DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 439 CE 006 089

AUTHOR Wiley, Llewellyn N.
TITLE Potential Uses of the Functional Account Code in Describing Job Requirements. Final Report for Period March 1974-June 1975.
INSTITUTION Air Force Human Resources Lab., Lackland AFB, Tex. Occupational and Manpower Research Div.
SPONS AGENCY Air Force Human Resources Lab., Brooks AFB, Texas.
REPORT NO AFHRL-TR-75-53
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Job Analysis; *Manpower Utilization; Measurement Techniques; *Military Personnel; Occupational Clusters; Tables (Data); *Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS Air Force; *Functional Account Code

ABSTRACT

A major problem in the utilization of personnel appears in the identification of skills and knowledges acquired in job assignments held in the past. Lack of regular job inventorying of Air Force personnel by individuals rather than samples makes it infeasible to use job inventories to recapture a given airman's record. The possibility of using the Functional Account Code (FAC) in occupational analysis was formulated and a preliminary assessment to verify its potential is presented in the study. The study was made possible with the use of a file of records on all studies clustering job inventories from 1965-1971 with the FAC for each airman included. It was first shown that, when individuals are sequenced by FAC, the job clustering corresponds well with the FAC. Seventy-five Air Force Systems Commands are shown in graphic form. A more intensive analysis was then made of the Administration Specialist ladder, which contains the largest number of FAC's of any specialty. It was found that FAC titles agreed well with the titles assigned to job clusters by the analyst who interpreted the homogeneous grouping of the job inventories. Longitudinal analyses are planned as a continuation of the study. (Author/EC)

AFHRL-TR-75-53

AIR FORCE HUMAN RESOURCES LABORATORY

POTENTIAL USES OF THE FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNT CODE IN DESCRIBING JOB REQUIREMENTS

By

Llewellyn N. Wiley

OCCUPATIONAL AND MANPOWER RESEARCH DIVISION
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236

October 1975
Final Report for Period March 1974 – June 1975

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235

NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This final report was submitted by Occupational and Manpower Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236, under project 7734, with Hq Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235.

This report has been reviewed and cleared for open publication and/or public release by the appropriate Office of Information (OI) in accordance with AFR 190-17 and DoDD 5230.9. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DDC to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

RAYMOND E. CHRISTAL, Chief/R&D Director
Occupational and Manpower Research Division

Approved for publication.

HAROLD E. FISCHER, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE *(When Data Entered)*

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER: AFHRL-TR-75-53

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.:

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER:

4. TITLE *(and Subtitle)*: POTENTIAL USES OF THE FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNT CODE IN DESCRIBING JOB REQUIREMENTS

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED: Final, March 1974 – June 1975

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER:

7. AUTHOR(s): Llewellyn N. Wiley

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s):

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: Occupational and Manpower Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS: 62703F, 77340701

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS: Hq Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235

12. REPORT DATE: October 1975

13. NUMBER OF PAGES: 16

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS *(if different from Controlling Office)*:

15. SECURITY CLASS. *(of this report)*: Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE:

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of this Report)*

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)*

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

work history
functional account code
airman job records
administration specialist jobs
longitudinal records

20. ABSTRACT *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

A major problem in the utilization of personnel appears when one attempts to identify skills and knowledges acquired in job assignments held in the past. Lack of regular job inventorying of Air Force personnel by individuals rather than samples makes it infeasible to use job inventories to recapture a given airman's record. Present plans to broaden the use of identifiers of special skills may correct this deficiency for future airmen, but it fails to do so for the bulk of current personnel. A possibility of using the Functional Account Code (FAC), assigned by the management engineering team (MET), was perceived, and a pilot study performed to verify the potential. This was possible because a file of records on all studies clustering job inventories from 1965–1971 had just been readied, with the FAC for each airman included. It was first shown that when individuals are sequenced by FAC the job

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE *(When Data Entered)*

Item 20 (Continued)

clustering corresponds well with the Functional Account Code. Seventy-five AFSCs are shown in graphic form. A more intensive analysis was then made of the Administration Specialist ladder, which contains the largest number of FACs of any specialty, in which it was found that FAC titles agreed well with the titles assigned to job clusters by the analyst who interpreted the homogeneous grouping of the job inventories. Longitudinal analyses are planned as a follow-on.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

POTENTIAL USES OF THE FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNT CODE IN DESCRIBING JOB REQUIREMENTS

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

As its title states, this study attempts a preliminary assessment of the Functional Account Code (FAC) as a possible asset in occupational analysis. Conversely, it considers job analysis data as a possible asset to accomplishing manpower requirements evaluations.

