

# Non-Citizens in Today's Military: Final Report

Anita U. Hattiangadi • Aline O. Quester  
Gary Lee, SgtMaj, USMC (Ret.) • Diana S. Lien  
Ian D. MacLeod

with


David L. Reese • Robert W. Shuford



4825 Mark Center Drive • Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1850

Approved for distribution:

April 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Henry S. Griffis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H'.

Henry S. Griffis, Director  
Workforce, Education and Training Team  
Resource Analysis Division

This document represents the best opinion of CNA at the time of issue.  
It does not necessarily represent the opinion of the Department of the Navy.

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. Specific authority: N00014-00-D-0700.  
For copies of this document call: CNA Document Control and Distribution Section at 703-824-2123.

# Contents

<b>Executive summary</b> . . . . .	1
<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	5
<b>Characteristics of the non-citizen population</b> . . . . .	9
Citizenship categories and eligibility for military service. . .	10
Characteristics of non-citizens of “recruitable age” (18 to 24) . . . . .	11
Total number . . . . .	11
Share with Legal Permanent Residency . . . . .	11
Geographic distribution . . . . .	11
Educational attainment. . . . .	13
Country of origin . . . . .	14
English language ability . . . . .	17
Trends in the non-citizen population . . . . .	18
Non-citizens in the military . . . . .	19
Non-citizen accessions . . . . .	21
Number . . . . .	21
Educational attainment. . . . .	22
Birth country . . . . .	22
Race/ethnic distribution . . . . .	24
<b>Non-citizens: street to force.</b> . . . . .	27
Recruiting . . . . .	27
Proof of LPR status . . . . .	27
Background investigations . . . . .	28
Proof of education . . . . .	28
English proficiency . . . . .	29
New language initiatives . . . . .	31
Occupational restrictions. . . . .	32
Reenlistment standards. . . . .	34
Service preference . . . . .	35

<b>Naturalization of non-citizen servicemembers</b> . . . . .	37
Legal framework . . . . .	37
Background . . . . .	37
Recent changes . . . . .	38
Service handling of non-citizen applications . . . . .	39
Processing . . . . .	39
Policy . . . . .	40
Timing of application. . . . .	42
Possible problems with applications . . . . .	42
<b>Additional incentives to gaining citizenship</b> . . . . .	45
Special pays and bonuses for language proficiency . . . . .	45
Other incentives . . . . .	47
Benefits of citizenship beyond the military . . . . .	47
<b>Statistical analyses of success</b> . . . . .	51
Independent variables for attrition logit regressions. . . . .	52
Non-citizens . . . . .	52
Educational background . . . . .	53
High quality: Tier I and AFQT greater than 49th percentile. . . . .	53
DEP and DEP greater than or equal to (ge) 3 months . . . . .	54
Summer accession . . . . .	54
Accession waivers . . . . .	55
Marital/dependency status at accession . . . . .	55
Data for the analyses . . . . .	55
Results: 3-month attrition . . . . .	55
Overall 3-month attrition results. . . . .	56
Three-month attrition results by service. . . . .	59
Results: 36-month attrition. . . . .	62
36-month attrition results for logistic regressions. . . . .	63
36-month attrition results by service . . . . .	65
<b>Who acquires citizenship while in the military?</b> . . . . .	69
Data . . . . .	71
Characteristics of enlisted personnel who became citizens. . . . .	75
Likelihood of becoming a citizen while in the military . . . . .	76
Proxy of time-to-citizenship while in the military. . . . .	79

<b>Recommendations</b> . . . . .	83
<b>Conclusions</b> . . . . .	87
<b>Appendix A: More on policies and procedures for recruiting non-citizens</b> . . . . .	89
Verification of LPR status . . . . .	89
Background investigations . . . . .	91
Entrance National Agency Check (ENTNAC) . . . . .	91
National Agency Check/Local Agency Check/ Credit Check (NACLIC) . . . . .	91
Proof of education . . . . .	91
Air Force . . . . .	92
Army . . . . .	92
Marine Corps . . . . .	92
Navy . . . . .	93
Documentation . . . . .	93
English proficiency . . . . .	93
Waiver requirements . . . . .	94
Occupational restrictions . . . . .	96
<b>Appendix B: More on the Army Translator Aide (09L) pilot program</b> . . . . .	99
<b>Appendix C: Variable definitions</b> . . . . .	103
<b>Appendix D: Three-month attrition regressions</b> . . . . .	105
<b>Appendix E: Thirty-six-month attrition</b> . . . . .	111
<b>Appendix F: Non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military</b> . . . . .	113
<b>Appendix G: Time-to-citizenship regressions</b> . . . . .	115
<b>References</b> . . . . .	117
<b>List of figures</b> . . . . .	125
<b>List of tables</b> . . . . .	127



## Executive summary

Legal Permanent Residents (LPRs) are eligible to enlist in the military and have done so successfully since the Revolutionary War. In fact, roughly 35,000 non-citizens are serving in the active military, and about 8,000 enlist each year. As the military services continue to face a difficult recruiting environment, it is important to recognize the growth in the youth population due to immigration and the potential for success of non-citizen servicemembers.

Non-citizen servicemembers offer several benefits to the military. First, they are more diverse than citizen recruits—not just racially and ethnically, but also linguistically and culturally. This diversity is particularly valuable as the United States faces the challenges of the Global War on Terrorism. Second, we find that non-citizens do extremely well in the military. In fact, black, Asian and Pacific Islander (API), and Hispanic non-citizens have 3-month attrition rates that are 7 to 8 percentage points below those for white citizens. Furthermore, non-citizens have 36-month attrition rates that are 9 to 20 percentage points lower than the attrition rates of white citizens.

Since 9/11, several changes in policy and practice have taken place that may encourage more non-citizens to consider military service—for example, the executive order allowing non-citizens serving in the U.S. military to apply for expedited citizenship after only 1 day of active-duty service. The 2004 National Defense Authorization Act accomplished the following:

- Reduced the peacetime waiting period for U.S. citizenship application
- Allowed applicants to be granted emergency leave and priority government transportation to complete citizenship processing
- Eliminated all application fees for non-citizen servicemembers

- Allowed for the finalization of military citizenship applications to take place at U.S. consulates, embassies, and overseas U.S. military installations
- Gave special immigration preference to the immediate family of non-citizens awarded posthumous citizenship.

The military services and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) have worked together to streamline the citizenship application process for servicemembers. Also, the services have initiated several programs (such as the Army's Translator Aide (09L) pilot program) that might be particularly appealing to non-citizens.

Non-citizens who become citizens can reap other benefits from military service, such as the ability to apply for security clearances and to receive substantial bonuses for language skills. Having citizenship opens up a broader array of opportunities, including jobs, to servicemembers. Finally, naturalized servicemembers get other rights and privileges of U.S. citizenship, such as the right to vote, the automatic granting of citizenship to dependent children, the ability to sponsor family members living overseas, special naturalization or LPR preference for their immediate family, free entry and exit from the United States, and the ability to hold public office.

Many non-citizen servicemembers obtain their citizenship while in the military. In fact, we estimate that non-citizen recruits entering the Air Force, Navy, or Marine Corps from FY95 to FY02 had a 47-, 16-, or 33-percent chance, respectively, of having U.S. citizenship recorded in their personnel files by September 2003.

Although there have been great strides in making it simpler and more convenient to apply for citizenship while serving in the military, even more could be done to facilitate the process. Our recommendations include (a) providing military recruiters with information on what documents and information non-citizen recruits will need if they want to apply for citizenship while serving in the military and (b) developing materials for applicants or new recruits that explain eligibility for expedited citizenship, the benefits of filing for citizenship while in the military, and the benefits of attaining citizenship. We also



recommend investigating reasons for differences in service policies regarding non-citizens and publicizing the results of such a study.

Recommendations that may be beyond the purview of Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Accession Policy include (a) having the services commit to more structured installation-based assistance to help non-citizen servicemembers with their citizenship applications and (b) providing installation-based immigration assistance to the dependents of servicemembers.



# Introduction

In FY04, this country spent \$2.7 billion to recruit 182,000 active-duty enlisted servicemembers. One overlooked source of military manpower is immigrants and their families. In fact, much of the growth in the recruitment-eligible population will come from immigration.

The United States is a country of immigrants. Recent waves of immigration have made today's foreign-born population the largest in U.S. history—11.7 percent in 2003, up from 9.3 percent in 1995 [1, 2]. Immigrants will fuel much of the growth in the youth population. About a third of the world's population is under age 15, and the overwhelming majority lives in developing countries. Because this large bulge of future workers will have difficulty finding work in their native countries, many may emigrate—either alone or with young families. Of the 16 million foreign-born people who entered the United States between 1990 and 2002, almost a quarter were under age 21.

Most immigrants will not be U.S. citizens, but many will become Legal Permanent Residents. Between 1973 and 2002, an estimated 21.5 million people became LPRs.<sup>1</sup> In 2002, more than 1 million immigrants became LPRs in addition to 10.4 million people who were already LPRs.<sup>2</sup> Over two-thirds of them, 7.8 million, had been in the United States long enough to be eligible for naturalization.


LPRs are eligible to enlist in the Armed Forces; those with temporary resident status (e.g., for study, business, or pleasure), refugee status, or undocumented status are not eligible.<sup>3</sup> In addition, male LPRs age

1. About 8 million of them became citizens through naturalization or, in the case of children under 18, their parents' naturalization.
2. This estimate allows for emigration, mortality, and people who entered the country illegally and had their status converted to LPR. It also estimates the number of pre-1973 LPRs.
3. Citizenship requirements cannot be waived, and the services cannot sponsor a non-citizen for LPR status.

18 to 25 are required to register with the Selective Service. Citizenship is required, however, for virtually all appointments as a commissioned, warrant, or National Guard officer.<sup>4</sup> Many non-citizens view the military as a way to serve their adopted country while gaining useful skills. In fact, non-citizens have fought in the U.S. Armed Forces since the Revolutionary War.

Figure 1 shows the population of “recruitable age” (defined as those age 18 to 24) by citizenship status. Although most of these people are citizens, about 4.1 percent are LPRs—which translates into roughly 1.5 million potential recruits.

Figure 1. Population of “recruitable” age, by citizenship status<sup>a</sup>



a. These estimates were prepared by Dr. Jeffrey Passel, Urban Institute, Washington, DC. He takes full responsibility for the accuracy and validity of the estimates. The views expressed are those of CNA and should not be attributed to Dr. Passel, the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Average of 2000-2003 Current Population Survey.

Roughly 8,000 non-citizens enlist every year. The Navy accesses the highest percentage of non-citizens, followed closely by the Marine Corps and the Army. The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC)

4. Some medical officers and chaplains are not required to have citizenship. Requirements are found in Sections 532 and 591 of Title 10 and Section 313 of Title 32. In addition, some offer programs have additional requirements that must be met for officers whose immediate family members are non-citizens.

estimates that about 35,000 non-citizens currently serve in the active military, with an additional 12,000 serving in the Guard and Reserve.<sup>5</sup> In 2003, the four services had the following numbers of non-citizens:

- Navy—15,880 non-citizen Sailors
- Marine Corps—6,440 non-citizen Marines
- Army—5,596 non-citizen Soldiers
- Air Force—3,056 non-citizen Airmen [4].

There are several reasons why it is important to study non-citizens in the military at this time. First, although non-citizens constitute a relatively small share of accessions and the force, their proportion is expected to grow over time. In fact, much of the growth in the U.S. youth population over the next two decades will result from immigration. Second, the challenges facing the U.S. military in the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) suggest that the linguistic and cultural diversity non-citizens bring to the services are especially valuable. Third, many non-citizens are interested in expedited citizenship for servicemembers enacted in a post-9/11 executive order, further expanding the pool of potential recruits. In this environment, OSD and the military services need to be aware of opportunities and challenges they may face in recruiting non-citizens. Fourth, increased security concerns may restrict future job opportunities available to non-citizen recruits—potentially undermining even the best recruiter efforts. Finally, information on the performance of non-citizens in the military is important to evaluating their participation in the Armed Services.

---

5. A 2004 article alleged that there were over 16,000 servicemembers whose citizenship was listed as “unknown” [3]. The article caused considerable concern by concluding that, “That’s about one in 100 active-duty military members who might be U.S. citizens, legal immigrants—or just about anybody else.” When the services investigated this, they found that most of the “unknowns” in the Navy were officers—for whom citizenship is a requirement. In some cases, data entry had been incomplete. DMDC has been working to cleanse the database.



## Characteristics of the non-citizen population<sup>6</sup>

The 2000 census provides a profile of the U.S. non-citizen population.<sup>7</sup> However, neither the census nor large sample surveys provide data on non-citizens' resident status: Legal Permanent Residents (green card holders), refugee arrivals (who are eligible to apply for green cards), legal non-immigrants (temporary workers/students), and undocumented aliens.


Immigration researchers, therefore, must estimate the legal resident population. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security issued a set of estimates in May 2004 [5]. Between 1973 and 2002, an estimated 21.5 million people received LPR status. About 8 million of them became permanent citizens through naturalization or, in the case of children, the naturalization of their parents. An estimated 11.4 million people were LPRs in September 2002. (Over two-thirds of them had been in the U.S. long enough to be eligible for naturalization.)<sup>8</sup> Mexicans made up 27 percent of LPRs, followed distantly by people from the Philippines (5 percent), India, China, and the Dominican Republic (4 percent) [5].

New security measures may be affecting the number of green cards being processed and granted. A recent report found that the number of pending green card applications reached 6.2 million at the end of

- 
6. Dr. Martha Farnsworth Riche, former director of the U.S. Census Bureau, and Dr. Jeffrey Passell, Senior Researcher at the Urban Institute, contributed greatly to this section. We are grateful for their help, and we assume full responsibility for any errors.
  7. Unlike several other countries, the U.S. census tallies everyone who lives in the United States on the census day (the first of April in years ending in zero), not just citizens.
  8. This estimate allows for emigration, mortality, and people who entered the country illegally and had their status converted to LPR. It also estimates the number of pre-1973 LPRs.

FY03, and only 705,827 green cards were granted in FY03, down from 1.06 million in 2002 (see figure 2) [6].

Figure 2. Number of green cards issued<sup>a</sup>



a. Source: [5].

## Citizenship categories and eligibility for military service

Table 1 details the different citizenship status categories and whether people in those categories are eligible for military enlistments.

Table 1. Standard terminology on citizenship and immigration status

Citizen	Status	Eligible?	Description
Yes	Permanent	Yes	Native-born U.S. citizens
Yes	Permanent	Yes	Naturalized U.S. citizens
No	Permanent	Yes	LPRs (also called Legal Resident Aliens or green card holders)
No	Permanent	Yes	U.S. nationals (those from American Samoa and Swains Island)
No	Permanent	No	Refugees <sup>a</sup> (most adjust their status to LPR in 2-3 years)
No	Temporary	No	Non-immigrants or legal temporary residents (primarily temporary work visas or student visas)
			Includes foreign students, diplomats, intracompany transferees, au pairs, and "hi-tech" guest workers (H-1B visas)
No	Temporary	No	Undocumented (illegals)—visa overstayers, clandestine entrants, etc.

a. These are individuals admitted into the U.S. as refugees, parolees, or asylum seekers.



Note that service policy seems to govern the enlistment of dual U.S. citizens. For example, the Army does not allow the enlistment of dual U.S. citizens unless they declare citizenship for one country [7, p. 5]. The Air Force does allow dual U.S. citizens to enlist, but those who do not renounce their citizenship to the non-U.S. country are treated like non-citizens for classification purposes and are not eligible for clearances [8, p. 3].

## **Characteristics of non-citizens of “recruitable age” (18 to 24)**

### **Total number**

The census-based profile of the non-citizen population serves as a useful estimate of the number and characteristics of non-citizens in the recruitable pool. The 2000 census found 18.5 million non-citizens, amounting to 6.5 percent of the total population. Fully 2.9 million (15.6 percent) of them were age 18 to 24. More than half (57 percent) of these recruitable-age non-citizens were men. Thus, there were about 1.7 million male, non-citizen 18- to 24-year-olds in 2000.


### **Share with Legal Permanent Residency**

Using data from the Current Population Survey (CPS), Dr. Jeffrey Passel has produced detailed demographic estimates of the LPR population for the U.S. Census Bureau. Figure 3 shows the residency status of non-citizen 18- to 24-year-olds. As the figure shows, only a little over a third of the population of non-citizens of recruitable age are LPRs. That translates into about 1.5 million LPRs (or green card holders) age 18 to 24 whom the U.S. Armed Forces can potentially recruit. Currently, the military recruits only about 180,000 new recruits annually.

### **Geographic distribution**

Table 2 shows the geographic distribution of the LPR population age 18 to 24. The last column of the table reports the share of that population that holds at least a high school diploma.

Figure 3. Residency status of the non-citizen 18- to 24-year-old population<sup>a</sup>



a. These estimates were prepared by Dr. Jeffrey Passel, Urban Institute, Washington, DC. He takes full responsibility for the accuracy and validity of the estimates. The views expressed are those of CNA and should not be attributed to Dr. Passel, the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Average of 2000-2003 CPS.

Table 2. Geographic distribution of LPRs age 18 to 24<sup>a</sup>


State or region	Number	Percentage in	
		Region/state	Region with H.S. +
California	491,000	31.9	59.2
New York	212,000	13.8	64.0
Texas	151,000	9.8	52.4
Florida	94,000	6.1	66.2
Mountain States (MT, ID, WY, CO, NM, AZ, UT, and NV)	94,000	6.1	56.9
Illinois	93,000	6.0	57.1
South (NC, SC, GA, KY, TN, AL, MS, AR, LA, and OK)	72,000	4.7	58.9
New Jersey	69,000	4.5	76.5
Pacific States (WA, OR, AK, and HI)	63,000	4.1	59.2
Mid-Atlantic States	58,000	3.8	70.2
Upper Midwestern States (OH, IN, MI, and WI)	58,000	3.8	69.8
New England (ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, and CT)	55,000	3.6	66.1
Plains States (MN, IA, ND, SD, NE, and KS)	30,000	2.0	58.6
Total	1,540,000	100.0	61.2

a. Prepared by Dr. Jeffrey Passel, Urban Institute, Washington, DC. Average of 2000-2003 CPS.

## Educational attainment

Because LPRs are the largest non-citizen population eligible for recruitment, we primarily focus on them. But we also want to look at the entire non-citizen group since many could eventually become LPRs. Although 18- to 24-year-old non-citizens are slightly more likely to have completed high school than non-citizens as a whole, nearly half of them (48 percent, compared with 25 percent of all U.S. residents in that age group) have not, and, thus, are unlikely to be recruited.<sup>9</sup> About half of 18- to 24-year-old non-citizens are high-school graduates, and 28 percent of these young non-citizens have some post-high-school education (compared to 46 percent of all 18- to 24-year-olds). Young non-citizen women have slightly better educational attainment than young men; a third of non-citizen women aged 18 to 24 have some postsecondary education, compared with less than a fourth of the men that age (see figure 4).

Figure 4. Educational attainment of non-citizens age 18 to 24, by gender<sup>a</sup>




a. Prepared by Dr. Martha Farnsworth Riche, 2000 census, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1% tabulation.

9. DoD policy requires that no more than 10 percent of recruits be Tier II (generally test-based diploma holders, like GEDs) or Tier III (non-degree holders).

Limiting our analysis to LPRs reduces the share of 18- to 24-year-olds with less than a high school diploma and increases the share with more than a high school diploma (see figure 5). Only about a quarter of those with less than a high school diploma are currently enrolled in school. Thus, 330,000 18- to 24-year-old LPRs are still in high school, 340,000 18- to 24-year-old LPRs are high school graduates, and 537,000 have some schooling beyond high school.

Figure 5. Educational attainment of legal permanent residents age 18 to 24, by gender<sup>a</sup>



a. These estimates were prepared by Dr. Jeffrey Passel, Urban Institute, Washington, DC. He takes full responsibility for the accuracy and validity of the estimates. The views expressed are those of CNA and should not be attributed to Dr. Passel, the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Average of 2000-2003 CPS.

## Country of origin

Because of Mexico’s proximity to the United States and the differences in economic opportunities in the two countries, Mexico was the birth country of nearly half of non-citizens age 18 to 24 in 2000 (see table 3). Mexican non-citizens are disproportionately male and young adults. Young adults make up a smaller proportion of the population that comes from other regions, especially Europe. Non-citizens from “Other America,” however, the second major source of young adult non-citizens, also are disproportionately male and young.

Table 3. Number of non-citizens age 18 to 24 by region of origin<sup>a</sup>

Region	Number	Percent male	Percent all ages <sup>b</sup>
Mexico	1,407,040	61%	20%
Other America <sup>c</sup>	670,600	55%	15%
Asia	514,447	52%	13%
Europe	204,744	50%	10%
Africa	79,159	50%	14%
Oceania	14,132	52%	13%


a. Prepared by Dr. Martha Farnsworth Riche, 2000 census, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1%, tabulation.

b. This means, for example, that non-citizens age 18 to 24 constitute 20 percent of the entire non-citizen population from Mexico.

c. All countries of North and South America, with the exception of Mexico.

