
F174 REVIEW MASTER IDENTIFICATION INPUTS FOR ACCURACY	2.00	16
D90 CONDUCT TRAINING BRIEFINGS	1.96	3
G181 COMPILE DATA FOR MISSILE SUMMARIES	1.73	4
G200 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON MISSILE MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	1.63	1
I243 CALCULATE UNSCHEDULED VS SCHEDULED MISSILE MAINTENANCE RATES	1.60	7
G198 PREPARE MISSILE STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	1.53	4
G186 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON PROJECTED MISSILE CAPABILITIES	1.50	1

TABLE 35

TASKS OF AVERAGE TRAINING EMPHASIS AS RATED BY 391X0B RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TRAINING EMPHASIS RATING	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
A5 ESTABLISH PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS	2.21	4
E145 UPDATE MAINTENANCE CAPABILITY COMPUTATION RECORDS	2.21	19
F155 ESTABLISH CEM LOCAL REPORT CONTENTS OR FORMATS	2.21	1
F172 PREPARE WORK CENTER MANPOWER STATUS SUMMARIES	2.00	19
B31 ESTABLISH PUBLICATION FILES	1.95	9
B23 CONDUCT STAFF MEETINGS	1.79	6
B27 DIRECT MAINTENANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE FILES	1.74	10
C61 EVALUATE CONTENTS OF TOs	1.63	13
A2 ASSIGN SPONSORS FOR NEW PERSONNEL	1.42	3
F163 EVALUATE HISTORICAL MANAGEMENT INQUIRY REPORTS	1.37	6
J246 ESTABLISH CEM MATERIAL CONTROL CANNIBALIZATION REPORTING PROCEDURES	1.16	3
A3 DEVELOP ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS	1.11	24
C73 EVALUATE SOURCE DOCUMENTS OTHER THAN TOs	1.05	13
D97 ESTABLISH STUDY REFERENCE FILES	1.00	4
B30 DRAFT OR REVISE JOB DESCRIPTIONS	.95	9

TABLE 36

TASKS RATED BELOW AVERAGE FOR TRAINING EMPHASIS FOR 391X0A RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TRAINING EMPHASIS RATING	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
E123 PREPARE CEM EQUIPMENT HIGH FIVE REPORTS	.57	4
C75 EVALUATE UNIT ALERT OR EMERGENCY PROCEDURES	.43	4
E124 PREPARE COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONIC METEOROLOGICAL (CEM) MANAGEMENT REPORTS	.13	1
E112 FILE VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT WORK ORDER FORMS (AF FORM 1823)	.10	1
J249 REVIEW CEM INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	.07	3
K252 EVALUATE CEM BASE SELF-SUFFICIENCY	.07	4
L264 CALCULATE CEM MAN-HOUR COST FACTORS	.07	1
L265 CALCULATE CEM MAN-HOUR UTILIZATION FACTORS	.07	1
M274 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	.07	1
M276 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON CEM REQUIREMENTS	.07	1
E141 PREPARE VEHICLE HISTORICAL MANAGEMENT INQUIRY REPORTS	.06	1
E143 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	.02	1
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	0	6
J245 CORRECT CEM SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	0	4
J246 ESTABLISH CEM MATERIAL CONTROL CANNIBALIZATION REPORTING PROCEDURES	0	3

TABLE 37

TASKS RATED BELOW AVERAGE FOR TRAINING EMPHASIS FOR 391X0B RESPONDENTS

TASKS	TRAINING EMPHASIS RATING	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
A16 SCHEDULE LEAVES OR PASSES	.58	3
C64 EVALUATE INDIVIDUALS FOR PROMOTION, DEMOTION, OR RECLASSIFICATION	.47	1
C67 EVALUATE JOB DESCRIPTIONS	.47	3
C81 WRITE CIVILIAN PERFORMANCE RATINGS	.47	4
G189 CORRECT AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	.42	28
E133 PREPARE KEYPUNCH MACHINE UTILIZATION REPORTS	.37	3
E119 PREPARE AIRCRAFT MISSION ANALYSIS REPORTS	.32	35
H215 EVALUATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT STATUS DATA	.32	26
B41 PREPARE PERSONNEL ACTION REQUESTS	.26	1
E120 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT REPORTS	.26	22
E106 COMPILE DATA FOR DAEDALIAN TROPHY NOMINATIONS	.21	19
F165 KEYPUNCH WORK ORDER DETAIL INQUIRY CARDS	.11	4
C75 EVALUATE UNIT ALERT OR EMERGENCY PROCEDURES	0	4
G205 REVIEW MISSILE EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	0	1
G207 REVIEW MISSILE INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	0	1