A Functional Account Code is part of the authorization for every airman position. This 4-digit designation combines the concept of organizational level with the mission of the activity in which the position exists. Thus, the designation 1000 stands for "command and command support," 1100 is "administration/staff," 1110 is "administrative communications," and 1111 is "abbreviations and terminology standardizations (HQ USAF use only)." Similarly, 1200 is "logistics staff," 1300 is "operations staff," 1400 "plans and programming," 1500 "comptroller," 1600 "personnel," etc. The first digit, left, designates a major category of activity, with "mission equipment maintenance" in the 2000 division, "mission equipment operations" in the 3000 division, "direct support" in the 4000 division, "medical" in the 5000, "research and development" in 6000, "activities outside USAF" in 7000, "inservice activities and/or contract services" in 8000, with 9000 undefined, and 9999 "unallotted."

Functional Account Codes are part of the manpower apportionment system of the Air Force, and they are the specific responsibility of the management engineering teams (MET). With occasional exceptions, the FAC will be found on the uniform airman record (UAR) for any active duty airman. This even includes students and patients. Standard FAC recordings exist back to 1966, with improved records since 1970.

As a first step in considering the interplay of Functional Account Codes and job inventory data, McFarland (1974) found that the two yielded essentially the same job types. The jobs he studied were in the field of data automation. The possibility that management engineering team data and occupational analysis data are coincident could be further examined by comparing recently developed files of clustered job inventories with recorded FACs for the same job incumbents. If the results proved encouraging, one might envision the following applications of the results of deeper analyses:

a. Contribution of job inventory data to making management engineering team decisions.

b. Identification of areas in which job inventories fail to separate tasks that actually differ because of organizational distinctions.

c. Use of the Functional Account Code to provide work history data for individual airmen.

d. Identification of areas in which the same tasks are performed in different specialties, optimizing cross-training, and leading toward variable specialty assignments for the same personnel.

e. Describing the allocation of jobs and tasks within work centers and identified mission units to specify common manpower requirements.

f. Assisting management engineering teams to determine the number of agencies that must be studied when establishing standards.

II. APPROACH

A newly assembled set of tape files was used. These contain the 130,000 records of job inventories that were used in homogeneous clustering studies during the period 1965–1971. The files have been augmented by matching against the uniform airman record (UAR) tapes and the AFHRL files of test results and enlistment histories. The massive new files were designed for periodic updating, and they will contain the Functional Account Code appearing on the UAR tape for each airman at the time he completed a job inventory. As a result of the availability of these files, the following steps could be taken to appraise the potential of FACs:

1. The entire file of cases was printed in the following sequence: (1) clustering study number, (2) Functional Account Code, (3) clustering sequencer, or, "K-path order," (4) grade;

2. Counts were made of: (1) total number of cases in each clustering study, (2) the number of different FACs recorded for the incumbents in each study, (3) the number of cases appearing in K-path sequence after first ordering on FAC, (4) then the ratio of the number of K-path sequenced cases to total study cases was computed;

3. The 702X0 and 702X0A, Administration Specialist career ladder, was rearranged manually, trading first-ordering by K-path sequence for that by FAC, and the definitions of both the K-path clusters and the FACs were written down for comparison;

4. After review of the counts obtained in Step 2, a new printout of the entire file was requested, changing the ordering to: (1) job inventory clustering study number, (2) K-path sequence within the study, (3) FAC, (4) grade, and (5) the stored meanings of the Functional Account Codes.

