DDS&T-625-83

1 : : : 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Center for the Study of Intelligence

FROM: James V. Hirsh
                 Acting Deputy Director for Science and Technology

SUBJECT: Demographic Profile: CSI Research Project

REFERENCE: CSI 83-0610, dated 30 June 1983

25X1   1.   The attached outline contains a number of topics for
consideration by [ ]in her Agency demographic
profile research project. Although these topics were developed
within the DDS&T as being of interest to us, many of them
probably are not unique to this Directorate. I recognize the
enormity of her task, especially in light of the short time she
has to collect the research data, analyze them, and write the
report. I wish her well.

25X1   2.   Should [ ]not be able to meet the due date, I
suggest that either she or another qualified Agency officer be
given sufficient time to complete this potentially worthwhile
project. We have tried to remain within the general bounds of
demography but perhaps have overreached them in some instances.
Also there is a certain amount of overlap among topics included
under major outline headings.

        3.   I would be happy to meet with [ ]at some   25X1
mutually acceptable time. Also[ ]on my staff   25X1
25X1   (extention[ ] is available should you need clarification or
additional information from here or any of the individual Offices
in the Directorate.

                                                                 25X1

                                      James V. Hirsh

Attachment:
    As stated

                                                                 25X1

OUTLINE OF DDS&T TOPICS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE PROJECT

The following topics and questions seek data on how it was THEN and how it is NOW.

RECRUITING

- How were current employees recruited? Previously?
- What motivating factors attracted them to the Agency (e.g., money, interesting work, security, location, and the like)?
- What percentage stay in the career field for which they were recruited? What percentage switch?
- What are the expectations of new employees in terms of career development and what are the probabilities that they will achieve those objectives?
- Kinds of people recruited:
    Educational levels?
    Socio-economic mix (e.g., Ivy League or not)?
    Experience levels?
    Specialists vs generalists?
    Do we hire the expertise we need or do we develop it? If we develop it, must we? Could we contract for it?
- Numbers of applications received vs numbers brought on board. Where do greatest losses occur? Reasons?
- What geographic areas and institutions offer the most fertile recruitment opportunities for technical officers? Other substantive officers? Non-technical/substantive?
- At what point in their lives are most technical officers recruited?

STAFFING

- Initial job category vs current or final; career track, (e.g., is it related to background at EOD)?
- Scientific and technical employees as a percentage of total Directorate workforce? Substantive non-scientific/technical employees as percentage of Directorate workforce? Agency workforce?
- Substantive staff vs support staff?

SUBJECT: OUTLINE OF DDS&T TOPICS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE PROJECT

- Women and minorities as percentages of the Agency and Directorate populations of the technical staff? Non-technical substantive staff? Support staff?
- Average age of total Agency population? Directorate population? Technical vs the substantive non-technical and the support population? What are age distributions by grades within those populations?
- Grade creep-over time?
- How valid are the Agency's pre-employment tests as predictors of job performance?
- What is the degree of cross-directorate personnel assignments?
- Are certain scientific disciplines associated with rapid career progression in the DDS&T? The Agency? If so, which disciplines?
- What percentage of employees in the Agency and the DDS&T pursue additional education and what has been the change over time? How much is self-sponsored and how much component sponsored by Directorate?
- Are there discernible job progression/movement patterns in the Agency? In the Directorate? If so, what are they?

RETENTION

- Kinds of people who stay and kinds who leave?
- Attrition rates of technical officers? What are the real reasons for their leaving (e.g., perhaps better opportunities elsewhere, length of the recruitment process, expanding bureaucracy, too little or too much challenge, organization failed to meet assignment expectations as portrayed during recruitment, pay cap disillusionment with prospect of changes in retirement benefits/rules, changing public image of the Agency, social changes including trend toward greater self interest, couples having two incomes/careers, threats to safety at overseas locations, financial burden from high cost of living in Headquarters area and overseas locations)?
- Which scientific/technical disciplines tend to have higher retention rates? Loss rates?

SUBJECT: OUTLINE OF DDS&T TOPICS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE PROJECT

- Comparison of retention rates of employees hired immediately upon graduation (BS or graduate degrees) with co-op/summer intern/graduate fellow and with employees hired after experience in private industry?
- Comparison of retention rates for those hired at Grades GS-13 and above with those hired at grade levels through GS-12?
- What would have to change to reduce attrition rates?
- Impact of departures on those remaining?
- Is career progression random or planned? If planned, by whom--supervisor/manager or individual?
- Is there a definable career point where most technical employees make the decision to stay or leave? If so, could higher retention rate be achieved if attention/ routine action were taken at or prior to that decision point?