Looking at 18- to 24-year-old non-citizens' educational attainment by region of origin (figure 6) shows that the predominance of Mexicans accounts for the relatively low educational level of 18- to 24-year-old non-citizens. Over two-thirds of this most plentiful group of recruitable-age non-citizens has not completed high school—a basic prerequisite for a military career.

Figure 6. Educational attainment of non-citizens age 18 to 24 by region of origin<sup>a</sup>




a. Prepared by Dr. Martha Farnsworth Riche, 2000 census, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1% tabulation.

In contrast, 18- to 24-year-old non-citizens from Asia, Europe, Africa, and Oceania have relatively high educational levels. However, many of these non-citizens probably are in the United States to further their education, making them poor prospects for military recruiters.<sup>10</sup>

There are still, however, large numbers of well-educated young non-citizens whose legal status does qualify them for military service. Figure 7 shows educational attainment for LPRs age 18 to 24. This figure does not show Mexico separately but includes it in the Latin America/Caribbean group. Although over half of LPRs from this group have not completed high school, a large number of them—915,000 18- to 24-year-old LPRs in the Latin America/Caribbean group—have completed high school.

Figure 7. Educational attainment of LPRs (18-24) by region of origin<sup>a,b,c</sup>



- a. Prepared by Dr. Jeffrey Passel of the Urban Institute. Average of 2000-2003 CPS.  
 b. Europe includes all States of the former Soviet Union, including the Central Asian Republics; Canada includes "North America, not elsewhere classified"; "Asia/Middle East" includes only countries of continental Asia from Turkey in the west to Iran in the east (no Central Asian republics of the former Soviet Union); S. and E. Asia includes Asian countries from Afghanistan eastward; Latin America/Caribbean includes all countries south of the U.S.; "Other" is almost all unknown country of birth.  
 c. Total size of 18- to 24-year-old legal permanent resident populations by region of origin: S. & E. Asia = 294,000; Latin America/Caribbean = 915,000; Asia/Middle East = 38,000; Europe/Canada = 177,000; Africa/Oceania = 63,000; Other = 54,000.

**10. Non-citizens on student visas are not eligible for enlistment.**

## English language ability

The ability to speak English well or very well makes a non-citizen a more attractive recruiting prospect. In 2000, 1.8 million non-citizens age 18 to 24 either lived in an English-speaking household or reported that they spoke English well.

Non-citizens from Mexico, however, were more likely than others to lack English language ability—as were a large proportion of non-citizens from elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere (see table 4). Still, there are substantial numbers of Mexican immigrants in the 18-24 age group who speak English well.

Table 4. English language ability of non-citizens age 18 to 24<sup>a,b</sup>

Region	In English-speaking household	Speaks English well	Does not speak English well
Mexico	5%	37%	58%
Other America	18%	54%	28%
Asia	7%	82%	11%
Europe	18%	82%	9%
Africa	17%	75%	8%
Oceania	35%	60%	5%


a. Prepared by Martha Farnsworth Riche, 2000 census, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1%, tabulation.

b. The Ability to Speak English variable has a “not in universe” category that is “under 5” or answered no to “does this person speak a language other than English at home?” Since the age group for this profile is 18-24, we call the “not in universe” category “Speak English at home.” We combined the other categories: “very well” and “well” became “well”; “not well” and “not at all” became “not well.”

Combining English language ability and the military's basic educational requirement shows that, in 2000, nearly 45 percent of recruitable-age non-citizens from Mexico, along with 20 percent from other Western Hemisphere countries, did not speak English well **and** had not finished high school. In total, nearly 800,000 young non-citizens were doubly disadvantaged for military service, including small numbers (less than 5 percent) of young non-citizens from Asia, Europe, or Africa.

Although non-citizens of recruitable age are overwhelmingly from the Western Hemisphere (especially Mexico), the subgroup relevant to the military (with both high school graduation and English language ability) is more geographically varied. That said, however, there are still substantial numbers of non-citizens of recruitable age who are both high school graduates and fluent English speakers (see figure 8). In all, figure 8 shows that there are 1.1 million non-citizens who are of the appropriate educational level and English language ability to potentially be eligible for military service.

Figure 8. Non-citizens age 18 to 24, high school graduate or better and English language ability<sup>a</sup>



a. Prepared by Dr. Martha Farnsworth Riche, 2000 census, Public Use Microdata Sample, 1%, tabulation.

## Trends in the non-citizen population

The non-citizen population of recruitable age and educational quality is likely to grow. Today one in three of the world's citizens is under age 15, and 99 percent of them are in developing countries where finding employment for all of them may be difficult. Most people are reluctant to leave their countries, but the number of youth reaching working age is so large (given the population explosion of the latter



half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) that even the small percentage that emigrate will significantly increase the number of international migrants.<sup>11</sup>

In its current set of population projections, the U.S. Census Bureau has revised upward its assumptions about future immigration. In the past, the Bureau underestimated future immigration because it is difficult for an agency to assume that large numbers of people will enter the country illegally (i.e., that another agency will fail in its job). As a rule, economic conditions as well as fertility trends in the basic supply countries—Mexico and other hemispheric neighbors—will provide a guide to assessing the immigration outlook.

By the time people decide to emigrate, they often are older than normal recruiting age. Thus, much of the non-citizen population that recruiters can target will be the children of recent immigrants.

## **Non-citizens in the military**

Non-citizens have served in the U.S. military for much of our country's history, including the War of 1812, the Civil War, and both World Wars.<sup>12</sup> Almost half of Army enlistees in the 1840s were immigrants [10, p. 168], and more than 660,000 military veterans became citizens through naturalization between 1862 and 2000 [11]. We now examine the legal framework for the service of non-citizens and demographic characteristics of non-citizens currently serving in the military.

Sections 3253 and 8253 of Title 10 state that a person must be an American citizen or a lawful permanent resident to be eligible for enlistment in the regular Army or Air Force in peacetime.<sup>13</sup>

- 
11. Even though fertility rates have fallen in most developing countries in recent decades, the high rates that fueled the population explosion produced unprecedented numbers of parents. As individuals, these parents may be having fewer children than their parents did; as a group, however, they are having more children. Furthermore, fertility rates have remained high in Muslim countries and in much of Sub-Saharan Africa.
  12. Reference [9] contains a comprehensive history of non-citizens in the military.
  13. There is not an equivalent Title 10 statute limiting enlistment in the Navy and Marine Corps; in recruiting policy and practice, however, the same requirements are applied. Those in Guam, Puerto Rico, parts of the Canal Zone, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are U.S. citizens.

Citizenship is required, however, in all services for virtually all appointments as a commissioned officer, warrant officer, or National Guard officer.<sup>14</sup>

In addition, special legislation targeting the enlistment of non-citizens has periodically been enacted.<sup>15</sup> The Lodge Act of 1950 (and subsequent Acts in 1951, 1955, and 1957), for example, permitted non-citizen Eastern Europeans to enlist between 1950 and 1959.

Another example is the Navy's recruitment of Filipino nationals. The United States officially began recruiting Filipino nationals into the U.S. Navy in the late 1940s, when it signed the Military Bases Agreement of 1947 allowing U.S. military bases in the Philippines.<sup>16</sup> Changes in the agreement and policy capped the number of Filipino enlistments at 1,000 in 1952, 2,000 in 1954, and 400 from 1973 on. Navy policy restricted Filipinos to the steward and mess attendant ratings from WWII until 1973. In total, over 35,000 Filipinos enlisted in the Navy through the program between 1952 and 1991. The Navy stopped recruiting Filipino nationals and closed its recruiting facilities in the region in 1992 because of the end of the Military Bases Agreement, base closures, and force reduction measures [12].

Section 1426, Title 8 of the U.S. Code, allows an alien to be discharged from military service on the grounds that he or she is an alien. This person, however, is permanently ineligible for U.S. citizenship. When enlisting in the military, Marine Corps applicants must sign a statement that they understand this provision. Furthermore, they must confirm that "I understand that this does not grant me the

---

14. There are some limited exceptions. For example, chaplains and certain medical officers do not require citizenship. The requirements are found in Sections 532 and 591 of Title 10 and Section 313 of Title 32. For Reserve officer appointments, those who have previously served in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps also are eligible, even if they are not citizens or LPRs (Section 12201 of Title 10).

15. Reference [9] presents a full history of legislation of this type.

16. The Philippines gained independence in 1946, so the Navy could no longer recruit Sailors as it had when the Philippines was a U.S. colony. In fact, over 6,000 Filipinos served in the Navy during World War I and were allowed to serve in a range of ratings.


privilege or right to be discharged prior to completion of my enlistment” [13, pp. 3-29]. To see how much meaning this provision had, we examined Marine Corps separation records between 1990 and 2004, and found there was only one such separation.<sup>17</sup> This provision may be more relevant in times of a draft.

## Non-citizen accessions

### Number

The number of non-citizen accessions by service has been fairly stable since the late 1990s (see figure 9). As the largest service, the Army has the largest number of non-citizen accessions, followed closely by the Navy.

Figure 9. Number of non-citizen accessions, by service<sup>a</sup>




a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data.

When we examine non-citizens as a share of all accessions, the data tell a different story. As figure 10 shows, the Navy has the largest share

17. DoD separation codes do not have the fidelity required to make this determination for the other services.

of non-citizen accessions, probably because of its long-standing recruitment of Filipinos. The Army and the Marine Corps are second, although the Army shows a decrease in non-citizen accessions in the last few years whereas the Marine Corps shows an increase. The Air Force has a far smaller proportion of non-citizens than do the other services.

Figure 10. Non-citizen accessions as a share of all accessions, by service<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data.

## Educational attainment


Figure 11 shows the educational attainment of citizen and non-citizen recruits. Non-citizens are slightly more likely than citizens to have an Associate or a Bachelor's degree and somewhat less likely to have a GED. In general, however, their educational backgrounds are very similar.

## Birth country

As figure 12 shows, the birth countries of non-citizen accessions are quite diverse. The countries are listed in order of importance, with Mexico, the Philippines, Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, and El Salvador being the top five countries. Although many of the countries are from the Americas, South Korea and Vietnam are high on the list.

In recent years, there also have been nontrivial numbers of accessions from countries in the former Soviet bloc.

Figure 11. Educational attainment of accessions, by citizenship status<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data.

Figure 12. Non-citizen accessions, by birth country<sup>a</sup>

- Mexico
- Philippines
- Jamaica
- Dominican Republic
- El Salvador
- Haiti
- Colombia
- South Korea
- Trinidad & Tobago
- Peru
- Vietnam
- Nicaragua
- Ecuador
- Guyana
- Guatemala
- Cuba
- Nigeria
- Canada
- Honduras
- China
- Thailand
- UK
- + 198 more countries!

a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data. FY95–FY03 accessions.

Figure 13 shows the top five foreign birth countries by service. Mexico is the largest source of non-citizens for every service except the Navy (for which the Philippines is still the largest source of non-citizen accessions).

Figure 13. Top five foreign birth countries for non-citizen accessions, by service<sup>a</sup>

- **Army**
  - Mexico, Jamaica, Philippines, South Korea, Dominican Republic (39%)
- **Air Force**
  - Mexico, Philippines, Jamaica, El Salvador, Colombia (43%)
- **Marine Corps**
  - Mexico, Philippines, Jamaica, El Salvador, Dominican Republic (43%)
- **Navy**
  - Philippines, Mexico, Jamaica, Dominican Republic, Haiti (46%)


a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data. FY95–FY03 accessions.

## Race/ethnic distribution

Not surprisingly, the race/ethnic background of non-citizen accession is considerably more diverse than that for citizen accessions (see figure 14). If the services wish to increase the diversity of their forces, non-citizens offer a good source.

Although we usually think of diversity in terms of race and ethnicity, diversity comes in many other forms. For example, non-citizen accessions also can enrich our militaries with their diverse cultural backgrounds and linguistic abilities.

Figure 14. Race/ethnic distribution of accessions, by citizenship<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data. For FY02 accessions.





## Non-citizens: street to force

The treatment of non-citizens across the military services is not uniform—each service branch has different policies regarding the recruitment,<sup>18</sup> reenlistment, and use of non-citizen servicemembers. This is unusual and may create different cross-service incentives for non-citizens wishing to enlist in the military. It also may be time for the Department of Defense to establish more uniformity in the treatment of non-citizens across the services.

## Recruiting<sup>19</sup>

### Proof of LPR status

Recruiters' primary responsibility is to verify citizenship status. The most important requirement for non-citizens is proof of LPR status—either an I-551, popularly known as a green card, or a G-845, the military's formal request for LPR verification to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. In December 2002, these two forms became the only acceptable proof of LPR. (Multiple forms of identification were acceptable before that. Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz's 28 October 2002 memo, which requested that the Military Entrance Processing Command develop a document standard to verify SSN, place of birth, and citizenship, was the impetus for the change.)<sup>20</sup>

---

18. Recruiters are not allowed to recruit non-citizens in foreign countries. Keep in mind, however, that those born in Guam, Puerto Rico, parts of the Canal Zone, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are U.S. citizens.

19. Appendix A contains more details on the recruiting of non-citizens.

20. The Navy recruiting manual seems also to allow those with conditional LPR status to enlist if they have an unexpired alien registration card. The Air Force recruiting manual states that the date of expiration on the I-551 must not be less than 2 years from the date of issue. We are unsure whether these provisions have changed due to the DoD source document standards [14, 8].

## Background investigations

### **Entrance National Agency Check (ENTNAC)**

Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) personnel submit an Entrance National Agency Check to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) for all individuals enlisting in the Armed Forces. It is an employment trustworthiness investigation that does not qualify applicants for security clearances. ENTNAC consists of a technical search of the FBI criminal and investigative indices. The Defense Clearance and Investigations Index and the Security/Suitability Investigations also are checked.

### **National Agency Check/Local Agency Check/Credit Check (NACLIC)**

All the services except the Army require the National Agency Check/Local Agency Check/Credit Check for all enlistees.<sup>21</sup> The NACLIC is the background investigation needed for a Secret or Confidential security clearance. This checks FBI, fingerprint, local agency, and credit files for criminal and background information.

## Proof of education

Many non-citizen recruits were educated abroad. Verifying that the foreign education is equivalent to a U.S. high school diploma can be difficult, but it is important due to the limits on the number of non-high-school-diploma-graduates (non-HSDGs) allowed to enlist. Verification of educational credentials is service-specific, but all those educated abroad must have an evaluation of their educational level performed before enlistment, and all verification documents must be in English.

Although recruits are primarily responsible for verifying their educational credentials, recruiters may see this time for verification as an obstacle to enlistment.

---

21. The Army only runs NACLICs on those seeking a clearance that is Secret or above.

## English proficiency

### **Limitations of limited language proficiency**

Limited English proficiency may impose a practical hurdle to potential non-citizen recruits. By law, all applicants need a minimum of 10 percent on the Armed Forces Qualifying Test (AFQT) to be eligible for enlistment, and very few applicants are enlisted below the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile. In addition, each of the services requires a certain level of English proficiency.<sup>22</sup>

English proficiency of the potential recruit's parents may limit the recruitment of non-citizens. Language barriers can hamper parental consent and approval (parental consent is required for 17-year-olds), which are both important factors for several immigrant groups [15]. Although the number is increasing, there are still few recruiting publications in languages other than English for parents and influencers.

### **Special programs for those with limited English proficiency**

Several of the services offer special enlistment programs for those with limited English proficiency. The Army recently extended its 2-year pilot program,<sup>23</sup> the Foreign Language Recruiting Initiative (FLRI), designed to increase the number of Hispanics in the Army.<sup>24</sup> The Army accesses 200 recruits per year as part of the 4-year enlistment program, which uses a Spanish-language test to measure recruits' cognitive ability.<sup>25</sup> Program participants must demonstrate only enough English comprehension to understand the processing of

---

22. Appendix A describes English proficiency requirements in more detail.

23. The pilot was originally scheduled to run from January 2002 to January 2004.

24. This initiative is also called the Puerto Rican English Language (most of the program's participants are from Puerto Rico) or 09C Program. The Army used to have another program for English as a Second Language (ESL) enlistees (who may have spoken a native language other than Spanish), but the program was discontinued last year.

25. Applicants must first score between 21 and 30 on the ASVAB (in English). If they meet those criteria, they must score 18 or higher on the Wonderlic Personnel Test in Spanish to be eligible for the program.

their application and the Oath of Enlistment.<sup>26</sup> They are not assigned a military occupational specialty (MOS) at accession.

Following accession, recruits who are not fluent in English (i.e., those scoring between 40 and 74 on the ECLT) are enrolled in an English language program at the Defense Language Institute's English Language Center (DLIELC) at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, for up to 7 months.<sup>27</sup> After this training, recruits have to retake and pass the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB)—which is then used to determine their MOS—before they are sent to basic training.<sup>28</sup> Those who fail the ASVAB are separated.

The midterm results of the pilot program indicate that it has been successful, with about half of the participants increasing their AFQT scores by at least 10 points. This allows these people to enter the Army as at least Category IIIB recruits (a requirement for entry). Initial analysis also shows that there is not a high correlation between the Spanish-language test and the AFQT, indicating that the AFQT alone does not adequately capture the cognitive ability of Spanish-speaking recruits [16].

In the Navy, there is a special Fundamental Applied Skills Training (FAST) course at bootcamp for those who score 42 or lower on the Verbal Expression portion of the ASVAB. Non-native English speakers get 3 weeks of instruction in verbal skills and one week of instruction in study skills [14, p. 4-3].<sup>29</sup> A 1998 analysis by Hickox found that FAST students have a significantly lower attrition rate throughout the

---

26. They must score at least 40 on the English Comprehension Level Test (ECLT).

27. All DLIELC programs are total English immersion—students are required to converse only in English (even socially) once they begin the program. The length of the program depends on when English proficiency is achieved—program participants are given the ECLT monthly, and must score at least a 75.

28. They must score at least a 31 on the ASVAB and a 75 or more on the ECLT to qualify for enlistment.

29. This instruction takes place at Great Lakes, but DLIELC developed the curriculum.

first term and a significantly higher reenlistment rate for a second term than Sailors of similar abilities [17]. Another 1998 study by Quester et al. attributed half of the bootcamp attrition reduction of FAST participants to program participation and half to the generally lower attrition of those with particular race/ethnic backgrounds. The majority of FAST participants were Asian or Hispanic—groups with very low bootcamp attrition [18].

## **New language initiatives**

### **Army Translator Aide (09L) pilot program<sup>30</sup>**

The Army has developed a program to attract citizen and non-citizen native and heritage speakers of a variety of GWOT languages into the Army through the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR). The program's goal is to produce Soldiers who can work in the Translator Aide (09L) MOS overseas.

Enlistment requirements with regard to age, English proficiency, and ASVAB/AFQT have been relaxed as part of the program. Those who are not proficient in English undergo intensive English language training for a minimum of 6 weeks up to 6 months.

Most of the program's enlistees are non-citizens. At the end of their training, they are offered assistance if they wish to apply for citizenship and their applications are expedited.

### **Marine Corps recruiting initiative for Arabic speakers**

The Marine Corps has set a goal of attracting 300 Arabic speakers annually, to be distributed across all MOSs. Unlike the Army program, no enlistment requirements will be waived for these recruits, and they must additionally pass an Arabic language proficiency exam at the L2/S2 level. They will not get any additional training, beyond that which is required of any Marine.

As an incentive, the Marine Corps will offer a \$12,000 enlistment bonus to these new recruits. This bonus is payable on completion of

---

30. Appendix B describes this program in more detail.

training and being awarded an MOS. The initiative's aim is to have Arabic speakers available to many different commands on an ad hoc basis. Currently, there is no plan to have these speakers acquire expedited citizenship or serve in sensitive MOSs.

### **Concerns**

There is clearly a demand in today's military for those who have language ability, particularly those fluent in the languages of the Middle East. At the same time, there are a number of concerns about accessing native speakers—some of which are directly related to language abilities. For example, many potential recruits may have learned to speak the language from their parents and other relatives, but they may be unable to read or write the language (or only read and write at a basic level). Moreover, they may have learned only a dialect of the language or their vocabularies may be limited to household conversations rather than what would be useful in the military. Furthermore, pronunciation is often subtle. In Arabic, for example, the word meaning “appear” sounds like *bada*. The word meaning “start” sounds like *badaa*, with a slight guttural inflection. When pronounced quickly, these two words sound almost identical. But there is a big difference between “He appeared to shoot” and “He started to shoot” [19]. Finally, even if recruits are fluent in the language of interest, they may not be fluent in English. In all of these situations, more language training probably will be required, either in the language of interest to the military or in English.

There also are security concerns about accessing native speakers—particularly those from countries that are considered hostile. Because of these concerns, all initiatives are proceeding carefully.

### **Occupational restrictions**

The services' needs play a role in the accession of non-citizens. The relative size and role of first-term cohorts, reenlistment standards for non-citizens, and the proportion of MOSs, assignments, and options that require security clearances all vary by service. For example, the Marine Corps, which has a large first-term cohort and relatively low reenlistment goals, may offer more opportunities to non-citizens than the Air Force, which has a much smaller first-term cohort and cultivates more of a career force.

The biggest practical limitation on non-citizens in the military is the ability to obtain a security clearance, which currently requires U.S. citizenship [20]. Many military jobs require a clearance for entry and/or promotion.

