



Research Note 2024-02

**Development and Validation of the Restricted
Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery
(NSAB): Interim Technical Summary**

Kristen Horgan

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Christopher D. Nye

Drasgow Consulting Group

Elyssa Johnson

U.S. Army Research Institute

Eleanor Lovering, Kelsey Byerly

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Fritz Drasgow, Oleksandr S. Chernyshenko, Stephen Stark

Drasgow Consulting Group

Melissa Glorioso, Erin O'Brien

U.S. Army Research Institute

November 2023

**United States Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

**Department of the Army
Deputy Chief of Staff, G1**

Authorized and approved:

**SCOTT B. SHADRICK, Ph.D.
Acting Director**

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, LLC

Technical review by

Jamie Striler, U. S. Army Research Institute

DISPOSITION

This Research Note has been submitted to the
Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC).

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					
1. REPORT DATE (Month Year) November 2023		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (Month Year)	
				START DATE July 2020	END DATE November 2022
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Development and Validation of the Restricted Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery: Interim Technical Summary					
5a. CONTRACT NUMBER W911NF-18-C-0069		5b. GRANT NUMBER		5c. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT NUMBER	
5d. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 633007	5e. PROJECT NUMBER A792	5f. TASK NUMBER 1031		5g. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Horgan, Kristen; Nye, Christopher D.; Johnson, Elyssa; Lovering, Eleanor; Byerly, Kelsey; Drasgow, Fritz; Chernyshenko, Oleksandr, S.; Stark, Stephen; Glorioso, Melissa; O'Brien, Erin					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, LLC 1911 N. Fort Myer Drive, Suite 410 Arlington, VA 22209				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 6000 6th Street (Bldg. 1464 / Mail Stop: 5610) Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-5610			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) ARI	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Research Note 2024-02	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ARI Research POC: Elyssa Johnson, Ph.D., Selection and Assignment Research Unit					
14. ABSTRACT This report describes research to validate a new version of a personality and motivation measure, the <i>Restricted</i> Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery (NSAB), to inform noncommissioned officer (NCO) special assignment. The current research builds on the U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences' (ARI) previous Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS) and NSAB research that has shown these measures predict a range of performance and attitudinal criteria for new Soldier selection, military occupational specialty (MOS) qualification, and NCO special assignment selection (recruiters, instructors, drill sergeants, Special Forces). This report covers the preliminary results of data collected to validate a new, restricted version of the NSAB for operational use in a sample of Soldiers attending Basic Leader Course (BLC).					
15. SUBJECT TERMS NSAB, NCO selection, NCO special assignment, noncognitive assessment					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified	Unlimited Unclassified	48	
19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Dr. Tonia Heffner				19b. PHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 703-545-4408	

Research Note 2024-02

**Development and Validation of the Restricted
Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery
(NSAB): Interim Technical Summary**

Kristen Horgan

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Christopher D. Nye

Drasgow Consulting Group

Elyssa Johnson

U.S. Army Research Institute

Eleanor Lovering, Kelsey Byerly

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Fritz Drasgow, Oleksandr S. Chernyshenko, Stephen Stark

Drasgow Consulting Group

Melissa Glorioso, Erin O'Brien

U.S. Army Research Institute

November 2023

**United States Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI), Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, LLC (PDRI), and Drasgow Consulting Group (DCG) would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals and organizations for their support of the Restricted Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment (NSAB) project. We would like to thank Mr. Juan Ortiz for his support in facilitating Basic Leader Course (BLC) participation for the validation portion of this project. We appreciate the outstanding support provided by the many U.S. Training Doctrine and Command (TRADOC) BLC leaders, facilitators, and learners who assisted in data collections and generously shared their expertise as subject matter experts. We would also like to recognize Ms. Sharon Meyers, ARI, for her assistance with survey programming.

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE RESTRICTED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT BATTERY: INTERIM TECHNICAL SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Requirement:

The Army requires effective noncommissioned officers (NCOs) in special duty assignments such as recruiter, drill sergeant, and instructor to successfully transform civilians into well-trained and highly performing Soldiers and leaders. Other special duty assignments, such as Special Forces, fulfill a unique role within the Army. When placing NCOs into these special assignments, the Army has a variety of measures to evaluate NCOs' attributes, including cognitive ability, physical fitness, and education. Implementing a personality assessment as an operational screening tool for special duty assignments provides additional information to help Army decision makers recommend assignments with increased precision and allows for a whole-person assessment approach that considers an NCO's personality alongside other important requirements and predictors of success.

With this in mind, the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) has conducted several research studies to validate the NCO Special Assignment Battery (NSAB), a personality measure based on the Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS), for several NCO special duty assignments (Horgen, Nye, White, et al., 2013; Nye, Muhammad, Wolters, et al., 2018). After empirical evidence demonstrated the successful relationship between the NSAB and special duty assignment outcomes, such as performance and Soldier attitudes, the Army G-1 issued guidance on the Implementation of the NSAB for Special Assignments (HQDA EXORD 106-21). In June 2021, the Army began administering the NSAB in the Distributed Leader Courses 1, 2, and 3 (DLC 1, 2, 3), prior to attendance at Basic Leader Course (BLC), Advanced Leader Course (ALC), and the Senior Leader Course (SLC). The NSAB scores are provided to Human Resource Command (HRC), along with existing data and requirements, for assignment managers to utilize when assigning NCOs to drill sergeant and recruiter positions.

Additionally, the EXORD directed ARI to continue research on the NSAB, and as such, ARI authorized the development of a new, restricted version of the NSAB, so that the existing version of the NSAB can be used solely for research purposes and the newly developed version can be used solely operationally. This report describes the preliminary research to validate the new, restricted version of the NSAB in a large-scale effort with Soldiers and NCOs early in their careers.

Procedure:

A total of 199 BLC learners from U.S. Army TRADOC installations, representing Active and Reserve components participated in the research as of September 2022. Preliminary results describe data collected from two BLC locations. BLC learners completed the new, computer-adaptive restricted version of the NSAB and the NCO Life Questionnaire (NCOLQ). The NCOLQ is a self-report attitudinal and behavior measure that contains items regarding career intentions, perceived Army fit, affective commitment, motivation to lead, resilience,

organizational citizenship behaviors, leadership behaviors, and self-rated BLC performance. Learners' peers and facilitators (i.e., instructors) completed performance ratings. Finally, learners completed a demographic and background questionnaire. Data were collected from learners in proctored settings, and facilitators received an email with an instructional tutorial and a link to an online version of the rating scales.

Findings:

The NCOLQ scale reliabilities results indicated that most self-reported learner attitudes and behaviors can be measured reliably. The Army fit and resilience scale reliabilities were somewhat low (.67 and .58, respectively). We plan to review item-level statistics to examine whether the scale reliabilities can be improved when a larger sample of data is available for analysis. The self-report attitudinal and behavioral assessment, disciplinary actions, and peer performance ratings provided comprehensive coverage of the BLC learner criterion domain. Facilitator performance ratings are not included in this report due to the small sample size as of September 2022.

Utilization and Dissemination of Findings:

The new, restricted version of the NSAB will provide the Army with a secure operational screening tool for special duty assignments, while the previous version can be used for continued research. Building on the foundation of the current work, the project team plans to conduct additional data collection with Soldiers attending the Basic Leader Course to build larger samples to analyze the relationship between the new, restricted version of the NSAB and attitudes and performance. Additional research is planned to continue to examine the relationship between the two versions of the NSAB by comparing individuals' scores on the previous NSAB version to the new, restricted version of the NSAB. Validities will also be compared across the two versions. This will allow for one version to be used operationally and a second, equivalent version to be used for research purposes.

The NSAB has demonstrated value for use in NCO assignment to recruiter and drill sergeant duties and has the potential to add value for NCO selection for other assignments such as instructors or special operations. Further testing of the NSAB for use as an in-service selection tool for other NCO special populations and NCO leadership positions is recommended. Additional research will support Army leadership's interest in planning for NCOs' career lifecycles.