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- Does the organization respond rapidly enough to changing requirements?
- How do sweeping changes of upper management affect the organizational structure? Attrition rates? Production?
- Have there been changes from centralized to decentralized management? Placement of technical disciplines?
- Have changing demographic profiles resulted in organizational changes, restructuring?

MOST USEFUL SKILLS

- Skills across the spectrum of crafts as well as the scientific and technical disciplines
- Analytic skills.
- Oral and written communication skills
- Management skills/training/experience
- Interpersonal skills
- Motivation, imagination, creativity, initiative, dedication
- Experience in the private sector

Short-form of questionnaire: grouped by subject

Two major thrusts of questions: (a)to provide an over-all
profile of employees to match with US general population
for similarities &/or differences; and (b) to get at level
of education/skills and rate of acquisition, retention, and
loss.

----

1. Total number of employees?

2. Average age at time of hire ?

3. Average grade at time of hire ?

4. Total number of employees born in: (list by region).

5. Total number of employees residing in (at time of hire): (list
    by region).

6. Number of employees who lived overseas prior to
    employment:
    a) total
    b) less than one year, one to five years, six to
       10 years, over ten years

7. Total number of employees whose:
    a) parents worked for the Agency
    b) whose relatives (non-parent) worked for the Agency
    c) whose parents worked for the Agency overseas

8. Total number of employees who served in: (list by world
    geographic area).

9. Average number of years served in: (list by world area).

10. Average age of employee at:
    a) time of hire with a college degree
    b) retirement
    c) early retirement
    d) resignation

11. Total number of handicapped employees ?

12. Average number of siblings of all employees?

13. Total number of employees who are the eldest (or only
    child) in their families ?

14. Total number of employees who are the youngest child
    in their family ?

15. Average number of schools employees attended prior to graduation from high school ?

16. Total number of employees who, at time of hire, were:
    a) single
    b) married
    c) widowed
    d) separated
    e) divorced
    f) annulled marriage
    g) remarried

17. Total number of employees divorced after time of hire ?

18. Average number of marriages, per employee, at time of hire?

19. Average number of marriages, per employee, contracted after time of hire?

20. Total number of marriages between Agency employees ?

21. Total number of divorces between Agency employees married to each other?

22. Average number of children employees have?

23. Total number of employees who, at time of hire, had:
    a) no college degree
    b) a B.A./B.S.
    c) a degree in: (list disciplines)
    d) a M.A. degree
    e) a Ph.D. degree
    f) any higher degree (M.D., lawyer, etc.)

24. Average grade at time of hire of employees with:
    a) a college degree
    b) a graduate degree

25. Average grade at:
    a) time of first overseas assignment with the Agency
    b) time first eligible to retire
    c) retirement
    d) early retirement
    e) resignation

26. Average number of years in service of employees:
    a) without a college degree
    b) with a college degree
    c) with a higher degree at time of hire
    d) eligible to retire
    e) who resign
    f) at retirement

27. Total number of employees with:
     a) a higher degree
     b) a M.A. in: (list disciplines)
     c) a Ph.D. in: (list disciplines)
     d) a M.D.
     e) a law degree
     f) other

28. Total number of employees:
     a) eligible to retire
     b) who retired
     c) who retired early
     d) who resigned

29. Average number of years in:
     a) college for all employees
     b) overseas service for all PCS employees (non-TDY-ers)
     c) post-graduate school, prior to hire
     d) college, at retirement
     e) college of employees who retire early
     f) college of employees who resign

30. Average number of Directorates served in:
     a) at time eligible to retire
     b) at retirement
     c) at early retirement
     d) by employees who resign

INTRODUCTION

The idea of having a demographic profile of the Agency arose at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Center for the Study of Intelligence approximately 18 months ago. Initial work was attempted in the summer of 1982 when an employee was attached to the Center for a few months, but the project failed to get underway for lack of data.

Lacking resources, nothing more was attempted until this summer when again an employee came to the Center for three months. The proposed assignment was to produce a concepts paper which would serve as a terms of reference for a full-scale demographic profile of the Agency to be undertaken some time in the future, resources and interest permitting. On this occasion, the attempt to acquire data proved to be more successful.

METHODS AND PROBLEMS

The ideal method was conceptualized as a mix of collecting and analyzing data; conducting both intensive and extensive interviews; and reading Agency histories to lend relevance to the statistics. The method which actually evolved was dictated by circumstances, as described below.

From the beginning of the project, at the end of June 1983, the primary concern was to collect sufficient data to give meaning to the concepts paper. Accordingly, a questionnaire was designed to collect general demographic data as well as data of particular concern to Agency managers (skills bank, retirement rates, etc.).