The services have different needs in terms of billets and proportions of their force that require clearances. The Marine Corps and the Army have relatively fewer MOSs and a lower proportion of the force requiring security clearances, whereas the Air Force has a relatively higher number and proportion of billets requiring clearances. In fact, the Air Force estimates that only 40 career fields are open to non-citizens [21].

We were able to tabulate for Navy and Army accessions both the number of individuals in MOSs and the number of MOSs that required clearances (see table 5). We did this at a servicemember's first, second, and third year of service.

Table 5. Clearance requirements for Army and Navy personnel<sup>a</sup>

Variable	Army	Navy
Number of servicemembers in 1 <sup>st</sup> year of service <sup>b</sup>	54,434	34,739
% in MOSs requiring clearances	22.9 <sup>c</sup>	17.2
Number of MOSs	220	85
% of MOSs requiring clearances	25.5	42.2
Number of servicemembers in 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of service <sup>d</sup>	52,920	34,353
% in MOSs requiring clearances	24.2	40.9
Number of MOSs	193	85
% of MOSs requiring clearances	26.9	44.7
Number of servicemembers in 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of service <sup>e</sup>	45,458	34,256
% in MOSs requiring clearances	22.3	46.5
Number of MOSs	191	84
% of MOSs requiring clearances	26.2	44.0

a. For all MOSs in the 1995–2003 period for individuals in our dataset, 24.1 percent of Army MOSs and 42.7 percent of Navy MOSs required security clearances.

b. Accessions who entered in FY03.

c. Percentage of MOSs requiring clearances out of all the MOSs that FY03 accessions are in at the end of their first year of service.

d. Accessions who entered in FY02.

e. Accessions who entered in FY01.

The results for the years of service are fairly consistent, except for the percentage of MOSs requiring clearances for Sailors in their first year of service. This number is low (17.2 percent) because many Navy Sailors are still seamen, airmen, or firemen, and are therefore not occupationally qualified. Comparing the Navy and Army in the second year of service, we see that 24.2 percent of Soldiers are in occupations requiring clearances (26.9 percent of the occupations) and that 40.9 percent of Sailors are in occupations requiring clearances (44.7 percent of occupations).

Even MOSs that do not require a security clearance per se may require one for particular billets. For example, Marines in the Infantry MOS do not need security clearances, but they may need them to be placed in a Security Guard billet.

As we discuss in a later section, the military provides special opportunities for non-citizens to become citizens. Even if a non-citizen is naturalized, however, there may be other restrictions that may prevent him or her from entering a certain MOS. For example, Army MOS 97B (Counterintelligence Agent) requires that a Soldier's spouse and immediate family (including parents, parents-in-law, siblings, and children) have U.S. citizenship. In addition, the Air Force does not assign non-citizens to overseas bases. Non-citizens are allowed, however, to deploy on TDY rotations [22].

## Reenlistment standards

The reenlistment standards for non-citizens differ among the services. The Navy and Marine Corps have no statutory restrictions on the reenlistment of non-citizens, although the ability to obtain a security clearance may become a practical restriction beyond a certain point. The Army allows non-citizens to serve 8 years, either consecutive or not, which coincides with the 8-year universal military service obligation incurred by every military enlistee.<sup>31</sup> The Air Force limits

---

31. Reference [7, Section 2-4] states that Army applicants and enlistees must be advised of this restriction. If a Soldier can prove that he/she has submitted all citizenship paperwork and is only awaiting processing, he/she can file for an extension of up to 12 months. Similarly, reference [23, Table 4.1, Rule 25] authorizes 6-month extensions in the Air Force if the applicant is within 120 days of the date of separation and citizenship has not been obtained for reasons beyond the applicant's control.



non-citizens to one enlistment term of either 4 or 6 years and requires them to get their citizenship to reenlist.<sup>32</sup>

## Service preference

All enlistees must take the Oath of Enlistment, swearing to support and defend the U.S. Constitution. According to [13], U.S. citizenship is “the preferred status for enlistment to create a legally binding obligation from the servicemember based on the premise that these individuals are more capable of fulfilling their contractual military service obligation” [13, p. 3-35]. That said, non-citizen and citizen applicants must be treated equally. It is probably true, however, that in good recruiting climates, recruiters may have less incentive to process non-citizens who often require additional paperwork. Recruiters may feel that the extra hurdles that come with processing non-citizens are not worth the effort if they have many qualified citizen recruits.

---

32. Reference [23] details the Air Force’s reenlistment policy. Unit commanders must inform the member of his/her ineligibility for reenlistment upon receipt of the selective reenlistment personnel roster. Non-citizens and U.S. nationals with 24 or more months of active-duty service in a regular component of any branch of the Armed Forces cannot enlist. The Air Force also requires that non-citizens who have served in any other country’s armed forces get special permission to enlist [23, pp. 24 and 26].



# Naturalization of non-citizen servicemembers

## Legal framework

### Background

To reward non-citizen servicemembers for their honorable service, U.S. law grants them expedited citizenship privileges. Sections 328 and 329 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA) of 1952 pertain to the expedited citizenship of non-citizens in the Armed Forces.<sup>33</sup>

Section 328 applies to naturalization during peacetime. It reduces the amount of time (from 5 years to 3 years) that a non-citizen active-duty servicemember must wait before applying for naturalization.<sup>34</sup>

Section 329 of the INA allows the President to waive wait times for non-citizens serving in the military during times of national crisis or emergency. Invoked during previous conflicts, this stipulation allows non-citizens to apply for naturalization after one day of honorable military service.<sup>35</sup> In July 2002, President Bush signed Executive Order 13269, allowing non-citizens who were serving honorably in the U.S. military to immediately apply for expedited citizenship. More than 18,500 servicemembers have applied to become citizens since President Bush's executive order, and nearly 9,000 have been granted citizenship [24]. Previous executive orders allowed an estimated 100,000 non-citizens on active duty to become eligible for citizenship [25].

---

33. These provisions apply to all active duty and those National Guard and Reserves that are classified as Selected Reserve or Ready Reserve.

34. Section 8 of the U.S. Code requires immigrants to be resident aliens (LPRs) for 5 years before they can apply for U.S. citizenship.

35. Those who have completed their active-duty service honorably also can apply for expedited citizenship if they file within 6 months of discharge.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) can revoke citizenship acquired through either Section 328 or Section 329 if the servicemember is discharged under other than honorable conditions within 5 years of naturalization through the military process.<sup>36</sup>

## Recent changes

Although President Bush's executive order allowing non-citizens to apply for citizenship after only one day of active-duty military service is still in effect, the 2004 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) permanently modified Section 328 of the INA, reducing the peacetime waiting period before application for citizenship from 3 years to 1 year of honorable active-duty service. DoD 1327.5 in the NDAA also allows applicants to be granted emergency leave and priority on government transportation if needed to complete citizenship processing. In addition, the 2004 NDAA eliminated all application fees for non-citizens in the military<sup>37</sup> and allowed for the finalization of citizenship applications to be extended to U.S. consulates, embassies, and overseas U.S. military installations effective 1 October 2004.<sup>38</sup> Previously, service personnel were urged to delay their applications until they were stateside, to avoid missed appointments with immigration officials or misdirected mail.<sup>39</sup>

Public Law 101-249 provides for the granting of U.S. citizenship to an alien or non-citizen national whose death resulted from injury or disease incurred on active duty with our Armed Forces during specified

---

36. Although this is part of the executive order, citizenship is rarely revoked in practice. In addition, it is unclear whether mechanisms that would be required to track military discharges and report this information to USCIS are in place.

37. For example, the application fee used to be \$320, and the biometric (fingerprinting) fee was \$70. Source: <http://uscis.gov/graphics/forms-fee/forms/index.htm>.

38. Finalization includes interviews, swearing-in ceremonies, and the delivery of naturalization certificates.

39. The Army now requires that Soldiers with pending citizenship applications be reminded to notify USCIS of address changes during in-, out-, Soldier Readiness, mobilization, extended temporary duty, deployment, redeployment, and reintegration processing [26].

periods of military hostilities.<sup>40</sup> Posthumous citizenship has been granted to 48 non-citizens killed while serving in the GWOT [24].

Posthumous citizenship traditionally was an honorary status and did not convey any benefits under the INA to any relative of the decedent. However, new provisions in the fiscal 2004 NDAA made the citizenship more than just honorary. Now, immediate family (to include spouses, children, and parents) get special preference for immigration purposes [27]. Members of the immediate family of non-citizens were usually subject to long waiting periods and annual quota restrictions for immigration, but this special provision waives these quotas and expedites the process. Immediate family members who do not have LPR status may get it based on the deceased servicemember's newly granted citizenship. The authorization also waived the application fee that families previously had to pay [28].

## Service handling of non-citizen applications

### Processing

Before 1999, the military had virtually no role in processing citizenship applications for non-citizen servicemembers. Servicemembers would file their applications at the local Immigration and Naturalization Service office in their jurisdiction of residence. The application then would proceed to one of three processing centers, and finally to another center for completion of the interview process. If a servicemember received permanent change-of-station orders during this process, his or her application would be moved to a new INS Service Center—often resulting in delays.

To facilitate expedited processing, military applications are now assembled within each service.<sup>41</sup> Applications then are sent to one processing center in Lincoln, Nebraska, where an estimated 3,000 are

---

40. Next of kin must file a request (with supporting documentation) within 2 years of the servicemember's death.

41. This applies only for applications being filed under Sections 328 and 329.

currently awaiting processing.<sup>42</sup> USCIS estimates that it receives about 800 military applications per month [29]. Interviews then are conducted in the center closest to the servicemember's installation.

When USCIS processes the application, it contacts the servicemember to schedule an interview and an English and civics test (at the nearest USCIS office).<sup>43</sup> Once all these steps are completed, the applicant takes the Oath of Allegiance and gets his or her Certificate of Naturalization.<sup>44</sup>

## Policy

DoD coordinates non-citizen policy through OSD Personnel and Readiness, Morale, Welfare and Recreation (OSD P&R MWR).<sup>45</sup> This office coordinates with USCIS Nebraska and sets overall DoD policy for the services to follow. It also distributes USCIS's "Guide to Naturalization" (Form M-476) to each service.

The services maintain decentralized policies for managing non-citizens in the ranks. Each service must provide a point of contact for servicemembers to go through for expedited citizenship under Sections 328 and 329. No further direction is given to the services as to how to best provide assistance. The Navy and Marine Corps have delegated the duty to their JAG Officers and civilian lawyers, whereas the Air Force and Army have delegated the process to their personnel commands.

---

42. According to [29], current processing time at the Lincoln USCIS facility is 55 days, down from several months. USCIS San Antonio noted that the Lincoln office's staff has almost doubled in the past year.

43. Exams are in English unless the individual (1) suffers medically from a disability or impairment that makes this infeasible, (2) is 50+ with at least 20 years of U.S. residency, (3) is 55+ with at least 15 years of U.S. residency, or (4) is 65+ with at least 20 years of U.S. residency.

44. Ceremonies usually are held monthly.

45. The head of Officer Enlisted Personnel Management used to manage the citizenship program.

## **Marine Corps**

The Marine Corps centrally manages the process of naturalizing non-citizens in its ranks. Each major command has a Staff Judge Advocate and a citizenship coordinator to assist Marines with their applications, and legal assistance can track the status of applications. The Legal Administrative Manual (P5800.P16C Chapter 14) provides guidance.

In conjunction with Marine Corps Personnel command, the JAG Division at Headquarters Marine Corps sends e-mails each quarter to all non-citizens notifying them of their eligibility for the expedited process.<sup>46</sup> Alien applicants also are told of expedited citizenship eligibility in their pre-enlistment brief [13, p. 3-30].

The Marine Corps JAG division estimates that it average 900 applications per year and that most are approved within 6 months (down from a previous average of 2 years).

## **Navy**

The Navy requires each command to appoint a command representative for citizenship processing, and also requires Sailors reporting to a new command to be advised on the expedited citizenship process in their “Welcome Aboard” packets. Recruiters also brief non-citizen applicants on their eligibility for expedited citizenship. The Legal Assistance Policy Branch at the Washington Navy Yard formulates basic policy and disseminates it to all commands.

## **Army**

The Army handles naturalization of non-citizen Soldiers through military personnel offices, or MILPOs, at each command. Army JAGs are not typically involved with the process. Recruiters advise and counsel non-citizen recruits on the expedited citizenship process available to them. The Army Public Affairs office has distributed information on expedited citizenship to Spanish-language newspapers.

## **Air Force**

The Military Personnel Flight (MPF) Customer Service Elements are required to distribute a USCIS brochure on obtaining citizenship to all

---

46. In the future, Marine Corps Personnel Command will provide citizenship information on all new recruits to the JAG division on a periodic basis.

non-citizens [30]. The MPF also is required to produce a quarterly listing of all non-citizens assigned to the base and provide a briefing on Air Force guidelines concerning citizenship. In addition to explaining naturalization rules, the briefing spells out what non-citizens are restricted from doing in the service. The MPF also must report information about those who have filed applications by quarter, so that processing times can be tracked.

Those interested in applying for citizenship are directed to the base citizenship point of contact (POC), who typically is located in the local base personnel office. Citizenship POCs, who are junior enlisted, contractors, or civilian personnel, can assist with the process, but are not experts in immigration law and are not required to have extensive knowledge of the naturalization process. Servicemembers who need more expertise are referred to the base legal office and local USCIS experts.

As in the Army, JAGs are not typically involved in this process. The Air Force also has a Personnel Contact Center to assist customers, military, and civilians with a wide array of programs, including the citizenship program.

### **Timing of application**

Despite the executive order that specifies “one day of active duty,” OSD currently advises non-citizen servicemembers to wait until they reach their permanent duty station before filing for citizenship.<sup>47</sup> Practically speaking, it may be difficult to track the whereabouts of servicemembers before they reach their permanent duty stations. It also may be difficult for servicemembers to find the time to complete the many steps of the process, including getting their fingerprints and photographs taken and collecting the necessary documentation.

### **Possible problems with applications**

Several problems can slow the processing of citizenship applications or, in some cases, cause them to be returned or denied.

---

47. Reference [31] also states this. In addition, OSD MWR Policy recommends that servicemembers apply no later than 60 days before a permanent change of station (PCS) move.



## **Service problems**

Two issues have arisen as the services try to assist servicemembers with their citizenship applications. One is ensuring that each installation has personnel able to assist servicemembers with citizenship issues.

DoD, the Department of Transportation, and USCIS signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in the spring of 2000. This MOU outlined the responsibilities of each organization in the filing and processing of servicemembers' citizenship applications.

In the MOU, the services agreed to "identify support offices within the Services and ensure that members have access to required forms, current instructions and assistance." Each service also designated which office had primary responsibility for coordinating citizenship activities. The Army designated the Adjutant General Directorate (Personnel Service Support Division), the Navy designated the Office of the Judge Advocate General (Legal Assistance), the Air Force designated the Directorate of Personnel Force Management (AF/DPF), and the Marine Corps designated HQ Marine Corps, Code JAL. (The Coast Guard also is included in the MOU, and it designated the Coast Guard Personnel Command (CGPC-adm) as its office of primary responsibility for coordinating citizenship activities.)

The agreement did not specify who should be designated as the citizenship point of contact at the installation level. As such, each service (and installation) has approached this differently. This has sometimes led to lapses in the provision of citizenship services.<sup>48</sup>

---

48. For example, Fort Hood, which is the largest active-duty armored post in the military, provided citizenship services through its Army Community Service (ACS) office until 17 December 2002—when the special duty assignment handling the function left. In February 2003, the Personnel Servicing Battalions (PSBs) took over the function but were deployed less than 2 months later and didn't return until April 2004. Luckily, a retention staff sergeant developed the needed expertise to assist servicemembers in the lapse periods. Given that there are an estimated 2,500 non-citizens at Fort Hood, such lapses were problematic. The PSBs are now handling the function, but the Army has recently begun to downsize PSBs (in fact, Fort Hood's 546<sup>th</sup> PSB was deactivated in October 2004), which could again put citizenship services at risk.

Because citizenship POCs can change, there also is the potential for mistakes—resulting from inadequate training or inexperience.

## **Additional incentives to gaining citizenship**

Non-citizens can reap other benefits beyond expedited citizenship from military service. If they become citizens, they can apply for security clearances and can receive substantial bonuses for language skills. Aside from linguist positions, having citizenship opens up a broader array of jobs and opportunities to servicemembers.<sup>49</sup>

## **Special pays and bonuses for language proficiency**

As the war on terrorism continues, language capability is increasingly important to the services. At a recent conference, Dr. David Chu, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, noted that “since Sept. 11, 2001, our national security concerns have taken us from the streets of Manhattan to the mountains of Afghanistan to the resort city of Bali.” He added that the country—and specifically the military—needs people who can relate to all those areas and more [32].

Although the military can train recruits in needed languages, such training is intensive and time-consuming. For example, language teachers estimate that it takes 2 to 3 years for an English speaker with no prior familiarity with Arabic to become fluent.

The Marine Corps, however, has recently implemented two initiatives to increase the number of Arabic-speaking Marines. As part of one initiative, it will reenlist 50 clearable Marines and send them to 63 weeks of Arabic language training at the Defense Language Institute (DLI). At the end of the training, they must achieve 2/2 language proficiency in Arabic. After PMOS school, they will be assigned to the operating forces.

---

49. Information about an applicant’s skill in reading, writing, or speaking a foreign language is collected on the DD Form 1966, but we are unsure of its accuracy.

The other Marine Corps initiative will increase the 0231 (Intelligence Specialist) structure by 100 Marines, with the intention of awarding them a new secondary MOS of 0271 (Arabic Language/Intelligence skills). They will receive 63 weeks of language training at DLI and 14 weeks of Intel training. At the end of their training, these Marines will have to achieve a minimum 2/2 score in language proficiency.

These initiatives are to increase the number of speakers of languages that are important to the military. Table 6 shows the number of speakers of a variety of important “investment languages” within the entire DoD population.

Table 6. Current DoD language capability in investment languages<sup>a</sup>

Investment language	Number of speakers within DoD
Arabic	3,686
Chinese	2,157
Farsi	892
(Philippine)	5,391
Hindi	197
Indonesian	289
Korean	3,462
Kurdish	2
Russian	4,125
Serb-Croat	956
Spanish	4,8337
Turkish	311

a. Source: Major B. J. Sanchez, “Department of Defense: Our Language Capability,” DoD Briefing, 8 Apr 2004.

Non-citizens who speak languages of interest to the military (Arabic, Chinese, and others)<sup>50</sup> and obtain citizenship (thereby allowing

50. The Navy currently stresses French, Arabic, Persian-Farsi, Chinese Mandarin, Korean, Vietnamese, Serbian, Croatian, and Russian. The Army stresses Arabic, Russian, and Portuguese.

them to apply for security clearances and interpreter MOSs<sup>51</sup>) could be eligible for rather substantial Special Reenlistment Bonuses (SRBs). Each service sets its own bonus levels. For example, a Navy E-4 fluent in Mandarin Chinese or Arabic with 4 years of service reenlisting for 4 additional years receives a \$36,282 SRB [33]. In general, more difficult and essential languages receive larger bonuses, but even fluent Spanish speakers in approved billets can receive SRBs. A fluent Spanish speaker in the Navy with 4 years of service reenlisting for 4 additional years receives an SRB of \$3,628.<sup>52</sup>

In addition, servicemembers in billets that require language skills may receive Foreign Language Proficiency Pay of up to \$300 per month for as long as they maintain proficiency.

## Other incentives

As previously noted, the Army and Air Force restrict non-citizen reenlistments. Obviously, if a non-citizen is not allowed to reenlist, he or she would not be eligible for reenlistment bonuses. Less obvious, perhaps, is that those who are not considered “retention eligible” may not be allowed to get certain types of retraining, to participate in certain professional military education programs, or to apply for certain special programs.

Finally, U.S. citizenship is a prerequisite for a security clearance. Those without a clearance face more limited civilian and military job opportunities.

## Benefits of citizenship beyond the military

Obtaining U.S. citizenship carries with it tangible and intangible benefits beyond additional opportunities in the military. The right to vote and the automatic granting of citizenship to dependent children are

---

51. For example, the Marine Corps’ Arabic Cryptologic Linguist enlistment bonus requires citizenship.

52. The SRB is not paid as a lump sum in the Navy, but is spread over the reenlistment period.

possibly the most important, but many other opportunities and benefits also come with citizenship.

Minor, unmarried children are automatically naturalized when their parent receives his or her citizenship. Under the Child Citizenship Act of 2000, children (both natural and adopted) who have at least one citizen parent, are under age 18, are LPRs, and are currently residing in the U.S. with the parent automatically get citizenship [34]. Children over the age of 18, or legal adults, must file for citizenship on their own.<sup>53</sup>

Naturalized citizens also are able to sponsor family members living overseas to come to the United States and become LPRs. The process and speed differ based on the relationship between the sponsor and family member, specifically whether the family member can be classified as immediate family or if he or she must be considered under the family-sponsored preference criteria.