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE RESTRICTED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT BATTERY: INTERIM TECHNICAL SUMMARY

CONTENTS

	Page
DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE RESTRICTED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT BATTERY.....	9
Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery (NSAB).....	10
METHOD	11
Participants.....	11
Measures	13
Procedures.....	17
DATABASE CLEANING AND DEVELOPMENT.....	18
RESULTS	19
Participant Experience & Disciplinary Actions.....	19
NSAB Descriptive Statistics	20
NCOLQ Scale and Item Descriptive Statistics	21
Peer Rating Descriptive Statistics.....	23
Summary	27
DISCUSSION.....	27
REFERENCES	28

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. NCO LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	1
APPENDIX B. DEMOGRAPHIC AND BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE.....	1
APPENDIX C. PEER RATING FORM.....	1
APPENDIX D. FACILITATOR RATING FORM	1

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	
TABLE 1. LEARNER DEMOGRAPHICS.....	122
TABLE 2. LEARNER GENDER.....	122
TABLE 3. LEARNER ETHNICITY AND RACE	122
TABLE 4. LEARNER – COMPONENT AND PAYGRADE.....	133
TABLE 5. LEARNER – HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION.....	133
TABLE 6. NSAB FACETS	144
TABLE 7. TRADOC DATA COLLECTION SITES	177
TABLE 8. LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO BLC.....	199
TABLE 9. LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE AT BLC.....	199
TABLE 10. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS RECEIVED PRIOR TO BLC.....	20
TABLE 11. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE STANDARDIZED SCORES ON THE NSAB FACETS	20
TABLE 12. SELF-RATED PERFORMANCE.....	211
TABLE 13. FUTURE ASSIGNMENT PREFERENCE	211
TABLE 14. NCOLQ SCALE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND RELIABILITIES.....	222
TABLE 15. NCOLQ SCALE INTERCORRELATIONS.....	233
TABLE 16. NUMBER OF PEER RATINGS	233
TABLE 17. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PEER RATINGS.....	233
TABLE 18. RATING SCALE INTERCORRELATIONS FOR PEER RATINGS.....	244
TABLE 19. AGGREGATED PEER-LEARNER PERFORMANCE RATING RELIABILITY	265

	Page
TABLE 20. NCOLQ AND AGGREGATED PEER PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE INTERCORRELATIONS.....	266

Development and Validation of the Restricted Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery

The Department of the Army is responsible for recruiting and training thousands of new Soldiers annually and for the continued training and development of Soldiers throughout their careers. The Army requires effective Soldiers in leadership positions and special duty assignments such as recruiter, drill sergeant, and instructor to help recruit, train, and guide Soldiers. Together, the noncommissioned officers (NCOs) in these special duty assignments are responsible for transforming civilians into highly trained Soldiers and leaders. Given the importance of these assignments, it is crucial to identify and place NCOs who are likely to be successful in these special duty assignments.

NCO special duty assignments are important not just to the Army but to the development of NCOs themselves. These assignments provide broadening opportunities and leadership experience, beyond military occupational specialty (MOS) related activities, which NCOs can leverage to progress their careers and grow in character, presence, and intellect (Department of the Army, 2018). NCOs can best succeed and take advantage of these opportunities if they are placed in assignments that are compatible with their abilities and personality characteristics.

The purpose of the Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery (NSAB) is to identify NCOs most likely to succeed in special duty assignments. The NSAB is a personality assessment comprised of 16 dimensions of the Big Five personality factors and other well-researched personality dimensions (Chernyshenko et al., 2010; Chernyshenko et al., 2007). Implementing a new, restricted version of the NSAB as an operational screening tool for special duty assignments will provide additional information to help Army decision makers recommend assignment decisions with increased precision and allows for a whole-person approach that considers an NCO's personality alongside other important requirements and predictors of success. This allows the existing version of the NSAB to be used for research purposes, while the newly developed, restricted version can be used operationally and increases test security.

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) has conducted several research studies to validate the NSAB for several NCO special duty assignments. After demonstration of the successful relationship between the NSAB and special duty assignment outcomes, the Army G-1 issued guidance on the Implementation of the NSAB for Special Assignments (HQDA EXORD 106-21). In June 2021, the Army began administering the NSAB in the Distributed Leader Courses 1, 2, and 3 (DLC 1, 2, 3), prior to attendance at Basic Leader Course (BLC), Advanced Leader Course (ALC), and the Senior Leader Course (SLC). The NSAB is automatically scored, with scores sent to ARI and the U.S. Army Human Resources Command (HRC). NSAB scores supplement existing data and requirements (e.g., physical fitness, cognitive ability, educational credentials, conduct, and years of service) used when making drill sergeant and recruiter assignments. The EXORD also directed ARI to continue research on the NSAB, and as such, ARI requires the development of a new version so that one version of the NSAB can be used for research purposes and the other can be used operationally.

This report describes continuing research to validate the new, restricted version of the NSAB in a large-scale effort with Soldiers and NCOs early in their careers. There are six primary

objectives of the overall research effort: 1) developing items and an item response theory model for a new, computer-adaptive restricted version of the NSAB; 2) planning for the administration of the new, restricted version of the NSAB in the TRADOC BLCs; 3) developing criterion measures; 4) completing the computer-adaptive software development for the new, restricted version of the NSAB; 5) conducting a concurrent criterion-related validation study with Soldiers attending BLC; and 6) comparing Soldiers' scores on the NSAB administered at DLC to their scores on the new, restricted version of the NSAB. Results for the first three objectives above are described in Horgen, et al. (2023). In this research note, we provide results for the fourth objective and preliminary results for the fifth objective. We first provide a brief description of the NSAB. Next, we describe the procedures and measures used in the ongoing concurrent criterion-related validation study. Finally, we present preliminary results for the initial phases of data collection with Basic Leader Course participants.

Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery (NSAB)

The NSAB is a personality assessment that is based on the Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS; Drasgow et al., 2012). The NSAB is a personality assessment comprised of 16 dimensions of the Big Five personality factors and other well-researched traits (e.g., Physical Conditioning, Military Self-Efficacy; Chernyshenko et al., 2010; Chernyshenko et al., 2007; Nye, Muhammad, Wolters, et al., 2018). The NSAB builds on the TAPAS trait taxonomy and was specifically designed for Army NCO in-service testing and to measure traits relevant for NCO performance. Like the TAPAS, the NSAB was specifically designed to address the limitations of traditional personality assessments. For example, a major concern with traditional personality assessments is applicant faking or response distortion in high-stakes settings. Past research has shown that test-takers can easily identify the correct or socially desirable responses on single statement personality measures and increase or decrease their scores when sufficiently motivated (Mueller-Hanson et al., 2003; White et al., 2001). As a result, response distortion is a potential threat to the validity of personality measures and may affect their utility in operational selection settings (White et al., 2008).

To address issues with response distortion on personality assessments, the NSAB takes advantage of modern psychometric methods and computing technology to offer a personality measure that (a) is fake-resistant, (b) utilizes computer-adaptive technology to measure a broad range of trait continua, and (c) is easily customized to meet the in-service assessment needs of diverse assignments in the military. The NSAB uses a multidimensional pairwise preference (MDPP) format that is designed to be resistant to response distortion by asking test-takers to choose the statement out of a pair of statements that best describes them (Stark et al., 2005; Stark et al., 2011, Stark et al., 2012). For each item, the two statements in the pair are matched on both their social desirability and extremity on the dimensions they assess. The purpose of matching statements in this way is to make identifying and selecting the most socially desirable responses more difficult for test-takers. Meta-analytic research has demonstrated the utility of this administration method for reducing the effects of response distortion (Cao & Drasgow, 2019) and research on the operational use has found no evidence of score inflation, even when compared to other respondents taking the test for “research purposes only” (Drasgow et al., 2012).

In 2013, ARI began conducting research to examine the validity of the NSAB for predicting recruiting duty success. Since then, ARI has continued to gather NSAB validity evidence for predicting performance in other special duty assignments, including drill sergeants, and instructors. Research on the NSAB to date has relied on TAPAS research statement pools, meaning all 32 TAPAS dimensions are available for use in NSAB research. Development of the new, restricted version of the NSAB with new statement pools was an essential component of the ongoing NSAB development and validation effort. Item development for the restricted version of the NSAB, hereafter referred to as the Restricted NSAB, is described in Horgen, et al. (2023). In the next section, we describe the procedures and measures used in the validation study, the development of the adaptive software for the Restricted NSAB, and the preliminary results from initial data collection efforts.

Method

A concurrent criterion-related validation study was conducted with Soldiers in BLC to investigate the relationship between the Restricted NSAB and attitudes and performance. Army Soldiers attend BLC as one of the first leadership training courses in the Noncommissioned Officer Education System (NCOES). Specifically, Army Specialists and Corporals are required to attend BLC as preparation for their duties and responsibilities as an NCO. Given this project is seeking to identify how to better match NCOs to special duty assignments, BLC attendees are an ideal sample for validating the Restricted NSAB because the graduates join the pool from which special duty assignment NCOs are drawn.