Very shortly thereafter, a series of interviews with the Director of Personnel, the Executive Director, the DDA, ADDI, and DDS&T--as well as other interested individuals--were conducted to ascertain

their specific interests and concerns^ what, in particular, might
they want to know about the Agency population?/ [to further focus
the project's direction.] Early on these individuals' own
perceptions about Agency demographics (" the majority of people
used to come from the East and from Ivy League schools") came to be
referred to as popular Agency "myths" which would be interesting to
test against [whatever] data_ the
[could be collected.] The most common
responses, however, were of an intense but generalized interest:
people simply wanted to know what the Agency population looked
like now and how--if at all--it had changed over time and in what
respects. The dominant concern was that trends be identified so
that projections of future needs could more accurately be made.
The notable exception to this generalized response came from the
DDS&T which provided a detailed and comprehensive outline of
issues which could, in itself, serve as the "concepts paper"
(see Appendix A). It was a useful contribution which helped to
                       important
[in] delineating useful areas of inquiry but, in the event, proved
somewhat disheartening as the inability to address several of the
issues became more apparent.

The initial enthusiasm which characterized the construction
of the questionnaire for the Information and Analysis Branch (IAB)
of the Office of Personnel was considerably dampened by the
realities. The first hard fact was that 1976 was the furthest
back that all data had been coded so as to be electronically
retrievable. Some kinds of data were available back to 1966, and
even smaller amounts (categories of information) were available as
far back as 1947.

The second discouraging factor was that some kinds of

information requested (where did employees come from?) had never

been acquired. In ~~the~~ *This* case [~~of geographic location~~] the information

was not kept because the Agency never had to fill a geographically

defined quota--hence there was no perceived need to collect the

information. Neither was all^*of the* information [~~that~~] *which* employees provide

on the Personal History forms of the Agency application package

[~~all~~] encoded. *Q* Furthermore, many of the questions sought to distinguish

between characteristics/qualifications that an employee had at time

of hire (as opposed to developing or acquiring as a consequence

of being an Agency employee). The regular IAB programs could not

make this distinction. [~~IAB could answer how many employees have a~~

~~higher degree, but not how many had a higher degree at time of hire~~]

Other questions aimed at tracking employee careers could not be

answered (for example, the numbers who had served in more than one

Directorate).

Perhaps most discouraging of all, the data were given in

aggregates (all current employees) and could not be broken out

annually in order to make statements about trends, rates, and

other comparisons possible. The data represented everyone on

board, whatever their time of entering on duty. (See Appendix B--

a copy of the original questionnaire showing which questions could

be answered, and what changes were necessary to make it possible.)

With all of these qualifications plainly stated, the IAB analysts

began to work on those questions which could be electronically

answered--often after being reworded. For example, the question

"Average number of years in service of employees with a higher

degree at time of hire" could be answered only by dropping the

"at time of hire" qualifier, [~~as noted above.~~]

While waiting for the IAB analysts to provide the first round of data, more interviewing resulted in the serendipitous acquisition of the first set of hard data. These came from

[ ] of the Office of Medical Services, who had been acquiring data for the last three years and who generously shared these: total Agency population numbers from 1952-1982 broken down by Directorates and showing totals in the foreign field, as well. These data resulted in the first of the graphics produced for the demographic project.

Working with ~~the OMS~~ These data first exposed another problem which was to plague the remainder of the project: Directorate totals did not equal Agency totals (which were invariably higher) after 1957. It was difficult to identify the "hidden" category of people, and it is still not conclusively resolved--tentatively, it is assumed they belong to the Interim Assignment Staff.

The dimensions of the problem of consistency in the numbers became clearest when the first data from IAB (acquired the first week of August) was closely followed by data given the author by another office--although IAB was the original source of both sets. Many of the totals were different, even for the same month and year.

Two important facts emerged from the initial confusion. One was that the figures fluctuate from month to month so that it is necessary to collect numbers from exactly the same day and month (30 June, e.g.) for every issue or comparability becomes impossible. Second, it became obvious that defining the population was no easy task, and that different reports (shelf reports) used different parameters. The most common dichotomies which account for differing totals are:

--Full-time permanent personnel (FTP) only or FTP plus
part-time personnel (PTP).

--GS grade personnel only or GS plus other civilian
personnel.

--FTP regular staff only or FTP regular staff plus staff
contractors. (In 1975 a combined ceiling was instituted,
and it becomes impossible to distinguish between regular
staff and staff contractors. Prior to 1975, staff
contractors were never included unless there was a specific
request that they be.)