These steps were aimed at evaluating the potential of the FAC record as a data source. Conclusions based upon the ratios from Step 2, above, were expected to be tentative indications of trends. The actual number of Functional Account Codes involved for the Administration Specialist ladder was not known at that time, but there were logical reasons to believe that the ladder would reveal the maximum possible divergence of any set of job assignments, by local job title, from Functional Account Code meanings. This report maintains the hypothesis that: if there is correspondence between job clusters and job titles in the Administration Specialist ladder against FAC meanings, corresponding relationships will be greater in most other ladders. Thus, the 702X0, 702X0A qualitative comparisons were made as a critical and extreme test.

III. RESULTS

The quantitative findings are reported in Table 1, which contains the ratios from 71 clustering studies. These appear in temporal order. In some cases several clusterings were accomplished under a given study number, and the job inventory was administered to personnel in several shredouts of the ladder. Not all ladders are represented, and some are notable for the number of missing cases. The 702X0, 702X0A, Administration Specialist clustering study actually included the 70490, Administration Superintendent (8 and 9 skill level) personnel. These were dropped from the data files because of their early entrance into the Air Force, which resulted in lack of aptitude test data. Table 1 contains the number of missing cases in Column 4 and the number of FAC 9999 (unallotted FAC) cases in Column 5. The cases in these two columns reduce the effective ratios in Column 9 by amounts that cannot be exactly determined because it is not known that the cases would appear in K-path order if they were present.

The degree of correspondence has been graphically interpreted in Figure 1.

Figure 1 plots the number of FACs appearing for a clustering study against the percent of cases that emerged in K-path sequence (Column 3 vs 9 of Table 1). A very considerable negative correlation has been suppressed by truncating the graph with a single category "over 70." The entry in the 11–20 percent column is the 702X0, 702X0A ladder, with a percentage of 14 and a total of 284 Functional Account Codes. The other two "over 70" entries are the 751X0, 751X2 (Education and Training Specialist), having 112 FACs, and the 204XX, 206XX (Intelligence and Photo Interpretation Specialist), with 76 FACs. Thus, the presence of numerous Functional Account Codes breaks up the K-path sequence and gives the appearance of little or no relationship between FAC and K-path. Put another way, the argument is that if task clusters corresponded to functional coding the cases would emerge in K-Path order after having first been sequenced by FAC. This argument encounters difficulties at the two extremes, many and few codes. A small number of codes would result in large chunks of incumbents, who would necessarily appear in K-path sequence; a very large number would introduce so many breaks in K-path that small clusters would be destroyed as units. A "small number" appears from Figure 1 to be 20 or fewer Functional Account Codes. If one looks at the graph for studies with more than 20 FACs, it can be seen that over 70 percent of the cases fall in K-path sequence, which is a substantial correspondence between the two orderings.

Figure 1 provides a rough standard for comparison of future studies which relate FAC to K-path sequencing. When new studies are added to the data files used in the present inquiry their ratios can be imposed on this graph. Failure of a specialty with only 20 FACs to yield a 50 percent correspondence might be symptomatic of extreme heterogeneity within the DAFSCs, or of need for additional analyses by the management engineering teams. Notably, no ladder yields such a poor relationship in the specialties studied so far.

Qualitative comparisons of the Functional Account Code meanings with the cluster titles assigned by the job analyst in the Administration Specialist area revealed many possibilities of contribution in both

Table 1. Cases Appearing in K-path Sequence after First Ordering on Functional Account Code (FAC)

Identification									
Study Number	DAFSC	Total N	Number of FACs	Number in Missing FACs	Number in FAC 9999	Number of Continuous K-path Nos.	Ratio of Col 4/Col 2	Ratio of Col 5/Col 2	Ratio of Col 6/Col 2
	Column 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
3103	915XX	1027	23	11	3	896	.01	.00	.87
3166	432XX	1651	38	15	6	1395	.01	.00	.84
3196	906XX	1338	44	54	18	746	.04	.01	.56
3197	421XX	1520	38	17	6	907	.01	.00	.60
3192	751,751X2	1285	112	27	7	573	.02	.01	.45
3219	671,3X0,672X0	1518	34	75	12	922	.05	.01	.61
3227	431X0	825	25	15	2	526	.02	.00	.64
3228	733X0,X1	974	16	16	3	857	.02	.00	.88
3230	982XX	488	11	20	2	378	.04	.00	.77
3274	322XX,A,B,F,R 322XX,N,P	1299	26	14	5	1144	.01	.00	.88
3303	543XX	1368	40	29	1	1135	.02	.00	.83
3313	204,206XX	1599	76	25	17	756	.02	.01	.47
3352	903XX	559	13	38	1	490	.07	.00	.88
3353	305XX	1073	28	9	7	851	.01	.01	.79
3354	301XX	1206	33	20	10	857	.02	.01	.71
3430	435XX,F,A,B,C	1654	27	12	32	1418	.01	.02	.86
3454	605X0,X1	1835	23	73	35	1658	.04	.02	.90
3503	301XX	1493	31	21	11	1228	.01	.01	.82
3504	301XX,L,A	1502	34	17	24	1245	.01	.02	.83
3521	424XX	1073	49	21	22	853	.02	.02	.79
3522	423XX	1474	28	20	24	1288	.01	.02	.87
3526	307XX	1196	22	16	23	1062	.01	.02	.89
3551	563,566XX	1001	27	19	13	814	.02	.01	.81
3553	342XX,E,G,T,A	919	14	10	22	855	.01	.02	.93
3554	301XX,325XX, C,A	917	25	7	12	819	.01	.01	.89
3555	253XX	441	9	5	6	411	.01	.01	.93
3581	472X0,X1, 473X0,X1	1870	36	46	50	1430	.02	.03	.76
3624	551X0,X1	1964	34	62	39	1194	.03	.02	.61
3688	611,612XX	1236	34	22	22	654	.02	.02	.53
3700	303XX	724	32	10	6	543	.01	.01	.75

Table 1. Cases Appearing in K-path Sequence after First Ordering on Functional Account Code (FAC) (Cont'd)

Identification									
Study Number	DAFSC	Total N	Number of FACs	Number in Missing FACs	Number in FAC 9999	Number of Continuous K-path Nos.	Ratio of Col 4/Col 2	Ratio of Col 5/Col 2	Ratio of Col 6/Col 2
	Column 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
3710	422XX	1279	20	14	22	1178	.01	.02	.92
3728	305XX	1040	30	4	8	871	.00	.01	.84
3751	325XX,422XX	1327	18	23	59	1095	.02	.04	.83
3753	361X3,X4	454	18	12	7	330	.03	.02	.73
3790	273X0,X2, 275X0	1958	35	417	35	1226	.21	.02	.63
3834	534,536XX	1787	29	175	54	1427	.10	.03	.80
3851	362,363XX	849	18	108	52	547	.13	.06	.64
3873	252XX	1484	15	278	47	1074	.19	.03	.72
3885	421XX	1896	25	297	98	1489	.16	.05	.79
3886	981X0,X1	1480	28	215	46	985	.15	.03	.67
3905	651XX	791	19	110	25	605	.14	.03	.76
3909	317XX	655	42	83	13	360	.13	.02	.55
3954	324XX	1231	20	163	25	1035	.13	.02	.84
3989	902XX	1852	50	124	35	1092	.07	.02	.59
4027	545,547XX,A	1528	54	73	75	1151	.05	.05	.75
4076	421XX	1983	44	86	66	1118	.04	.03	.56
4085	922XX,A,J,U,B	1580	36	66	46	1031	.04	.03	.65
4093	402,404XX	585	38	23	41	347	.04	.07	.59
4106	321XX,G,X,Z, K,L,R	654	20	13	12	568	.02	.02	.87
4122	233,4,6XX	1956	46	83	13	1129	.04	.01	.58
4155	902XX	665	20	41	6	512	.06	.01	.77
4171	341XX	339	5	7	0	314	.02	.00	.93
4176	443XX	1049	17	48	3	792	.05	.00	.76
4228	433XX	1810	38	68	27	1295	.04	.01	.72
4238	303XX	1006	34	37	35	731	.04	.03	.73
4252A	461XX	1996	41	80	32	1269	.04	.02	.64
4252B	463XX	1995	30	69	39	1422	.03	.02	.71
4258	304XX	854	36	21	24	620	.02	.03	.73
4287	901XX	641	16	18	13	571	.03	.02	.89
4322	362,363XX	626	24	23	47	396	.04	.08	.63
4338	301XX	1971	40	93	40	1539	.05	.02	.78

Table 1. Cases Appearing in K-path Sequence after First Ordering on Functional Account Code (FAC) (Cont'd)

Identification									
Study Number	DAFSC	Total N	Number of FACs	Number in Missing FACs	Number in FAC 9999	Number of Continuous K-path Nos.	Ratio of Col 4/Col 2	Ratio of Col 5/Col 2	Ratio of Col 6/Col 2
	Column 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9
4358	732XX,U,A	1987	69	89	68	1143	.04	.03	.58
4363	325XX	1483	22	42	58	1304	.03	.04	.88
4391	702XX,A	1939	292	71	89	276	.04	.05	.14
4392	607XX,A	1781	25	68	14	1440	.04	.01	.81
4413	253XX	624	15	19	3	552	.03	.00	.88
4426	301XX	1689	43	56	64	1139	.03	.04	.67
4429	432XX	1067	34	40	13	759	.04	.01	.71
4456	271,274XX	1981	61	66	14	1259	.03	.01	.64
4471	542XX	422	19	10	3	346	.02	.01	.82
4480	571XX	1969	20	76	15	1550	.04	.01	.79

Note. — (—) = rounded up; will be found in next lower decile in Figure 1.

Number Of FACs	Percent >>									
	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Over 70		(1)			(2)					
66-70						(1)				
61-65							(1)			
56-60										
51-55								(1)		
46-50						(2)		(1)		
41-45						(3)	(2)			
36-40						(2)	(f)	(4)	(2)	
31-35						(3)	(1)	(4)	(2)	
26-30							(1)	(3)	(5)	
21-25							(2)	(2)	(5)	
16-20							(1)	(5)	(6)	(1)
11-15								(2)	(2)	(1)
6-10										(1)
1-5										(1)

Figure 1. Relation of the number of Functional Account Codes (FAC) to the percent of cases appearing in K-path sequence after ordering on FAC.

directions. A small excerpt from this analysis is given in Table 2. By scanning Table 2 one can infer that the management engineering teams might benefit from knowing task similarities or identities across commands and levels of organization; that an E-6 in one situation appears in the same cluster with an E-4 in another. It appears certain that job analysts could benefit from knowing the setting in which supervisory and NCOIC activities are exercised. The task cluster data seem to justify the practice of using Administration Specialties in many ways and places, while the FAC meanings suggest that a rich variety of experience might be tapped through reporting the FACs that a man has held during his enlistment history. Two small segments of the comparisons are given in Table 2 to illustrate this point. The upper half of Table 2 shows a wide diversity of assignments for higher level (and presumably experienced) Administration Specialists, and the lower half shows repetition of the FACs, in very good agreement with the job analyst's titles for the clusters. The upper portion of Table 2 suggests the resevoir of information which may be available from reporting all the FACs that an airman has held during service, while the lower portion suggests the use of task clustering as a basis for checking upon the need for distinctions among organizational assignments (Note particularly the block of cases shown with K-path numbers 1596–1609).

A further analysis was made to produce Table 3 data. Table 3 compares excerpts of reported local job titles with FAC meanings taken from the record of the same incumbents. The cases in the clustering study of 702X0, 702X0A incumbents were paired for the two titles, local and FAC, and a series of subjective judgments was made by the author of the present study. The object was to estimate the consistency of relationship between the two kinds of title. It was assumed that not all the reported titles reflected the same moment in assignment time, depending upon the UAR tape selection. That is, some UAR titles would be in definite error, reflecting the wrong job title for the tasks reported by the incumbent. These would likely occur in the subjective category "different," and a few in the category "unclear." The commonest source of uncertainty was the tendency of respondents to call themselves "Administration Specialists," which is the generic title for the career ladder. Since all personnel in DAFSC 702X0, 702X0A could be called this, regardless of their assignments, the response added no new information. On the other hand, there was information content in such responses as "Asst NCO," "Chief Clerk," "NCOIC," and "Clerk-Typist," all of which added to job identification. When coupled with the respondent's identification of his unit or organization the resulting information often exceeded that obtainable from the Functional Account Code. Moreover, the sum of information from local job title, grade, and FAC was often impressive. Taking the first 1,000 K-path numbers as representing the 1,996 cases of the 702X0, 702X0A clustering study, the following distribution of judgments was obtained:

SAME	UNCLEAR	DIFFERENT	INCUMBENT	FAC
Job Represented by FAC and Job Title	Whether FAC and Job Title Refer to the Same Job	Jobs Can Be Inferred From Job Title and FAC	Contributes More or Equal Information	Contributes More or Equal information
474	350	48	626	567

In addition, there was the missing data classification:

MISSING
UAR record missing
NR (no title from incumbent)
9999 is the FAC used

The SAME, UNCLEAR, DIFFERENT, and MISSING categories total 1,000, but the relative contribution categories total much more. Wherever the two were equal in contribution credit was given to both, and in cases where the DIFFERENT column entered credit was also given to both information sources, incumbent and FAC. In the vast majority of entries in the UNCLEAR column the incumbent had used the Administration Specialist designation, and the job analyst would have profited by having the Functional Account Code at hand to help in describing the job cluster. However, whenever the incumbent elected to supply detailed information as to his job title, more could be learned from him. Unfortunately for the analyst, this was often done in very cryptic abbreviations. These could be deciphered with the aid of the FAC designation of the organization, but the abbreviations were not standardized and would not otherwise have been understandable.

Table 2. Excerpts of Administration Specialist Higher Level Assignments

K-path Number	FAC	702XOA	Grade	Job Cluster Definition	Functional Account Code (FAC) Meaning
			HIGHER LEVEL JOB ASSIGNMENTS		
0121	1012		5		Command Unit Administration
0122	1621		6		CBPO Administration
0123	1200		5		Logistics Staff
0124	1070		5		Medical Services Mgmt. Staff
0125	3801		7	Unit Command NCOICs, K-path nos. 0118–0223, part of a larger cluster of command function NCOs	Ground Communications–Electronics Admin
0126	3800		7		Ground Communications–Electronics
0127	3101		7		Operations Unit Administration
0128	2120		4		Maintenance Control
0129	1220		5		Supply & Services Staff, Security Police
0130	4310		7		Administration & Reports
0131	1621		6		CBPO Administration
0132	(Missing)		7		(Missing)
0133	1621		6		CBPO Administration
0134	1621		6		CBPO Administration
0135	1200		6		Logistics Staff
0136	3863		5		Digital/Crypto Operations–Terminal Cnt.
0137	1340		5		Standardization/Evaluation
0138	1330		6		Operational Training
0139	1012		6		Command Unit Administration
0140	3100		6		Operations
0141	3718		5		Combat Crew Training (Operational Comms.)
0142	4320		5		Correction
0143	3101		4		Operations Unit Administration
0144	4402		6		Civil Engineering Administration Mgmt.
0145	(Missing)		5		(Missing)
			ROUTINE ASSIGNMENTS		
1591	(Missing)		5	Message Distribution Clerks, K-path nos. 1588–1593, part of a	(Missing)
1592	1115	*	6		Message Management/Distribution Center
1593	3863	*	5		Digital/Crypto Operations–Terminal Cnts.

Table 2. Excerpts of Administration Specialist Higher Level Assignments (Cont'd)

K-path Number	FAC	702XOA	Grade	Job Cluster Definition	Functional Account Code (FAC) Meaning
			ROUTINE ASSIGNMENTS (Cont'd)		
1594	3863		4	larger cluster of	Digital/Crypto Operations–Terminal Cnts.
1595	(Missing)		5	general clerks	(Missing)
1596	4351		4		Priority A Alert Aircraft Security
1597	3110		3		Aircraft Crew
1598	2170		4	Flight Records Clerks,	Records, Reports, & Admin. (Deleted later)
1599	4721		3	K-path nos. 1598–	Records & Forms–Base Operations
1600	4721		4	1605, part of the lar-	Records & Forms–Base Operations
1601	4721		4	ger cluster of general	Records & Forms–Base Operations
1602	4721		3	clerks	Records & Forms–Base Operations
1603	4710		3		Base Operations
1604	4721		4		Records & Forms–Base Operations
1605	4721		3		Records & Forms–Base Operations
1606	4721		4		Records & Forms–Base Operations
1607	4721		3		Records & Forms–Base Operations
1608	4721		3		Records & Forms–Base Operations
1609	4710		4		Base Operations
1610	1120	*	6	Documentation Tech-	Documentation
1611	1123	*	6	nicians (II), K-path	Engineering Data Service Center (EDSC)
1612	1121	*	6	nos. 1610–1614	Documentation Management
1613	1120	*	6		Documentation
1614	1120	*	7	Documentation Tech-	Documentation
1615	1143	*	3	nicians (I), K-path nos. 1615–1619	Publications & Forms Distribution Mgmt.

Table 3. Comparison of Job Titles with FAC Meaning

K-path Number	Grade	Evaluation					Reported Job Title	Functional Account Code (FAC) Meaning
		Same	Unclear	Differ	Incum+	FAC+		
0481	2		*			*	Admin Spcl	Operational Plans
0482	4		*			*	Clk	Records, Reports and Administration
0483	4	*			*		Sp Services Admin Clk	Personnel Services
0484	4		*			*	Admin Spec	Special Actions/CBPO
0485	4		*			*	Admin SPCL	Field Maintenance Unit Administration
0486	4		*		*	*	Chief Admin Clk	Organization Maintenance Unit Administration
0487	All Data Missing							
0488	5	*			*	*	Chief Clk	Group/Squadron Command and Unit Administration
0489	5	*			*		Admin Spec Maint Cont Div	Maintenance Control
0490	5	*			*		Chief Clk 67 OPS	Operations
0491	3		*		*		CE Div Chief Clk	Records, Reports and Administration
0492	3		*			*	Admin SPCL	Technical/Flying Training Unit Administration
0493	5		*			*	Chief Clk	Communications, Armament and Electronics Maintenance Unit Administration
0494	3	*			*		Pers Admin Office	Administrative Communications
0495	4		*			*	70250 Admin SPEC	Depot Maintenance
0496	4	*			*	*	CBPO Adm	Consolidated Base Personnel Office Administration
0497	5		*		*	*	NCOIC Det Admin	Pre-Commissioning Officer Education
0498	4	*			*		Admin Clk CBPO Asgn	Assignments/CBPO
0499	3		*			*	Admin Clk	Engineering Development—Space
0500	3		*			*	Orderly Room Clk	Housing and Billeting Service
0501	5		*			*	Admin Spec	Traffic Management
0502	5		*			*	Admin Specl	Auditing
0503	3		*			*	Admin Spec	Records, Reports and Administration
0504	6	*			*		NCOIC Current Oper	Operations Staff
0505	4	*			*	*	Chief Clk Safety Div	Flight Safety

[a]The columns Incum+ and FAC+ indicate the information contribution of the incumbent's reported job title and the Functional Account Code meaning, respectively. An asterisk in both columns indicates either equivalence of information (see No. 0496) or new information from each source (see No. 0505).

Standardization of job titles could be improved greatly through the combined efforts of the management engineering teams and Occupational Analysis. Many local usages would prove to represent the same job with different titles if reduced to common denominators. This could lead to small extensions of the Functional Account Code as an individual work history identifier. The need for this hardly requires elaboration.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Functional Account Code (FAC) contains a great deal of untapped information. Cooperation between the management engineering teams and Occupational Analysis should produce improvements in the products of both. The possiblility of recovering the work history of individuals by means of Functional Account Codes should be thoroughly explored.

The question arises as to whether or not plans for introduction of special experience identifiers into airman records might not do the same job as obtaining work history from the Functional Account Code. Such could very well be the case, but it begs the point that there are many thousands of experienced personnel now in the Air Force about whom we need more information concerning their work history. No new system can provide information that has been lost. The hope that some of this information is recoverable should encourage us to find out how much can be recovered and how large an effort would be required to do so. By addressing existing UAR files, especially to conjunction with the files of clustered jobs, it seems feasible to measure the wealth of the stored records.

REFERENCE

McFarland, B.P. *Potential uses of occupational analysis data by Air Force Management Engineering Teams.* AFHRL-TR-74-54, AD A000 047. Lackland AFB, Tex.: Occupational Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, July 1974.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1975-671-602/8028