While attending BLC, Soldiers learn the fundamental skills needed to lead small groups of Soldiers (NCO Worldwide, 2022). Students, also referred to as learners, are taught in a collaborative, small group setting of up to 20 Soldiers per classroom, and instruction consists of 169 academic hours over the course of four weeks, or a “cycle” (NCOA, 2018).

Data were collected from BLC learners and facilitators (i.e., instructors) to examine the validity of the *Restricted* NSAB and directly test the relationship between the NSAB facets and learner success in BLC. For details regarding the development of the criterion measures, see *Development and Validation of the Restricted Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery* (Horgen et al., 2023).

Participants

A total of 199 BLC learners, representing Active and Reserve components, from U.S. Army TRADOC installations participated in the research as of September 2022. Preliminary results describe data collected from two BLC locations at large Army installations. The majority of learner participants were male (81.9%), in the Active Army (99.5%) and had an average of 3.98 years in service. Many learners reported having a high school diploma or GED (33.2%), and a large portion of learners (45.2%) reported having completed some college. Additional demographic details are provided in Tables 1 through 5. BLC facilitators also participated in the validation study; however, the facilitator sample size is insufficient to report on results at this time.

Table 1
Learner Demographics

	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	199	25.40	3.96
Self-reported ASVAB General Technical score	198	108.03	12.21
Total time in service (in years)	196	3.98	1.65
Total time in current paygrade (in years)	176	1.57	1.28

Note. *n* = 199.

Table 2
Learner Gender

	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	163	81.9
Female	36	18.1
Missing	0	0.0

Note. *n* = 199.

Table 3
Learner Ethnicity and Race

	<i>n</i>	%
Ethnicity		
Not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	128	64.3
Of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	71	35.7
Missing	0	0.0
Race ^a		
American Indian or Alaska Native	10	5.0
Asian	12	6.0
Black or African American	44	22.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	2.5
White	110	55.3
Two or more races	18	9.1
Missing	0	0.0

Note. *n* = 199.

^a Learners could select more than one racial group.

Table 4
Learner – Component and Paygrade

	<i>n</i>	%
Component		
Active Army	198	99.5
Army National Guard	0	0.0
Army Reserve	1	0.5
Missing	0	0.0
Current Paygrade		
E4	118	59.3
E5	81	40.7
Missing	0	0.0

Note. *n* = 199.

Table 5
Learner – Highest Level of Education

	<i>n</i>	%
Less than 12 years of school (no diploma or certificate)	1	0.5
High school certificate or GED	3	1.5
High school diploma	63	31.7
Some college credit, but did not graduate	90	45.2
Associate degree (e.g., AA, AS)	18	9.0
Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS, AB)	20	10.1
Some graduate school	0	0.0
Graduate degree (e.g., MA, MS, JD)	4	2.0
Missing	0	0.0

Note. *n* = 199.

Measures

Restricted Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery (NSAB)

The new computer-adaptive version of the NSAB, the *Restricted NSAB*, consists of an item pool of 732 items measuring 16 facets of personality (see Table 6). This version contains 131 pairs of statements referring to how participants might typically think, feel, and act. Participants were instructed to select one statement from each pair of statements that is most like them.

Table 6
NSAB Dimensions

Dimension Name	Definition
Achievement	High scoring individuals are seen as hard working, ambitious, confident, and resourceful.
Dominance	High scoring individuals are domineering, “take charge” and are often referred to by their peers as “natural leaders.”
Even Tempered	High scoring individuals tend to be calm and stable. They don’t often exhibit anger, hostility, or aggression.
Humility	High scoring individuals tend to be honest, to put others’ needs before their own, and do not focus on being the center of attention.
Intellectual Efficiency	High scoring individuals are able to process information quickly and would be described by others as knowledgeable, astute, and intellectual.
Non-Delinquency	High scoring individuals tend to comply with rules, customs, norms, and expectations, and they tend not to challenge authority.
Optimism	High scoring individuals have a positive outlook on life and tend to experience joy and a sense of well-being.
Order	High scoring individuals tend to organize tasks and activities and desire to maintain neat and clean surroundings.
Persistence	High scoring individuals tend to focus on tasks and activities until they are completed and are determined to accomplish their goals even in the face of obstacles.
Physical Conditioning	High scoring individuals tend to engage in activities to maintain their physical fitness and are more likely to participate in vigorous sports or exercise.
Responsibility	High scoring individuals are dependable, reliable and make every effort to keep their promises.
Self-Efficacy	High scoring individuals are confident in their skills and abilities to accomplish any task that they take on.
Selflessness	High scoring individuals are generous with their time and resources.
Sociability	High scoring individuals are friendly and tend to seek out social interactions.
Tolerance	High scoring individuals are interested in other cultures and opinions that may differ from their own. They are willing to adapt to novel environments and situations.

Table 6 (continued)

Dimension Name	Definition
Virtue	High scoring individuals adhere to standards of honesty, morality, and “good Samaritan” behavior.

Development of NSAB Adaptive Software. The development of the computer-adaptive software for the Restricted NSAB consisted of updating the software used for past NSAB administrations to incorporate the new statement pools described by Horgen et al. (2023)). Incorporating these new statement pools involved updating the test blueprints and replacing the statement pools used in previous versions of the NSAB. In addition, the software was updated to run on the Army Learning Management System (ALMS) platform. Specifically, we modified the NSAB interface to support recent technical changes to ALMS, which included migrating the NSAB from Oracle to MySQL.

NCO Life Questionnaire (NCOLQ)

The NCOLQ is a self-report attitudinal and behavior measure that contains items regarding Career Intentions, Perceived Army Fit, Affective Commitment, Motivation to Lead, Resilience, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Leadership Behaviors, and Self-Rated BLC Performance. The NCOLQ attitudinal items were based on ARI’s Army Life Questionnaire measuring similar content areas but modified to fit the BLC context. Participants responded to the items using a Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree, or 1 = Far Less Often to 5 = Far More Often). See Appendix A for the final version of the NCOLQ.

BLC Learner Demographic & Background Questionnaire

A short set of demographic items was used to collect information such as race, ethnicity, time in service and assignment, component, MOS, and paygrade. Additional background and experience items included ASVAB GT score, highest level of education, leadership experience in unit prior to BLC, leadership experience in BLC, and disciplinary actions received prior to BLC (see Appendix B).

Peer Rating Form

The Peer Rating Form included seven dimensions of learner-specific performance and overall effectiveness at BLC, including Adaptability, Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning, Problem Solving/Decision Making, Cultural Tolerance, Relating to and Supporting Peers, Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values, and Overall Effectiveness (see Appendix C). Learners rated up to four of their peers on BLC performance. Within each performance dimension, statements describe behaviors at high, moderate, and low levels of effectiveness on a 7-point rating scale (7 = High to 1 = Low). Raters were instructed to compare observed learner performance with the statements on each dimension to provide learner performance ratings.

Facilitator Rating Form

The Facilitator Rating Form included dimensions of BLC performance and potential future success in special duty assignments (see Appendix D). The rating scales were designed to be completed by facilitators to assess two dimensions of learner performance in BLC (Cultural Tolerance and Overall Effectiveness) and potential for future successful performance in three special duty assignments (instructor, recruiter, and drill sergeant). Within each rating scale, statements describe behaviors at high, moderate, and low levels of effectiveness on a 7-point rating scale (7 = High to 1 = Low). Raters were instructed to compare observed learner performance with the statements on each dimension to provide learner performance ratings. In the future we plan to collect facilitator ratings of additional performance dimensions in Form 1009A, described below.

BLC Learner Performance Criteria Measures

We planned to collect data from three sets of BLC academic measures to assess BLC learner performance: Form 1009A, overall GPA, and awards. These three BLC learner performance criterion measures are described in more detail below.

Form 1009A – Assessing Attributes and Competencies. Learners are assessed on leadership attributes and competencies using Form 1009A throughout BLC. Facilitators use six behaviorally-anchored rating scales to assess performance at BLC: Character/Accountability; Presence/Comprehensive Fitness; Intellect/Critical Thinking and Problem Solving; Leads/Communication and Engagement; Develops/Collaboration; and Achieves/Life Long Learner. Ratings of these leadership attributes and competencies are made on a four-point scale. At the end of the course, each learner has a total of four ratings for each of the leadership attributes and competencies. The sum of all four facilitator ratings on a single attribute or competency determines if a learner earned a minimum of 70, otherwise referred to as “Met the Standard.” BLC academic achievement awards (e.g., Commandant’s List, Superior Academic, or Achieved Course Standards) are based on the overall sum of all facilitator ratings for each attribute and competency.