--Civilians only or civilians plus military personnel.

In addition to these choices, all of which can result in

differing totals on the same issue for the identical time period,

there was the problem of extraneous service groups which have

appeared and disappeared over the course of Agency history: The

X, Y, and Z service groups; the Undetermined (U) group; the ICS

group; the NIESO group; and the 5 (still unidentified) group. Finally,

totals are affected by the inclusion or exclusion of the Wage Board.

Any total which includes every possible category of employee is

colloquially referred to as a "kitchen sink" total, but it is rarely

used. There is reason to believe that the figures provided by

STAT [   ] are "kitchen sink" totals, however, since they are consistently

higher than totals on other reports.

With the cooperation of IAB, OMS, and EEO, by the end of August

the Center had a fairly complete set of shelf reports which spanned

the entire history of the Agency. But one last problem remained.

One set of reports (1966 to 1983) gave Agency strength by career

service, sex, race, occupation and grade--but did not show ~~grades~~ length of service

educational level or language capabilities. The reports spanning

1947 to 1965 primarily show totals. The last set of reports (1982

& 1983 only) show sex, age, length of service, career service,

occupation, educational level and language capability--but not grade or race. Interpretations and conclusions would clearly require interpolation, extrapolation, and plain leaps of faith.

By the middle of August it was apparent that the battle to gather comparable and consistent numbers on any issue was the primary focus of attention for the project. It was also clear that while one standard demographic question could not be answered (geographic origin of employees), there was a rich mine of information to be tapped on other subjects. On the other hand, several of the more pressing questions about career tracks, background of employees, motives for either joining or leaving the Agency, still could not be addressed. In effect, the nature of the available data ultimately dictated the course of the project.

This is not to imply that every issue for which there is information has been addressed. Undoubtedly some data, although available, were never acquired. However, it became clear that the project had to rely on the shelf reports,~~produced by IAB~~
                              provide annual
~~annualized reports~~ which ~~include annual~~ counts,rather than on information on "all current employees" (regardless of year) which is what
                              an ad hoc
one gets in response to A query to the IAB data bases. Nonetheless, it is felt that the information provided in this pilot study will provide both an interesting and a useful baseline for future efforts of the same nature.

Sources and The 1952 Baseline

There are three bodies of data, each different in the categories and amount of information provided, as noted earlier. The data

STAT   provided [   ]by IAB was retrieved both electronically and manually. An IAB analyst had to go to Archives and manually inspect

and count data for the years prior to 1966. Thus this body of data--
whose totals are consistently higher than the shelf report totals,
which begin in 1966--provides the only source of figures by Directorate
prior to 1966. This corpus (called the OMS data for clarity) begins in
1952 and goes through 1982,which accounts for the 1952 baseline of
the present study. The OMS data are also the source of the bulk
of the graphics,and which are easily identifiable by the 1952-1982
identifier in their titles.

The drawback, which requires one of those leaps of faith, is
that attempts to provide information for years which span pre- and
post-1966 involves using number sets which are not identical. There
is reason to believe, however, that the rates and proportions are
the same on the OMS and shelf report data. Looking at patterns of
growth and decline, for example, the OMS data and shelf report data
yield identical patterns although the numbers (and resulting percentages)
are quite different. In the point made at the beginning of the next
section, it was necessary to compute growth and decline patterns, by
                                      over
Directorate, ∧ the last 30 years. The contrast between the OMS
and shelf report numbers can be seen below, although the patterns are
identical:

1974-1983: OMS   1974-1983: shelf report   STAT

DDA		
DDO		
DDI		
DDS&T		

Clearly, anyone wanting to use these figures to make a budget
argument will have obvious preferences for one set of numbers over
the other. The numbers cannot be used for specific purposes of a

budget allocation nature, but one set and the other, in combination,
of growth & decline,
can be used to make points which refer to patterns.^ (In the point

made in the following section, the OMS numbers are used throughout, for

consistency, and [semper veritas]to make the point more dramatically.)

To provide maximum utility to the present study, and to prevent

frustration and confusion, it is necessary to indicate the precise

source, parameters of the population, and method of computation used

for every table, graphic, and even theoretical or interpretive point

made. This will tax the reader's patience but it is the only means
of
of making this rich body of data usable by others and/not perpetuating

the problems experienced by the author and other users of personnel data.