Analysis of Training Documents

Technical school personnel at the Chanute Technical Training Center, Chanute AFB, matched survey tasks to related areas of the 391X0A/B STS, dated April 1979. School personnel also matched survey tasks to areas of instruction from the 3ABR39130A Plan of Instruction (POI) effective June 1979 and from the 3ABR39130B POI effective July 1979. To provide an additional tool for increasing the efficiency of technical school training, the school matchings are combined with training emphasis ratings, task difficulty ratings and task data for various incumbent groups. The computerized matchings then provide the basis for the training analysis. The matchings are forwarded to technical school personnel for their use in future STS and POI modifications.

Specialty Training Standard (STS) Analysis. Generally, the analysis of the 391X0 STS indicates the STS provides good, comprehensive coverage of the job performed by 391X0A/B incumbents. However, computer product evaluation tasks may warrant inclusion in future STS revisions. Computer product evaluation tasks have high ratings of training emphasis and task difficulty (see Tables 38 and 39) and are performed by high percentages of the career ladder incumbents (see Tables 8 and 9). Therefore, the specific mention of such tasks may be appropriate in future STSs.

3ABR39130A and 3ABR39130B POI Analysis. Due to a request from technical school personnel, the POI analysis looks closely at the statistics instruction provided in the present ABR courses. Of the 14 statistics tasks matched to the 3ABR39130A POI, only three are performed by more than 30 percent of 39130A first term personnel. The three tasks are calculating means, medians, or modes for miscellaneous data; calculating standard deviations; and calculating mean deviations. Similarly, of the 15 statistics tasks matched to the B-shred POI, only the same three tasks are performed by more than 30 percent of the B-shred first term personnel. ATCR 52-22 suggests a 30 percent of first term members performing as a cut off for providing resident school training.

This analysis suggests the present ABR courses may include more statistics instructions than is absolutely necessary for present first term performance. Large portions of the statistics instruction included in the present resident courses may be better suited for other forms of training available for 391X0 personnel (OJT, CDC, etc.).

Tables 38 and 39 list tasks performed by substantial percentages of A- and B-shred first term respondents but which are not matched to the present entry-level POIs. The tasks listed in Tables 38 and 39 involve evaluating computer products and preparing maintenance summaries, reports, studies, and briefings. Due to the high training emphasis ratings for these tasks and the high percentages of first term respondents who perform them, the tasks may warrant inclusion in future revisions of the 3ABR39130A and 3ABR39130B POIs.

TABLE 38

TASKS PERFORMED BY 391X0A FIRST TERM RESPONDENTS
AND NOT MATCHED TO THE 3ABR39130A PLAN OF INSTRUCTION

TASKS	391X30A TRAINING EMPHASIS	TASK DIFFICULTY	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	6.06	5.25	53
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	5.53	4.99	43
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	6.19	6.85	53
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	5.53	6.23	47
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	5.38	6.37	53
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	5.04	6.93	31

TABLE 39

TASKS PERFORMED BY 391X0B FIRST TERM RESPONDENTS
AND NOT MATCHED TO THE 3ABR39130B PLAN OF INSTRUCTION

TASKS	391X30B TRAINING EMPHASIS	TASK DIFFICULTY	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	6.58	5.25	72
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	5.68	4.99	67
M282 PREPARE CEM STUDIES	5.63	6.49	39
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	5.53	4.53	50
M283 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	5.37	6.62	33
E131 PREPARE GROUND CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS DATA REPORTS	5.16	4.92	50
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	4.79	6.85	50

Summary of Training Analysis

Overall, the STS provided a good comprehensive overview of the job performed by 391X0 incumbents. However, computer product evaluation tasks may warrant inclusion in future STSs. The analysis of basic resident training indicates more statistics instruction is provided than may be necessary. Also computer product evaluation tasks and tasks concerning analysis reporting may warrant inclusion in both entry-level courses.