A citizen's immediate family—defined as a spouse, unmarried children under age 21, or parents—receive special preference for naturalization or LPR processing (whether currently inside or outside the United States). If the family member cannot be classified as immediate family, he or she still can receive special preference for LPR status based on family preference criteria [35].<sup>54</sup> Unlike LPRs, citizens can sponsor parents and siblings for entry into the United States.

U.S. citizens are able to leave the United States on travel for as long as they like without losing their citizenship. Immigrants with LPR status are limited to trips abroad of 2 years and require a reentry visa if their stay lasts beyond 1 year [36]. Also, it is usually easier to reenter the U.S. as a citizen than as an LPR.

---

53. This law went into effect on 27 February 2001 and is not retroactive.

54. The four family-sponsored preferences follow:

- (1) *First Preference*: Unmarried children age 21 and over of U.S. citizens;
- (2) *Second Preference A & B*: A. Spouses and unmarried children under age 21 of LPRs; B. Unmarried children age 21 and over of LPRs;
- (3) *Third Preference*: Married children age 21 and over of U.S. citizens;
- (4) *Fourth Preference*: Brothers and sisters of adult citizens (adult = age 21 and over).

Once granted, U.S. citizenship never needs to be renewed. LPR status itself does not need to be renewed, but green cards (which prove LPR status) must be renewed every 10 years [37]. The fee to renew a green card is \$175, plus an additional \$80 if the applicant has turned 14 since his or her last green card was issued [38].<sup>55</sup> In addition, LPRs found without their green cards face penalties, including conviction of a misdemeanor offense, which can entail fines or imprisonment [39].

U.S. citizenship is rarely revoked, although there have been several high-profile cases involving former Nazis [40]. LPR status, however, can be revoked rather easily if the person is found to have abandoned his or her residence, had a prolonged absence, been convicted of a crime, failed to pay income taxes, or become separated or divorced from a sponsoring spouse [41].

Becoming a U.S. citizen allows one to hold any public office in the United States except the Presidency. As of 2000, eight Members of Congress were foreign-born citizens [42].

Obtaining citizenship also provides access to civilian job opportunities that require a security clearance. The executive branch of the federal government specifically forbids U.S. non-citizens from being paid with appropriated money with few exceptions [43].

U.S. citizens also face none of the restrictions that LPRs do when seeking Social Security disability benefits or survivor benefits for their families. Many LPRs are limited to 7 years of Social Security benefits and must be physically present in the United States to collect these benefits [44, 45].

---

55. The specific procedures for renewing an expiring green card are in the Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] at 8 CFR §264.5.





## Statistical analyses of success

We gauge successful adaptation to military life by the completion of:

- Entry-level training (i.e., bootcamp)
- The first term of service.

We measure these milestones by the lack of attrition. There is a rich literature on the characteristics associated with successful adaptation to military life [46–49],<sup>56</sup> and enlistment standards reflect these characteristics.

In this section, we model attrition probabilities in a multivariate framework. Because the dependent variable, attrition, is binary (a person either attrites or does not), we estimate the probability of attrition given the recruit’s characteristics. If we make appropriate assumptions about the distribution of error terms across service members in the sample, we can estimate the attrition model using a logistic function. In this case,

$$y_t = \frac{1}{1 + \exp((-\beta)'x_j)} ,$$

where:

$y_t$  = the probability that individual  $t$  will attrite

$x_j$  = a vector of characteristics

$\beta$  = the vector of estimated coefficients.

---

56. Characteristics include high school graduation, high test scores, delayed entry program (DEP) participation, and meeting the in-service weight-for-height standards.

This equation is estimated using maximum likelihood techniques. Because the function is non-linear, the derivatives depend on the point at which they are evaluated. We evaluate them at the mean of the data. However, since our independent variables are primarily dummy variables (0 or 1), we estimate the marginal effect as the difference between a base case and the characteristic in question at the mean of the data for all other variables.<sup>57</sup> We now turn to defining the components of the vector X, the independent variables.

## Independent variables for attrition logit regressions

Educational attainment and intelligence of the recruit, participation in the delayed entry program, accession in the summer months, accession waivers, marital/dependency status, race/ethnic background, and non-citizen status are independent variables we explore. The regressions also include control variables for the fiscal year of accession.

### Non-citizens

Previous work showed that non-citizen accessions in the Marine Corps had lower attrition than citizen recruits [15]. Although we are unaware of any previous work for the other services, we expect to find similar results for non-citizens in the other services. The potential citizenship benefit provides an extra incentive for non-citizens both to enter the military and to complete bootcamp and the first term of service. However, non-citizens could have more difficulty adapting to military life, due to language or cultural difficulties.

Hispanics are the largest group of non-citizens (see table 7). In some of our regressions, we interact the non-citizenship variable with race and ethnicity. Unfortunately, the race/ethnic codes for accessions in FY03 are incorrect, and DMDC is unable to fix them. Thus, we omit FY03 accessions from most of our empirical work.

---

57. When there is a set of related characteristics, such as educational background, we have one base case (in our work, HSDG), and all marginal effects are calculated relative to the base case.

Table 7. Non-citizen accessions, FY95-02, by race/ethnic background

Race/ ethnicity	All services	Air Force	Navy	Army	Marine Corps
Hispanic	35.1%	24.6%	31.1%	35.0%	47.1%
API	24.6%	31.7%	33.3%	20.5%	14.8%
White	11.2%	14.8%	8.4%	11.8%	12.7%
Black	22.7%	18.6%	22.3%	27.3%	16.5%
Other	6.4%	10.3%	4.9%	5.4%	8.9%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## Educational background

Educational background is probably the most important predictor of attrition (see [50] for an early study and [51] for a more recent study). Recruits without regular high school diplomas have been found to have higher attrition. Here, we break the educational categories into dropouts (all Tier III), GEDs (all Tier II), adult education (part of Tier I), one semester college (part of Tier I), high school diploma graduates (HSDGs, bulk of Tier I), Associate degree (part of Tier I), and BA/BS+ (rest of Tier I).

## High quality: Tier I and AFQT greater than 49<sup>th</sup> percentile

Although each service recruits its own members and sets its own standards, DoD requires, at a minimum, that the educational background of 90 percent of each service's accessions be Tier I recruits. Tier I recruits are primarily high school diploma graduates, but the category also includes those with college and other professional degrees, adult education holders, and people with one semester of college.

Similarly, DoD requires that at least 60 percent of each service's accessions have AFQT scores that place them in the top half of this nationally normed examination (AFQT categories I-III A). These standards reflect historical experience with what makes a successful recruit.

Thus, we identify high-quality recruits as those who test in the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile and above on the AFQT and whose educational background is Tier I.

## DEP and DEP greater than or equal to (ge) 3 months

Another important attrition discriminator is delayed entry program (DEP) participation. Rather than shipping to bootcamp in the same month as enlistment, recruits in the DEP have a ship date up to 12 months after their signing date. Previous research has associated 3 or more months of DEP participation with substantially lower attrition [15, 46].

Recruits entering the service with at least 3 months in the DEP may have lower attrition because they:

- *Avoid “quick” decisions.* If recruits change their minds about joining the service, they can drop out of the DEP *before* going to bootcamp. It is considerably cheaper for the services to attrite recruits from the DEP than from active duty.
- *Find a better occupational fit.* Recruits are more likely to get a school seat for a particular occupation if they do not ship immediately.
- *Become better prepared.* Recruits in the DEP participate in recruiter-organized activities. They familiarize themselves with the service, become more physically fit, and may become more committed to becoming a servicemember.

## Summer accession

Past research for the Navy and the Marine Corps [15, 18] has shown that higher proportions of high-quality recruits access between June and September. It may be that summer accessions are especially motivated because so many of them are recent high school graduates. Recruits of all quality types, however, have lower attrition if they start bootcamp during these months, so perhaps even non-graduates “pick up on” the motivation of recent graduates. Summer is the most popular time for recruits to enter, and 45 percent of all military accessions in FY95 through FY03 entered in these months.

## **Accession waivers**

The services grant a wide variety of enlistment waivers to recruits. Waivers are given at both the contracting and accession point, so we combined waiver information. We then divided waivers into the following categories: alcohol or drugs, serious legal, dependents, medical/physical, and other waivers. Previous research has shown that recruits with waivers have slightly higher attrition rates than recruits with no waivers.

## **Marital/dependency status at accession**

We identify recruits who are married or have a dependent child at accession. These recruits have more distractions than single recruits, but they also may have more incentive to succeed.

## **Data for the analyses**

DMDC provided us with the data for our analyses, sending us accession files, separation files, and yearly September snapshots of service-members. We received data for accessions in all four services for FY88 through FY03. Unfortunately, race/ethnic identifiers, critical to our analyses, are incorrect for FY03 accessions. Thus, we did not analyze the data for FY03.


Appendix C provides variable definitions.

## **Results: 3-month attrition**

Because bootcamps vary in length (from 6 weeks in the Air Force to 3 months in the Marine Corps), we estimated 3-month attrition rates for all services. We estimate these logistic regressions separately for FY88–FY94 accessions and FY95–FY02 accessions. Separating out recent accessions from those in an earlier period allows us to see if behavior has changed over time. The average 3-month attrition rate was 9.4 percent for accessions in the earlier period and 10.6 percent for the later period.

Before turning to the statistical work, it is interesting to examine the yearly average 3-month attrition rates for citizens and non-citizens (see figure 15).

Figure 15. Three-month attrition for non-citizen and citizen recruits, all services



### Overall 3-month attrition results

Our first set of logistic regressions combined all observations in each subperiod, controlling for the service. These regressions, found in table 34 in appendix D, showed that—all else equal—non-citizens had 3-month attrition rates that were lower than those of citizens: 1.8 percentage points lower in the earlier period and 3.7 percentage points lower in the recent period. Since non-citizen recruits are more diverse in their race/ethnicity than citizen recruits, however, we next estimated logistic regressions where we interacted the citizenship variable with race/ethnic status (table 35 in appendix C has the mean values and marginal effects for the FY88–FY94 and FY95–FY02 regressions).

In table 8, we show the estimated marginal effects by citizenship and race/ethnic status for accessions in FY95–FY02.

Table 8. Three-month attrition estimates by race/ethnicity and citizenship status: FY95–FY02 accessions<sup>a</sup>

	Marginal effect by race/ethnicity					
	White	API	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Other
Citizen	Base case	-.047**	-.029**	-.042**	.034**	-.033**
Non-citizen <sup>b</sup>		-.033**	-.077**	-.081**	.009**	-.058**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level.

b. The regressions have variables for race/ethnic background and interaction variables for non-citizens of different race/ethnic backgrounds. The omitted category is white citizens. To obtain the marginal effect for non-citizens, add the marginal effect for the race/ethnic category to the marginal effect for the race/ethnic non-citizen interaction.

The race/ethnicity and non-citizen indicator variables are very powerful. All are statistically significant at the 1-percent level, and the effects are large. Black, API, and Hispanic non-citizens are predicted to have 3-month attrition rates that are 7 to 8 percentage points below those for white citizens (the base case). All else equal, white and other non-citizens are predicted to have 3-month attrition rates of 3.3 and 5.8 percentage points below those of white citizens. Only Native American non-citizens have higher attrition rates than the base case; these recruits compose a very small group of Canadian Native Americans with generally higher attrition. In short, when the race/ethnic backgrounds of non-citizens are included in the non-citizen definitions, the marginal effect on attrition from non-citizen status increases. The majority of non-citizens are Hispanic or API; all else equal, these two categories of non-citizens have 3-month attrition rates that are less than half the rate for white citizens.

Table 9 shows the marginal effects for the other independent variables in the regression. Turning first to the educational background variables, we see that GEDs (Tier II) and dropouts (Tier III) have attrition rates that are 2.4 or 3.9 percentage points above those of HSDGs. Consistent with earlier work for Sailors and Marines, we find that recruits with adult education or 1-semester-college educational backgrounds (Tier I) have 3-month attrition rates that are similar to those for Tier II and III recruits, as their attrition rates also are about 3 percentage points above those of HSDGs. Recruits with Associate degrees and those with BA or BS degrees have 3-month attrition rates that are 1.5 and 2.6 percentage points below those of HSDGs.

Table 9. Three-month attrition estimates by education, accession waiver, service, and other variables<sup>a</sup>

Variable	Marginal effect
Education	
Dropout	.039**
GED	.024**
Adult education	.029**
1 semester college	.033**
HSDG	Base case
Associate degree	-.015**
BA/BS+	-.026**
Accession waiver	
No waiver	Base case
Alcohol or drugs	.008**
Serious legal	.006**
Dependents	.012**
Medical or physical	.018**
Other	.009**
Service	
Army	Base case
Air Force	-.014**
Navy	.020**
Marine Corps	.013**
Other	
Tier I & AFQT > 49	-.028**
DEP 1-2 months	.007**
DEP ge 3 months	-.024**
Female	.051**
Married or dependents	.021**
Jun-Sep accession	-.016**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level;

\* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level.

Full estimates are found in appendix D.

**Turning to accession waivers, we find small positive effects on attrition probabilities for waived recruits. The largest effects are for medical or physical waivers (1.8 percentage points).**



Controlling for the service, Air Force recruits have lower, and Navy and Marine Corps recruits higher, 3-month attrition rates than do Army recruits (the base case).

The bottom panel of table 9 reports the marginal effects for other variables of interest. Again, these results hold all other characteristics constant and examine only the effect of changing the characteristic of interest. High-quality recruits have 3-month attrition rates that are 2.8 percentage points lower than other recruits. DEP participation of 1 or 2 months lowers attrition by 0.7 percentage point, but DEP participation of 3 or more months lowers attrition by 2.4 percentage points. Female recruits have attrition rates that are 5.1 percentage points higher than male recruits. Recruits who have dependents at accession have 3-month attrition rates that are 2.1 percentage points higher than recruits without dependents. Finally, recruits accessing in the summer have—all else equal—3-month attrition rates that are 1.6 percentage points lower than recruits accessing at other times of the year.<sup>58</sup>

### Three-month attrition results by service

Appendix D provides mean values and marginal effects from logistic regressions for 3-month attrition that were done separately by service for FY95–FY02 accessions. The marginal effects on 3-month attrition by non-citizen and race/ethnic status were similar across the services.<sup>59</sup> As in the regression for all the services discussed above, the marginal effects for these variables are very large and statistically significant (see table 10).

Next, we explored other differences that we found across the services. Table 11 shows the marginal effects on 3-month attrition for a set of characteristics for accessions who entered in the FY95–FY02 period. Females made up 26 percent of Air Force accessions, 18 percent of Navy accessions, 20 percent of Army accessions, and 7 percent of

---

58. Some of these results differ substantially by service. We discuss results by service in the next section.

59. The effects were a little smaller in the Air Force and a little larger in the Navy, but 3-month attrition is lowest in the Air Force and highest in the Navy.

Marine Corps accessions. In all services, female attrition was higher than male attrition, but the effects were much smaller in the Navy and the Air Force than in the Army or Marine Corps. Other things equal, female 3-month attrition in the Army was almost 9 percentage points higher than male attrition. In the Marine Corps, female 3-month attrition was 5 percentage points higher than male attrition whereas, in the Air Force and Navy, the attrition differences were smaller.

Table 10. Marginal effects on 3-month attrition for non-citizen recruits, by service and race/ethnic background: accessions in FY95–FY02<sup>a</sup>

	Air Force	Navy	Army	Marine Corps
Hispanic non-citizen	-.053**	-.076**	-.076**	-.073**
White non-citizen	-.033**	-.034**	-.034**	-.028**
Black non-citizen	-.051**	-.085**	-.085**	-.067**
API non-citizen	Not sig.	-.095**	-.075**	-.060**
Other non-citizen	-.064**	-.064**	-.064**	Not sig.

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level;  
 \* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level.  
 Full estimates are found in appendix D.

Table 11. Three-month attrition estimates for FY95–FY02 accessions: differences by service<sup>a</sup>

	Marginal effects by service			
	Air Force	Navy	Army	Marine Corps
Female	.026**	.015*	.088**	.053**
DEP 1-2 months	-.005*	-.007**	Not sig.	-.005**
DEP 3 or more months	-.020*	-.031**	.009**	-.028**
Married or dependents	Not sig.	.026**	.022**	.037**
June-Sept accession	-.004**	-.025**	-.018**	-.018**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level.  
 \* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level.  
 Full estimates are found in appendix D.

Direct ships generally have lower attrition than those who sign their contracts and enter the DEP to ship in a later month. In fact, most recruits ship from the DEP (from a high of 93 percent in the Air Force to a low of 85 percent in the Army). All else equal, DEP participation of 3 or more months reduces attrition, but the impact is smaller in the Army and Air Force than in the Navy or Marine Corps (where such participation reduces attrition by about 3 percentage points).

The percentage of recruits who were married or had dependents at accession was about 14 percent in the Army, 9 percent in the Navy and Air Force, and 6 percent in the Marine Corps. Although Air Force recruits who were married or had other dependents did not have attrition rates significantly different from their single counterparts, other services' recruits who were married or had other dependents had attrition rates that were 2 to 4 percentage points higher at the 3-month point.

Particularly in the Navy, Army, and Marine Corps, summer accessions—holding everything else, including quality, constant—have 3-month attrition rates that are about 2 percentage points lower than those for recruits who enter in other months.

We now examine the impact of specific educational backgrounds on attrition (table 12). All effects are relative to HSDGs. It is important to remember that most recruits are HSDGs (95 percent in the Air Force, 85 percent in the Navy, 81 percent in the Army, and 89 percent in the Marine Corps).<sup>60</sup> In the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, a general pattern emerges of dropouts, GEDs, adult education, and 1-semester-college recruits having higher attrition than HSDGs, Associate degree, and Bachelor's degree holders. Note that both adult education and 1-semester-college recruits, who are formally classified as Tier I recruits, have generally worse attrition than dropouts (Tier III) and GEDs (Tier II).

In the Air Force, attrition varies little by educational background with one exception: recruits with adult education backgrounds (about 0.1

---

60. While Tier I recruits are primarily HSDGs, adult education, one semester college, Associate degrees, and BA/BS+ also are Tier I recruits.

percent of Air Force accessions) have predicted 3-month attrition rates 7.8 percentage points above those of HSDGs.

Table 12. Marginal effects for 3-month attrition: education and ability background differences by service<sup>a</sup>

	Marginal effects by service			
	Air Force	Navy	Army	Marine Corps
Dropout	Not sig.	.029**	Not sig.	.065**
GED	-.014**	.024**	.025**	.040**
Adult education	.078**	.033**	.020**	.026**
One semester college	Not sig.	.042**	.028**	.050**
Associate degree	Not sig.	-.021**	-.018**	Not sig.
BA/BS+	-.009**	-.033**	-.036**	-.031**
Tier I and AFQT>49	-.026**	-.039**	-.023**	-.026**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level.

Full estimates are found in appendix D.

The accession waiver variables generally were less statistically significant and smaller in their effects than other independent variables in the 3-month logistic regressions by service. For Air Force recruits, only dependent and medical/physical waivers attained statistical significance and increased attrition by less than 2 percentage points, respectively. For the other services, waiver variables were statistically significant in general, but the attrition increase also was less than 2 percentage points.

## Results: 36-month attrition

We use 36-month attrition for our “first-term” attrition measure because it means that we exclude only 2-year contracts (about 3 percent of Army and 0.3 percent of Navy accessions). Thus, we estimated 36-month attrition for the over 1 million recruits who entered from FY95 through FY00. In this period, there were over 46,000 non-citizen recruits. Before turning to the statistical work, we report 36-month attrition rates for citizens and non-citizens: 32.2 and 18.7 percent, respectively.

### 36-month attrition results for logistic regressions

The statistically significant and large reductions in attrition for non-citizens that we observed in the 3-month attrition analyses are only magnified when we examine 36-month attrition. As in the 3-month attrition regressions, we control for citizenship status, race/ethnic background, DEP participation, educational background, quality, accession waivers, presence of dependents at accession, summer entry, Service, and accession fiscal year. After controlling for these independent variables in a logistic regression for all accessions, we find that the marginal effect of non-citizen status is a reduction in predicted attrition of 10 percentage points.

Such a regression, however, hides the fact that the race/ethnic backgrounds of non-citizens more heavily favor groups with generally lower attrition. Thus, in the regressions we report in table 37 of appendix E, we interact citizenship status with race/ethnic background. Table 13 shows the marginal effects of citizenship status for different race/ethnic backgrounds. Other things equal, non-citizens have 36-month attrition rates that are 9 to 20 percentage points lower than white citizens (the base case). Again, most non-citizens are Hispanic or API; these non-citizen recruits have 36-month attrition rates 16.5 and 20.0 percentage points, respectively, below the base case of white citizens.

Table 13. 36-month attrition estimates by race/ethnicity and citizenship<sup>a</sup>

Citizenship status	Marginal effect by race/ethnicity				
	White	API	Black	Hispanic	Other
Citizen	Base case	-.106**	-.032**	-.085**	-.060**
Non-citizen <sup>b</sup>	-.087**	-.200**	-.172**	-.167**	-.143**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level.

b. The regression has variables for race/ethnic background as well as interaction variables for non-citizens of different race/ethnic backgrounds. The omitted category is white citizens. To obtain the marginal effect for non-citizens, add the marginal effect for the race/ethnic category to the marginal effect for the race/ethnic non-citizen interaction. See table appendix E for full logistic regression results.