One last caveat to the reader: most of the statistics (all of the

percentages, but many others besides)were the work of the author,and

IAB is not responsible for either errors or misuse of the raw data which

might inadvertently have occurred. Percentages, averages, and most

other statistics have consistently been rounded off to the next

highest number when the fraction was .50 or higher. On a few occasions

this led to a minor distortion of the numbers, as when a set of three

numbers (percentages, for example) should add up to 100 but the fraction

were almost evenly distributed in thirds. In such cases, the highest

fraction was always chosen to round off to the next highest whole

number. For example, faced with .33, .31, and .36, the latter number

was chosen to round upward so that all the percentages would add to 100
than
rather∧99. This happened very seldom, but it did occur.
presented are for FTP and/or
Finally, although most data/[were collected only for] GS personnel *on*
∧
[from the shelf reports]/ the IAB statistics provided on average age,

length of service, etc., are always computed for the larger population

(which might include part-timers in some cases or non-GS civilian

personnel, in others). The author was necessarily constrained to use

these figures as the raw data for computing other statistics, although

the IAB statistics are calculated on a slightly larger population

than the one the author was describing.

DAILY BANK BALANCES AND MONTHLY BANK STATEMENTS

An Analogy To Explain The Differences Between "All Current Employee"
Reports and Quarterly, Biannual, Or Annual Shelf Reports

When you go into your bank and ask what your (current)
balance is, the figure the bank gives you probably will not match
any figure in your checkbook. There are outstanding checks,
deposits not credited, etc., in the bank's figure. If you ask
again the next day, you may get a different figure from the bank--
more checks have been presented against your account, deposits
credited, and so on.

The only way you can be certain what your balance is, is to
wait for your monthly bank statement. This has all the information
you need: what checks are outstanding, your balance at a precise
check number; all deposits and withdrawals; and the dates of those
transactions.

Note that you know your exact balance only for a date already
past. Your latest bank statement ends with check #500 but you have
already written 20 more, and now want to know your balance after
writing check #520. You have to wait until next month! (Unless
you are a meticulous bookkeeper and don't rely on an accountant.
If you rely on an accountant...)

*Paul— I wrote this for you and Nate. On reflection, I think
it should be included in the Preface (suitably edited) as
the very last section, perhaps. Somewhere in the "Methods
and Problems" part at any rate.*

M. B.

OUTLINE FOR A DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY OF THE

Preface

    --Introduction
    --Methods and Problems

Theoretical Overview: Long-Term Trends

    ~~--Competition Breeds Politicization (Consequences of IC Competition)~~
    --Sensitivity to Changes in Administration
    --The Creation of Four Cultures
    --Recruitment and Retention
    ~~--Ideals and Realities: Values, Symbols, and Change~~

1983 Snapshot: The Agency and Directorates

    --10 topics to be covered
    --trends, problems, issues

        1) age   6)   marital status
        2) sex   7)   occupation (P-T-C)
        3) race   8)   percent on probation
        4) education   9)   grade level
        5) language capability   10)   retirement rate

The Agency Over Time

    --information, where available, on 10 topics in comparative
      snapshots: 1952, 1962, 1972, & 1982

The DDA Over Time

    --information, where available, on 10 topics
    --trends, problems, issues

The DDO Over Time

    --information, where available, on 10 topics
    --trends, problems, issues

The DDI Over Time

    --information, where available, on 10 topics
    --trends, problems, issues

The DDS&T Over Time

    --information, where available, on 10 topics
    --trends, problems, issues

The DCI's Office Over Time

    --information, where available, on 10 topics
    --trends, problems, issues

Myths Re-Visted

    --summary chapter: changes in trends over time
    --the genesis of "myths" (Sally's concept)

THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

Introduction

Sensitive to Changes in Administration

A first step in the demographic project was to develop an annual chronology which set the Agency in the context of U.S. and world history. The tenure of each of the Directors (DCI) was used to integrate Agency and national/world history, and the OMS totals by Directorate (U.S. and foreign field populations) were incorporated. The result indicated that the CIA and each of the Directorates are ~~appear~~ sensitive to fluctuations in the country's political and

economic environment. This can be understood as an inevitable consequence of the circumstances which gave rise to the Agency in 1947 and those which accounted for its survival.

STAT   The [   ] history (1976) documents that the Central Intelligence Group (CIG--the 1947 forerunner to the CIA) came into existence in a ferment of competition among other Federal Departments. Problems of "turf" characterize Agency history within the larger Intelligence Community (IC) and, inevitably, internally as well. The Agency's struggle to survive, in spite of the Departments' (State, War, etc.) efforts to dominate and control it, had a number of immediate and long-term consequences. One of these is that the personal stature and proclivities of individual Directors had an enormous impact on the over-all direction the Agency took at any given period. Only one of the first four Directors was not a

STAT   military careerist, and [   ] credits General Walter Bedell Smith's reputation in the Community, his assertiveness, and his administrative abilities for shaping the Agency as it is today (1976: 12)

Another critical factor in the Agency's history has been the nature of the relationship between the DCI and the President of the United States, and the effect of the President's personal work style and his interests on Agency priorities. It was Truman's interest in and desire for the Agency's _Daily_ summary that made current intelligence the career track to quick advancement, and resulted in the _Daily_ taking precedence over production of the National Intelligence Estimates (NIEs) [1976: 15].

