MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITY

QUANTICO, VA

Kabar Cohort 4, Team 4

Capstone Project

Marine Corps Intelligence Activity
Military and Civilian Interaction

By:
Captain John P. Brown, USMC
Mrs. Christina Clark
Mr. Jorge Miranda
Mr. Neri G.Terry, Jr.

Capstone Advisors:
Dr. Susmita Murphy, PhD
Ms. Katy Stucky

June 2011

Table of Contents

Introduction

Methodology

Discussion
-The Origins of Civilians at MCIA
-Breakdown of Survey Respondents and Results
-Key Differences: Culture and Commonality

CI/Humint / PAC Comparison

Recommendations

Conclusions

Appendix A: Ka-Bar Civilian Military Environmental Survey

Introduction

For some years, the perception of intra-workforce tension, particularly between military and civilian personnel, has pervaded MCIA. Recently, during the fourth iteration of the Kabar Leadership Training Program, Marine Corps Intelligence Seniors requested that a group of four mid-level managers examine the professional interaction between its military and civilian personnel - this request is itself a tacit acknowledgement of that perception. This paper is the result of that group's efforts. Its purpose is to examine and confirm if friction exists between the Marine Corps Intelligence Activity's (MCIA) military and civilian workforces. Furthermore, this paper will provide evidence (or lack there of) of friction , research its cause, and provide recommendations to reduce or eliminate it.

Although MCIA has existed for over 20 years, it is imperative at this juncture in its history to take a hard look at workforce interaction. The implementation of the Marine Corps Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Enterprise (MCISR-E) combined with shrinking budgets across the federal government necessitates that the command fully understand the differences in workforce attitudes, dynamics, and how these differences impact the command's ability to efficiently and effectively achieve mission accomplishment.

The issues at hand are complex and this paper was prepared in a matter of weeks. As such, the group acknowledges that this examination has merely scratched the surface of the issues discussed herein. However, their efforts have provided confirmation that something is amiss and

provide at least preliminary recommendations to begin friction reduction. It is expected that further research should be made into this issue.

Methodology

Three basic techniques were used to obtain information for the preparation of this paper. First, the members of the group conducted informal interviews with various civilian and military personnel. The information and insight gained through the interviews was invaluable as the contributing individuals were predominantly senior leaders with years of experience in the Marine Corps, Intelligence Community (IC), and the command itself. These interviews will not be provided in specific content here but helped give direction to the group and helped focus its efforts. These interviews, combined with the groups' collective experience, were the primary source material for the discussion of key differences between Military and Civilian employees' culture and mindsets.

Secondly, the group conducted a comparison of two different MCIA companies with different demographics and organization: the Production and Analysis Company (PAC) and Counter Intelligence / Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Company (CI/HC).

Third, the group developed and distributed a survey to MCIA members via a web service. This instrument resulted in a significant amount of written comments. The statistical results of the survey are given in Appendix A along with a summation of trends that appeared in the written answers.

Discussion

The Origins of Civilians at MCIA

For Marines coming out of the Fleet Marine Force (FMF) and joining MCIA for the first time, the prevalence and influence of civilians within the command may seem unusual. The following is a brief description of the creation of the command and its manpower sourcing. This has been provided to create a common understanding for discussion.

MCIA was created in 1987 with funds from the General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP). The purpose for MCIA was to fill a gap between the FMF and the IC, as these entities were not capable of meeting the Marine Corps' intelligence needs at the theater and service level. Below are some examples of functions and responsibilities assigned to MCIA by the Commandant of the Marine Corps:

- Provide intelligence support to the full range of Marine Corps activities, with emphasis on threat support to the acquisition process.

- Expanded HUMINT capabailities to support expeditionary activities to include case officers, technical support specialists, linguists and area specialists.

- Provide improved scientific and technical intelligence support.