We now turn to marginal effects for the other independent variables and compare them to the marginal effects for 3-month attrition (see table 14). The first part of the table looks at effects by education—all

the effects for 36-month attrition are statistically significant and about 3 times larger than for 3-month attrition. Educational background matters *throughout* the first term of service—both during and after bootcamp. GEDs and 1-semester-college accessions, for example, have 36-month attrition rates that are 9.5 and 7.8 percentage points higher than those for HSDGs.

Table 14. Attrition estimates by education, accession waiver, service, and other variables<sup>a</sup>

Variable	Marginal effect	
	3-month attrition	36-month attrition
Education		
Dropout	.039**	.127**
GED	.024**	.097**
Adult education	.029**	.099**
1 semester college	.033**	.105**
HSDG	Base case	Base case
Associate degree	-.015**	-.047**
BA/BS+	-.026**	-.078**
Accession waiver		
No waiver	Base case	Base case
Alcohol or drugs	.008**	.047**
Serious legal	.006**	.053**
Dependents	.012**	.027**
Medical or physical	.018**	.019**
Other	.009**	.033**
Service		
Army	Base case	Base case
Air Force	-.014**	-.074**
Navy	.020**	-.008**
Marine Corps	.013**	-.055**
Other		
Tier I & AFQT > 49	-.028**	-.049**
DEP 1-2 months	.007**	-.032**
DEP ge 3 months	-.024**	-.082**
Female	.051**	.105**
Married or dependents	.021**	.018**
Jun-Sep accession	-.016**	-.018**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level;

\* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level.

Full estimates are found in appendix E.

Accession waivers are much more important predictors of attrition in the post-bootcamp period. Recruits with accession waivers are predicted to have attrition rates that are 1.7 to 5.3 percentage points higher than recruits without waivers.

Turning to the service variables, the differences between the 3-month and the 36-month marginal effects are most interesting. Although the Marine Corps and Navy had 3-month attrition rates that were about 2 percentage points higher than the Army's (the base case), 36-month attrition rates show a different pattern. At 36 months, Navy attrition is only 0.5 percentage point above the Army's, whereas the Marine Corps rate is 3.2 percentage points below the Army's. Clearly, the Marine Corps takes proportionally more of its attrition in the first 3 months of service than do the other services.

The final panel of table 14 looks at the marginal effects for a variety of other background characteristics. Whereas high quality and DEP participation for at least 3 months widen the attrition differences over the entire first term of service, the same is not true for summer accessions or for those married or with dependents at accession. For these last two characteristics, the attrition differences we observe in the first 3 months of service are roughly the same as those observed over the entire first term of service. Accessing married or with dependents raises attrition about 2 percentage points, and accessing in the summer lowers attrition by about 2 percentage points.

### **36-month attrition results by service**

Table 15 shows average 36-month attrition rates by service, as well as the marginal effects of non-citizen status by race/ethnicity. In all the services, these results are extremely large and statistically significant at the 1-percent level. Clearly, most non-citizens have successfully adapted to military life.

Table 16 looks at differences in behavior across the services. Recruits with dropout, GED, adult education, or 1-semester-college educational backgrounds generally have 36-month attrition rates about 10 percent higher than HSDGs, although there are a few exceptions by service. In all services except the Marine Corps, recruits with either an Associate or Bachelor's degree have lower 36-month attrition than HSDGs, but the magnitude of these results vary by service.

Table 15. Marginal effects on 36-month attrition for non-citizen recruits:  
by service and race/ethnic background<sup>a</sup>

	Air Force	Navy	Army	Marine Corps
Hispanic non-citizen	-.124**	-.165**	-.190**	-.147**
White non-citizen	-.066**	-.101**	-.105**	-.064**
Black non-citizen	-.079**	-.194**	-.202**	-.139**
API non-citizen	-.151**	-.205**	-.194**	-.138**
Other non-citizen	-.153**	-.143**	-.167**	-.106**
Average 36-month attrition rate	.256	.344	.342	.286

a. These marginal effects are in relation to the omitted category, white citizens.

\*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level;

\* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level. See appendix E.

Table 16. 36-month attrition estimates: differences by service<sup>a</sup>

	Marginal effects by service			
	Air Force	Navy	Army	Marine Corps
Educational background & ability				
Dropout	Not sig.	.111**	-.065**	.158**
GED	-.017*	.093**	.112**	.110**
Adult education	.146**	.107**	.090**	.078**
One semester college	Not sig.	.124**	.105**	.091**
Associate degree	-.036**	-.067**	-.048**	Not sig.
BA/BS+	-.110**	-.082**	-.090**	Not sig.
Tier I and AFQT>49	-.053**	-.069**	-.034**	-.059**
Other variables				
Female	.054**	.034**	.186**	.105**
DEP 1-2 months	-.035**	-.030**	-.023**	-.021**
DEP 3 or more months	-.080**	-.097**	-.059**	-.074**
Married or dependents	-.037**	.030**	.026**	.042**
June-Sept accession	Not sig.	-.022**	-.023**	-.026**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level.

\* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level.

For complete regression see appendix E.



Holding all else constant, female recruits have higher 36-month attrition rates than male recruits in all the services, but the differences vary substantially—from 3.4 percentage points in the Navy to 18.6 percentage points in the Army. DEP participation lowers attrition in every service, but the effects are strongest for those with 3 or more months in the DEP. Recruits who entered married or with dependents have lower 36-month attrition in the Air Force, but higher 36-month attrition in the other services. All results are statistically significant. Finally, summer accessions in all services except the Air Force have 36-month attrition that is 2 to 3 percentage points lower than accessions who enter in other months.



## Who acquires citizenship while in the military?

In recent years, there have been significant administrative and legislative changes to the citizenship process for non-citizens serving in the U.S. military. The goal of these changes has been to expedite the citizenship application process. President Bush's 2002 executive order dramatically shortened—from 3 years to immediately upon entering the service—the time a non-citizen serving honorably in the U.S. military has to wait before applying for U.S. citizenship. In addition, the centralization of application processing and the elimination of application fees reduced the burdens of applying for citizenship.

The expedited citizenship process offered to U.S. military personnel is an attractive enlistment incentive for non-U.S. citizens. Encouraging non-citizen servicemembers to become citizens also can increase the pool of personnel eligible for MOSs with clearance requirements.

In this section, we provide information on the number and share of non-citizen accessions who become U.S. citizens while in the military services. Then, we examine the characteristics of those who are likely to become citizens while serving, using the term “new citizen” to describe non-citizens accessed in the FY95–FY03 period whose military personnel records recorded them as U.S. citizens by September 2003. Our new citizen measure undercounts those who became citizens for two reasons:


1. We are unable to observe non-citizen attrites who later became citizens.
2. We miss any non-citizen accessions whose U.S. citizenship was recorded in personnel records after September 2003.

Finally, we proxy the length of the U.S. citizenship process for non-citizen accessions.

To fully determine the effect of President Bush’s 2002 executive order on the probability of non-citizen servicemembers attaining citizenship and on the length of time to citizenship, we would need information on the citizenship status of all military personnel and dates for citizenship attainment. Unfortunately, our data are restricted to military accessions, and our citizenship attainment variable is simply whether U.S. citizenship is recorded on a September personnel file.

Figure 16 shows the number of non-citizen accessions in the FY95 through FY03 period whose U.S. citizenship was recorded in military personnel files by September 2003. From FY95 through FY03, the number of new citizens increased; however, there is no sharp increase in new citizens following the 2002 executive order. To evaluate the impact of the 2002 executive order, different data and another study would be required.

Figure 16. Numbers of new citizens by fiscal year of citizenship reporting<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC non-citizen accession data.

## Data

The data we requested from DMDC included accession files, separation files, and yearly September snapshots for 1995 through 2003.<sup>61</sup> Citizenship status is a field in the September snapshots, but there is no associated date of citizenship. We determine whether a non-citizen accession has become a citizen by the first September he or she appears as a citizen in our files. Needless to say, this is a noisy measure of when an accession actually becomes a citizen.

We calculate time-to-citizenship as the number of months from accession to the first September an accession is listed as a citizen in our data files. For example, a non-citizen recruit who receives citizenship in October of 1997 will be considered a U.S. citizen as of September 1998—11 months after the fact. In addition, since we have no independent information on citizenship status, we are unable to judge whether citizenship information is entered into personnel files in a timely manner. Thus, our measures are only rough estimates of acquiring citizenship and the time it takes for non-citizen military personnel to acquire citizenship.

Figure 16 makes it apparent that citizenship status for Army accessions was not updated until FY00.<sup>62</sup> Although it is unknown whether all the FY95–FY99 non-citizen Army accessions records were correctly updated, we certainly can observe that many records were updated. Unfortunately, non-citizen Army accessions who left before FY00 (but who became citizens before FY00) still will be listed as non-citizens in our data.<sup>63</sup> We show the Army information in our descriptive statistics but, as a precaution, exclude Army accessions from the regressions for obtaining citizenship and months-to-citizenship.

---


61. We do not include FY04 accessions since the race and ethnic data fields are not consistent with the earlier years of data.

62. Before FY00, only 3 Army recruits who accessed between FY95 and FY03 are listed as becoming U.S. citizens. In the September 2000 personnel snapshot, over 3,000 Army non-citizens had their non-citizen status updated to U.S. citizenship.

63. Fortunately non-citizens have lower-than-average attrition, so this is not as big a problem as it might be.

The increase in citizenship among servicemembers accessing in the mid- to late-1990s corresponds with reductions in the administrative barriers to citizenship. Figure 17 shows the percentage of non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military. Between FY95 and FY03, the FY95–FY98 accession cohorts have the largest percentages of accessions who became U.S. citizens in the military. The largest cohort of non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military was FY98 (2,300 new citizens).<sup>64</sup>

Figure 17. Percentage of non-citizen accessions that became U.S. citizens by September 2003<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data.


Most non-citizen accessions do not become citizens immediately upon entering the services, particularly since there was a 3-year waiting period before June 2002 (assuming they had not previously met the 3-year residency requirements). Thus, the peak in citizenship among pre-1999 non-citizen accessions may be from those accessions

64. As of September 2003.

becoming eligible for citizenship around the time that reductions in citizenship processing time occurred. Secondary potential causes for the high number of new citizens in the mid-1990s include better job opportunities for U.S. citizens relative to non-citizens or the recession of the early 2000s making citizenship more attractive.

For accessions after FY98, the number and share of non-citizens who became U.S. citizens while in the military dropped. This is not surprising, given that the citizenship process is lengthy and more recent accessions have had less time to become citizens and have their citizenship recorded. Most non-citizen accessions attaining citizenship while in the service are Army Soldiers (see figure 18). The number of non-citizen Army accessions becoming U.S. citizens has ranged from 436 for FY95 accessions to 826 for FY98 accessions.

Figure 18. Number of new citizens, by service and fiscal year of accession<sup>a</sup>




a. CNA tabulations of DMDC non-citizen accession data.

The Army is the only one of the services in which the number of non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens has increased with recent

cohorts. For example, 765 Soldiers accessed as non-citizens in FY03 were recorded as becoming citizens by the end of the year, compared with only 544 of the almost 5,000 FY03 non-citizen accessions in the other services.<sup>65</sup> The Army, the largest service, is followed in total number of new citizens by the Marine Corps, the smallest service. As previously shown, the Air Force has the smallest number of non-citizen accessions but the highest proportion over most of the period of non-citizen accessions who became citizens while serving. (See figure 19.) Given the importance of clearances for Air Force personnel, this result probably is not surprising.

Figure 19. Percentage of non-citizen accessions that became citizens by September 2003<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC accession data.

65. In fact, 74 percent of the Army's FY03 new citizens came from FY03 Army accessions. Either the Army has greatly increased the processing of non-citizen recruits' citizenship applications or there is some other explanation for this fact.



## Characteristics of enlisted personnel who became citizens

Table 17 shows that there are slight differences in the demographic characteristics of non-citizen accessions who stay non-citizens and those who become citizens while in the military. For example, 7.9 percent of non-citizens who became citizens while in the military accessed with some college education, compared with 7.5 percent who did not become citizens. Fifty-four percent of new citizens are high quality (Tier I with an AFQT score in the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile and above), compared with 48 percent of non-citizen accessions whom we do not observe becoming citizens. Overall, a higher proportion of new citizens than non-citizens are female (19.5 percent compared with 18 percent).

Table 17. Percentage of non-citizen accessions in each subgroup<sup>a</sup>

Variable	Percentage	
	Stayed non-citizen <sup>b</sup>	Became U.S. citizen while in the service
Education		
Dropout	.008	.003
Adult education	.018	.013
GED	.029	.024
HSDG	.870	.881
One semester of college	.029	.026
Associate degree	.013	.015
BA/BS+	.033	.038
Race/ethnicity <sup>c</sup>		
White	.109	.122
Asian/Pacific Islander	.241	.254
Black	.228	.228
Hispanic	.362	.316
Native	.003	.003
Other	.057	.077
Service		
Army	.393	.332
Air Force	.074	.190
Navy	.350	.216
Marine Corps	.183	.262

Table 17. Percentage of non-citizen accessions in each subgroup<sup>a</sup>  
(continued)

Variable	Percentage	
	Stayed non-citizen <sup>b</sup>	Became U.S. citizen while in the service
	Other	
Tier I & AFQT > 49	.476	.538
Female	.180	.195
Married or dependents	.126	.133

a. CNA tabulations of DMDC data for FY95–FY03 accessions. We include non-citizen accessions in all four services.

b. The “stayed non-citizen” category includes non-citizen accessions who either left the military before becoming U.S. citizens or were not reported as U.S. citizens by September 2003.

c. CNA tabulations of DMDC data for FY95–FY02 accessions. We include non-citizen accessions in all four services.

The race/ethnic characteristics of non-citizen accessions who do and do not become U.S. citizens are similar. The only difference, true for all accessions examined, is that a slightly lower proportion of new citizens are Hispanic. This does not seem to be based on birth country. The top ten foreign birth countries for non-citizens who do and do not become U.S. citizens are the same, and the order of these countries is very similar. For both groups, the Philippines is the top birth country, followed by Mexico, Jamaica, and the Dominican Republic.

## Likelihood of becoming a citizen while in the military

Using a logit model, we estimate the probability of becoming a U.S. citizen controlling for a number of observable characteristics.<sup>66</sup> We examine the decision to become a citizen while in the service since we are unable to observe when or if citizenship is acquired after leaving the military. The probability of a non-citizen accession becoming a U.S. citizen increases the longer he or she stays in the service. Thus,

66. We exclude Army non-citizen accessions from our analysis since we are unsure of the quality of the citizenship data in the Army records. In our models, we control for fiscal year of accession, service, race/ethnicity, gender, education, dependent status, age at accession, and high quality.

we might expect servicemembers who typically are more likely to attrite to be less likely to become U.S. citizens while in the service; however, we do not find this to be universally true.

Table 18 reports the calculated marginal effects for covariates of interest. To get the marginal effects, we first estimate the predicted probability of becoming a U.S. citizen for a base case, or group with a certain set of characteristics. The marginal effects represent the change in the probability of becoming a U.S. citizen while in the military for a group of non-citizens compared with the base case. For example, the predicted probability that a non-citizen accession without dependents—our base case—becomes a citizen while in the military is 25.8 percent. The predicted probability of a non-citizen accession with dependents becoming a citizen is 30.3 percent. In this case, the marginal effect of having dependents on the likelihood of becoming a citizen is .045, or 4.5 percentage points.

Table 18. Marginal effects for the probability of becoming a U.S. citizen

Variable	Marginal effect <sup>a</sup>
Education	
Dropout	-.037
GED	.004
Adult education	-.037*
HSDG	Base case
1 semester college	.019
Associate degree	.080**
BA/BS+	.091**
Race/ethnicity	
White	Base case
Asian/Pacific Islander	.006
Black	-.011
Hispanic	-.035**
Native	.041
Other	.022*
Age	
18 years of age	Base case
19 years of age	.011
20 to 24 years of age	.007
25 and older	.013

Table 18. Marginal effects for the probability of becoming a U.S. citizen (continued)

Variable	Marginal effect <sup>a</sup>
Service	
Air Force	.137**
Navy	-.167**
Marine Corps	Base case
Other	
Tier I & AFQT > 49	.014**
Female	.022**
Married or dependents	.045**

a. \*\* indicates z statistic significant at 1-percent level;  
 \* indicates z statistic significant at 5-percent level.  
 Our sample includes Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps non-citizen accessions. Army non-citizen accessions were excluded. Full estimates are in appendix F.

Our estimates are consistent with the raw averages reported earlier. Controlling for age, race, and so on, female non-citizen accessions are 2.2 percentage points more likely than their male counterparts to become citizens while in the service. As previously noted, non-citizen accessions with dependents are more likely to become citizens while in the military. These results are surprising, given that accessions who are female or have dependents are more likely to attrite than males or accessions without dependents.

Educational background also seems to play a role in the attainment of citizenship. Non-citizens accessing with either an Associate or Bachelor’s degree are over 9 percentage points more likely to become citizens while in the military than non-citizen accessions with only a high school degree. Non-citizen accessions with adult education are 4 percentage points less likely than high school degree holders to be observed becoming U.S. citizens.


Holding all else constant, Air Force non-citizen accessions are most likely to become U.S. citizens, followed by non-citizen accessions in the Marine Corps and the Navy. We estimate that non-citizen recruits entering the Air Force, Navy, or Marine Corps have a 47-, 16-, or 33-percent chance, respectively, of becoming U.S. citizens while in the military. Our logit estimates from the individual services are

consistent with those from our full sample; however, our service-specific findings are not as statistically robust.

## Proxy of time-to-citizenship while in the military

In this section, we estimate a proxy for how long it takes a non-citizen accession to become a U.S. citizen. As previously noted, all but three of the Army’s FY95–FY98 non-citizen accessions who became citizens are listed as achieving citizenship in FY00. This is reflected in our estimated time-to-citizenship (see figure 20).

Figure 20. Rough estimate of time-to-citizenship<sup>a</sup>



a. CNA tabulations of DMDC FY95 to FY03 accession data. For non-citizen recruits between 1998 and 2002, the executive order may have reduced their actual waiting period for citizenship by up to 3 years.

We also observe a decline in the time-to-citizenship for non-citizen accessions in the Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy, but it was not as dramatic. Recent decreases in time-to-citizenship could be the result of one or both of the following:

- The fact that recent recruits have less time to become citizens and only non-citizen accessions who became citizens very quickly will be included in the data.
- Improvements in the services' citizenship application process.

Figure 20 shows which accessions were influenced by President Bush's 2002 executive order that eliminated the waiting period for servicemembers to apply for citizenship. Accessions before 1998 were not affected by the executive order and had to be legalized aliens for at least 3 years before applying for citizenship, whereas non-citizens accessing less than 3 years before the executive order may have had their waiting periods shortened. Eligible non-citizen accessions after June 2002 no longer have to wait to apply for U.S. citizenship. Without additional years of data, we are unable to disentangle whether the decrease in time-to-citizenship is due to sample selection or a reduction in administrative and legislative barriers to citizenship.

Table 19 shows our multivariate regression estimates of the time-to-citizenship for Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy new citizens.<sup>67</sup> All else equal, we find that time-to-citizenship differs by race/ethnicity, service, recruit quality, and dependent status at accession.<sup>68</sup> Compared with white new citizens, Hispanic non-citizen accessions take almost 3 months longer to become U.S. citizens. Blacks and Asian/Pacific Islanders also take longer than whites to become U.S. citizens. The time-to-citizenship is 12.1 months shorter for new citizens in the Marine Corps than for new citizens in the Air Force. Finally, non-citizen accessions with dependents who became citizens by September 2003 did so almost 3 months earlier than their counterparts without dependents at accession.

---

67. Our time-to-citizenship regressions control for fiscal year of accession, Service, race/ethnicity, gender, education, marital status, age at accession, and high quality.

68. Thus, whereas older non-citizen recruits are more likely to become citizens, the citizenship process takes longer for them. This is an interesting and non-intuitive result.

Table 19. Estimated months until citizenship<sup>a</sup>

Variable	Coefficient
Race/ethnicity	
White	Base case
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.61**
Black	5.44**
Hispanic	2.76**
Native	-5.87
Other	2.06*
Age at Accession	
18 years of age	Base case
19 years of age	.921
20 to 24 years of age	1.71
25 and older	.113
Service	
Air Force	12.14**
Navy	13.03**
Marine Corps	Base case
Other	
Tier I & AFQT > 49	-1.63**
Female	.557
Married or dependents	2.90**

a. \*\* indicates t statistic significant at 1-percent level;

\* indicates t statistic significant at 5-percent level.

Our sample includes Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps non-citizen accessions. Army non-citizen accessions were excluded.

Full estimates are in appendix G.

The average length of the process for becoming citizens for those who attained citizenship while in the Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy is 33, 31, and 20 months, respectively. We also estimated separate time-to-citizenship models for the Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy.<sup>69</sup> Some of our service-specific findings follow:

69. Our service-specific time-to-citizenship regressions control for fiscal year of accession, race/ethnicity, gender, education, marital status, age at accession, and high quality.

- Within the Air Force, white non-citizen accessions become citizens more quickly than other non-citizen accessions.
- Female Marines take 3.3 months longer than male Marines to become U.S. citizens.
- Within the Navy, high-quality non-citizen accessions become citizens almost 4 months earlier than other accessions.
- Within both the Navy and Marine Corps, non-citizen accessions with dependents became citizens 4 and 3 months earlier, respectively, than other accessions.



## Recommendations

Getting information out about the success of non-citizens in all of the military services is important. When we began this study, we found virtually no literature on the performance of non-citizens in the military. Yet, we find that non-citizens perform remarkably well and have lower 3- and 36-month attrition rates than citizens. Thus, not only do non-citizens bring linguistic and cultural diversity to the services, they also bring a track record of superior performance. OSD–Accession Policy should publicize these results, which could serve as a recruitment incentive.

As the services (particularly the Army and Marine Corps) make efforts to increase the number of Arabic-language speakers, it will be important to document which recruiting, training, and compensation strategies work and which do not. A more linguistically and culturally diverse force is likely to be required even after the current conflict ends, and it will be important to know what strategies are most and least effective in sustaining required diversity.

The services and USCIS have made strides in simplifying and facilitating the process of applying for citizenship while serving in the military. That said, there are things that OSD–Accession Policy could do to further improve the process. These would not only benefit servicemembers but would supply the services with a more capable and flexible force.<sup>70</sup>

Collecting the documentation/information needed to apply for citizenship can be a daunting task. Often, documents must be sent from abroad or the servicemember must consult with family members to retrieve background information. Consequently, we believe that

---

70. Because non-citizen servicemembers are restricted from some occupations and assignments, the services cannot use them as flexibly as citizen servicemembers.

OSD–Accession Policy could provide military recruiters with information on what documents/information non-citizen recruits will need if they want to apply for citizenship while serving in the military. This would allow recruits to assemble these materials while still at home in the DEP.

OSD–Accession Policy also could work with USCIS’s Office of Citizenship to develop materials for applicants or new recruits that explain:

- Eligibility for expedited citizenship
- Benefits of filing for citizenship while in the military
- Benefits of attaining citizenship.

This information would be useful to those considering military service and could provide initial points of contact for those interested in obtaining more information.<sup>71</sup>

OSD–Accession Policy also might want to investigate reasons for differences in service policies regarding non-citizens. An all-service conference to discuss these policies (and compare their advantages and disadvantages) might prove useful.

We make several recommendations that may be beyond the purview of OSD–Accession Policy. We feel that they are important to raise, however, because they are likely to affect non-citizens’ performance and satisfaction, as well as their ability to attain citizenship while in the military.

First, we believe that the services should commit to more structured installation-based assistance to help non-citizen servicemembers with their citizenship applications. If citizenship assistance services are unavailable or personnel are not adequately trained, the non-citizen servicemembers suffer. USCIS San Antonio has developed training for citizenship POCs at Fort Hood; the services should investigate whether POCs at other installations could receive similar training. By

---

71. In focus groups held as part of a previous study, we were surprised that many non-citizen recruits (in bootcamp at the time) were unaware of the expedited citizenship provisions.

ensuring that servicemembers' citizenship applications are in order before they are sent to USCIS, skilled installation-based personnel could facilitate the process and shorten application processing times.

Second, we believe that the services should provide installation-based immigration assistance to the dependents of servicemembers.<sup>72</sup> We learned in our interviews that the dependents of non-citizen servicemembers often think they are automatically in a legal immigration status. For example, an person in the United States on a student visa may marry a non-citizen servicemember and wrongly believe that no change in status is necessary. In fact, those who have not continually updated their status with USCIS can be prosecuted or deported.

This is not a problem that affects only the servicemember's dependents; it can have spillover effects on the retention and job performance of the servicemember. Although there are legal options for keeping dependents in the country (such as filing for humanitarian visas through a local congressional office or filing for a humanitarian parole through USCIS), servicemembers will need help navigating these procedures.

---


72. Currently, not all military installations offer services to assist these individuals.



## Conclusions

Non-citizens are a vital part of our country's military. Demographic trends and new incentives (including new language programs and expedited citizenship), make it likely that their numbers within the military's ranks will grow. These non-citizen recruits will provide the services with a more richly diverse force (in terms of race/ethnicity, language, and culture). Non-citizens also perform very well; figure 21 summarizes the attrition rates for citizen and non-citizen personnel.

Figure 21. A summary of the attrition rates of citizen and non-citizen servicemembers



In short, we find that non-citizens do remarkably well in the military—both throughout bootcamp and the first term of service—and that the effects are strong and statistically significant. Many of them pursue citizenship while in the military, and this is positively correlated with retention. Non-citizens provide the military with a rich pool of diverse recruits who have significant potential to succeed.



## Appendix A: More on policies and procedures for recruiting non-citizens

### Verification of LPR status

Concern about the validity of recruits' social security numbers, alien registration numbers, and place of birth arose in the fall of 2002. A verification process (started in December 2002) required that Military Entrance Processing Command (MEPCOM)<sup>73</sup> personnel verify original documents required by each service for those in the delayed entry program as of 16 December 2002. DoD later developed standard source documents for verification of these fields (see table 20).

In August 2004, MEPCOM began coordinating with the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), the Social Security Administration (SSA), and USCIS for further verification of LPR status. The MEPS Liaison submits Alien Registration numbers for non-citizen recruits to DMDC, who forwards them to USCIS for verification. Similarly, SSNs are sent to DMDC and then forwarded to SSA. Verification usually is completed within 24 hours [14, 52]. It should be noted, however, that commanding officers in the Recruiting Commands are ultimately responsible for document verification.

The MEPS Liaison NCO is responsible for further review and validation of all documents. He or she must personally inspect all validating documents and sign a statement to that effect before shipping [13, p. 3-29]. The MEPS Liaison must verify all documents again at least 48 hours before the recruit ships for active duty.

---

73. MEPCOM is responsible for verifying the mental qualifications, medical qualifications, and eligibility of applicants.

Table 20. DoD Standard Source documents<sup>a,b</sup>

	U.S. born <sup>c</sup>	Naturalized U.S. citizen	FSM/RMI/ Palau <sup>d</sup>	Jay Treaty of 1796 Natives	Not U.S. citizens
Place of birth	Birth Certificate U.S. Passport <sup>e</sup> DD 372 <sup>f</sup> FS 240 <sup>g</sup> DS 1350 <sup>h</sup> FS 545 <sup>i</sup>	Birth Certificate Passport	Birth Certificate Passport	Birth Certificate Passport	Birth Certificate Passport
SSN	Original Social Security Card DD 214 <sup>j</sup> NGB Form 22 <sup>k</sup>	Original Social Security Card DD 214 NGB Form 22	Original Social Security Card DD 214 NGB Form 22	Original Social Security Card DD 214 NGB Form 22	Original Social Security Card DD 214 NGB Form 22
Citizenship	Birth Certificate U.S. Passport DD 372 FS 240 DS 1350 FS 545	U.S. Passport INS N-550/551/ 570 <sup>l</sup> INS N-560/ 561 <sup>m</sup>	Birth Certificate Passport INS N-550/551/ 570 INS N-560/561	Birth Certificate Tribal Letter/ Card	INS G-845 <sup>n</sup> INS I-551 <sup>o, p</sup>

a. Source: Mr. Michael Styka at USMC Recruiting Command.

b. All must be originals, except for the Birth Certificate, DD 372, FS 240, DS 1350, FS 545, and Tribal Letter/Card, which can be "Certified True Copies."

c. People born in Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Guam are U.S. citizens. Source: USC 8, Sections 1402-1407.

d. Federated States of Micronesia/the Republic of the Marshall Islands/Palau.

e. Must have been originally issued for 5 or more years.

f. Request for Verification of Birth

g. Counselor Report of Birth Abroad (of a U.S. citizen)

h. Certificate of Birth

i. Certificate of Birth Abroad

j. Certificate of Release/Discharge from Active Duty

k. National Guard only

l. Naturalization Certificate

m. Certificate of Citizenship

n. Document Verification Request

o. Permanent Residence Card (green card)

p. In addition, USCIS says that (1) an I-94 Arrival/Departure Record on which is stamped in the lower right-hand corner the words "Processed for I-551" and (2) a passport from the country of nationality in which is stamped on one of the pages "Processed for I-551..." are acceptable proofs of citizenship, but these are not currently listed in the DoD guidance. The Navy Recruiting Manual lists these two proofs as acceptable and also includes a Form I-688—a Temporary Resident Alien Card with a black sticker or stamp.



## Background investigations

### Entrance National Agency Check (ENTNAC)

Recruiting personnel are responsible for preparing three forms used for the ENTNAC: SF Form 86 (Questionnaire for National Security Positions),<sup>74</sup> Form S2280 or Form 258 (fingerprinting forms), and DD Form 1966 (Record of Military Processing).<sup>75</sup> Fingerprinting is done at the MEPS. The ENTNAC may be automated or manual, but non-citizens do not qualify for the automated check [53, p. 48].<sup>76</sup> The ENTNAC must be submitted on the date that the applicant contracts into the DEP, and usually takes 3 to 5 days. In most cases, recruits cannot depart for training until the ENTNAC results are received [53, p. 48].

### National Agency Check/Local Agency Check/Credit Check (NACLCL)

The NACLCL must be submitted to OPM within 90 days of the date of the ENTNAC submission. OPM recently estimated that it takes an average of 200 days to close a NACLCL investigation [29]. Non-citizens are processed as enlistments only (the citizen box on the NACLCL is left blank and the non-citizen is not adjudicated); when the non-citizen becomes a citizen, his or her NACLCL can be forwarded for clearance adjudication to the appropriate service department.

## Proof of education

Verification of educational credentials is service specific, but all those educated abroad must have an evaluation of their educational level performed before enlistment.

---

74. The electronic version of this form is called the Enlisted Personnel Security Questionnaire (EPSQ).

75. The Services use DD Form 1966 to request applicant enlistment and MEPS uses it to report accession data. It standardizes information collected across the Services and the way in which such information is recorded.

76. Among the criteria for an automated ENTNAC is that the enlistee must be a U.S. citizen at birth.

## **Air Force**

In the Air Force, evaluations can be obtained through a state department of education, college or university listed in the current education directory, or authorized credentials evaluation agency.<sup>77</sup> College credits must be earned from an institution listed in the Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education publication. If not, the credits must be evaluated by an institution listed in that publication. The applicant must pay any associated fees [8, p. 34].

## **Army**

In the Army, applicants completing high school or having college credits from foreign<sup>78</sup> colleges or universities must have their documents evaluated and accredited by either:

- A state board of education, a state university or recognized university or college listed in the Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education publication.
- Any organization that is a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Service (NACES).

The applicant must pay any associated fees [7].

## **Marine Corps**

In the Marine Corps, the foreign credential must be deemed equivalent to a traditional American high school program of instruction before enlistment. This can be done by (1) the country's consulate (unless listed as a hostile/instable country), (2) a state board of education, state university, or recognized university listed in the Directory

---

77. The credentials evaluation agency must be a member of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

78. The U.S. Virgin Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Marshall Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Canada, Puerto Rico, the DoD Dependent School System, and Overseas American-sponsored Elementary and Secondary Schools assisted by the U.S. Department of State are exempt from this evaluation requirement, and their education documents are treated in the same manner as any U.S. school.

of Postsecondary Institutions, or (3) foreign language services that are accredited by the American Association of Collegiate Registrar and Admissions Officers. The recruiting station must verify the educational credentials, and document them on DD Form 1966 [13, p. 3-51].

## Navy

Naval Recruiting Command evaluates foreign education credentials using the Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers' Projects for International Education Research (PIER) World Education Series publications. Recruiters must submit a request for evaluation of foreign education to the Education Service Specialist with the applicant's diploma and transcript (with translation) at least 2 days before the applicant's processing at MEPS [14, p. 2-110].

## Documentation

All verification documents must be in English. Any documents not in English must be translated. In the Marine Corps, translation must be done by a competent person who is not affiliated with the service, and both the translated and the original document must be submitted [13, p. 4-8]. The Army allows a bilingual Soldier to translate the documents.<sup>79</sup> The Navy makes the applicant responsible for getting a certified English translation, and both the original and translated copies must be included in the applicant's packet [14, p. 2-54]. The Air Force requires that the applicant get documents translated and pay all associated fees. The translation must include a statement from the translator that he or she is competent to translate and that the translation is correct.

## English proficiency

The services require a certain level of English proficiency.<sup>80</sup> For example, the Army states that "the ability to read, write, and speak sufficient

---

79. The bilingual Soldier must have the language skill identifier in his or her MOS, he or she must sign the translation, and a commissioned officer must witness his or her signature.

80. There are a few special programs that allow for the enlistment of non-proficient English speakers.

English to understand the oath of enlistment and the ENTNAC interview” is an unwaiverable requirement [7, p. 6]. Navy policy dictates that “applicants who have difficulty expressing themselves or otherwise understanding English will not be accepted for enlistment” [14, p. 2-55].

When the MEPS Liaison NCO verifies an applicant’s documents, he or she also must sign a statement certifying that “the applicant, without further instruction, is able to read, write, and speak the English language sufficiently to complete recruit training” [13, p. 3-29].<sup>81</sup>

Those found not to be proficient in English are referred to a MEPS section chief for evaluation, which can include administration of the English Comprehension Level Test (ECLT).<sup>82</sup>

The MEPS section chief subsequently may submit a recommendation for termination of processing to the MEPS commander. The individual services’ recruiting offices have the ability to issue a waiver for the MEPS interview requirements if they choose to do so [53].

## Waiver requirements

In the Marine Corps, there is an administrative waiver code (LYB) for aliens or U.S. citizens who have traveled or resided in a nation whose interests are inimical to those of the United States or those who have traveled or resided in countries with areas of instability (see table 21) [13, p. 3-31].<sup>83</sup> For recruits with this administrative code (which is

---

81. The Navy additionally requires that the Navy Enlisted Classifier attest to the applicant’s fluency in English [14, p. 2-55]. There are some exceptions, however. For example, the MEPSs have added civilian translators to their staffs to assist 09Ls (discussed later), who are allowed to have translators with them during processing.

82. Theoretically, all recruits whose native language is not English should take the ECLT at the MEPS.

83. Residence refers to that occurring after the applicant’s 15<sup>th</sup> birthday. Travel includes more than two trips within 5 years preceding enlistment, but excludes family vacation, school trips, sporting events, or other similar, short-lived group-sponsored visits. In practice, however, virtually no recruits receive these waivers.

granted at the CG MCRC level), recruiters must either get proof of a favorable ENTNAC or a verification receipt from OPM showing a request for a NACLC before the applicant can ship [13, p. 3-31; 54].

Table 21. Hostile countries/countries of instability<sup>a</sup>

Afghanistan	South Sakhalin (Karafuto)
Albania	Laos
Angola	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lebanon
Boznia & Herzegovina	Liberia
Cambodia	Libyan Arab Republic
Colombia	Lithuania
China (including Tibet)	Mongolian People's Republic
Cuba	Nicaragua
Estonia	Pakistan
Romania	Somalia
Ethiopia	Southern Yemen
Hungary	Syria
Iran	Commonwealth of Independent States (former USSR)
Iraq	Vietnam
North Korea	Former Yugoslavian Nation
Montenegro	Yemen
Kurile Islands	Serbia

a. [13, p. 3-30].

The Navy, Army, and Air Force do not require a formal waiver, but all military applicants have to disclose travel to hostile countries on their EPSQ for 5 years before their enlistment date. OPM (the investigative authority) examines any questionable travel and, if warranted, forwards the case to the service recruiting command for an eligibility determination [55].

## Occupational restrictions

The biggest practical limitation on non-citizens in the military is the ability to obtain a security clearance, which currently requires U.S. citizenship.

Many military jobs require a clearance for entry and/or promotion. For example, the Army notes that, although non-citizens can enlist, they may not enlist for any MOS, Assignment, or Option that requires a security clearance [7, section 5-60]. The guidance counselor at MEPS is required to verify this [53, section 6-5]. The Marine Corps requires a pre-enlistment brief, during which non-citizen applicants are informed of these restrictions [13, p. 3-30]. Tables 22 through 25 through show examples of occupations requiring U.S. citizenship, by service.

Security clearances are handled at the unit level. Each Commanding Officer must delegate, in writing, the responsibility for administering the security program to the unit's security manager.<sup>84</sup> One of the security manager's responsibilities is to process security clearance requests for servicemembers. If a servicemember without a clearance is ordered to handle classified material, it is up to the security manager to initial the clearance request.

Recent changes in these processes should speed this process. As discussed earlier, the investigations for clearances are now handled through the NACLIC. Currently, all new recruits have these investigations, which take about 200 days. Information for citizen recruits is sent for service adjudication after the NACLIC investigation is complete. Non-citizens will have a completed investigation, but the results would have to be sent to the service for adjudication to initiate the clearance. Any servicemember who entered before the NACLIC was standard for all recruits will still need the investigation as the first step in obtaining a clearance.

---

84. In operational commands, this is usually someone in the Intelligence section.

Table 22. Some Army MOSs requiring U.S. citizenship<sup>a</sup>

MOS	MOS title
13C	Tactical Automated Fire Control Systems Specialist
14E	PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator/Maintainer
18C	Special Forces Engineer Sergeant
24N	CHAPARRAL System Mechanic
31P	Microwave Systems Operator-Maintainer
35E	Radio and Communications Security Repairer
45G	Fire Control Repairer
52E	Prime Power Production Specialist
55D	Explosive Ordnance Disposal Specialist
74B	Information Systems Operator-Analyst
93B	Aeroscout Observer
96Z	Intelligence Senior Sergeant

a. For complete list, see [http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/pdf/p611\\_21.pdf](http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/pdf/p611_21.pdf).

Table 23. Some Navy ratings requiring U.S. citizenship<sup>a</sup>

Rating	Rating title
CTA	Cryptologic Technician (Administrative)
ET	Electronics Technician
IS	Intelligence Specialist
MT	Missile Technician
PC	Postal Clerk

a. For complete list, see [http://buperscd.technology.navy.mil/bup\\_updt/upd\\_CD/BUPERS/OCCSTD/Occstd.pdf](http://buperscd.technology.navy.mil/bup_updt/upd_CD/BUPERS/OCCSTD/Occstd.pdf)

Table 24. Some Air Force AFSCs requiring U.S. citizenship<sup>a</sup>

AFSC	AFSC title
1AOX1	Inflight Refueler
1C1X1	Air Traffic Controller
1N5X1	Electronic Signal Intelligence Exploitation Specialist
2AOX1B	Avionics Test Station and Components Maintenance Specialist
2A7X3	Aircraft Structural Maintenance Specialist
2POX1	Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory Specialist
2W1X1C	Aircraft Armament System Specialist
3C3X1	Communication Component System Planning and Implementation Specialist
3VOX3	Visual Information Product Documentation Specialist
7S0X1	Special Investigator
8M000	Postal Specialist
9S100	Applied Geophysics

a. For complete list, see <http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/pubfiles/af/36/afman36-2108/afman36-2108.pdf>, Attachment 39

Table 25. Some Marine Corps MOSs requiring U.S. citizenship<sup>a</sup>

MOS	MOS title
0161	Postal Clerk
0211	Counterintelligence/HUMINT Specialist
0844	Field Artillery Fire Control Man
2336	Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technician
2611	Cryptologic Digital Network Technician/Analyst
5811	Military Police

a. For complete list, see [http://www.usmc.mil/directiv.nsf/9d816d546727ed748525651700581631/4744c049b38f2baf85256af1005cf8fd/\\$FILE/MCO%20P1200.7Z.pdf](http://www.usmc.mil/directiv.nsf/9d816d546727ed748525651700581631/4744c049b38f2baf85256af1005cf8fd/$FILE/MCO%20P1200.7Z.pdf)



## Appendix B: More on the Army Translator Aide (09L) pilot program

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (ASD P&R) and Army G-1, at the direction of DoD, have created a program aimed at attracting citizen and non-citizen native and heritage speakers of Arabic (modern standard and Iraqi dialects), Dari (Persian Afghan and Persian-Dari), Kurdish, Pashto (Afghan and Peshawari), and Turkish into the Army through the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR).<sup>85</sup> The program's goal is to produce soldiers who can work in the Translator Aide (09L) MOS overseas.<sup>86</sup>

Enlistment requirements with regard to age, English proficiency, and ASVAB/AFQT have been relaxed as part of the program.<sup>87</sup> Enlistees commit to an 8-year Military Service Obligation (MSO) in the IRR. All enlist as either E-3s or E-4s, and are awarded E-4 upon completion of

---

85. DoD guidance included (1) languages of interest, (2) enlistment into the IRR, and (3) a shortened basic training course (no longer in place). The program was directed in February 2003 and implemented in July 2003. The first student arrived at DLIELC in September 2003. Non-citizens are enlisted as 09Ls; most citizens (except those who do not qualify) are enlisted as 97L (Translators/Interpreters).

86. The idea was to provide more translators "on the ground" since it was believed that other translators were occupied with higher-level activities.

87. Recruits may be up to 40 years old and must score at least L2/S2 in language proficiency for their native language (meaning they are very fluent) and demonstrate some English proficiency (by scoring at least a 40 on the ECLT). There is no minimum ASVAB score requirement for those going into the English language training; those not requiring English language training must have a minimum ASVAB score of 10. They must also eventually score an R2 by taking the DLPT while at Lackland.

their advanced training.<sup>88</sup> As of 28 June 2004, those enlisting are eligible for an enlistment bonus of \$7,000 [56].<sup>89</sup>

After accession, the 09Ls who do not speak English fluently go to Fort Sill for 3 days for initial processing before proceeding to DLIELC, where they undergo intensive English language training for a minimum of 6 weeks up to 6 months.<sup>90, 91, 92</sup>

Initially, attrition out of the English language training was very high (about 50 percent).<sup>93</sup> This was believed to stem from both cultural differences and misunderstanding on the part of the recruits.<sup>94</sup> The Army took several steps to counter this attrition and, in the most recent quarter, attrition had dropped to less than 30 percent.<sup>95</sup>

- 
88. This is a recent change: see USAREC MSG 04-082.
  89. The bonus is payable upon completion of their advanced training: 50 percent upon award of MOS, 25 percent at the 2-year anniversary, and 25 percent at the 4-year anniversary of enlistment.
  90. During this time, recruits get their initial clothing issues, create records, receive vaccinations, and are screened for medical, dental, and vision deficiencies and financial problems.
  91. Those scoring less than 80 on the ECLT (about 1/2 to 2/3 of 09L recruits) must undergo English language training. Those already fluent in English, scoring 80+ on the ECLT, and with an English Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) score greater than or equal to L2/S2 go directly to basic training.
  92. The length of training depends on when English language proficiency is achieved.
  93. Mental problems and refusal to train are the main reasons for attrition.
  94. Apparently, many recruits wrongly believed that they were to serve as civilian translators rather than Soldiers. Cultural difficulties included unwillingness to train with women and requests for modified bathroom and dining facilities. Lackland has made several accommodations to address these issues.
  95. This included adding staff (so that the program was staffed more like a basic than an advanced training program) and requiring 09Ls to sign a 5-page statement, which summarizes the terms and benefits of their service and has been translated into eight languages, at the MEPS (developed in April 2004). Lackland also plans to add an Arabic-speaking drill instructor (perhaps a 09L graduate) to its staff in the near future [57].

To complete their training, 09Ls in the English language training program must attain at least an 80 on the ECLT,<sup>96</sup> an OPI score of L2/S2 (listening and speaking), a Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) score of L2/R2 (listening and reading) in their target language, and an ASVAB score of at least 10.

After completing their training, 09Ls go to Fort Jackson for 9 weeks of Basic Combat Training<sup>97</sup> and 6 weeks of Advanced Individual Training (AIT) (which is specific to 09Ls).<sup>98</sup> They are placed on leave for 2 weeks before reporting for duty in accordance with their mobilization orders.

Most of the program's recruits are non-citizens. They do not need citizenship/security clearances (the 09L billets do not require clearances), although they undergo the NACLIC and an additional counterintelligence investigation. While the 09Ls are in AIT, those who are non-citizens and want to become citizens get assistance with their applications. Those non-citizens who desire citizenship have their applications expedited immediately after they complete AIT.<sup>99</sup>

---

96. PERSCOM has authorized a 5-point waiver. The ECLT is administered monthly.

97. 09Ls originally went through a separate, shorter (6-week) basic training course but are now integrated into the regular 9-week classes with other recruits. Although there were fears that attrition would rise for 09Ls after this integration, it did not. If a basic training course is not starting within 15 days of the recruit finishing his or her English language training, the recruit returns home to assist with local recruiting through the Hometown Recruiter Assistance Program [58].

98. This originally was only 3 weeks of training, but the Army recently added 2 weeks of modern standard Arabic training (for document translation) and another week for review. The first class to complete this longer advanced training program graduated on 16 December 2004 [57].

99. Because 09Ls train under "active-duty for training" orders, they cannot apply for citizenship until they are mobilized. However, on the last day of AIT (the day they become mobilized), the company commander takes non-citizens who wish to apply for citizenship to the local USCIS office (in Charleston, SC), where their photographs and fingerprints are taken and their applications are submitted. USCIS marks these applications "linguist-special case," and they get special processing at USCIS Lincoln.

So far, approximately 270 recruits have signed up for the program, 167 students have come to DLIELC for training (67 of whom graduated), and 44 have completed their advanced training.<sup>100</sup> They are mobilized for 1 year with an optional 1-year extension.

Because the program is a pilot, many issues still need to be resolved—including determining the right proponency and developing a career path. The Army is doing a survey-based, in-house evaluation of the program, which will be released in August 2005 [57].

---

100. The class that graduated in December added another 20 or so to this number. The program's accession goal is about 250 annually [57].

## Appendix C: Variable definitions

This appendix presents the variable definitions and the logistic regressions for 3-month attrition (see table 26).

Table 26. Variable definitions

Variable	Variable definition
<b>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</b>	
3-month attrition	1 if recruit attrites (does not complete) the first 3 months of service; else 0.
36-month attrition	1 if recruit attrites in the first 36 months of service; else 0. This variable is defined for accessions with initial contracts of 3 or more years. We use separation codes to define attrites, counting early releases within 3 months of the obligation end date as completers.
Became a citizen	1 if recruit is observed becoming a citizen while in the service; else 0. This variable is defined for non-citizen recruits.
Months to citizenship	Number of months from entering the service to the earliest September snapshot that a recruit is observed as being a citizen. This variable is defined for non-citizen recruits we observe becoming citizens while in the service.
<b>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</b>	
Non-citizen	1 if recruit is a non-citizen; else 0. There are also 5 non-citizen variables that categorize the race/ethnicity of non-citizens as Hispanic, Black, White, API, or other. These variables are 1 if the recruit is a non-citizen of that race/ethnicity; else 0.
Race/ethnic identifiers	A set of 0/1 variables that describe the recruit's race/ethnic background. Each recruit has a value of 1 in one of the following variables: Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islander (API), White, Black, Native American, or Other race/ethnic.
Female	1 if recruit is female, else 0.
Educational background	We have a series of 0/1 variables that define educational background.
Dropout	1 if the recruit has no educational credentials (Tier III), else 0.

Table 26. Variable definitions (continued)

Variable	Variable definition
GED	1 if the recruit is Tier II, else 0.
One semester college	1 if the recruit's credential is one semester of college. These recruits are in Tier I, but we have found they have high attrition rates.
HSDG	1 if the recruit is Tier I (except for one semester college, an AA, or a BA/BS or higher degree), else 0.
Associate degree (AA/AS)	1 if the recruit has an AA/AS degree, else 0.
BA/BS+	1 if the recruit has a Bachelor's or higher degree, else 0.
Tier I and AFQT>49	1 if Tier I recruit who scored in the 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile or higher on the AFQT; else 0.
DEP	1 if recruit entered through the DEP; else 0.
DEP ge 3 months	1 if recruit was in the DEP for 3 or more months; else 0.
Accession waivers	We have a series of 0/1 variables that define accession waivers. Recruits can have more than one accession waiver, although few do.
Alcohol or drugs	1 if accession waiver for drugs or alcohol, else 0.
Serious legal	1 if accession waiver for a serious offense or a felony (adult or juvenile), else 0.
Dependents	1 if accession waiver for dependents, else 0.
Medical/physical	1 if accession waiver for medical or physical reasons, else 0.
Other waiver	1 if accession waiver for anything not in the above categories, else 0.
Married or dependents at accession	1 if the recruit was married or had dependents at accession, else 0.
June-September accession	1 if accessions was in June-September, else 0.
Fiscal year identifiers	A set of 0/1 variables that reflect the fiscal year in which recruit began bootcamp.

## Appendix D: Three-month attrition regressions

This appendix contain the results of the logistic regressions for 3-month attrition (tables 27 through 29).

Table 27. Logistic regressions for 3-month attrition<sup>a</sup>

	Mean		Marginal effect <sup>b</sup>	
	FY88-94	FY95-02	FY88-94	FY95-02
Non-citizen	.029	.045	-.018**	-.037**
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>				
API	.020	.032	-.041**	-.046**
Black	.186	.189	-.029**	-.029**
Hispanic	.069	.104	-.032**	-.041**
Native American	.007	.014	-.017**	-.008**
Other race/ethnic	.007	.014	-.016**	-.031**
White	.711	.647	omitted	omitted
Female	.136	.180	.038**	.051**
DEP	.863	.885	-.008**	-.007**
DEP >3months	.587	.530	-.018**	-.017**
<b>EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND</b>				
Dropout	.014	.0108	.032**	.038**
GED	.032	.059	.022**	.024**
Adult education	.012	.017	.041**	.029**
One semester college	.015	.020	.039**	.033**
HSDG	.902	.867	omitted	omitted
Associate degree	.008	.008	-.015**	-.015**
BA/BS+	.017	.020	-.013**	-.026**
Tier I and AFQT>49	.654	.620	-.034**	-.028**
<b>ACCESSION WAIVER</b>				
Alcohol or drugs	.057	.061	.003**	.008**
Serious legal	.062	.066	.003**	.006**
Dependents	.011	.015	.010**	.012**

Table 27. Logistic regressions for 3-month attrition<sup>a</sup> (continued)

	Mean		Marginal effect <sup>b</sup>	
	FY88-94	FY95-02	FY88-94	FY95-02
Medical/physical	.029	.054	.016**	.018**
Other waiver	.055	.049	-.002**	.009**
No waiver	.793	.773	omitted	omitted
Married or dependents at accession	.118	.103	.012**	.021**
June-Sept. accession	.464	.446	-.005**	-.016**
<b>SERVICE</b>				
Air Force	.154	.182	-.003**	-.014**
Navy	.322	.264	.016**	.019**
Marine Corps	.143	.183	.026**	.013**
Army	.381	.371	omitted	omitted
Dependent variable	.094	.106		
Number of observations	1,374,350	1,417,014		
Chi square	23,943	25,519		

a. The regressions also controlled for the fiscal year of accessions and for observations missing information for DEP. Omitted categories in the regressions are citizen, white, high school diploma graduates, no accession waiver, Army accessions, and accessions in FY02.

b. \*\* indicates significance at the 1-percent level;  
\* indicates significance at the 5-percent level.



Table 28. Logistic regressions with non-citizen race/ethnic interactions for 3-month attrition: FY95-FY02 accessions<sup>a</sup>

	Mean		Marginal effect <sup>b</sup>	
	FY88-94	FY95-02	FY88-94	FY95-02
<b>CITIZENSHIP/RACE/ETHNICITY</b>				
Hispanic non-citizen	.009	.016	-.025**	-.031**
White non-citizen	.004	.005	-.009**	-.033**
Black non-citizen	.006	.010	-.025**	-.052**
API non-citizen	.009	.011	-.013**	-.030**
Other non-citizen	.002	.003	-.010	-.025**
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>				
API	.020	.032	-.043**	-.047**
Black	.186	.189	-.029**	-.029**
Hispanic	.069	.104	-.031**	-.042**
Native American	.007	.014	.001	.034**
Other race/ethnic	.014	.028	-.018**	-.033**
Female	.136	.180	.038**	.051**
DEP	.863	.885	-.008**	-.007**
DEP > 2 months	.587	.530	-.018**	-.017**
<b>EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND</b>				
Dropout	.014	.008	.032**	.039**
GED	.032	.059	.022**	.024**
Adult education	.012	.017	.041**	.029**
One semester col- lege	.015	.020	.039**	.033**
Associate degree	.008	.008	-.015**	-.015**
BA/BS +	.017	.020	-.013**	-.026**
Tier I and AFQT>49	.654	.620	-.034**	-.028**
<b>ACCESSION WAIVER</b>				
Alcohol or drugs	.057	.061	.003**	.008**
Serious legal	.062	.066	.003**	.006**
Dependents	.011	.015	.010**	.012**
Medical/physical	.029	.054	.016**	.018**
Other	.055	.049	-.002**	.009**
<b>SERVICE</b>				
Air Force	.154	.182	-.003**	-.014**

Table 28. Logistic regressions with non-citizen race/ethnic interactions for 3-month attrition: FY95-FY02 accessions<sup>a</sup> (continued)

	Mean		Marginal effect <sup>b</sup>	
	FY88-94	FY95-02	FY88-94	FY95-02
Navy	.322	.264	.016**	.020**
Marine Corps	.143	.183	.026**	.013**
Married/dependents	.118	.103	.012**	.021**
Jun-Sep accession	.464	.446	-.005**	-.016**
Constant				
Mean dependent variable	.094	.106		
Observations	1,374,350	1,417,014		
Chi square	23,966	25,588		

a. The regressions also controlled for the fiscal year of accessions and for observations missing information for DEP. Omitted categories in the regressions are citizen, white, high school diploma graduates, no accession waiver, Army accessions, and accessions in FY02.

b. \*\* indicates significance at the 1-percent level;  
\* indicates significance at the 5-percent level.

Appendix D

Table 29. Mean values and marginal effects from the 3-month attrition logit regression: FY95 to FY02 accessions<sup>a</sup>

	Air Force		Navy		Army		Marine Corps	
	Mean	Partial <sup>b</sup>	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial
Non-citizen (Hispanic)	.006	-.016*	.017	-.042**	.016	-.025**	.023	-.036**
Non-citizen (White)	.004	-.033**	.005	-.034**	.005	-.036**	.006	-.028**
Non-citizen (Black)	.005	-.021**	.012	-.062**	.012	-.052**	.008	-.058**
Non-citizen (API)	.008	-.011	.018	-.045**	.009	-.023**	.007	-.024**
Non-citizen (Other)	.002	-.033**	.003	-.036**	.002	-.025**	.004	-.010
Citizen	.975	omitted	.945	omitted	.956	omitted	.952	omitted
API	.033	-.045**	.044	-.049**	.027	-.052**	.022	-.036**
Black	.170	-.030**	.198	-.023**	.223	-.040**	.127	-.009**
Hispanic	.068	-.037**	.113	-.034**	.101	-.051**	.133	-.037**
Native American	.006	.039**	.029	.041**	.009	.007	.012	.030**
Other race/ethnic	.022	-.031**	.041	-.028**	.021	-.039**	.029	-.034**
White	.707	omitted	.604	omitted	.628	omitted	.689	omitted
Female	.257	.026**	.176	.015**	.200	.088**	.069	.053**
DEP	.932	-.005*	.853	-.007**	.883	-.002	.885	-.005**
DEP >3months	.659	-.015**	.516	-.024**	.433	-.009**	.617	-.023**
Dropout	.001	-.000	.027	.029**	.001	.008	.003	.065**
GED	.009	-.014**	.043	.024**	.106	.025**	.035	.040**
Adult education	.001	.078**	.032	.033**	.014	.020**	.014	.026**
HSDG	.952	omitted	.854	omitted	.806	omitted	.926	omitted
One semester college	.009	-.006	.025	.042**	.026	.028**	.014	.050**
Associate degree	.009	-.009	.007	-.021**	.012	-.018**	.003	-.010
BA/BS+	.020	-.009**	.012	-.033**	.034	-.036**	.005	-.031**
Tier I and AFQT>49	.763	-.026**	.581	-.039**	.579	-.023**	.621	-.026**
Accession waiver								
Alcohol or drugs	.001	.011	.035	.018**	.009	-.014**	.264	.008**
Serious legal	.047	-.000	.100	.016**	.040	-.021**	.091	.010**
Dependents	.010	.017**	.022	.009**	.002	-.013*	.034	.004
Medical/physical	.036	.007**	.045	.017**	.054	.021**	.085	.021**
Other waiver	.031	.001	.103	.010**	.008	-.006	.073	.008**
No waiver	.881	omitted	.710	omitted	.892	omitted	.518	omitted
Married or dependents	.085	.000	.094	.026**	.142	.022**	.056	.037**
June-Sep accession	.377	-.004**	.461	-.025**	.458	-.018**	.469	-.018**
Observations	257,376		373,478		526,611		259,549	
Chi square	3,292		7,472		14,680		4,544	
Mean dependent variable	.084		.123		.103		.110	

a. The regressions also controlled for the fiscal year of accessions and for observations missing information for DEP. Omitted categories in the regressions are citizen, white, high school diploma graduates, no accession waiver, Army accessions, and accessions in FY02.

b. This is the partial derivative or marginal effect. \*\* indicates significance at the 1-percent level; \* indicates significance at the 5-percent level.



## Appendix E: Thirty-six month attrition

This appendix presents the results from the logistic regressions for 36-month attrition (see table 30).

Table 30. Marginal effects from the 36-month attrition logit regression: FY95–00 accessions<sup>a</sup>

	All services Partial <sup>b</sup>	Air Force Partial	Army Partial	Navy Partial	Marine Corps Partial
Non-citizen (Hispanic)	-.079**	-.057**	-.086**	-.094**	-.060**
Non-citizen (White)	-.087**	-.066**	-.105**	-.101**	-.064**
Non-citizen (Black)	-.140**	-.079**	-.139**	-.168**	-.131**
Non-citizen (API)	-.094**	-.055**	-.083**	-.130**	-.051**
Non-citizen (Other)	-.083**	-.094**	-.096**	-.091**	-.055**
API	-.106**	-.096**	-.111**	-.114**	-.087**
Black	-.032**	-.004	-.063**	-.026**	-.008**
Hispanic	-.086**	-.067**	-.104**	-.071**	-.087**
Native American	.073**	.122**	.050**	.075**	.057**
Other race/ethnic	-.060**	-.059**	-.071**	-.052**	-.051**
Female	.105**	.054**	.186**	.034**	.105**
DEP	-.032**	-.035**	-.023**	-.030**	-.021**
DEP >3months	-.050**	-.045**	-.036**	-.067**	-.053**
Dropout	.127**	.044	-.065**	.111**	.158**
GED	.097**	-.017*	.112**	.093**	.110**
Adult education	.099**	.146**	.090**	.107**	.078**
One semester college	.105**	-.009	.105**	.124**	.091**
Associate degree	-.047**	-.036**	-.048**	-.067**	-.051**
BA/BS+	-.078**	-.110**	-.090**	-.082**	.004
Tier I and AFQT>49	-.049**	-.053**	-.034**	-.069**	-.059**
Accession waiver					
Alcohol or drugs	.047**	-.011	.094**	.053**	.044**
Serious legal	.053**	.026**	.008*	.066**	.058**
Dependents	.027**	.026**	-.061**	.010	.026**
Medical/physical	.019**	-.002	.021**	.006	.036**

Table 30. Marginal effects from the 36-month attrition logit regression: FY95–00 accessions<sup>a</sup>  
(continued)

	All services Partial <sup>b</sup>	Air Force Partial	Army Partial	Navy Partial	Marine Corps Partial
Other waiver	.033**	.026**	.019**	.040**	.018**
Married or dependents	.018**	-.037**	.026**	.030**	.042**
June-Sep accession	-.018**	-.001	-.023**	-.022**	-.026**
Air Force	-.074**				
Navy	-.008**				
Marine Corps	-.055**				
Observations	1,037,897	187,381	375,029	280,080	195,407
Chi square	41,226	2,876	18,853	12,242	6,958
Mean dependent variable	.316	.256	.344	.342	.286

a. The regressions also controlled for the fiscal year of accessions and for observations missing information for DEP. Omitted categories in the regressions are citizen, white, high school diploma graduates, no accession waiver, Army accessions, and accessions in FY02.

b. This is the partial derivative or marginal effect of the variable on 36-month attrition.

\*\* indicates significance at the 1-percent level;

\* indicates significance at the 5-percent level.

## Appendix F: Non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military

Table 31 presents logistic regressions for the probability that a non-citizen accession became a U.S. citizen while in the military.

Table 31. Mean values and marginal effects from becoming a U.S. citizen logit regressions: FY95-FY02 non-citizen accessions<sup>a,b</sup>

	Combined sample <sup>c</sup>		Navy		Air Force		Marine Corps	
	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial
<b>SERVICE<sup>d</sup></b>								
Air Force	.159	.137**	—	—	—	—	—	—
Navy	.518	-.167**	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY<sup>e</sup></b>								
API	.269	.006	.330	-.001	.315	.030	.148	-.002
Black	.200	-.011	.226	-.003	.187	-.028	.165	-.019
Hispanic	.351	-.035**	.310	-.031**	.247	-.040*	.469	-.044**
Native American	.003	.041	.002	-.034	.001	.164	.006	.084
Other race/ ethnic	.068	.022*	.048	.025	.098	.014	.084	.018
<b>EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND<sup>f</sup></b>								
Dropout	.010	-.037	.018	-.030	.001	.060	.002	-.021
GED	.018	.004	.022	-.012	.008	.031	.017	.023
Adult education	.019	-.037*	.027	-.029	.001	-.088	.016	-.033
One semester college	.023	.019	.029	.024	.012	.036	.019	-.001
Associate degree	.010	.080**	.011	.064**	.015	.103*	.005	.057
BA/BS+	.018	.091**	.024	.089**	.021	.000	.006	.116*
Tier I and AFQT>49	.494	.014**	.423	.015**	.686	-.024	.513	.030**
<b>AGE AT ACCESSION<sup>g</sup></b>								
19 years	.216	.011	.197	.019	.220	.011	.245	.001
20 to 24 years	.357	.007	.367	.021	.423	.008	.307	-.008
25 or older	.370	.013	.382	.024*	.309	.029	.379	-.007

Table 31. Mean values and marginal effects from becoming a U.S. citizen logit regressions: FY95-FY02 non-citizen accessions<sup>a,b</sup> (continued)

	Combined sample <sup>c</sup>		Navy		Air Force		Marine Corps	
	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial	Mean	Partial
<b>OTHER CHARACTERISTICS<sup>h</sup></b>								
Female	.158	.022**	.170	.027**	.292	.036**	.073	-.032
Married/ dependents	.106	.045**	.131	.027**	.093	.109**	.072	.039*
<b>FY OF ACCESSION<sup>i</sup></b>								
1995	.096	.173**	.097	.096**	.095	.302**	.096	.219**
1996	.108	.166**	.111	.086**	.097	.331**	.109	.204**
1997	.123	.161**	.127	.084**	.100	.357**	.127	.182**
1998	.132	.141**	.134	.053**	.118	.399*	.134	.149**
1999	.138	.103**	.141	.025**	.124	.240**	.140	.150**
2000	.136	.089**	.135	.034**	.153	.197**	.130	.108**
2001	.135	.108**	.136	.055**	.137	.236**	.132	.115**
Mean dependent variable	.263		.164		.469		.319	
Number of observations	39,223	39,223	20,334	20,334	6,252	6,252	12,637	12,637

a. The race/ethnic variables are incorrect in the FY03 accession data; thus, we omitted FY03 accessions from the regression analysis.

b. \* significant at 5% level;  
\*\* significant at 1% level.

c. We are unsure of the quality of the Army citizenship data, so our combined sample only includes Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps non-citizen accessions.

d. Omitted category is Marine Corps.

e. Omitted category is white.

f. Omitted category is high school diploma graduate (HSDG).

g. Omitted category is 18 years of age or younger.

h. Omitted categories are male, non-A-cell recruit, and no dependents at accessions.

i. Omitted category is FY-2 accessions.



## Appendix G: Time-to-citizenship regressions

Table 32 presents mean values and regression results for time-to-citizenship regression.

Table 32. Mean values and coefficients from time-to-citizenship regressions: FY95 to FY02 non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military<sup>a,b</sup>

	Combined Sample <sup>c</sup>		Navy		Air Force		Marine Corps	
	Mean	Coef	Mean	Coef	Mean	Coef	Mean	Coef
<b>SERVICE<sup>d</sup></b>								
Air Force	.285	12.14**	—	—	—	—	—	—
Navy	.324	13.03**	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>RACE/ETHNICITY<sup>e</sup></b>								
API	.271	3.61**	.350	7.29**	.336	2.06	.158	-.267
Black	.193	5.44**	.236	7.12**	.179	4.95**	.168	4.77**
Hispanic	.322	2.76**	.263	4.08**	.228	2.52*	.438	1.94*
Native Am	.004	-5.87	.002	-9.95	.001	7.63	.008	-6.86*
Other race/ethnic	.086	2.06*	.058	2.27	.109	1.49	.093	.817
<b>EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND<sup>f</sup></b>								
Dropout	.005	.437	.013	.929	.001	-19.81	.001	3.49
GED	.016	.656	.019	-.112	.010	2.59	.018	.919
Adult education	.013	.368	.022	-.547	.001	1.24	.014	-.250
One semester college	.022	-.746	.033	-.356	.010	1.25	.021	.720
Associate degree	.013	1.62	.017	2.94	.019	3.03	.005	-6.44
BA/BS+	.023	-.074	.040	-1.08	.024	.799	.008	4.85
Tier I and AFQT>49	.553	-1.63**	.458	-3.82**	.681	-.917	.537	-.216
<b>AGE AT ACCESSION<sup>g</sup></b>								
19 years	.219	.921	.188	2.83	.217	.709	.246	-.035
20 to 24 years	.359	1.71	.363	3.78	.421	.660	.310	1.48
Over 25 years	.369	.113	.405	3.06	.319	-2.43	.375	-.742

Table 32. Mean values and coefficients from time-to-citizenship regressions: FY95 to FY02 non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military<sup>a,b</sup> (continued)

	Combined Sample <sup>c</sup>		Navy		Air Force		Marine Corps	
	Mean	Coef	Mean	Coef	Mean	Coef	Mean	Coef
<b>OTHER CHARACTERISTICS<sup>h</sup></b>								
Female	.177	.557	.192	-.608	.311	.827	.067	3.27**
Married or dependents	.114	2.90**	.157	4.23**	.111	.724	.081	3.33**
<b>FISCAL YEAR OF ACCESSION<sup>i</sup></b>								
FY 1995	.118	24.47**	.122	31.29**	.109	27.20**	.121	15.86**
FY1996	.127	26.12**	.133	32.23**	.117	31.28**	.131	16.51**
FY1997	.142	23.14**	.152	26.26**	.125	30.12**	.145	14.92**
FY1998	.144	21.81**	.137	23.94**	.158	29.79**	.141	13.13**
FY1999	.131	18.29**	.118	20.46**	.126	25.09**	.145	11.16**
FY2000	.125	11.87**	.119	12.71**	.140	15.90**	.118	7.62**
FY2001	.132	3.76**	.139	6.84**	.137	1.43	.122	3.19*
constant		-.858		5.69*		8.76**		6.28**
Mean dependent variable	27.29		33.25		31.23		19.49	
Observations	10,300	10,300	3,333	3,333	2,934	2,934	4,033	4,033

a. The race/ethnic variables are incorrect in the FY03 accession data; thus, we omitted FY03 accessions from the regression analysis.

b. \* significant at 5% level;  
\*\* significant at 1% level.

c. We are unsure of the quality of the Army citizenship data, so our combined sample only includes Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps non-citizen accessions who are observed becoming citizens by September 2003.

d. Omitted category is Marine Corps.

e. Omitted category is white.

f. Omitted category is high school diploma graduate (HSDG).

g. Omitted category is 18 years of age at accession.

h. Omitted categories are male, non-A-cell recruits, and no dependents at accession.

i. Omitted category is FY02 accessions.

## References

- [1] U.S. Census Bureau. *Foreign-Born Population of the United States Current Population Survey - March 1995 Detailed Tables*. 12 Sep 2000. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/foreign/for95dtabs.html>>
- [2] Luke J. Larsen. *The Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2003: Population Characteristics*. P20-551, Aug 2004
- [3] Bruce Finley. "Military Eyeing 'Unknowns.'" *Denver Post*, 24 Feb 2004
- [4] Valerie Alvord. "Non-citizens fight and die for adopted country." *USA Today*, 8 Apr 2003. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-04-08-noncitizen-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-04-08-noncitizen-usat_x.htm)>
- [5] U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *Estimates of the Legal Permanent Resident Population and Population Eligible to Naturalize in 2002*, Prepared by Nancy F. Ryтина, May 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/lprest2002.pdf>>
- [6] Mary Beth Sheridan. "Anti-Terror Measures Delaying Green Cards." *Washington Post*, 23 Sep 2004, p. A1
- [7] Department of the Army. *Personnel Procurement: Regular Army and Army Reserve Enlistment Program*. Army Regulation (AR) 601-210 28 Feb 1995. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/pdf/r601\\_210.pdf](http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/pdf/r601_210.pdf)>
- [8] Air Education and Training Command. *Recruiting Procedures for the Air Force*. ATEC Instruction 36-2002, 18 Apr 2000

- [9] Lynn O'Neil and Omer Senturk. *Noncitizens in the U.S. Military*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, Mar 2004
- [10] Russell Weigley. *History of the United States Army*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967
- [11] Darlene Goring. "In Service to America: Naturalization of Undocumented Alien Veterans." *Seton Hall Law Review*, 31, 2000: 402
- [12] Anthony Pido. *The Filipinos in America: Macro/Micro Dimensions of Immigration and Integration*. New York: Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc., 1985
- [13] Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. *Military Personnel Procurement Manual, Volume 2: Enlisted Procurement*. MCO P1100.72C/PCN 10200590400, 18 Jun 2004
- [14] Navy Recruiting Command. *Navy Recruiting Manual-Enlisted*. COMNAVCRUITCOMINST 1130.8F, 11 Mar 2002
- [15] Anita U. Hattiangadi, Lewis G. Lee, and Aline O. Quester. *Recruiting Hispanics: The Marine Corps Experience*, Jan 2004 (CNA Research Memorandum D0009071.A2)
- [16] Gina Medsker et al. *U.S. Army Foreign Language Recruiting Initiative (FLRI): Midterm Evaluation, Final Midterm Report*, 6 Oct 2003 (Human Resources Research Organization Report IR 03-54)
- [17] Jeffrey Hickox. *First Term Attrition of Fundamental Applied Skills Training (FAST) Students*. Unpublished thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Mar 1998
- [18] Aline O. Quester et al. *Final Report for CNA Study on Answering Decision Makers' Questions: Organizing Training Information for Policy Analysis*, Jun 1998 (CNA Research Memorandum 98-76)
- [19] Souheila Al-Jadda. "Lost in Arabic Translation." *The Christian Science Monitor*, 16 Sep 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005

- <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0916/p09s01-coop.html>>
- [20] Defense Security Service. "Frequently Asked Questions." updated 15 Aug 2003. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.dss.mil/aboutdss/faq.htm>>
- [21] Interview with Air Force CMSgt Dennis Drogo, AF/DPLAP, Air Force Accession Policy, 25 May 2004
- [22] E-mail exchange with Air Force Capt Sean P. Harrington, Chief, Air Force Assignment & Classification Policy, Sep 2004
- [23] Secretary of the Air Force. "Reenlistment in the United States Air Force." *Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-2606*, 21 Nov 2001. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/pubfiles/af/36/afi36-2606/afi36-2606.pdf>>
- [24] U.S Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. "Quick Military Statistics Reference (Internal)". Received from the Office of Citizenship press office, 22 Nov 2004
- [25] Kelly Wallace. "Bush Speeds Citizenship for Military." *CNN.com*, 3 Jul 2002. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.cnn.com/2002/US/07/03/bush.military.citizenship/>>
- [26] U.S. Army Human Resources Command. "Soldier Citizenship Application Program Update." *MILPER message number 04-157*, 6 May 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.armystudyguide.com/link\\_out/milper\\_messages.htm](http://www.armystudyguide.com/link_out/milper_messages.htm)>
- [27] Donna Miles. "Posthumous citizenships include family benefits." *Air Force Link*, 5 Mar 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?storyID=123007143>>
- [28] Donna Miles. "Posthumous citizenship on 'fast track,' includes family benefit for those killed in time of war." *The Flagship*, 18 Mar 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.flagshipnews.com/archives\\_2004/mar182004\\_9.shtml](http://www.flagshipnews.com/archives_2004/mar182004_9.shtml)>

- [29] Interview with Air Force Col Michael Pachuta and Mr. Bill Gleason, OSD Morale, Welfare, and Recreation, 18 Jun 2004
- [30] U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services, Office of Citizenship. *Naturalization for Military Personnel*. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/graphics/services/natz/MilitaryBrochurev7.pdf>>
- [31] Department of the Air Force. The Air Force Guide to Citizenship Application, Jul 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.afpc.randolph.af.mil/mpf/MPFWorkcenters/Customerservice/BCIS/AF%20Guide%20to%20Citizenship%20%20%20July%202004.doc>>
- [32] Jim Garamone. "DoD Studies Foreign Language Needs of Future." *Armed Forces Information Service*, 22 Jun 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2004/n06222004\\_2004062204.html](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2004/n06222004_2004062204.html)>
- [33] Naval Personnel Command, Center for Career Development. "Selective Reenlistment Bonus Calculator." *Stay NAVY website*. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.staynavy.navy.mil/Tools/SRB/default.asp>> (with stated parameters for current fiscal year)
- [34] U.S. Department of Justice. *Fact Sheet: Child Citizenship Act of 2000 (Public Law 107-395)*, 1 Dec 2000. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/graphics/publicaffairs/factsheets/adopted.htm>>
- [35] U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps. "Immigration Information Center: Immigration & Nationality Law Basics." updated 5 Dec 2001. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.jagcnet.army.mil/8525689200431626>>
- [36] U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. "Now that You Are a Permanent Resident." updated 11 Mar 2003. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/graphics/howdoi/perRes.htm>>

- [37] U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. "How Do I Renew My Permanent Resident Card (Green Card)?" 30 Oct 2003. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/graphics/howdoi/renew.htm>>
- [38] U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. "Forms and Fees." updated 4 Jan 2005. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/graphics/formsfee/forms/index.htm>>
- [39] U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Immigration and Naturalization Act. Section 264, 8 U.S.C. 1304, Updated 30 Oct 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://uscis.gov/lpBin/lpext.dll/inserts/slb/slb-1/slb-21/slb-7146?f=templates&fn=document-frame.htm#slb-act264>>
- [40] U.S. Department of Justice. "Justice Department Moves to Revoke U.S. Citizenship of Former Nazi Ghetto Policeman Who Shot Jews." Press Release, 8 Jan 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2004/January/04\\_crm\\_005.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2004/January/04_crm_005.htm)>
- [41] Pederson & Freedman, LLP. *Your Rights and Duties as a Lawful Permanent Resident of the United States*. 21 May 2003. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.usvisainfo.com/object/pdf/IV/rights\\_duties\\_LPR.pdf](http://www.usvisainfo.com/object/pdf/IV/rights_duties_LPR.pdf)>
- [42] "Born Abroad." *CQ Daily Monitor*, Vol. 36, No. 135, 12 Sep 2000: 7
- [43] U.S. Office of Personnel Management. "Federal Employment of Non-Citizens: Detailed Policy Information with Citations," updated 25 Oct 1999. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.opm.gov/employ/html/Citizen.htm>>
- [44] Social Security Administration. "Supplemental Security Income (SSI) For Noncitizens." SSA Publication #05-11051, Jan 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.ssa.gov/pubs/11051.html>>
- [45] Social Security Administration. "Your Payments While You Are Outside The United States." Based on SSA Publication

#05-10137, Jul 2002. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://www.ssa.gov/international/your\\_ss.html](http://www.ssa.gov/international/your_ss.html)>

- [46] James H. North. *Length of Time in the Delayed-Entry Program and Its Effect on Marine Corps First-Term Survival*, Aug 1990 (CNA Research Memorandum 2790006200)
- [47] James H. North and Adebayo M. Adedeji. *Rankings by Historical Attrition Rates of Potential Marine Corps Recruits*, Sep 1991 (CNA Research Memorandum 2790021910)
- [48] Aline O. Quester et al. *Identifying Successful Marine Corps Recruits*, Apr 1990 (CNA Research Memorandum 2789031410/REV)
- [49] Aline O. Quester. *First-Term Attrition in the Marine Corps*, Mar 1993 (CNA Research Memorandum 2792020000/final)
- [50] William H. Sims. *Personal Characteristics and Military Manpower*, Dec 1974 (CNA Research Memorandum 74-3024)
- [51] Jennie W. Wenger and Apriel K. Hodari. *Predictors of Attrition: Attitudes, Behaviors and Educational Characteristics*, Jul 2004 (CNA Research Memorandum D0010146.A2)
- [52] Interview with Baltimore MEPS PAO, 5 Aug 2004
- [53] Headquarters Departments of the Army, the Air Force, and Marine Corps Order. *Personnel Procurement Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS)*. Army Regulation 601-270/AFR33-7/MCO P-1100.75C, 20 Dec 1999
- [54] Marine Corps Recruiting Command. "New Department of Defense (DoD) Enlistment Waiver Codes Implementation." *MCRC Frost Call 033-99*, 26 Apr 1999. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <[http://sja.hqmc.usmc.mil/lao/Files/Waiver\\_Codes.doc](http://sja.hqmc.usmc.mil/lao/Files/Waiver_Codes.doc)>
- [55] Phone conversation with Bob Phillips, Commander, Navy Recruiting Command, 9 Oct 2004



- [56] U.S. Army Recruiting Command. "Army offering \$7,000 enlistment bonus for translator aides." Press Release, 25 Aug, 2004. Web site accessed Jan 2005 <<http://www.usarec.army.mil/hq/apa/download09Lbonus0804.doc>>
- [57] Phone conversation with Naomi Verdugo, Army Assistant Deputy for Recruiting and Retention, 19 Oct 2004
- [58] Phone conversation with CAPT Gregory Carbajal, DLIELC/LEOE, USAF, 10 Oct, 2004



## List of figures

Figure 1. Population of “recruitable” age, by citizenship status . . . . .	6
Figure 2. Number of green cards issued . . . . .	10
Figure 3. Residency status of the non-citizen 18- to 24-year-old population . . . . .	12
Figure 4. Educational attainment of non-citizens age 18 to 24, by gender . . . . .	13
Figure 5. Educational attainment of legal permanent residents age 18 to 24, by gender. . . . .	14
Figure 6. Educational attainment of non-citizens age 18 to 24 by region of origin. . . . .	15
Figure 7. Educational attainment of LPRs (18-24) by region of origin . . . . .	16
Figure 8. Non-citizens age 18 to 24, high school graduate or better and English language ability . . . . .	18
Figure 9. Number of non-citizen accessions, by service . . . . .	21
Figure 10. Non-citizen accessions as a share of all accessions, by service. . . . .	22
Figure 11. Educational attainment of accessions, by citizenship status . . . . .	23
Figure 12. Non-citizen accessions, by birth country . . . . .	23
Figure 13. Top five foreign birth countries for non-citizen accessions, by service . . . . .	24

Figure 14. Race/ethnic distribution of accessions, by citizenship . . . . .	25
Figure 15. Three-month attrition for non-citizen and citizen recruits, all services . . . . .	56
Figure 16. Numbers of new citizens by fiscal year of citizenship reporting . . . . .	70
Figure 17. Percentage of non-citizen accessions that became U.S. citizens by September 2003 . . . . .	72
Figure 18. Number of new citizens, by service and fiscal year of accession. . . . .	73
Figure 19. Percentage of non-citizen accessions that became citizens by September 2003 . . . . .	74
Figure 20. Rough estimate of time-to-citizenship . . . . .	79
Figure 21. A summary of the attrition rates of citizen and non-citizen servicemembers . . . . .	87

## List of tables

Table 1.	Standard terminology on citizenship and immigration status. . . . .	10
Table 2.	Geographic distribution of LPRs age 18 to 24 . . . .	12
Table 3.	Number of non-citizens age 18 to 24 by region of origin . . . . .	15
Table 4.	English language ability of non-citizens age 18 to 24, . . . . .	17
Table 5.	Clearance requirements for Army and Navy personnel . . . . .	33
Table 6.	Current DoD language capability in investment languages . . . . .	46
Table 7.	Non-citizen accessions, FY95-02, by race/ethnic background . . . . .	53
Table 8.	Three-month attrition estimates by race/ethnicity and citizenship status: FY95–FY02 accessions . . . .	57
Table 9.	Three-month attrition estimates by education, accession waiver, service, and other variables . . . .	58
Table 10.	Marginal effects on 3-month attrition for non-citizen recruits, by service and race/ethnic background: accessions in FY95–FY02 . . . . .	60
Table 11.	Three-month attrition estimates for FY95–FY02 accessions: differences by service . . . . .	60
Table 12.	Marginal effects for 3-month attrition: education and ability background differences by service . . . .	62

Table 13. 36-month attrition estimates by race/ethnicity and citizenship . . . . .	63
Table 14. Attrition estimates by education, accession waiver, service, and other variables . . . . .	64
Table 15. Marginal effects on 36-month attrition for non-citizen recruits: by service and race/ethnic background . . . . .	66
Table 16. 36-month attrition estimates: differences by service. . . . .	66
Table 17. Percentage of non-citizen accessions in each subgroup. . . . .	75
Table 18. Marginal effects for the probability of becoming a U.S. citizen. . . . .	77
Table 19. Estimated months until citizenship. . . . .	81
Table 20. DoD Standard Source documents, . . . . .	90
Table 21. Hostile countries/countries of instability . . . . .	95
Table 22. Some Army MOSs requiring U.S. citizenship . . . . .	97
Table 23. Some Navy ratings requiring U.S. citizenship . . . . .	97
Table 24. Some Air Force AFSCs requiring U.S. citizenship . . . . .	98
Table 25. Some Marine Corps MOSs requiring U.S. citizenship . . . . .	98
Table 26. Variable definitions . . . . .	103
Table 27. Logistic regressions for 3-month attrition . . . . .	105
Table 28. Logistic regressions with non-citizen race/ethnic interactions for 3-month attrition: FY95-FY02 accessions . . . . .	107

Table 29. Mean values and marginal effects from the 3-month attrition logit regression: FY95 to FY02 accessions . . . . .	109
Table 30. Marginal effects from the 36-month attrition logit regression: FY95–00 accessions . . . . .	111
Table 31. Mean values and marginal effects from becoming a U.S. citizen logit regressions: FY95-FY02 non-citizen accessions, . . . . .	113
Table 32. Mean values and coefficients from time-to-citizenship regressions: FY95 to FY02 non-citizen accessions who became U.S. citizens while in the military, . . . . .	115