Perhaps the most important and long-term consequence of the IC's fear of losing its own intelligence collection and analysis functions to the CIG/CIA was that the CIA's dominant role evolved in a different area than the one originally intended. Rather than devoting most of its efforts to coordinating functions and the production of NIEs--which theoretically would reduce duplication of effort by the IC--the post-war concern with Soviet intentions and aggression (the Cold War) resulted in the early pre-eminence of the Directorate of Plans (DDP--now the Directorate of Operations or

STAT DDO). [   ] 1976: 8-9; 12; 26)

While it was the intended analytic and coordinating functions of the Directorate of Intelligence (DDI) which gave birth to the CIA (1976: 8-9), it was the covert action capability of the DDO which accounted for the Agency's growth and, perhaps, its very survival. For a succession of U.S. Presidents, the CIA provided an option that lay between diplomacy and overt war, thanks to the OSS expertise, technology, and [   ] overseas stations still in   STAT place after World War II (1976: 45). "The Departments (essentially the NSC) defined U.S. policy objectives; covert action represented one means of obtaining those objectives, and the CIA executed the operations" (1976: 30). Certainly the decades of the Cold War (see Figure 1) are the period of the Agency's initial and greatest growth. The period of detente sees the sharpest decline in Agency strength since its inception.

Arguably, other factors could account for the sharp decline in Agency strength since the beginning of detente. [   ] states   STAT

that there was a wave of retirements in the early 1970s--is this
coincidence, or was there also a political cause? The Viet Nam
war was winding down. There were government ordered personnel cuts
in the late 1960s--concern with the national budget deficit or a
reflection of the political climate?

25X1

These factors are all
undoubtedly part of the explanation of the decline in Agency size,
but alternative hypotheses invite discussion as well. Specifically,
what were the political motives--if any--which themselves created
the set of factors which reduced the Agency's strength?

The pleasure and wrath of United States Presidents were visited
on the CIA--most often in the person of its Director--according to
the Agency's ability to further a President's foreign policy objectives.
The paramilitary efforts demanded by various Presidents could not
be concealed from the world or the U.S. public as other covert
actions could. Equally obvious, it is covert action failures which
become publicized and have an impact on public and Congressional
opinion. The Bay of Pigs fiasco and the Watergate disclosures
demonstrate the Agency's vulnerability to Presidential pressures.

A depressing indication of the extent to which the CIA's
public image has been linked to a President's activities is
provided by the 1982 World Almanac. The first mention of the
Central Intelligence Agency, in the section on United States
history, comes on page 713 under the 1974 entries: "Charges that
the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) abused its powers by massive
domestic operations were published Dec. 21".

The Four Cultures

The Agency's sensitivity to Presidential and Directors' styles and concerns has had different impacts on each of the Directorates. This may account for both the emergence of the four Directorate "cultures" and the enormous resistance to creating one culture. Problems of "turf" characterize internal relations, both within and between Directorates, as employees respond to obvious opportunities for advancement.

Using 1961 (Bay of Pigs) and 1973 (Watergate) as historical boundaries to test this idea, Agency history can be divided into three periods: 1953 to 1961; 1962 to 1973; and 1974 to the present. The following table shows the results. *(OMS numbers)*

25X1

One of the patterns revealed by this table is that while a Directorate might experience some growth during a span of years, -- nevertheless its over-all share of Agency resources may decline (notably the case with the DDI). This suggests that Presidential pressures and Directors' particular interests have had a noticeable impact on the differential development of the Directorates. It is no secret that Dulles was passionately interested in the DDO and virtually ignored the rest of the Agency, for example.

The table shows that over the 30 year period, the DDI's portion of over-all Agency size declined from being ⬚ to 25X1 being approximately ⬚ of the whole. 25X1

The DDO has gone from being ⬚ of the Agency to 25X1 less than ⬚ although part of the DDA strength (particularly 25X1 the Office of Communications) properly relates to DDO functions. Nevertheless, the DDA has the most stable history over the 30 years of any of the Directorates, remaining consistently near one-third of Agency strength since 1953. Because of the support and the services it provides the other Directorates, the DDA bridges the large gulf which separates the DDI and the DDO, for example, as no other Directorate can. This fact by itself contributes to the particular "culture" of the DDA, as does the diversity of the people that make up its population.