Overall GPA. The learner’s overall GPA is determined by a combination of six evaluations, and Soldiers must pass each evaluation with a score of 70 percent or higher. The six evaluations are determined by learners’ performance on the following assessments: 1009S Public Speaking and Information Briefing; 1009W Assessing Writing, Compare and Contrast Essay; 1009W Assessing Writing, Informative Essay; Conduct Individual Training Rubric; Conduct Physical Readiness Training Rubric; and Conduct Squad Drill Rubric.

Awards. Learners are honored for their achievements through various awards. Learners whose overall score on Form 1009A meets or exceeds 480 are designated with the honor of Commandant’s List. This list comprises the top 20 percent of learners in a BLC cycle. The next 20 percent of learners in the cycle are recognized for their performance with the Superior Academic Achievement award, while the remaining learners are recognized as Achieved Standard. Distinguished Honor Graduate is awarded to the learner with the highest GPA in a BLC cycle, and the learner with the second highest GPA is designated with Honor Graduate. Additionally, a learner who is eligible for the Commandant’s List, is in favorable disciplinary

standing, and is nominated by their peers and Small Group Leader (SGL) may be awarded the Distinguished Leadership Award by the board. The Sexual Harassment Prevention (SHARP) Essay assessment is not part of learner's GPA; however, the essays are sent to the commandant to determine which learner will receive the Commandant's Writing Award. Lastly, the Iron Sergeant Award is presented to the learner who scores the highest on the Army Combat Fitness Test.

Procedures

After gaining support from the NCO Leadership Center of Excellence (NCOLCoE) to conduct this research, project staff coordinated with Army points of contact at each BLC location to collect data during two site visits to Army TRADOC locations in September 2022 (see Table 7). The project team used a proctor manual and protocol to ensure standardized measurement and administration across the data collections.

Table 7
TRADOC Data Collection Sites

Location	BLC Cycles	<i>n</i>	%
BLC Location 1	1	160	80.4
BLC Location 2	1	39	19.6
Total	2	199	100.0

Prior to each site visit, project staff coordinated with a local point of contact to obtain BLC roster information. This information was used for a number of procedural actions: 1) to generate login credentials for both learners and facilitators to access their respective questionnaires; 2) to randomly assign learners (ratees) to peer-learner raters for the Peer Rating Form; and 3) to assign learners (ratees) to facilitator raters for the Facilitator Rating Form. Learner-peer matchups for the Peer Rating Form were conducted at the squad-, classroom-, or platoon-level, depending on the level of detail provided in roster information from each BLC. For the Facilitator Rating Form, facilitator-learner matchups were determined either by learners' self-report of a facilitator with whom they interacted most, or by the local point of contact's list of learners and facilitators at the squad- or classroom-level.

Facilitators were instructed to complete the Facilitator Questionnaire online in an un-proctored environment via an email sent by project staff. The communication was sent during the last week of BLC instruction to provide facilitators with enough time to observe the performance of learners. Specifically, the email described the purpose of the project and provided a link to the questionnaire and login credentials. A short instructional tutorial with additional details about the project and how to access the questionnaire was also provided as an attachment in the communication to facilitators.

The Learner Questionnaire was administered online in a proctored environment by project staff. Proctors administered the Learner Questionnaire during the last week of BLC to allow sufficient time for peers to observe learner performance. Learners listened to a briefing prior to receiving instruction to begin the questionnaire and provide ratings for four of their

peers. In the event of technical difficulties that could not be resolved swiftly (e.g., login credentials not working, unable to access the questionnaire), proctors provided a paper and pencil version of the Learner Questionnaire. A paper and pencil version was unavailable for the NSAB, as the computer-adaptive test requires computer administration.

Within both the Learner and Facilitator Questionnaires, participants were provided with a consent form, as well as a brief rater training designed to: 1) orient raters to the rating task; 2) train raters to use the behavioral anchors to make their ratings; 3) describe common rating errors (e.g., halo) and how to avoid them; and 4) encourage raters to be as accurate as possible.

Following both data collections, project staff provided each BLC location with a participation update regarding completion of both the Learner and Facilitator Questionnaires. On a quarterly basis, project staff will deliver an in-depth feedback report specific to each BLC location. The results presented in these reports will capture responses to both questionnaires across approximately three cycles worth of data collection. The feedback reports will contain participation rates across three cycles, dimension-level results for the rating forms and the NCOLQ, and significant findings, if applicable.

Database Cleaning and Development

After the data collection was completed for each BLC location in each cycle, data from paper and pencil administrations were combined with data collected electronically and a final database was created for analysis. Next, we began the process of cleaning and aggregating the data to begin developing a final database.

We used several steps to clean and eliminate poor -quality data from each database (i.e., data from each location, each cycle). The NSAB scores were screened for unmotivated responding. Respondents were flagged as potentially unmotivated if their observed response patterns contained an unusually low/high number of statement “A” selections, an unusually large number of patterned responses (e.g., ABABAB...), or they responded unusually quickly to a large number of items (e.g., responding to items in less than one or two seconds) or to the test as a whole.

For the Peer Rating, NCOLQ, and demographic and background items, we began with 199 cases and checked the data for impossible values, lack of variance in responding, random responding, and missing data. Information from the data collection issue logs was also used to identify poor quality data. Specifically, eight cases were removed based on random responding criteria by failing both attention check items (e.g., “Please select strongly disagree.”), and 12 cases showed no variance across six pages or more of the questionnaire, suggesting a lack of attention. Removing these cases resulted in a sample size of 179 cases with NCOLQ, demographic, and background data.

For the peer rating data, after applying the data cleaning procedures above, there was an initial set of 716 unique learner-peer ratings distributed across 243 learners. For clarity, the number of learners in the initial peer rating data ($n = 243$) is greater than the number of learners mentioned above ($n = 179$) because learners received ratings from their peers even if they did not have NCOLQ data. Sets of learner-peer ratings were removed from further analyses if ratings did

not demonstrate any variance across all seven rating scales for a peer ($n = 64$), the learner indicated that he/she was not very familiar with the peer's performance by selecting the response option "Don't Know" on more than five rating scales ($n = 56$), or if the learner failed to provide ratings on more than five rating scales ($n = 0$). These exclusion criteria resulted in a final set of 596 learner-peer ratings distributed across 239 learners.

Results

After cleaning all databases (i.e., data from each location, each cycle), we developed a final database to conduct analyses. The results presented represent data aggregated across all locations and cycles collected through September 2022.

Participant Experience & Disciplinary Actions

Army and BLC experience and disciplinary background data on learner participants are presented in Tables 8 and 9. Many learner participants reported past leadership experience as Squad/Section Leaders and/or Team Leaders in their units prior to BLC. The majority of learners reported they were a Platoon Sergeant (65.9%) during BLC, and a smaller percentage reported they were a First Sergeant (3.9%) during BLC.

Table 8
Leadership Experience Prior to BLC

	<i>n</i> ^a	%
Squad/Section Leader	84	46.9
Team Leader	96	53.6
Other Leadership Position	26	14.5

^a Learner participants could select more than one response (i.e., held multiple leadership positions).

Table 9
Leadership Experience at BLC

	<i>n</i> ^a	%
Platoon Sergeant	118	65.9
First Sergeant	7	3.9

^a Learner participants could select more than one response (i.e., held multiple leadership positions).

The demographic and background data also included results for the disciplinary actions criterion (see Table 10). The majority of learners did not report any disciplinary actions prior to BLC. However, seven (3.9%) learners reported they had received a field grade Article 15, 14 (7.8%) learners reported they had received a company grade/summarized Article 15, and 32 (17.9%) learners reported they had received a Flag Action (i.e., suspension of favorable personnel actions). Additionally, 25 (14.0%) learners reported they had been formally counseled

for lack of effort, poor behavior or discipline, or unsatisfactory performance. The 25 learners that had been formally counseled had an average of 1.64 formal counselings prior to BLC.

Table 10
Disciplinary Actions Received Prior to BLC

	<i>n</i> ^a (yes)	% (yes)
Field Grade Article 15	7	3.9
Company Grade/Summarized Article 15	14	7.8
Flag Actions	32	17.9
Formal Counselings ^b	25	14.0
1-2 Counselings	22	88.0
3-5 Counselings	4	16.0

^a Learner participants could select more than one response (i.e., had multiple types of disciplinary actions). ^b Formal counselings for lack of effort, poor behavior or discipline, or unsatisfactory performance.

NSAB Descriptive Statistics

Table 11 shows the descriptive statistics for the NSAB facets after removing unmotivated responses. The values presented in this table are based on the raw NSAB dimension scores, which are in the item response theory (IRT) theta metric. Results suggest that the Soldiers in this sample tended to score highest, on average, on Optimism and lowest on Sociability.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics for the Standardized Scores on the NSAB Facets

NSAB Facets	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Achievement	.06	.49
Dominance	-.02	.56
Even Tempered	.20	.51
Humility	-.25	.45
Intellectual Efficiency	.11	.55
Non-Delinquency	-.38	.55
Optimism	.46	.47
Order	-.20	.43
Persistence	-.07	.53
Physical Conditioning	-.07	.73
Responsibility	-.09	.38
Self-Efficacy	-.03	.46

Table 11 (continued)

NSAB Facets	Mean	SD
Selflessness	.21	.37
Sociability	-.56	.53
Tolerance	.14	.41
Virtue	.22	.39

Note. $n = 166$. Values are in the IRT theta metric.

NCOLQ Scale and Item Descriptive Statistics

The NCOLQ contained a self-rated learner performance item. Results suggest that a strong majority of learner participants view their performance as either one of the best (25.1%) or better than most (53.6%) compared to other learners in their classroom (see Table 12). The distribution of the self-rated performance results was highly restricted, with almost 79% of learners falling into the upper end of the scale.

Table 12
Self-Rated Performance

	<i>n</i>	%
One of the best (exceed 95 percentile)	45	25.1
Better than most (66 to 95 percentile)	96	53.6
Average (35 to 66 percentile)	35	19.6
Below average (below 35 percentile)	1	0.6
Missing	2	1.1

Note. $n = 179$. Participants were asked, “Compared to other Soldiers in your classroom, would you say you are:”.

Additionally, the NCOLQ included a future assignment preference item (see Table 13). Results indicated a similar number of learners would choose to remain in their current military specialty/occupation (39.1%), compared to learners who indicated they would select a totally new military specialty/occupation (40.2%). Other learners would select a Recruiting duty assignment (27.9%), Drill Sergeant duty assignment (30.2%), or Instructor duty assignment (33.0%). Almost half of learners indicated they would prefer to apply to become a Warrant Officer, and 32.4% indicated that they plan to leave the Army.

Table 13
Future Assignment Preference

	<i>n</i>^a	%
Remain in my current military specialty/occupation	70	39.1
Select a totally new military specialty/occupation	72	40.2

Table 13 (continued)

	<i>n</i> ^a	%
Select a recruiting duty assignment	50	27.9
Select a drill sergeant duty assignment	54	30.2
Select an instructor duty assignment	59	33.0
Apply to become a warrant officer	85	47.5
Another assignment (open-ended)	32	17.9
Leave the Service	58	32.4

Note. Participants were asked, “If you had the freedom to select a future assignment several years in advance, which of the following would you choose?”

^a Learner participants could select more than one response (i.e., select multiple future assignments).

Next, we describe the self-report attitudinal and behavioral criteria portion of the NCOLQ. The NCOLQ included Likert scale items regarding career intentions, Army fit, affective commitment, motivation to lead, resilience, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and leadership behaviors. Coefficient alpha scale reliabilities are presented in Table 14 and are moderately high for most of the scales, ranging from .58 (resilience) to .91 (leadership behaviors).

NCOLQ scale means and standard deviations are also presented in Table 14. The NCOLQ scale means ranged from 3.27 (affective commitment) to 3.77 (motivation to lead).

Table 14
NCOLQ Scale Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities

Scale	Item(s)	α	Mean	SD
Career Intention	1	-- ^a	3.39	1.24
Army Fit	4	.67	3.60	0.72
Affective Commitment	4	.82	3.27	0.89
Motivation to Lead	17	.81	3.77	0.47
Resilience	7	.58	3.63	0.59
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	12	.84	3.61	0.61
Leadership Behaviors	14	.91	3.72	0.63

Note. $n = 177-179$.

^a The NCOLQ career intention scale does not have a coefficient alpha associated with it as only one item comprises the scale.

Correlations between the NCOLQ scales are presented in Table 15. As shown, the majority of the scales were moderately to highly correlated with one another. For example, organizational citizenship behaviors and leadership behaviors were highly correlated ($r = .77$) while Army fit and motivation to lead are moderately correlated ($r = .28$).

Table 15
NCOLQ Scale Intercorrelations

NCOLQ Scale	or	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Career Intention	--						
2. Army Fit	.61**	--					
3. Affective Commitment	.45**	.57**	--				
4. Motivation to Lead	.28**	.28**	.42**	--			
5. Resilience	.22**	.33**	.34**	.44**	--		
6. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	.17*	.16*	.37**	.48**	.24**	--	
7. Leadership Behaviors	.15*	.13	.32**	.54**	.26**	.77**	--

Note. $n = 179$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Peer Rating Descriptive Statistics

After cleaning the data as described above, a total of 239 learners received an average of 2.49 ratings per learner, resulting in a final sample of 596 learner-peer ratings (Table 16).

Table 16
Number of Peer Ratings

	<i>n</i> ^a	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max</i>
Peer Ratings	239	2.49	.92	1	4

^a Sample size represents the number of learners (not number of raters) with peer ratings.

Means and standard deviations for each performance dimension of the Peer Rating scales are provided in Table 17. Mean peer ratings ranged from 5.80 (adaptability) to 6.36 (cultural tolerance) on a 7-point scale.

Table 17
Means and Standard Deviations for Peer Ratings

Performance Dimension	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Adaptability	5.80	1.40
Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning	5.86	1.37
Problem Solving/Decision Making	5.82	1.33
Cultural Tolerance	6.36	1.15
Relating to and Supporting Peers	6.00	1.26
Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values	5.85	1.29

Table 17 (continued)

Performance Dimension	Mean	SD
Overall Effectiveness	5.95	1.31

Note. $n = 556-588$ (unaggregated peer ratings). Dimensions were rated on a 7-point scale, with 7 = high and 1 = low.

Correlations between the learner-peer rating performance dimensions, are presented in Table 18. As shown, the peer rating scales were moderately to highly correlated with one another, ranging from $r = .43$ to $r = .72$.

Table 18
Rating Scale Intercorrelations for Peer Ratings

Performance Dimension	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Adaptability	--						
2. Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning	.71**	--					
3. Problem Solving/Decision Making	.69**	.70**	--				
4. Cultural Tolerance	.48**	.43**	.60**	--			
5. Relating to and Supporting Peers	.52**	.59**	.67**	.59**	--		
6. Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values	.54**	.51**	.63**	.51**	.64**	--	
7. Overall Effectiveness	.70**	.66**	.72**	.55**	.60**	.58**	--

Note. $n = 549-574$ (unaggregated peer ratings).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Interrater reliability estimates (ICC(1, 2)) and r_{wg} estimates for each peer performance rating dimension are presented in Table 19. To achieve an adequate sample for the ICC analysis, we selected cases with two peer raters ($n = 82-96$). The results of interrater reliability analyses demonstrate low agreement across the rating dimensions. However, the ICC (1, 2) values may be attenuated, as the analysis only included two raters, and a higher number of raters would likely result in larger ICC values. Further, low ICC(1, k) values may be a result of low interrater consistency, low interrater agreement, highly skewed data, or a combination of these issues (LeBreton & Senter, 2008).

We also examined interrater agreement using a within-group correlation, $r_{wg(j)}$ (James, 1982; James et al., 1984). The $r_{wg(j)}$ provides a measure of the interchangeability of raters by comparing observed variance in ratings to a hypothetical expected variance (the estimated variance obtained if the raters completely disagreed). To compute the r_{wg} estimates, cases with only one peer rating were removed, yielding an average of 2.72 raters per ratee. Using the uniform null distribution, we computed r_{wgs} for each learner, resulting in a range of 192 to 206 r_{wg} values for each performance dimension. We created an average r_{wg} for each performance dimension for ease of interpretation. The summary statistics presented below in Table 19 represent the minimum, maximum, and average r_{wg} for each peer performance rating

dimension. Results of the r_{wg} analyses demonstrate moderate to strong agreement (LeBreton & Senter, 2008).

Table 19
Aggregated Peer-Learner Performance Rating Reliability

Dimension	ICC ^a	r_{wg} ^b		
		Min.	Max.	Mean
Adaptability	0.47	-3.50	1.00	0.66
Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning	0.24	-3.50	1.00	0.59
Problem Solving/Decision Making	0.31	-3.50	1.00	0.65
Cultural Tolerance	0.43	-3.50	1.00	0.72
Relating to and Supporting Peers	0.35	-3.50	1.00	0.67
Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values	0.31	-2.13	1.00	0.68
Overall Effectiveness	0.42	-2.13	1.00	0.72

Note. Dimensions were rated on a 7-point scale (1 = low and 7 = high).

^a $n = 82-96$; ICC(1, 2); cases with ratings from two peer raters were used. ^b $n = 192-206$; mean number of raters per ratee = 2.72.

Prior to comparing the peer ratings to the NCOLQ scales, peer ratings were aggregated by averaging the peer ratings for each learner. Correlations between the NCOLQ and performance rating scales are presented in Table 20. As shown, the BLC performance rating scales and NCOLQ scales did not correlate highly with one another with few significant correlations between the two criteria.

Table 20
NCOLQ and Aggregated Peer Performance Rating Scale Intercorrelations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
NCOLQ Scale														
1. Career Intention	--													
2. Army Fit	.61**	--												
3. Affective Commitment	.45**	.57**	--											
4. Motivation to Lead	.28**	.28**	.42**	--										
5. Resilience	.22**	.33**	.34**	.44**	--									
6. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	.17*	.16*	.37**	.48**	.24**	--								
7. Leadership Behaviors	.15*	.13	.32**	.54**	.26**	.77**	--							
Peer Ratings														
8. Adaptability	-.01	.01	.00	.24**	.14	.06	.10	--						
9. Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning	.02	.01	.06	.15*	.07	.06	.00	.73**	--					
10. Problem Solving/Decision Making	.13	.04	.07	.13	.16*	-.04	-.03	.76**	.69**	--				
11. Cultural Tolerance	.03	.09	.02	.10	.11	-.03	-.03	.61**	.47**	.69**	--			
12. Relating to and Supporting Peers	.06	.09	.13	.12	.12	.01	-.07	.59**	.61**	.71**	.60**	--		
13. Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values	.02	-.06	-.03	.10	.10	-.08	-.19*	.58**	.51**	.67**	.54**	.66**	--	
14. Overall Effectiveness	.02	.06	.03	.12	.08	.06	-.01	.69**	.68**	.78**	.61**	.62**	.59**	--

Note. $n = 174\text{--}237$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Summary

In sum, the NCOLQ scale reliabilities results indicated that most self-reported learner attitudes and behaviors can be measured reliably. The Army fit and resilience scale reliabilities were somewhat low (.67 and .58, respectively). We plan to review item-level statistics to examine whether the scale reliabilities can be improved when a larger sample of data is available for analysis. The self-report attitudinal and behavioral assessment, disciplinary actions, and peer performance ratings provided comprehensive coverage of the BLC learner criterion domain. After additional data are collected, we plan to describe the facilitator rating results and conduct factor analyses on the NCOLQ and peer ratings. Further, once a larger sample is available, validity analyses will be conducted to examine the relationship between the NSAB and the criteria.

Discussion

Given the importance of NCO special duty assignments, particularly recruiters, instructors, and drill sergeants, and the Army's need to maintain combat readiness, the Army needs effective measures to identify and place Soldiers likely to be successful in these roles. Accordingly, past and current NSAB research shares similar goals: to produce a valid, reliable, fake-resistant assessment to predict leadership potential and success in NCO special assignments in order to inform selection decisions.

Preliminary results indicate the criterion measures reliably assess learner attitudes and that the distribution of scores is consistent with previous ARI NCO research. We will continue to collect additional data and plan to conduct analyses to examine the relationship between the Restricted NSAB and attitudinal and performance criteria. We also plan to examine the relationship between the Restricted NSAB and the NSAB administered during DLC 1 by comparing individuals' scores on each version of the NSAB. This includes comparing validities across the two versions.

References

- Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., & Drasgow, F. (2010). Individual differences, their measurement, and their validity. *Vol. 2. Selecting and developing members for the organization*. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 117-151). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12170-000>
- Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., Drasgow, F., & Roberts, B. W. (2007). Constructing personality scales under the assumptions of an ideal point response process: Toward increasing the flexibility of personality measures. *Psychological Assessment, 19*(1), 88–106. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.19.1.88>
- Drasgow, F., Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., Nye, C. D., Hulin, C. L., & White, L. A. (2012). *Development of the Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS) to support Army selection and classification decisions* (Technical Report 1311). U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Horgen, K., Nye, C. D., Johnson, E., Lovering, E., Byerly, K., Drasgow, F., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., Glorioso, M., & O'Brien, E. (2023). *Development and validation of the Restricted Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery (NSAB)* (Technical Report 1426). U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Horgen, K. E., Nye, C. D., White, L. A., LaPort, K. A., Hoffman, R. R., Drasgow, F., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., & Conway, J. S. (2013). *Validation of the Noncommissioned Officer Special Assignment Battery* (Technical Report 1328). U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- James, L. R. (1982). Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 219-229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.2.219>
- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 85-98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.1.85>
- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L., (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 815-852. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106296642>
- Mueller-Hanson, R., Heggstad, E. D., & Thornton, G. C. III. (2003). Faking and selection: Considering the use of personality from select-in and select-out perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 348–355. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.348>
- NCO Worldwide (2022). Basic Leader Course. Retrieved October 30, 2022 from <https://www.ncoworldwide.army.mil/Academics/Basic-Leader-Course/>
- Nye, C. D., Muhammad, R. S., Wolters, H. M. K., Drasgow, F., Chernyshenko, O., & Stark, S. (2018). *New scale development for enhanced suitability screening* (Research Note 2018-01). U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

- Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., & Drasgow, F. (2005). An IRT approach to constructing and scoring pairwise preference items involving stimuli on different dimensions: The multi-unidimensional pairwise preference model. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 29(3), 184-201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621604273988>
- Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., Drasgow, F., Lee, W. C., White, L. A., & Young, M. C. (2011). Optimizing prediction of attrition with the U.S. Army's Assessment of Individual Motivation (AIM), *Military Psychology*, 23(2), 180-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08995605.2011.550234>
- Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., Drasgow, F., & White, L. A. (2012). Adaptive testing with multidimensional pairwise preference items: Improving the efficiency of personality and other noncognitive assessments. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(3), 463-487. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112444611>
- U.S. Army NCO Academy (NCOA). (2018). The Fort Bliss NCO Basic Leaders Course Student Guide. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from <https://www.ncolcoe.army.mil/Portals/71/administration/fbncoa/ref/BLC-Student-Guide.pdf>
- U.S. Department of the Army. (2018). *U.S. Army Noncommissioned Officer professional development guide* (DA PAM 600-25). Washington, DC: Department of the Army. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN13774_DAPam600-25_FINAL.pdf
- White, L. A., Young, M. C., Hunter, A. E., & Rumsey, M. G. (2008). Lessons learned in transitioning personality measures from research to operational settings. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(3), 291–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00049.x>
- White, L. A., Young, M. C., & Rumsey, M. G. (2001). ABLE implementation issues and related research. In J. P. Campbell & D. J. Knapp (Eds.), *Exploring the limits in personnel selection and classification* (pp. 525–558). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Appendix A. NCO Life Questionnaire

NCO Life Questionnaire for BLC Learners

In the next section, you will answer questions about your life as a Soldier.

Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential, and only aggregated results will be analyzed and reported.

Future Assignment Preference

1. If you had the freedom to select a future assignment **several years in advance**, which of the following would you choose? (Select all that apply)
 - ☐ Remain in my current military specialty/occupation
 - ☐ Select a totally new military specialty/occupation
 - ☐ Select a Recruiting duty assignment
 - ☐ Select a Drill Sergeant duty assignment
 - ☐ Select an Instructor duty assignment
 - ☐ Apply to become a Warrant Officer
 - ☐ Select another assignment (please list) _____
 - ☐ Leave the Service

Career Intentions & Army Fit

In this section you will rate your level of agreement with several statements regarding your life as a Soldier.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1. I plan to make the Army my career.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Life in the Army is worse than I expected before I joined the service.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The Army is a good match for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I do not fit very well in the Army.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The Army fulfills my needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Affective Commitment

In this section you will rate your level of agreement with several statements regarding your life as a Soldier.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
6. I feel a strong sense of belonging to the Army.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I feel like I am part of the Army “family.”	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I feel personally attached to the Army.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. I feel that the problems faced by the Army are also my own problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Motivation to Lead

In this section you will rate your level of agreement with several statements regarding your job as a Soldier.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1. I am definitely not a leader by nature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I have a tendency to take charge in most groups or teams that I work in.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Most of the time, I prefer being a leader rather than a follower when working in a group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I believe I can contribute more to a group if I am a follower rather than a leader.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I usually want to be the leader in the groups that I work in.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I am the type of person who likes to be in charge of others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I am only interested in leading a group if there are clear advantages for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I will never agree to lead if I cannot see any benefits from accepting that role.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I would only agree to be a group leader if I knew I could benefit from that role.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I would want to know "what's in it for me" if I am going to agree to lead a group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. If I agree to lead a group, I would never expect any advantages or special benefits.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. I feel that I have a duty to lead others if I am asked.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. I agree to lead whenever I am asked or nominated by the other members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. I was taught to believe in the value of leading others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. It is appropriate for people to accept leadership roles or positions when they are asked.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. It is an honor and privilege to be asked to lead.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. I would never agree to lead just because others voted for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Resilience

When answering the following questions, indicate what you have done or felt when you've experienced a stressful situation in your job as a Soldier **in the last 6 months**.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1. I was confident in my ability to get through the stressful situation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I liked to work out when I was stressed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Knowing I had family or friends outside of the Army for support helped me deal with challenging situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I found it difficult to relax and enjoy myself when waiting to find out about something important.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. When I felt myself getting too tense, I exercised to relax my body and calm myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Even remotely possible threatening events worried me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Knowing I had support from my cadre and peers in the Army helped me deal with challenging situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

When answering the following questions, think about your job as a Soldier. Compared to other Soldiers **in your unit prior to BLC**, how often did you...

	Far less often	Less often	About as often	More often	Far more often
1. Seek out a challenging assignment that was above and beyond your regular duties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Spend down time learning about procedures, equipment, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Take initiative to find another task when finished with regular work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Volunteer for extra duties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Work to accomplish your mission even when supervisors were not present.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Demonstrate concern about the image or reputation of your unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Volunteer to help another Soldier learn skills or share job knowledge with him/her.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Assist another Soldier with a personal problem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Offer to help other Soldiers accomplish their work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Focus on the positive, rather than complaining about what was wrong.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Seek out additional training or development even if it would lead to more work in the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Go out of the way to encourage or praise another Soldier.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Leadership

When answering the following questions, think about your job as a Soldier. Compared to other Soldiers **in your unit prior to BLC**, how often did you...

	Far less often	Less often	About as often	More often	Far more often
1. Make sure everyone in your unit felt like a valued member of the team.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Listen to the problems of your fellow Soldiers and provide constructive feedback.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Encourage your fellow Soldiers to act on information rather than assumptions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Clarify task objectives to fellow Soldiers who didn't understand them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Keep your unit focused on its goals and objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Take initiative to ensure team success.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Provide creative solutions to issues or problems that arose on the job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Step in to deal with an interpersonal conflict before it escalated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Demonstrate the Army Values both on- and off-duty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Monitor your environment for changes that might have impacted the unit's mission.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Try to be the Soldier selected for leadership opportunities that arose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Make sure to check on a fellow Soldier if he or she seemed upset.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Take educational courses for your own personal development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Feel other Soldiers looked to you for direction on performing their tasks when supervisors were unavailable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Self-Rated Performance

For this question, think **about yourself and your classmates at BLC**.

Compared to other Soldiers in your classroom, would you say you are:

- One of the best (exceed 95 percentile)
- Better than most (66 to 95 percentile)

- c. Average (35 to 65 percentile)
- d. Below average (below 35 percentile)

Appendix B. Demographic and Background Questionnaire

BLC Learner Demographic and Background Questionnaire

In the next section, you will answer questions about your background and experience.

Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential, and only aggregated results will be analyzed and reported.

1. Please enter your time in service: ____ Years ____ Months
2. What is your current pay-grade?
☐ E4 ☐ E5 ☐ Other _____
3. Please enter your time in current grade: ____ Years ____ Months
4. What is your current MOS? _____ (e.g., 11B, 19K, 21B)
5. What is your gender?
☐ Male
☐ Female
6. What is your age? ____ Years
7. What is your component? (Select one)
☐ Regular Army
☐ Army National Guard
☐ Army Reserve
8. What is your current General Technical (GT) score? _____
9. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)?
☐ No
☐ Yes (Cuban, Chicano, Mexican, Mexican American, Puerto Rican, or another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin)
10. What is your race? (Select one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be)
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian
☐ Black or African American
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ White

11. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Select one)

- ☐ Less than 12 years of school (no diploma or certificate)
- ☐ High school certificate or GED
- ☐ High school diploma
- ☐ Some college credit, but did not graduate
- ☐ Associate degree (e.g., AA, AS)
- ☐ Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS, AB)
- ☐ Some graduate school
- ☐ Graduate degree (e.g., MA, MS, JD)

12. Please describe your leadership experience in **your unit prior to BLC** (check each that you have been rated at):

- ☐ Squad/Section Leader
 - ☐ Team Leader
 - ☐ Other Leadership Position, specify title (e.g., shift leader)
-

13. Please describe your **BLC** leadership experience (check each position you had at BLC):

- ☐ Platoon Sergeant
- ☐ First Sergeant

When answering the following questions on this page, indicate disciplinary actions you received prior to BLC.

14. Have you ever received...

a field grade Article 15?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

a company grade/summarized Article 15?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

a Flag Action (i.e., suspension of favorable personnel actions)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

15. Have you ever been formally counseled for lack of effort, poor behavior or discipline, or unsatisfactory performance?

- ☐ Yes If yes, how many times? _____
- ☐ No

Appendix C. Peer Rating Form

BLC Learner Questionnaire and Peer Rating Form

Introduction:

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) has developed a new version of the NCO Special Assignment Battery (NSAB), a talent management tool for use in informing NCO special assignment decisions. Information you provide will help the Army improve the special duty assignment process and enhance our ability to match NCOs with assignments where they are most likely to be successful.

Rating Instructions:

As part of the project, you will rate 4 peers in your squad in seven areas.

1. Adaptability
2. Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning
3. Problem Solving/Decision Making
4. Cultural Tolerance
5. Relating to and Supporting Peers
6. Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values, and
7. Overall BLC Effectiveness

These ratings will be used **only to evaluate the NSAB tool**. Your ratings are confidential. Your ratings will **NOT be revealed to your squad members, your facilitators, or BLC leadership**, nor will the ratings become part of Army personnel or BLC records.

It is very important that you **complete the performance ratings accurately**. Without accurate ratings we have no way to evaluate the new version of the NSAB.

Before you begin, let's review a couple of important points.

- It's unlikely that an individual performs at exactly the same level in all performance categories. Most people will be more proficient in some categories and less proficient in others. Your **evaluations should reflect your peer's strengths and weaknesses**.
- Do not compare Soldiers to each other – evaluate each Soldier by **comparing their behavior to the descriptions on the rating scales**.
- Sometimes raters let things that have nothing to do with performance affect their evaluations, such as personality, or how much they like the person. These rating scales **target only performance** and that's what you should base your ratings on.
- Performance described in the High category, "6" or "7", is truly outstanding. You should **reserve these ratings, especially the "7," for the very high performers**.
- If you have not observed your peer's performance in an area, choose the "Don't Know" option.

Please **read through the description of each rating scale carefully**. That way all Soldiers will be measured against the same benchmarks. Then rate each squad member on one scale before

moving to the next rating scale. Your rating form has been pre-populated with a random selection of four of your BLC squad members.

Adaptability				
How effectively does this Soldier adapt to varying BLC requirements by modifying behavior, plans, or goals?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is able to function very effectively in new situations (e.g., PRT, or Physical Readiness Training; D&C, or Drill and Ceremony). - Thinks and acts quickly in response to changes. - Rarely gets frustrated in situations that do not go as planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is able to function adequately in new situations (e.g., PRT, or Physical Readiness Training; D&C, or Drill and Ceremony). - Modifies behavior when faced with unexpected events or changes. - At times, may get frustrated in situations that do not go as planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has difficulty functioning effectively in new situations (e.g., PRT, or Physical Readiness Training; D&C, or Drill and Ceremony). - Does not adapt quickly to new environment or changes. - Is easily frustrated in situations that do not go as planned. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Self-Management and Self-Directed Learning				
How effectively does this Soldier self-manage his/her course-related responsibilities, development, and personal responsibilities?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectively manages course and personal responsibilities. - Consistently seeks out assistance during off-duty hours to improve skills. - Willingly shares knowledge and experience. - Enthusiastically takes on challenging assignments and additional responsibilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shows effort to manage course and personal responsibilities. - Attempts to work on problem areas when encouraged to do so. - When asked, shares knowledge and experience. - Sometimes seeks out additional responsibilities, training, or challenging tasks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Makes little or no effort to balance course and personal responsibilities. - Ignores or otherwise fails to participate in opportunities for extra help from peers or SGLs. - Does not volunteer to share knowledge or experience. - Rarely seeks out additional responsibilities or challenging tasks. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Problem Solving/Decision Making				
How effectively does this Soldier react to new problem situations and make reasonable, informed decisions regarding solutions?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistently reacts to new problem situations by applying previous experience and previous education/training appropriately and effectively. - Applies rules or strategies with effective consideration of circumstances. - Assesses costs and benefits of alternative solutions and makes effective decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Often reacts to new problem situations by applying previous experience or education/training but does not always do so effectively. - Applies rules or strategies correctly to most situations. - Attempts to assess costs and benefits of alternative solutions but does not always make effective decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fails to apply previous experience and training or realize their relevance. - Blindly applies rules or strategies without regard to the uniqueness of a situation. - Fails to assess costs or benefits of alternative solutions before making decisions. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Cultural Tolerance				
How effectively does this Soldier demonstrate respect for and tolerance of others at BLC?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Treats others with respect regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. - Encourages others to display tolerance and sensitivity. - Easily works, socializes, and communicates well with others, regardless of background; takes initiative in learning about other cultures and social backgrounds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognizes the need to treat others with respect regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, but may not always demonstrate understanding of others' perspectives. - Attempts to call out others if they are obviously disrespectful. - Willing to work and communicate with those from different backgrounds but may be uneasy with those from other cultures or backgrounds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shows little tolerance and respect for others of different gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. - Makes insensitive comments to or about others based on racial, gender, social or cultural differences. - Dislikes working with people of other backgrounds; uncomfortable with social or cultural differences. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Relating to and Supporting Peers				
How effectively does this Soldier relate to and support peers?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Always treats peers in a courteous and tactful manner. - Is enthusiastic and works to build group spirit and cohesion even when faced with difficult assignments or long hours. - Offers assistance without waiting to be asked, even in complicated interpersonal situations. - Actively seeks out peers' opinions and incorporates peers' ideas into plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Usually courteous and tactful when dealing with peers. - Supports peers but may complain about difficult assignments or long hours. - Provides assistance to others, especially when it is clear that help is needed. - Tries to develop approaches to tasks that consider obvious differences of opinion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tends to be rude, selfish, and insensitive to peers. - Rarely supports others; focuses on own work rather than helping the group. - Generally, fails to provide assistance to others, even when there is clear need to do so. - May force his/her approach to tasks on others without seeking input. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Demonstrating Fitness, Military Bearing, & Army Values				
To what extent does this Soldier set a good example for others to follow in terms of physical fitness, military bearing, and Army values?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintains excellent physical fitness. - Always dresses sharply in correct uniform. - Consistently maintains excellent military bearing. - Sets an outstanding example for others by exceeding the standards for appropriate military behavior; models Army values and encourages others to do the same. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets basic standards for physical fitness. - Usually dresses properly maintaining Army standards. - Usually displays good military bearing. - Attempts to set a good example of Soldier behavior for others to follow; upholds Army values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is generally overweight or in poor physical condition. - Often dresses sloppily. - Displays poor military bearing. - Sets a poor example for others to follow and fails to model even minimally acceptable behavior as a Soldier; fails to uphold Army values 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Overall Effectiveness			
How effectively does this Soldier perform at BLC?			
- Performs excellently in areas important to success at BLC. - Exceeds standards and expectations for performance.	- Performs adequately in areas important to success at BLC. - Meets standards and expectations for performance.	- Performs poorly in areas important to success at BLC. - Does not meet standards for performance.	DON'T KNOW
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	
7 6	5 4 3	2 1	

Appendix D. Facilitator Rating Form

BLC Facilitator Rating Form

Rating forms will be formatted so facilitators will rate all learners on each dimension.

Introduction:

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) has developed a new version of the NCO Special Assignment Battery (NSAB), a talent management tool for use in informing NCO special assignment decisions. Information you provide will help the Army improve the special duty assignment process and enhance our ability to match NCOs with assignments where they are most likely to be successful.

Rating Instructions:

As part of the project, you will rate each Soldier in your class in three areas:

1. Cultural Tolerance
2. Overall BLC Performance
3. Potential for Future Success in three areas

These rating scales were developed for use as part of this project. These scales, along with results from Form 1009A-Assessing Attributes and Competencies and BLC grades, will be used evaluate the revised NSAB tool.

Your ratings will be used **only to evaluate the revised NSAB tool**. Your ratings are confidential. Your individual ratings will **NOT be revealed to your learners, other facilitators, or BLC leadership**, nor will the ratings become part of Army personnel or BLC records. Only aggregated data will be analyzed and reported.

It is very important that you **complete the performance ratings accurately**. Without accurate ratings we have no way to evaluate the new version of the NSAB.

Before you begin, let's review a couple of important points.

- Do not compare Soldiers to each other – evaluate each Soldier by **comparing their behavior to the descriptions on the rating scales**.
- Sometimes raters let things that have nothing to do with performance affect their evaluations, such as personality, or how much they like the person. These rating scales **target only performance or potential** and that's what you should base your ratings on.
- Performance described in the High category, "6" or "7", is truly outstanding. You should **reserve these ratings, especially the "7," for the very high performers**.
- If you have not observed a learner's performance in an area or can't estimate how they would perform in potential future assignments, choose the "Don't Know" option.

Please **read through the description of each rating scale carefully**. That way all Soldiers will be measured against the same benchmarks. Then rate each learner on one scale before moving to the next rating scale. Your rating form has been pre-populated with your BLC learners.

Cultural Tolerance				
How effectively does this Soldier demonstrate respect for and tolerance of others at BLC?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Treats others with respect regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. - Encourages others to display tolerance and sensitivity. - Easily works, socializes, and communicates well with others, regardless of background; takes initiative in learning about other cultures and social backgrounds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognizes the need to treat others with respect regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, but may not always demonstrate understanding of others' perspectives. - Attempts to call out others if they are obviously disrespectful. - Willing to work and communicate with those from different backgrounds but may be uneasy with those from other cultures or backgrounds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shows little tolerance and respect for others of different gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. - Makes insensitive comments to or about others based on racial, gender, social or cultural differences. - Dislikes working with people of other backgrounds; uncomfortable with social or cultural differences. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Overall Effectiveness				
How effectively does this Soldier perform at BLC?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performs excellently in areas important to success at BLC. - Exceeds standards and expectations for performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performs adequately in areas important to success at BLC. - Meets standards and expectations for performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performs poorly in areas important to success at BLC. - Does not meet standards for performance. 	DON'T KNOW	
HIGH	MODERATE	LOW		
7 6	5 4 3	2 1		

Potential for Future Success

Using the rating scales below, evaluate each Soldier on his or her **potential effectiveness as a future E5-E7 in the job duties described**.

Do NOT rate the Soldier's current BLC performance, but instead, provide your best estimate of how well the Soldier is likely to perform **two to five years in the future**, assuming the Soldier would receive additional training.

Which of the following best describes the Soldier's potential for success in the Recruiter job duties below?				
Duties that involve reacting positively to setbacks and rejection, gaining trust and respect of others, establishing rapport, selecting and adapting communication style, showing genuine interest in individuals, identifying and reaching out to civilians who may be interested in joining the Army, and establishing and maintaining good relationships in the community.				
Would likely be a top-level performer.		Would likely be an average performer.		Would likely be a bottom-level performer.
HIGH		MODERATE		LOW
7	6	5	4	3
				2
				1
DON'T KNOW				

Which of the following best describes the Soldier's potential for success in the Drill Sergeant job duties below?				
Duties that involve developing one's own knowledge and skills; demonstrating integrity; providing direction to and leading trainees; displaying tolerance of those from other backgrounds; performing administrative duties; solving problems; preparing for and conducting training; and performing counseling, coaching and mentoring.				
Would likely be a top-level performer.		Would likely be an average performer.		Would likely be a bottom-level performer.
HIGH		MODERATE		LOW
7	6	5	4	3
				2
				1
DON'T KNOW				

Which of the following best describes the Soldier's potential for success in the Instructor job duties below?				
Duties that involve motivating Soldiers to learn new information and skills, presenting information, facilitating learning, assessing Soldier learning and development progress, providing feedback, and managing classrooms.				
Would likely be a top-level performer.		Would likely be an average performer.		Would likely be a bottom-level performer.
HIGH		MODERATE		LOW
7	6	5	4	3
				2
				1
DON'T KNOW				

What is your current pay-grade?

☐ E4

☐ E5

☐ E6

☐ E7

☐ E8

Please enter your time in service: _____ Years

Please enter your time as a BLC Facilitator: _____ Years _____ Month