At the time of its inception, MCIA was led by a Military Director (although at one point the Director billet was handed to a civilian for approximately six years) and employed a workforce that was a mixture of Marines and Civilian personnel. In this way, the workforce structure of today's command is very similar to the way it was in 1987. In fact, in the twenty-plus years since the command was established, the reasons for employing Civilian personnel are relatively

unchanged. In terms of today's daily work force at MCIA, Civilians (both Marine Civilians and contractors) account for approximately (63%) of the work force.

Today as in the past, the benefit of utilizing civilians guarantees a sense of longevity and continuity within the command, vice the regular three-year rotations of active duty military personnel. This continuity is also beneficial from an analytic perspective; civilians can specialize in areas that require strategic vision and subject matter expertise while active duty personnel provide perspective to current operations and tactical problem sets. It is feasible for Marines to develop the same level of area-specific knowledge as their Marine Civilian coworkers, but this is the exception and not the norm given the rate of turnover of military personnel. Another important reason for utilizing civilians at MCIA is funding. Simply put, utilizing civilians as a portion of the workforce is cost effective. Through the use of Civilians, the command gains access to funded billets that are paid for by other elements of the IC. Finally, and in line with the first example, civilian personnel possess unique educational backgrounds, skills, knowledge, and experiences that would be difficult to replicate through the Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) schools and standard Marine career progression. Examples of this include sociologists, engineers, researchers, librarians, graphic and web design specialists, and many others.

Breakdown of Survey Respondents and Results

Based on the survey instrument, the workforce categorized itself into three distinct groups based upon background and experience. The first is active duty Marines (35% of respondents), both officer and enlisted. The remaining civilian respondents can be further characterized based upon previous military experience or the absence thereof - DoD civilians with military experience comprised (32%) of the respondents, and the remaining Marine Civilians, (26%), described themselves as not having prior military service before joining the command.

Overall, the survey results were encouraging. With regards to an initial orientation upon arriving at the command, (67%) said that they believed their training was either very adequate or adequate. In terms of training specific to their roles/position, (53%) believed that their initial training was either very adequate or adequate. With regards to specific training relating to working with Civilian personnel, (60%) said that their training was either very adequate or adequate.[1] However, statistics also supported that an underlying tension does exist between military civilian personnel. Nearly one out of every two responses received indicated this. Furthermore, in breaking down individual comments, specific trends appeared that may need to be addressed. First, many believed that Civilians were under appreciated by their Marine coworkers. Secondly, many believed that there had not been sufficient training to dealing with the opposite demographic (i.e. Military or Civilian) within the workforce (this directly contradicts the statistics already provided). Lastly many felt that the perceived friction was a result of separate chains of command for both Marines and Civilians. In trying to answer what the source of this friction was, and more importantly - whether or not it is significant, the group

---

[1] A flaw in this data is that large groups of the respondents have had specific training in either Marine or Civilian issues (i.e. FITREPS and DCIPS). However, what the survey did not uncover is whether or not opposite is true (i.e. have military personnel received specific training on managing civilians and vice a versa)

was led time and again to the issue of culture which will be discussed further and illustrated with a comparison between two companies within MCIA.

Key Differences: Culture and Commonality

As will be discussed in the comparison between the PAC and CI/HC, a key difference between the two is the number of civilians with no military experience[2] in PAC as compared to CI/HC. This is critical because it gives the later a culture and training background that is more traditionally military in nature than the former. Personnel from military backgrounds, vice those who have no military experience, have a distinct culture, mindset, and range of experiences through which they view organizational authority, leadership techniques, communications, and time. The same is true for those without military experience. These differences have been perfunctorily acknowledged – for example the request for this paper – but not sufficiently understood. If not understood, these different perspectives, can impair fulfillment of the commander's intent and mission accomplishment.   Only a thorough understanding and open discussion of the two demographic differences can cause members at all levels to be more self-aware in how they present issues and interact with various elements of the workforce.