The 1973 transfer of NPIC from the DDI to the relatively young DDS&T had the net effect of equalizing the two Directorates' share of Agency strength. However, the DDI remained at the same strength while the DDS&T's portion of the Agency increased by 5% over the following decade.

The DDO's acquisition of DCD in 1973 off-set what otherwise

would have been a much greater reduction in size as a result of the

Schlesinger cuts. It is not known whether this was one of the

motives for the transfer, but other data also suggest that "leveling

differences" among Directorates, components, and occupations may

be a trend in Agency history. In 1982, for example, the Office of Personnel

upgraded eight Clerical positions to Technical, and two Clerical

positions to Professional. The result was to equalize the

proportions of Clerical and Technical employees in the Agency.

In 1981, Professionals made up 63% of the Agency; Technicals were

10% and Clericals were 27%. Following the re-definition of the

positions in 1982, the percentage of Professional employees remained

at 63%. Technicals now made up 18% and Clericals were 18% of the

Agency's force.

None of this explains why the DDO has not regained lost ground,

however, and leads to the discussion of another long-term consequence

of the initial forces which shaped the Agency's development.

Recruitment and Retention

The beginning of the separate cultures in the Agency has to be

attributed to the interaction of complex factors dating back to

the late 1940s and early 1950s. The lack of cooperation by other

Federal Departments, in those early days, restricted the DDI's

access to their information and impeded their coordination function

(1976). The DDO's fear of their operations being compromised

(security concerns) led to extraordinary comparmentation within the

Agency (1976: 22). The special frustrations or advantages

experienced differed in each of the Directorates from the beginning.

Perhaps one cultural theme was common to the entire organization:

career advancement was linked to producing quickly and being

associated with fast-breaking events--current intelligence and projects.
Long-term researchers and asset developers (in the DDO) may have
the slowest advancement and career success in the Agency. (This is
one of several issues that the available data cannot address). But
each Directorate has its special history and mission, and the
personality characteristics and talents of its employees necessarily
differ.

The significance of this latter fact lies in the impact which
United States and world historical events have on the ease with
which specific types of employees can be recruited and retained.
For example, the present economy which puts academics at a
disadvantage in the market place affords the DDI the best opportunity
to recruit with relative ease. The same economy favors a scientific/
technological career in private industry over one in the DDS&T. Over
time, these differences in the career attraction the Agency offers
to civilians with different specialties leads to over-all disparities
in Directorate size. It may also contribute to the maintenance of
careful boundaries (cultures) among the Directorates so that the
history of one cannot affect the development of another.

The political consequences of Presidential demands on the
CIA--and the resulting impact on public and Congressional opinion
when the consequences are negative--certainly affects the morale
of Agency employees. People evidence surprise when they learn that
25X1   more employees [   ] left under Helms than under any other DCI. One
person's quick response was that the rate was lower under Helms than
25X1   under Schlesinger [   ] for example. The accuracy of this
observation is not as telling as the rapidity with which it was made.
Helms was one of our own and furthermore the cuts were ordered by

the government, ostensibly as part of the national concern with the

budget deficit. The cuts made by Turner ☐ during the Carter _   25X1

presidency were also more demoralizing to employees than those made

during Helms' tenure. Again there is a noticeable difference in

rate, but it seems apparent that the political motive for the cuts
affect recruitment of new people.
is the critical factor in employee morale. The same factors could ∧

The post-Watergate decade shows a 16% reduction in the DDO's

strength (difference between 1974 and 1983 strength). Two hypotheses

suggest themselves to explain the DDO's failure to recoup from the

1973 cuts. First, the change in U.S. values which followed the   25X1

Viet Nam war and Watergate scandal could also affect the motivation

of young people to choose a career in the clandestine services. ☐

states that Dulles' stand against Senator Joseph McCarthy in 1953

contributed to the Agency's reputation as a liberal institution (1976:44)
making it an attractive place to work.
The negative impact of the Watergate publicity could represent the

opposite effect of discouraging people from seeking a career with the

Agency.

A positive aspect of the same phenomenon can be seen in Figure 1.

The State Department has reported that following international crises,

their application rate soars. The Iranian revolution and the taking

of American hostages in Iran coincided with the second-lowest point

in Agency strength. A marked increase in Agency strength followed the

hostage crisis, suggesting that the event stirred a wave of patriotic

fervor in American citizens, as well as inclining the Federal government

not to be caught short again.