The specialty structure analysis revealed that career ladder members usually find their jobs somewhat interesting but are far less positive about the utilization of their training. The low perceived utilization of training by career ladder members, combined with the deletions and additions suggested by this analysis, may indicate a need for substantial revisions in resident course training.

Analysis of Major Command Differences

An additional analysis concerning the differences in tasks performed by 391X0A/B personnel in the various major commands is included in this report.

391X0A Major Command Differences. The 391X0A major command analysis concerns incumbents assigned to AFLC, ADCOM, AFSC, PACAF, ATC, SAC, USAFE, MAC, and TAC. Generally, 391X0A personnel perform the same aerospace vehicle production analysis tasks regardless of command. The relative percent time spent on tasks vary slightly but overall 391X0A personnel perform the same analysis function.

However, there is one command difference in usage of 391X0A personnel. DAFSC 391X0A personnel in the Air Force Logistics Command perform a distinct job when compared to the rest of the career ladder. Table 40 highlights the five most time consuming tasks for AFLC 391X0A personnel. AFLC 391X0A personnel spend more time with computer products than any other major command group. Also, AFLC respondents compile data for engineering changes. Not surprisingly, AFLC respondents compose 63 percent of the Logistics Center Production Analysts job group identified in the specialty structure analysis.

391X0B Major Command Differences. The analysis of 391X0B major command differences centers around personnel in TAC, ADCOM, AFSC, AFCS, and USAFE. DAFSC 391X0B personnel in AFCS and USAFE, using CEM data, perform a production analysis function centering around evaluating computer products, compiling data, and writing narrative reports. DAFSC 391X0B personnel in AFSC and ADCOM perform this same analysis process but perform more calculation tasks, such as calculating mean time between maintenance or calculating standard deviations.

The most interesting 391X0B major command difference is the usage of TAC personnel. Of the five TAC 391X0B incumbents in the survey sample, at least two are involved in aerospace vehicle production analysis which is normally performed by 391X0A personnel. The aerospace vehicle production tasks include compiling data for aircraft summaries or preparing aircraft studies. Overall the group still primarily performs CEM production analysis.

TABLE 40

FIVE MOST TIME CONSUMING TASKS FOR AFLC DAFSC 391X0 INCUMBENTS

TASKS	RELATIVE PERCENT TIME SPENT	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	11	72%
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	7	48%
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	6	40%
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	4	32%
C55 COMPILE DATA TO EVALUATE ENGINEERING CHANGES	3	24%

Summary

Overall, 391X0A personnel in most of the major commands analyzed perform a similar aerospace vehicle production analysis process. DAFSC 391X0A personnel in AFLC are much more involved in computer products evaluation and in compiling data for engineering changes. Generally 391X0B incumbents are also involved in similar analysis functions although AFSC and ADCOM 391X0B incumbents are more involved with calculations. Also, several TAC 391X0B personnel seem to be involved in aerospace vehicle production analysis functions (391X0A tasks).

Comparison of Current Survey to Previous Survey

This analysis compares the current survey findings with the October 1973 survey of the 391X0A/B career ladder. Overall, both surveys identified similar job types. Table 41 presents a matching of 1973 job groups with the 1979 job groups. As Table 41 indicates, the majority of the job groups in the 1973 survey match a job group in the 1979 survey project. The matching indicates an overall stability in the career field from 1973 to the present.

However, there were several groups in each survey that were not matched. The C-shred maintenance analysis personnel in the 1973 survey are no longer in the career ladder and hence are not found in the present survey. Two instructor groups in the 1973 job groups are also unmatched. No distinct job group of instructors fell out in the 1979 survey, instructors from the technical school being among the ungrouped survey incumbents.

The 1979 survey report has two groups unmatched to 1973 job groups. The Aerospace Vehicle MAJCOM Production Analysts and the Logistics Center Production Analysts are two job types which were not identifiable in the previous survey. While the two groups are most like the Data System Design Analysts of the previous survey, it is now possible to separate these incumbents into distinct groups centering around their specialized operating locations.

With the exception of the unmatched groups, the career ladder has remained quite stable from 1973 to 1979. The major change in the career ladder was the deletion of C-shredout personnel.

One other interesting point is apparent in the current survey. In the 1973 survey report, B-shred personnel felt their job more interesting than A-shred personnel. However, in the current survey, A-shred job interest indices are now somewhat higher than DAFSC 391X0B personnel.

TABLE 41

COMPARISON OF JOB GROUPS REPORTED IN THE 1973 AND 1979 SURVEYS

1973 SURVEY JOB GROUPS

NCOIC PRODUCTION ANALYSIS (A)*

NCOIC PRODUCTION ANALYSIS, MAINTENANCE
ANALYSIS TECHNICIAN, MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS
SPECIALIST (A)
MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIAN (A)

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIAN,
MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (A)
JOB TYPES 089

072
036
054
147

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (A)
JOB TYPES 012
087

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIAN
MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALIST
NCOIC PRODUCTION ANALYSIS (B)

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS TECHNICIAN,
MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALIST (B)
MAINTENANCE ANALYST SPECIALIST

NCOIC REPORTS AND ANALYSIS, MAINTENANCE
ANALYSIS TECHNICIAN, MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS
SPECIALISTS (C)

DATA SYSTEM DESIGN ANALYST (A, B, C)

UNMATCHED JOB GROUPS

INSTRUCTOR: MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS

INSTRUCTOR: STATISTICS/DATA AUTOMATION

1979 SURVEY JOB GROUPSAEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS
SUPERVISORSAEROSPACE VEHICLE FIRST-LINE
SUPERVISORSAIRCRAFT PRODUCTION ANALYSTS
MISSILE PRODUCTION ANALYSTSCEM PRODUCTION ANALYST FIRST-LINE
SUPERVISORS

CEM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

(TRANSFERRED TO 427X CAREER FIELD)

AEROSPACE VEHICLE STAFF ANALYSTS
CEM STAFF ANALYSTSAEROSPACE VEHICLE MAJCOM PRODUCTION
ANALYSTS
LOGISTICS CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

* (A) INDICATES THE SHRED WHICH COMPOSED THE JOB TYPE IN PREVIOUS SURVEY, A, B, OR C

IMPLICATIONS

The Maintenance Analysis career ladder appears to be a relatively stable occupational area; while the motor vehicle maintenance analysis functions have been removed from the career ladder and made into a separate specialty, the focus of the remaining specialty shredouts has remained on the quantitative analysis of aerospace vehicle or communications systems maintenance.

An analysis of the structure of the specialty based on study of the similarity of tasks performed and the relative percent time spent on tasks, revealed two major clusters of jobs plus one independent job type. The two major clusters corresponded with the present specialty shredouts, which tends to validate the present career ladder structure as depicted in AFR 39-1. Tasks were included in the inventory to ascertain if such tasks were performed by other members of the specialty. Data from the survey revealed that almost no Maintenance Analysis personnel reported performing such motor vehicle maintenance analysis tasks. This tends to suggest that the former "C" shredout was indeed a distinct and separate type of work and supports the move of this work to a new and separate specialty.

During the analysis of the structure of the specialty, it was observed that while most of the major job types reported fairly high levels of job interest and feelings that their talents were being utilized, the perceived use of training was much lower. This implies that although members of the career field are interested in their work and find the work challenging, a substantial percentage feel that there is some problem in being able to use the training they have previously received.

An analysis of the training programs revealed that personnel entering this career field are receiving a considerable amount of training in statistics although generally less than 30 percent of the personnel in their first enlistment were using statistics in their work. However, computer product evaluation tasks and tasks concerning analysis reporting were being performed by substantial percentages of first enlistment personnel but these tasks were not emphasized in the initial training program. These findings suggest that a review of the training program is perhaps needed to refine the curriculum objectives to be more relevant to the jobs performed by first enlistment personnel.

APPENDIX A

The GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS for the job groups are the tasks performed more by that particular group than any other group in the SPECIALTY STRUCTURE ANALYSIS.

The REPRESENTATIVE TASKS for the job groups are listed in descending order by percent time spent. That is to say, the top representative task is the most time consuming task for that group while the 20th task is the 20th most time consuming task. The percentage of the group performing the task is displayed to the side of each task.

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC092 - AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER

NUMBER IN GROUP: 456

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 71%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: SAC (27%), TAC (25%), USAFE (15%), MAC (12%), ATC (6%),
PACAF (4%), OTHER (11%)

LOCATION: CONUS (76%), OVERSEAS (24%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 49 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 3 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	77
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	76
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	68
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	59
H210 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEMS RELIABILITY	52

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	77
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	85
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	85
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	77
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	82
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	77
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	73
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	78
C195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	70
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	70
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	68
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	73
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	63
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	60
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	66
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	64
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	57
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	60
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	59
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	70
F170 PREPARE REFERRALS FOR ABNORMAL TRENDS	64
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	61

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC075 - AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 199

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 31%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: TAC (29%), USAFE (20%), SAC (20%), MAC (10%), ATC (6%),
ADCOM (5%), OTHER (10%)

LOCATION: CONUS (72%), OVERSEAS (28%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 20% SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 2 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
G179 COMPILE AIRCRAFT SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS DATA	61
G186 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON PROJECTED MISSILE CAPABILITIES	86
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	58
I228 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE WORK CENTER CAPABILITIES	56

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	86
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	76
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	79
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	75
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	80
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	69
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	68
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	74
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	56
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	65
G179 COMPILE AIRCRAFT SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS DATA	61
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	71
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	66
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	61
E119 PREPARE AIRCRAFT MISSION ANALYSIS REPORTS	51
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	55
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	63
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	56
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	57
G201 REVIEW AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR ACCURACY	50

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: GRP129 - MISSILE PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 12

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 2%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: SAC (100%)

LOCATION: CONUS (100%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 17 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 3 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
I235 CALCULATE MISSILE EQUIPMENT CAPABILITIES	67
I238 CALCULATE MISSILE MAN-HOUR COST FACTORS	50
I239 CALCULATE MISSILE MAN-HOUR UTILIZATION FACTORS	67
I240 CALCULATE MISSILE MISSION EQUIPMENT AVAILABILITY	33
I241 CALCULATE MISSILE MISSION MAINTENANCE CAPABILITIES	42

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
G181 COMPILE DATA FOR MISSILE SUMMARIES	92
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	92
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	92
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	100
E120 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT REPORTS	83
G200 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON MISSILE MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	83
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	83
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	100
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	100
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	75
I239 CALCULATE MISSILE MAN-HOUR UTILIZATION FACTORS	67
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	83
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	67
I243 CALCULATE UNSCHEDULED VS SCHEDULED MISSILE MAINTENANCE RATES	75
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	83
Q338 CALCULATE MEANS, MEDIANS, OR MODES FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	75
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	83
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	67
E108 FILE MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL LISTS	83
E107 FILE CORRESPONDENCE	67

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC073 - AEROSPACE VEHICLE FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 113

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 18%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: SAC (28%), TAC (27%), MAC (13%), USAFE (12%), ATC (7%),
OTHER (13%)

LOCATION: CONUS (80%), OVERSEAS (19%), NOT REPORTED (1%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 83 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 4 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	84
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	97
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	87
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	95
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	89
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	85
B47 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39150A)	74

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	97
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	95
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	95
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	92
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	93
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	89
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	91
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	89
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	93
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	86
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	65
B47 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39150A)	74
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	93
H223 REVIEW BLIS INQUIRIES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OF PROBLEMS	87
I228 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE WORK CENTER CAPABILITIES	84
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	84
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	89
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	89
Q348 CALCULATE WORK CENTER CAPABILITY	81
H209 CALCULATE AEROSPACE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT OR SYSTEM CAPABILITIES	81

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC074 - AEROSPACE VEHICLE PRODUCTION ANALYSIS
SUPERVISORS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 47

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 7%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: SAC (40%), TAC (23%), USAF (11%), MAC (9%), PACAF (6%),
OTHER (11%)

LOCATION: CONUS (79%), OVERSEAS (21%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 91 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 4 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	77
D84 ASSIGN OJT TRAINERS	47
A16 SCHEDULE LEAVES OR PASSES	74
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	91
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	89

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	91
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONAL OR MILITARY RELATED PROBLEMS	94
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	89
A7 ESTABLISH WORK PRIORITIES	91
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	74
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	79
A11 PLAN OR SCHEDULE WORK ASSIGNMENTS	81
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	72
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	83
B25 DEVELOP WORK METHODS OR PROCEDURES	72
B53 SUPERVISE MILITARY PERSONNEL WITH AFSC# OTHER THAN 391X0	49
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	64
G199 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	55
B47 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39150A)	51
C79 PREPARE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	72
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	62
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	55
B44 SUPERVISE APPRENTICE MAINTENANCE ANALYSTS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39130A)	43
A1 ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO DUTY POSITIONS	77
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	45

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC076 - AEROSPACE VEHICLE MAJCOM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 19

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 3%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: TAC (37%), USAF (26%), MAC (11%), ADCOM (6%), AFSC (5%),
ATC (5%), PACAF (5%), SAC (5%)

LOCATION: CONUS (68%), OVERSEAS (32%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 37 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 4 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	95
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	74
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	89
B23 CONDUCT STAFF MEETINGS	59
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	53

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	89
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	95
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	79
F167 PREPARE BRIEFINGS EXCLUDING TRAINING BRIEFINGS	74
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	79
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	74
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	84
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	84
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	79
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	84
G183 CONDUCT BRIEFINGS ON AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE PERFORMANCE	58
C54 ANALYZE WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS	53
B25 DEVELOP WORK METHODS OR PROCEDURES	68
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	42
E121 PREPARE AIRCRAFT OR MISSILE STATUS DATA	53
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	53
C78 MAKE STAFF ASSISTANCE VISITS	47
C74 EVALUATE SUGGESTIONS	74
C73 EVALUATE SOURCE DOCUMENTS OTHER THAN TOs	58
C66 EVALUATE INSPECTION REPORTS OR PROCEDURES	47

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC077 - AEROSPACE VEHICLE STAFF ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 41

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 6%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: SAC (34%), ATC (12%), USAF (12%), MAC (10%), PACAF (10%),
TAC (10%), OTHER (12%)

LOCATION: CONUS (66%), OVERSEAS (32%), NOT REPORTED (2%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 46 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 3 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

<u>TASKS</u>	<u>PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING</u>
Q332 CALCULATE LINES OF REGRESSION	71
Q333 CALCULATE MEAN DEVIATIONS	80
Q338 CALCULATE MEANS, MEDIAN, OR MODES FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	83
Q345 CALCULATE STANDARD DEVIATIONS	88
Q356 PERFORM TIME SERIES (SECULAR TREND) ANALYSIS	71

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

<u>TASKS</u>	<u>PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING</u>
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	90
Q345 CALCULATE STANDARD DEVIATIONS	88
Q338 CALCULATE MEANS, MEDIAN, OR MODES FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	83
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	83
Q333 CALCULATE MEAN DEVIATIONS	80
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	78
Q350 CONSTRUCT CONTROL CHARTS FOR AVERAGES	71
H218 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION (MDC) DATA	68
G180 COMPILE DATA FOR AIRCRAFT SUMMARIES	61
Q332 CALCULATE LINES OF REGRESSION	71
G195 PREPARE AIRCRAFT STUDIES OR BRIEFINGS	59
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	63
B26 DIRECT DEVELOPMENT OR MAINTENANCE OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR CHARTS	68
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	78
Q330 CALCULATE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES APPLYING NONPARAMETRIC TESTS	66
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	68
Q331 CALCULATE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES USING PARAMETRIC TESTS	63
E138 PREPARE RECORD OF ANALYSIS STUDIES	59
Q346 CALCULATE STANDARD ERRORS OF MEANS	51
E145 UPDATE MAINTENANCE CAPABILITY COMPUTATION RECORDS	49

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: GRP051 - COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONIC-METEOROLOGICAL (CEM)
PRODUCTION ANALYSIS CLUSTER

NUMBER IN GROUP: 102

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 16%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: AFCS (59%), AFSC (16%), ADCOM (10%), USAFE (6%), TAC (5%),
OTHER (4%)

LOCATION: CONUS (72%), OVERSEAS (28%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 32 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 2 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	84
K260 REVIEW CEM FULLY MISSION CAPABLE RATES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	70
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	73
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	75
J247 ESTABLISH CEM WORK CENTER PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OR RESUBMISSION OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS	67

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	84
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	84
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	75
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	81
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	78
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	71
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	73
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	71
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	62
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	74
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	69
K260 REVIEW CEM FULLY MISSION CAPABLE RATES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	70
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	65
L272 CALCULATE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERROR RATES	64
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	74
M282 PREPARE CEM STUDIES	66
Q337 CALCULATE MEAN TIME TO RESTORE (MTTR) EQUIPMENT TO OPERABLE STATUS	67
K259 REVIEW CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	61
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	64
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	59

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: SPC072 - CEM PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 77

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 12%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: AFCS (64%), AFSC (13%), ADCOM (8%), TAC (7%), OTHER (8%)

LOCATION: CONUS (70%), OVERSEAS (30%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 32 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 2 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	84
J245 CORRECT CEM SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	82
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	77
L272 CALCULATE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERROR RATES	73
M280 PREPARE <u>CEM</u> MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	77

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	84
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	87
F166 PREPARE BLIS RETRIEVAL REQUEST FORMATS	88
J245 CORRECT CEM PROJECT DOCUMENT ERRORS	82
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	77
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	75
J250 REVIEW CEM MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION SOURCE DOCUMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	75
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	84
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	79
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	79
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	83
F148 AUDIT BASE LEVEL INQUIRY SYSTEM (BLIS) RETRIEVAL REQUEST CARDS	75
L272 CALCULATE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERROR RATES	73
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	71
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	77
K260 REVIEW CEM FULLY MISSION CAPABLE RATES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	73
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	75
J247 ESTABLISH CEM WORK CENTER PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OR RESUBMISSION OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS	78
B22 ADVISE CHIEF OF MAINTENANCE ON MAINTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT	77
M282 PREPARE <u>CEM</u> STUDIES	68

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: GRP112 - CEM PRODUCTION ANALYST FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 8

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 1%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: AFCS (50%), AFSC (25%), ADCOM (13%), USAFE (12%)

LOCATION: CONUS (62%), OVERSEAS (38%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 62 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 2 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
A14 PREPARE OR UPDATE LOCAL OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS	75
A7 ESTABLISH WORK PRIORITIES	75
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	88
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	88
B48 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39150B)	75

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	88
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	88
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	100
C78 MAKE STAFF ASSISTANCE VISITS	75
K260 REVIEW <u>CEM</u> FULLY MISSION CAPABLE RATES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	75
K259 REVIEW <u>CEM</u> EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	75
K253 EVALUATE <u>CEM</u> EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	75
E107 FILE CORRESPONDENCE	100
M282 PREPARE <u>CEM</u> STUDIES	75
J248 REVIEW <u>CEM</u> EQUIPMENT UTILIZATION OR STATUS REPORTS FOR INCLUSION OF REQUIRED INFORMATION	56
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	88
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	88
C82 WRITE STAFF STUDIES, SURVEYS, OR SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING TRAINING REPORTS	75
B48 SUPERVISE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS SPECIALISTS (AFSC 39150B)	75
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR <u>CEM</u> MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	63
A7 ESTABLISH WORK PRIORITIES	75
J249 REVIEW <u>CEM</u> INVENTORY REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	63
D93 DEMONSTRATE HOW TO LOCATE TECHNICAL INFORMATION	75
M280 PREPARE <u>CEM</u> MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	63

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: GRP209 - CEM STAFF ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 7

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 1%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: ADCOM (42%), AFCS (29%), USAF (29%)

LOCATION: CONUS (71%), OVERSEAS (29%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: 14 PERCENT SUPERVISE AN AVERAGE OF 4 PEOPLE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	57
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORMS 2422)	100
L270 CALCULATE CEM UNSCHEDULED VS SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE RATE	71
K257 REVIEW CEM CONTROL CHARTS TO DETERMINE FAILURE RATES	71
M283 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	71

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
J244 COMPILE DATA FOR CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	100
Q345 CALCULATE STANDARD DEVIATIONS	100
E135 PREPARE MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS REFERRAL FORMS (AF FORM 2422)	100
Q337 CALCULATE MEAN TIME TO RESTORE (MTTR) EQUIPMENT TO OPERABLE STATUS	100
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	100
M280 PREPARE CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES FOR DISTRIBUTION	86
K259 REVIEW CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS FOR ACCURACY	86
Q338 CALCULATE MEANS, MEDIAN, OR MODES FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	86
K260 REVIEW CEM FULLY MISSION CAPABLE RATES FOR DEVELOPING TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	86
Q333 CALCULATE MEAN DEVIATIONS	86
Q334 CALCULATE MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURES (MTBF)	86
Q346 CALCULATE STANDARD ERRORS OF MEANS	86
K257 REVIEW CEM CONTROL CHARTS TO DETERMINE FAILURE RATES	71
L270 CALCULATE CEM UNSCHEDULED VS SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE RATE	71
M283 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVES OF CEM MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	71
K253 EVALUATE CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS REPORTS	57
F162 EVALUATE BLIS REPORTS	86
F156 ESTABLISH CEM SPECIAL REPORT CONTENTS OR FORMATS	57
E131 PREPARE GROUND CEM EQUIPMENT STATUS DATA REPORTS	71
Q356 PERFORM TIME SERIES (SECULAR TREND) ANALYSIS	57
L269 CALCULATE CEM SYSTEMS RELIABILITY	57
F173 PREPARE WRITTEN NARRATIVE OF STATISTICAL STUDIES	71

GROUP ID NUMBER AND TITLE: GRP033 - LOGISTICS CENTER PRODUCTION ANALYSTS

NUMBER IN GROUP: 16

PERCENT OF SAMPLE: 2%

MAJOR COMMAND DISTRIBUTION: AFLC (62%), AFSC (13%), SAC (13%), TAC (6%), OTHER (6%)

LOCATION: CONUS (100%)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION: NONE

GROUP DIFFERENTIATING TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C55 COMPILE DATA TO EVALUATE ENGINEERING CHANGES	38
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	81
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	94

REPRESENTATIVE TASKS:

TASKS	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
C60 EVALUATE COMPUTER OUTPUTS	94
C59 EVALUATE COMPUTER INPUTS	81
E144 UPDATE COMPUTER LISTINGS	44
C55 COMPILE DATA TO EVALUATE ENGINEERING CHANGES	38
B25 DEVELOP WORK METHODS OR PROCEDURES	31
B29 DRAFT CORRESPONDENCE	25
F169 PREPARE PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530)	38
B38 INTERPRET POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, OR PROCEDURES FOR SUBORDINATES	19
F149 AUDIT DAILY DATA INPUTS	19
G194 IDENTIFY AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	13
C56 EVALUATE ADMINISTRATIVE FORMS, FILES, OR PROCEDURES	19
E134 PREPARE LABOR TIME CARDS	25
B39 INVENTORY EQUIPMENT, TOOLS, OR SUPPLIES	25
G189 CORRECT AEROSPACE VEHICLE SOURCE DOCUMENT ERRORS	19
E107 FILE CORRESPONDENCE	25
A14 PREPARE OR UPDATE LOCAL OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS	19
N303 REVIEW PUNCH CARD TRANSCRIPT FORMS (AF FORM 1530) FOR ACCURACY	6
E147 UPDATE TO FILES	13
E136 PREPARE MAINTENANCE DATA COLLECTION REPORTS	6
C54 ANALYZE WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS	19
F151 CONSTRUCT MISCELLANEOUS GRAPHS, CHARTS, OR TABLES	6
B46 SUPERVISE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL	6
C66 EVALUATE INSPECTION REPORTS OR PROCEDURES	6
C68 EVALUATE MAINTENANCE OR USE OF WORKSPACES, EQUIPMENT, OR SUPPLIES	6
C75 EVALUATE UNIT ALERT OR EMERGENCY PROCEDURES	6
B24 COUNSEL SUBORDINATES ON PERSONAL OR MILITARY RELATED PROBLEMS	13

	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING
	92
	92
ARTS, OR TABLES	92
	100
NANCE MANAGEMENT REPORTS	83
FILE MAINTENANCE SUMMARIES	83
	83
NG TRENDS OR PROBLEMS	100
STICAL STUDIES	100
ON REPORTS	75
ATION FACTORS	67
INTENANCE OR UTILIZATION OF	
	83
	67
MISSILE MAINTENANCE RATES	75
OF STATUS BOARDS, GRAPHS, OR	
	83
S FOR MISCELLANEOUS DATA	75
ION (MDC) DATA	83
SPECIAL REPORTS EXCLUDING	
	67
	83
	67