Culture is critical in determining how well personnel interact. Culture, whether it is religious, national, or in the case of this paper, organizational, is built around commonality. *Culture can be defined as*, "T*he customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group;* also*: the characteristic features of everyday existence shared by people in a place or time,"* or, *"the set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterizes an*

---

[2] In the Survey instrument, 26% of the respondents reported themselves as civilians without military experience.

institution or organization."[3]. Regardless of which definition is used to define culture, the theme of commonality comes through in words such as, "customary", "characteristic", and "shared."

In the sense of an organization such as Marine Corps Intelligence Activity, it is important to understand the particular culture(s) that exist within the work force because each will have it's own language (i.e. vernacular or jargon), defining behaviors, or values. The application of this understanding can foster better communication and ultimately mission accomplishment within the organization.

The culture of the Active Duty Marines, and Marine Corps as a whole, is uncommonly homogenous. This is due in large part to the comparatively small size of the Marine Corps when compared to the likes of the Army, Navy, or Air Force. This small size creates in and of itself a commonality of experience. For example, all Marines attend the same style of boot camp, whether it be at Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island or San Diego. Additionally, there are relatively few duty stations within the Marine Corps with the largest concentrations of Marines being stationed in either South Eastern North Carolina (Camp Lejeune), Southern California (Camp Pendleton and 29 Palms), or Okinawa.

However, in addition to the commonality that is a result of size and location, the Marine Corps makes a significant investment to build a common ethos through shared experiences. It is regularly said that, "Every Marine is a rifleman," because each Marine has received an entry level course in platoon and squad level infantry tactics. This experience and ethos focuses every

---

[3] *http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/culture*.

Marine to subordinate themselves to the common goal of supporting the deployed Marine in combat. As a Marine fighter pilot once said, "I'm a Marine rifleman temporarily flying an F-8 Crusader." In fact, in the defense of Wake Island, once their Wildcat fighters were put out of action, the Marine fighter pilots naturally took up the rifle and continued the fight – as they had been trained. Another common experience that is celebrated annually is the Marine Corps Birthday Ball with its standard ceremony and traditions. While there are many more examples, these examples more than any other contribute to the Marine Corps' unique culture or ethos.

The 02xx family of MOS's, Intelligence Marines, share these experiences with each other as well as several others. Because the field is so small, most Marines have come from the same units, schools, and know each other over the course of a career in the MOS field. Additionally, given that these Marines come through the same MOS's and units, most have had the opportunity to serve together in Iraq or Afghanistan - a bonding experience in and of itself.

In talking with the Marines at the command in the development of this paper, many said that they prefer to work with other Marines because their fellow Marines, "Get *it*." The group submits that "It" in this instance means that the Marines all subscribe to basic cultural tenets such as the Marine in the field is the top priority, unity of effort, unity of command, and mission accomplishment. As a result, the Marines work very well amongst themselves.

In sharp contrast to the Marine Work force, the civilian work force is as diverse as it is numerous. This is by design - it would do no good for an organization with a global focus, in this instance the Marine Corps, to build an intelligence organization where every analyst was an

Africa subject matter expert. the same could be said for the Middle Eastern analysts, etc. Additionally, there is no single feeding entity like a boot camp. Most of the civilian personnel attended various collegiate-level institutions. They then come to the command via different roads either as career civil servants coming from another agency within the IC, academics, or as functional area experts. With this diversity comes other differences such as generational differences. Civilian personal can range from individuals in their mid-twenties to early sixties. By contrast, the majority of Marines are senior NCOs, SNCOs, and company grade officers in their late twenties and thirties. Thus, when asked to describe the common culture of the civilian work force it is not possible. There isn't one. Simply put, the culture of the work force is diversity. Yet have no doubt, this diverse group of uniquely talented personnel bring great opportunity to MCIA if fully integrated. The challenge as identified in the Survey instrument is to eliminate the sense by many civilians that their contributions and roles are ignored or unappreciated – while culturally empowering them with the same ethos of the Marine Rifleman that Marines have.

The comparison and contrast of two MCIA companies –

Production and Analysis Company (PAC) and Counter Intelligence / Human Intelligence

Company (CI/HC)

This portion will focus on CI/HC, and why it is considered a more efficient entity as stated by senior leaders during interviews. Furthermore, this comparison specifically highlights the areas of leadership, common skillsets, and generational commonalities.

From the very beginning, CI/HC has been led by military personnel and supported by civilian employees and other active duty personnel. The Company Commander is usually an Intelligence Officer (0202), or more rarely a HUMINT Officer (0204) – most come from the 0202 community. At the branch level, (Technical Support Branch [TSB], Counterintelligence Branch [CIB], CI/H Management Branch [CHMB], and Operations and Support Branch [OSB]) the military lead is similar, except within OSB where it always a HUMINT Officer (0204). Additionally, most officers (0202 or 0204(s)) that join CI/HC have little to no previous CI/H experience at the service-level. On the other hand, the deputies are all retired CI/H personnel (0211 and 0210), with many years of experience at various levels within community. In essence, this places the organizational authority on Military personnel while leaving the details of the skillset or functions to the civilian deputy who consequently plays the role of a subject matter expert (SME) and mentor. The two become a team based on mutual respect for one another's role, unity of effort becomes seamless. Both have a common cultural background and the CI/HC civilians know what they are getting into when they joined.

CI/HC benefits, with minor exceptions, from a military and civilian workforce that shares a common background in regards to the prevailing skillset, or occupational field. Both sides have been trained at the same basic MOS schools; the same is true with sustainment and advance training. Only levels of experience separate the military from the civilians. This common background bonds Military and Civilian personnel that work in CI/HC, thus creating a belief in the same vision and goals. This also plays a key role in day-to-day interaction between both groups.

As stated previously, the civilian workforce at CI/H is %99.9 retired Marines. This is instrumental in the interaction between military and civilian personnel for the following reasons: CI/HC civilian employees understand (and demonstrate) the military mindset better than those with little to no military experience found in the PAC; they also held high leadership positions while in uniform so they fully understand the concept of a chain of command; and finally, they are much more settled in their life and career goals due to retirement, which makes for a stabilized workforce with minimized turn-over.

Some would consider all of the above to be a homogenized environment that suffers from 'group thinking'. However, this environment is balanced by the oversight of a CI/H company commander with fresh eyes that scrutinizes and asks all the hard questions until it meets the 'outsider' smell test. Having this 'outsider' at the highest position of CI/HC forces military and civilian personnel to fit its activities well within the Marine Corps' model and business practice. The CI/HC career civilians with their military background professionally recognize they must subordinate themselves in support of their 'visiting' company commander, mentoring him or her on the CI/HC's historic rules and practices, while taking advantage of this 'outsider's' professional leadership experience and training. The effective company commander in turn will understand he must be sensitive to the long-term effects of his 'visiting' decisions and take counsel of these mentors. It is an effective implementation of institutional checks and balances.

Matrix 1 is presented to fully depict the above.

	Production & Analysis (PAC) Company	CI/HUMINT Company
LEAD	Military	Military
DEPUTY	Civilian	Civilian
Subordinate Unit Leaders	Civilian	Military
SKILLS	Analysis Directorate, Weapons & Technology, Quality Control & Dissemination, Geospatial Intelligence Directorate	0211
AVERAGE AGE	Both young and retired.	Retired

Matrix-1 depicting PAC and CI/HC organizational culture.

An analysis of the PAC is a perfect contrast to the CI/HC in almost all of the areas discussed in the previous section: skill sets, leadership, and background such as no military experience. In terms of training and skill sets, the PAC is incredibly diverse. Under this section of the command are a variety of disciplines like imagery, geospatial, all-source, open source, and country-specific analysts. Given this variety of skill sets and disciplines it isn't possible for each of these to have the same background, same mindset like the personnel in CI/HC do.

The senior leadership (by this we mean Directors and Deputy Directors) within the PAC is predominantly career MCIA civilians. The obvious exception to this the Company Commander,

an 0202 Lieutenant Colonel. Beneath him, each of the units under the PAC (Analysis

Directorate, Geospatial Intelligence Directorate, Weapons and Technology, and Quality and

Dissemination) is under the purview of a civilian director, generally a career MCIA GG14 or 15.

Additionally, there is no standardization in terms of who functions as deputies within each

directorate. The Analysis Directorate is the only branch that employs an active duty military

member as the deputy (a Major), whereas Weapons and Technology's deputy is another civilian,

the Geospatial Intelligence Directorate does not have a deputy at all.

Regardless of perspective, a variety of issues can be found with this construct. First and

foremost, the leadership is out of balance given that the PAC has the preponderance of military

personnel within the command. Furthermore, senior NCOs, SNCOs, and company grade officers

assigned to the PAC are typically used to filling leadership billets. Instead of leadership

positions or responsibility befitting their rank, these Marines are often utilized in very nebulous

capacities as "team leads" or "military deputies" - titles that convey little in terms of

responsibility and come with even less organizational authority. In some instances, military

personnel were expected to manage the day to day output of civilian personnel with their

"teams" or "directorates" but weren't given the authority to administratively review that

individual's performance. These reviews were handled by civilian branch heads; who also write

on the military senior military personnel.

This lack of balance immediately places strain on the chain of command and traditional rank

relationships. In the best case scenario, a large aspect of the work force is feeling under-utilized,

personnel are being undermined in either rank or position. Take for an example the common

conundrum of who works for whom. Who is a junior Marine going to listen to in most instances, a GG14 or the Captain? Whether correct or not, more often than not, that SNCO or NCO is going to listen to the direction of an appointed officer, as they've been trained to do. It's a testament to the professionalism of both the Civilians and Marines at MCIA that turf wars such as this don't arise more often. However, in order to avoid such conflicts most personnel in the PAC utilize work around techniques other than the chain of command or are reluctant to give or enforce clear direction. Thus at the end of the day, many people are left wondering, who is really in charge? Feedback from the Survey instrument offers a reoccurring theme of two chains of command or communications and the operational friction these bring.

Recommendations

Based on analysis of the survey results and dialogue with numerous individuals, the following

recommendations are provided. These recommendations by no means constitute all that must be

accomplished to eliminate military civilian friction, but do represent a beginning.

1. *Implement command focus groups to address current organizational structure and processes.*

The command should continue to routinely execute these surveys and take the pulse of the

organization. A balance is required as too many and they will be seen as a nettlesome burden.

Too few and opportunities will be missed. At the completion of this effort, the command should

ensure that it thanks the participants for taking the time to assist with this effort. The 236

voluntary written comments in this survey are really an astounding demonstration that MCIA

employees are interested in the welfare of their organization, and that it can be improved. As

one Kabar member put it, "You can't buy that with money."

2. In*stitute a training coordinator or workforce development branch to enable a significant*

investment in onboarding acculturation and long-term professional training for both Marines

and civilians.

Discussions with MCIA employees and the Survey instrument made it apparent that Marines

who hold MCIA leadership billets must be "re-Battle Sight Zeroed" (BZO) on how to lead in a

civilian workplace. It takes two to tango. We owe it to the Marines and our civilian workforce.

Conversations readily brought out that Marine leaders do not have sufficient indoctrination to

subjects such as DCIPS, SF-180s, and SLACADA. This needs to be rectified as soon as they

walk in the door of the command. Additionally, Marine leaders must learn to lead in the civilian

environment and an excellent road to that is the Kabar Leadership Program. To the greatest

extent possilbe, it should be emphasized of Marines leading civilians at MCIA. Finally, Marine

leaders must understand that unlike the FMF, the decisions they make have a lasting impact on

the civilians they leave behind. Marines visit the MCIA civilian's 'home' for (at most) three

years, a passing moment in the civilian's decades of service they may spend there. Today we

have Marines arriving to lead at MCIA that were not yet born when the MCIA plank holders

stepped aboard.

For civilians to effectively integrate into the MCIA culture we must invest in them our Marine

Corps culture. At junior positions this can be readily accomplished through TBS events, MIOC,

FMF FTX S-2 augments, and MEU S-2 augments. Professional training in their particular

disciplines must also be accounted for. As has been effectively demonstrated through Kabar,

such training can generally be accomplished with little negative impact on the primary duties if

accomplished in short doses.

3. *Work to emphasize a common vision/mission and chain of command for all personnel.*

The Survey continually noted comments about this issue and the need for better communication.

Additionally, more can be done to better integrate Marines or civilians within the chain of

command. There needs to be one line of communications where Marines and civilians must be

fully integrated as a unit. Like it or not, a Marine way work for a civilian for a period of time, or

vice a versa. As such, those who have utilized "work arounds" within the chain of command

(i.e. going directly to a Chief of Staff) can not be tolerated.

4. *Flatten the organization.* The Survey instrument <u>found no indication of significant work place</u> <u>friction at the lower levels</u>, but did identify it at the senior management levels. Left in a position of authority too long, the ambitious career bureaucrat will seek to expand their program with insufficient regard for the Marine Corps enterprise. To allay this and provide leadership experience for those in uniform, in any given shop, Marines should generally occupy senior billets with supporting civilian deputies. The advantage to this is the scheduled turn-over that brings in fresh eyes and ideas. The civilian deputy must learn through acculturation that it is their duty to mentor and provide their Marine leader the benefit of their continuity. The Marine leaders must be held accountable that they are sensitive to this relationship while leading the organization through change – and change will be continuous by force of nature. To be a successful civilian senior manager in MCIA will require an ethos of subordinating themselves to the greater good. Just because you do not have the title of Director or Branch Head does not mean you do not have leadership influence or receive comparable pay. Making this happen for both Marine leaders and senior civilian managers will require the acculturation discussed above. The Survey also continually heard calls for issuance of clear, consistent mission guidance.

5. *Increase social activities.* Without personal interaction at many levels, no organization can maximize the many talents such as those found in MCIA. The Survey instrument noted a surprisingly large number of calls for increase social activities. These included events such as command picnics, athletics (intramural teams?), and particularly battlefield staff rides.

Conclusions

There is friction in the MCIA Marine and Civilian leadership interaction. The source of this friction is rooted in the different cultures of Active Duty Marines and Marine Civilians, as well as organizational structures that have become blurred and lack clear lines of authority between individuals at various levels. Disruption and friction can be good in an organization as they can help to move change forward, but evidence in the Survey instrument points to unproductive friction at MCIA. The very good news is it can be resolved as just another obstacle between MCIA progressing from a good intelligence organization to an excellent intelligence organization. MCIA has some great leaders at all levels, and the lessons from this analysis points to room for improvement and input from the rank and file on how to accomplish this.

Appendix A:

Ka-Bar Civilian Military Environmental Survey.

This twenty question instrument was developed by Team 4 members and delivered and collected via the web. A tabulation of results is available with original written comments at Appendix A. There were 165 individuals who responded to this survey.

Question 1. Select the choice that best describes you.

Active duty military	35%
DoD Marine Civilian	26%
DoD Marine Civilian with previous military experience.	32%
Reservist	1%
Contractor	5%

Question 2. My current pay grade can be best described as…

E-1 – E9	22%
O1 – 010	13%
Pay Band 1 (GS 01 – 08)	0%
Pay Band 2 (GS 09 – 13)	24%
Pay Band 3 (GS 14 – 15)	32%

NA	8%

Question 3. In my capacity I manage…

Only military personnel	10%
Only civilian personnel	5%
Both military and civilian	33%
NA	53%

Question 4. My current supervisor is…

Military	45%
Civilian	55%
NA	0.6%

Question 5. I am responsible for writing…

FITREPs only	7%
DCIPS	19%
Both FITREPS and DCIPS	15%
NA	59%

Question 6. I would describe my working relationship with my boss as…

Very good	58%
Good	27%
Poor	3%
Very poor	2%
Workable	8%
Not answered	0%

Question 7. I would describe my working relationship with my subordinates as…

Very good	58%
Good	34%
Poor	2%
Very poor	0%
Workable	5%
Not answered	2%

Question 8. When I arrived at the command my overall orientation to the command was…

Very adequate	15%
Adequate	52%
Inadequate	30%
None of the above	4%

Question 9. When I arrived at the command I felt that the level of my initial training pertaining to my position I received with regards to my job was…

Very adequate	8%
Adequate	47%
Inadequate	36%
None of the above	8%

Not answered	1%

Question 10. When I arrived at the command, I felt the training I had in working with civilian personnel was:

Very adequate	13%
Adequate	47%
Inadequate	24%
None of the above	16%

Question 11. Do you feel the current structure of the organization impedes or facilitates the interaction between civilian and military personnel?

Impedes	38%
Facilitates	62%
Not answered	0.6%

Question 12.   With your knowledge of the current mission, do you feel the organization impedes or facilitates the interaction between civilian and military personnel?

Yes	33%
No	66%

Question 13. Do you feel you know how your work relates to the organizations goals and priorities?

Yes	83%
No	17%

Question 14. Do your managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization?

Yes	64%
No	35%

Question 15. Do you feel personal empowerment with respect to work processes?

Yes	53%
No	47%

Question 16. Are you satisfied with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?

Yes	58%
No	42%

Question 17. My supervisor/manager provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my

job performance.

Yes	73%
No	27%

Question 18. I believe there is friction between military and civilian personnel within the

organization.

Yes	45%
No	55%

See below an analysis of the three opportunities for comments which can be read in Appendix A.

Question 18. I believe there is friction between military and civilian personnel within the organization.

Yes: 45%   No: 55%   There were 61 comments from a possible 165 participants (**37% contributed written comments**).

<div align="center">Culling Significant Trends From The Comments.</div>

Below are apparent, subjective categories or bins the responses were classified into for analytical purposes. Each response could fall into more than one bin and some responses could not be categorized:

A	Nothing to report, NA, Not a problem, NSTR, etc	3
B	"I'll just wait out the CO (my Marine supervisor)."	5
C	Civilians feel their roles are ignored / unappreciated. ("This is my home.")(Includes DCIPS issues, which ties into culture training.)	12

D	Marines feel ignored / unappreciated.	7
E	Conflict is individual personality (a few bad apples) driven vice the institution.	3
F	Segregation issues between military/civilian, operates in segregated fashion. In sufficient mixing.	1
G	Because of organizational structure (two chains of command, and may relate to communications).	6
I	Because of poor management.	2
J	Civilian empire building and agendas. Flatten the organization.	2
K	Need better training / acculturation (both for Marines dealing with civilian workforce and for civilians about the Marine Corps).	10
L	Reduce layers of management.	1
M	Friction is at higher management/organization level.	7
N	Friction is at lower organization level.	0
P	Need more social interaction such as command picnics, athletic events (intramurals?), and particularly the value of battlefield staff rides.	2
Q	Need for better guidance / clear communications. (See item F & G above)	6
R	High end mission conflicts (DIAP vs tactical)	4

Question 19. In your opinion, what has helped military and civilian personnel interaction in the past?

There were 90 comments from a possible 165 participants

(**54% contributed written comments**).

Culling Significant Trends From The Comments.

Below are apparent, subjective categories or bins the responses were classified into for analytical purposes. Each response could fall into more than one bin and some responses could not be categorized:

A	Nothing to report, NA, Not a problem, NSTR, etc	2

B	"I'll just wait out the CO (my Marine supervisor)."	1
C	Civilians feel their roles are ignored / unappreciated. ("This is my home.")(Includes DCIPS issues, which ties into culture training.)	4
D	Marines feel ignored / unappreciated.	2
E	Conflict is individual personality (a few bad apples) driven vice the institution.	1
F	Segregation issues between military/civilian, operates in segregated fashion. In sufficient mixing.	18
G	Because of organizational structure (two chains of command, and may relate to communications).	5
I	Because of poor management.	0
J	Civilian empire building and agendas. Flatten the organization.	4
K	Need better training / acculturation (both for Marines dealing with civilian workforce and for civilians about the Marine Corps).	15
L	Reduce layers of management.	0
M	Friction is at higher management/organization level.	2
N	Friction is at lower organization level.	0
P	Need more social interaction such as command picnics, athletic events (intramurals?), and particularly the value of battlefield staff rides.	3
Q	Need for better guidance / clear communications. (See item F & G above)	13
R	High end mission conflicts (DIAP vs tactical)	3

Question 20. With regards to improving the civilian/military working environment of the command, if I was CO for a day, I would…?

There were 92 comments from a possible 165 participants

(**55% contributed written comments**).

Culling Significant Trends From The Comments.

Below are apparent, subjective categories or bins the responses were classified into for analytical purposes. Each response could fall into more than one bin and some responses could not be categorized:

A	Nothing to report, NA, Not a problem, NSTR, etc	3
B	"I'll just wait out the CO (my Marine supervisor)."	2
C	Civilians feel their roles are ignored / unappreciated. ("This is my home.")(Includes DCIPS issues, which ties into culture training.)	3
D	Marines feel ignored / unappreciated.	0
E	Conflict is individual personality (a few bad apples) driven vice the institution.	1
F	Segregation issues between military/civilian, operates in segregated fashion. In sufficient mixing.	1
G	Because of organizational structure (two chains of command, and may relate to communications).	1
I	Because of poor management.	0
J	Civilian empire building and agendas. Flatten the organization.	3
K	Need better training / acculturation (both for Marines dealing with civilian workforce and for civilians about the Marine Corps).	11
L	Reduce layers of management.	3
M	Friction is at higher management/organization level.	2
N	Friction is at lower organization level.	0
P	Need more social interaction such as command picnics, athletic events (intramurals?), and particularly the value of battlefield staff rides.	11
Q	Need for better guidance / clear communications. (See item F & G above)	7
R	High end mission conflicts (DIAP vs tactical)	4

Overall General Trends from Questions 18, 19, and 20

There were a total of 236 voluntary written comments from a possible 165 participants. Clearly a sizable portion of the population validates there are frictional issues given the number of comments.

Culling Significant Trends From The Comments.

Below are apparent, subjective categories or bins the responses were classified into for analytical purposes. Each response could fall into more than one bin and some responses could not be categorized:

		Question number: 18	19	20
A	Nothing to report, NA, Not a problem, NSTR, etc	3	2	3
B	"I'll just wait out the CO (my Marine supervisor)."	5	1	2
C	Civilians feel their roles are ignored / unappreciated. ("This is my home.")(Includes DCIPS issues, which ties into culture training.)	12	4	3
D	Marines feel ignored / unappreciated.	7	2	0
E	Conflict is individual personality (a few bad apples) driven vice the institution.	3	1	1
F	Segregation issues between military/civilian, operates in segregated fashion. In sufficient mixing.	1	18	1
G	Because of organizational structure (two chains of command, and may relate to communications).	6	5	1
I	Because of poor management.	2	0	0
J	Civilian empire building and agendas. Flatten the organization.	2	4	3
K	Need better training / acculturation (both for Marines dealing with civilian workforce and for civilians about the Marine Corps).	10	15	11
L	Reduce layers of management.	1	0	3
M	Friction is at higher management/organization level.	7	2	2
N	Friction is at lower organization level.	0	0	0
P	Need more social interaction such as command picnics, athletic events (intramurals?), and particularly the value of battlefield staff rides.	2	3	11
Q	Need for better guidance / clear communications. (See item F & G above)	6	13	7
R	High end mission conflicts (DIAP vs tactical)	4	3	4