The second hypothesis to explain the DDO's difficulty in recruiting

suitable candidates is that those who do apply now have different

characteristics and motivations than candidates in the past. The

rejection rate of CTs is higher now than formerly, but _____

(Psychological Services Division) insists that the Agency's standards

have not changed in the last 25 years. The higher rejection rate

reflects changes in the type of applicants. Perhaps the negative

publicity the Agency has suffered also works to attract unsuitable

candidates.

If the Agency's standards for recruitment have not changed

in 25 years, but the values of the general population have changed,

the use of the older standards may result in the recruitment of

people who are marginal--in motivation and characteristics--to the

rest of the country. Put differently, the rigid application of

the old standards may no longer identify the same kind of people

as those standards once did. Changes in values and symbols will

mask characteristics in civilians which the Agency may want in its

employees, while use of the old standards may select for people

with characteristics which are not as desireable.

It would be useful to know in what way the CTs who wash out

today differ from those who are accepted. This might permit

identification of the specific values, symbols and lifestyles

of civilians which are at odds with the old standards but which

are held, nonetheless, by the type of employee the Agency desires

to attract.

Reliable information confirms that many applicants are

rejected in the field by "old-hand" recruiters who "know" that

the applicants do not possess characteristics the Agency wants.

The problem of recruitment and retention of personnel, in the DDO

and other Directorates, may require learning how to identify the

same kind of people under different symbolic guises. The current,

long-term employees in the Agency have changed with the rest of

the country. Concern with the environment and its resources; interest

in self-help programs and groups; non-political involvement in civil

rights issues, and a host of other current interests (representing

changes in values) characterize Agency employees just as much as they

do the general population. But the recruitment standards may not be

as up-to-date. The <u>overt</u> values, symbols, and lifestyles of the

healthy, well-adjusted person of the 1980s will not be the same as

those of the 1950s. The healthy, well-adjusted solid American citizen

of <u>1880</u> might strike us neurotic, bigoted, and inflexible today.

It may also be that economic changes are responsible for problems

in recruitment and retention of personnel, if the Agency cannot

compete with the private sector. If an individual is extrinsically

motivated (by a high salary, for example), it could be that--in the

past--such a person sought ~~an~~ employment with the Agency ~~career~~ and remained satisfied

during a long, productive career. However, if extrinsic motivation

is a dominant characteristic in an individual, then he/she probably

will not stay when economic changes favor the private sector. ~~In times~~

~~like the present,~~ The words of M.F. Herz, with reference to a career

in the Foreign Service, apply to Agency service as well:

"Those who believe that every effort made 'for the government'

must be compensated, who look upon every assignment with a calculus

of advantages vs. disadvantages, who need to 'do their own thing' on

their own terms, will miss an entire dimension of the diplomatic life

that is different in kind from every other career, except perhaps

the military services, because of the discipline that it requires.

A career in diplomacy is simply too demanding and dangerous to be

approached in any other spirit. Therefore, unless one can derive

some pride from the fact that one is also serving one's country--
yes, serving one's country--the inevitable sacrifices and disabilities
that are involved will never seem adequately compensated" (in Kearney
1981: 15)*

Herz recommends that this attitude be stressed in the earliest
recruiting stages (1981: 15) and the same approach might also benefit
the Central Intelligence Agency.

* I am indebted to Dr. Helen Kearney for making available a copy
of her paper, "Organizational Constraints on Lifestyles," presented
at the Groves Conference on Marriage and the Family, Mount Pocono,
Pennsylvania, May 1981. The Herz quote is taken from that paper.

Subject copy

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

STAT

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Policy Agenda: Personnel Management in the 1980's

FROM: Chief, Policy Staff/OPPPM 1006 Ames	EXTENSION	NO.		
		DATE] 8 NOV 1980 **STAT**		

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. DD/P&E 1006 Ames				In September you saw the first draft of the attached policy agenda. Since that time we have met with two groups of personnel careerists to gather further input in refining the policy agenda. The attached is the result of this refinement.
2.				
3. EA/D/PPPM 5E58 Hqs.				
4.				In initially discussing the concept of a policy agenda, you mentioned the possibility of further review either by your senior OPPPM managers, the PMAB, EXCOM, or the DDCI. Do you wish to pursue any of these avenues?
5. DD/PPPM				
6.				
7. D/PPPM				If you agree with the Agenda, we will order it into priority action items. _____ is n**STAT** working on IA (applicant of the 80's) and I plan to have other staff members begin inquiry into compensation and mobility shortly.**STAT**
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

FORM 1-79   **610** USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS